

PROVISIONAL

E/2006/SR.24  
25 July 2006

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Substantive session of 2006

Operational activities segment

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 12 July 2006, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. MÉRORÈS (Haiti)  
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

- (b) REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARDS OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME/UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND,  
THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND AND THE WORLD FOOD  
PROGRAMME

---

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

GE.06-62794 (E) 190706 250706

In the absence of Mr. Hachani (Tunisia), Mr. Mérorès (Haiti),  
Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

## OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

- (b) REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARDS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME/UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND, THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND AND THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (E/2005/34/Rev.1-E/ICEF/2005/5/Rev.1, E/2005/35, Supp. No. 15, E/2006/5, E/2006/6-E/ICEF/2006/3, E/2006/14, E/2006/34 (Part I) - E/ICEF/2006/5 (Part I), E/2006/34 (Part I)/Add.1-E/ICEF/2006/5 (Part I)/Add.1 and E/2006/36, Supp. No. 16; E/2006/L.6; E/2006/CRP.8; DP/2006/15 and 16)

### Dialogue with executive heads of United Nations funds and programmes

Mr. OCAMPO (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), Moderator, said that the emphasis placed on achieving the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals at the 2005 World Summit had given new urgency to reform of the United Nations system as it mobilized support for nationally-led development strategies. Increased commitments in official development assistance (ODA) in response to the Summit would also require the United Nations development system to strengthen its capacity to deliver effective support at the country level.

A number of points had been underscored during discussions in the Council as well as in the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities. The Council played a central role in ensuring coherence and coordination, in particular with regard to the United Nations funds and programmes, which were subject to its authority. The specialized agencies and the non-resident agencies involved must be fully incorporated into a coordinated system at the country level. In the context of slower growth in multilateral funding channelled through the United Nations system than through non-United Nations organizations and the reduction in the relative size of core funding in relation to non-core funding, the issue of funding must be addressed.

The 2006 work priorities of the United Nations Development Group reflected General Assembly resolution 59/250 and the 2005 World Summit Outcome. Priorities were identified under the unifying theme of “one programme, one leader, one team” and included coherence among inter-agency mechanisms in supporting efforts to meet internationally agreed goals. Coherence was to be achieved by coordinating the work plans of the United Nations Development Group, the Executive Committee on Economic and Social Affairs, the high-level committees on programmes and management of the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee for coordination of humanitarian activities.

The dialogue with the executive heads should explore the challenges facing both the United Nations system and national partners in the implementation of reforms in the rapidly changing global environment for development. They should include improved coordination of operational activities for development and of steps to implement General Assembly resolution 59/250. In that context, he referred delegations to the consolidated list of names prepared by the Executive Committee of the United Nations Development Group (E/2006/CRP.1). The current dialogue would provide critical input to the Council’s deliberations on operational activities and to the guidance the Council would provide to the United Nations development system, in the context of the recommendations of the High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence, the review of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 59/250, and the next triennial comprehensive policy review.

Mr. DERVIS (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)), speaking on the topic of strengthening the resident coordinator system, said there were currently 27 agencies, funds and programmes which were members of the United Nations Development Group. They had a vast array of knowledge and skills but that very diversity could pose a challenge at the country level, where there was a need to act in a coherent and cohesive manner while still respecting the mandates of each member. Increasing coherence was in fact the key challenge in reform of the United Nations system; the High-level Panel on System-wide Coherence, of which he was an ex officio member, would make recommendations in that regard at the General Assembly in September 2006.

The funds and programmes that made up the Executive Committee of the United Nations Development Group were working to adopt a team approach based on providing support for country-driven priorities in the context of a programming and financial framework which promoted synergies and did not impose excessive bureaucratic or administrative burdens on the country in question. The resident coordinator was at the heart of that team approach; he or she chaired the country team and must have the necessary authority to manage system activities in the country. The resident coordinator must be a professional, not a bureaucrat, and must have the team-building skills, knowledge and expertise required for the position. There was a great variety of views, approaches and expertise within the United Nations system; the work of the United Nations Development Group, which concentrated on programmes and operations at the country level, was enriched by the regional and development experience of other parts of the United Nations.

