



Economic and Social Council

Provisional

12 September 2011

English

Original: French

Substantive session of 2011

Provisional summary record of the 32nd meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 15 July 2011, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Gutiérrez Reinel (Vice-President) (Peru)

Contents

Operational activities of the United Nations system for international development cooperation

Updated presentation of progress in the independent evaluation of the initiative “Delivering as One”

Panel discussion on “Strengthening the Leadership of the United Nations Resident Coordinator: The Role of Accountability Frameworks, Resources and Results Reporting”

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 Official Records Editing Section, room E 4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Operational activities of the United Nations system for international development cooperation (agenda item 3)

Updated presentation of progress in the independent evaluation of the initiative “Delivering as One”

1. **The President** said that four years earlier, the Secretary-General and eight Member States had decided to launch the initiative “Delivering as One” in order to provide more consistent support to countries in which the United Nations operates. Since then, more than 20 countries had voluntarily joined it; and it was essential for future reforms of United Nations operational activities to draw on the experience gained from it.

2. During the comprehensive review of policy on operational activities, the General Assembly had requested that an independent evaluation be done of the initiative “Delivering as One” begun in 2010. The findings of that evaluation would be an essential input for the next quadrennial comprehensive policy review.

3. **Mr. Back**, speaking in his capacity as head of the secretariat responsible for the independent evaluation of the initiative “Delivering as One”, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), recalled that the assessment of lessons learned from the initiative followed on from a request by Member States made in the context of the triennial comprehensive review of operational activities in 2007. The procedures for that assessment had been set out in General Assembly resolution 64/289 (A/RES/64/289) on the coherence of the United Nations system, which provided for the establishment of the Evaluation Management Group. Created in February 2011, the Group consists of nine evaluation specialists from the five regions, representatives of the pilot countries, and members of the Joint Inspection Unit and the United Nations Evaluation Group. Mr. Back hailed the extrabudgetary financial contributions of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, India, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and several specialized United Nations agencies, which had made the evaluation possible. The budget now stood at US\$2.2 million, and a trust fund had been established for that purpose.

4. At the inaugural meeting of the Evaluation Management Group in March 2011, it had been agreed that the conceptual framework and assessment criteria

for evaluation would be based on guidance provided by Member States through the resolutions arising from the triennial comprehensive reviews of operational activities of 2001, 2004 and 2007 and the resolutions on system-wide coherence adopted subsequent to the 2005 World Summit’s final document; and that the evaluation would focus on national ownership and national leadership, capacity building and reduction of transaction costs, and would examine new ways of functioning for the United Nations system (innovative financing instruments, coordination mechanisms, simplification and harmonization of business practices).

5. While avoiding duplication, the independent evaluation would assess the validity of each of the evaluations done in seven of the eight pilot countries and leverage the analyses performed and information gathered, and it would subsequently be determined whether additional data gathering on the seven countries was indicated. The experience of Pakistan in the implementation of the initiative “Delivering as One” which was deemed important, had been included in the independent evaluation, even though no evaluation had been done at country level. The Evaluation Management Group had hired an evaluation team, comprising a team leader, an evaluation specialist and a specialist in development aid, which had begun its work in July 2011 and would go through a launch phase during which it would focus on reviewing documents for each country. The independent evaluation would be conducted with the assistance of a group of experts to ensure quality results. After the launch phase, in September 2011, a report would be prepared which would serve as a basis for the implementation phase in 2012, building on the lessons learned through the experiences of the eight pilot countries.

6. The evaluation would also address the initiatives taken throughout the system resulting from the initiative “Delivering as One”: management framework and accountability of the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), particularly with regard to the responsibilities of the resident coordinator and the resident UNDP representative, Expanded Funding Window, cross-cutting issues such as gender, harmonization of practices and relationship between the initiative “Delivering as One” and humanitarian aid. The in-country studies to be done and an evaluation of the systemic issues would be accompanied by a careful examination of all available documentation, interviews with everyone involved and validation of the findings by

national and United Nations system decision-makers, followed by a verification of all information.

