



UN agencies' cooperation in the framework of the SDGs

Authors:

BARBORA RUZICKOVA, UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS IN PRAGUE

NATALIYA YAREMCHUK, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA

BORA BESGUL, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST

Agency: UNODC

Mentor: BILLY BATWARE

Counsellor: JOHANNES MAERK

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL APPROACH	3
2.1. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
2.2. THEORETICAL APPROACH.....	5
3. RESEARCH DESIGN	9
3.1. FACTORS AND INDICATORS	9
3.2. MAIN RESEARCH QUESTION	11
3.3. METHODOLOGY.....	11
3.4. LIMITATIONS.....	11
4. CONTENT ANALYSIS	12
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	12
5.2 RESULTS OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS.....	12
5.2.1 UNIDO-UNDP	13
5.2.2 UNODC-WHO	13
5.3 CONCLUSION:.....	14
6. INTERVIEWS	15
6.1 INTERVIEW ANALYSIS	15
6.1.1 UNODC and WHO	16
6.1.2 UNIDO and UNDP	18
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
8. CONCLUSION	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
APPENDIX	24

1. Introduction

The crucial point of development of the UN cooperation was the adoption of the Millennium Declaration and its Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). (Le Blanca, 2014) Although it can be claimed that these goals have been successful on a large scale, it is hard to state that the interagency cooperation has been strengthened which seems to lead to the efficiency loss. On the other hand, the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals

(SDGs) in September 2015 has been cutting edge of the development area of the United Nations. This brings the change of paradigm of the international policies on cooperation. The United Nations agencies have aligned themselves with specific goals which are cross-cutting in nature, allowing for greater cooperation among different agencies and ensuring effective implementation in order to resolve one of the main critics to UN in the time of MDGs (UN activities were not unified and with duplicated tasks and miscommunication). (Klingebiel, 1998) The research starts with the question whether these goals and paradigm change really are the magic bullet for kick-starting a much-needed cooperation within the UN agencies or whether they have similar fate as MDGs?

This paper aims to draw a concrete picture of interagency cooperation of the UN agencies in the framework of the newly established SDGs. However, concentrating on every partnership in the UN system would make the research very broad and hardly possible due to the number of the common projects. Therefore, it is important to narrow down the topic, only focusing on the chosen agencies. On the other hand, selecting agencies to investigate is also another difficult task because the activities of the UN funds and programs are highly diverse (Barkin, 2015). Some institutions have a sectoral orientation (e.g. nutrition), others a target-group-specific one (e.g. children), while e.g. UNDP, the largest UN program, has no fixed programmatic focus but UNDP plays a key role in the UN's development cooperation.

In order to understand how and to what extent different agents in the UN system cooperate with each other, the research project examines the current organizational structure by focusing on some particular agents and their cooperation with each other in terms of mutual implementation of the newly introduced SDGs. The case study is conducted with a detailed and intensive analysis of the UN cooperation by focusing on the collective case analysis of certain agencies: UNIDO and UNDP; UNODC and WHO. These institutions have been chosen based on the consultations with the group's mentor, Mr. Batware. According to Billy Batware, those agencies cooperate well on many fronts and work on some common topics. Moreover, to make an analysis more objective to understand the whole system of the UN, each agency is responsible to different organ: UNDP to the General Assembly (financed through voluntary rather than assessed contributions), UNIDO and WHO to the ECOSOC (funded by both voluntary and assessed contributions) and UNODC (member of Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)) to the Secretariat (funded by both voluntary and assessed contributions), (Funds, Programmes, Specialized Agencies and Others, United Nations, 2018; The United Nations System; United Nations, 2018). Even though strong cooperation was the important variable for choosing these partnerships for the analysis, the accessibility to these institutions was another motive to choose these corresponding institutions since the research team's network in these institutions is stronger than in other agencies. Nevertheless, this paper seeks to conduct a cooperation analysis that can be applied easily to other complex institutions in the UN system or other UN-like international, regional organizations around the world.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Approach

2.1. Literature Review

Development cooperation can be defined as an activity that meets the following criteria (Alonso and Glennie, 2015): It aims explicitly to support national or international development priorities. In order to help classify activities by whether they are developmental or not we should rely on globally agreed goals, namely the internationally agreed development goals, such as the MDGs and new SDGs, alongside other international or regional development agreements. It is not driven by profit. It is about correcting market failures and rules that impede or undermine developmental objectives. Development cooperation should be based on cooperative and non-hierarchical relationships between international partners that seek to complement resources and capacities.

“Scholarship on multilevel governance emphasises efficiency gains through coordination, and functional and differentiation across regimes (Zürn and Faude, 2013, 119 - 130). A fragmented regime complex can be efficient where there is clear division of labour, specialisation, and role differentiation among institutions operating at different levels of governance (Biermann, Pattberg, and van Asselt, 2009, 14 - 40). However, the necessary condition for effective governance is effective regime management. Without regime cohesion and rule-system stewardship, the whole is unlikely to be greater than the sum of its parts. We now understand all too well the obstacles to cooperation and enforcement when faced with asymmetric negative externalities (Mitchell and Keilbach, 2001, 891 - 917).

The preliminary research has revealed that no previous research has been done in the terms of inter-agency cooperation on SDGs. Even though some documents point out the problem of inter-agency cooperation in the UN (Sixty-ninth General Assembly, Thematic Debate, United Nations, 2015), the existing literature puts its emphasis more on the issue and possibilities of strengthening cooperation between the United Nations, regional organizations, and sub-regional organizations (Silva, 2003) and partly overlooks the importance of cooperation among UN agencies to reach desired targets. Goal 17 itself also barely attracts the attention of the UN agencies cooperation; “In order to access to science, technology, and innovation and enhance knowledge sharing on mutually agreed terms, improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, should be enhanced”, “Global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence, enhance policy coherence for sustainable development (UNDP, Goal 17 Targets, 2018).

“Global governance and partnership were incorporated into the MDGs as Goal 8 (Develop a global partnership for development), but there was no domestic governance goal and no goal about cooperation among agencies of the UN. The proposed inclusion of Goal 16 in the SDGs (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels) by the Open Working Group for Sustainable Development Goals (2014) is therefore novel and important. The MDGs partnership between richer and poorer nations is based on a ‘compact’, in which richer nations commit themselves to meeting aid obligations, while poorer countries provide the ‘appropriate policy context for development’, including good governance, sound economic decision making,

transparency, accountability, rule of law, respect for human rights and civil liberties, and local participation (UNDP, Human Development Report 2003; Greig, Hulme and Turner, 2007). But, as Clarke argues, the notion of ‘partnership’ in development has typically referred to aid (Clarke, 2004). And this is a longstanding view, with donor aid targets dating as far back as the Pearson Commission (Hudson, 2015; Pearson, 1969).

The implementation of a broadening development agenda – such as might emerge from the combination of a post-MDG agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), (High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, 2013) relies on two strands of cooperation (Kaul, 2013a; Kaul, 2013b). On the one hand, development cooperation focuses on supporting domestic policies in developing countries with the main focus on poverty reduction. On the other hand, all countries irrespective of their level of development have an interest in engaging in international cooperation in order to provide and preserve global public goods.