Ms. VENEMAN (Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)), speaking on coordination during the transition from emergencies to recovery and development, said humanitarian coordination needed to be supported by such tools as the consolidated appeals process, common information services and the recently introduced "cluster approach". Development coordination had traditionally focused on the United Nations country team and its national partners. In the early stages of recovery and transition, a mixture of approaches was needed, with clearly aligned responsibilities. The transition period required even greater involvement at the country and local levels. The United Nations system should ensure coordination and enhanced service delivery in the context of a "build back better" approach.

There was currently a strong consensus that early recovery actions must begin concurrently with humanitarian assistance. That had led to the creation of an "inter-agency cluster" on early recovery to provide support for complex recovery processes. New peacebuilding initiatives included the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Standing Fund for Peacebuilding. The roles and responsibilities of the different players in peacebuilding were being defined through the inter-agency process and had been a focus of the United Nations Development Group Executive Committee.

Investing in coordination would accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. Improved coordination directly contributed to increased aid effectiveness while strengthening partnerships and ensuring greater accountability and predictability of response. Examples of improved coordination included the new cluster leadership approach in Pakistan, multi-donor trust fund mechanisms in several crisis-affected countries and the joint assessment mission in Sudan. Those mechanisms were not yet being fully exploited but they clearly illustrated the potential contribution that enhanced coherence and coordination with a broad range of partners could make to fulfilling the international community's responsibility to help those affected by devastating crises.

Ms. OBAID (Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)), speaking on the topic of a streamlined country presence, recalled that implementation of the joint office model had been called for in General Assembly resolution 59/250 in the context of reforms to make the United Nations presence at the country level more effective in helping countries achieve internationally agreed development goals. A joint office had been established for the first time in Cape Verde. A common country programme had been approved by the four Executive Committee agencies; it included clear agency-specific sections, which ensured that each agency could be held responsible by its governing body for achieving the expected results. A single organizational and staffing structure with a single set of business processes and a single cost-sharing administrative budget had been established, although one agency had to be the support agency or vehicle for the administration of the office since no legal entity which covered all four funds and programmes existed. The Executive Committee agencies had jointly designated one individual to act as the representative of the joint office; that representative was also the resident coordinator. As the Cape Verde joint office was a pilot programme, its working methods would be adjusted as necessary.

She stressed that a streamlined country presence involved more than just the joint office model. Hosting arrangements also existed where a larger United Nations agency managed the country programme of other agencies that had smaller programmes or that had no physical presence in the country. Progress had been made in establishing common premises. There were currently 62 United Nations Houses, where all the executive committee agencies were housed in

the same building; the goal was to add three new United Nations Houses every year. A common services programme had been established in 57 countries. In each country, an operations management team had been created to develop new common services in addition to those already existing; most had focused on items such as air travel, local procurement of bulk commodities and transport pooling. An extensive review of that programme had recently been concluded.

Although the Cape Verde joint office had only been running for six months, and had been designed for a very small United Nations operation, some preliminary lessons had already emerged. A strong commitment from the Government and a well-functioning United Nations country team were crucial to the success of a joint office; and the selection of countries for joint offices should be a bottom-up process, with guidance as needed from the respective headquarters of the agencies concerned. Each joint office must be adapted to the specific situation in each country, and must reflect the mandates of the respective programmes and funds as well as the national goals of the country. The joint office must also have the technical and administrative capacity necessary to deliver the agreed programme.

Differences in business practices, policies and procedures were making it more difficult for the funds and programmes to work together. The High-level Committee on Management of the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the Management Group of the United Nations Development Group were therefore working with renewed urgency to harmonize and simplify practices and procedures. That would facilitate inter-agency collaboration and also reduce the transaction costs for partners, including Governments.

