



THE PRESIDENT
OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

9 April 2018

Excellency,

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter, dated 9 April 2018, from H.E. Mr. Sabri Boukadoum, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Algeria and H.E. Mr. Ib Petersen, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Denmark, Co-facilitators of the repositioning of the United Nations development system, in the context of the General Assembly resolution 71/243 related to the quadrennial comprehensive policy review (QCPR) of operational activities for development of the UN system.

The Co-facilitators are circulating the second revised draft General Assembly resolution on the repositioning of the United Nations development system.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.



Miroslav Lajčák

All Permanent Representatives and
Permanent Observers to the United Nations
New York



THE PERMANENT MISSION OF ALGERIA
TO THE UNITED NATIONS



9 April 2018

Excellency,

As mentioned at our meeting of today, Monday, 9 April, we are pleased to transmit to you a revised text of the draft General Assembly resolution on the repositioning of the UN development system. The revised draft has benefitted from the input that Member States have submitted during informals and in writing, as well as the feedback, comments and ideas that delegations have presented during the technical consultations on the Resident Coordinator system convened by our representatives and kindly moderated by Mr. Nicolas Randin of the Permanent Mission of Switzerland. A table containing a list of proposals received in writing is also included with this letter.

We have heard all positions and carefully considered all inputs received both orally and in writing. We are aware that differences remain on some issues. We do trust, however, to have captured all fundamental issues of importance to delegations, particularly – though not exclusively – in sections III and VI dedicated respectively to a reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system and on funding of the United Nations development system.

On the issue of a reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system, we acknowledge that some delegations envision the provisions on newly agreed structure, funding and management arrangements as a package. On the issue of the separation of the Resident Coordinator system, we are mindful that this will depend on a decision on funding arrangements and the future of UN-DOCO, as well as an effective and efficient transition for the overall system and UNDP in particular. All these elements are included in the text of the resolution, including different options for the funding of the Resident Coordinator system that require further consideration and final decision.

As you will see, we have maintained the option of funding a reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system through assessed contributions in the text, as many delegations have continued to reiterate their preference for such funding arrangements. We have also heard from those who do not favor this option, and those who believe that this may not be the sole possibility. As such, we have included in the text language on a possible hybrid funding arrangement suggested by one delegation, in light of the initial support expressed by some and mindful that others will require time to consider it. We understand that the predictability of funding remains the defining mark that will ensure consensus on the funding for the

Resident Coordinator system, and we are determined to continue our discussions towards finding consensus on a practical arrangement to that end.

In section VI dedicated to the funding of the UN development system, we have heard those who have asked for further streamlining of the text. With regard to the Funding Compact, we have reflected in the text the proposal that the Compact be further shaped through a funding dialogue.

In order to give ample time to delegations to consider the revised text of the resolution, we are pleased to inform you that we will reconvene on Wednesday, at 10:00 am, in conference room 2.

We have witnessed convergence on a large number of issues. At the same time, we know that some significant questions have to be addressed. We remain confident that through the spirit of cooperation consensus can be achieved in a timely manner.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Boukadoum', written over a horizontal line.

H.E. Mr. Sabri Boukadoum
Permanent Representative of Algeria
to the United Nations

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ib Petersen', written over a horizontal line.

H.E. Mr. Ib Petersen
Permanent Representative of Denmark
to the United Nations

All Permanent Representatives and
Permanent Observers to the United Nations
New York

**General Assembly resolution on the repositioning of the United Nations development system,
in the context of the QCPR**

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its resolution 71/243 of 21 December 2016 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of United Nations operational activities for development and its general guidelines and principles for the United Nations development system, as the main instrument to better position the United Nations operational activities for development to support countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda,

Taking note of the reports of the Secretary-General on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of United Nations operational activities for development¹ and welcoming his efforts on repositioning of the UN development system,

II. A new generation of UN Country Teams

1. *Welcomes* a revitalized, strategic, flexible, results- and action-oriented United Nations Development Assistance Framework as the single most important instrument for planning and implementation of UNDS activities in each country, in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, in full consultation with national governments and ensuring that national governments have final decision on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework;
2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to lead the efforts of the entities of the UN development system to collaboratively implement a new generation of UN country teams, with needs-based tailored country presence, to be built on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and finalized through an open and inclusive dialogue between the host Government and the UN development system, facilitated by the Resident Coordinator, to ensure the best configuration of support on the ground, as well as enhanced coordination transparency, efficiency and impact, in accordance with national development policies, plans priorities, and country needs;
3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to work through the United Nations Sustainable Development Group to determine the presence and the composition of the United Nations country teams, based on country development priorities and long-term needs, the approved United Nations Development Assistance Framework, as well as appropriate criteria, and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter;
4. Request the Secretary-General, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 71/243, to conduct a review of the configuration, capacity, resource needs, role and development services of multi-country offices, in full consultation with involved countries to improve their contribution to country progress in achieving the 2030 Agenda,
5. *Calls on* the entities of the UN development system to strengthen the capacities, expertise and skill sets to support national governments in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, and, where relevant, build the capacities to promote progress on those Goals lagging behind, building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities;

¹ A/72/124-E/2018/3, A/72/684-E/2018/7 and A/73/63-E/2018/8

6. *Welcomes* measures by the Secretary-General for advancing common business operations, where appropriate, including common back-offices and with the target of 50% common premises by 2021, to enable joint work and generate greater efficiencies, synergies and coherence, and *requests* their full implementation;
7. *Reiterates* that all savings achieved through efficiency gains should be directed to programmatic activities;
8. *Reiterates* its call for the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations;

III. Reinvigorating the role of the Resident Coordinator system

9. *Decides* to create a dedicated, impartial, empowered, and development-focused coordination function of the UN development system by separating the functions of the Resident Coordinator from the UNDP Resident Representative, drawing on the expertise and assets of the entire UN development system entities, including non-resident agencies;
10. *Requests* the Secretary-General to strengthen the authority and leadership of Resident Coordinators over United Nations country teams and system-wide accountability on the ground for implementing the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and support countries in their implementation of the 2030 Agenda, through:
 - (a) enhanced authorities for the Resident Coordinator to ensure alignment of both agency programmes and of inter-agency pooled funding with national development needs and priorities as well as with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, in consultation with the national government
 - (b) full mutual and collective performance appraisal to strengthen accountability and impartiality, with Resident Coordinators appraising the performance of UN country team heads and UN country team heads informing the performance assessment of Resident Coordinators
 - (c) the establishment of a clear matrixed reporting model, with UN country team members accountable and reporting to their respective entities on individual mandates and reporting to the Resident Coordinator on respective contributions to the collective results of the UN development system towards achievement of Agenda 2030 at country level, based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework
 - (d) reporting by the Resident Coordinator to the Secretary-General and to the host government on the implementation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework
 - (e) a collectively owned internal dispute resolution mechanism;
11. *Welcomes* the strengthening of the Resident Coordinator independent recruitment process, including with due consideration to gender parity and geographical balance, and, recalling that highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity serve as the paramount consideration in the employment of staff, *emphasizes* the need to ensure appropriate merit, expertise and development focus of Resident Coordinators' profiles, and to strengthen the training and interagency recruitment process to that end;

12. *Emphasizes* that the adequate and predictable funding of the Resident Coordinator system is essential to deliver a coherent, effective, efficient and accountable response in accordance with national needs and priorities, and, in this regard, *endorses* the SG's proposal to provide USD255 million annually to ensure the necessary, predictable and sustainable funding of the Resident Coordinator system through
- assessed contributions within the regular budget of the United Nations;
- or*
- funding equally divided among (i) assessed contributions, (ii) a UN Sustainable Development Group cost-sharing agreement revised to increase contributions by agencies, funds and programmes to the level required including by benefiting from efficiency gains, and (iii) a coordination levy on earmarked contributions to UN operational activities for development to cover for the remaining one third of the RC system funding needs;
13. *Endorses* the transformation of the UN Development Operations Coordination Office to assume managerial and oversight functions of the Resident Coordinator system under the leadership of an Assistant Secretary-General, as a stand-alone coordination office reporting to the Chair of the UN Sustainable Development Group, and *requests* the Chair to report on an annual basis to the ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development;

IV. Revamping the regional approach

14. *Reaffirms* the role of the United Nations development system at the regional level including the Regional Economic Commissions and the regional teams of the United Nations development system, and *underlines* the need to continue to make them fit for purpose in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context;
15. *Emphasizes* the need to address gaps and overlaps at the regional level and *endorses* a phased approach to revamp the UN development system at the regional level, and in this regard *requests* the Secretary-General to:
- (a) implement the measures proposed in his report² to optimize functions and enhance collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels; and
 - (b) provide options, on a region by region basis, for longer-term reprofiling and restructuring of the regional assets of the United Nations at the 2019 ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development;

V. Strategic direction, oversight and accountability for system-wide results

16. *Takes note* of the Secretary-General's proposal on the repositioning of the Operational Activities Segment of the Economic and Social Council and *looks forward* to the outcome of the ongoing review of General Assembly resolution 68/1;
17. *Takes note* of the Secretary-General's proposal to gradually merge the NY-based Executive Boards of funds and programmes, and *urges* Member States to continue making practical changes to further enhance the working methods of the Boards with the aim of improving the

² A/72/684- E/2018/7

efficiency, transparency and quality of governance structures, including through deciding on ways to improve the functions of the Joint Meeting of the Boards;

18. *Stresses* the need to improve monitoring and reporting on system-wide results and, in this regard, *welcomes* the strengthening of independent system-wide evaluation measures and the establishment of a dedicated unit to that end, as proposed by the Secretary-General;
19. *Welcomes* the decision by the Secretary-General to brief the Economic and Social Council in his capacity as Chair of the Chief Executives Board, to ensure full transparency in the activities of the Board and improve its responsiveness to the Member States;

VI. Funding the United Nations development system

20. *Recognizes* that significantly improving the level, predictability, quality and flexibility of its funding base is a prerequisite for the successful repositioning of the United Nations development system as well as for strengthening its neutrality and multilateral nature, with the aim of better supporting countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda in line with national needs and priorities in a coherent and integrated manner;
21. *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investments of Member States in the United Nations development system and the system's transparency for system-wide results, and *takes note* of the Secretary-General's proposals to bring core resources to at least a 30% level in the next five years, double both inter-agency pooled funds to a total of USD3.4 billion and entity-specific thematic funds to a total of USD800 million by 2023;
22. *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's proposals to establish a dedicated coordination fund and, in this regard, *invites* Member States to provide voluntary contributions in the amount of USD35 million to the Resident Coordinator system in support of system-wide activities on the ground;
23. *Invites* Member States to contribute on a voluntary basis to the capitalization of the United Nations Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda at USD290 million per annum;
24. *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's commitment to reposition the United Nations development system in accordance with Member States' calls in General Assembly resolution 71/243 and the present resolution, and *requests* the UN development system, as part of its commitment to the Funding Compact, inter alia to:
 - (a) *provide* annual reporting on system-wide support to the Sustainable Development Goals and present aggregated information on system-wide results by 2021;
 - (b) *comply with* the standards of International Aid Transparency Initiative or similar initiatives to enhance transparency and access to financial information in all UN development system entities;
 - (c) *undergo* independent system-wide evaluations of results achieved, at global, regional and country level;
 - (d) *comply with* existing full cost recovery policies and *further harmonize* cost recovery by individual UN development system entities through differentiated approaches;
 - (e) *allocate*, as appropriate, at least 15% of non-core resources to joint activities;