7. The launch phase would lead to a precise statement of work to guide the conduct of the evaluation. The Evaluation Management Group would meet in Geneva in September 2011 to take stock of its work and, at the 66th session of the General Assembly, its chair would present the evaluation report, which would form an important input to the General Assembly's deliberations for the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities in 2012.

8. **Mr. Panneels** (Belgium) asked whether it was intended that the evaluation should include a review of the experiences of the 20-odd countries that had undertaken to implement the initiative "Delivering as One" by taking action on their own initiative. He also asked whether the report on the launch phase would be made public.

9. **Mr. Back** (UNDESA), recognizing that the experience of the countries in question was very interesting, said that because the information about them was still inadequate, the focus was currently on the eight pilot countries. He added that there was no reason for the findings of the final report on the launch phase not to be disclosed, although they were not intended for publication.

Panel discussion on "Strengthening the Leadership of the United Nations Resident Coordinator: The Role of Accountability Frameworks, Resources and Results Reporting"

10. **The President** said that the role of the Resident Coordinator, an extremely complex one owing to the lack of official accreditation and adequate resources, was essential to the coherence of the United Nations system and that an effort was underway to implement criteria to ensure mutual accountability between United Nations in-country teams and the Resident Coordinator. While preparing the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities in 2012, there was a need to look at the Resident Coordinator's authority and resources for leading and coordinating the in-country team, reporting to the government, and identifying the key orientations his or her job should have.

11. **Ms. Clark** (Director of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that UNDP had changed the evaluation process for resident coordinators

to ensure they had the skills to lead the in-country team, take the necessary decisions and, for example, deal with the humanitarian crises they might face during their tenure. Their training also addressed global development trends, to better equip them to understand the issues of the day and to give them an overall strategic vision of the opportunities and challenges. Ms. Clark said that the Secretary General's report on the functioning of the resident coordinator system (E/2011/86) indicated that resident coordinators and in-country teams work better together; that they share coordination tasks fairly; that the role of the Resident Coordinator is increasingly recognized by in-country teams; and that the evaluation of country representatives and results reporting are satisfactory. In addition, resident coordinators are more involved in the evaluation of results achieved by in-country teams and, to help them focus more on issues of concern to the entire in-country team, UNDP has established 51 country director positions. In 2010, the programme allocated US\$73 million for resident coordinator positions, and UNDG members also contribute to the funding of coordination activities, but in future other co-financing modalities will need to be considered, as recommended in a draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council on the triennial comprehensive review of operational activities.

12. A high-level joint UNDG committee had undertaken a study to identify common results reporting principles within the United Nations system; a meeting of the governing boards would be held on the subject in September.

13. **Mr. Rawley** (United Nations Resident Coordinator for Egypt) said that he had served as Resident Coordinator in Egypt for five years, and that his mandate had been conducted in two stages. During the period leading up to the popular uprisings of January 2011, Egypt had entered the category of middle-income countries, but even though the Government had been committed to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the absence of national priorities and coordinated action with international partners had slowed progress, and international financial assistance had declined, except for that provided by the United States and the European Union. Egypt had been and still was a country where extreme poverty affected nearly 20% of the population, with endemic income disparities between regions, and where food security was far from assured. In addition, the country faced the

threat of climate change and was being tested by the avian flu pandemic.

14. Mr. Rawley had been elected chairman of the Development Partners group, an entity bringing together 34 international development partners and some of the main United Nations organizations working in the field of development; its work had led to the Cairo Programme of Action on development effectiveness, which set out four specific objectives: an analysis of the situation (the main development challenges of the next fifteen years), a list of priorities around which the international community must mobilize, the efforts needed to strengthen management for results, and an action plan taking into account the principles of mutual accountability between the Government and development partners on the two key issues of health and education. The situation analysis had been conducted by thirty Egyptian social sciences researchers with the participation of civil society, government and international development partners. It had been approved by the Council of Ministers in September 2010 and used as a basis for developing the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and other programmes implemented by development partners such as the European Union and the Government of Spain.

15. With UNDP support the resident coordinator's team had set up a support programme to build national stakeholders' capacity in order to improve management for results. Agreements had been reached to establish mutual responsibility between the Government and development partners in health and education. Overall, the situation analysis had laid the groundwork for the UNDAF that had replaced the common country assessment, strengthening partnerships with the Government and civil society and reinvigorating the work of international partners in the country.

