ECOSOC Dialogue on the longer-term Positioning of the UN Development system (Session I)

Intervention by CANADA

Remarks delivered by Isabelle Hentic, First Secretary

15 December 2014

Canada welcomes the organization of this first dialogue on positioning of the UNDS, as mandated by ECOSOC resolution in July 2014.

Canada recognizes the complexity of the issues to be covered by the dialogue, and we would like to congratulate the two co-authors for coming up in such a short time frame with the valuable discussion paper before us, which includes all the interlinked parameters included in the ECOSOC resolution: functions, funding, governance, capacity, impact, partnerships and organizational arrangements.

Like others have stated, these elements have to be analysed in a comprehensive manner in order to address the various dimensions leading to an ambitious repositioning of the UNDS to be fit for purpose in the Post-2015 agenda.

Canada would like to thank the panelists for drilling down on the issues this morning on the fundamental elements, and the additional insights provided this afternoon on efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

First, let me say that Canada shares the same enthusiasm and optimism expressed by panelists with regards to furthering the reforms of the UNDS. We are confident that with trust, consistent and hard work, and a spirit of partnership, we can collectively move the system in the direction of better relevance and stronger impact.

Let me provide some comments on the proposals and questions contained in the discussion paper.

On Functions

We agree to give special focus to the requirements of LDCs and the need for a differentiated approach for tackling inequalities in rights and opportunities in middle income countries.

We also agree with the need for the UNDS to be less focussed on disbursement, and more on up-stream work, including norms setting, policy and advocacy. Integrated and strategic policy support can be

powerful and sustainable when delivered coherently at a country level. This is one of the major lessons from the experiences gathered through Delivering as one.

On Funding

Canada is very encouraged by the series of structured dialogues on critical mass of funding and on the quality on non-core funding, which took place throughout 2014. It has not always been an easy discussion, but Member States managed to progress on concepts and to agree in many ways on the important enabling and realistic factors for the longer term financing the UNDS. The dialogues are ongoing and should feed into this broader one.

On Partnerships

We agree with all the proposals articulated in the discussion paper, in particular on the need to strengthen partnerships with civil society at the UN, and we would add with the private sector in an orderly and sustainable manner. In this regard, we value the contribution of the Global Compact which has developed a range of principles and tools to support the system and member states in this endeavour.

On Organization/Capacity

Canada supports the idea of exploring reforms of the United Nations Development System in HQ and in the field. We note that changes in the development architecture have implications for the humanitarian architecture, therefore it is essential that both sides consult each other, and work together throughout the process. Responses to crises should be more proactive. We need to approach protracted crises differently and take advantage of the full range of humanitarian and development tools.

However, in practical terms, creating partnerships and synergies at headquarters is not enough; coordination should be tackled down to organizational and structural levels with new models pushing

for more coordinated responses in the field. Many UN agencies, programmes and funds already have this double mandate, and more needs to be done to build on this duality, with a view to ensuring continuum and avoiding fall-backs.

We agree that broadening existing accountability lines to incorporate stronger horizontal accountability is highly recommended. Strengthened accountability and improved leadership are pillars of the IASC Transformative Agenda which Canada has been supporting together with a number of member states over the last years. Greater efforts are required on the part of member states and UN agencies to address the separation of the humanitarian and development streams of organizations, and to promote coordination whether at headquarters or in the field.

On Results/Impact

Canada would suggest that the questions in future dialogues be reframed to include both development outcomes and impact, acknowledging that impact is an ultimate step in a theory of change that relies on the successful achievement of outcomes. We agree that in Post 2015, the measurement of outcomes will relate to the ability of the UNDS to provide adequate support to Member States in formulating policies and programs. It will also relate to the effectiveness of the UNDS itself to apply RBM successfully in a System-Wide integrated manner, as well as through support to member states in strengthening local results-based monitoring and evaluation systems which enable them to track progress, and communicate results.

On Governance

We believe that the governance of operational activities is to a large extent already devolved and exercised at the country level. In effect, the Country Program Document (and UNDAF) is the guiding instrument, agreed between the UN and the government, and implemented jointly. The role of the

Executive Boards is to discuss the higher level results (outcome level/impact) of UN interventions that are rolled up from the country level and reported on in the context of the Strategic Plans.

We agree that governance relating to normative agendas must observe a consensus, and that governance related to evidence based policy making requires rigorous documentation and expert representation. There is certainly scope for pursuing greater UNDS wide governance coherence that is able to support the integrated approach embodied in the post 2015 development agenda. This would likely involve some forms of re-arrangements or re-organization of the various UN entities into thematic or issue-based clustering.

We look forward to further deliberation on this issue, and more broadly to continuing the dialogue with UN colleagues and Member States in an open, and trust-based manner for a stronger and improved UN Development System.