- (f) *enhance* visibility of Member States' contributions to core resources and pooled funds, and related results;
- (g) *achieve* efficiency gains as envisioned by the Secretary-General in his report³;

25. *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's proposal to launch a Funding Dialogue with the view to further operationalize the Funding Compact and *requests* the Secretary-General to report on the outcome of the Funding Dialogue at the ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development in 2019, for Member States' consideration;

VII. Following-up on the UNDS repositioning efforts at the global, regional and country level

26. *Requests* the UN Sustainable Development Group to improve the system-wide strategic document in light of the present resolution and in line with General Assembly resolution 71/243, to ensure that it is more specific, concrete and targeted in addressing gaps and overlaps, and *further requests* the Secretary-General to submit the next system-wide strategic document to the 2019 ECOSOC Segment of Operational Activities for Development for Member States' consideration;

27. *Reaffirms* the role of the Department of Social and Economic Affairs and *looks forward to* the Secretary-General's update to the Member States on the alignment of the Department with the 2030 Agenda, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 70/299, before the beginning of the 73rd session of the General Assembly;

28. *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's proposals to strengthen a UN system-wide approach to partnerships, and *urges* the UN development system to strengthen its cooperation with International Financial Institutions, as well as the private sector, civil society, philanthropic entities and academia, while upholding the principles, objectives and priorities of the United Nations;

29. *Requests* the Secretary-General to ensure an effective and efficient transition to a repositioned UN development system, particularly to a reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system, including by giving due consideration to the role of UNDP in supporting countries in their efforts to realize the 2030 Agenda;

30. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council on progress in the implementation of the mandates contained in the present resolution, and the mandates contained in the QCPR resolution 71/243 as part of his annual reporting to the 2019 ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development, and to the 74th session of the General Assembly for its further consideration and to inform the next cycle of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review to be launched in 2020.

³ A/72/684-E/2018/7

General Assembly resolution on the repositioning of the United Nations development system, in the context of the QCPR

List of Member State proposals

<p>Zero Draft</p>	<p>Proposals from consultation of 3 and 9 April</p>
<p>Preambular</p>	<p>CANZ: Relevant to go back to our original comments because while there has been progress made, some of our key messages are still relevant. In particular, we are looking for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stronger language, particularly in support of the SG’s reform effort. ○ Deadlines as well as who is being tasked: still room for improvement ○ Further streamlining <p>Japan: First, as a whole, my delegation finds a number of elements of refinement in this introductory section of the draft text. It is more focused and more succinct. My delegation welcomes these improvements.</p>
<p><i>Reaffirming</i> its resolution 71/243 of 21 December 2016 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of United Nations operational activities for development and its general guidelines and principles for the United Nations development system, as the main instrument to better position the United Nations operational activities for development to support countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda and to ensure that no-one is left behind,</p>	<p>G77: <i>Reaffirming</i> its resolution 71/243 of 21 December 2016 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of United Nations operational activities for development and its general guidelines and principles for the United Nations development system, as the main instrument to better position the United Nations operational activities for development to support countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda and to ensure that no-one is left behind, for Sustainable Development in a coherent and integrated manner in line with the mandates of the entities of the United Nations development system, and recognizing that this requires a United Nations development system that is more strategic, accountable, transparent, collaborative, efficient, effective and results-oriented, Comment: the Group believes that PP 1 of the current revised draft should be amended. As we are striving to move forward the implementation of the QCPR, changing agreed language and cherry picking a particular principle over others should be avoided as it does not reflect the proper balance of the QCPR as a whole. We therefore ask that reference to “leaving no one behind” be deleted and that the language of PP 1 reflect the exact wording of PP 2 of the QCPR resolution.</p> <p>Russian Federation: <i>PP1 Reaffirming</i> its resolution 71/243 of 21 December 2016 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of United Nations operational activities for development and its general guidelines and principles for the United Nations development system, as the main</p>

	<p>instrument to better position the United Nations operational activities for development to support countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda and to ensure that no one is left behind,</p> <p>EU: PP section broadly ok, but should "welcome", or take note "with appreciation" of the SG's reports, that form the basis of this exercise (while "taking note" of the report on 71/243).</p> <p>Japan: Third, we join others in acknowledging the fact that the crux of this reform is supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. We accept the relevant reference in PP1.</p>
<p><i>Taking note of the reports¹ of the Secretary-General and welcoming his efforts on repositioning of the UN development system, and taking note of the report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 71/243 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of the United Nations operational activities for development²,</i></p>	<p>G77: <i>Taking note</i> of the reports³ of the Secretary-General and welcoming his efforts on repositioning of the UN development system, and taking note of the report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 71/243 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of the United Nations operational activities for development⁴,</p> <p>EU: The OP section has not been streamlined, despite the many calls for a shorter text and no reopening of the QCPR.</p> <p>CANZ: PP2: Rather than taking note, we would like PP2 to “welcome” the reports of the SG. The text would also benefit from a reference in support of the SG’s broader reform efforts. <i>Proposal: Welcomes the report of the Secretary General and welcoming his efforts on UN reform</i> . . .As stated previously, we think that this para should be in the OP section.</p> <p>Japan: We can accept the present formulation of “Taking note of the reports of the Secretary-General” and “welcoming his efforts on repositioning of the UN development system”.</p>
<p><u>II. A new generation of UN Country Teams</u></p>	
<p>1. Welcomes a revitalized, strategic, flexible, results- and action-oriented United Nations Development Assistance Framework as the single most important</p>	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes</i> a revitalized, strategic, flexible, results- and action-oriented United Nations Development Assistance Framework as the single most important instrument for planning of UNDS activities in each country, in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, aligned with</p>

¹ A/72/124-E/2018/3 and A/72/684- E/2018/7

² A/73/63-E/2018/8

³ A/72/124-E/2018/3 and A/72/684- E/2018/7

⁴ A/73/63-E/2018/8

<p>instrument for planning of UNDS activities in each country, in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, aligned with national priorities and outlining a clear UN response, in full consultation with national governments;</p>	<p>national priorities and outlining a clear UN response, in full consultation with national governments; while ensuring the full participation of national governments in the preparation, finalization, implementation monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF and that the national governments should have the final decision on the substantive elements of the UNDAF;Comment: we reiterate our previous amendments to current OP 1 of the revised draft to be reflected in their entirety so as to ensure the full participation of national governments in the preparation, finalization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF. The paragraph must also reflect that national government should have the final decision on the substantive elements of the UNDAF.</p> <p>EU: Add "and implementation" after "planning", and replace "UNDS" by "UN". Delete "in full consultation with national governments" – duplicative (in general, multiplication of such references not necessary and fails to recognise that QCPR is already strong on that point). Add "to deliver on collective outcomes" at the end</p> <p>CANZ: OP1: in the last round of negotiations, we suggested this para include a reference to UNDS entities buying into the new central role of the UNDAFs so as to underline that there should be ownership for this change from the broader system. Proposal: ...and requests the leader of each entity of the UNDG to make a strong political commitment to support the SG reform process, including with their governing structures, and provide a summary of actions taken to OAS ECOSOC in 2019.</p> <p>Russian Federation: We support G77 addition - while ensuring the full participation of national governments in the preparation, finalization, implementation monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF and that the national governments should have the final decision on the substantive elements of the UNDAF.</p> <p>Japan: We can accept the present OP1 as it is. At the same time we are open to other member states' suggestions to further improve the paragraph.</p>
<p>2. Requests the entities of the UN development system to collaboratively implement a new generation of UN country teams, shifting to a model of tailored country presence building on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and in open, transparent, inclusive and full consultation between the host Government and the UN development system, facilitated by the Resident</p>	<p>G77: We had also previously called for the deletion of OPs 2 and 3 to be replaced with a new alternative OP which called for the UNDAF to be finalized through an open and inclusive dialogue between the host Government and the UN development system, facilitated by the RC, to ensure the best configuration of support on the ground, in accordance with national development policies, plans and priorities. At this stage, we would like to assert that as a general comment, we do not support the formulation of any system-wide criteria to determine the presence and the composition of the United Nations country teams, and as such, have called for the deletion of</p>

<p>Coordinator, to ensure the best configuration of support on the ground, in accordance with national development policies, plans and priorities;</p>	<p>current OP 3. delete and replace with previous para they submitted: Calls upon the entities of the UN development system to collaboratively implement a new generation of UN country teams, with a needs based tailored country presence and to be built on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and finalized through an open and inclusive dialogue between the host Government and the UN development system, facilitated by the Resident Coordinator, to ensure the best configuration of support on the ground, in accordance with national development policies, plans and priorities, while ensuring that the final decision on the UNDAF and the configuration of UNCTs remains under the authority of the national government;</p> <p>EU: Add after "ground": "and enhanced coordination, coherence, transparency, efficiency and impact". Add at the end "and in full compliance with the 2030 Agenda"</p> <p>US: <i>Requests</i> the entities of the UN development system to collaboratively implement a new generation of UN country teams, shifting to a model of tailored country presence building on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and in open, transparent, inclusive and full consultation between the host Government and the UN development system, facilitated by the Resident Coordinator, to ensure the best configuration of support on the ground, in accordance with national development policies, plans and priorities, <u>and to address the country's needs;</u></p> <p>Japan: can further improve by implying the virtue and value for a new generation of UN country teams of working with actors outside the United Nations in a complementary and mutually-reinforcing manner. Therefore my delegation would like to propose to add the following phrase at the end of the present OP2: "as well as partnership with actors outside the United Nations Development System"</p>
<p>3. Requests the Secretary-General to work through the United Nations Sustainable Development Group to ensure the use of needs-based and indicative quantitative and qualitative criteria to determine the presence and the composition of the United Nations country teams, based on country development priorities and long-term needs, and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter;</p>	<p>G77: see comments for OP 2</p> <p>EU: Replace "the Secretary General" by "UNDS entities". Add after "qualitative criteria": "using the ratio of programmatic spending compared to operational costs, as well as the identification of entities with expenditures of less than 10 per cent of the total annual expenditure of the country teams as indicators"</p> <p>Norway: would like to reiterate that both the Secretary General and UN entities should be requested to work through the United Nations Sustainable Development Group. The new model for country presence should furthermore result in a reduction of the number of organizations with separate offices</p>

