**Chief Executives Board
for Coordination**

25 October 2005

**Report of the High-level Committee on Programmes
at its tenth session**

**(Frascati, Italy, 6 to 8 October 2005)**

1.    The High-level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) held its tenth session in Frascati, Italy, from 6 to 8 October 2005. The agenda of the meeting and the list of participants are attached, respectively, in annexes I and II.

## I.   2005 World Summit: reflection on the Summit Outcome and implications for the United Nations system

2.    The discussion of the implications of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (General Assembly resolution 60/1) on the work of the United Nations system took place just weeks after its adoption by Member States. While focusing on the preparations for the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) session to be held on 28 October, the Committee also reviewed the Outcome in the light of the priorities it had identified at its second retreat at the Greentree estate in Manhasset, New York, in July and its "One United Nations: Catalyst for Progress and Change" report.

3.    In launching the discussion, the Chairman noted that the Outcome provided much substance, on the basis of which the United Nations system should move forward in a strong and coherent manner. While a lot of attention had been paid to the Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council, there were many other challenges requiring a strong global system. The recent hurricanes in the United States of America and typhoons in Asia and concerns about an avian flu pandemic showed the link between developmental issues, such as the environment and health, and human security. Imbalances in the financial system were growing, and, in this regard as well, the Outcome noted the role of international institutions. The just-launched report of the Global Commission on International Migration underscored the importance of closer cooperation in this area. These issues needed to be managed and addressed not from any single country or agency perspective but in an integrated manner within the context of a strong international system.

4.    He further noted that recent commitments to substantial increases in official development assistance, associated with new innovative modalities, provided new challenges. Did we have a system that was efficient and effective? Was the system

too fragmented? Did we have the right international architecture? While there was a clear call for greater consolidation and integration, he noted that the proliferation of special purpose funds represented a counter-trend. That being said, how the system worked together at the country level was crucial to our commitment to make a difference in the lives of people. He noted the recognition given in the 2005 World Summit Outcome to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in this connection.

5.    The Chairman considered that the most critical issue for HLCP was to foster a strong, coherent system of organizations that worked together at all levels, globally, regionally and nationally. The Outcome also looked at the values underpinning our work. As mentioned in the "One United Nations" report, issues of zero tolerance for sexual exploitation and abuse, accountability and transparency were key concerns for further action. The Volcker report should also be taken into account when reviewing these matters. There were many issues on which HLCP and the High-level Committee on Management (HLCM) should work together, and a joint meeting of the two Committees might be considered.

6.    The Secretary of CEB introduced the note on the follow-up to the 2005 World Summit. He noted that the value of the Outcome lay, in the first instance, in its strong reaffirmation of Member States' faith in multilateralism, that is, in the renewed consensus it reflected that what the Organization stands for is worth protecting and seeking to advance. In his letter of 30 September 2005 to permanent representatives, the President of the General Assembly said that he sensed an eagerness to seize the opportunity to reassert the relevance and importance of the United Nations to the issues at the top of the international agenda and added that it was by United Nations actions on implementation that the Summit would be judged. He also said that the Outcome should not set the limit on our ambitions. Rather, it should be a beachhead from which we launch ourselves forward. In the same spirit, the response of the system should be geared to identifying and exploiting all opportunities that the outcome document offered for advancing progress, whether they arose from the many specific new advances that the Outcome reflected or from the Outcome's reaffirmation of principles and policies that the system has been advocating over the years.

7.    Beyond the specific advances reflected in the Outcome, he considered that assessments of the Summit's contribution to progress should encompass the energy and commitments that the processes leading up to the Summit had generated (the most notable example being the European Commission agreement on official development assistance targets) and, indeed, the energy that the Summit was now generating with respect to follow-up — an energy that was very visible and very tangible in New York at the moment.

8.    Turning to the development chapter of the Outcome, he highlighted the unambiguous commitment that Member States had expressed to the implementation of the development vision that came out of the United Nations conferences and summits; their strong pledge for action at the national level, especially for developing strategies to achieve the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals; and the reaffirmation of their commitment to the global development partnership agreed in Monterrey. The Outcome's treatment of full and productive employment and decent work for all, gender mainstreaming, sustainable development and science and technology reflected especially important advances in terms of both policies and commitments.

