

**IAHWG CONS****12 MARCH 2026, 10AM, CR1****NOTE FOR THE CO-CHAIRS**

---

**[For information: only read black text.]**

**Ambassador Wallace/Schwalger**

**I call to order the informal meeting of the working group.** 

**On behalf of Ambassador Wallace allow me to express our appreciation for your participation in today's meeting of the Informal Ad Hoc Working Group on the Mandate Implementation Review where we will continue to work on the draft resolution "Mandate Creation, Implementation and Review for an Effective and Efficient United Nations".**

**As you are aware, we have only two weeks left to complete our work. It is important for the credibility of this process, the UN80 Initiative and the UN more broadly that we achieve an ambitious, pragmatic and consensus outcome.**

**Thank you to those who shared your views on the revised text at our meeting on 3 March. Thank you also for sending us copies of your statements and/or written text proposals by email. With the Secretariat's support, we are continuing to post these to the UN80 website, alongside our notes. We take the opportunity to remind you that today is the final day to submit written text proposals on the Rev.1.**

**As you are aware from our most recent letter of 5 March, we intend to spend this morning's meeting on two key areas where we have further work to do to forge consensus. The first of these is mandate review, the existing stock of mandates and the related issue of OP25. The second area is the matter of the role of, and requests to, the Secretariat. We intend to spend about half our time on each, so we would appreciate if you could keep your contributions in the first half of this meeting to issues related to Mandate Review.**

## **CO-CHAIRS NOTES – MANDATE REVIEW**

---

**Before we open the floor to delegations, we would like to make a few explanatory comments on Mandate Review. I will now pass the floor to Ambassador Wallace/Schwalger to start with issues related to Mandate Implementation Review.**

**Thank you. Good morning.**

**1. Mandate implementation review - impact: We assess we are getting close to agreement on mandate implementation review. We have listened closely to those who have noted that the impacts of some mandates take a long time to show themselves. We agree. At the same time, we do not assess that the language in OPs 12-14 is at odds with this. Mandate implementation reviews, if conducted well, would evaluate short and long-term impacts over the course of the mandate's lifespan.**

**2. Mandate implementation reviews - cycle: Some delegations have requested a 3 to 5-year mandate implementation review cycle be included in the resolution. We are open to this suggestion and would welcome views of others, including whether this should be included? Should it be a mandatory provision or guidance?**

**3. Collective mandate implementation reviews: We have received a request for clarification on collective mandate implementation reviews. Collective mandate implementation reviews are not conducted consistently at the UN but have been conducted successfully in the wider multilateral system, for example in the environment conventions. While the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) might not strictly be defined as a collective review, it is the primary UN General Assembly mechanism for assessing and guiding the effectiveness, efficiency, and coherence of UN operational activities for development. Therefore, it provides a conceptual analogy when thinking about collective reviews.**

**The language in OP16 recognizes that the conduct of collective mandate implementation reviews in the UN is in its infancy. The draft resolution provides for expanding and enhancing their use but does not suggest all mandates would be part of collective reviews. Rather, Member States may wish to take the initiative to focus on a cluster of mandates – we have highlighted disabilities and transnational crime as two examples where collective mandate implementation reviews might be beneficial.**

**A key driver for including collective mandate implementation reviews in the draft resolution is to enable these to take place across different intergovernmental bodies, as appropriate. This is where the real value-add of collective mandate implementation reviews is to be had.**

**The Secretariat is well placed to identify where there are synergies between the implementation of different mandated activities. In this regard, we are conscious that the Secretariat generally has more information across the mandate landscape than we do as Member States. To address this asymmetry of information between Member States and the Secretariat, in OP17 we invite the Secretary-General to provide recommendations on *possible* specific clusters of mandated activities that could benefit from collective mandate implementation review. Naturally, decisions on whether to take forward the Secretary-General's recommendations would be in the hands of Member States as provided for in OP 34 (c) iv.**

**In fact, it is worth reminding delegations that in each and every case where we are commissioning the Secretary-General to undertake some analysis or make recommendations on mandates, that each of these would come back to the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform for consideration and decision by Member States.**

**I now pass the floor back to Ambassador Schwalger to make some additional comments about Mandate Review.**

**We acknowledge up front that Mandate Review remains an area where we will need to compromise as we strive for consensus on the draft resolution.**

**4. Mandate Review – what it is and isn't: Before we hear from working group members, we thought it was worth reminding ourselves what it is and what it isn't. The draft resolution, as it stands:**