	<p>US: <i>Requests</i> the Secretary-General to work through the United Nations Sustainable Development Group to ensure the use of needs-based and indicative quantitative and qualitative criteria to determine the presence and the composition of the United Nations country teams, based on country development priorities and long-term needs, the approved United Nations Development Assistance Framework, and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter;</p> <p>Russian Federation: delete para. It's our understanding that the composition of country teams will be decided by the Government in the UNDAF. In this venue we support the US proposal: OP3 alt. Requests the Secretary-General to work through the United Nations Sustainable Development Group in ensuring that the composition of the United Nations country teams, flows from the UNDAF which takes into account country priorities and national Governments' requests. Comment: In any case, the process of determination of needs-based qualitative and quantitative criteria should be developed in full consultation with MS and to be presented at the next OAS.</p> <p>Japan: First, we are fairly comfortable with and can accept the retention of the reference to "the use of needs-based and indicative quantitative and qualitative criteria to determine the presence and the composition of the United Nations country teams". Second, we also accept the idea that such criteria to determine the presence and the composition of the UN country teams are based on country development priorities and long-term needs, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Third, and most importantly, we would like to reiterate the importance we attach to strengthening the system based on the comparative advantages of the United Nations and aiming at strengthening its partnership with non-UN actors on that basis. It is in relation particularly to this last point that my delegation would like to propose to add the following wordings at the end of the present OP3: "and also taking into consideration partnership with actors outside the United Nations Development System based on the Group's comparative advantage"</p>
<p>4. Request the Secretary-General, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 71/243, to conduct a review of the configuration, capacity, resource needs, role and development services of multi-country offices, in full consultation with involved countries to improve their contribution to country progress in achieving the 2030 Agenda,</p>	<p>G77: Request the Secretary-General, in pursuant to of General Assembly resolution 71/243, to conduct a review of the configuration, capacity, resource needs, role and development services of multi-country offices, in full consultation with involved countries to improve their contribution to country progress in achieving the 2030 Agenda,</p> <p>EU: Delete, as review already requested in QCPR, and the SG undertakes to do it in para 42 of his Report. If has to stay, add "as previously requested"</p> <p>CANZ: OP4: This is an outstanding mandate from the QCPR so should therefore be retained in the</p>

	<p>text. A time frame for the review also needs to be added to this para, to ensure there is action taken. <i>Proposal - ...by the end of 2018</i></p> <p>Norway: would like to suggest including a timeframe for the review.</p> <p>Japan: Regarding OP4 concerning multi-country offices, we are fairly comfortable with the present formulation of this operational paragraph. At the same time we are open to other member states' suggestions to further improve it. Among those suggestions, we can support the proposal of the delegation of the United States which appears on the compilation of member states proposals.</p>
<p>5. Calls on the entities of the UN development system to strengthen the capacities, expertise and skill sets to deliver on a comprehensive manner on the Sustainable Development Goals, and ensure progress on those Goals lacking furthest behind as identified in the reports of the Secretary-General, building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities;</p>	<p>G77: delete this para. Salt. Calls on the UNDS entities, in alignment with their respective mandates, to strengthen their capacities and capabilities to deliver on SDGs 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 15 that are underfunded, to support the implementation of the SDGs in a comprehensive manner, including all specific national development priorities. Comment: We believe that current OP 5 should be amended as we had stated in the previous informal consultations to strengthen the capacities of UNDS entities to deliver on the SDGs that are underfunded, and to support the implementation of the SDGs in a comprehensive manner, including all specific national development priorities.</p> <p>EU: Delete. If stays, do not focus on goals lagging furthest behind; could have something along the lines of "Ensure delivery in a comprehensive manner based on comparative advantage etc." Should then also add after "skill sets": "to be better equipped in supporting developing countries".</p> <p>CANZ: OP5: adding "when relevant", as suggested by Switzerland. Proposal: Calls on the entities of the UN development system to strengthen the capacities, expertise and skill sets to deliver <u>in</u> a comprehensive manner on the SDGs <u>when relevant</u>, and ensure progress on those goals lacking furthest behind as identified in the reports of the SG, building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities</p> <p>Norway: would like to reiterate that due attention has to be paid to the comparative advantages of the UNDS. The UNDS cannot "ensure" progress on any goals, but it can support such progress. We suggest replacing "ensure" with "where relevant, support".</p> <p>US: Calls on<u>Encourages</u> the entities of the UN development system to strengthen the capacities, expertise and skill sets to deliver on a comprehensive manner on the Sustainable Development</p>

	<p>Goals, and ensure progress on those Goals lacking furthest behind as identified in the reports of the Secretary-General⁵, building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities;</p> <p>Switzerland: <i>Calls on</i> the entities of the UN development system to strengthen the capacities, expertise and skill sets to deliver on a comprehensive manner on the Sustainable Development Goals, and, when relevant, ensure progress on those Goals lacking furthest behind as identified in the reports of the Secretary-General⁶, building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities;</p> <p>Japan: Regarding OP5, my delegation found significant improvement, and welcomed the revision. We particularly welcome the reference at the end of the present text to “building on comparative advantages and reducing overlaps and duplication across entities”.</p> <p>Russian Federation: New addition:, and in this regard requests the SG to ensure the participation of all relevant operational funds, programmes and specialized agencies in the UNDG work in order to provide a comprehensive pool expertise in the context of SDGs.</p>
<p>6. Welcomes measures by the Secretary-General for advancing common business operations, including through mutual recognition and common premises, to enable joint work and generate greater efficiencies, synergies and coherence, and requests their full implementation;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes</i> measures by the Secretary-General for advancing, where appropriate, common business operations, including through mutual recognition and common premises, to enable joint work and generate greater efficiencies, synergies and coherence, and <i>requests</i> their full implementation; Efficiency gains should be redirected to programme activities. Comment: On OP 6, we reiterate our proposal to insert the term “where appropriate” when referring to the measures undertaken by the Secretary-General for advancing common business operations, including through common premises. In keeping consistent with our general approach, we would like to delete the reference to “mutual recognition” as the reference here is incomplete and the issue is already tackled in OP 52 of the QCPR resolution. We would also like the paragraph to reflect that any efficiency gains accrued should be redirected to programing activities.</p> <p>EU: Add "requests the SG and all UNDS entities to implement the target of 50 per cent common premises by 2021" and "looks forward to the HLCM strategy to establish common back offices for all UNCTs by 2022"</p>

⁵ ~~A/72/124-E/2018/3 and A/72/684-E/2018/7~~

⁶ A/72/124-E/2018/3 and A/72/684- E/2018/7

	<p>CANZ: OP6: we believe this text could be strengthened by adding ref to the target and support the suggestion provided by the EU on this.</p> <p>Norway: Welcome strengthened wording, could support specifying agreed targets, along the lines suggested by others.</p> <p>Russian Federation: <i>Welcomes</i> measures by the Secretary-General for advancing common business operations, where appropriate, including through mutual recognition and common premises, to enable joint work and generate greater efficiencies, synergies and coherence, and <i>requests</i> their full implementation; Comment: This provision should come in conformity with the principle of “no one size fits all” approach and the principle of the voluntary adoption of the “Delivering as one” approach by the programme country, as indicated in the QCPR.</p> <p>Japan: paragraph in the zero draft. We should request full implementation of measures proposed by the Secretary-General in this regard. At the same time we believe it important for the paragraph to imply the importance of global and/or regional service office (vertical centres). In that relation, our proposal to further improve the paragraph is adding the words of “common back office” after “including through” in the present text. My delegation recalls the secretariat’s oral statement on efficiency. My delegation welcomes the fact that that explanation was shared in writing to member states a few days ago. My delegation has advocated the idea of having efficiency gains accrued from the development system to be reinvested to development-related activities.</p>
<p>7. Reiterates its call for the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations;</p>	<p>G77: delete this para. As mentioned earlier, the Group reiterates its call for the deletion of OP 7 with a view to avoiding the restatement of principles settled in the QCPR resolution, The issue of UNDS coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts has already been extensively tackled and settled in the QCPR and does not require a new mandate by the group.</p> <p>Russian Federation: delete this para. This issue is fully covered in the QCPR OP24, thus through reaffirming the QCPR in the preambular, there’s no need for additional language on this topic.</p> <p>EU: Need reflect both 14 and 24 of the QCPR: “Reiterates its call for the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with the respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, welcomes in this regard the SG’s efforts to enhance a whole of system response as mandated by</p>

	<p>QCPR paragraphs 14, 24, 56 and 57, including through a new Joint Steering Committee to advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration and emphasizes the importance of humanitarian principles and of international humanitarian law”.</p> <p>US: <i>Reiterates</i> its call for the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination <u>collaboration and cooperation</u> with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations <u>with the aim of reducing need, vulnerability and risk over multiple years, based on shared understanding of the context and each actor's operational strengths, in support of national development priorities, while fully respecting the humanitarian principles for humanitarian action; (Ref: 72/133 OP 22);</u></p> <p>Switzerland: <i>Reiterates</i> its call for the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination <u>collaboration</u> with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations; <u>and reaffirms that humanitarian action should be guided by UNGA Resolution 46/182 and its subsequent resolutions, and be delivered in accordance with International humanitarian law and with the principles of humanity, independence, neutrality and impartiality;</u></p> <p>Japan: We can accept the present text. However we are open to other member states’ suggestions for further improvement. For example, we find the proposal of the US delegation useful as a valuable attempt to bridge the gap among member states.</p>
<p>III. Reinvigorating the role of the Resident Coordinator system</p>	<p>CANZ: We agree with Russia on importance of section 3, as it goes to the heart of the decision-making process but disagree on timeframe. We have the details we need so need to take action now. CANZ is ready to move forward.</p>
<p>8. * Decides to create a dedicated, impartial, empowered, and development-focused coordination function of the UN development system by separating the functions of the Resident Coordinator from the UNDP representational function, drawing on the expertise and assets of the entire UN development system entities, including non-resident agencies; *</p>	<p>G77: 8 pre. Reaffirms that the RC System must maintain its development focus and eradication of poverty must remain its overarching objective and that the RCs must serve the purpose of the implementation of the UNDAF, under national leadership and ownership with a developmental and non-politicized perspective. Comment: The group would like to retain its previous proposal to add an OP 8pre which would reaffirm that the RC System must maintain its development focus, the eradication of poverty must remain its overarching objective and that the RCs must serve the purpose of the implementation of the UNDAF, under national leadership and ownership with a developmental and non-politicized perspective. The Group believes that the reinvigoration of the</p>

role of the RC System is a critical part of this UNDS repositioning effort. The Group is supportive of this process, and appreciates the proposal presented by the SG in the December Report. As such, the position of the Group as it relates to OPs 8, 13 and 14 of the current revised draft is premised on the following four inter-linked points that are to be considered as an indivisible whole: 1) The Group welcomes the principle of assessed contribution for the funding of the reinvigorated RC system; 2) The Group is in favor of the separation of functions of the reinvigorated RC from the UNDP representational function subject to the caveats that the RC is: i) a development function; ii) functions under the principle of national ownership; iii) is supported by a sound governance structure, including a strengthened UN DOCO under the Secretariat; and iv) the separation is linked to funding through assessed contribution; 3) The funding of the reinvigorated RC system through assessed contribution should not be done through absorption within the current budget, but should be additional; and 4) These proposals should undergo the regular Fifth Committee review process to consider their full implications.