16. Since January 2011, in addition to social demands, the Tahrir Square protesters had been demanding dignity, freedom and social justice in Egypt. Democratic transition was a long-term process in which the work of the United Nations system was to strengthen the capacity of the State and non-State institutions to fulfil the people's aspirations.

17. Since January, the United Nations had been working to develop the "strategy to support the transition to democracy in Egypt" for 2011-2012. Many United Nations agencies had engaged in extensive

analytical work that had greatly contributed to the dialogue on the development and distribution of resources in Egypt.

18. In particular, the United Nations system had experience of analytical work, workshops and joint programmes in such diverse areas as climate change, productive employment and HIV/AIDS. In addition, the UNDAF, which had been finalized 24 January 2011, the eve of the events of Tahrir Square, could be seen as prescient in that it highlighted not only foreseeable problems (quality of basic services, food security, environmental protection), but also issues (equity, governance and multiparty platforms) that would be central after 2015.

19. In addition, major efforts were being made by the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) to meet the new needs resulting, in particular, from the exodus from Libya of some 400,000 Libyans, Egyptians and nationals of third countries seeking to return to their country of origin. A program had also been developed for the Upper Egypt region, beset by the socioeconomic consequences of the return of some 200,000 Egyptians from Libya and an unemployment crisis affecting some 500,000 people. In the area of democratic governance, UNDP had organized an international forum aimed at sharing the experiences of countries that had experienced a similar transition. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and UNDP were working to achieve police reform, which was crucial. In the field of elections, Egypt had a high-level adviser. The transition strategy thus established would strengthen the United Nations' commitment to civil society (NGOs, universities, foundations, private sector) in this decisive period in Egypt's history.

20. Mr. Rawley gave a positive assessment of his experience in Egypt: the activities undertaken had enjoyed the support of the Government and other partners and benefited from the United Nations' long-term investment in the country but also the valuable assistance of the United Nations in-country team. The staff of the Resident Coordinator's office had made a valuable contribution in key areas such as strategic planning, support for joint programming, results-oriented monitoring and evaluation, and communications.

21. The United Nations system and, more broadly, the whole development system needed to keep up their engagement in middle-income countries that continued to face significant development-related challenges: resident coordinators could help create synergy between the various players in the United Nations system, national partners and all those who contributed to development.

22. **Mr. Piper** (United Nations Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator, Nepal) said that the coherence of the United Nations system was essential in that it allowed UNDG to meet the government's current needs. UNDG's future at the country level depended on three major trends: first, governments' increased capacity for managing their sectoral programmes; second, the exponential growth of the "market" for national institutions, which, being more cost-effective, require the United Nations system to provide strategic, quality support; and third, the emergence of new "horizontal" development priorities, which made the various UNDG members' ability to work together even more vital.

23. The resident coordinator's role was usually to help the in-country team to adapt and better respond to new demands. Delegating greater powers to the resident coordinator could speed up the transition process, provided these powers were conferred by his or her peers. In that context, UNDAF played a central role in generating a dialogue with national authorities, defining strategic priorities and focusing on relevant issues. The UNDAF should provide a framework for United Nations operations over the next five years. Results were what cemented UNDG's cohesion in the field. The common country assessment on which the UNDAF was based was not structured along traditional lines but analytically identified vulnerable groups in Nepal and the structural reasons for their vulnerability. It could also form the basis for a possible monitoring and evaluation framework. Designing programmes to address these groups' vulnerabilities would only be possible during the preparation of the UNDAF with the Government. For best results, priorities should be set with an eye to the people's needs.

24. In a country like Nepal, the United Nations system's consistency and leadership were put to the test as it was confronted with unusual situations: the peace process aimed to resolve both short-term problems (mine clearing, elections) and the longer-term issues related to social, economic and political change. In

January 2011, a common strategy for peace and development in Nepal was implemented, uniting all Nepalese development partners and the United Nations system in action. In addition, a transition assistance strategy had been adopted to fill the institutional shortcomings countries generally faced in times of transition. That strategy allowed activities related to peacebuilding and the planning and analysis of humanitarian and development actions to be centralized in an integrated Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator's office. In addition, a country that was often exposed to the risk of natural disasters, like Nepal, required greater cooperation between humanitarian and development actors.

