

20251112

**Statement on Mandate Delivery**

My delegation welcomes the Report's system-level approach and practical solutions on mandate delivery. While reaffirming our support for these initiatives, we would like to offer several observations to strengthen them.

**First, we should reflect on the questions of why and how.**

The Funding Compact has not achieved its goals over five years. Earmarking has grown to 85 percent. Yet the proposed solution in paragraph 77.2 asks us to "fully apply" the Compact. If we have not applied it for five years, what will enable us to do so now? Without addressing why our commitments fail, we risk repeating them through aspirational language alone.

While Workstream 3 addresses these issues with some action points, we must examine our own funding decisions: what incentives or disincentives drive current practices. Yet we shouldn't dwell too much on this structural challenge, but rather move toward and focus on workable and practical solutions, for instance, for the better budgeting process and the ways to redeploy resources.

The same applies to proliferating meetings and reports. We must ask ourselves why they have increased despite lessons learned during the COVID-19 period. Calls for self-restraint will not suffice without understanding what drives this demand. At the very least, the utility of meetings and reports must be measured against their costs. My delegation supports measures to make these costs transparent and available and to reduce the repetition and recurrence of reports.

**Second, critical questions of authority and process remain unclear.**

The Report recommends a clear division of labor based on comparative advantage. But key questions persist: Does the Secretary-General have sufficient authority to reallocate resources or reassign mandates? How can we prioritize and streamline mandates without micromanaging implementation?

We must avoid the illusion that strengthening coordination mechanisms automatically improves outcomes. The Report proposes enhanced oversight and coordination platforms. However, coordination without authority is merely facilitation.

My delegation thus believes that the Secretariat must be empowered to pursue reform with appropriate operational flexibility. We Member States may excel at creating mandates but prove less disciplined at managing their lifecycle.

If duplication and inefficiency stem partly from our design failures, we should grant the UN system appropriate authority and flexibility to rationalize and adapt over time.

Reform cannot succeed under micromanagement from the membership. We must distinguish between our legitimate role in strategic oversight and the operational flexibility the Secretariat requires to implement our decisions effectively.

**Third, the three challenges appear deeply interdependent, yet the Report treats them as parallel problems.**

If we grant resource flexibility before establishing division of labor, might entities duplicate rather than coordinate? If 85 percent of funding is earmarked, what incentive do entities have to withdraw from areas where they attract funding, regardless of comparative advantage? Without understanding these interdependencies and sequencing, we risk piecemeal reform that addresses symptoms in isolation.

## **Conclusion**

These comments reflect our commitment to ambitious reform. Member States must also be prepared to make difficult governance choices: between micro-control and effectiveness, between regulation and operational flexibility, between aspirational commitments and binding obligations. My delegation stands ready to engage constructively in this process.

Thank you.