EU: Still think that we should streamline OPs 8 to 12 (reopens QCPR, lacks clarity). One strong OP endorsing the SG's vision of a reinvigorated RC system would be enough. Replace "Decides" by "Endorses the SG's proposal". Delete "development-focused" – redundant. Replace "representational function" by "resident representative".

CANZ: We need to make an active decision, not to delete it as some delegations have suggested in their written comments, we also feel like more can be done to point out who is responsible here. We should decide but also request the system, or in this case the entities, to ensure their buy in to what is the major change in the reforms. Has implications on a lot of other paragraphs, we need to be wary of the second and third effects of change to this para.

Switzerland: [8 bis Urges all Member States concerned to provide accreditation to appointed Resident coordinators as the highest-ranking development representative of the United Nations in country.](#)

Norway: supports the separation of the RC and the RR function. We reiterate our suggestion to specify that the Resident Coordinator shall be accredited as the highest-ranking representative of the UN development system.

Russian Federation: delete this para. **OP8alt. Requests the SG to conduct a comprehensive independent evaluation of the RC system, highlighting the roles and contributions of relevant**

	<p>UNDS stakeholder to the functioning of the RCs. OP8alt bis. Also requests the SG in cooperation with UNDP Administrator to present at the ECOSOC OAS (2019) a comprehensive, evidence-based set of proposals, building on the findings of this evaluation, on how to reinforce the management and accountability system and how to ensure appropriate funding support for the resident coordinator system, including through an effective and fair cost-sharing arrangement among United Nations development system entities, including, in order to secure the impartiality and fairness of the resident coordinators.</p> <p>RF comment: we support the G77 addition: Reaffirms that the RC System must maintain its development focus and eradication of poverty must remain its overarching objective and that the RCs must serve the purpose of the implementation of the UNDAF, under national leadership and ownership with a developmental and non-politicized perspective.</p> <p>Japan: My delegation would like to reiterate first of all our support for ideas for an independent and strengthened RC system. At the same time, my delegation recalls the fact that it has emphasized time and again that the purpose for such strengthening should be improving the quality of services delivered by the UN country teams on the ground of developing countries. We would like to see such changes made. That is why we asked a number of questions since January. Will the proposed changes bring about impactful changes on the ground? Why does independence from UNDP only make the system independent, while the argument about the alleged harms of a RC double-hatting a UNDP RR is not appears to be evidence-based at all? Our position on this paragraph would be premised on clearer answers to these and other questions we have already submitted in January.</p> <p>Norway: An independent and dedicated RC function is key for a repositioned UNDS that can better support countries in their implementation of the 2030 Agenda.</p>
<p>9. Reaffirms the important role of UNDP in supporting countries in their efforts to realize their national development goals and targets in accordance with the 2030 Agenda;</p>	<p>G77: delete this para. On OP9, the Group agrees that UNDP is a key partner of developing countries within the UNDS, and that it should continue to play an important role, in any scenario, in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, in line with national priorities. However, even if we appreciate the intention of the paragraph in this regard, we do not see the need for addressing a particular entity of the UNDS in this General Assembly resolution, which should deal with the system as a whole</p> <p>EU: What is the purpose of this para? Nobody contests this role.</p> <p>CANZ: We need to be more proactive, and provide the system and SG with assistance and direction on timeline, DOCO, regional effects in line with a clear transition plan that minimises the</p>

	<p>effect on UNDP. CANZ would be happy to provide text along these lines to the chairs if that was helpful. Proposal: <i>Reaffirms the important role of UNDP in supporting countries in their efforts to realize their national development goals and targets in accordance with the 2030 Agenda and requests the Secretary-General to ensure there is a clear transition plan for the separation of the functions of the Resident Coordinator from UNDP that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>minimises the impacts on UNDP and its outcome delivery;</i> • <i>considers the effects on its funding;</i> • <i>provides clear timeframes;</i> • <i>clarifies its relationship to a transformed UN Development Coordination Office;</i> • <i>and, effective and efficient arrangements, including considering Memorandums of Understanding, on potential future cost recouping arrangements for UNDP’s backbone support at the global, regional and local levels including back office and country platform arrangements;</i> <p>EU: As mentioned in earlier meetings, and as underlines by several colleagues, Norway would welcome greater clarity on the role of UNDP after the separation of functions.</p> <p>Russian Federation: In this formulation this para doesn’t bring additional value to the resolution. We still need more clarity about the role of UNDP in case of potential separation of the RC function, as well as a clear transition plan and full evaluation of costs involved for UNDP. It should be clear, that the UNDS reform should not be effected at the cost of one agency. And in case UNDP is requested to place its assets and expertise at the service of the wider development system, it will be performed on the basis of a fee-for-service model.</p> <p>Japan: My delegation again recalls the fact that a number of delegations including ours have questioned the relationship between the RC system and UNDP under the proposed reinvigorated RC system. We intend to propose our language based on clearer explanations on this matter.</p>
<p>10. Requests the Secretary-General to strengthen the authority and leadership of Resident Coordinators over United Nations country teams and system-wide accountability on the ground for implementing the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and support Member States in their implementation of the 2030 Agenda, through:</p>	<p>G77: Replace “Member States” with “countries. “ We would also like to retain our proposals to OP 10 in their entirety, particularly OP 10 (c)bis, which states that the reports originating from the RCs to the UN Secretary-General shall be on the implementation of the UNDAF, while ensuring that the scope, number and frequency of these reports are agreed with the host governments, as well as OP 10 (c)ter, which ensures full accountability of RCs to the national government for their functions and activities and the establishment of a clear and annual reporting mechanism of the RC to the host government on the implementation of RC’s agreed mandate and in compliance with the UNDAF.</p>

	<p>EU: Delete – shouldn't reopen QCPR. If had to stay, rewrite the chapeau along the lines of "Endorses the SG's response to the QCPR request to strengthen the RC function". (a) duplicates OP1. Eliminate REVISED DRAFT 29 March 2018 4 "in consultation with the national government". Add language on enhanced RC authority over financial instruments. In (b), replace "informing" by "contributing to"</p> <p>CANZ: OP10: happy with some of the inclusions. We are willing to consider what the US suggested on 10a, particularly with insertion of the UNDAF, 10c, happy to see an reemphasis of UNDAF here as well.</p> <p>Norway: will consider the different suggestions raised by colleagues, and revert at a later stage.</p> <p>Japan: Regarding OP10, we find no problem with the chapeau and can go along with it. We are comfortable with the remaining subparagraphs of (b), (c) and (d) in the present forms.</p>
<p>(a) enhanced authorities for the Resident Coordinator to ensure alignment of both agency programmes with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and of inter-agency pooled funding with national needs and priorities, in consultation with the national government</p>	<p>Russian Federation: It is still unclear how the RC will ensure that the agencies' country programmes are aligned to the UNDAF. CPDs are affirmed by their respective Executive Boards.</p> <p>Proposal: enhanced authorities for the Resident Coordinator to facilitate the UNCT interagency dialogue with the host Government to align/integrate both agency programmes with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and interagency pooled funding priorities with national needs without compromising the financial and general accountability of individual entities of the United Nations country team to their respective headquarters</p> <p>US: enhanced authorities for the Resident Coordinator to ensure alignment of both agency programmes and of inter-agency development pooled funding with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and of inter-agency pooled funding with national <u>development</u> needs and priorities <u>with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</u>, in consultation with the national government <u>and relevant stakeholders</u></p> <p>Japan: We propose to replace the phrase "pooled funding" with "programmes". Resident Coordinator's authority to ensure alignment of inter-agency activities with national needs and priorities should be broader. The scope should not be restricted only to inter-agency pooled-funding.</p>

<p>(b) full mutual and collective performance appraisal to strengthen accountability, with Resident Coordinators appraising the performance of UN country team heads and UN country team heads informing the performance assessment of Resident Coordinators</p>	<p>G77: full mutual and collective performance appraisal to strengthen accountability and impartiality, with Resident Coordinators appraising the performance of UN country team heads and UN country team heads informing the performance assessment of Resident Coordinators and host governments contributing to the assessment of RCs and UNCTs</p>
<p>(c) the establishment of a clear matrixed reporting model, with UN country team members accountable and reporting to their respective entities on individual mandates and reporting to the Resident Coordinator on respective contributions to the collective support of the UN development system towards achievement of Agenda 2030 at country level, based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</p>	<p>G77: add “UNDESA at headquarter level” at the end of this para. G77 - (c)bis The reports originating from the RCs to the UN Secretary-General shall be on the implementation of the UNDAF, while ensuring that the scope, number and frequency of these reports must be agreed with the host governments to ensure that the reports are consistent with the agreed mandate and within the agreed framework of UNDS in country operation. (c)ter: Full accountability of RCs to the national government for their functions and activities and the establishment of a clear and periodic reporting mechanism of the RC to the host government on the implementation of RC’s agreed mandate and in compliance with the UNDAF</p> <p>US: the establishment of a clear matrixed reporting model, with UN country team members accountable and reporting to their respective entities on individual mandates and reporting to the Resident Coordinator on respective contributions to the collective support <u>results</u> of the UN development system towards achievement of Agenda 2030 at country level, based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</p> <p>Switzerland: (c) the establishment of a clear matrixed reporting model, with UN country team members accountable and reporting to their respective entities <u>and to the Resident Coordinator</u> on individual mandates and reporting to the Resident Coordinator on respective contributions to the collective support of the UN development system towards achievement of Agenda 2030 at country level, based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework</p>
<p>(d) a collectively owned internal dispute resolution mechanism;</p>	

