



Distr.: For participants only
14 March 2013

English only

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

Sixty-ninth session

Bangkok, 25 April-1 May 2013

Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

**Final review of the conference structure of the
Commission, including its subsidiary structure, pursuant
to resolutions 64/1 and 67/15**

Evaluation of the Conference Structure of the Commission

* E/ESCAP/69/L.1.

EVALUATION OF THE CONFERENCE STRUCTURE OF THE COMMISSION

Evaluation Team's Report
February 2013

Commissioned by ESCAP secretariat

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Evaluation Team would like to extend its heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Secretary of ESCAP, for taking the initiative to conduct an independent evaluation of the conference structure and for entrusting this task to the members of the Evaluation Team. Similarly, the Evaluation Team is grateful to Mr. Shun-Ichi Murata for his guidance during the evaluation process, and members of the Reference Group consisting of Mr. Adnan Aliani, Ms. Laura Lopez, Mr. Mitchell Hsieh, Mr. Donald Clarke, and Mr. Edgar Dante, for their support and valuable comments.

The Evaluation Team would like to thank all those who have contributed to the finalization of this evaluation report. In particular, the team would like to thank Mr. Donald Clark and Mr. Edgar Dante of the Programme Planning and Partnerships Division, ESCAP, and Ms. Laura Melchiade and Ms. Chulaluck Sridama, for their assistance during this evaluation.

The Evaluation Team would also like to express their great appreciation for the many individuals who devoted their valuable time to participate in the interviews and discussions. At the heart of this evaluation are the Member States and the Evaluation Team would like to convey their deepest gratitude to all the representatives and honourable delegates who went beyond the line of duty to ensure that the voice of the Asia-Pacific reverberates in this report strongly and clearly. A list of those who were formally consulted and interviewed during the evaluation is provided in Annex.

Finally, the Evaluation Team would like to thank the regional United Nations agencies, who demonstrated their commitment to work under the banner of 'one UN' and to contribute to this report.



Dr. Hafiz Pasha
Lead Evaluator



Ms. Geetha Karandawala
Associate Evaluator



Mr. Teemu Puutio
Research Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 2 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | 3 |
| LIST OF ACRONYMS | 4 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 10 |
| 1.1. Background of the evaluation | 10 |
| 1.2. Purpose, objectives and outputs | 10 |
| 1.3. Scope of the evaluation | 12 |
| 2. METHODOLOGY | 14 |
| 2.1. Description of methodology | 14 |
| 2.2. Limitations | 17 |
| 3. FINDINGS | 18 |
| 3.1. General – Conference Structure | 18 |
| 3.2. Commission Session | 21 |
| 3.3. Committees | 25 |
| 3.4. Ad Hoc Ministerial and other intergovernmental meetings | 28 |
| 3.5. Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives | 29 |
| 4. CONCLUSIONS..... | 34 |
| 5. RECOMMENDATIONS | 35 |
| ANNEXES | 45 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ACPR | Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives and Other Representatives Designated by Members of the Commission (ESCAP) |
| APBF | Asia-Pacific Business Forum |
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| ECOSOC | Economic and Social Council |
| ESCAP | Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| LDCs | Least Developed Countries |
| LLDCs | Landlocked Developing Countries |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| RI | Regional Institutions |
| RCM | Regional Coordination Mechanism |
| SROs | Subregional Offices (ESCAP) |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Regional Context

The Asia-Pacific region is the largest region of the world, with a population approaching 4 billion. It has been the fastest growing region in economic terms, with a growth rate 4 percentage points above the global average. But there has been variable progress on the Millennium Development Goals; while East Asia is on track, South Asia is off-track on some of the goals. This is a reflection primarily of the absence of inclusive development. Inequalities have widened not only within countries but also among countries. Asian LDCs have only achieved a growth rate less than half the regional average. Today, Asia-Pacific still accounts for two-thirds of global poverty.

In recent years, recession in countries of the European Union and slow growth in USA have led to a fall in the growth rate of developing country exports from 13% in 2010 to 4% in 2012. Asia-Pacific's export growth has been affected as these countries account for 33% of the regions' exports. Consequently, the region's economic growth rate has fallen by almost 2 percentage points.

Simultaneously, foreign direct investment and other private financial flows into developing countries of Asia-Pacific are estimated by the IMF to have fallen by 63% and net overseas development assistance by 66% from the previous year in 2012. The Fund highlights the considerable uncertainty about future growth of the global economy and projects the region's growth rate at between 3 and 6%, down sharply from 8.5% in 2010.

In addition, energy supplies are emerging as a binding constraint to future growth, especially in South Asia. Stagnant exports and relatively high oil prices are affecting the balance of payments of many Asian countries, but the IMF is largely focused on the financial crisis in the European Union.

At this time, there is need to focus on a development strategy which indigenizes more the process of growth within the region. This will involve the promotion of regional integration among countries of Asia-Pacific with focus on intra-regional trade and investment flows, South-South cooperation and transfer of technology. Within countries, domestic demand will have to be one of the prime drivers of growth.

Therefore, at this historical juncture, when the Asia-Pacific makes a transition from globalization to regionalization, the ESCAP has a vital role to play as the prime inter-governmental organization of the region. It is in this context that proposals have to be formulated for appropriate changes in the Conference Structure of the Commission, to help in the achievement of the following:

- Sustaining economic growth of the region in a slow-growing global economy
- Promoting inclusive development, especially for achieving faster poverty reduction
- Focusing on sustaining development, especially on energy and water resources

- Enhancing resilience, in the face of higher incidence of large natural disasters in the region

Member states have identified the same challenges in their responses to the questionnaire

| <i>Identified challenges</i> | <i>% of respondent countries (48 responses in total from 30 countries)</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Inclusive development (including poverty reduction) | 83 |
| Sustainable development | 61 |
| Development of regional public goods and infrastructure (energy, transport etc.) | 56 |
| Development of resilience against natural disasters and climate change | 50 |

The leadership of ESCAP has already been emphasising the above themes. Therefore, there is no doubt about the relevance of the Commission agenda today. What is required is more effective projection and operationalization of the themes, especially through the Conference Structure of ESCAP.

The Evaluation Process

Vide resolution 64/1 passed in 2008, the Member States took action to ensure that ESCAP's Conference Structure operates effectively and efficiently and that the Conference Structure is conducive to achieving the abovementioned goals. Through the resolution, the Member States decided to conduct a review of this Conference Structure and requested the Executive Secretary to submit to the sixty-ninth session a report analyzing the functioning of the Conference Structure in order to facilitate the review.

A midterm review was conducted earlier at the sixty-seventh session of the Commission, based on a report submitted by the Executive Secretary focusing in particular on whether the Conference Structure had served the purpose of improving efficiency and attracting higher and wider representation from members and associate members. The Commission's midterm review led to the adoption of resolution 67/15, which, among other things to be considered at the final review, requested the Executive Secretary to carry out further study and analysis.

In essence, this evaluation report is the culmination of the review process first conceived of in 2008 and it aims to contribute to the assessment of the overall functioning of the conference structure. This report also explores the views of Member States concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of the Conference Structure and formulates recommendations which aim to make the Conference Structure increasingly effective and efficient.

This report encapsulates the wealth of information, data and views of not only the Member States of ESCAP but also of the UN agencies and representatives of the Private Sector and Civil Society who share a common interest in ESCAP's activities. The evaluation, including a set of interviews, bilateral discussions and structured questionnaires, was conducted during a period of five months spanning from October 2012 to February 2013.

The Findings and conclusions

The findings of this report corroborate the sentiment that time has come to enable ESCAP to perform more effectively its role as the most representative body for the Asian and Pacific region and its comprehensive mandate as the main economic and social development centre of the United Nations system for the Asian and Pacific region.

Other specific areas include the duration of the Commission Session, which the Member States have indicated could be shortened to five days. The Secretariat's efforts in moving towards paper smart sessions and strengthening the utilization of video-conferencing and other modern technologies including the social media, were validated by the responses, and the Member States saw further potential for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Conference Structure through further endeavors towards paper smart sessions.

The Evaluation Team also observed that while the Member States are generally satisfied with ESCAP's Committee structure certain adjustments could prove beneficial in terms of facilitating the efficiency and effectiveness, including streamlining and shortening the Committee Sessions, and strengthening the Committees' capacity to work together on cross cutting issues. In the context of cross cutting work in particular, the Evaluation Team noted that further endeavors to involve other UN agencies and other stake holders where appropriate was held as desirable by the stakeholders of the evaluation.