On the one hand, the paper summed up Klingebiel’s claim about the UN development cooperation in the following points: there has been unclear substantive profiles of some agencies (for example UNDP’s functions), inadequate political control and coordination within the UN (GA, ECOSOC, UN Secretariat, but also supervisory bodies of funds and programs), insufficient mechanism of coordination between the UN and the specialized UN agencies and last but not least proliferation of UN development-cooperation agencies, which entails fragmentation of tasks as well as overlapping functions and double work, inadequate quality and insufficient cost awareness (Klingebiel, 1998). Another paper which studied the same topic has written by Steffan Bauer and Frank Biermann in 2004 (Bauer and Biermann, 2004). The study analyses progresses of cooperation and collaboration between UNDP and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in particular with a view to the integration of their respective policy objectives within the overall framework of Sustainable Development (SD). The paper indicates that the policy integration for SD between this cooperation is rather difficult because of administrative pathologies. Even though both are formally equal in the UN organizational set up, UNDP outweighs that of UNEP due to inadequate power of UNDP in political and bureaucratic aspects. The study points out that the structural imbalance between environment and development institutions obstacles the policy integration on the ground. Moreover, it recommends that the UNEP’s power should be strengthened in order to achieve a meaningful integration. Additionally, recent guidance note developed by the Strategic Planning and Inter-Agency Affairs Unit puts forward how a single goal or set of goals of an agency interact with the SDGs overall. It requires a cohesive approach that recognizes how the SDGs are interlinked. Achieving one target can be dependent on another – ensuring responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision making at all levels (16.7) is dependent on ensuring women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life (5.5), and vice versa (UNODC, Guidance Note, 2018). Finally, After the resolution A/72.L52 of the General Assembly in an interview with UN News, UN Deputy Secretary-General Amina Mohammed said that there is a strong evidence that the cooperation among the UN Agencies has been so far a cacophony and today we have an opportunity to make symphony for the SDGs, which makes a real difference on the ground of the UN (UN News, 2018). The statement could refer that the reform is desperately

needed. Conducting research on this topic is relevant and actual because there is a strong practical use for the future activities of the UN. Moreover, as it has understood after the literature review, there is an evidence-based gap about interagency cooperation in the UN. Therefore, the paper targets to fulfill this evidence-based gap as well as bring light to subsequent analyzers in the field.

Identifying and analyzing the impact of the paradigm change on the interagency cooperation of the UN is the main interest of the research. Also, the reform did not only bring its own challenges but also inherited lack of cooperation problems of the UN system: communication problems, new structures, legal restrictions, topic restrictions, specializations of agencies, funding etc.

2.2. Theoretical approach

Investigating the traditional international relations theories in the context of IOs helps the study to reach a better understanding of the real nature of the United Nations System and then find an appropriate methodology to address the problem of inter-agency cooperation within this complex system, and then find a way to adopt all of these institutions in the framework of SDGs.

Liberalism states that IOs help states to overcome collective action problems and develop shared values and norms. They promote an interdependency among states which reduces the chances of violent conflicts. In addition to that, they provide assistance to the victims of international politics, poor, refugees, epidemics, disasters, war, and economic crises (Martin and Simmons, 1998). On the other hand, Neo-Liberal Approach expects that IOs foster the cooperation beyond simply providing an opportunity for member states by developing their own identities. Concordantly, IOs' impact on state action has been discussed in neoliberal institutionalism of Robert Keohane (Keohane, 2011, 157 – 164). In this point of view, IOs are significant for states' action in part because they influence the incentives facing states, even if those states' fundamental interests are defined autonomously. In this regard, IOs make it possible for states to take actions that would otherwise be inconceivable. Considering the UN tasks and activities, liberal and neo-liberal approaches give to this study a better positioning of the UN system rather than any other theoretical approach to the IOs in this context (Pease, 2008). On the other hand, the study focuses on international regimes as they explain principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations (Krasner, 1982).

The main theoretical approach for analyzing the cooperation between UN agencies is the organizational theory and its approaches. Organizational theory is the study of how organizations function and how they affect and are affected by the environment in which they operate. This project defines organizations as social units of people, an entity comprising a group of people that have collective goals, mostly monetary profit oriented. The main assumption to apply organizational theory to the public institution is the organizational affiliations and the organizational settings in which they act will shape their way of thinking, their behaviour, and at last, the content of public policy. "An organization theory approach to the public sector assumes that it is impossible to understand the content of public policy and public decision-making without

analysing the way political-administrative systems are organized and their modes of operation (Christensen *et al.*, 2007). In regard to the organizational theory, both profit and non-profit organizations, as well as international organizations and non-governmental organizations, require changes to adapt to the changing environment in order to increase efficiency in order to reach their desired targets. The New Public Management stresses that organizational models and managerial methods from money oriented private institutions can be assigned to public organizations with great benefits by converting it more "businesslike" and improving its efficiency. Looking at the UN administrative structure, it is seen that, in parallel with NPM, the main body of UN has set goals with SDGs and has aligned its autonomous, separate bodies in order to reach these desired outputs. Barzelay states that the NPM aimed to introduce modern business methods to administrative work, chiefly with the use of many effective technological tools (Barzelay, 2001). "The focus of NPM evolved into restructuralization of the administrative institution just through the digital culture-change, when it tried to fulfill the requirements of changing the paper-based administratorship into a digital one, and lead the mainframe-system into the PC-era. When every administrative office started to informatize spontaneously and quickly, the demand became pointless", (Karvalics, 2008, 5). The progression has led to an argument whether NPM lost its importance and, eventually, failed or the new paradigm evolved NPM to a different approach. Dunleavy stresses out that "Not the NPM is dead, but the NPM is a universal frame of approach", (Dunleavy *et al.*, 2006). In other words, Newton's building blocks are still there with the new contribution of Einstein. Both Albert Einstein and Sir Issac Newton are regarded as the forefathers of physics, but both held different theories that are fundamentally different from the other.

The Digital Era Governance (DEG) replaces the most characteristics features of the NPM. It is not simply an element of administrative work, but it is its operative fundament (Karvalics, 2008, 7). To put it in another way, it changes and structures behaviours to IT based framework, pressuring organizations and operations to adapt this new social and technological environment. On the contrary to the NPM, DEG offers the reintegration of services, the demand-based holistic approach, and the extensive digitalisation of administrative operations (Karvalics, 2008). Thinking the DEG in the context of UN system; reverse agentification¹ and disruption, joined-up governance, horizontal approach - organizations, re-planning of back office functions, network simplification, interactive information-giving and searching, restructuring on the ground of demand, data warehousing, agile administrative processes, sustainability, providing electronic services, utility computing, new form of automated processes, channel streaming, open-book government as some key elements and components of DEG which can be applied into UN administration system in order to increase service efficiency and effectiveness that UN craves for.

SDGs bring the change of paradigm of the international policies on cooperation and its targets, so it can also increase inter-agency cooperation. In this regard, this project suggests; "Paradigm change in the paradigm change" by alleging that the new paradigm in cooperation with SDGs fits well with the new understanding of public administration with DEG since it highlights networking, information and knowledge management, the best mixture and horizontal governance. These principles could be used as a cure for much needed inter-agency cooperation.