<p>11. Welcomes the strengthening of capacities of Resident Coordinators and staff in the Resident Coordinator offices to be fully in accordance with country needs and priorities and in accordance with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework;</p>	<p>EU: Delete – shouldn't reopen QCPR.</p> <p>CANZ: OP11 and 12 can be deleted given the need not to relitigate here. We also agree with the EU that the RC recruitment goes well as is anyway.</p> <p>US: Welcomes the strengthening of the Resident Coordinator independent recruitment process, including with due consideration to gender parity and geographical balance, and, recalling that highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity serve as the paramount consideration in the employment of staff, emphasizes the need to ensure appropriate merit, expertise and development focus of Resident Coordinators' profiles, with the skills and experience required to work across development, humanitarian and peacebuilding contexts as necessary, and to strengthen the training and interagency recruitment process to that end;</p> <p>Japan: My delegation does not find additional values to the QCPR resolution. Like European Union, we do not believe it necessary. We therefore join them proposing the deletion of this paragraph.</p>
<p>12. Welcomes the strengthening of the Resident Coordinator independent recruitment process, including with due consideration to gender parity and geographical balance, and, recalling that highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity serve as the paramount consideration in the employment of staff, emphasizes the need to ensure appropriate merit, expertise and development focus of Resident Coordinators' profiles, and to strengthen the training and interagency recruitment process to that end;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes</i> the strengthening of the Resident Coordinator independent recruitment process, including with due consideration to gender parity and geographical balance and the representation of developing countries, and, recalling that highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity serve as the paramount consideration in the employment of staff, <i>emphasizes</i> the need to ensure appropriate merit, expertise and development focus of Resident Coordinators' profiles, and to strengthen the training and interagency recruitment process to that end;Comment: with regard to OP 12, which deals with the recruitment process of the RCs, due consideration needs to be given to gender parity, geographical balance, including the representation of developing countries. This should also be considered not only for the RCs, but equally for their teams.</p> <p>EU: Delete – shouldn't reopen QCPR, no need to review the current RC recruitment process. If has to stay, replace "geographical balance" by "geographical diversity".</p> <p>Japan: Like the previous paragraph, my delegation does not find it necessary. We therefore propose to delete the paragraph.</p> <p>US: <i>Welcomes</i> the strengthening of the Resident Coordinator independent recruitment process, including with due consideration to gender parity and geographical balance, and, recalling that highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity serve as the paramount consideration in the employment of staff, <i>emphasizes</i> the need to ensure appropriate merit, expertise and</p>

	<p>development focus of Resident Coordinators' profiles, <u>with the skills and experience required to work across development, humanitarian and peacebuilding contexts as necessary</u>, and to strengthen the training and interagency recruitment process to that end;</p>
<p>13. * Emphasizes that the adequate and predictable funding of the Resident Coordinator system is essential to deliver a coherent, effective, efficient and accountable response in accordance with national needs and priorities, and, in this regard, endorses the SG's proposal to provide USD255 million annually through assessed contributions to ensure the necessary funding of the Resident Coordinator system; *</p>	<p>Russian Federation: <i>Emphasizes</i> that the adequate and predictable funding of the Resident Coordinator system is essential to deliver a coherent, effective, efficient and accountable response in accordance with national needs and priorities, and, in this regard, endorses the SG's proposal to provide USD255 million annually through assessed contributions to ensure the necessary funding of the Resident Coordinator system; Comment: Contradicts OP57(g) QCPR To ensure appropriate funding support for the resident coordinator system, including through an effective and fair cost-sharing arrangement among United Nations development system entities, based on the cost of the coordination functions performed, and in this regard to ensure that all entities of the United Nations development system report on their use of the resident coordinator system and their contribution to the cost-sharing mechanism to their respective governing bodies</p> <p>EU: Open to options, but decision needs be based on cost-benefit analysis, prevent counterproductive politicisation and ensure the RC's impartiality</p> <p>CANZ: we come back to our questions on modalities that we have previously raised. What practically does it means to have assessed contributions, do we need a grant, a service level arrangement, ring fencing? We think we need to have more of a realistic sense from the Secretariat as to what the proposal would entail, to assess its impacts, and before we could take it forward. We need some more clarity here. CANZ has already set out its criteria regarding any funding, that it needs to be: increased, predictable, not micromanaged and remain de-politicised. CANZ also wonders about the location issue with this – given the movement of paras 23 and 25, we wonder if we should be moving this para to where they are as well .</p> <p>Norway: reiterates our support, in principle, that the RC system should be funded through assessed contributions. We need to make sure, however, that we do this in a way that will ensure adequate and predictable funding, and that the integrity and impartiality of the RC function is protected.</p> <p>US: * <i>Emphasizes</i> that the adequate and predictable <u>and sustainable</u> funding of the Resident Coordinator system is essential to deliver a coherent, effective, efficient and accountable response in accordance with national needs and priorities, and, in this regard, <u>decides that funding of the</u></p>

~~Resident Coordinator system shall be made on a voluntary basis endorses the SG's proposal to provide USD255 million annually through assessed contributions to ensure the necessary funding of the Resident Coordinator system; *~~

US: Requests the Secretary-General to fund the Resident Coordinator system through an effective and fair cost-sharing arrangement among UNDS entities, taking into account only the respective levels of voluntary member-state contributions to their overall budgets;

Japan: We would like to reiterate the fact that the amount of 255 million US dollars referred to in the paragraph is equivalent to 10 per cent of the entire annual regular budget of the United Nations and that we are concerned about that. In that regard, the basis of this large amount of financial resources of 255 million US dollars requires further and clearer explanations. Hence we propose the following paragraph regarding OP13:

"Requests the United Nations Development Group to improve its efficiency through reforming its business process and other viable means with a view to reinvesting the efficiency gains accrued from such improvement to emerging activities related to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda effectively including through reinvigorating the Resident Coordinator System;"

Switzerland: Speaking In my national capacity: We have heard carefully that some do not support assessed. We may wish to consider options to presented in the next compilation as several options in writing on the table could ease discussions. One proposal we could reflect, if there is appetite for options is as follows:

Three sources of financing each set at one-third each and the same amount of approximately, \$85m.

Slice 1: from assessed contributions. That would mean that for the budget of the UN, it would be a 3% increase. For context, last year the SG and 5C has approved previous budget at 3% lower than before.

Slice 2: from a revised cost sharing agreement. This would need to increase from \$35m to \$85m. Efficiency gains that are realised could form part of it to reach the \$85m. The revised formula would not need to include Secretariat as there is the assessed contributions, and would ensure a collegial system, as per RF comment based on QCPR OP53.

Slice 3: from a levy. Earmarked development contributions could pay a certain fee to coordination, since it is earmarked that generates the coordination work. There is about \$12bn of development earmarked contributions, so the levy would need to be 0.7% levy to reach approximately \$85m.

Norway: Preferred option remains to fund the reinvigorated and independent RC system through

assessed contributions, as proposed by the SG. But given the importance of this reform to the whole repositioning exercise, and as there are diverse views on how to fund it, we are willing to show flexibility and take part in a discussion of alternative options. Any option to be considered has to ensure sufficient and predictable funding and protection of the integrity and independence of RC system. Based on the above considerations, our preliminary views on the five potential funding sources presented based on last week’s technical consultations are as follows:

- 1) **Assessed contributions:** This is our preferred option
 - 2) **UNDG cost-sharing agreement:** As an existing arrangement that has been tested, it is worthwhile to consider a continuation. An updated agreement would, however, need to overcome today’s shortcomings, in particular through full implementation by all parties.
 - 3) **Savings through efficiency gains:** While we hope the reforms will lead to considerable savings through increased efficiency, the savings will appear gradually and on each individual entity’s budget. Hence relying on savings will not be predictable as a sustainable funding source for the RC system.
 - 4) **A levy on voluntary contributions** (all - or just earmarked): this would be a more predictable and sustainable source of funding. If applied across-the-board, it would also be a relatively fair arrangement from a burden-sharing perspective.
 - 5) **A voluntary fund:** A fully voluntary fund based on pledges would not be predictable.
- Based on these preliminary comments, we think the three most viable sources to consider – if we cannot agree on assessed contributions alone - are 1) assessed, 2) an updated UNDG cost-sharing agreement, and 4) a levy on voluntary contributions.

14. Endorses the transformation of the UN Development Coordination Office to assume managerial and oversight functions of the Resident Coordinator system under the leadership of an Assistant Secretary-General, as part of the United Nations Secretariat, as a stand-alone coordination office;

G77: Endorses the transformation of the UN Development **operations** Coordination Office

Russian Federation: delete and replace: **Endorses the transformation of the UN Development Coordination Office into an independent entity to assume managerial and oversight functions of the Resident Coordinator system under the leadership of an Assistant Secretary-General, as a stand-alone coordination office under the collective leadership and ownership of operational agencies;** Comment: We can continue working on the US proposal, however we need more clarity which operational agencies will be involved in the leadership and ownership of the new DOCO.

US: Endorses the transformation of the UN Development Coordination Office into an independent entity to assume managerial and oversight functions of the Resident Coordinator system under the leadership of an Assistant Secretary-General, ~~as part of the United Nations Secretariat,~~ as a stand-alone coordination office under the collective leadership and ownership of operational agencies;

	<p>EU: No need to reiterate functions that DOCO already undertakes – shorten into "Endorses the transformation of the UN Development Coordination Office to a stand-alone coordination office, under the Secretary-General".</p> <p>CANZ: we could positively view the language proposed by the US or EU here. Must be clear that the DOCO is a standalone entity, not part of the Sec.</p> <p>CANZ: OP14 bis Emphasises the importance of a smooth transition period during this period of reform, to ensure that the UNDS continues to deliver on the 2030 Agenda, and in this light decides that a transition plan is to be agreed between, inter alia, the EOSG, UNDP and DOCO to ensure ongoing delivery and effective transition in relation to, inter alia, the financial, legal and administrative arrangements, including human resourcing arrangements, to ensure that the UNDS is nimble, responsive and effective, the RC system is empowered, UNDP remains the backbone of the UNDS, and that member states are updated in relation to this transition plan at the ECOSOC OAS in 2019,</p> <p>Norway: supports transforming DOCO into a stand-alone coordination office, and suggest to take out the reference to it being part of the Secretariat.</p> <p>Japan: My delegation read and listened to carefully the comments made by a number of groups and member states. My delegation is still one of them which do not understand very well the role and function of UNDP in the new organizational framework as proposed by the Secretary-General. We have difficulties in considering this matter without sufficient level of clarity.</p>
<p>IV. Revamping the regional approach</p>	
<p>15. Reaffirms the role of the United Nations development system at the regional level including the Regional Economic Commissions and the regional teams of the United Nations development system, in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Reaffirms</i> the role of the United Nations development system at the regional level including the Regional Economic Commissions as an essential component of the United Nations development system relying on its evidence-based, convening and technical cooperation functions in accordance with the mandates of its Member States and their intergovernmental subsidiary bodies, in supporting of but not limited to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context and of each Regional Economic Commission and its regional mechanisms; and the regional teams of the United Nations development system, in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context;</p>