Recommendations

Based on the terms of reference and the process of evaluation, described above, the Evaluation Team makes the following key recommendations¹ on the Conference Structure of the Commission:

COMMISSION SESSION

1. Reduce duration of Commission Session from seven days to five days (Monday to Friday)
2. Have overarching themes for the whole Session, for 2014 a possible choice of theme is "Promoting Regional Integration"
3. Establishment of Inter-Divisional Task Forces within the Secretariat on relevant themes especially including the theme topic for the Commission Session
4. Merge the Theme Study with the Economic and Social Survey

¹ The basis for making the recommendations is also described in detail later in the report

5. Expand Special Body coverage to include LDCs, LLDCs and Small Island countries every year
6. Organize a one day preparatory session prior to the Special Body meeting of the Commission Session
7. Invite global/regional head of relevant UN Agency (depending upon the theme) for High-Level Panel
8. SROs to organize preparatory meetings prior to the Commission Session at the sub-regional level, with participation by civil society and the private sector
9. Organize annual ESCAP distinguished lecture on the theme of the Commission Session by a world expert as a special event at the end of the first day of the Ministerial Segment
10. Invite corporate leaders from region for a special session on the role of the private sector in relation to the theme
11. Invite Civil Society Organizations to showcase their work in exhibitions held during the Commission Sessions
12. Promote stronger media coverage at sub-regional and national levels
13. Resolution topics to evolve from substantive deliberations between Member State
14. Draft resolutions should normally be introduced two weeks prior to Commission Sessions
15. Resolutions to explicitly indicate actions by Member States and the Secretariat respectively with measurable outcomes and reporting modalities

COMMITTEES

16. Constitute new committee on Energy
17. ICT committee to be converted to Technology Committee
18. Each committee to meet every alternate year. However, where a particular topic becomes an urgent issue to the region, the Commission may mandate a specific Committee or multiple Committees to meet in the gap year.
19. Committee meetings to be reduced to two to two and half days
20. Extra half a day or one day to be used for joint meetings of the Committees to enable thematic discussions
21. Invite participation of civil society and the private sector in Committee Meetings

ACPR

22. Quarterly meetings with more informal sessions on topical subjects, especially prior to the Commission Session
23. ACPR to review periodically the work of SROs and RIs
24. Increase participation by video conference of Pacific Island countries
25. ACPR may follow up and report implementation of resolutions by Member States

REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

26. Regional institutions to be further integrated into the subprogrammes
27. The governing council and technical committee to be merged into one steering committee which will be chaired by the host country and which will report to the relevant Committees as appropriate

EXPERT GROUP MEETINGS

28. Secretariat to facilitate Member State nomination of experts from their countries to Expert Group meetings, and to more effectively distribute information on topic, date and outcome of meeting.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation

This final report contains the observations, findings, recommendations and conclusions generated during the evaluation of the Conference Structure of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), conducted during October 2012 – February 2013.

ESCAP is headquartered in Bangkok as the most representative body for the Asian and Pacific region and its comprehensive mandate as the main economic and social development centre of the United Nations system for the Asian and Pacific region and it has a membership of 53 members and nine associate members. It is the largest United Nations body serving the Asia-Pacific region, and provides the only intergovernmental forum to discuss issues of concern in a region stretching from Turkey in the west to Fiji in the east. The current intergovernmental Conference Structure was adopted by member States through resolution 64/1, and comprises the following: the Commission which meets each year in April or May; eight sectoral committees, with four of the eight meeting in alternate years; and any other ad hoc ministerial conferences or other intergovernmental meetings decided by the Commission. Five regional institutions also fall under the auspices of the Commission.

The Commission discusses and deliberates on issues pertaining to inclusive, sustainable and resilient economic and social development in the region, deciding on the recommendations of its subsidiary bodies and of the Executive Secretary, and any other administrative or budgetary issues related to its work. Delegations include officials from across government ministries; the composition of delegations may vary from session to session, reflecting the annual theme of the Commission Session, which is decided upon by the Commission, in consultation with the secretariat and the Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives and Other Representatives Designated by Members of the Commission (ACPR).

This structure of the Commission is supported by the ACPR. It advises and guides the Executive Secretary on the work of the Commission, its subsidiary bodies and the secretariat.

1.2. Purpose, objectives and outputs

Through resolution 64/1, the Commission decided to conduct, at its sixty-ninth session, a review of this conference structure, including its subsidiary structure, taking into account the outcome of the midterm review. The Commission requested the Executive Secretary to submit to the sixty-ninth session a report analyzing the functioning of the Conference Structure in order to facilitate the review.

The midterm review was conducted at the sixty-seventh session of the Commission, based on a report submitted by the Executive Secretary focusing in particular on whether the Conference Structure had served the purpose of improving efficiency and attracting higher and wider representation from members and associate members. The Executive Secretary's report was based in part on the monitoring and evaluation of the Conference Structure and its link to the programme priorities of the Commission also requested in resolution 64/1.

The Commission's midterm review led to the adoption of resolution 67/15, which, among other things to be considered at the final review, requested the Executive Secretary to carry out further study and analysis, and to submit the findings, especially on the following issues:

- The duration of the Commission Session in order to gain efficiencies in time and cost;
- The governance structure of the regional institutions vis-à-vis the respective roles and relevant mandates of the Commission, the committees and the governing councils;
- With a view to further integrating the regional institutions into the work of the relevant subprogram's, the relevance of regional institutions to each subprogramme and committee, and the review of budget allocations to improve support for regional institutions through such mechanisms as staff exchanges and joint projects to support their work;
- The feasibility of promoting and developing the role of the Advisory Committee in order for it to assist the Commission in carrying out and coordinating its tasks during the intersessional period (as per resolution 67/15).

In addition, the Executive Secretary was also asked to formulate a new comprehensive questionnaire to facilitate the final review of the functioning of the Conference Structure of the Commission, and to submit those findings as part of the final review. The resolution also requested further study on proposals for improving the utilization of, and participation in, expert group and other meetings, and possible dissemination of outcomes, in order to engage more fully and constructively with member States and to provide a clearer contribution to the intergovernmental processes.

The following outputs were delivered to the ESCAP secretariat, through the Evaluation Unit of the Programme Planning and Partnerships Division during the evaluation process:

1. Evaluation work plan and framework detailing the approach of the evaluation team
2. Surveys questionnaires and their results
3. First draft and final evaluation reports
4. Presentation on the findings, conclusions and recommendations

It is envisaged that based on this evaluation report, a further report of the evaluation findings and recommendations by the Executive Secretary will be submitted to the Commission at its sixty-ninth session in order to facilitate the Commission's review of its conference structure, including its subsidiary structure.

1.3. Scope of the evaluation

This independent evaluation, in line with resolutions 64/1 and 67/15, assessed the efficiency of the Conference Structure as set out in resolution 64/1 and its ability to attract higher and wider representation from its members and associate members.

The specific objectives of this assessment were:

- (i) To assess the overall functioning of the conference structure, including its efficiency, as set out in resolution 64/1;
- (ii) To determine the effectiveness of the Conference Structure in attracting higher and wider, and more relevant, representation from its members and associate members;
- (iii) To examine the issues highlighted in resolution 67/15 for further study and analysis; and
- (iv) To formulate concrete, action-oriented recommendations to strengthen the overall functioning of the conference structure.

The evaluation assessed the overall functioning of the Conference Structure using the evaluation criteria and questions stated below:

- **EFFECTIVENESS**

- How could the Conference Structure be strengthened as a key intergovernmental forum to consider issues related to inclusive and sustainable and social development in the Asia and the Pacific region?
- How could the Conference Structure be better utilized as a platform to highlight current development needs and priorities of the region?
- To what extent has the Conference Structure been effective in attracting higher and wider representation from member and associate members?
- How could the Conference Structure be enhanced to promote greater participation of and contributions from other relevant intergovernmental and international (including the UN system) organizations at the regional and subregional levels?
- To what extent has the closer integration of the Special Body sessions into the Conference Structure been effective in highlighting the Pacific and LDC priorities and concerns?
- To what extent do the organizational and meeting patterns/formats of the Conference Structure enable member States to participate fully in the deliberations?
- How could the servicing of the Conference Structure by the secretariat be strengthened to facilitate effective outcomes?
- To what extent does the governance structure of the regional institutions vis-à-vis the respective roles and relevant mandates of the Commission, the committees and the governing councils promote greater integration of the regional institutions into the work of the relevant subprogrammes and committees. (As required by paragraph 19b and 19c of resolution 67/15)

- How could the budgetary and staffing resources of the regional institutions be further enhanced to support their work? (As required by paragraph 19c of resolution 67/15)
- To what extent it is feasible to promote and develop the role of the Advisory Committee in order for it to assist the Commission in carrying out and coordinating its tasks during the intersessional period? (As required by paragraph 19d of resolution 67/15)

- **EFFICIENCY**

- What is the optimal frequency and duration of the Commission Session to gain further efficiencies in time and cost?
- What further measures could be taken to move towards paper smart sessions of the Commission and its conference structure?
- What is the optimal number and areas of focus of intergovernmental Committees?
- How could the benefits of attendance at the intergovernmental meetings by the member States be enhanced to justify the costs (travel, time, opportunity cost of absence from the office)?
- How could the communication between the secretariat and member States between Commission Sessions be further strengthened to contribute to the effective and efficient functioning of the Commission Session?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Description of methodology

The Evaluation Team comprised of a Lead Evaluator, an Associate Evaluator and a Research Assistant. The team undertook a transparent and participatory evaluation process that involved staff and representatives from Member States, the private sector, the civil society and the United Nations agencies. It is important to note that the observations, key findings, conclusions and recommendations within this report are based on the information and views gathered from the Member States. However, the report and the quality of its contents largely benefited from the participation of all stakeholders. The evaluation process complied with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and data analysis standards as set out in ESCAP's M&E Guidelines².