¹ Opposite of fragmentation; united agencies at least by network.

UN is an intergovernmental organization with social, environmental, and economic goals. “The work of the UN can be divided into two broad categories: promoting economic and social development, and enhancing regional and international security (Moran, 2009).

One of the most significant characteristics of Government 2.0 or DEG is networking, allowing the total information awareness to all participants in the cooperation with net-centered governance to make right decisions and reactions at short notice. Moreover, it determines the design, architecture, and processes of the working organization as a platform – stage of the interaction of the smart masses (Karvalics, 2008, 19 – 20). All things considered, the UN system, inevitably, needs to adapt a new way of networking which will unite all the relevant agencies (UNIDO, UNDP, etc.), local institutions, and individuals into one joint platform.

In parallel with networking, the information and knowledge management are also indispensable part of the Government 2.0. In fact, looking deeply these two features don’t contradict but complete each other entirely. The meaning of networking is “optimized to functional information and knowledge processes”. Significantly, all the information and knowledge process must be planned, maintained, watched, and, lastly, measured. A stronger professional and knowledge management is a must since government 2.0 suggests a solution for supplementing needed knowledge from a larger community which it crosses the borders of the inter- agency cooperation (Karvalics, 2008, 19 – 20). Then again, a well-planned, maintained, measured information and knowledge management can compose the total information awareness for the agencies to reach information synchronously from constructed wider data assets.

Walker states that the most essential principle of the new understanding is the horizontal cooperation “which was the challenge of private organizations for quite a while and they finally found the solution to end the increasingly obvious disadvantages of the so called divisional structural system by so-called matrix organization, which refreshes the vertical structure with horizontal elements”, (Walker, 2006, 3). Karvalics describes horizontal cooperation in new paradigm; “The horizontal structures map the “uniting” and “re-integration” elements of Governance 2.0 in an organizational way.” and adds “Today we see that such an integration would have gone far in dealing with many administrative deficits, absences of attention, fragmentations of resources, lacks of capacity and competence”, (Karvalics, 2008, 24– 26). What is more important of DEG is it offers an opportunity to integrate all knowledge processes of key importance and helps to reach a better service delivery accordingly.

Having applied the Government 2.0 approach to UN serves a practical grounding, allowing to further study with another perspective, entirely focusing on inter-organizational cooperation. The governance approach is mostly based on horizontal governance which replaces hierarchical leadership with collaboration, shared responsibility and coordination for decisions and outcomes (Moran, 2009, 91). The demand for integrated service provision takes a crucial place in governance which stimulates horizontal networks through cooperation. In this sense, SDGs and the paradigm change target a much-needed cooperation between UN agencies. On the other hand, whether UN agencies’ central relations are based on hierarchical (vertical) or horizontal governance remains an important question as well. Tensions between upper ranked employees and lower ranked ones over delivering services and meeting the community needs (Moran, 2009, 91) as Pollitt and Bouckaert

have emphasised the issue with the term of “Incompatible statements” (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004).

The study takes into consideration that Intergovernmental structure of UN system makes it impossible to approach UN as a single public institution which corresponds to private sector so-called Multinational Corporations (MNC), defined by Sumantra Ghoshal and D. Elanor Westney (Young and Ghoshal, 2016, 4 – 5) and Samuel P. Huntington (Huntington, 1973, 334 - 368). Government 2.0 approach cannot be applied only to incorporate private company models into UN as a public institution but as an intergovernmental institution which it works with public organizational principles and structures in the international setting. The UN accepted definition of MNC is that MNCs are enterprises which control assets factories, mines, sales offices and the like in two or more countries. UN is a complex system that consists of many different agencies in which some of these agencies are direct subsidiaries of the main UN central organs and some regional organizations are more autonomous and administratively are not subsidiaries of the main UN central organs. Moreover, autonomous organizations also give a report to the Economic and Social Council but they don't draw their funds from UN. In addition to that, some of the agencies focus on research and monitoring, while others are active on the ground of implementing the goals of the UN. Some employ a handful of people, others employ thousands. *UNODC* has approximately 500 staff members worldwide, its headquarters are in Vienna and it operates in 20 field offices, as well as liaison offices in New York and Brussels (UNODC, UNOV , 2018); *WHO* has more than 7000 people from more than 150 countries in 150 WHO offices in countries (WHO, 2018); *UNIDO* employs some 670 staff at Headquarters (Vienna) and in field representations in about 80 countries and has 167 member states (Structure of UNIDO, UNIDO, 2018); UNDP employs approximately 1,100 at its headquarters in New York and 5,300 in field operations (UNDP, Devex, 2018).

Some are fairly actively overseen by the UN organ that created them, and others operate almost independently of the central UN bureaucracy (Barkin, 2015). Therefore, the study assumes that UN and UN-like organizations can be observed only in the framework of complex multinational organization models that features similar characteristics with the UN structure. On the other hand, existing literature on DEG has little to apply on MNCs since it is a developing paradigm. Moreover, many of those who study MNCs have been skeptical of the contributions that organization theory can make to their quest for developing a deeper understanding of the environmental, strategic and organizational challenges of multinational management by stressing out the complexity of the MNCs (Young and Ghoshal, 2016, 9).

Liberal and neo-liberal approaches give a better theoretical understanding than any other theoretical approach, explaining that IOs make it possible for states to take actions that would otherwise be inconceivable. On the other hand, besides the liberal and neo-liberal approaches, most significantly, the research found that the organizational theories and their sub-approaches offers a better theoretical understanding to analyse inter-agency cooperation since it proposes that UN-like intergovernmental organizations also need to change to adapt to the changing environment in order to increase efficiency and reach desired outcomes. NPM may be one of the most discussed public administrative approaches by most leading scholars. With this in mind, NPM evolved into a new structure, a so-called Digital Era Governance (DEG) at short notice because NPM was lacking the

principles of the new paradigm change that came out with technological improvements and digitalisation. DEG in the context of the UN with SDGs reveals the necessary implementations to increase the quality of the service delivery. The study has named this combination a paradigm change in a paradigm change. It highlights networking, information and knowledge management, the best mixture, horizontal governance. The study has assumed that these principles could be used as a cure for much needed inter-agency cooperation in UN-like institutions. In parallel with DEG, the paper also applied the MNC literature in order to indicate that the corresponding institution of the intergovernmental organization can only be a multinational organization.

3. Research Design

3.1. Factors and Indicators

Cooperation

There is no available quantitative data on how to measure cooperation. Evaluating the management of cooperation had been studied by Jordan (2001). In his research, he states that “The evaluation of the task performance by individual IOs would provide an important criterion for analysis and assessment” (Jordan, 2001).

The research methods are content analysis and personal semi-structured interviews (interview guide including a list of topics or issues with internal and external experts of the UN about the cooperation of the UN Agencies). Indicators in content analysis are the number of the unified activities as well as the frequency of communication between the agencies. Common activities can lead to duplicated tasks and miscommunication if the tasks are not clarified efficiently. Aligning projects and agencies is likely to result in extra costs and increased workload in the form of meetings and reporting requirements.