	<p>Russian Federation: supports the G77 proposal: Reaffirms the role of the United Nations development system at the regional level, particularly the Regional Economic Commissions, as an essential component of the United Nations development system relying on its evidence-based, convening and technical cooperation functions in accordance with the mandates of its Member States and their intergovernmental subsidiary bodies, in supporting of but not limited to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context and of each Regional Economic Commission and its regional mechanisms;</p> <p>EU: Add at the end "underlines the need to improve coordination and enhance efficiency at the regional level in line with mandates given in paragraphs 45(a) and (b), 69, 70 and 81 of 71/243".</p> <p>CANZ: we feel we could delete without losing any substantive impact, we are affirming what has already been litigated and the only substantive point here is that of a region by region approach which is already included in 16. Number of QCPR references proposed by the EU speak to the need to delete rather than relitigate here.</p> <p>US: <i>Reaffirms</i> the role of the United Nations development system at the regional level including the Regional Economic Commissions and the regional teams of the United Nations development system, <u>and notes the need to continue to make them fit for purpose</u> in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, recognizing the specificities of each regional context;</p> <p>Japan: My delegation believes that the present OP15 can be a good basis for further discussions and building consensus eventually as we find it streamlined and improved carefully. OP16</p>
<p>16. Endorses a phased approach, including immediate steps and longer-term options, to strengthen the UN development system at the regional level, and in this regard:</p>	<p>G77: the group would like to retain the amendments made to paragraphs 15 and 16 by the group in their entirety. We would further suggest strengthening this section by adding two sub paragraphs to alternative paragraph 16 proposed by the group during the previous informal consultations:</p> <p>16 alt. Decides that the revamping of the regional approach should be elaborated following a region-by-region basis and, in this regard:</p> <p>(a) Stresses the need to strengthen the role of the regional and sub-regional approaches in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, as well as other agendas and commitments,</p> <p>(b) Emphasizes the need to address gaps and overlaps at the regional level, bearing in mind the need to avoid a “one-size-fits-all” model for the regional approach and to build upon the specificities of each region and the strengths of its regional mechanisms, including Regional</p>

Economic Commission as one of the main subsidiary bodies of the ECOSOC,

(c) Further emphasizes the need to preserve the functions already performed by the UNDS at the regional level, including the support provided to States and UNDS entities regarding policy advice, normative support and technical capacity, as well as the capacities and resources needed in this regard,

(d) Highlights the need to preserve and reinforce the direct interactions between States and the Regional Economic Commissions.

(e) Aligning of the leadership and coordination arrangements of the UNDS with the changes at the global and national levels through the enhanced capacity of UNDESA

(f) Emphasizes the crucial role of the Regional Economic Commissions in supporting the building, development and strengthening of national capacities

G77 added the following paras during the 5th consultation:

(d)bis stresses the need for the RECs to serve as platform to engage Member States and various relevant stakeholders, including regional and sub-regional organisations, in their related discussions and works in order to achieve the SDGs;

(d)ter highlights the need to enhance interactions and sharing of experiences and best practices amongst the RECs in order to promote mutual learning and collaboration;

EU: Replace "strengthen" by "revamp". At the end of (a), add: "in order to improve system-wide coherence and efficiency, reduce duplication and build synergies across the system with external stakeholders."

CANZ: The Who – can we restructure this para so A and B are being requested by the SG, drafting it as requests the SG; to implement; to provide options. Would suggest it reads: Proposal:
Endorses a phased approach, including immediate steps and longer-term options, to strengthen the UN development system at the regional level, and in this regard requests the Secretary-General:

(a) to implement the measures proposed in his report to optimize functions and enhance collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels; and

(b) to provide options, on a region by region basis, for longer-term reprofiling and restructuring of the regional assets of the United Nations at the 2019 ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development;

US: *Endorses* a phased approach, including immediate steps and longer-term options, to ~~strengthen~~improve the UN development system at the regional level, and in this regard:

<p>(a) requests the Secretary-General to implement the measures proposed in his report to optimize functions and enhance collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels; and</p>	<p>Russian Federation: <i>requests</i> the Secretary-General to implement the measures proposed in his report⁷ to optimize functions and enhance collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels without compromising the structural integrity of RECs; and</p> <p>Russia comment: Redeployment of staff of the RECs away from headquarters to enhance capacities of UNCTs and fill substantive gaps in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda contradicts the GA rule of procedure 153, regulation 2.10 of UNFRR (ST/SGB/2003/7) and Rule 105.1 of UNFRR, which forbid to redeploy staff funded through assessed contributions to entities financed through XB resources (AFPs). In addition, the redeployment of substantive/technical staff from RECs to UNCTs would cause the opposite effect than what was originally intended in the 2016 QCPR, namely to consolidate knowledge and technical expertise. By definition UNCTs work only in the one country they serve. Pooling technical staff in the UNCTs will only accumulate knowledge in one country at the disservice of all others.</p> <p>US: requests encourages the Secretary-General to implement the appropriate measures proposed in his report⁸ to improve their efficiency and effectiveness to optimize functions and enhance collaboration at the regional and sub-regional levels; and</p> <p>Japan: Regarding OP16subparagraph (a), my delegation would like to suggest for this subparagraph to capture both a review as proposed by the SG and the intended optimization of efficiency and effectiveness. Therefore, we would like to propose the following reformulation of subparagraph (a): “Requests the Secretary-General to immediately implement a review of UN regional entities and their functions and work to optimize their efficiency and effectiveness”.</p>
<p>(b) looks forward to options, on a region by region basis, for longer-term reprofiling and restructuring of the regional assets of the United Nations at the 2019 ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development;</p>	<p>Japan: Regarding subparagraph (b) of the same paragraph, we view the proposals from the European Union and Russia positively as good basis for further discussion. Regarding the present formulation in the revised draft, we are a little concerned about the possibility of the reference to “on a region by region basis” as it may burden the secretariat and others unnecessarily, while we understand the necessity of considering regional differences. At this point in time we do not have a specific proposal to address this concern, but my delegation may further consider the matter with a view to submitting a proposed language to address this.</p>
<p>V. Strategic direction, oversight and accountability for system-wide results</p>	

⁷ A/72/684- E/2018/7

⁸ ~~A/72/684- E/2018/7~~

<p>17. Takes note of the Secretary-General’s proposal on the repositioning of the Operational Activities Segment of the Economic and Social Council and looks forward to the outcome of the ongoing review of General Assembly resolution 68/1;</p>	<p>CANZ: as we have previously submitted, could benefit from having criteria attached. We propose language for the end: Proposal: “particularly as it relates to the timing, link to other segments, and length.”</p> <p>Japan: We can accept</p>
<p>18. Takes note of the Secretary-General’s proposal to gradually merge the NY-based Executive Boards of funds and programmes, and encourages the Executive Boards to conclude the review on the working methods of the Boards with the aim of improving the efficiency, transparency and quality of their meetings, including through strengthening the functions of the Joint Meeting of the Boards;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Takes note</i> of the Secretary-General’s proposal to gradually merge the NY-based Executive Boards of funds and programmes, and <i>encourages</i> the Executive Boards to conclude the review on the working methods of the Boards with the aim of improving the efficiency, transparency and quality of their meetings, including through further considering strengthening the functions of the Joint Meeting of the Boards;</p> <p>Switzerland: <i>Takes note</i> of the Secretary-General’s proposal to gradually merge the NY-based Executive Boards of funds and programmes, and <i>encourages</i> the Executive Boards to conclude the review on the working methods of the Boards with the aim of improving the efficiency, transparency and quality of their meetings, including through granting decision-making authority on areas of joint action to the existing strengthening the functions of the Joint Meeting of the Boards;</p> <p>EU: Replace by "Welcomes steps already taken by Bureaux, Member States and UN entities to improve working methods of the boards in line with QCPR para 46 a-c, and urges member states to continue making immediate and practical changes to further enhance the working methods of the Boards in line with SG report para 119; Decides to give legislative authority on areas of joint action or common interest to the existing Joint meeting of the board, that includes UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNOPS, WFP and UN Women."</p> <p>CANZ: Pleased with pragmatic revisions.</p> <p>Norway: would like to keep the reference to the proposal by the SG. In addition, it should be underlined that the overall objective of the proposed changes is broader than to improve the efficiency, transparency and quality of the meetings. Rather, the broader objective should be to strengthen the coherence, efficiency and effectiveness of the governance structure of the UNDS.</p> <p>US: <i>Takes note of the Secretary-General’s proposal to gradually merge the NY-based Executive Boards of funds and programmes, and encourages</i> the Executive Boards to conclude the review on the working methods of the Boards with the aim of improving the efficiency, transparency and</p>

	<p>quality of their meetings, including through strengthening the functions of the Joint Meeting of the Boards;</p> <p>Japan: My delegation also can accept OP18 as it is in the revised draft, while we are aware of remaining differences on the subject matter.</p>
<p>19. Stresses the need to improve monitoring and reporting on system-wide results and, in this regard, welcomes the strengthening of independent system-wide evaluation measures and the establishment of a dedicated unit to that end, as proposed by the Secretary-General;</p>	<p>G77: We would also like to retain our proposal to add an OP 19bis., which Stresses the need for transparency of the activities of the United Nations Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the United Nations Development Group to ensure their effective interaction with and improve their responsiveness to Member States. 19bis. Stresses the need for transparency of the activities of the United Nations Chief Executives Board for Coordination and the United Nations Development Group to ensure their effective interaction with and improve their responsiveness to Member States.</p> <p>US: <i>Stresses</i> the need to improve monitoring and reporting on system-wide results <u>of the UN development system in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda</u> and, in this regard, <i>welcomes</i> the strengthening of independent system-wide evaluation measures, <u>as well as the use of joint evaluations using the existing evaluation capacities, and requests further information on feasibility of</u> and the establishment of a dedicated unit to that end, as proposed by the Secretary-General;</p> <p>CANZ: we are supportive of the language and the language underpinning it. Have some remaining questions about funding, structure and staffing etc.</p> <p>Russian Federation: <i>Stresses</i> the need to improve monitoring and reporting on system-wide results and, in this regard, welcomes the strengthening of independent system-wide evaluation measures and the establishment of a dedicated unit to that end, as proposed by the Secretary-General; and request the SG to reinforce the capacities of Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) in the area of operational activities for development to produce independent system-wide evaluations for the ECOSOC OAS in cooperation with UNEG.</p> <p>Japan: Regarding OP19 of system-wide evaluation, we do not submit any proposal at this point in time. We take note of a number of different views expressed, however. We would welcome in this regard any additional information about the establishment of a dedicated unit as proposed by the Secretary-General.</p>

VI. Funding the United Nations development system

CANZ: We can agree with the call for a Funding Compact, but believe the specific elements should be agreed through the dialogue. We have similar questions to the EU about the nature of the Funding Dialogues – particularly in relation to the time frame and end result.

Norway: Overarching comment: Norway reiterates that this section would benefit from more balanced language, including language on the overall objective for the reform of the funding system. The overall aim is to make repositioning of the UNDS possible – this requires higher quality, more predictable funding. We would like to propose a streamlining of section VI on funding that will effectively reduce the no of paras to 4 or 5:

I: (Introduction)

The first four paras of this section - OP 20 – 23 - all seem to be based on language from various paras of the QCPR. They hence do not bring anything new, while at the same time they do not fully reflect all the important paras on funding contained in the QCPR.