25. Mr. Piper urged the governments of countries benefiting from programmes to help the in-country team facilitate the transition by explaining to their departments that the team was uniquely positioned to help address the "horizontal" issues related to development. He further advised that donor governments be encouraged to support the in-country team in its task by allocating additional funds to structures of a more thematic and horizontal nature and by adapting the modus operandi of financing structures to the in-country team's existing strengths. Finally, he argued that Member States in general should be more ambitious in reforming the United Nations system, reorganizing existing investments to keep the system in line with current requirements.

26. **Ms. Beagle** (Deputy Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) and Co-Chair of the Working Group on the UNDG Resident Coordinator System) said that to create conditions favourable to the work of the Resident Coordinator, action needed to be taken at the level of individuals, systems and resources. Given the complexity and diversity of the Resident Coordinator's tasks, the focus of recruitment should be on management and leadership skills. The United Nations had recently developed an assessment centre responsible for selecting the best qualified candidates. The participation of women and other minorities in the resident coordinator system had also increased. The possible system-level actions pertained to mutual accountability, knowledge management and business practices. The UNAIDS experience illustrated this: its horizontal structure allowed it to propose multisectoral solutions to complex problems; it had a results and accountability framework based on a clear division of tasks between the different

parties; and its country-level action was carried out as part of joint United Nations teams under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator. In addition, the United Nations system would benefit from strengthening its knowledge management system to better share best practices and highlight its ability to mobilize knowledge from various sectors and provide technically solid guidance. Finally, considerable efforts had been made in the field of business practices by UNDG and the High Level Committee on Management. The harmonization of processes and, in particular, of the means used to pool all parties' efforts had increased. Establishing a common framework for assessing and communicating the results would be useful and would reduce the burden on in-country teams and governments, who were now forced to cope with several frameworks at once. Many in-country teams worked together under the existing rules or simplified ones. Such was the case in Vietnam, which had a communications team, common job descriptions, and teams supervised by outside organizations. Communications need not be determined by the type of institution, but rather the issues discussed. In that regard, the Resident Coordinator's leadership was essential in unifying business and programme practices.

27. As regards resources, the funds allocated to the Resident Coordinator needed to be regular and predictable, but the cost of transactions within the United Nations system also had to be reduced. It was important, therefore, to invest in the skills required for management, planning and monitoring in order to carry out the necessary changes. Pooled funds, thematic funds and multi-donor trust funds had helped promote coherence and break down barriers, not only within the United Nations system but also within governments. The UNAIDS Unified Budget and Workplan had shown that pooling resources and clearly apportioning tasks had a significant impact on results. In addition, the reduction of transaction costs had already had positive results in the form of simplified procedures, but efforts in this area should be continued by enhancing information sharing, particularly on the quality and effectiveness of operations. Finally, to amortize investments at all levels, improvements were needed to the use of existing resources: sharing support services, streamlining practices, improving the division of labour, and taking advantage of technology. In that way the United Nations would succeed in helping countries more effectively while respecting national priorities.

28. **Mr. Panneels** (Belgium) noted that in both cases, Nepal and Egypt, the use of extrabudgetary funds had been presented as beneficial and desirable, in that it allowed the specialized agencies to respond quickly. He asked why resources of that type were critical in meeting the needs, and whether baseline resources could not be employed to achieve the same results. Concerning the accountability system related to the resident coordinator's function, he asked whether, in stakeholders' opinion, existing mechanisms were sufficient or whether further improvements could be made.

29. **Mr. Dhungana** (Observer of Nepal) thanked the Resident Coordinator for his remarks on UNDP's experience in the field of economic and social development in Nepal, which involved much coordination at various levels. As a country transitioning to democracy, Nepal set great store by the cooperation it received from the United Nations system. Institutional strengthening, capacity building, empowerment of people and the fight against inequalities were all issues that were priorities for the Government of Nepal, which hoped to continue and expand its constructive cooperation with the United Nations system in the future.