United Nations system

The research conducts the content analysis and, in accordance with this purpose, it looks for the following five points in the documents. The UN should cooperate in the following areas: These points are described in the book, "Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda," published in 2006 by the International Institute on Sustainable Development. The study suggests that there seems to be a consensus around five main goals in relation to global governance on environment and sustainability (GGE): (1) knowledge, whereby a GGE is a knowledge-based and knowledge-producing system; (2) coherence, through a shared global environmental vision; (3) performance, with GGE institutions that are well-managed, have the resources they need, and use these resources efficiently; and (4) mainstreaming, into other arenas of international policy and into non-environmental institutions. (Najam *et al.*, 2007). Correspondingly, since UN requires an efficient global governance with its agencies in order to reach SDGs, the study claims that these elements should be investigated in the cooperation of the UN network.

The first element needed for a globally successful system is knowledge. Science should be the authoritative basis of sound environmental policy. The GGE system should be seen as a

knowledge-based and knowledge-producing system. The UN has a scientific understanding and assessment of emerging environmental challenges. The UN has set up not only scientific committees and scientific and technical panels, but has also ensured the participation of epistemic communities in the creation of universal agendas and publishes scientific publications (UN, A/69/763, 2015). Another elements are coherence and cooperation. The governance should operate as a coherent "system" with reasonable coordination, regular communication, and a shared sense of direction among its various elements. The UN provides normative capacity building assistance, joint tools for planning, monitoring and reporting, shares knowledge (especially involving other agencies), (UN, A/69/763, 2015). Successful global governance requires global decision-making in the field of cohesion and cooperation. The UN has achieved this in terms of development (not security) as a global universal Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and previously less ambitious agreements, including the Millennium Declaration. Over the past approaches to sustainable development, one of the main problems in the UN system has been the lack of cross-sectoral unification of strategies, policies and implementation (UN: Prototype Global Sustainable Development Report, 2014, 54). As for SDGs, no research has yet been published on cooperation and coherence, which is the reason for empirical research of this work. The fourth element of a global sustainable government for effective agenda setting is the institution's performance. The institutions that make up the system of global government should be properly managed; they should have the resources they need and should make effective use of these resources. The ultimate purpose of the system is to improve global conditions. For these purposes, the UN uses the following tools: program harmonization, classification of programs and expenditures, statistical categories and reporting methods. The UN has come to agree on the setting of norms and standards in the area of social and environmental sustainability and incorporating the element of responsibility into its instruments (UN A/69/763, 2015). The third element is closely related to the fourth element, which is mainstreaming. The system should seek to incorporate environmental concerns and actions within other arenas of international policy and action, and particularly in the context of sustainable development. The UN has put in place "Delivering as one", an initiative launched in 2005 by former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for development aid, humanitarian aid and environmental issues. The goal of the initiative is to work more efficiently in one-person, single-budget, one-office and one-man development (mainly used within the UNDG development group), (UN A/61/583, 2006). The UN also quarterly reviews UN implement country policies (UNCTs), (UN A/RES/50/120, 1996).² The UN has also incorporated various issues into the Agenda 2030 in different goals.

The question of the research related to these indicators is: What has changed with the introduction of the SDGs? Is the UN system capable of global sustainable governance with SDGs?

² UN teams exist in 131 countries for inter-agency cooperation at a country level. The team is led by a country coordinator who reports to the Secretary General.

3.2. Main research question

Research question: To what extent has joint cooperation of the UN agencies been influenced by the adoption of 2030 agenda and the change in the paradigm that the SDGs have brought?

Research sub-question: What are the possible approaches that can be undertaken in order to maintain, strengthen and monitor the cooperation between the UN agencies? This is relevant for creating the recommendations on how to monitor the cooperation as the final part of the research project.

3.3. Methodology

The research focuses on qualitative research methods that are supposed to give answers to questions about experiences, meaning, and perspective, most often from the standpoint of a participant. The research paper conducts a multiple case study with two qualitative research methods: interviews and content analysis of jointly prepared documents. In order to understand how and to what extent different agents in the UN system cooperate with each other, the research project examines the current organizational structure by focusing on some particular agents and their cooperation with each other in terms of mutual implementation of the newly introduced SDGs.

Partly, collected data are dependent on the content analysis of the documents (Rules of procedures, Memorandum of understanding) of joint works of the UN agencies. Apart from the content analysis, semi-structured interviews with experts and staff members are conducted in order to seek out the magnitude of interagency partnerships at the time of planning, implementation, and evaluation. Additionally, the study assumes that different staff member in different levels have different perceptions. Therefore, questions are asked both higher and lower level employees in the observed agencies.

3.4. Limitations

One of the main hardships for measuring the cooperation is the lack of documentation on the matter that can be tracked. The agencies cooperate, however, not everything is documented into the files that can be accessed. Moreover, even though it is possible to find document on common projects, it is unlikely that they will be helpful in getting to understand the level of the cooperation between the agencies. One should also not forget that the reports made on projects tend to be rather idealistic and will only show one side of the cooperation and the result, rather than the way to achieving the result. Therefore, it is rather important to conduct expert interviews as well as interviews with staff members who are involved in the inter-agency communication.

The work is also very much dependent on the interviews with relevant people for the research. In most cases those are staff members of the UN whose schedules are very tight.

Since there is not much factual information, a lot of the conclusions have to be drawn from the points of view of the interviewees. While, most probably, the opinions are well-grounded, there

is still always a possibility of various types of unconscious/ conscious biases or subjective opinions. In order not to fall into a trap of only seeing one side of the coin, it is important to talk to people from as many different backgrounds as possible, as well as talk to staff members of different ranks.

4. Content analysis

4.1 Introduction

Intergovernmental agencies in the UN system in the framework of organizational theory serves as a functional approach to understanding the environment in which they operate. Organizational theory assumes that regardless of the type of the organizations, they all oblige to changes in order to adapt to the new requirement of this environment to increase efficiency and effectiveness, especially in the SDG based new working structure. In this regard, the research has used the content analysis as a tool to assess the cooperations of UNIDO-UNDP and UNODC-WHO by investigating main documents of these agencies whether they have created a common framework for cooperation or not. The paper assumes that content analysis plays an essential role along with interviews. Additionally, DEG together with the organizational approach, encourages also intergovernmental organizations to adopt the new changing social and technological environment. Looking at the current official cooperations based on content analysis helps to understand to what extent DEG would provide a solution for the lack of cooperation among UN agencies. On the other hand, it is important to highlight that DEG is not selected as a criterion of assessment. The paper try to focus on each of the joint implementations.

In order to understand to what extent the interagency cooperation is aligned with SDGs, relevant sources of information are looked into. Following, are the variables that have been investigated in this content analysis.

- 1) Joint reports prepared by multiple agencies.
- 3) Joint SDGs activities.
- 4) UN Resolutions about the post-2015 Agenda.
- 5) Rules of procedures.
- 6) Memorandum of understandings.
- 7) Other indicators and mechanisms which help to analyze the interagency cooperation.
- 8) Revision of Academic Literature

4.2 Results of the Content Analysis

The analysis reveals the interagency cooperation between UNIDO and UNDP, as well as UNODC and WHO based on the specific documents.