In order to avoid reopening of - or cherry-picking from – the QCPR, we suggest to replace these first four paras (OP 20, 21, 22, 23) with one new para that highlights why changes in the present funding pattern is required, along the following lines:

Replace OP 20-23 with: **Recognizes that significantly improving the level, predictability and flexibility of its funding base is a prerequisite for the successful repositioning of the United Nations development system, with the aim of better supporting countries in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development in a coherent and integrated manner;**

Japan: Regarding this section of funding the UN development system, my delegation would like to focus on a framework which is called a funding compact. This concerns the entire section but particularly OP 24. My delegation listened to the EU's intervention regarding this matter carefully with interest. We felt that it can be a good basis of discussions. At this point in time, we would like to make some preliminary comments in light of what was stated by the delegation.

First, we can be in favor of the idea of developing a framework of mutual commitment, which may be called a funding compact, as a framework of commitments between the UN and member states. Second, regarding a funding dialogue which the Secretary-General proposed to launch, member states may encourage or call on him to do so with a view to agreeing on the details of such a funding compact. A number of groups and member states mentioned that the details of such a compact need to be discussed and agreed upon. The said statement of EU recognized that the SG report asks and commitments as a base line without prejudging the outcome of the funding dialogue. The proposed dialogue may serve as a good framework to do so. We however do not have instruction on the matter yet. Third, we support the reference in the said EU statement to the idea of including efficiency gains from streamlining business operations, common back offices and so on as part of their commitment in such a funding compact. Where appropriate, challenges

	<p>regarding streamlining business operations, etc. or reinvestment of efficiency gains accrued from such process may be considered in the context of such a dialogue.</p>
<p>20. Reiterates that the fundamental characteristics of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system should be, inter alia, their universal, voluntary and grant nature, their neutrality and their multilateralism, and that the integrated nature of the 2030 Agenda requires a more sustainable funding approach;</p>	<p>G77: Reiterates that the fundamental characteristics of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system should be, inter alia, their universal, voluntary and grant nature, their neutrality and their multilateralism, and that the integrated nature of the 2030 Agenda requires a more sustainable funding approach; as well as their ability to respond to the development needs of programme countries in a flexible manner, and that the operational activities for development are carried out for the benefit of programme countries, at the request of those countries and in accordance with their own policies and priorities for development; Comment: We would like to retain our proposal as expressed during the last informals to add operative paras 20pre. and 20prebis to stress the principle of CBDR and reiterate the importance of ODA as a critical source of funding the UNDS, as well as to emphasizes that funding must be aligned with national development priorities and strategies of program countries with a view to reflect national ownership of their development trajectory. We further would like to amend OP 20 so that reiterates that the operational activities for development of the UN system should be able to respond to the development needs of programme countries in a flexible manner, and that the operational activities for development are carried out for the benefit of programme countries, at the request of those countries and in accordance with their own policies and priorities for development. 20pre. Stresses the principle of CBDR and reiterates the importance of ODA as a critical source of funding the UNDS. 20prebis. Emphasizes that funding must be aligned with national development priorities and strategies of program countries with a view to reflect national ownership of their development trajectory</p> <p>EU: Rework this section. The objective should be to: - Endorse the SG's proposal to establish Funding Compact as a framework of commitments between the UN and all of its Member States. - Call on the SG to launch a Funding Dialogue in 2018 to agree on the details of such a Funding Compact in the form of time-bound targets and indicators. - Recognize the SG Report's asks and commitments as a base line for setting such targets without prejudging the outcome of the Funding Dialogue. 4 A/72/684- E/2018/7 REVISED DRAFT 29 March 2018 6 - Welcome the SG's promise to carry out reform of the UNDS as an important commitment from the side of the UN. - Call on the UNDS to include efficiency gains from streamlining business operations, common back offices and common premises as part of their commitment in the Funding Compact. - Note that the Funding Compact concerns voluntary funding of the UNDS as well as other contributions, such as in-kind provision from Member States and other stakeholders. - Request that a first set of</p>

	<p>targets and indicators to measure results are agreed in time to be presented at the Operational Activities Segment of ECOSOC in 2019. - Call on Member States and other stakeholders to give priority to the capitalization of the PBF and the Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda</p> <p>CANZ: We agree with the content, but this para is restating what we have already agreed to in the context of the QCPR. We therefore call for its deletion.</p> <p>US: <i>Reiterates</i> that the fundamental characteristics of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system should be, inter alia, their universal, voluntary and grant nature, their neutrality and their multilateralism, and that the integrated nature of the 2030 Agenda requires a more sustainable funding approach;</p>
<p>21. Stresses the importance of increasing core funding as the bedrock of the activities of the UN development system and of improving the quality of non-core resources, noting that non-core resources represent an important contribution to the overall resource base of United Nations operational activities for development as a complement to, and not a substitute for, core resources;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Stresses</i> the importance of increasing core funding as the bedrock of the activities of the UN development system and of improving the quality of non-core resources, noting that non-core resources represent an important contribution to the overall resource base of United Nations operational activities for development as a complement to, and not a substitute for, core resources and that any earmarked funding should be in line with the needs and priorities of developing countries. 22pre. Calls for substantial increase of contributions to the development activities of UNDS with a growth rate no less than that of the contributions to the humanitarian activities so as to ensure an increasing proportion of funding for development activities of UNDS, and requests the SG to further present proposals to achieve such goals. Comment: we would like to add a reference to earmarked funding and state that any earmarked funding should be in line with the needs and priorities of developing countries.</p>
<p>22. Encourages the UN development system to work systematically and in a collaborative manner to effectively broaden and diversify the funding base of the United Nations development system to increase the volume and sustainability of funding;</p>	<p>G77: Delete this para. We would also like to add a paragraph 22pre., which would call for a substantial increase of contributions to the development activities of UNDS, with a growth rate no less than that of the contributions to the humanitarian activities so as to ensure an increasing proportion of funding for development activities of UNDS, and requests the Secretary General to further present proposals to achieve such goals. We ask for the deletion of paragraphs 22 and 23 of the current version of the zero draft.</p> <p>EU: Add after "funding base": "in accordance with AAAA".</p> <p>CANZ: We echo the calls to retain this para given the importance of broadening the donor base</p>

	<p>Russia: add at end - and to allocate more non-core resources, where applicable, to joint activities.</p>
<p>23. Encourages the entities of the United Nations development system to take action to enhance the use of inter-agency pooled funding mechanisms, particularly at country level, that reflect and support common objectives and cross-cutting issues for United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, and also encourages entities of the United Nations development system to increase entity-specific thematic funds with clear objectives aligned to the 2030 Agenda to improve the quality of earmarked funding;</p>	<p>G77: delete this para</p> <p>EU: Replace "Encourages" by "Requests" throughout OP</p> <p>CANZ: We support the calls to strengthen the language in this para and therefore suggest that it should begin with “requests”, rather than “encourages”</p>
<p>24. * Welcomes the Secretary-General’s call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investments of Member States in the United Nations development system and the system’s transparency for system-wide results, the Secretary-General’s proposals to bring core resources to at least a 30% level in the next five years, double both inter-agency pooled funds to a total of USD3.4 billion and entity-specific thematic funds to a total of USD800 million by 2023; *</p>	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes</i> the Secretary-General’s call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investments of Member States in the United Nations development system and the system’s transparency for system-wide actions and results, the Secretary-General’s proposals to bring core resources to at least a 30% level in the next five years, double both inter-agency pooled funds to a total of USD3.4 billion and entity-specific thematic funds to a total of USD800 million by 2023; * and requests the SG to further present options on achieving such targets by increasing contributions in alignment with national needs and priorities. Comment: We support paragraph 24 and request the Secretary General to further present options on achieving such targets by increasing contributions in alignment with national needs and priorities.</p> <p>EU: Welcome SG proposal as a starting point, but should not pre-empt outcome of Funding Dialogue. What does the Secretariat have in mind on the Funding Dialogue (focus, outcome, timeline)?</p> <p>CANZ: We propose to merge OP24 and OP28. Proposal: Welcomes the SG’s call for a Funding Compact and endorses the SG’s proposal to launch a Funding Dialogue.</p> <p>US: <i>Welcomes</i> the Secretary-General’s call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investments of Member States in the United Nations development system and the <u>accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness of the system and its constituent entities; looks forward to discussions of the compact</u>system’s transparency for system-wide results, the Secretary-General’s proposals to bring core resources to at least a 30% level in the next five years, double both inter-</p>

~~agency pooled funds to a total of USD3.4 billion and entity-specific thematic funds to a total of USD800 million by 2023; *~~

Russian Federation: *Welcomes* the Secretary-General's call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investments of Member States in the United Nations development system and the system's transparency for system-wide results, ~~the Secretary-General's proposals to bring core resources to at least a 30% level in the next five years, double both inter-agency pooled funds to a total of USD3.4 billion and entity-specific thematic funds to a total of USD800 million by 2023;~~ **and looks forward to discussions of the compact.**

Norway: OP 24, 27 and 28 - On the Funding compact and dialogue:

We support welcoming the SG's call for a Funding Compact, as well as his proposal to launch a funding dialogue. The question is how far we can go in defining the mutual commitments of the Funding Compact in the current resolution, or if we should leave this to the Funding Dialogue. We have earlier suggested several modifications to the present OP27. It should hence either be modified or deleted (and defined through the dialogue).

Moreover, we are at this stage – even before mutual commitments have been agreed - skeptical to defining the Funding Compact as “an accountability platform” – and it is in any case not the only one (implementation of the QCPR provisions and the present resolution are also crucial for us when we take funding decisions).

OP24 and OP28 could be merged:

Replace OP 24 and 28 with one combined para along the following lines:

Welcomes the Secretary General's call for a Funding Compact, as a critical tool to maximize the investment of Member States in the United Nations development system and the system's enhanced results and efficiencies; and in this regard further welcomes the Secretary General's proposal to launch a Funding Dialogue, with the aim of defining the mutual commitments of the UNDS and Member States as part of the Funding Compact;

Japan: Regarding this section of funding the UN development system, my delegation would like to focus on a framework which is called a funding compact. This concerns the entire section but particularly OP 24. My delegation listened to the EU's intervention regarding this matter carefully with interest. We felt that it can be a good basis of discussions. At this point in time, we would like to make some preliminary comments in light of what was stated by the delegation.