Mr. MORRIS (Executive Director, World Food Programme (WFP)), speaking on the topic of improved country programming to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, said that to achieve increased coherence and effectiveness would require a real commitment to partnership by the United Nations system. While he believed that reform for reform's sake was useless, he would welcome a renewed focus on the importance of only taking decisions that would have a positive impact on the system's clients in the field, namely, those who were at risk and in need of help. The various funds, programmes and agencies must be

ready to work in the context of a government-led and government-owned poverty eradication strategy with a view to strengthening the relevant government's efforts to meet its humanitarian and development responsibilities and improve the lot of its citizens. WFP currently devoted 80 per cent of its energies to humanitarian assistance in crisis situations and approximately 20 per cent to development; he believed that humanitarian and emergency assistance helped create the conditions for a successful transition to development.

Comprehensive coordinated assessment mechanisms, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the linkage of United Nations efforts with government priorities were exemplary development tools. The commitment of the United Nations and the international community to the Millennium Development Goals was the single most important step ever taken in promoting development. He strongly believed that the elimination of hunger and improved nutrition were key factors in progress towards achieving each of the Millennium Development Goals. There must therefore be an international effort to eliminate hunger, especially child hunger; of the 850 million people facing hunger in the world, 300 to 400 million were children and that problem could be eliminated at relatively little cost. He cited the example of Botswana, where every child currently received adequate nutrition and attended school. The Government's efforts had at first been supported by the United Nations system but the Government had gradually assumed more ownership and was currently fully responsible for programmes in that area.

The Millennium Development Goals should be seen as constituting the world's basic development and humanitarian agendas. The challenge of attaining them should unite the United Nations family and its development partners in a compelling common cause. The international campaign against HIV/AIDS had worked brilliantly, through the agency of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), because it had been a campaign of the committed and the willing.

Issues of food security, especially in the 50 or so poorest countries in the world, required an equally focused response from the international community. The resources available to the United Nations development and humanitarian community were marginal when compared to those of the Bretton Woods institutions or bilateral assistance agencies; but the

United Nations had a comparative advantage in terms of its expertise and worldwide support for capacity-building. A very small amount of money could make a huge difference: he had been strongly encouraging the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to take the lead in efforts backed by WFP, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and other organizations to help Governments develop food security strategies. So many other goals, particularly in the field of health and education, depended on children being well nourished. The cost of feeding a child in school for a year was minimal, scarcely more than \$30, compared with the massive returns on the investment.

In response to the “triple threat” crisis in southern Africa, involving HIV/AIDS, food security and problems of governance and capacity, all parts of the system had come together at the regional and country levels to transform the action of the United Nations. The collective effort had underlined the key leadership role of the resident coordinators, working in close cooperation with Governments, and the need for the United Nations to remain strongly focused on the needs of those it existed to serve.

Mr. MELKERT (Associate Administrator, UNDP), speaking on ways to improve the performance and effectiveness of the resident coordinator system, said that strengthening the resident coordinator function was important for conveying the concept of “one United Nations”, increasing the system’s efficiency and effectiveness on the ground, and strengthening the visibility and accountability of its operational action. All members of the resident coordinator system must be held accountable through performance appraisals that rated staff according to their individual contributions to UNDAF. The focus in the last two years had been on improving the calibre of resident coordinators through the testing and selection process, increasing the collective sense of ownership of the resident coordinator system and on improving its functioning.

In view of the increasing responsibilities entailed in the resident coordinator’s function, UNDP had established more than 30 posts for country directors, whose job was to focus on management, allowing the resident coordinator to concentrate more on the leadership of the United Nations country team and on the concerns and priorities of non-resident agencies.



The new pilot system of performance reporting, until recently an exclusively UNDP process, was based on a weighted appraisal of the resident coordinator's and resident representative's functions by the four regional directors of the funds and programmes of the Executive Committee, and incorporated feedback from members of the country team and other United Nations Development Group agencies. The performance appraisal in 2006 would be based on a fully reciprocal appraisal system, whereby the resident coordinator and the country team would be rated according to their results and contributions to the work of the team. A new system of team self-assessment had been tried out in 20 countries and would be introduced generally in September 2006.

More needed to be done to promote inter-agency mobility for mid-career staff to upgrade their skills and give them the multi-agency experience required to become an effective resident coordinator. Continuing attention was being given to increasing the percentage of resident coordinators from outside UNDP; that percentage currently stood at 27 per cent. There was also a need to appoint more women; the number of women currently occupying posts as resident coordinators or representatives currently stood at 28 per cent.

Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the current preoccupation with coherence and coordination should not cause the United Nations to lose sight of the virtues of competition, which in his country was associated with enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. While the idea of "one United Nations" had some clear advantages, there was a danger that, from the perspective of a developing country, the merging of the distinctive identities of its different agencies within a single office might be seen as an impoverishment of the system. He would be interested to hear whether the panel thought there might be scope for healthy competition within the unified field offices. It was also necessary to keep in mind the concepts of governance and of accountability to both donors and recipients. Would the new arrangements not make it more difficult to measure and monitor results? Account should also be taken of the possible loss of brand identity and loyalty - which, in the case of UNICEF, for example, was an asset worth hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States alone. He was concerned that the changes envisaged should not damage the work of the organization. At the same time, he wished to express his appreciation of the

visionary leadership shown by the executive heads present on the rostrum, which was the United Nations system's most valuable asset in meeting the challenges facing the international community.

Mr. NEBENZIA (Russian Federation) said that the reform of the resident coordinator system would have a decisive impact on the operational activities of the United Nations at all levels. However, any increase in the authority of the resident coordinators should be counterbalanced by greater accountability. The preparation of a comprehensive accountability framework for resident coordinators, as requested in General Assembly resolution 59/250, would require, among other things, the development of appropriate mechanisms. It was essential that the resident coordinator system, which was traditionally associated with the work of UNDP, should be both accountable and an integral part of the United Nations development system as a whole. Ways would have to be found to avoid conflicts of interest and authority between the resident coordinators and the representatives of other United Nations agencies.

At the regional level, attention needed be paid to the harmonization of organizational structures and to the coverage and location of regional offices. Emphasis should be placed on regional interaction between funds and programmes and between regional teams and the Council's regional commissions, whose demonstrated expertise could make a significant contribution in a whole range of areas to the effectiveness of the development activities of the United Nations. The cooperation of all parts of the system in responding to the needs of recipient countries was the key to reform of the system and to enhancing the public image of the United Nations. In that connection, he agreed with the representative of the United States of America about the importance of safeguarding the brand identity of the different agencies. The belief that reform for reform's sake was pointless would underlie his Government's approach to the reform of operational activities in all the governing bodies of the United Nations.

Mr. CABRAL (Guinea-Bissau) said that any doubts he may have had about the reform of the United Nations development cooperation system had been largely allayed by the presentations of the executive heads. From the perspective of the developing world, the

combination of expertise and compassion that the funds and programmes of the United Nations Development Group brought to bear on the problems of the needy represented what was best in the United Nations system. He endorsed what Mr. Morris had said about the importance of a real commitment to partnership and on focusing on needs. He welcomed the fact that the pilot programme for a joint office run by the resident coordinator was taking place in Cape Verde, which was a good example of a developing country that was making progress. While he understood Mr. Miller's reservations concerning accountability, he had been reassured by what he had heard from the Associate Administrator of UNDP about accountability and the preservation of the identity of members of the country team. He believed that the reform, although it would require compromises, would succeed, but only if it was characterized by a genuine focus on needs.

Mr. SOW (Guinea) said that, in the space of two years, his country had experienced directly the reorganization of the United Nations development system, with the support of the organizations represented on the podium under leadership of UNDP. The recent inauguration in Guinea of a unified field office had raised the profile of the United Nations there and had helped his Government to work on an integrated strategy for achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The restructuring was to be welcomed as the sign of a determination to improve coordination without harming the identity of the various agencies involved, to limit bureaucratic practices that were shocking in the midst of great poverty, and to adopt a commendable results-oriented approach. The pilot programme involving the establishment of a joint office in Cape Verde might well be replicated elsewhere. In any event, ways should be found to mobilize countries to work towards internationally agreed development goals. As the representative of the United States had pointed out, there were virtues in competition, but geographical distribution must also be taken into account in allocating resources, so that all regions benefited equitably from United Nations operational activities.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the key contribution of the Peacebuilding Commission would be at the country level in post-conflict societies. The idea was to create a societal equilibrium that would prevent any additional conflict from leading to a

descent into chaos. Some agencies, including UNICEF, had devised elaborate post-conflict programmes of their own. It was important for the Executive Committee funds and programmes to work towards a single peacebuilding model for each affected country.