4.2.1 UNIDO-UNDP

UNIDO's mandate is to support Member States in achieving SDG-9, which calls to "Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation". The relevance of inclusive and sustainable industrial development, however, applies in greater or lesser extent to all SDGs. (UNDP 2018)

- UNIDO enters into consultation with specialized and related agencies on matters that are of direct concern or for new activities to be undertaken by the Organization. UNIDO renewed its mandate with a view to more explicitly pursuing integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in UNIDO activities. (General Assembly Economic and Social Council 2015)
- UNIDO already has established a new integrated results and performance framework as the basis for long-term results-based management, monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems. (UNIDO 1985)
- The UNDP strategic plan focuses on key areas including poverty alleviation, democratic governance and peacebuilding, climate change and disaster risk, and economic inequality. UNDP provides support to governments to integrate the SDGs into their national development plans and policies. UNDP has completed a complementary reorganization of its bureau, offices and staffing, in part to ensure mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development (General Assembly Economic and Social Council 2015) and break down work silos across development themes. (UNDP 2018)
- Participation of non-members is secured by the executive board, which may invite any other organizations of the United Nations system to participate in the deliberations, in particular for questions that relate to their activities or those involving coordination questions. (UNDP 2011)
- In 2018, UNDP and UNIDO strengthened their cooperation through an inter-agency agreement that combines the core competencies and specialized expertise of UNIDO with the broad country-level representation and delivery capacity of UNDP. The operational focus of the agreement lies in two components: expanding UNIDO field coverage in a cost-effective manner through the establishment of UNIDO Desks in UNDP Country Offices, and developing joint activities in private sector development. As a result, UNIDO Desks have been set up in 16 countries, and UNDP and UNIDO have developed a number of joint programmes aimed at strengthening private sector enterprises and institutions in support of national development goals.(UNIDO 2018)

4.2.2 UNODC-WHO

The other cooperation which this paper analyses is the interagency relation between UNODC and WHO.

- UNODC promotes a holistic development perspective in the UNDG Regional teams and the UN Country Teams (UNCTs) through the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) process.

- UNODC works particularly closely with WHO and UNAIDS on the provision of policy advice to Member States on harm reduction among people who inject drugs and in prison settings, including drug dependence treatment.
- The UNODC-WHO joint Programme on Drug Dependence Treatment and Care was launched in 2009 to promote human and accessible treatment and care for persons affected by drug use and dependence. The aim is to promote policies that strike the right balance between the reduction of drug supply and demand; and incorporate science-based drug prevention and dependence treatment.
- These organizations also work together because UNODC and WHO both have constitutional mandates to address issues presented by drug use and dependence. The Joint UNODC-WHO Programme on Drug Dependence Treatment and Care is a milestone in the development of a comprehensive, integrated health-based approach to drug policy that can reduce demand for illicit substances, relieve suffering and decrease drug-related harm to individuals, families, communities and societies.(UNODC 2018)
- The Agenda 2030 was a motive to strengthen their relations as it is proved by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which has been signed between them in the framework of SDGs. According to the signed MoU in 2017, “Parties share similar objectives, in pursuit of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to support national governments in their efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals through and integrated approach, particularly SDG 3 and its targets 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 3.6 as well as SDG target 5.2, 16.1, 16.2.” “Parties (UNODC and WHO) agreed to join efforts and to maintain close and continuous working relations for the achievement of their common objectives and for the implementation of the memorandum.” (MOU 2017) One of the examples that the parties anticipate their collaboration focuses on is the treatment of drug use disorders. It is an activity that parties implement the global UNODC/WHO program on drug dependence treatment and care and other collaborative activities aimed at supporting countries.

4.3 Conclusion:

After the adoption of MDGs (when UN activities were barely unified), one of the main future goals was not only new development agenda but also better cooperation within UN agencies and strengthen the role of the UN through this strong cooperation. As Mitchell and Keilbach claim, the rule-system stewardship is necessary for greater system cooperation in the UN and all agencies (UNDP, UNIDO, UNODC, and WHO) and there is a proof of establishment of procedures for greater development cooperation and joint activities, especially in the context of SDGs. Although it was seen that the cooperation mentioned in MDG 8, the practice of UN agencies cooperation started just shortly before the establishment of a new development concept for the next 15 years (the partnership in MDGs era has typically referred as aid). The analysis revealed the existence of interagency cooperation between UNIDO-UNDP and UNODC-WHO.

The content analysis showed that while some features of DEG (restructuring, sustainability, and joined-up governance) has been applied to agencies cooperation in the new era, still there is a lot of space for DEG approach: reverse agentification and disruption, horizontal approach -

organizations, re-planning of back office functions, network simplification, interactive information-giving and searching, restructuring on the ground of demand, data warehousing, agile administrative processes, sustainability, providing electronic services, utility computing, new form of automated processes, channel streaming, open-book government. These key elements and components are questioned through semi-structured interviews and try to find out whether there are more features of DEG (networking, information and knowledge management, the best mixture, horizontal governance) in the chosen UN agencies or not.

Based on the Klingebiel's research (1998) about the unclear profiles of UN agencies (especially UNDP) and insufficient coordination between the specialized UN agencies with double work, the authors of this article can after content analysis claim that the situation has changed considerably. The examples are newly established inter-agency agreements (UNDP and UNIDO) on coordinated work and UNDP's new strategic plan and reorganization of its bureau and Memorandum of Understanding between UNODC and WHO.

The analysis revealed a strong institutional and operational connection between these two institutions and their mandates in some specific areas in the framework of SDGs. To what extent these new cooperation establishments will be efficient and effective is a remaining question which can be only answered in upcoming years.

5. Interviews

The questionnaire consists of three different sections; introductory questions, specific areas of analysis, and concluding questions. The areas of analysis section include five different points that the research intends to focus on: joint projects, knowledge, coherence, performance, and mainstreaming.

The questions for interviews with UN employees and experts are given below (in appendix). They are used to analyze interagency cooperation between corresponding agencies: UNODC and WHO; UNIDO and UNDP.

5.1 Interview Analysis

In total, 6 interviews were conducted: 2 interviews with experts in the field of UNODC-WHO cooperation, and 3 with UNIDO-UNDP experts, and 1 University professor with a thorough knowledge of the subjects. After the interviews were conducted, it became clear that it is better to keep the answers anonymous due to some of the statements made by the interviewees and the opposite views on the subject. Therefore, for privacy reasons, the names of the interviewees will not be mentioned, instead, indications "Interviewee 1", Interviewee 2", etc. will be used.

All the interviewees mentioned the importance of constant cooperation for beneficial communication and successful and continuous work on joint projects. According to Interviewee 2, good communication and cooperation are key in identifying common goals and learning from each other, which, in turn result in creating good practices. At the same time, what became clear

from the interviews is that cooperation is rather based on common projects and not directly on SDGs. It is rather that the projects include SDGs and are not created because of one particular SDG.