30. **Mr. Lysak** (Slovakia) said that the effective functioning of the resident coordinator system was essential to achieve results. Resident coordinators should have access to all agencies' technical resources and have more say in their apportionment. The effectiveness of operational activities could be improved by the use of instruments not yet fully exploited by the United Nations system. In that regard, it would be interesting to hear the views of stakeholders on the potential opportunities for greater use of budget support and the role that resident coordinators could play in the use of that modality.

31. **Mr. Christófolo** (Observer of Brazil) said his delegation strongly supported efforts to strengthen the resident coordinator system, whose role in communications with governments, other agencies and all stakeholders was particularly important. Resident Coordinators were also particularly well placed to oversee the implementation of decisions of the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations system and to centralize other programmes' best practices and policies so that they could be re-used in other operational situations. It was essential for resident coordinators to

take fully into account the priorities set by governments. The ability to meet national requirements largely determined the quality of operational performance in the medium to long term and how the United Nations' actions were perceived on the ground. The Brazilian delegation would like to know how resident coordinators could be given greater power to coordinate the initiatives of other actors in the field, including international organizations and foreign governments but also nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

32. **Mr. Pellet** (France) wanted particulars of the relationship between the Initiative "Delivering as One" and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process of the Council of Human Rights. As the second UPR cycle was to begin soon, a question arose as to the implementation of the recommendations accepted by the country under the first review. Economic, social and cultural issues were directly relevant to development. The French delegation would like to know how far UPR recommendations were taken into account by the entire United Nations system, beyond the High Commissioner for Human Rights, including the resident coordinator system. It considered that further efforts were needed to better leverage the results of this process across the United Nations system.

33. **Mr. Arvinador-Kanyirige** (Ghana) stressed the importance of effective institutional coordination with the United Nations system at all levels—international, regional, subregional and national—under the process "Delivering as One". In that regard, UNDP had helped the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to establish a mechanism for coordination among development partners in the subregion but, for various situational reasons, had not been able to take a leadership role in that mechanism. The representative of Ghana asked whether UNDP was planning to strengthen its relations with subregional economic groupings under the process "Delivering as One".

34. **Ms. Clark** (UNDP Administrator) told the representative of Brazil that resident coordinators were already playing a significant role in coordinating with development partners. Coordination with NGOs, in particular, was significant for a number of activities. However, resident coordinators had no power to impose decisions on such actors, whose cooperation could only be based on goodwill and the establishment of working relationships. Speaking to the question of the representative of France, she said United Nations or UNDP in-country teams were often asked by recipient

countries to help them either to draw up their reports to the Human Rights Council or to mobilize the necessary skills to implement the recommendations adopted at the end of the UPR.

35. On the issue of subregional coordination raised by the representative of Ghana, the United Nations system had often observed that for initiatives applicable to several countries, its configuration predisposed it to taking action on a country-by-country basis. Collaboration was growing strongly at present between in-country teams and UNDG, but was less successful at the regional and subregional levels. That was certainly an issue deserving of further study in the future.

36. **Mr. Rawley** (UNDP Resident Coordinator in Egypt) said that the extrabudgetary funds granted by the Spanish Government had been very useful in launching a climate change project and providing a framework for the United Nations system to get public authorities and the scientific community involved in this project. The funds had also made possible an innovative cultural heritage protection project that fully involved local people. In addition, the Spanish fund for the MDGs was not confined to financial aspects but endowed the Resident Coordinator with an enhanced role and established innovative joint programming procedures. Those arrangements had served as a model for 12 more other smaller-scale joint projects in the country. It was desirable for specialized agencies to seek increasingly to use resources to deal in a multisectoral way with the very complex problems that are the major challenges of the moment.

37. The current accountability system seemed fairly robust, but it would be useful, for example, if for all programmes unique to an institution the head of that institution could send a brief description of the programme to the in-country team, which could then verify its full compatibility with the UNDAF. Moreover, it was important for the Resident Coordinator to have the opportunity to produce an evaluation of the professional performance of institution heads, something only UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA were currently allowed to do.