**- Agrees that we will undertake Mandate Reviews going forward and that decisions whether to renew, adapt, merge, replace or retire mandates should be guided by criteria to be developed by Member States as per OPs 20 and 34 (c) v.**

**- Also agrees to undertake Mandate Reviews of the existing stock of mandates from General Assembly resolutions, reflecting the view of many of you that we need to tidy up mandates to ensure duplicative or out-of-date mandates do not syphon resources away from contemporary, priority productive mandated activities.**

**- Also acknowledges that Mandate Review is complicated and that we will need more time to agree the modalities to do Mandate Reviews. This includes questions such as the scope of the application of Mandate Reviews, how we take into account the diverse nature of mandates, who should undertake the reviews, and how do we provide for Mandate Reviews across the system.**

**It is also worth pointing out what the draft resolution does not propose. Specifically, it does not suggest that the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform undertake the Mandate Reviews itself. Member States will need to agree this as part of the modalities discussion.**

**5. Existing stock of mandates General Assembly v inter-governmental organs: When drafting the Rev.1 we were conscious of the need to respect the intergovernmental decision-making processes of other intergovernmental organs across the UN system.**

**Given we are a General Assembly-mandated working group, it is perfectly reasonable for us to *agree* that the GA should review its existing stock of mandates. And, to be clear, this would apply to the GA, its Main Committees and its subsidiaries. Given the Human Rights Council is a subsidiary organ of the GA it would apply as well. To this end, you will recall that the Human Rights Council already has an HRC Rationalization exercise underway.**

**We also make clear that ECOSOC, the Security Council, the funds and programmes, agencies and specialized agencies, would be expected to undertake similar Mandate Reviews as a result of this resolution. The *call upon* them to do so is contained in OP24. We acknowledge that the verb here is not as strong as “agrees” for the GA but reflects the view by many delegations that the GA cannot simply impose a decision on the other principal organs. We welcome delegations’ confirmation of this approach.**

**Ambassador Wallace will now make some additional comments about OP25.**

**6. OP25: We explained in detail at the meeting on 3 March the rationale for including OP25 in the Rev.1 and included this in our notes for that meeting. However, given some delegations have asked for additional clarification on the scope of OP25, allow us to respond now.**

**You will recall that as a result of feedback on the Zero Draft we realized a need to identify categories of mandates that, given their nature, should not be candidates for consolidation, rationalization, or retirement as part of a Mandate Review process. To this end, we identified mandates that are: 1) foundational, establishing norms of a universal character; 2) structural, creating standing institutions; and 3) inherently politically sensitive, concerning ongoing situations affecting international peace and security.**

**With regard to the first category (mandates which establish principles, standards and values that are of universal application and guide us across the UN's three pillars), we understand this to include universally accepted norms, such as human rights, self-determination, sovereign equality, and non-discrimination. This category would also include global frameworks with broad political ownership, such as the 2030 Agenda, and guidance not tied to specific operational tasks or time-bound activities.**

**With regard to the second category (institution-creating mandates which establish the UN's structural architecture), we understand this to mean mandates which: define the existence, purpose, and governance arrangements of major UN entities; carry long-term programmatic, administrative, and budgetary implications; and anchor the UN's operational capacity. Examples include mandates establishing UNDP, UNICEF and the PBC. These mandates would not typically be subject to review unless part of an explicit institutional reform exercise.**

**And, with regard to the third category of mandates (ongoing political situations with implications for international peace and security), we understand these to include mandates which address active, unresolved political situations where the UN plays a continuing role. Such mandates often: support mediation or negotiation processes; maintain international attention on protracted conflicts; guide or authorize Special Political Missions; or address situations where tensions persist and where the UN contributes to preventing escalation. Attempts to review these as part of a technical review exercise is likely to upset delicate diplomatic balances or send unintended political signals.**

**The exclusion of three defined categories of mandates would, in our view, ensure that the resolution remains focused on implementation and coherence, while safeguarding mandates that embody the UN's normative identity, institutional architecture, and political responsibilities.**

## **INTERACTIVE DISCUSSION – MANDATE REVIEW**

---

**I now open the floor to comments from working group members on Mandate Review. We particularly welcome text proposals and indications whether working group members agree or disagree with each other's proposals. If you are speaking for a Group, please identify yourself to the Secretariat. Please keep your comments as concrete and brief as possible to allow all delegations who wish to contribute on this matter to have the opportunity to do so.**