Since all measures in the interviews were based on individual experience and knowledge, and respondents could choose whether to provide their responses or not, bias in favor of 2030 agenda might exist in the results

5.1.1 UNODC- WHO

This subsection is focused on analysing the interviews of the experts in UNODC-WHO systems and their cooperation.

Every interviewee stressed the importance of good cooperation. According to Interviewee 1, the organizations are benefiting from cooperation because of their systems: drug issues require both a health approach and a law enforcement approach. The mandate of WHO gives it a unique place to help Member States to address the health challenges caused by drugs (health ministries). UNODC on the other hand has a law enforcement mandate which supports Member States to deal with the drug problem locally (police). Both these mandates are complementary in nature and in practice (Interviewee 1).

The cooperation between UNODC and WHO is not necessary a result of the SDGs framework, according to Interviewees 1,2 and 3. Despite this, SDGs have become an additional instrument that allows greater cooperation, means of identifying common grounds, and an aspect of strategic engagement that is holistic and comprehensive, stated Interviewee 2.

Interviewee 2 stated that SDGs make projects even more relevant, measurable, and give both organizations another instrument for cooperation to strengthen the existing efforts. According to Interviewee 3, “All UNODC programmes are now tagged to SDGs meaning that every programming has to take into account the different SDG targets and report on them. UNODC is a custodian to some indicators related also to SDGs 3, 5, 10, 11, 15 and 16, therefore the work is mainstreaming to contribute to the achievement of these indicators”.

Even though cooperation in the framework of the particular SDGs is rather difficult to analyse as it always intertwines with other SDGs and non-SDG-related matters, because of the mandates, all the projects that UNODC and WHO are implementing focus on SDGs. For example, according to Interviewee 2, UNODC-WHO joint prevention work on substance/drug use disorder is reflected in SDG 3.5 “Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol”. At the same time, drug prevention and treatment contributes to the achievement of SDG5 “Achieve Gender Equality and Empower All Women and Girls”, Target 16.1 of SDG 16 “Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere”, Target 16.2 “End abuse, exploitation,trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children” and Target 16.4 “By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial flows, combat all forms of organized crime”. One of the main principles of the UN, according to Interviewee 2 is to do evidence-based programming in order to get the numbers right. UNODC and WHO conduct joint studies on homicide which is one of the SDG indicators, namely 16.1 “Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere”. On SDG 5 for

example, according to Interviewee 2, UNODC has developed a comprehensive gender strategy agenda –strategy for gender equality and the empowerment of women (2018-2021) -which is the first institutional framework on gender equality for the UN Office in Vienna (UNOV) and the UNODC. The strategy was developed at the recommendation of UN WOMEN which helped in the development of its terms of reference and reviewed it. The strategy seeks to ensure that gender equality and the empowerment of women are integral parts of all aspects of the work of UNOV/UNODC in making the world safer from drugs, crime and terrorism and in ensuring the peaceful uses of outer space.

Interviewee 3, in turn mentioned that UNODC and WHO have an MoU since 2009 (as analysed in the content analysis) which created a joint programme on:

- Prevention of drug use and drug use disorders;
- Treatment of drug use disorders;
- Access to controlled drugs for medical purposes;
- New Psychoactive substances;
- Prevention, diagnosis, treatment, care and support for HIV, viral hepatitis and tuberculosis;
- Prevention of violence and violence-related deaths;
- Monitoring drug use and its health and social consequences.

UNODC and WHO also conduct studies on drug use disorders, understanding the root causes, as well as on homicide.

One of the perfect examples of cooperation benefits, besides joint reports, is that UNODC has been able to get access to local institutions such as the ministries of health which traditionally do not fall under the scope of UNODC, says Interviewee 2. “This is significant for carrying out comprehensive programming. We have reached over 30 countries globally in West Africa, South East Asia, South East Europe, and Latin America” (Interviewee 2). At the same time, there are challenges and obstacles. The main challenges, as Interviewee 2 mentioned, have been due to the different organizational structures and cultural differences of the two organizations. Although the mandates are related, the implementation takes place differently. Interviewee 3 said that the communication is not fully efficient. The goals of the projects, according to the interviewee are big, in his opinion, there is no descent communication channel with constant reporting and information exchange. The interviewee mentioned that very often happens that only one side reports the progress; which side is more proactive usually depends on a project and funding (donors). According to Interviewee 2, More structured coordination mechanism would benefit the cooperation between both organizations. Similarly, additional joint programming would further increase efficiency and avoid duplications and donor fatigue.

From the interviews it became clear that the current achievements are not directly a result of the SDGs, however, the SDGs have provided an additional mechanism for cooperation and as such have made joint programming more likely. Some of the best practices include the joint studies, comprehensive programming including ministries of health and law enforcement.

5.1.2 UNIDO-UNDP

The cooperation between UNIDO and UNDP turned out to be very different from the cooperation of UNODC and UNDP. Not all questions prepared could be answered by the experts because of the nature of cooperation. Every interviewee who the research group talked to about the UNIDO-UNDP cooperation mentioned that the nature of the relations of the organizations is very unique and quite difficult due to the fact that UNIDO used to be part of UNDP. Interviewees 4 and 6 mentioned that there was an attempt to have a better cooperation between the organisations, therefore a cooperation MoU was signed. A few UNIDO staff members were positioned in the offices at UNDP, which was supposed to increase the level of communication between the Agencies (as it is analyzed in the content analysis). Instead, according to the interviewees, it has caused a lot of internal conflicts and confrontations.

Interviewee 5 said that there are a few projects that the organisations are working on together, however, the number of the projects is rather small and the cooperation is rather weak. There is no constant communication or reporting going on, but rather there is a task that has to be done. According to Interviewee 4, a lot of work the UN does in general is very interconnected and complementary. Therefore, when the work is coordinated or best if it is jointly carried out, this ensures effectiveness, prevents duplications, and is cost effective. This is why the interviewee believes that the organisations should work on a better communication strategy.

Interviewee 6 mentioned that different organizational structures are one of the main differences, meaning that the communication channels are different and therefore, it is hard to unify the communication flow. Interviewee 4 said that even though they work with UNDP, he never meets with them personally not just because the communication is very weak, but also the locations are different.

The research paper is focusing on the cooperation of the agencies in the framework of the SDGs. Interviewee 4 pointed out that it is difficult to measure the cooperation in terms of the SDGs because the projects have a longer span than since the time the SDGs were adopted until now. Therefore, there should be further research done after the projects will have ended to be able to see more precise results.

6. Recommendations

In this section, recommendations are given by authors to UN authorities based on findings from in-depth literature analysis on DEG approach, content analysis, and semi-structured interviews. Even though, the research is fully aware that the UN funds and programs are highly diverse, it focuses only on the cooperation between UNIDO- UNDP and UNODC-WHO partnership and seeks to conduct a cooperation analysis that can be applied easily to other complex institutions in the UN system or other UN-like international organizations.