9.     He viewed as equally significant the Summit's intent to build a much stronger system within the United Nations to drive and review the realization of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, guided by the Economic and Social Council and its commissions. The new mandates assigned to the Council, including not only the annual ministerial reviews of progress but also the holding, biennially, of a high-level development cooperation forum, should be seen in this perspective. These new mandates also held a great deal of promise that the Council could become a key interlocutor of the system, as we sharpen the system's capacity to identify major emerging issues and to advance the ability of the international community to address them in a timely way.

10.     He noted that the "One United Nations" publication, issued by CEB, remained highly relevant to shaping the system's response to the Summit's Outcome. The publication had been transmitted by the President of the Economic and Social Council to the Summit and had generally been very well received. The Outcome contained many specific references to Member States' expectations of significant improvements in the system's coherence at both the policy and operational levels to which the system should give a clear and visible response.

11.     The representative of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General briefed the Committee on what was achieved and what was missing from the Outcome. In putting forward his report "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all" (A/59/2005 and Corr.1), the Secretary-General had stressed that he wanted bold and achievable recommendations by the Summit. The Outcome had removed doubts about global support for the Millennium Development Goals and made clear the critical partnership between developing countries, which agreed to formulate and implement national plans, and developed countries, which must now deliver on their pledges to boost financing for development.

12.     For the first time, all Governments clearly condemned terrorism, and there was a very strong push for the conclusion of a comprehensive convention on terrorism by the year's end. There was also strong support to flesh out the elements of a global counter-terrorism strategy. The representative of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General mentioned agreements to establish the Peacebuilding Commission, to strengthen the Secretary-General's capacity for mediation and good offices and to shore up the United Nations human rights machinery. The responsibility to protect, entailing timely and decisive action, through the Security Council, was clearly accepted by all Governments.

13.     He outlined the management reforms, notably the strengthening of the United Nations oversight capacity, the review of mandates older than five years and the commitment to overhauling rules and policies on budget, finance and human resources.

14.     Notable omissions in the Summit Outcome included nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and a decision on Security Council reform. In addition, there was lack of agreement among Member States on some aspects of management reform.

15.     Implementation was now being pursued on two parallel and complementary tracks: by Member States through the General Assembly and elsewhere and by the United Nations Secretariat and the system more broadly. In particular, the General Assembly needed to agree on the details of implementing the new functions of the Economic and Social Council as soon as possible. Decisions regarding the

Peacebuilding Commission would be taken on the issues of the composition of the organizational committee and reporting lines and would be negotiated under the leadership of the Ambassadors of Denmark and the United Republic of Tanzania, with the aim of reaching final decisions by mid-November 2005. The Ambassador of Spain was leading negotiations on a comprehensive convention on terrorism. Finally, the Ambassadors of Panama and South Africa would be chairing discussions on the functions, composition and modalities of the Human Rights Council. These processes needed to move forward rapidly.

16. The representative of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General informed the Committee that, on 27 September 2005, a joint meeting of HLCP and HLCM had taken decisions on follow-up and implementation. Task managers were assigned to support and reinforce the responsibility of department heads and other managers for delivering change. He briefed the Committee with respect to these arrangements, noting that a report on the implementation of decisions of the 2005 World Summit Outcome slated for action by the Secretary-General would be available for dissemination to Member States by mid-October 2005.

17. It was suggested that the directive issued by the Secretary-General to heads of departments in the United Nations on 7 October 2005 be circulated by the CEB secretariat to Committee members, given its relevance to the system-wide follow-up of the Outcome and its implications for the system as a whole. The issues relating to system-wide coherence would be addressed by CEB, on 28 October 2005.

18. In the ensuing discussion, participants made a number of observations on the implications of the Outcome. Some of those observations are summarized below:

(a) The concern that existed a few years ago about the future of multilateralism seemed to have abated somewhat. Nevertheless, what remained clear is that the use of multilateral channels for the purposes of development was on the table. There needed to be more of a collective effort by the system to create a climate that attracts resources through multilateral channels. This would entail greater coordination and harmonization at the country level;

(b) Individual organizations of the system should undertake an analysis of the implications of the Outcome for their own mandates. It was suggested that the CEB secretariat put this into a matrix in order to facilitate identification of the linkages and areas of synergy in which joint action could be possible, areas of potential overlap or duplication and possible areas in which HLCP and CEB could contribute concretely to greater policy coherence. They might wish to bring the Outcome to the attention of their governing bodies after the CEB session so that the discussions in the various governing bodies would be guided by a common framework;