The data used and analyzed during the evaluation process was gathered with a mixed approach of both qualitative and quantitative methods, including the following:

1. Desk research and analysis of:

- The Conference Structure of the other regional commissions;
- ESCAP's programme, conference and secretariat structure;
- ESCAP's mandates and reform initiatives over the past decade;
- Recent evaluations of the ESCAP regional institutions, subregional offices and subprogrammes;
- ESCAP strategic documents including the strategic framework and programme of work;
- Survey assessments of previously held Committee and Commission Sessions;
- Survey assessments of previously held ad hoc and other intergovernmental meetings;
- All other documents or information sources that were deemed relevant for the purposes of this evaluation;

2. Semi-structured interviews of ESCAP staff

- Executive Secretary;
- Deputy Executive Secretary;
- Division/Office Chiefs;
- Professional and support staff of the secretariat;
- Former Secretaries of the Commission and Programme Management Division Chiefs;

3. Semi-structured interviews of representatives of Member States

² Accessible through: www.unescap.org/pmd/evaluation/evaluation_system.asp

- Bangkok-based Permanent Representatives and other representatives at the working level;
- Subregional focus groups conducted through a mechanism appropriate for each subregion;

4. *Structured comprehensive questionnaire were sent to the following categories of stakeholders:*

- Representatives of Member States;
- Representatives of United Nations agencies;
- Representatives of the Private Sector;
- Representatives of the Civil Society;
- ESCAP staff members;

In choosing the sources for information and the interviewees the Evaluation Team paid special attention to gather a balanced and representative set of data in accordance with the following considerations:

- Geographical distribution of respondents;
- Economic distribution of respondents;
- Capturing the views and voices of all sub regions;
- Capturing the views of both vocal and non-vocal Member States with particular focus on LDCs, LLDCs and Pacific Island States;

The timeline of the evaluation process is described in the following table.

| ACTIONS BY THE EVALUATION TEAM | TIME PERIOD |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Desk reviewed relevant documents (TOR, relevant resolutions and other documents, summary results of past Conference Structure surveys, relevant ESCAP evaluation reports, etc.) | 1-5 October 2012 |
| Met with the evaluation team and held discussions with the ESCAP Reference group and ESCAP management on the evaluation scope and methodology | 1-5 October 2012 |
| Developed a detailed evaluation framework and workplan for review and approval by the ESCAP Reference Group | 1-5 October 2012 |
| Organized consultations and focus group discussions with ESCAP management and staff and representatives from the member States | 8-19 October 2012 |
| Developed and implemented a comprehensive survey questionnaire | 8-19 October 2012 |
| Reviewed summary results of interviews, meetings and survey questionnaires, including those conducted for intergovernmental meetings held from 2009 to 2012. | 22-25 October 2012 |
| Drafted an evaluation report in accordance with Annex I and II of the attached terms of reference and make revisions based on feedback from the Reference Group. | November 2012 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Held the presentation of the preliminary findings to ESCAP management and member States. | December 2012 |
| Presented preliminary findings to ESCAP management and made a presentation at ACPR session. | 14-31 January 2013 |
| Finalized the evaluation report and presented the document at ACPR session. | February 2013 |

The rating percentages presented in this chapter were derived from the actual questionnaire responses by the following methodology formulated by the Lead Evaluator in order for the Evaluation Team to more fully present the nuances within the questionnaire responses. The following box provides an example of how the rating percentages were derived.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Example of how scores were derived | Response scale 1-5 1: "To a great extent" - best rating 5: "Not at all" - worst rating |
| Formula for calculating percentage: | Score = $\frac{\text{Maximum} - \text{actual}}{\text{Maximum} - \text{Minimum}} \times 100\%$ |
| An example for calculating the percentage for the best response "1": | $= \frac{(5-1) \times 100}{(5-1)}$ $= \frac{4 \times 100}{4}$ $= 100\%$ |
| The individual percentages formulated in this manner were then aggregated to create regional and subregional averages with the following formula: | $\frac{\text{Sum of responses}}{\text{Number of responses}}$ |

2.2. Limitations

A limitation to this evaluation process was the limited timeframe for gathering the background data, including the views of the Member States. In addition, the timing of the evaluation process entailed long overlaps with the holiday periods of the Member States, requiring follow-up and data gathering.

The Evaluation Team is of the view that the abovementioned limitations have not negatively affected the evaluation process and that the evaluation is based on a representative set of information and data from a diverse stakeholders.

3. FINDINGS

This section contains the many findings and observations that emerged from the extensive consultation process. All in all, 48% of the Member States responded to the questionnaire with representation from all sub-regions. Nine UN agencies and a number of private sector entities and CSOs also responded to the questionnaire. Interviews were held with representatives of Member States prior to the distribution of the survey questionnaire and subsequent to analysing its results. In addition, a teleconference was held with the representatives of the Pacific Island States based in Suva and several key subregional organizations including the Pacific Secretariat. Extensive consultation was also held with staff, in order to obtain the views and ensure ownership on their part in the reform of the Conference Structure which they serve, particularly to see the practicality of the recommendations. However, the findings below are primarily based on the views of the Member States and the ideas derived from these views by the evaluation team. The evaluation team has taken note of the initiatives undertaken and the contributions made by the Secretariat in strengthening the Conference Structure during the period under review.

3.1. General – Conference Structure

Finding 1

Countries participating in the survey have confirmed positively that the Conference Structure has contributed to fulfilling the Commissions mandate as the main economic and social development centre in the United Nations system for Asia and Pacific region, with an average score of 80%.

| The Conference Structure has contributed to fulfilling ESCAP’s mandate as the main economic and social development centre of the United Nations system for the Asian and Pacific region | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Rating % (48 responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 78 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 90 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 61 |
| South and South-West Asia | 83 |
| Overall average | 80 |

Finding 2

Member States are of the view that while the challenges faced by countries are cross cutting and thematic in nature, the subsidiary structure of the Commission (eight Committees) is sectoral in nature and this is also reflected in the structure of the secretariat with corresponding divisions. Measures should thus be put in place to enhance the thematic focus and reduce the tension between thematic and sectoral needs.

Finding 3

Countries have also identified several regional and subregional initiatives that ESCAP should undertake to respond to emerging issues and challenges presented below. The listing includes only the six initiatives ranked highly by most Member States.

- a) Capacity building and technical cooperation;
- b) Promote regional integration;
- c) Sharing of experiences;
- d) Promote public – private partnerships;
- e) Encourage Dialogues among stake holders;
- f) Strengthen outreach;

Finding 4

The majority of survey responses and consultation results also highlighted the importance of “relevance” in the substantive issues to be deliberated, and the need for clear outcomes/actions and follow up, as key factors in enabling the Conference Structure to contribute to achieving the mandate of the commission. This brings to light the importance of high quality research and analysis, topical discussion, the need for flexibility, and the importance of clear and concise resolutions and their effective follow up.

Finding 5

A significant amount of countries have also highlighted the need to undertake deeper policy analysis at subregional level in close consultation with member countries.

Finding 6

The majority of Member States agree that ESCAP is viewed as the most representative body for the Asia and the Pacific Region by countries. However, the Member States have highlighted the existence of other forums, such as ASEAN, SAARC and APEC, which though not as representative would have competing interest for countries and accordingly the need for ESCAP to have a unique selling point.

During consultations Member States have identified that the key documents prepared for the Commission should contain cutting edge results, deep analysis and policy options and that the research capacity of the secretariat could be focused on one overarching theme that could be brought out with ample time for Member States to study and reflect.

In the changing landscape of the Asia Pacific region ESCAPs strength is seen to be its ability to bring a sense of inclusion amongst member countries that have been able to forge ahead in economic development and members who are yet to enjoy such economic development.

With some adjustment of the way the conference meetings are organized it would be possible for Member States to formulate positions at the subregional level. The Conference Structure can also be better utilized to enable countries with special needs to give voice to their concerns and priorities and provide a platform for dialogue between such groups as well as with other Member States.

Finding 7

In recent years, ESCAP has made commendable efforts to involve a more varied set of stakeholders in the various meetings and sessions organized within its Conference structure. The Member States have expressed their desire to not only continue engaging representatives from the private sector and civil society but also involve them in a more interactive manner than in the past in the form of open sessions for example. The scores on the related question are given below.

It is observed that while time available at the Commission Session may not allow them to speak at the session, their voices could be brought in to the deliberation and the results and analysis in the commission documents. Their voices can also feed into the deliberations of the Committee Sessions.

| Advisory inputs from a more varied set of stakeholders (private sector, civil society, etc.) are beneficial to ensure that ESCAP’s thematic focus is accurate and in line with the promotion of sustainable development in the region. | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(49 responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 74 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 80 |
| North and Central Asia | 92 |
| Pacific | 64 |
| South and South-West Asia | 71 |
| Overall average | 75 |

3.2 Commission Session

Finding 1

Member States have confirmed positively that the current structure of the Commission is effective in fulfilling its function with an average score of 81%. Member States are of the view that the incorporation of the special body sessions into the main Commission Session has considerably improved the visibility of the concerns and priority needs of the more vulnerable members of the Commission and also enabled them to interact and bring to the attention of other Members their challenges and opportunities. In addition, the Member States are of the view that the incorporation of the special body sessions into the main commission has positively contributed to the Conference Structure, as shown below.

| The current structure of the Commission Session, as shown in Annex 1, is effective in fulfilling its function. | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(48 responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 77 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 86 |
| North and Central Asia | 100 |
| Pacific | 66 |
| South and South-West Asia | 80 |
| Overall average | 81 |

| The incorporation of the Special Body sessions into the main Commission Sessions have been effective in highlighting the priorities and concerns of Pacific Island States and LDCs and LLDCs. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(40 responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 76 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 83 |
| North and Central Asia | 96 |
| Pacific | 67 |
| South and South-West Asia | 75 |
| Overall average | 78 |

Finding 2

Data collected during the review period 2008-2012 shows that an average of 77% of Member States attended the Commission Sessions. On an average the Commission Sessions attracted 24 participants at the ministerial level. 28% of countries have specifically indicated that they are satisfied with the level of participation at Commission Sessions. Member States have also highlighted significant obstacles for wider and higher level participation. Apart from financial issues the key requirement is “relevance”. Other issues include timing or length, cost effectiveness, inadequate benefits to policy makers, and understanding the process for nominations.

