

Minutes
SNA - GPCG Telephone Conference Call
19 March 2013

Attendance:

FAO: Tina Vahanen, Maria SanzSanchez, Elisa Marzo
UNDP: Estelle Fach, Dina Hajj
UNEP: Julie Greenwalt
MPTF Office: Mari Matsumoto
Secretariat: Thais Linhares Juvenal, Onye Ikwu, Helena Eriksson

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda
2. SNA Annual report 2012: financial reporting at output level
3. Costs for reporting at activity level
4. Potential collaboration with ODI
5. Update on the SNA budget revision status
6. AOB

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. SNA Annual report 2012: financial reporting at output level.

Secretariat referred to the comments at PB9 to report financial figures in details and the related PB9 decision¹. (Comments made by mainly one PB member). Since the Global Programme Framework Document 2011-2015 and the budget review 2013-2014 supporting document provide figures across the harmonized budget categories for each *Output* it can be expected that the financial reporting of the Annual Report 2012 should correlate to the same set up. The question is whether this break down is feasible and deemed needed.

Mari gave an update on MPTF Office's process of receiving and consolidating the financial figures. Since agencies and Secretariat have agreed to provide financial reporting at *output* level in the Annual Report 2012, the total amount of *output* figures needs to be cross-checked against the corresponding *outcome* figure and to make sure that all outcome figures are in line with the overall amounts by the MPTF Office. The Office receives the certified financial figures from the agencies so it is important that any disaggregated figures reconcile with the figures the office receives. This round, the certified financial figures will be ready end April/May which provides only a short time for the reconciliation by agencies. Regarding segregation of figures into budget categories, this is currently only reported at *SNA- Programme* level by the MPTF Office. (See table 4.6 in report <http://mdtf.undp.org/document/download/9139>). There is no system in place for approval of *Output* figures broken down into budget categories, for the time being. This is the way the programme was set up.

¹"The Board requested the Secretariat to improve reporting by PB10, including financial reporting at output level per agency and per categories of support. The Board also requested the Secretariat to develop a results-based monitoring framework, circulate its draft inter-sessionally for comments of the Policy Board and apply the finalized monitoring framework to the Annual Report 2012".

UNDP's system provides figures automatically at *output* level across budget categories. For FAO and UNEP the aggregated figures at *output* level are manually extracted, which obviously also would apply to any segregation at this level. For the two agencies it is already a tedious process to provide the total figure at *output* level. The new system under development will allow FAO to automatically extract *output* figures and their budget category divisions.

The Group mentioned that other reporting improvements and expansions (country results of targeted support, reporting on categories of support, etc) have already been made and that the SNA report has already evolved into providing provides aggregated output financial figures.

- It is not worthy to break down *output* figures into budget categories.
- Agencies to work with the MPTF Office to ensure that the *output* figures are in line with figures at higher levels and an updated timeline to be shared by the Secretariat for the finalisation of the Annual Report 2012.
- On the possibility to set up eight projects within the *SNA Programme* which could allow further breakdown of figures in the future was not supported since it will divide the overall Programme further.

It was clarified that the mentioning of "categories of support" in the PB9 decision 14 refers to ISF, country specific support and the Secretariat. Further, although the mentioning of "... apply the finalized mon. framework to the Annual Report 2012" is misleading, the Group did not consider it necessary to give a clarification on the decision text intersessionally when the framework is being sent.

3. Costs for reporting at activity level.

The Group discussed the additional costs involved in reporting at *activity* level with reference to PB9 decision 15². The reporting levels of SNA and NP need to be in synergy and a broad perspective to be applied when assessing costs for reporting at different levels. There are not only costs measured in numbers for hiring extra staff but other indirect costs of time for technical staff providing detailed inputs etc, MPTF Office's resources etc.

- The Secretariat will send an outline for implications associated to different levels of reporting by Monday 25 March for agencies' inputs.
- Agreed to decide later where the item fits into the PB10 agenda and not to have it as a stand-alone item.

4. Potential collaboration with ODI.

Item was postponed to next call.

5. Update on the SNA budget revision status.

Item was postponed to next call.

² "The Board requested the Secretariat to provide information on the possibilities of financial reporting by the UN-REDD Programme, including at activity level, and present the cost implications associated to the different levels of reporting (outcome, output and activity level)".

6. AOB.

A brief update was given by the Secretariat on the work on the Mon. Framework.