The joint office model was a logical step towards increased cohesiveness but he was glad to see it was recognized that “one size fits all” was not the desired goal, since countries differed, as did the scope of the operations they required. However, a model would cease to be a model if the fundamental paradigm was not followed in each country.

He was concerned that some large recipient countries had specialized government agencies that dealt with the various United Nations agencies in their own fields of competence. He wondered if Ms. Obaid would like to comment on the possibility of those host-country agencies losing out on skill transfers under the joint office model.

Mr. RAUBENHEIMER (South Africa) said that coordination and coherence in operational activities sometimes stemmed from unpredictable sources. For example, the ad hoc advisory groups established by the Council - particularly those for Burundi and Guinea-Bissau - had generated coherence on the ground not only within the United Nations country team but also among other development partners in those countries. The groups had been a useful, though somewhat unexpected, catalyst and much of their success had stemmed from the relationships they had built up and their combined focus on the same ultimate aims.

His Government had experienced an excellent partnership with the United Nations country team. It had “clustered” its own development analysis around the five themes of social issues, international relations, governance, justice and economics, and the country team had adopted those clusters in its response. However, while that approach was working for his own country, it might not be replicable in others. It was important to clarify that the evaluation of operational activities for development should involve Governments as well as United Nations bodies.

Lastly, he noted that competition was most often for resources, but the representative of the United States appeared to have competition for delivery in mind. Yet an abundance of choice of delivery mechanisms surely reflected duplication in delivery capacity. How did that situation tally with the limited availability of resources?

Mr. AHO-GLELE (Benin) said that WFP had already demonstrated the effectiveness of a non-competitive United Nations synergy at work in the field. Most United Nations agencies already incorporated the principles of synergy and coherence in their programmes; the question was how they could put those principles into practice in the field. He would like to know how reform in the field of operational activities for development related to the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries.

Ms. PICHYAKORN (Thailand) wondered whether host countries would have ownership of programmes under the new resident coordinator system and whether they would have a say in the selection of the resident coordinator, to ensure that the candidate selected was familiar with the host country's problems and politics. She was glad that gender equality was a consideration in the selection process and would like to know what percentage of representatives in the resident coordinator system were African or Asian and what further steps were envisaged for promoting "one United Nations".

Mr. EKANZA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) expressed his Government's appreciation of the WFP school feeding programme, which had had a highly positive impact on school attendance rates, particularly among girls, and on the capacity of the children concerned to profit from their schooling. The fact that the pilot scheme in Botswana had been entirely taken over by the Government was an example for the whole of Africa. However, he wondered what criteria had been adopted by WFP in its choice of countries for the programme and why the programme, having been operational for over 20 years, had not been extended to other poor countries with at least as great a need as Botswana. Was the problem one of resources? Or did prior conditions need to be met? He asked whether, within the framework of the efforts to achieve coordination, coherence and effectiveness in the United Nations system, the problem of feeding schoolchildren had been discussed with a view to extending the programme to other poor countries.

Ms. HAYCOCK (United Kingdom) said that the focus of the reform was to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations and to take the principles of effective aid as the basis for an agenda that was good for development, good for developing countries and good for

the United Nations. With something over one year left for implementing the triennial comprehensive policy review, she asked what priority challenges the panellists wished to bring to the Council's attention, how greater predictability and better quality of finance would help achieve United Nations objectives at country level, and what value they saw in the emerging idea of "results and resources" processes that would enable the United Nations and the recipient and donor countries to set out programmes within 10-year resource envelopes.

Mr. CONTINI (France) said that while he was in favour of reform that maintained the credibility of the United Nations, he was aware of the danger of reform for reform's sake. The quest for rationalization and coherence often led to even more complex bureaucracy, which hindered the attainment of objectives. The Millennium Development Goals could only be achieved if all donor countries gave their support and funding. That, of course, involved the fulfilment of largely unmet commitments, such as the preparation and implementation of the appropriate financing mechanism, which France was currently working on with Brazil, Chile and Norway. His Government had also recently introduced an international solidarity levy on air tickets to help fund development activities.