The issue of “relevance” is inevitably linked to several issues including the following:

- a) relevance of the theme of the commission;
- b) relevance, clarity and value of the documents;
- c) The interactive nature of discussion and the opportunities for participation;
- d) clear and measurable outcomes;
- e) follow up and monitoring of the outcomes;

Finding 3

While there is opportunity for intervention by Member States the current agenda does not seem to facilitate discussion amongst delegates. The importance of such discussion on emerging issues, and the need for minimum reporting by divisions have been highlighted by Member States during the consultative process.

Finding 4

The more vulnerable Member States have expressed their views that their gathering at the Commission Session could be better utilized by having independent meetings of the LDCs, LLDCs and Pacific Island Countries on the day preceding the senior officials segment. The outcomes of this meeting could be reported to the special body meeting. Member States with special needs have also expressed the view that the special body should explore issues relevant to all groups each year.

Finding 5

The Member States have confirmed that the Ministerial round table and high level panel facilitates discussion at Commission Session, giving a score of 76% in the survey.

During the consultative process Member States suggested that the interactive nature as well as the quality of deliberations could be further enhanced.

| The Ministerial roundtables and high-level panels facilitate interactive discussions at the Commission Session. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Rating %(40responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 73 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 78 |
| North and Central Asia | 83 |
| Pacific | 61 |
| South and South-West Asia | 85 |
| Overall average | 76 |

Finding 6

55% of countries favour April to June as the ideal timing for the Commission Session for a variety of reasons, particularly due to timing of parliamentary peak sessions and as it enables the reporting of most recent decisions of the commission to ECOSOC in July.

As to the duration of the Commission Session the majority preference is 5 days (see Figure 1 below).




Figure 1 – Preference for duration of Commission Session as per member States participating in the survey in percentages

Finding 7

Moving towards paper smart sessions was identified by 28% of countries as essential to moving towards enhancing ESCAPs conference structure.

Finding 8

To the question on whether the resolutions adopted at the Commission Session are translated into national implementation countries gave an average score of 63% which is lower in comparison to the rating of the other questions, as shown below:

| The resolutions adopted at the Commission Session are translated into national implementation. | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score % (40responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 65 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 81 |
| North and Central Asia | 92 |
| Pacific | 43 |
| South and South-West Asia | 55 |
| Overall average | 63 |

The resolutions being the key outcome of the commission play a critical role in determining the effectiveness of the Commission Session. The survey results as well as the consultations have highlighted the need to bring greater clarity and substance to the resolutions. It is apparent that in some instances resolutions contain directions for the secretariat to follow and very little by way of commitments of what member countries undertake to do.

To the question on whether the committees are effective in monitoring the implementation of resolutions countries gave 72% (see also section on Committees), as shown below.

| The Committees are effective in monitoring the status of implementation of resolutions. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(.0responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 69 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 70 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 56 |

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| South and South-West Asia | 67 |
| Overall average | 72 |

To the question on the systems in place nationally to monitor the implementation of ESCAP resolutions countries have identified the ministries that are focal points for ESCAP and are responsible for the implementation of resolutions. It is clear however that few countries have a specific system of implementing the resolutions adopted at the Commission Sessions and a mechanism to follow up and report. The periodic reporting and updating undertaken by the Secretariat is limited to the Secretariat's own implementation of resolutions.

Following are some of the key challenges that have been identified in ensuring relevant and clear resolutions that would contribute to the effectiveness of the Commission Sessions.

- Delayed submissions of resolutions by countries ;
- Lack of clarity in outcomes (operative paragraphs);
- Lack of capacity amongst some countries in clear drafting;
- Perception that the secretariat at times initiate resolutions ;
- Lack of follow up;

3.3 Committees

Finding 1

Countries confirm with a score of 82% that the Committee meetings are effective in fulfilling their functions, including reviewing and analyzing regional trends, identifying priorities and emerging issues and promoting regional dialogue, as shown below:

| The Committee meetings are effective in fulfilling their functions, including reviewing and analyzing regional trends, identifying priorities and emerging issues and promoting regional dialogue. | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(40responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 75 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 85 |
| North and Central Asia | 100 |

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Pacific | 61 |
| South and South-West Asia | 90 |
| Overall average | 82 |

Finding 2

The current eight committees had been established after a period of “thematic” operation where sectoral divisions were pooled together under thematic committees which clearly didn’t work well for several reasons. The reasons include the difficulties that countries faced in identifying suitable delegates to participate at the meeting due to the sectoral nature of line ministries. The divisions too faced difficulties in identifying and preparing documents on common themes where they did not arise naturally from the merged subject areas, and the issues were no longer sharp or focused.

During the current evaluation it was found that there was no support for cross cutting thematic committees which could be in addition to or as substitute to the current sectoral committees. While the Member States largely agreed that the current Committee structure covers the key sectoral issues as shown below, there was a shared sentiment that some already covered sectors could be further strengthened, including the energy sector and transfer of technology. During the consultations the majority of the Member States indicated that the Secretariat should focus on key challenges of the region and attempt to address these challenges in its work and when considering its Committee structure.

| The current eight Committees sufficiently cover key regional sectoral/thematic areas concerning inclusive and sustainable economic and social development. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(39responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 80 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 95 |
| North and Central Asia | 100 |
| Pacific | 67 |
| South and South-West Asia | 83 |
| Overall average | 83 |

Finding 3

There was support, however, for the establishment of thematic task forces at the division level which could work on themes that have a cross-cutting nature gathering together and optimizing the multisectoral expertise of the secretariat. Such an approach could institutionalize the growing awareness and progress made by the secretariat to dismantle the silos and work together on cross-cutting issues.

Finding 4

There was also inadequate support for the establishment of a Standing committees and/or Bureaus to facilitate communication and interaction between the stakeholders during the inter-sessional period and it was felt that this would add another layer of bureaucracy, and the secretariat could fulfill this role. The successful Bureau on statistics is attributed to special circumstance where the participants of the committee meetings and the Bureau being Chief Statisticians and this was not necessarily replicable in other committees

Finding 5

The majority of Member States are of the view that committees promote a collaborative approach between government, civil society the private sector and UN agencies, as shown below. Views obtained during the consultations indicate that while the regional co-ordination mechanism has been successful in promoting the work at a technical level, the UN agencies could be more deeply associated with the Committee Session so that they too can optimize the opportunities of the ESCAP intergovernmental forum at the highest level.

| The Committees promote a collaborative approach between government, civil society, the private sector and UN agencies and regional institutions at the regional and subregional level. | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(31responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 73 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 75 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 58 |
| South and South-West Asia | 75 |
| Overall average | 75 |

Finding 6

During the current survey, countries identified the obstacles for wider and higher level of participation in the Committees. 67% of countries identified financial issues as being the main obstacle for participation in Committee Sessions. In contrast 28% of countries identified financial issues as the main obstacle in Commission Sessions. 28% of countries identified relevance as the next factor and 28% expressed their satisfaction at the level of participation.

Other factors identified included cost effectiveness, timing or length, inadequate benefits to policy makers, monopolizing of sessions by some countries, heavy work load of ministry officials, and lack of understanding of the process for nominations.

3.4 Ad Hoc Ministerial and other intergovernmental meetings

Finding 1

The Member State's perceptions are that ESCAP adhoc ministerial meetings address issues relevant to member states, with a score of 77%, as shown below.

| The ESCAP ad hoc ministerial and other intergovernmental meetings have tangible outputs. | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Rating %(35responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 69 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 88 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 61 |
| South and South-West Asia | 85 |
| Overall average | 77 |

Finding 2

Views gathered during the consultative process show that such meetings are most effective when held to prepare regional positions and inputs to global meetings or to review the outcome of global meetings and formulate implementation plans. Such meetings also contribute to enhancing ESCAP's role as a platform to highlight current development needs and priorities.

Finding 3

An ideal number of meetings was not identified by countries and the current number (6 meetings during the year) seems to be sufficient, particularly as such meetings have to be mandated by the Commission. The need to remain focused in the selection of the issues to be deliberated, the number and quality of the supporting documents, and the need to communicate the outcome to all member states subsequent to the meetings were highlighted.

Finding 4

The sense of ownership, the importance of the subject matter for the Member State concerned, timely availability of the documentation are factors that would contribute in determining participation. While participation in person may not be feasible for some countries, video conferencing could be an option.

Finding 5

Joint organization of meetings with UN agencies where appropriate and greater participation of other stake holders were also considered to be factors that would enhance the effectiveness of adhoc Ministerial and other intergovernmental meetings

3.5 Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives

Finding 1

The Advisory committee of Permanent Representatives and other Representatives designated by members of the Commission (ACPR) is recognized as a unique body that amongst other matters facilitates cooperation and consultation between member states and the secretariat. The terms of reference envisages the ACPR, interalia, as a deliberative forum for substantive exchange of views and providing guidance on the formulation of the ESCAP agenda. It also envisages ACPR providing advice and guidance on matters of a procedural nature. Member States have given a score of 79% to the question whether the ACPR effectively fulfils its functions, as shown below.

| The ACPR effectively fulfils its functions as contained in its terms of reference. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score %(23 <i>responses in total</i>) |
| Southeast Asia | 75 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 81 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 63 |
| South and South-West Asia | 85 |
| Overall average | 79 |

Finding 2

Countries have noted that the responsibility for enhanced cooperation is mutual and while ACPR members could be more proactive in engaging more deeply and substantively, the Secretariat could be more proactive in the sharing of information with ACPR and in reporting on the follow-up.