***[For information: follow the the console.]***

**I now give the floor to \_\_\_\_\_.**

**\* \* \***

**I thank \_\_\_\_\_.**

**We have heard the last speaker on the list of speakers for today's discussion on Mandate Review.**

## **CO-CHAIRS NOTES – SECRETARIAT ROLE & REQUESTS**

---

**Before we open the floor to delegations on the role of and requests to the Secretariat contained in Rev.1, we wish to make a few comments.**

**1. Role of the Secretariat: Delegations have made clear that decisions on mandates must remain the exclusive prerogative of Member States. This is reflected as a core principle in the Rev.1 as OP1(c).**

**At the same time, as we have said many times, improving how we create, implement and review mandates for an efficient and effective UN requires a change in behaviour on the part of Member States and UN secretariats. Through this process we have created a strong partnership between working group members and the Secretariat on the mandate implementation review reflecting that both have a role to play in doing things better.**

**We all know that there are nuances in Member States' views on the role of the Secretariat. However, this does not need to be a stumbling block in the finalization of this resolution. The requests we make of the Secretary-General in the Rev.1 are within their responsibilities as detailed in Article 97 of the UN Charter. Moreover, where we have made requests of the Secretary-General for information, advice or recommendations, these would be provided to Member States for consideration and decision-making by the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform. This is clear in the OPs which contain the specific requests and in OP34 (c).**

**On the specific requests to the SG, allow us to make a few points of clarification.**

**2. Secretariat support: The request to the SG in OP3 to provide the proponents of mandates with enhanced administrative and technical secretariat support is intended to ensure more structured and consistent support for Member States throughout the mandate lifecycle, including the provision of indicative financial implications and likely implementation leads as envisioned in the Concept Notes. This support will enable informed decision-making without placing additional burdens on Member States.**

**We would observe that the earlier provision of financial information on proposed mandates has already been agreed in principle in OP36 of the most recent regular budget resolution (80/242).**

**3. Mandate Registry: The request to the SG to develop the UN Mandate Registry to ensure it is comprehensive and, to the extent possible, linked to similar registries across the UN system can be found in OP4. Reflecting the views of delegations, it also requests the SG to extend the functionality of the Mandate Registry going forward, and to provide Member States with training on its use (as per OP31). These requests help ensure the Mandate Registry fulfils its potential as a core reference tool to improve Member States visibility across the mandate landscape – a key deliverable of this resolution.**

**4. Enhanced information and resources: OP6 also seeks to empower Member States by requesting the SG to make available enhanced information and resources across the mandate lifecycle. Much of this already exists in some form but is difficult to locate and is under-utilized. The resolution asks the requested information to be made available in a centralized location for the ease and effective use of Member States.**

**5. Reporting: Report preparation and Member States use of reports featured highly in our Discovery Phase discussions. The request to the SG in OP8 provides for more accessible and easier to digest reporting on implementation, including through more focused and user-oriented reports. This would provide the Secretariat with more flexibility to tailor the format and length of reports.**

**At the same time, OP15 of the draft resolution seeks efficiencies by requesting the SG to consider combining reports or altering their periodicity to reduce duplication and redundancy without sacrificing content.**

**Rev.1 also requests the SG to strengthen and harmonize management for results mechanisms across the UN system, including through harmonized reporting standards (as per OP18). This is an important step if we want to get more serious about systemwide monitoring and evaluation of impact.**

**6. Mandate review advisory function: OP23 requests the SG to facilitate Member State reviews of mandates by regularly reviewing mandates to identify any mandates which may be inactive, duplicative, fully implemented, or overtaken by changed circumstances.**

**OP27 requests the SG to regularly review resolutions and decisions to identify candidates whose periodicity could be adjusted.**

**Both of these roles would be technical and advisory in nature, with any advice or recommendations put forward for consideration by Member States.**

**We appreciate that in the current financial climate requests to the Secretary-General which bring with them financial implications warrant careful scrutiny. Be assured that we have been working closely with the Secretariat to understand and interrogate the resourcing implications of this resolution.**

**We have approached the issue with a philosophy of promoting a careful balance in the resourcing of mandates which seeks maximum efficiency, while also stressing the importance of adequately resourcing mandates to achieve their objectives. Some of you have asked us to better reflect the outcomes of the latest budget resolution (80/242), notably OP15 of that resolution, in how this balance is reflected in the text. We are looking into this.**

**The draft resolution seeks to reflect this same balance in its own resourcing. It requests the Secretary-General to draw as much as possible on existing resources and mechanisms to implement the requests to him. At the same time, additional funding will clearly be required in some areas to achieve the outcomes we seek. We will need to be ready to invest in ourselves to improve the quality of our mandates and their implementation.**

