

## STATEMENT

by the representative of the of the Russian Federation, Mr. Evgeny STANISLAVOV,  
in the Second Committee of the 59<sup>th</sup> session of the UN General Assembly on agenda item 90 b  
“Triennial comprehensive policy review of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system”

4 November 2004

Mr. Chairman,

The main task before the ongoing triennial comprehensive policy review of the operational activities for development, in our opinion, is to determine concrete directions for further improving the work of the UN development system at country level. In the run-up to the forthcoming in 2005 review of the implementation of the Millennium Declaration it is necessary to set specific targets, attainment of which will enable the UN operational activities system to play an increasingly important role in assisting countries to reach the MDGs. The comparative advantages of operational activities should be fully used, in particular, in terms of **respecting principles of national ownership, universality, neutrality, voluntary nature of operational activities**, as well as **ensuring substantive focus, identity and mandate independence** of the funds and programmes. All this will allow the system to reaffirm its authority as an effective mechanism, through which the international community can translate its determination to attain the MDGs by 2015 into reality.

During recent deliberations we have had the opportunity to see that the Heads of the UN agencies have clear understanding of the importance of the task facing them and the vision of the ways to fulfill it. We are sure that member-states in their drafting of the UN GA resolution on TCPR will be able to back up this thrust of the UN funds and programmes principals. In this process we intend to take into account useful recommendations of the SG's report. We are grateful to the Secretariat for preparing a high quality document.

Mr. Chairman,

Implementation of the recommendation of the UN GA resolution 56/201 has allowed to reach a **real progress in realization of the reforms**: improving coordination and coherence, optimizing key parameters of the programming process etc. At the same time one can not but see that the reform agenda to a large extent is designed to be implemented first and foremost by the UNDG ExCom agencies. As it is rightly stressed in the Secretary-General's report, different parts of the UN development system participate in the reform at varying speeds. We are of the opinion that considerable possibilities to raise the effectiveness of the UN operational activities are created through more active involvement of the UN specialized agencies, regional commissions and other UN agencies into a coordinated and coherent work at country level. Future reform steps should therefore take equally into account interests, priorities and specifics of work of both UNDG ExCom agencies and other entities of the UN development system. Only such approach will be conducive to strengthening the UN system image as a unified and coordinated mechanism and will prevent widening of the gap between the agencies that are at the forefront of the reform and the part of the system that is still involved in these processes to a lesser extend.

Search for the optimal **resource mobilization modalities** is one of the key tasks of the TCPR. We share the opinion that the UN Pledging Conference has lost a great deal of confidence of member-states, in particular of the major donors. At the same time it should be taken into account that apart from the plenary meeting, overburdened with protocol, the format of the Conference includes the mechanism for presenting written pledges almost throughout the year. Such mechanism is very useful and should be preserved. In defining future pledging modalities a pragmatic approach should be taken aimed at finding optimal timeframe – from the point of view of both donor-countries and the UN agencies – for holding a

single event covering not only UNDG ExCom agencies, but also all other UN system entities participating in the UN Pledging Conference.

Further directions of **simplification and harmonization** of the rules and procedures should in real terms contribute to reducing complexity and diversity of requirements and administrative and financial burden of the programme countries and of the agencies themselves, without infringing on their mandate independence. The S&H process objectively has its limits due to the existing differences in the agencies' mandates, business-models and structures. Besides, as experience has shown, harmonization often does not lead to the simplification of the rules and procedures, but makes them even more complex. In this regard in the forthcoming period the emphasis should be put first and foremost on simplification efforts. The cost-effectiveness of harmonisation should also be thoroughly assessed. Up to now we have seen the increase of the administrative expenditures, but not their reduction.

We support further measures to **rationalize UN country presence** in recipient countries through an increased use of common premises and services. Development of cooperation between funds and programmes and specialized agencies and other UN structures having no field offices within UN country offices is a new avenue in this field.

**Country level coordination.** We support further improving the quality of CCA and UNDAF while ensuring the leading role of the recipient governments in their preparation. CCA/UNDAF processes should benefit from analytical work already done at national level and be less resource consuming. We note the importance of participation of all UN entities, including the specialized agencies, in CCA/UNDAF processes. We regard as positive development the introduction of the UNDAF results matrix. At the same time in countries with low levels of UN programme resources preparation of CCA/UNDAF is not always justified and moreover should not be a precondition for cooperation of these countries with the UN development system.

The issue of attribution of more formal authority to the **resident coordinators** over implementation of the UNDAF results matrix deserve to be seriously examined. A weighted and pragmatic approach to this issue is required. Steps in this direction should not infringe on the prerogatives of the recipient governments in cooperation with separate agencies, create an additional "bureaucratic" layer in their bilateral contacts or lead to increase in the administrative expenditures at country level.

**Post-conflict recovery and development** is one of important issues within the TCPR. We support the key role of the UN in addressing the tasks of transition period. We deem it necessary to focus efforts of the UN funds and programmes not on conceptual, but on practical aspects of ensuring coordinated and timely response at country level to post-conflict situations. Among the priorities here are: balanced combination of humanitarian and long-term assistance in accordance with country-specific needs, flexible application of the coordination instruments which combine relevant features of Consolidated Humanitarian Appeals and UNDAFs. It is also important to enhance cooperation with the Bretton Woods Institutions, mandated to work in post-conflict situations.

Thank you.