First, we can be in favor of the idea of developing a framework of mutual commitment, which may be called a funding compact, as a framework of commitments between the UN and member states. Second, regarding a funding dialogue which the Secretary-General proposed to launch, member states may encourage or call on him to do so with a view to agreeing on the details of

	<p>such a funding compact. A number of groups and member states mentioned that the details of such a compact need to be discussed and agreed upon. The said statement of EU recognized that the SG report asks and commitments as a base line without prejudging the outcome of the funding dialogue. The proposed dialogue may serve as a good framework to do so. We however do not have instruction on the matter yet. Third, we support the reference in the said EU statement to the idea of including efficiency gains from streamlining business operations, common back offices and so on as part of their commitment in such a funding compact. Where appropriate, challenges regarding streamlining business operations, etc. or reinvestment of efficiency gains accrued from such process may be considered in the context of such a dialogue.</p>
<p>25. Welcomes the Secretary-General’s proposals to establish a dedicated coordination fund and, in this regard, invites Member States to provide voluntary contributions in the amount of USD35 million to the Resident Coordinator system in support of system-wide activities on the ground;</p>	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes</i> the Secretary-General’s proposals to establish a dedicated coordination fund for the implementation of the UNDAF and, in this regard, <i>invites</i> Member States to provide voluntary contributions in the amount of USD35 million to the Resident Coordinator system in support of system-wide activities on the ground; Comment: With regards to paragraph 25, the group supports the Secretary-General’s proposal to establish a dedicated coordination fund, however we note that the paragraph should explicitly states that this fund should be dedicated for the implementation of the UNDAF. Similarly we support the proposal in OP 25 to establish the United Nations Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda to continue to support the implementation of the UNDAF on the ground, as well as the invitation extended to States, to contribute on a voluntary basis, towards the capitalization of the Joint Fund at USD290 million per annum.</p> <p>EU: See general comment on the section above. No need to give numbers; instead speak of "adequate funding".</p> <p>Norway: OP 25 on the Coordination Fund: should include a reference to the purpose of this fund. As we understand from the distributed brief, the purpose is to ensure “a well-functioning UNCT and UNDAF”.</p> <p>US: <i>Welcomes</i> the Secretary-General’s proposals to establish a dedicated coordination fund to support implementation of the 2030 Agenda and, in this regard, <i>invites</i> Member States to provide voluntary contributions in the amount of USD35 million to the Resident Coordinator system in support of system-wide activities on the ground;</p>

<p>26. Invites Member States to contribute to the capitalization of the United Nations Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda at USD290 million per annum.</p>	<p>G77: <i>Invites</i> Member States, on a voluntary basis, to contribute to the capitalization of the United Nations Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda at USD290 million per annum to continue to support the implementation of the UNDAF on the ground.</p> <p>EU: See general comment on the section above. No need to give numbers; instead speak of "adequate funding".</p>
<p>27. * Requests the UN development system, as part of its commitment to the Funding Compact, inter alia to:</p>	<p>EU: See general comment on the section above.</p> <p>CANZ: The text currently suggests that a compact already exists so we suggest the following revision to the chapeau. Proposal: Requests the UNDS, as part of its commitment to the Funding Compact, to, inter alia.</p> <p>Russian Federation: Requests the UN development system, as part of its commitment to the Funding Compact discussions, inter alia to:</p> <p>Norway: OP26 on the Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda: We suggest to include a reference to the purpose of this fund as well. (should be drawn from the Terms of Reference for the Fund). The invitation to capitalize the fund should not only be directed to Member States, but also include non-state actors.</p> <p>US: * <i>Requests</i> the UN development system, as part of its commitment to the Funding Compact discussion, inter alia to:</p>
<p>(a) provide annual reporting on system-wide support to the Sustainable Development Goals and present aggregated information on system-wide results by 2021;</p>	
<p>(b) enrol into the International Aid Transparency Initiative or similar initiatives to enhance transparency and access to financial information in all UN development system entities;</p>	<p>G77: enrol into the International Aid Transparency Initiative or similar initiatives to enhance transparency and access to financial information in all UN development system entities; Comment: On 27(b), we would like to stress the importance accorded by the group to the issue of enhancing transparency and access to financial information in all UN development system entities, and comply fully with international transparency standards, but we would like however to delete the specific reference to the International Aid Transparency Initiative.</p>

	<p>US: <i>enroll into <u>and comply fully with</u> the International Aid Transparency Initiative and similar initiatives to enhance transparency and access to financial information in all UN development system entities;</i></p> <p>CANZ: We support the various elements that have been highlighted in this para and specifically request the retention of a reference to IATI.</p>
(c) undergo independent system-wide evaluations of results achieved, at global, regional and country level;	G77: <i>undergo independent system-wide evaluations of activities and results achieved, at global, regional and country level, with the support of UNDESA, according to the mandate coming from States.</i>
(d) comply fully with existing full cost recovery policies and further harmonize cost recovery by individual UN development system entities through differentiated approaches;	Russian Federation: <i>comply fully with existing full cost recovery policies and further harmonize, where applicable, cost recovery by individual UN development system entities through differentiated approaches. Comment: It's not feasible for all agencies to comply with harmonized cost-recovery policies, as they have different business models.</i>
(e) allocate at least 15% of non-core resources to joint activities	<p>Russian Federation: delete. Comment: This provision interferes in the individual bilateral agreements between donors and agencies, we can't support it. As an option we suggest to transform this provision into a recommendation and to move to OP22</p> <p>US: <i>allocate at least 15%, <u>as appropriate to agency mandates and circumstances,</u> of non-core resources <u>of development programming</u> to joint activities</i></p>
(f) enhance visibility of Member States' contributions to core resources and pooled funds, and related results; *	G77: We would also request the deletion of subparagraph 26(f).
28. * Welcomes the Secretary-General's proposal to launch a Funding Dialogue to operationalize the Funding Compact and serve as an accountability platform for the implementation of and follow-up to the Funding Compact; *	<p>G77: <i>Welcomes the Secretary-General's proposal</i> Decides to launch a Funding Dialogue to operationalize the Funding Compact and serve as an accountability platform for the implementation of and follow-up to the Funding Compact; *</p> <p>Russia: <i>Welcomes the Secretary-General's proposal to launch a Funding Dialogue to operationalize the Funding Compact and serve as an accountability platform for the implementation of and follow-up to the Funding Compact;</i> to discuss and finalize the proposals for the Funding Compact</p>

	<p>EU: See general comment on the section above.</p> <p>CANZ: As noted above, we propose merging this para with OP24. And like the EU, we have questions about how the Funding Dialogues can serve as an accountability platform. We would therefore appreciate more info on this.</p>
<p>VII. Following-up on the UNDS repositioning efforts at the global, regional and country level</p>	
<p>29. Requests the UN Sustainable Development Group to improve the system-wide strategic document in light of the present resolution and to ensure that it is more specific, concrete and targeted, and further requests the Secretary-General to submit the next system-wide strategic document to the 2019 ECOSOC Segment of Operational Activities for Development for Member States' consideration;</p>	<p>G77: delete. The group would like to replace para 29 with a para 29alt which would read as follows:29alt. Requests the heads of the entities of the UNDS under the leadership of the SG, to submit the system wide strategic document as requested in General Assembly resolution 71/243, while taking into account the provisions of the current resolution for consideration of the states at the 2019 operational activities segment for development of the ECOSOC</p> <p>EU: Add after "targeted": "including by adding explanations on how overlaps and gaps can be addressed"</p> <p>Russian Federation: The SWSD as it stands now doesn't comply with the original QCPR mandate (OP20), which aimed to address identified gaps and overlaps in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. We're still considering options on how to address this issue.</p> <p>CANZ: We believe this para could be strengthened by adding a reference in this para to how the system-wide strategic document should respond to where the UNDS has a comparative advantage. Proposal: Requests the UN Sustainable Development Group to improve the system-wide strategic document in light of the present resolution and to ensure that it is more specific, concrete and targeted, and that it responds to areas where the UNDS has a comparative advantage . . .</p> <p>Japan: We can accept OP29 as it is as presented in the revised draft.</p>
<p>30. Reaffirms the role of the Department of Social and Economic Affairs, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 70/299;</p>	<p>G77: delete this para. The group would also like to retain its proposal on OP 30 which addresses that the role of DESA, as one of the leading UN entities in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. 30alt. Reaffirms that the role of DESA, as one of the leading UN entities in supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda needs to be strengthened, as well as its role in providing capacity building to States and in promoting the system-wide</p>

implementation of the policy guidance of the GA and ECOSOC by the UNDS in the area of operational activities for development

EU: Secretariat briefing on progress on DESA reform (mandated by 70/299) should form the basis of an ambitious paragraph.

CANZ: Just as we have a reference to ECOSOC reform, a strong case can be made for retaining the mention of DESA reform in the text as mandated in Res.70/299.

US: Requests the Secretary-General to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, accountability and internal coordination of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, considering the need for avoiding overlap in its work, and ensuring that the work of the Department is organized in an integrated, cohesive, coordinated and collaborative manner, in accordance with resolution 70/299~~Reaffirms~~Reaffirms the role of the Department of Social and Economic Affairs, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 70/299;

Russian Federation: We are ready to support this language proposals AS IS. While the repositioning of the UNDS is discussed in the context of the QCPR, the proposed reform of DESA was NOT a part of the QCPR and should be effected as a follow-up process to the 70/299.

Japan: Regarding OP30 which concerns DESA, we would like to encourage the Secretary-General to brief member states on the subject matter at an early date. Regarding the text, we support the proposal from the delegation of the United States. We also view the proposal of EU as another good basis for discussion.

31. Welcomes the Secretary-General's proposals to strengthen a UN system-wide approach to partnerships, and urges the UN development system to strengthen its cooperation with International Financial Institutions, as well as the private sector, civil society, philanthropic entities and academia, while upholding the principles, objectives and priorities of the United Nations;

G77: ~~Welcomes~~ **Takes note** the Secretary-General's proposals to strengthen a UN system-wide approach to partnerships, **and looks forward for its comprehensively consideration within the Towards Global Partnerships General Assembly resolution**, notes **further** the partnership agreement with the World Bank and further urges the UN development system to strengthen its relationship with the International Financial Institutions, while upholding the principles, objectives and priorities of the United Nations;

CANZ: Parliaments should also be included in the list of stakeholders with which the UNDS can better cooperate

Japan: We can accept OP31 in the revised draft text.

<p>32. Stresses the importance of supporting South-South and triangular cooperation, recalling that South-South and triangular cooperation is a complement and not a substitute for North-South cooperation;</p>	<p>G77: we can delete this para. Comment: The Group would like thank the Co-Facilitators for proposing OP32 on South-South cooperation. The Group attributes great importance to this issue; however, we do not believe there is a need for addressing it at this resolution.</p> <p>EU: Ok, but "triangular cooperation" should be moved to the end of the paragraph. Could be deleted as part of overall streamlining.</p> <p>CANZ: Support the calls made by the G77 to delete this paragraph</p> <p>Japan: Like the Group of G77 and China as well as EU, my delegation believes this paragraph is not absolutely necessary.</p>
<p>33. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council on progress in the implementation of the mandates contained in the present resolution, and the mandates contained in the QCPR resolution 71/243 as part of his annual reporting to the 2019 ECOSOC Segment on Operational Activities for Development, and to the 74th session of the General Assembly for its further consideration and to inform the next cycle of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review to be launched in 2020.</p>	<p>Russian Federation: It's our understanding, that there will be just one comprehensive report.</p> <p>EU: Should only be one report. Terminate para after "OAS".</p> <p>Japan: My delegation can accept OP33 as it is in the present form.</p>