(c) Mainstreaming the main horizontal themes, from sustainable development to human rights and gender, in the policies of all United Nations organizations was critically important. In order to make progress on the development agenda, operational coordination was not sufficient. The specialized agencies and organizations without field representation, given their mandates, had much to contribute to the coherence of policies and their sequencing. HLCP had a role to play in this regard that the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) cannot exercise;

(d) Member States had made system-wide coherence a priority. The United Nations system needed to be open and realistic about where we were and where we were not in order to go forward on a basis of trust, complementarity and commitment, both individually and as a system;

(e) The new mandate envisaged for the Economic and Social Council would serve to guide the development cooperation architecture and related policies of the United Nations system, bilaterals and others, so as to maximize their impact on achieving internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals. In this connection, it was also noted that policy directives could only be given to bodies under the purview of the Council;

(f) HLCP and CEB had important roles to play in ensuring policy coherence across the full spectrum of issues, including those related to peace and security. It was noted that, historically, the coordination dimension of such issues tended to arise in different ways from that related to development, and that the relationship between the United Nations and specialized agencies was expressed differently in the political as compared to the economic and social areas. Further integration should be pursued, and work in the area of peacebuilding provided such an opportunity;

(g) When system-wide coherence was referred to, it should be recalled that CEB is part of the system. It should thus focus its efforts on answering three key questions:

• What should the system-wide approach be? Should there be a United Nations system road map?

• What are the operational challenges at the country and regional levels and how can we meet them using policy coherence among organizations of the system and knowledge sharing, both within the system and with Governments?

• How do we achieve policy coherence with regard to specific issues?

(h) In dealing with policy coherence issues across the system, use should be made of existing instruments and mandated requests from United Nations intergovernmental bodies. In this regard, in its resolution 59/57 on the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, *A Fair Globalization: Creating Opportunities for All*, the General Assembly recalled the commitment in the Millennium Declaration to ensure policy coherence and better cooperation throughout the system and invited relevant organizations of the United Nations system and other relevant multilateral bodies to provide information to the Secretary-General on their activities to promote an inclusive and equitable globalization. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the International Labour Organization (ILO) would prepare a template for the provision of information, consult with the agencies concerned and compile a report for submission to the Secretary-General, as called for by the resolution;

(i) On the issues of management and coordination more broadly, it was important that the CEB discussion take into consideration the findings of the Volcker report, including those related to the United Nations system's weakness in the coordination of large programmes;

(j) The Outcome articulated important linkages, such as between energy and climate change and between globalization and full and productive employment for

all. This was a huge advance and should be reflected in the way the system moves ahead. Knowledge sharing and capacity-building needed to be strengthened vigorously in this regard;

(k) The system should be proactive in interpreting the notion of more tightly managed entities and how this notion might be jointly pursued to ensure the most effective support possible at country and regional levels, in order to go beyond just improving management processes and programming and look towards a transformation of the way the system works at all levels. In this process, transparency and close consultations were essential;

(l) There was a growing gap between legality and legitimacy, which was a wider problem than that pertaining to the use of force. A sense of community derives from shared core values; it would be a mistake not to recognize that this does not pertain to the current international reality. It was also important to acknowledge that the public perception of the United Nations needed to be addressed and misunderstandings corrected, in order to increase the institution's credibility and viability;

(m) Regarding the Millennium Development Goals, there were two distinct perspectives: one, that the outcome document underscored their importance; two, that the very fact that it was necessary to have the debate again weakened the commitment to them. At the same time, the Outcome included reference to issues, such as full and productive employment for all, as central objectives that had not been sufficiently covered in the Millennium Declaration. The aim was to operationalize the concept of the broad development agenda in a way that did not detract from the Millennium Development Goals;

(n) It was observed that while the Summit did not come to an agreement regarding nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, the agreed commitments from earlier years remained legally valid. Nevertheless, concern was expressed over the absence of agreement in the Outcome on these issues;

(o) HIV/AIDS remained an issue that cut across sectoral lines, relating to peace and security, development and human rights;

(p) The Committee would need to look at the important issues that would arise from the second phase of the World Summit on the Information Society, which was scheduled to take place in Tunis in November 2005.