The research seeks the SDG oriented answers for stronger cooperation in the literature of public administration. Solutions of DEG play an essential role in the new social and technological environment. Even though, some features of DEG have already been applied in observed partnerships, as revealed with content analysis and interviews, there are, still, many other features

that seem to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the services. Here are the recommendations of the research:

- **Rethinking current interagency cooperation with the new paradigm in public administration, DEG.** UN as a huge public administration with dependent and independent agencies could increase its efficiency and effectiveness of service and good delivery with DEG approach which highlights networking, information and knowledge management, the best mixture and horizontal governance.
- **Adapting a new way of networking which includes all the relevant agencies, local institutions, and individuals into one electronic platform.** This platform will help to create the information and knowledge sharing system. Thus, all of the actors (local, regional, global) could share their knowledge in a quick and easy manner, especially in the case of when they face difficulties in different layers of the system. It is also expected to create a common and simple communication flow which unites all different organizational structures together.
- **Creating a stronger professional knowledge management which crosses the borders of the interagency cooperation.** It provides total information awareness for all relevant agencies in the assigned network to reach information synchronously from **created** wider data assets. This management would also decrease the conflict and confrontations based on horizontal governance and shared responsibility.
- **Prioritizing the horizontal governance which is based on shared responsibility and coordination.** The corresponding governance should include external local partners and individuals.
- **Encouraging MOUs an Interagency agreements between agencies.** Interviews have confirmed the insufficient coordination in many cases between the specialized UN agencies with double work has been decreased considerably. To this end, the research has found out that the newly established Memorandum of Understandings and Interagency agreements have played an essential role in this decrease. On the other hand, to what extent these partnerships influence the quality of the service is a remaining question which could be analyzed in the upcoming period of time.

7. Conclusion

Strengthening the interagency cooperation in the UN system is a challenging process. The existing literature disregards the importance of cooperation among UN agencies to reach desired targets. Therefore, according to the conducted research, applying DEG's approach to UN cooperation, in order to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the given services, provides a unique way to rethink and examine the UN by highlighting the new social and technological environment. "Paradigm change in the paradigm change" fits well with the new understanding of public administration with DEG.

The research calls attention to the problems of the interagency cooperation that prevents agencies to work closely on projects. There is no descent communication channel with constant reporting and information exchange. Additionally, unstructured coordination mechanisms and lack of joint programming are a problem, which leads to duplications of the tasks and donor fatigue.

Also, horizontal governance creates new conflicts and confrontation among agencies in the newly established partnerships.

Cooperation problems, based on different aspects hinder attaining a stronger partnership between corresponding agencies. Therefore, further research should be done after the ongoing projects will have ended to be able to understand the precise impact of the SDGs.

Bibliography

- Alonso, José Antonio a Jonathan GLENNIE. What is development cooperation? 2016 Development Cooperation Forum Policy Briefs. ECOSOC, 2015, (1).
- Barkin, J. (2015). *International organization: theories and institutions*. Springer.
- Barzelay, M. (2001). *The new public management: Improving research and policy dialogue* (Vol. 3). Univ of California Press.
- Bauer, S., & Biermann, F. (2004). *Partners or Competitors? Policy Integration for Sustainable Development between United Nations Agencies*. Change.
- Biermann, F. Pattberg, P. and van Asselt, H. (2009). *The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis*. *Global Environmental Politics*, 9(4).
- Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., Roness, P. G., & Røvik, K. A. (2007). *Organization theory and the public sector: Instrument, culture and myth*. Routledge.
- Clarke, P. (2004). *Building a global partnership for development?* In: Black, R., & White, H. (Eds.) *Targeting development: critical perspectives on the Millennium Development Goals*. Basingstoke: Routledge.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Tinkler, J., & Bastow, S. (2006). *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government*. Oxford University Press.
- Greig, A., Hulme, D. and Turner, M. (2007) *Challenging Global Inequality: Development Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hudson, D. (2015). *Global finance and development*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Huntington, S. P. (1973). *Transnational organizations in world politics*. *World Politics*, 25(3).
- Karvalics, L. Z. (2008). *Towards Governing in the Digital Age*.
- Kaul, I. (2013 a): *Global public goods: a concept for framing the post-2015 agenda?*, Bonn: DIE (Discussion Paper 2/2013)
- Kaul, I. (2013 b): *Financing progress in the post-2015 era : why we need a Monterrey plus conference*.
- Kelly-Kate S. Pease (2008). *International Organizations: Perspectives on Governance in the Twenty-First Century*, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Keohane, R. (2011). *Neoliberal institutionalism*. *Security Studies: A Reader*.
- Klingebiel, Stephan. *United Nations Development Cooperation: Challenges and reforms at the end of the 1990s*. German development institute. *Deutsches institut für entwicklungspolitik*, 1998, (2), 4. ISSN 1434-8934.
- Krasner, Stephen D. *Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as intervening variables*. *International Organization*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1982, 36(2), 21. ISSN 0020-8183/82/020/185-21.

- Le Blanca, David. Issue 4: Towards integration at last? The Sustainable Development Goals as a network of targets. Division for Sustainable Development, UNDESA: Rio+20 working papers. New York City: United Nations, 2014.
- Lisa L. Martin, Beth. A. Simmons (1998). Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions, *International Organization*, Autumn. (Lisa L. Martin, 1998).
- Mitchell, R. B., & Keilbach, P. M. (2001). Situation structure and institutional design: reciprocity, coercion, and exchange. *International Organization*, 55(4).
- Moran, T. H. (2009). The United Nations and transnational corporations: a review and a perspective. *Transnational Corporations*, 18(2).
- Najam, Adil, Mihaela Papa and Nadaa Taiyab (Lead Authors); International Institute for Sustainable Development; Cutler J. Cleveland (Topic Editor). 2007. "Global Environmental Governance: Elements of a Reform Agenda." In: *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Eds. Cutler J. Cleveland (Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment).
- Pearson, L. B. (1969). *Partners in development: report of the Commission on International Development*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Robert S. Jordan (2001). *International Organizations: A Comparative Approach to the Management of Cooperation*. Westport, Praeger Publishers.
- Silva, M. L. (2003). *The Human Rights Based Approach to Development Cooperation towards a Common Understanding among UN Agencies*.
- Walker, Robert S. (2006) *The Super Solution to Government Dysfunction* The Ripon Forum, August/Sept.
- Young, C., & Ghoshal, S. (2016). *Organization theory and the multinational corporation*. Springer.
- Zürn, M., & Faude, B. (2013). On fragmentation, differentiation, and coordination. *Global Environmental Politics*, 13(3).

UN documents:

- MOU : agreements & memorandum of understanding mutually entered into between UNODC and WHO, (2017).
- Strengthened Cooperation between United Nations, Regional Organizations Vital to International Peace, Security, Speakers Stress at General Assembly Debate. Sixty-ninth General Assembly, Thematic Debate, AM & PM Meetings. United Nations General Assembly, 2015.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2003) *Human Development Report 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among Nations to End Poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations, 2014, *Prototype Global Sustainable Development Report*, Division for Sustainable Development, New York.
- UNODC, *Guidance Note – The SDGs, Human Rights, Gender, and Sustainable Development in the 2030 Agenda*, 2018.

Resolutions of the United Nations:

Delivering as one. Report of the High-level Panel on United Nations System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment: A/61/583. General Assembly. United Nations, 2006.

Mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the United Nations: A/70/75–E/2015/55. *United Nations: General Assembly Economic and Social Council*. 2015.

Review of environmental governance within the United Nations system: A/69/763. General Assembly. United Nations, 2015.

Review of environmental governance within the United Nations system: A/69/763. General Assembly. United Nations, 2015.

Review of environmental governance within the United Nations system: A/69/763. General Assembly. United Nations, 2015.

Triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system: A/RES/50/120. General Assembly. United Nations, 1996.

Online sources:

Funds, Programmes, Specialized Agencies and Others. *United Nations* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-28]. Accessed from: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/funds-programmes-specialized-agencies-and-others/>

The United Nations System. *United Nations* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-28]. Accessed from: http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/structure/pdfs/UN_System_Chart_30June2015.pdf

United Nations Development Programme, Goal 17 Targets, <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-17-partnerships-for-the-goals/targets/>, 10.07.2018.

HLP (High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda) (2013): A new global partnership: eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development (2013) : the report of the high-level panel of eminent persons on the post-2015 development agenda, New York: United Nations; online: <http://www.post2015hlp.org/the-report/>

Development Progress Blog; online: <http://www.developmentprogress.org/blog/2013/11/26/financingprogress-post-2015-era-why-we-need-monterrey-plus-conference>

UN News, Countries back ‘ambitious and comprehensive’ reform of UN development system, accessed from: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2018/05/1011111>, 10.07.2018.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). *UNOV* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-30]. Accessed from: <https://www.unov.org/unov/en/unodc.html>

About WHO. *World Health Organization* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-30]. Accessed from: <http://www.who.int/about/structure/en/>

Structure of UNIDO. *UNIDO* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-30]. Accessed from: <https://www.unido.org/who-we-are/structure>

- UNDP cuts HQ staff, creates new lower-level jobs. *DEVEX* [online]. [cit. 2018-10-30]. Accessed from: <https://www.devex.com/news/undp-cuts-hq-staff-creates-new-lower-level-jobs-83612>
- Historic New Sustainable Development Agenda Unanimously Adopted by 193 UN Members. Sustainable Development Platform [online]. United Nations [cit. 2018-08-21]: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/8371Sustainable%20Development%20Summit_final.pdf
- The role of the Secretary-General [online]. United Nations [cit. 2018-08-21]. Accessed from: <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/role-secretary-general>
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). *UNDP* [online]. [cit. 2018-12-16]. Accessed from: <http://www.undp.org/content/unct/mongolia/en/home/agencies/united-nations-industrial-development-organization--unido-.html>
- Rules of procedures of the general conference. *UNIDO* [online]. 1985 [cit. 2018-12-16]. Accessed from: https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2009-11/Rules%20GC-E_0.pdf
- Sustainable development goals. *UNDP* [online]. 2018 [cit. 2018-12-16]. Accessed from: <http://www.jposc.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>
- Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, of the United Nations Population Fund and of the United Nations. *UNDP* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2018-12-16]. Accessed from: <http://web.undp.org/execbrd/pdf/9719131e.pdf>
- Partnerships with international development organizations. *UNIDO* [online]. 2018 [cit. 2018-12-16]. Accessed from: <https://www.unido.org/our-focus/cross-cutting-services/partnerships-prosperity/partnerships-international-development-organizations>
- UNODC-WHO Joint Programme on drug dependence treatment and care. *UNODC* [online]. 2009 [cit. 2018-10-01]. Accessed from: <https://www.unodc.org/documents/drug-treatment/UNODC-WHO-brochure.pdf>

Appendix

Interview questions:

Introductory Questions

1. How important is it to have a good cooperation and why?
2. Our questionnaire uses the following indicators to measure effective cooperation between UN agencies on SDGs (see Annex I): joint projects/activities, leadership, knowledge, coherence, performance, and mainstreaming. Are these indicators applicable in your opinion? If not, which indicators do you use in your agency?
3. What would you say the current level of cooperation on the SDGs between your agency and the partnering agency is?
4. Is there a need for a better interagency cooperation and why? Please provide an example

Questions based on areas of analysis

Joint projects/activities

8. Does your organization implement joint project/activities with (the partner organization)?
9. Are these projects/activities ongoing or completed?
10. Were these projects/activities introduced in the framework of the SDGs?
11. What have been the main outcomes of the projects (if already completed)?
12. In your opinion, has cooperation between your organization and (the partner organization) improved as a result of these joint projects/activities?
13. What is the prospect for continuing joint projects/activities in the current area or starting new ones in different areas in the framework of the SDGs?
14. Networking in Digital Era Governance (DEG) is defined as a stage of interaction of the smart masses, allowing the total information awareness to all participants in the cooperation with net-centered governance. How your organization unites all the relevant agencies and organizations, inside and outside, into a project into one single joint platform? Is there any tool that have been used for it? Has it changed with SDGs?

Knowledge and information

15. Has your agency of the UN set up scientific committees and scientific and technical panels on SDGs' related matters? Has your agency ensured the participation of other actors (epistemic communities) in the creation or publication of scientific publications etc. when it comes to SDGs?
16. How do you exchange knowledge with the partner agency or another agency that you are working closely with? Does the partner agency cooperate and share knowledge with other UN agencies and what are the means (Database, reports, interagency communication, etc.)?

17. Do your agency and the partner organization conduct joint capacity building activities or inter-agency trainings in the framework of the SDGs?
18. Do your agency and the partner agency produce reports on joint work?
19. DEG states that all the information and knowledge process must be planned, maintained, watched, and measured. How your organization deals with this management in the joint information flow especially with SDGs?

Coherence

1. Is there reasonable coordination, regular communication, and a shared sense of direction among various departments/sections of your agency since the implementation of SDGs? Please provide examples. How often do you personally talk to someone from the partnering agency about common work-related tasks?
2. Does your agency provide normative capacity building assistance, joint tools for planning, monitoring and reporting, and sharing knowledge with (the partner organization) and other agencies?
3. Do both agencies jointly participate in the development of joint projects/programs and decision-making process when it comes to common projects on SDGs?
4. Is there cross-sectoral unification of strategies, policies and implementation of SDGs?

Performance

1. Has your agency used the following tools in the framework of SDGs: program harmonization, classification of programs and expenditures, statistical categories and reporting methods?
2. Has your agency set norms and standards in the area of social and environmental sustainability and incorporated the element of responsibility into its instruments in the framework of SDGs?
3. In your view, has SDG-based cooperation (e.g. joint projects/activities) improved the performance of your organization? Please explain?

Mainstreaming

1. In the spirit of comprehensive achievement of the SDGs, which initiatives (or innovations) has your agency put in place to achieve SDGs? Does your agency conduct evaluations on SDGs (in cooperation with the cooperating agency)?
2. In your agency programming, are the SDGs mainstreamed in all areas of your organization's mandate?

Concluding Questions

1. What have been the best practices from the SDG-based cooperation between your agency and (the partner organization)?
2. What are the main challenges in cooperation between your agency and...?
3. What should be done to maintain or enhance the cooperation between ... in your opinion?