Finding 3

Countries have identified several factors that would enable ACPR to enhance its impact in setting agendas of the committees and Commissions sessions. Not being subject matter specialists ACPR members need to rely on the capitals to provide input on substantive issues and agenda setting and therefore need adequate time to consult with capitals. Accordingly the secretariat needs to provide the documentation well on time to facilitate such consultative process with the capitals. ACPR members also in turn need to endeavour to obtain input from capitals so that the agenda of the Commission, Committees and Intergovernmental meetings could be enriched with views from Member States indicating their priorities.

Finding 4

The agenda of the ACPR meetings and its formal setting is not conducive to interactive discussions between ACPR members and the secretariat, and informal meetings on agenda setting and topical issues would be mutually beneficial.

Finding 5

The ACPR is currently composed of the Permanent Representatives of member and associate member countries based in Bangkok. It thus lacks representation, particularly from Pacific island countries and central Asian Countries. The Member States noted that the limitations in participation could be overcome by utilization of modern conferencing technologies.

Finding 6

It would be beneficial for ACPR to have a full picture of the work of the secretariat including the subregional offices of ESCAP and the Regional Institutions in order to see amongst other matters how the work of these entities fit into the work programme.

Finding 7

The need for clear outcomes from Commission Sessions and follow up of these outcomes and reporting has been highlighted as a key factor in determining the effectiveness of the conference structure. The outcomes of the Commission Session are predominantly in the form of its resolutions. Since the ACPR is deeply involved in the negotiation of draft resolutions in consultation with the capitals, this role could be extended to the follow up and reporting on the implementation of the Commission resolution at a national level.

3.6 Regional Institutions

Finding 1

The Regional Institution falling within the purview of ESCAP have been established by the commission over a period of time, with some, at the initiation of host countries. It is envisaged that they would complement the work programme of ESCAP. The Member States participating in the survey were of view that the Regional Institutions are well integrated into the work of the ESCAP subprogrammes and given a score of 77% to the related question. However, the survey results show a strong desire of amongst countries to strengthen this integration and also bring the work of the Regional Institutions within the purview of the subsidiary structure of the conference, ie the relevant committees. The majority of countries were also of view that the Regional Institution should be supported with staff exchanges and project funding support. The minority view was that they could be independent or be subject to a Zero Budgeting exercise. The sub-regional scores are given below.

| The regional institutions are well integrated into the work of the ESCAP subprogrammes. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Sub-region | Score % (37responses in total) |
| Southeast Asia | 79 |
| East and Northeast Asia | 90 |
| North and Central Asia | 95 |
| Pacific | 66 |
| South and South-West Asia | 67 |
| Overall average | 77 |

Finding 2

It was noted that while each Regional Institution has a particular focus their work activities at times span several subprogrammes and committees and that there is a need to amend the reporting structure to accommodate this cross-cutting nature of many of the Regional Institutions.

If the Regional Institutions are to be well integrated into the work of the subprogrammes then the logical conclusion would be that they have to also come within the purview of the relevant committees. If on the other hand the regional Institutions were to be independent of the subprogrammes and the committee, then there would be a place for a separate governing structure.

3.7 Participation

Finding 1

During the period under review, Ministerial-level attendance has held steady at the Commission Sessions. At the 2009 Commission Session there were 25 Ministerial-level participants present, with 24 at the 2010 session, 24 at 2011 session and 21 at the 2012 session according to available statistics.

The practise of inviting Heads of state /Prime Ministerial level representatives has further enhanced interest in the Commission Session and increased participation.

Finding 2

For the Commission and Committee Sessions, two common threads dominated member States' feedback on encouraging higher and wider participation: (a) advance preparations, such as early distribution of the agenda and relevant pre-session documents which would enable capitals to identify the "correct" and/or "appropriate" participants; and (b) prospect of clearly derived and focused deliberations at the Commission and Committee Sessions.

Other respondents suggested that provision of financial assistance for some qualifying delegations would enable participation by more member States. Member States have also emphasized the importance of advocacy efforts to increase public awareness of the Commission as an important intergovernmental forum and to sensitize policymakers about the work of ESCAP.

Some member States cited the following as factors in deciding on the composition of their delegations to the Commission: their view of ESCAP as a key regional forum, their commitment to participate at the ministerial level and a particular session's theme topic and its relevance to national interests.

Finding 3

Feedback relating to committee meetings mostly mirrored that which concerned Commission Sessions, although respondents also mentioned that Committee Sessions were scheduled too closely to non-ESCAP meetings; it was suggested that the sessions be scheduled further apart. It was also suggested that including agenda items that required decision-making at Committee Sessions could lead to higher representation from line ministries.

Some suggestions have also been made to examine the possibility of having the secretariat organize training programmes or workshops for officials from the capitals on how Governments could benefit from United Nations conferences and meetings in order to give them a better understanding of multilateral conferences and how Governments could better use regional organizations such as ESCAP.

3.7 Expert Group Meetings

Finding 1

Expert Group Meetings are small meetings of experts in a given field, convened by the secretariat for the purpose of obtaining advice and information, and an exchange of experience on a clearly defined subject.

During the consultative process, several countries expressed the view that while they acknowledge the need for the secretariat to fund experts who are recognized in the subject area under consideration, member states may also wish to nominate experts from their countries on a self funded basis, where the topic is of particular relevance, or where they feel that such experts would gain from the deliberations.

Countries have also expressed the view that they would like to receive the conclusions or ideas that have emanated from EGMs.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The rich and diverse nature of responses to the questionnaire and views articulated in meetings by Member States have led to a large number of findings on various components of the Conference Structure. The overall conclusion is that while the Commission continues to be the prime inter-governmental forum in Asia-Pacific it needs to be more effective in performing its role at a time when major changes are taking place in the global economy and the region has to focus more on integration and supporting countries with special needs.

Based on the above findings, 28 key recommendations have been identified which help in achieving the following:

- Enhanced role of Member States;
- Focus on relevant themes and emerging sectors;
- Identification of links between themes, sectors and sub-regions;
- Stronger support to the Conference Structure by the Secretariat;
- Greater integration of different components of the Conference Structure;
- Promotion of “One UN”;
- Participation by a more diversified set of stakeholders;
- Deeper sub-regional engagement of the ESCAP;
- Stronger engagement of the countries with special needs, both regionally and globally;
- Increased awareness of the people of the region of the role and work of the ESCAP;

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The basis for making the recommendations highlighted in the Executive Summary is given below:

Commission Session


Recommendation 1: *Reduce duration of Commission Session from seven days to five days (Monday to Friday)*

As highlighted in the findings, 75% of the responding Member States are in favour of a reduction in the duration of the Commission Session, with the majority of Member States suggesting the duration of five days. The objective is to save on costs and time.

The proposal is for the Commission Session to start on a Monday and end on Friday of the same week. The new structure of the Commission Session is given in Figure 2, which incorporates the following changes:

- I. The Senior Officials segment to be reduced from three to two days, while the length of the Ministerial segment continues to be three days
- II. The panel on survey should come first in order to highlight the broader developments in the region, followed by the panel or round table on the Theme Study
- III. Streamlining the report of the Commission. The report from the senior officials segment could contain only matters that require decisions from the Commission (Committee recommendations, management issues etc.) thereby reducing the time and cost of report writing, translation etc. and reducing the time that has to be allocated for the adoption of the report. The report for the ministerial segment could only contain the resolutions and decisions, rather than the proceedings. The secretariat can keep verbatim accounts of the entire proceedings as audio files as is done in the GA and ECOSOC. See further the diagram containing the present and proposed structure of the Commission Session.

Figure 2 – Proposed new structure of the Commission Session



10

Recommendation 2: *Have overarching theme for the whole Session, for 2014 a possible choice of theme is “Promoting Regional Integration”*

Given the relevance of the themes pursued by ESCAP via Resolution 64/1 and Rio +20, the success of a Commission Session will be enhanced if the accepted theme guides the deliberation and acts as the overarching theme. It is suggested that a possible theme for the 2014 Session is “Promoting Regional Integration”, which may be adopted as the theme at the end of the 2013 Session. The theme approach should be reflected also in the deliberations at the Senior Officials Segment.


Recommendation 3: *Establishment of Inter-Divisional Task Forces within the Secretariat on relevant themes especially including the theme topic for the Commission Session*

In order to address emerging thematic issues within the Secretariat it is recommended that the Secretariat will take action to establish Inter-Divisional Task Forces. Inter-Divisional Task Forces comprise of members of several ESCAP divisions working towards the attainment of specific goals falling under a single cross-cutting theme. The task forces will enable the identification of linkages of different sectors with emerging themes including the theme for the Commission Session and the derived implications for initiatives in different sub-programmes.

In fact, the success of the Commission rests on understanding and maximising the inter linkages between Themes, Sectors, and Sub-Regional focuses, as depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3

THE INTERLINKAGES



6

Recommendation 4: Merge the Theme Study with the Economic and Social Survey

In order to strengthen the thematic relevance of ESCAP’s work and research outputs, it is recommended that the Theme Study is merged with the Economic and Social Survey. This will contribute to greater “buy-in” of the contents of the Flagship report of ESCAP by Member States. By adding the theme selected by Member States, the Survey will be enhanced and provide for a stronger media campaign at the time of launch of the report. This is also the practice followed by other international agencies.