38. **Mr. Rawley** advised the Slovakian representative that the United Nations system could play a facilitating role as regards budget support. Governments that so desired ought to conduct a capacity assessment on the sector or ministerial post receiving support, identifying technical or operational areas that needed to be

strengthened; assistance of that type could then be provided by the United Nations system and other partners. On the question raised by the representative of Brazil, with respect to the effect given to decisions of the Economic and Social Council, Mr. Rawley said that in Egypt's case, some fifty leaders and cadres of specialized agencies had been brought together by the in-country team as the UNDAF was being prepared for a workshop one of whose basic tools had been the triennial comprehensive review of operational activities.

39. On coordination with stakeholders, the situation analysis that had been developed in consultation with a number of development partners had been widely disseminated. The document was of great interest to any partner wishing to get involved. It was useful, in the context of a developing country like Egypt, for support to be structured in such a way as to bring together partners and to promote a culture of managing for results; that would help NGOs determine where they could be most useful and obtain tangible development results.

40. **Mr. Piper** (UNDP Resident Coordinator for Nepal) advised the Belgian delegation that the reason baseline resources were not more used was that they were insufficient. Only a quarter of the annual budget of the in-country team in Nepal (US\$200 million) was funded through the regular budget. It depended on the extrabudgetary funds to carry out more ambitious, intersectoral endeavours. Further, that financing method generally afforded greater operational flexibility than funding out of baseline resources.

41. On the issue of budget support, though it seemed illogical for the specialized agencies to act as intermediaries for transactions that could be done directly with governments, they were nevertheless able to play a coordinating and advisory role. As regards UPR, in addition to the help the in-country team could give the government in preparing for its review and implementing the recommendations arising therefrom, the new organizational structure had caused the Resident Coordinator to take on a much more assertive public role. As Resident Coordinator in Nepal, Mr. Piper had had occasion to take a stand on issues such as citizenship and the ratification of certain international instruments.

42. **Ms. Beagle** (Deputy Executive Director of UNAIDS) noted that coordination, in the sense in which earlier speakers had used the term, did not reflect the

usual definition of the word, which could have a bureaucratic connotation, but referred to such diverse activities as strategic planning, programme support, monitoring and evaluation, communications or partnership building.

43. **Mr. El Karakasy** (Egypt) thanked the United Nations system and UNDP for their support to his country since the events of January 2011. The UNDP Resident Coordinator noted that a transition strategy for Egypt was being developed. UNDP had also established a strategy with respect to the changes in the Arab world and had presented it to Member States in New York. Mr. El Karakasy wondered whether defining such a strategy, at a time when the situation there was very volatile, was not a little delicate, and whether UNDP was not in danger of rushing things by trying to show that it was present and helping countries. In addition, Mr. El Karakasy felt that great emphasis had been placed on governance issues since the revolution in Egypt—on very important issues such as elections and reforms to the security sector. He wondered, however, whether this might not be to the detriment of issues related to economic exclusion, equally important, and which were indeed so described by the UNDP Administrator in her articles and speeches. What balance did UNDP see being struck between these two dimensions of governance and development?

44. **Ms. Yarlett** (Australia) asked in what ways cohesion and coordination among development and humanitarian actors could be strengthened and systematized. More interaction between the two stakeholder communities was indicated in three areas in particular: emergency preparedness, capacity building among national authorities and local communities, and the transition to recovery and early recovery activities.

45. **Mr. Schmid** (Germany) said that the role of resident coordinators should be, in addition to internal coordination, to seek a strong and reliable relationship with partner countries but also the donor community. He wondered how interaction with bilateral partners could be enhanced.

46. **Ms. Lemieux** (Canada) asked what steps might be taken to move forward in defining the guidelines to be followed for the comprehensive quadrennial policy review of operational activities—the objective being to push the boundaries and make the resident coordinator system truly operational—and wanted to know the role of the specialized agencies in that regard. With regard to

the harmonization of practices and the simplification of *modus operandi*, an area where the possible savings were too often the focus, it would be helpful to think instead in terms of efficiency gains and, in that regard, to have more evidence of the actual results from the countries themselves.

47. **Ms. Messmer Mokhtar** (Switzerland) asked what proposals had been made to ensure predictable funding for the Resident Coordinator's office in the transition countries in particular, and to make this funding part of the operational system's core resources.