He supported the idea of "one United Nations". The main reform in that connection obviously related to the appointment of resident coordinators with adequate power and authority. They should be independent, credible, legitimate in the eyes of all the agencies concerned, and adequately funded.

He also supported efforts to rationalize the work of the United Nations Development Group and to strengthen UNDAF with a view to maintaining certain programmes that were underfunded from extrabudgetary funds. The idea of a single budget raised some concerns, as it might make it more difficult to define the recipient country's development priorities and also to fully protect all human rights. He would welcome information on the joint office in Viet Nam and on any steps to harmonize management methods.

Ms. AJAYI (Nigeria) said that United Nations agencies in Nigeria had started operating a joint office, which had been donated by the Government, making for better coordination. She was confident that the challenges they faced could be overcome thanks to the commitment of all concerned.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that the panel had itself demonstrated the coherence and coordination that was being sought for the United Nations system. He would like to know how programme countries would be involved in the new resident coordinator system. His Government had recently adopted a “cluster” approach in the area of humanitarian activities; such an approach might usefully be replicated in other areas of activity of the United Nations.

Mr. DERVIŞ (Administrator, UNDP) said that it was necessary to strike a balance between the need for cohesiveness and the need for competition. Even in the private sector, too much competition could be counterproductive. The difficulties inherent in a system where a Government must deal with 17 agencies instead of just 1 were readily apparent. At the same time, it was indeed necessary to reduce overhead expenses, which gave the impression of waste, and to develop a more cohesive management style for United Nations agencies. There was clearly a need for competition in the development field in terms of results, and also in terms of ideas and recommendations, but competition for funding could be harmful. Donors must show more cohesiveness, in particular by avoiding the earmarking of funds, which was extremely detrimental to the efficiency of operations.

Ms. VENEMAN (Executive Director, UNICEF) said that in development efforts, the problems encountered were often simply too great to leave room for competition in the field, and that in such cases it was imperative to ensure the best possible utilization of resources through a coordinated response. Competition was appropriate in the marketplace of ideas, and there would be competition for resources, but that was quite different from the need for a coordinated United Nations team that avoided duplication and waste and could effectively achieve results in the field. The coordinating mechanism used by UNAIDS provided a model of such coherence.

The co-location of offices and services would provide a means of ensuring coherence. However, it was also critical to ensure more homogenous business practices and processes in the various agencies. Country teams worked better together when they had common objectives, and in that respect the Millennium Development Goals provided a single set of aims that applied across the board. As it was important to measure the outputs of programmes, the United Nations

agencies must work with the development banks and other institutions to ensure that data were reliable and standardized. UNICEF no doubt had the best known brand identity of all United Nations agencies, and that brand was vital to UNICEF's fundraising activities and relations with its national committees. Funding for United Nations agencies must be predictable, must cover long-term needs and must avoid earmarking. Given donor reluctance to provide core resources, the next best thing would be for them to provide resources linked to thematic activities. Lastly, he pointed out that the world of financing had evolved, and non-State sources such as the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and various foundations were playing an unprecedented role.

Mr. REYES (Observer for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that coherence and coordination were crucial to the effectiveness of United Nations activities, which must be in absolute harmony with national development strategies. His Government attached special importance to South-South cooperation, in which the fight against poverty and hunger must be the priority. In 2006, his Government had provided some \$3 million of development support to Burkina Faso, Mauritania and Niger through WFP. The United Nations funds and programmes must pay more attention to resource management with the aim of increasing transparency. Lastly, he said that WFP reports should contain more information on the work done in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Ms. OBAID (Executive Director, UNFPA) underscored the need for both compassion and passion when dealing with such issues as hunger, poverty, HIV/AIDS and maternal mortality. At the Paris High-level Forum on Joint Progress toward Aid Effectiveness held in February and March 2005, numerous government ministers from developing countries had called for coherence on the part of the international organizations. But States too must be coherent. For example, the Government of South Africa had decided in its discussions on bilateral and multilateral development cooperation to refer to only one document - the one produced for the UNDAF common country assessment - and had made it a matter of policy not to replicate that document in others. By so doing, the Government had sent an important message of coherence.