Recommendation 5: *Expand Special Body coverage to include LDCs, LLDCs and Small Island countries every year*

There are 13 LDCs, 12 LLDCs and 17 Small Island countries, accounting for a sizeable portion of the Member States of ESCAP. These countries have already been identified as countries with special needs. They require the forum of UNESCAP to not only build partnerships with other Member States on South-South cooperation but also to project globally the support they need for removing constraints to faster development. For example, while Asia-Pacific LDCs account for an approximate 35% of the global population of LDCs, they get substantially less ODA per capita than LDCs in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Therefore, rather than alternate years, the Special body session should cover annually all three groups of countries with Special Needs. In addition, one chapter of the Survey should be devoted to trends in Asian LDCs and LLDC's highlighting in particular those issues that are relevant to the specific theme of the Commission for that year.

Recommendation 6: *Organize a one day preparatory session prior to the Special Body meeting of the Commission Session*

In order to provide the three groups the opportunity to discuss matters of common concern, it is recommended that there should be a one-full day special body session immediately preceding the Commission, where issues related to all three groups of countries are discussed. In the Senior Officials segment one hour can be devoted to reviewing and discussing key outcomes (chair's summary) of the one-day meeting. Resolutions emanating from the meeting can be put to the working group on draft resolutions.

Recommendation 7: *Invite global/regional head of relevant UN Agency (depending upon the theme) for High-Level Panel*

This is consistent with the objective of promoting "One UN" at the regional level as reiterated in the Quadrennial Review. In their responses to the questionnaire, UN Agencies have expressed their desire to work with ESCAP in advocacy work relating to the realization of particular themes. As such, it is recommended that depending upon the theme of a particular year, the relevant UN agency be associated in the preparation of the Theme Study and the Global/Regional head of the agency be invited to sit and speak on the High-Level Panel in the Commission Session. This collaboration will also facilitate the working of the RCM.

Recommendation 8: *SROs to organize preparatory meetings prior to the Commission Session at the sub-regional level, with participation by civil society and the private sector*

Different sub-regions may have different perspectives on different themes given the diversity of the region as a whole. It will be useful, therefore, to have preparatory meetings of representatives of Member States organized by SROs. This will enable a clearer and stronger articulation of views in the Commission Session and add a "bottom-up" dimension to the process of formulation of resolutions and building consensus. This process will be strengthened by participation of civil society and the private sector in the sub-regional preparatory meetings.

Recommendation 9: *Organize annual ESCAP distinguished lecture on the theme of the Commission Session by a world expert as a special event at the end of the first day of the Ministerial Segment*

A Distinguished Lecture may be held as a special event during the Commission Session possibly on the evening of the first day of the Ministerial Segment, with discussants from the region. This lecture on the theme for the year by a world authority will add to the substantive content and intellectual quality of discussions in the Commission Session.

Recommendation 10: *Invite Corporate Leaders from the region for a special session on the role of the private sector in relation to the theme*

The majority of Member States have indicated that advisory inputs from a varied set of stakeholders is beneficial. The corporate private sector of Asia-Pacific has acted as a major engine of growth and achieved high level of maturity, including recognition of social responsibility. CEOs of major companies (and not only members of APBF) may be invited for a special event on how the private sector can contribute to the realization of the theme for the year. This special event could be held on the evening of the second day of the Ministerial segment. Key private sector representatives can also be invited to participate in panels where appropriate.

Recommendation 11: *Invite Civil Society Organizations to showcase their work in exhibitions held during the Commission Sessions*

Considering the importance of input from varied stake holders, it is suggested that Civil Society Organizations are given the opportunity to partake in the Commission Sessions through exhibitions devoted to showcasing their work, views and concerns.

Recommendation 12: *Promote stronger media coverage at regional and national levels*

The responding Member States have highlighted the need for stronger media coverage. This will be facilitated by the theme-bound nature of the Commission Session and the launch of the Survey Report inclusive of the Theme study.

The media exposure and profile can also be enhanced by pro- active engagement with the media at subregional and country level.

Recommendation 13: *Resolution topics to evolve from substantive deliberations between Member States*

Recommendations being the key outcomes from the Commission Session should address challenges identified by Member States in ESCAP intergovernmental meetings, including ad-hoc ministerial and other intergovernmental meetings, and be channelled through the relevant Committees wherever possible.

Recommendation 14: *Draft resolutions should normally be introduced minimum two weeks prior to Commission Sessions*

In order to enable appropriate deliberation on resolutions, and enable sufficient consultation with Capitals, it is recommended that draft resolutions be introduced within a minimum of two weeks prior to the beginning of the Commission Session. It is however noted, that draft resolutions addressing urgent emerging issues may have to be introduced immediately prior to the Commission Session.

Recommendation 15: *Resolutions to explicitly indicate actions by Member States and the Secretariat respectively with measurable outcomes and reporting modalities*

The need for resolutions to be more action-oriented has been strongly emphasized by the responding Member States. The formulation and implementation of resolutions is one of the litmus tests of the success of the Conference Structure. Early preparation and submission of resolutions will be essential for success.

It is recommended that while the secretariat could continue to report to the commission on the implementation of the resolutions as mandated by the commission, the ACPR could have the role of reporting and providing information and inputs that would feed into the secretariat's report to the Commission

The structure of a typical resolution could be as follows:

Section 1: Preamble

Section 2 (a): Actions by countries themselves

Section 2 (b): Supporting actions by Secretariat and other agencies

Section 3: Reporting mechanism and modalities:

When: At which Commission Session or Committee Session,

How: Countries to report through country papers or respond to questionnaires prepared by Secretariat; Report compiled by Secretariat through secondary sources etc.,

Who: Through whom will the reporting be done (ACPR or the relevant Committee)

Committees

Recommendation 16: *Constitute a new Committee on Energy*

The majority of the Member States have indicated the wish to ensure that ESCAP works on the pressing current and foreseeable challenges of the region. It has been highlighted in the introduction to this report that energy supplies could emerge as one of the binding constraints to growth of the region. The regional character of this issue arises from the likelihood of cross-border trade in the form of oil and gas pipelines from North and East Asia to the rest of the region and within South Asia. Also, research and application of alternative technologies could act as a regional public good. The Secretariat has made a major contribution in the area of development of regional infrastructure on transport. The time has come for similar work in the area of energy, and possible down the road, in water resources.

Recommendation 17: *ICT committee to be converted to Technology Committee*

Given the wide and growing disparities in development within Asia-Pacific, there is substantial scope for transfer of technology, beyond ICT, among countries of the region. This will facilitate the process of a gradual change in the division of labor and industry specialisation. In many cases this could be a “low hanging fruit” for promoting the development of Asia-Pacific LDCs.

Recommendation 18: *Each committee to meet every alternate year. However, where a particular topic becomes an urgent issue to the region, the Commission may mandate a specific Committee or multiple Committees to meet in the gap year.*


Recommendation 19: *Committee meetings to be reduced to two to two and half days*

This will create some space for transition from a narrow sectoral focus to an orientation towards the linkages with themes.

Recommendation 20: *Extra half a day or one day to be used for joint meetings of the Committees to enable thematic discussions*

This will enable focus on interlinkages between sectors and themes, and potentially lead to identification of initiatives which are synergistic and mutually reinforcing in character. An example of how different combinations of Committees can act as building blocks for realization of a particular theme is given in Figure 4.

Figure4
EXAMPLE OF BUILDING BLOCKS TO ADDRESS THEMATIC ISSUES



Recommendation 21: Invite participation of civil society and the private sector in Committee Meetings

The private sector will continue to act as the engine of growth in the region, but will need to be more innovative and dynamic in order to sustain the regional high rate of growth at a time when the rest of the world economy is growing slowly. Civil society has a vital role to play in promoting inclusive and sustainable development and increasing resilience and preparedness against natural disasters. As such, participation of civil society and the private sector will add value to the Committees. Appropriate selection criteria may have to be identified to determine which CSOs are to be invited.

ACPR

Recommendation 22: *Quarterly meetings with more informal sessions on topical subjects, especially prior to the Commission Session*

Member States have emphasised on the need for ACPR meetings with more substantive content and reporting by the Secretariat. It is recommended that while there are quarterly meetings with formal agenda, more informal sessions may be organized for a discussion on topical subjects, especially prior to the Commission Session.

Recommendation 23: *ACPR to review periodically the work of SROs and RIs*

In meetings with permanent representatives of Member States in Bangkok, it was frequently stated that the ACPR does not have adequate knowledge of the work of the RIs and SROs and how this is integrated with the Secretariat. As such, it is recommended that the ACPR may review periodically the work of SROs and RIs.

Recommendation 24: *Increase participation by video conference of Pacific Island countries*

Many of the Pacific Island countries do not participate in ACPR meetings due to the absence of diplomatic representation in Bangkok. It is recommended that participation may be made possible by video conference of designated representatives from Suva SRO.

Recommendation 25: *ACPR may follow up and report implementation of resolutions by Member States*

The ACPR may periodically report on the implementation of resolutions by member States to enable the secretariat to include implementation at the country level in the reports on implementation of resolutions prepared by the secretariat as mandated by the commission or to submit a special progress report to the Commission Session along with the report of the secretariat

Regional Institutions

Recommendation 26: *Regional Institutions to be further integrated into the Sub-Programmes*

Over 90% of the responding Member States have suggested stronger integration of the RIs with the sub-programmes. This will ensure greater focus on the themes, promote synergies and pooling of resources. In particular, the secondment of Secretariat staff to the RIs may be explored.