48. **Mr. Ahmed Ould** (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)) noted that the United Nations' in-country teams were encountering problems of greater and greater complexity; the food security issue, which one might suppose an exclusive concern of FAO, paradoxically involved many partners from outside the field of agriculture: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). FAO, which recognized and supported the work of resident coordinators in that regard, said it was crucial for them to have team leadership skills.

49. **Mr. Edmonds** (International Labour Organization (ILO)) asked how the resident coordinator could help implement the mandates given to institutions in Geneva or at Headquarters, via the UPR but also the ILO governing body or other specialized agencies. As funding for the development system was not based on a precise architecture, Mr. Edmonds would like to know what role could be played by Mr. Piper, as a former UNDP official, in reducing conflict and competition for funding between the Programme and other agencies.

50. **Ms. Clark** (UNDP Administrator) said that in Egypt, it was important to ensure not only the political but also the economic transition. UNDP's quick-acting tools and initiatives such as the short-term "cash for work" programmes could be used in such cases to improve the living conditions of people in affected areas. On the issue of the interface between development stakeholders and humanitarian caseworkers, Ms Clark pointed out that the relations between the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) and the humanitarian teams were very strong. She urged member states to have due regard, in their responses to funding applications, for the importance of

early recovery, which, being no less essential than the provision of food, medication and shelter, must therefore be catered for right from the initial response phase.

51. Responding to the Canadian delegation, Ms. Clark said that enhancement of resident coordinators' responsibilities and the means available to them was less important than their personal ability to direct operations and the respect they commanded among their teammates. With regard to harmonization and the savings it might afford, she said the point was to better combine activities under joint programmes and to do more while doing it better. Lastly, on the issue of the rivalry for resources at the country level, she noted that one of the great advantages of the single fund was that it fostered democratic decision-making as to what would receive funding in the country.

52. **Ms. Beagle** (Assistant Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS) pointed out the importance of tripartite relationships (national authorities, partners, office of the Resident Coordinator) and of the initiative "Delivering as One" on missions such as those undertaken in Vietnam, Mozambique or Malawi. The savings resulting from the harmonization and simplification of ways of doing business could be partially quantified, but the improvement observed mainly came out in the quality of service provided and the contribution to the building of a cooperative work culture.

53. There was no lack of systems available to guarantee accountability, but they had to be made to work. What was chiefly needed was job descriptions and performance evaluations for each staff member that properly emphasized cooperation and team spirit at work.

54. **Mr. Piper** (United Nations Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator, Nepal) said the model developed in Nepal was an important innovation in that it brought together a wide range of complementary skills—public authorities, development experts, humanitarian caseworkers. Given the high risk of earthquakes in the country, the humanitarian community must imbue development activities with pragmatism and a sense of urgency; however, its mode of funding meant that it must admit its limitations and its inability to engage in long-term operations. Everyone must be aware of their own limitations and what they can do for others.

55. In Nepal, the work had not been confined to internal coordination, as was clear from the Strategy for Peace and Development. Mr. Piper noted that while twenty years ago, UNDP had been a donor and had operated as such, it no longer played that role; it must henceforth fight against national authorities' misperception of its coordinating role. More broadly, we must never lose sight of the universal dimension of the work being done nor the fact that it was being done on behalf of 193 Member States. Mr. Piper added that given the considerable energy deployed to establish the guiding document—the UNDAF—, it would be wise for the master plan to supplant the many documents prepared in parallel for the various countries. Finally, as regards relations between the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions, it was unclear what was expected of each, and given the conflicting messages on the issue, it seemed the time had come to debate that point.

56. **Mr. Rawley** (United Nations Resident Coordinator for Egypt) said that the responsibility for the conduct of coordination belonged to all stakeholders, including technical staff. When recruiting staff, it had become all-important to assess teamwork skills and partnership building ability. In Egypt, the coordination team in place was attending to the economy, as it ought, and was seeking to have government agencies—which had the wherewithal—support the execution of emergency employment programmes, and make progress with thoroughgoing police reform, as was ardently desired by the people.

57. **The President** noted that, for the first time, the ECOSOC Bureau had in 2011 held three meetings with its opposite numbers at the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, heralding closer ties in future between the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.