**Additional resources are required in 3 specific areas:**

**1) enhanced technical Secretariat support; 2) development of the Mandate Registry and other digital tools; and 3) the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform.**

**1) Technical secretariat support: Firstly, enhanced technical secretariat support will be required to: assist proponents of mandates with relevant information; provide Member States with information and resources; and strengthen systemwide coordination. We are encouraging the SG to provide this through existing resources and mechanisms as much as possible, and to carefully consider how the requested services are provided.**

**Current thinking is that a small amount of additional human resourcing will be required in DGACM, DMSPC and EOSG. This would include some mid-level positions to support the development of the functions requested in the resolution and to interface with Member States in their delivery, as well as some more junior positions to undertake day-to-day delivery. In total six roles are proposed at an approximate cost of \$700,000 in 2026 (with an annual cost of \$1,400,000).**

**2) Mandate Registry and other digital tools: Secondly, the further development of the Mandate Registry and the prototyping of additional tools and resources also carry cost. The next stage of the development of the Mandate Registry to turn it into a stable, enterprise-level platform as outlined in OP4 and the creation of a centralized location for information and resources relevant to decision-making across the mandate life cycle as outlined in OP6 is estimated to cost \$300,000 annually.**

**The maintenance of other digital tools in future phases would need to be costed and considered on their merit based on clear and robust business cases following further consideration in the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform as detailed in OP34 (c) x.**

**3) Working Group on Mandate Reform: Thirdly, the transition to the proposed Working Group on Mandate Reform will also have cost implications. We heard clearly the importance Member States place on providing full interpretation services and maintaining webcasts to ensure inclusivity and transparency, and these account for the bulk of the cost.**

**The daily cost for six hours of meeting time is approximately \$15,000 of which about \$11,000 of this is interpretation costs. Based on 14 full days of meetings, which we think would be roughly sufficient over 18 months spanning 2026 and 2027, the total cost would be \$210,000. Additional informal meetings on the margins of the Working Group are included in any entitlement.**

**It goes without saying that all costs associated with this resolution will be treated as PBIs and therefore subject to established budgetary and programme coordination mechanisms and decision-making processes, with each to be judged on its own merits.**

**The fundamental questions to ask ourselves are: to what extent are we willing to invest in ourselves to achieve better outcomes across the system? And, for each mandated activity which comes with an associated cost, will this deliver benefits that justify the costs? Further, will the efficiencies we realize result in redundancies in other areas downstream that may offset at least some of the initial costs?**

**From our perspectives as co-chairs the total cost of approximately \$1.1 million in 2026 and \$1.7-\$1.8 million the following years required to implement this resolution is very modest – it represents only 0.04 percent of the total Regular Budget.**

**We have invited Ruth de Miranda, Director, General Assembly and ECOSOC Affairs Division of DGACM, and Christophe Monier, Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division of DMSPC, here today to provide some clarification on the technical aspects of the budgetary implications of the draft resolution and to answer any questions. Mr Monier the floor is yours, to be followed by Ms de Miranda.**

**\* \* \***

## **INTERACTIVE DISCUSSION – SECRETARIAT**

---

**I now open the floor to comments from working group members on the role of and requests to the Secretariat, noting we particularly welcome text proposals. If you are speaking for a Group, please identify yourself to the Secretariat. Please keep your comments as concrete and brief as possible to allow all delegations who wish to contribute on this matter to have the opportunity to do so. Naturally, we would request you provide your text proposals to the co-chairs in writing as well.**

***[For information: follow the the console.]***

**I now give the floor to \_\_\_\_\_.**

**\* \* \***

**I thank \_\_\_\_\_.**

**We have heard the last speaker on the list of speakers for the discussion on the role of and requests to the Secretariat.**

## **CLOSING**

---

**In terms of next steps, we intend to use our next meeting on Tuesday 17 March in CR2 to consider issues related to Member States responsibilities across the mandate life cycle and next steps, particularly as these relate to OP34 and the proposed transition to the Working Group on Mandate Reform.**

**As you are aware, Decision 79/571 mandates that we must complete our work by the end of March. In order to be ready for the General Assembly plenary meeting scheduled by the President of the General Assembly to adopt the resolution on 31 March 2026, we need to complete our work as the Informal Ad Hoc Working Group by around 24 March. This will allow the Secretariat the necessary time to prepare for the plenary meeting in line with established practice.**

**The meeting is adjourned.** 