Recommendation 27: *The governing council and technical committee to be merged into one steering committee to be chaired by the host country and which will report to the committees as appropriate*

Regional institutions have a top-heavy governance structure including a Governing council and a technical committee. Further amendments in the form of removing unnecessary layers of governance structures, in line with the previous assessments of Regional Institutions, could provide further efficiencies in their operation of the Regional Institutions.

Expert group meetings

Recommendation 28: *Secretariat to facilitate Member State nomination of experts from their countries to Expert Group meetings, and to more effectively distribute information on topic, date and outcome of meeting.*

Expert Group Meetings enable the secretariat to seek views of recognized experts and brainstorm and engage in discussion on specialized subjects where external technical input is required. It is therefore necessary for the secretariat to have the flexibility to invite and fund these experts. On the other hand it is also necessary to enable member states to nominate experts who could contribute and benefit from such deliberations, in their personal capacity without governmental responsibility.

In order to facilitate such participation the secretariat is recommended to highlight the details of expert group Meetings in the ESCAP website and also inform ACPR well in time.

The outcomes or ideas emanating from the discussion of EGM's should also be made available in summary form through the ESCAP website, and be made available to Member States on request, apart from being submitted to Committee Sessions or intergovernmental meetings as appropriate.

ANNEXES

- Annex I Terms of Reference
- Annex II List of reviewed documents
- Annex III List of interviewees

Annex I

Evaluation of the Conference Structure of the Commission of ESCAP

Terms of Reference

As per 17 September 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the evaluation

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was originally established on 28 March 1947 as the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), a subsidiary body of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The role of the Commission has been elaborated upon subsequently in various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, ECOSOC and the Commission itself. ECAFE changed its name and orientation in 1973 and since then the Commission has taken the lead in promoting regional cooperation for inclusive and sustainable economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific, a dynamic region characterized by growing wealth, diversity and change, but also to some degree challenged with persistent poverty, environmental degradation, inequality and insecurity.

ESCAP is headquartered in Bangkok as the regional arm of the United Nations and has a membership of 53 members and 9 associate members. It is the largest United Nations body serving the Asia-Pacific region, and provides the only intergovernmental forum to discuss issues of concern in a region stretching from Turkey in the west to Fiji in the east.

The current intergovernmental conference structure was adopted by member States through resolution 64/1, and comprises the following: the Commission itself, which meets each year in April or May; eight sectoral committees, with four of the eight meeting in alternate years; and any other ad hoc ministerial conferences or other intergovernmental meetings decided by the Commission. Five regional institutions also fall under the auspices of the Commission, with the Governing Council of those institutions reporting annually to the Commission.

This structure is supported by the Advisory Committee of Permanent Representatives and Other Representatives Designated by Members of the Commission (Advisory Committee or ACPR). It advises and guides the Executive Secretary on the work of the Commission, its subsidiary bodies and the secretariat. ACPR meets in Bangkok in regular sessions four times a year, as well as in special ad hoc and working group sessions, and is usually attended by representatives from embassies in Bangkok.

The Commission discusses and deliberates on issues pertaining to inclusive, sustainable and resilient economic and social development in the region, deciding on the recommendations of its subsidiary bodies and of the Executive Secretary, and any other administrative or budgetary issues related to its work. Delegations include officials from across government ministries; the composition of delegations may vary from session to session, reflecting the annual theme of the Commission session, which is decided upon by the Commission, in consultation with the secretariat and ACPR.

In general, the cycle of meetings functions along the following pattern: the committees and the ministerial conferences or other intergovernmental meetings agree on recommendations concerning certain issues, which are forwarded to the Commission for its consideration. Should the Commission take action, in the form of a consensus decision or resolution, on any of the recommendations sent to it, those decisions and resolutions are then referred back to the appropriate subsidiary body for implementation and follow-up.

Through resolution 64/1, the Commission also decided to conduct, at its sixty-ninth session, a review of this conference structure, including its subsidiary structure, taking into account the outcome of the midterm review. The Commission requested the Executive Secretary to submit to the sixty-ninth session a report analysing the functioning of the conference structure in order to facilitate the review.

The midterm review was conducted at the sixty-seventh session of the Commission, based on a report submitted by the Executive Secretary focusing in particular on whether the conference structure had served the purpose of improving efficiency and attracting higher and wider representation from members and associate members. The Executive Secretary's report was based in part on the monitoring and evaluation of the conference structure and its link to the programme priorities of the Commission also requested in resolution 64/1.

The Commission's midterm review led to the adoption of resolution 67/15, which, among other things to be considered at the final review, requested the Executive Secretary to carry out further study and analysis, and to submit the findings, especially on the following issues:

- The duration of the Commission session in order to gain efficiencies in time and cost;
- The governance structure of the regional institutions vis-à-vis the respective roles and relevant mandates of the Commission, the committees and the governing councils;
- With a view to further integrating the regional institutions into the work of the relevant subprogrammes, the relevance of regional institutions to each subprogramme and committee, and the review of budget allocations to improve support for regional institutions through such mechanisms as staff exchanges and joint projects to support their work;

- The feasibility of promoting and developing the role of the Advisory Committee in order for it to assist the Commission in carrying out and coordinating its tasks during the intersessional period (as per resolution 67/15).

In addition, the Executive Secretary was also asked to formulate a new comprehensive questionnaire to facilitate the final review of the functioning of the conference structure of the Commission, and to submit those findings as part of the final review. The resolution also requested further study on proposals for improving the utilization of, and participation in, expert group and other meetings, and possible dissemination of outcomes, in order to engage more fully and constructively with member States and to provide a clearer contribution to the intergovernmental process and further strengthen programme delivery.

1.2 Purpose and objectives

It is in this context that the ESCAP secretariat is launching an evaluation, in line with resolutions 64/1 and 67/15, to assess the efficiency of the conference structure as set out in resolution 64/1 and its ability to attract higher and wider representation from its members and associate members. A report of the evaluation findings and recommendations will be submitted by the Executive Secretary to the Commission at its sixty-ninth session in order to facilitate the Commission's review of its conference structure, including its subsidiary structure.

The specific objectives are:

- (v) To assess the overall functioning of the conference structure, including its efficiency, as set out in resolution 64/1;
- (vi) To determine the effectiveness of the conference structure in attracting higher and wider, and more relevant, representation from its members and associate members;
- (vii) To examine the issues highlighted in resolution 67/15 for further study and analysis; and
- (viii) To formulate concrete, action-oriented recommendations to strengthen the overall functioning of the conference structure.

1.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the overall functioning of the conference structure using the evaluation criteria and questions stated below:

- **Effectiveness**

- How could the conference structure be strengthened as a key intergovernmental forum to consider issues related to inclusive and sustainable and social development in the Asia and the Pacific region?
- How could the conference structure be better utilized as a platform to highlight current development needs and priorities of the region?
- To what extent has the conference structure been effective in attracting higher and wider representation from member and associate members?
- How could the conference structure be enhanced to promote greater participation of and contributions from other relevant intergovernmental and international (including the UN system) organizations at the regional and subregional levels?
- To what extent has the closer integration of the Special Body sessions into the conference structure been effective in highlighting the Pacific and LDC priorities and concerns?
- To what extent do the organizational and meeting patterns/formats of the conference structure enable member States to participate fully in the deliberations?
- How could the servicing of the conference structure by the secretariat be strengthened to facilitate effective outcomes?
- To what extent does the governance structure of the regional institutions vis-à-vis the respective roles and relevant mandates of the Commission, the committees and the governing councils promote greater integration of the regional institutions into the work of the relevant subprogrammes and committees. (As required by paragraph 19b and 19c of resolution 67/15)
- How could the budgetary and staffing resources of the regional institutions be further enhanced to support their work? (As required by paragraph 19c of resolution 67/15)
- To what extent it is feasible to promote and develop the role of the Advisory Committee in order for it to assist the Commission in carrying out and coordinating its tasks during the intersessional period? (As required by paragraph 19d of resolution 67/15)

- **Efficiency**

- What is the optimal frequency and duration of the Commission session to gain further efficiencies in time and cost?
- What further measures could be taken to move towards paper smart sessions of the Commission and its conference structure?
- What is the optimal number and areas of focus of intergovernmental Committees?
- How could the benefits of attendance at the intergovernmental meetings by the member States be enhanced to justify the costs (travel, time, opportunity cost of absence from the office)?
- How could the communication between the secretariat and member States between Commission sessions be further strengthened to contribute to the effective and efficient functioning of the Commission session?

1.4 Deliverables

The following outputs will be delivered to the ESCAP secretariat, through the Evaluation Unit of the Programme Planning and Partnerships Division:

5. Evaluation work plan and framework detailing the approach of the evaluation team
6. Surveys questionnaires and their results
7. First draft and final evaluation reports
8. Presentation (ppt) on the findings, conclusions and recommendations

The draft evaluation report, including preliminary findings and recommendations, will be shared with the Executive Secretary and the Senior Management Team of ESCAP prior to finalization. The final report will be submitted to the Commission in official ESCAP document format.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation Team

An evaluation team comprising of a Lead Evaluator, an Associate Evaluator and a Research Assistant will be established to undertake the evaluation in as rigorous manner as possible. The team is expected to produce evidence-based data and utilize appropriate approaches of data collection methods and analysis. The team will undertake a transparent and participatory evaluation process that will involve staff and representatives from member States and development partners. It will comply with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards as set out in ESCAP's M&E Guidelines³,

The **Lead Evaluator** will assume overall responsibility for carrying out the evaluation. This includes, among other activities, managing the work of the team, acting as a spokesperson for the team, formulating the evaluation work plan and framework, leading the interviews, preparing the draft report and presenting the final report to Executive Secretary of ESCAP and the member States, through the ACPR.

