Additional ITA Comments and Reflections on the Governance paper

• The idea of integration rather than coordination is a very ambitious one. In practice it’s still difficult to foresee whether the great transformation of both the governance and organizational structure could be carried out without strong resistance from various agencies or the transformed structure could really live up to expectation. So there needs to be a systematic and consistent research program on the feasibility and roadmap of the transformation steps needed. A three-to-five year reviewing period needs to be set to evaluate the dynamic implications of all the reform measure having been taken.

• The proposal on setting up a Sustainable Development Board working as an overarching organ transcending the current competencies of various EBs or GCs definitely has great advantages. The difficulty lies in the process in centralization of the power and competence in terms of strategic guidance and budget planning. There are also practical difficulties related to the operation of the overarching organ. Despite the elaboration on better secretariat support and more frequent meeting time, reasonable doubts still exist concerning the efficiency of oversight by such an overarching organ on such a non-uniformed miscellaneous UNDS composed of so many agencies. There is a need for a systematic research program on all such kind of dramatic transformative measures proposed.

• The sustainable development board should have a broad mandate for working towards sustained peace; it should have a strategic capacity for engaging in system-wide prevention and ensuring coherence between the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding areas.

• An equitable balance between sustainable development priorities and the concerns of the funding partners could be achieved if the globally relevant instrument is organized by themes within the SDGs that speak of the mandates of specialized agencies – for instance People’s basic needs, Prosperity, Planet.

• Organizing by SDG themes entails the risk of sub-dividing the SDGs according to mandates again. This not only undermines the comprehensive and interconnected character of the SDGs, but also coherence amongst agencies, as they are more likely to focus on specific elements of SDGs according to their mandates.

• As the convener of HLPF, ECOSOC would also need to ensure that the forum plays an effective role in the follow up to the 2030 Agenda.

• A more robust management consultancy mechanism established within the UN sustainable development system, which could include a dedicated system-wide body of experts familiar with UN processes but possessing an independent status, perhaps working in conjunction with external consultants and stakeholders of different kinds on appropriately constituted review panels, provided with appropriate resources and privileges to request information. Such consultants could be called upon electively or alternatively might play a mandatory role in periodic reviews of organizations (as opposed to countries). In such periodic reviews, organized according to a system-wide schedule, each organization’s
approaches would be compared to those of other organizations within and beyond the system, and possible innovations and improvements would be shared.

- Improve and simplify the reporting mechanisms of the UNDS entities though the use of modern technology and managerial tools, ensuring that information is available for member states to exercise control and oversight with full transparency, and review and evaluate the performance of the system as it happens, facilitating timely reaction by the governing bodies when needed.

- ECOSOC system needs to align all subsidiary bodies to the council’s cycle and its theme, ensuring that all commissions and technical bodies feed into ECOSOC deliberations in proper time.

- There should be effective and integrated communication process from the secretariats of the governing bodies regarding the progresses and hindrances of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.