A joint office model was different from the co-location of all United Nations offices at a single premises, as in the latter case, each fund or programme would still have a separate representative. The joint office model did not negate the existence of separate sectors, each of which related to the appropriate government ministry in a better integrated, multisectoral approach ensuring improved response to government counterparts. The adoption of the joint office model in Viet Nam, unlike the one in Cape Verde, had taken a bottom-up approach, whereby the country itself had initiated the reform, which was only just beginning. In principle, it had been agreed that the model would include: a single United Nations representatives seconded by agency country directors, each representing a sector; a single, integrated programme, with various agencies taking lead roles; a single budget plan; and one United Nations building, with as many shared services as possible. The joint office model could of course be applied to agencies other than the United Nations funds and programmes, including for example the World Health Organization (WHO).

With regard to the location of regional offices, UNFPA was considering the placement of its regional offices with the regional commissions. Regarding management methods, the Chief Executives Board for Coordination had adopted the International Public Sector Accounting Standards, which were to be adopted by all United Nations agencies by 2010. The funds and programmes of the Executive Committee were also working to select compatible enterprise resource planning models to facilitate comparability of human resources management, security and auditing, for example.

Mr. MORRIS (Executive Director, WFP) said that a shared sense of commitment, compassion and passion would be the greatest contributor to coherence in development and humanitarian work. The main point in joining forces was related not so much to competition as to unity, and a shared focus on the people who needed help. In many instances, the same people required the assistance of numerous United Nations programmes or funds, which provided very different services. It was true that combating hunger and malnutrition was much more complex than merely providing food, as it involved health and sanitation and a whole gamut of other services. Similarly, the HIV/AIDS issue could not be addressed without each programme or agency doing its piece in a united effort. Worldwide, WFP had 2,300 partners, generally

non-governmental organizations with extremely committed staff who delivered its services. In Zimbabwe alone, there were between 14 and 25 such partners delivering food. WFP was working to strengthen the operational capacity of such organizations.

Regarding governance, he said that United Nations programmes must have executive boards that were emotionally engaged in their work, that understood their mandates, that were involved, accountable and focused and that transmitted their aspirations. It would be a terrible thing indeed if a single, monolithic agency reported to the 192 Member States on all issues. Branding was of prime importance, as the world was inevitably political, and it was necessary to be recognized in order to make a case for funding.

The position of resident coordinator must be one of leadership, not management. To engage the best people, it must be as attractive as possible in terms of stature, profile, training, investment and compensation. Funding was of paramount importance to WFP, which was totally dependent on voluntary contributions to cover a budget of some \$3 billion. It received no core funding, and its financing in small countries was related to the tonnage delivered, which was completely irrational. It would be better for example to relate the funding to assessment, early warning and disaster preparedness. Funding that was predictable or was provided at the beginning of programmes was up to 30 per cent more effective than that received during implementation of humanitarian or development projects.

WFP had emergency programmes in about 75 countries and development programmes in about 35 - the least developed countries and those with the least food security. Some 15 years before, 80 per cent of its work had been in development, but that figure was now less than 15 per cent. The shift to emergency relief work was in part due to the dramatic increase in natural disasters, conflict and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Still, the effectiveness of development, prevention, mediation and moderation work was considered to be between 5 and 10 times greater than that of emergency relief work.

Mr. MELKERT (Associate Administrator, UNDP), said that it was the UNDP Administrator, as chair of the United Nations Development Group, who provided external accountability. Internal accountability was certainly also of great importance. Local

Governments played a role in the designation of the resident coordinator, and were expected to provide their consent. In designating resident coordinators, UNDP distinguished only between candidates from the North and those from the South. There were currently about 52 per cent with backgrounds from the North. The Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries was a reference for all organizations in the United Nations system, and provided another example where complementarity was the best way forward.

Mr. OCAMPO (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), Moderator, said that the relationship between agencies that were not part of the United Nations Development Group Executive Committee and the regional commissions, and also between such agencies and the resident coordinators was of special interest, as was the link between the United Nations Development Group and the Executive Committee on Economic and Social Affairs.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.