³ Accessible through: <www.unescap.org/pmd/evaluation/evaluation_system.asp>.

The **Associate Evaluator** will be responsible for analyzing and summarizing information gathered from relevant reports/documents and feedback from various stakeholders, through interviews, survey questionnaires and focus group discussions. He/she will assist the evaluation team in the formulation of an evaluation framework and workplan and a comprehensive survey questionnaire and the preparation of an evaluation report.

The **Research Assistant** will provide research and statistical data collection support for the evaluation team and assist in analyzing and summarizing information gathered from relevant reports/documents and feedback from various stakeholders, through interviews, survey questionnaires and focus group discussions. He/she will also support the evaluation team in the preparation, implementation and analysis of a comprehensive survey questionnaire as well as the preparation of an evaluation report, including charts, tables, graphs, and presentation materials, including PowerPoint.

The evaluators should be familiar with evaluation methodologies and should have proven expertise in conducting evaluations. Ideally, they should have experience in conducting evaluations of a highly political and sensitive nature.

2.2 Reference Group

A Reference Group established within ESCAP has an oversight function to ensure the evaluation process follows with the ESCAP evaluation guidelines and in line with the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group. The Group will review basic evaluation documents, such as the terms of reference, evaluation framework and workplan, survey questionnaires, evaluation report and presentation materials, and ensure accuracy of information contained in those documents. It will provide advice on evaluation methodology and facilitate the engagement of all relevant stakeholders or informants in the evaluation process.

The Reference Group will be under the direction of the Deputy Executive Secretary. The Group will keep Senior Management Team (SMT) and ACPR informed of the progress of the evaluation exercise prior to the formal presentation of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

2.3 Primary deliverables

The primary deliverable of the evaluation will be a report of not more than 25 pages (excluding annexes), containing an executive summary, covering the issues identified in the scope of work, and providing recommendations for further action. A draft table of contents is provided as Annex 1.

The evaluation will be conducted as follows:

Desk review of:

- The conference structure of the other regional commissions
- ESCAP's programme, conference and secretariat structure
- ESCAP's mandates and reform initiatives over the past decade
- Recent evaluations of the ESCAP regional institutions, subregional offices and subprogrammes
- ESCAP strategic documents including the strategic framework and programme of work

Interviews at ESCAP of:

- Executive Secretary
- Deputy Executive Secretary
- Division Chiefs
- Selected professional secretariat staff
- Former Secretaries of the Commission and Programme Management Division Chiefs

Interviews of ESCAP Members, using a standard set of questions as well as phone and video interviews:

- Key senior-level officials of ESCAP focal point ministries in selected capitals
- Bangkok-based Permanent Representatives and other representatives at the working level
- Subregional focus groups conducted through a mechanism appropriate for each subregion

Ad hoc session of the Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism

3. WORKPLAN

The table below includes a breakdown of tasks and their schedule.

| TASK | SCHEDULE |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Desk review relevant documents (TOR, relevant resolutions and other documents, summary results of past conference structure surveys, relevant ESCAP evaluation reports, etc.) | 24-28 September 2012 |
| Discussion with the ESCAP Reference group and ESCAP management on the evaluation scope and methodology | 2-5 October 2012 |
| Develop a detailed evaluation framework and workplan for approval by the ESCAP Reference Group | 2-5 October 2012 |
| Conduct meetings with ESCAP management and staff as well as with member States (ACPR) and conduct interviews with representatives of ESCAP member States, development partners and other stakeholders | 8-19 October 2012 |
| Develop and implement a comprehensive survey questionnaire | 8-19 October 2012 |
| Review summary results of interviews, meetings and survey questionnaires, including those conducted for intergovernmental meetings held from 2009 to 2012. | 22-26 October 2012 |
| Draft an evaluation report in accordance with Annex I and II of the attached terms of reference and make revisions based on feedback from the Reference Group | 1– 15 November 2012 |
| Present preliminary findings to ESCAP management | 26-30 November 2012 |
| Finalization of evaluation report and presentation to ACPR | 3 rd week of January 2013 |

Annex II

Evaluation of the Conference Structure of the Commission of ESCAP

List of Reviewed Documents

1. TOR Evaluation ESCAP Conference Structure 2012

2. Monitoring & Evaluation System Overview and Evaluation Guidelines

3. Commission Sessions Assessments

2009 Summary assessment of the outcomes of the 65th session of the Commission

2010 Summary assessment of the outcomes of the 66th session of the Commission

2011 Summary assessment of the outcomes of the 67th session of the Commission

2012 Summary assessment of the outcomes of the 68th session of the Commission

4. Final Assessments, Committees, 2009

2009 Summary assessment of the first session of the Committee on Statistics

2009 Summary assessment of the first session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction

2009 Summary assessment of the first session of the Committee on Trade and Investment

2009 Summary assessment of the first session of the Committee on Macroeconomic Policy, Poverty Reduction

2009 Summary assessment of the first session of the Committee on Environment and Development

5. Final Assessments, Committees 2010

2010 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Social Development

2010 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Transport

2010 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Information and Communications Technology

2010 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Statistics

6. Final Assessment Committee 2011

2011 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction

2011 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Trade and Investment

2011 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Macroeconomic Policy, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Development

7. Final Assessments, Committees 2012

2012 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Information and Communications Technology

2012 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Statics

2012 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Transport

2012 Summary assessment of the second session of the Committee on Environment and Development

8. Ministerial Conferences

Survey Questionnaire of Asia-Pacific High-level Intergovernmental Meeting on the Assessment of Progress against Commitments in the Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS and the Millennium Development Goals (2012)

Survey Questionnaire of Implementation of the Asia and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons High-Level Meeting (2012)

Survey Questionnaire of Beijing+15 High-Level Meeting (2009)

Survey Questionnaire of Ministerial Conference on Transport (2012)

Survey Questionnaire of Regional Review of the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing High-level Meeting (2012)

9. Key Evaluation Reports (others)

OIOS report on Audit of governance and organizational structure of ESCAP (2010)

Report on 'Strengthening and integration of regional institutions' (2011)

Framework on the working relations between subregional offices (SORs) and substantive divisions of ESCAP (2012)

ESCAP Resource Mobilization Strategy (2012)

Programmatic Approach and Resource Mobilization Strategy (2011-13)

Capacity Development Project Management, Guidelines for ESCAP Staff (2012)

Report on the Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific (SIAP)

An overview of ESCAP programmatic approach and resource mobilization (PPP)

10. Precedent Evaluations

ESCAP External Evaluation (2006)

Evaluation of ESCAP's Approach to Capacity Development Final Report (2007)

Evaluation of the APCICT Final Report (2010)

Evaluative Review of the ESCAP Pacific Office Final Report (2011)

Evaluation of the ESCAP subprogramme on Information and Communications Technology and Disaster Risk Reduction (2012)

Review of issues pertinent to the subsidiary structure of the commission, including the programme performance report for the biennium 2008-2009 and the work of the ESCAP regional institutions: statistics (2010)

11. Resolutions

ESCAP Resolution 64/1, Restructuring of the conference structure of the Commission (2008)

ESCAP Resolution 67/15, Midterm review of the functioning of the conference structure of the Commission (2011)

Annex III

Evaluation of the Conference Structure of the Commission of ESCAP

List of Interviewees and respondents

Member States

| |
|---------------------------------|
| Australia |
| Bangladesh |
| China, The People's Republic of |
| Cook Islands |
| Fiji |
| Hong Kong, China |
| India |
| Indonesia |
| Iran, The Islamic Republic of |
| Japan |
| Kazakhstan |
| Korea, Republic of |
| Lao People's Republic |
| Macao, China |
| Marshall Islands |
| Micronesia |
| Mongolia |
| Pakistan |
| Philippines |
| Russian Federation |
| Samoa |
| Sri Lanka |

| |
|-----------------|
| Solomon Islands |
| Thailand |
| Tonga |
| Turkey |
| Tuvalu |
| United States |
| Uzbekistan |
| Viet Nam |

ESCAP

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Executive Secretary |
| Deputy Executive Secretary |
| Secretary of Commission |
| Chief of Staff |
| ESCAP professional staff |
| |
| <u>Divisions and sections</u> |
| Information and Communications Technology and Disaster Risk Reduction Division |
| Macroeconomic Policy and Development Division |
| Office of the Executive Secretary |
| Programme Planning and Partnerships Division |
| Social Development Division |
| Statistics Division |
| Trade and Investment Division |
| Transport Division |
| Conference and Documentation Services Section |
| Strategic Communications and Advocacy Section |
| |
| <u>Subregional offices</u> |
| Almaty, Kazakhstan |
| Suva, Fiji |
| Delhi, India |
| Incheon, Republic of Korea |
| |

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Regional Institutions</u> |
| Asia and Pacific Training Centre for Information and Communication Technology for Development |
| Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific |
| Asian and Pacific Centre for Transfer of Technology of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia & the Pacific |

UN AGENCIES

| |
|---------|
| ILO |
| OHCHR |
| UNCCD |
| UNDP |
| UNEP |
| UNFPA |
| UNICEF |
| UNWOMEN |
| WHO |

PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDED ANONYMOUSLY