

**JOINT STATEMENT BY G-77 AND NAM AT THE INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM-WIDE COHERENCE: GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM (New York, 22 June 2007)**

Distinguished Co-Chairs,

The Joint Coordinating Committee wishes to reiterate once again its willingness to participate constructively in the process launched by the President of the General Assembly to facilitate an intergovernmental discussion of the recommendations contained in the High-Level Panel's Report and the comments made by the Secretary-General thereon.

2. The Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) again reaffirms its full confidence in your able leadership and is confident that you will conduct these discussions in an open, transparent and inclusive manner.
3. The Group of 77 and China and the Non-Aligned Movement reaffirm also all the elements voiced by the JCC during the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 16 April. Consequently, both Groups reiterate their preliminary views on the Report, which were conveyed in the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Co-Chairs of the JCC on 19 March 2007 and in the JCC Statement during the informal meeting of the General Assembly on 6 June 2007.
4. The JCC is working on the facilitators' proposed work programme based on the eight components or main themes as contained in the High-Level Panel's report on United Nations System-wide Coherence and would not favor moving recommendations from one section to another at this stage.

Distinguished Co-Chairs,

5. Pending more substantive and detailed future discussions of the several aspects and of each of the recommendations contained in the Report, the Group of 77 and China and the Non-Aligned Movement, which are still examining these Panel's proposals, wish to outline the following preliminary and overall views of the JCC on Governance and Institutional Reform:
  - i. The various development-related organizations, agencies, funds and programmes of the UN system, with their diverse and complimentary fields of activities, bring a unique wealth of expertise and resources in assisting in the achievement of the MDGs and the other internationally agreed development goals established by UN Conferences and Summits.
  - ii. There is an urgent need to restore balance to the UN's intergovernmental processes in particular to reflect the agreed principles of national ownership of the development strategies. In this context, it is essential to review the membership, rules and procedures, budgets and the decision making processes of the Executive Boards of individual UN funds and programmes to ensure greater transparency, representation and participation.
  - iii. The proposal for the establishment of a Sustainable Development Board needs to be critically evaluated, specially in view of the adoption by the General Assembly of the resolution on the strengthening of the ECOSOC (A/61/16). The proposed Board could be duplicative and add to the complexity and incoherence of intergovernmental governance, rather than improving it.

- iv. We need to seriously examine the extent to which the Panel's recommendation on "mainstreaming sustainable development into the work of the ECOSOC and the establishment of the Sustainable Development Board could possibly compromise the mandate of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) and its multi-year programme of work adopted in Johannesburg. We will also need to see whether these recommendations would in any way impact the functioning of the Main Committees, namely the Second and Third Committees, and their follow-up to the agreements reached at the major international conferences.
- v. The Panel's recommendation for the creation of the Global Leaders Forum of Economic and Social Council requires to be further elaborated. Its mandate, composition, periodicity and institutional location within the United Nations need to be further clarified.
- vi. While greater coordination and coherence within the development cooperation system is desirable, exhortations at the Secretariat-level for closer coordination and cooperation within the CEB or the UNDG may not produce positive results in themselves unless there is some mechanism for intergovernmental oversight and monitoring of such cooperation and coordination.
- vii. A central question is whether the Bretton Woods Institutions are willing to participate in the envisaged cooperation and coordination and if bilateral donors are also willing to coordinate and align their assistance programmes within comprehensive national development strategies.
- viii. We find the recommendation regarding the annual meeting of the Secretary-General and the participation of the Bretton Woods Institutions to review cooperation within the international development structures, as too broad and rather vague. Nevertheless, in discussing this we must take into account Articles 57 and 63 of the United Nations Charter, as they provide the framework for the relationship between the Organization and specialized agencies.
- ix. The JCC would like to seek clarification regarding the proliferation of proposed new units and groups, such as the Development Policy and Operations Group, Development Finance and Performance Unit and the Independent Evaluation Unit, and their possible overlap with existing structures.
- x. Any changes that might need to be introduced to the current development cooperation structures – both at country level, or at the level of the headquarters – will have to be incremental and well considered. These changes should not lead to additional administrative costs or unwieldy management structures.
- xi. The importance of the regional dimension of development is manifested in the mandates given to the regional commissions in the outcomes of the major UN Conferences and Summits. Improved coherence at the regional level will require strengthening existing UN regional mechanisms for horizontal coordination, and ensuring a vertical link-up and alignment in the UN development and coordination architecture at the global, regional, and country levels.

Distinguished Co-Chairs,

6. In closing, the Group of 77 & China and the Non-Aligned Movement, as we have stated on several previous occasions, would like to reaffirm that both groups will remain actively and constructively engaged in this process, and are committed to the success of these discussions, which must be aimed at strengthening multilateralism and promoting equity and development

including development cooperation in the United Nations as well as achieving greater coordination and coherence among the entities in order to avoid unnecessary duplications and overlaps of the Funds, Programs and Agencies' function and maximize their efficiency and effectiveness.

Thank you.