19. Further discussion was structured around four groups of topics for which HLCP could add value: peace, security, peacebuilding and the responsibility to protect; sustainable development and policy coherence with respect to matters related to the environment; system-wide coherence, with a focus on operational harmonization; and preparations for the CEB session later in the month. The following observations were made:

(a) HLCP could make a difference with respect to the responsibility to protect in its three dimensions — prevention, taking action and rebuilding. The Committee likewise could play a role in bridging the gulf between legality and legitimacy in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. It was suggested that the CEB system could benefit from the participation of the United Nations departments dealing with political issues. In this connection, the strength of HLCP was seen to be in policy coherence and coordination of implementation;

(b)    Three themes were articulated with respect to sustainable development: poverty eradication; changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns; and protecting the natural resource base. There was a need to pursue systemic issues related to coordination and coherence. This would involve a better understanding of knowledge-management processes, capacity-building, and ensuring an impact on policy development and implementation at the country level;

(c)    The distinction that exists between agencies that have a sustained presence at the country level and programme nationally and those that programme globally needs to be properly reflected in the formulation of the country programme document of the United Nations system. There is a need for a one-country framework based on country needs and with shared responsibilities assigned to agencies or clusters as required. The country team should be flexible, reflecting the agreed priorities, and United Nations house should be organized by sector rather than by agency. It was felt that the notion that the reform processes were moving at different speeds in different groups of agencies may not be conducive to the spirit of "One United Nations" or to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF);

(d)    There was no need for a CEB statement on the outcome document. The key points raised in the HLCP discussion should be brought to the attention of executive heads. The key issue remained country-level coherence. UNDAF is seen as an inadequate instrument. HLCP should pursue an action-oriented agenda, with vigorous follow-up and monitoring. Further, there was a greater need to project the role of CEB in the work of the organizations of the system. The Outcome highlighted the importance of system-wide coherence and coordination.

20.    The Secretary of CEB informed the Committee about the arrangements for the fall 2005 CEB session. He said that executive heads would examine the implications of the 2005 World Summit Outcome in two phases: first, a *tour de table*, in which each executive head would outline the implications of the Outcome for his/her organization; and, second, a discussion on the system-wide management of the follow-up.

## II.    Follow-up to High-level Committee on Programmes decisions

### A.    Progress report by the triennial comprehensive policy review task group

21.    At its second retreat at Greentree, in New York, the Committee had agreed that the task group on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 59/250 should formulate concrete proposals for activities in the areas in which the Assembly had explicitly requested a contribution by CEB. In the resolution, the General Assembly had called on CEB "to analyse the capacity development efforts of the United Nations development system and to make recommendations on measures necessary to enhance their effectiveness, including through the improvement of the assessment and measurement of results" (para. 29) and contribute, with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), to making "further progress in system-wide collaboration on evaluation, in particular harmonization and simplification of methodologies, norms, standards and cycles of evaluation" (para. 69). It was further

agreed that the task group would report on these proposals to HLCP at its tenth session. At the same time, UNDG would provide information on actions it was taking, including in particular areas requiring consultations with CEB and in which the General Assembly had sought a contribution from CEB.

22. The representative of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs introduced the report of the task group, which contained two sets of proposals for consideration by the Committee, on capacity development and the evaluation of operational activities for the development of the United Nations system, while the representative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on behalf of UNDG, presented the draft internal work-in-progress document on the UNDG 2005-2007 programme of work for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 59/250. The Committee took note of the UNDG document.

23. In the discussion on the specific proposals submitted by the HLCP task force for the implementation of resolution 50/250, Committee members made a number of suggestions:

(a)   On the proposal on capacity-building, it was pointed out that there was a need to avoid duplication with initiatives undertaken by UNDG and its working group on capacity development and that it would be useful to build on existing mechanisms in certain areas of capacity development, particularly in the area of technology;

(b)   On the proposal on the evaluation of operational activities for development, there was a request for further clarification of the role of UNEG, and it was noted that the proposal for HLCP should not entail the launching of new evaluation activities by CEB itself.

24. Following a full discussion of the elements related to the proposals of the task group, a revised proposal for the two distinct areas was tabled, emphasizing the need to respond to the specific tasks mandated to CEB by the General Assembly. The Committee endorsed the revised proposal, as follows:

(a)   On capacity development, the Committee agreed to launch an analysis of the capacity development efforts of the United Nations system, in order to respond to the request of the General Assembly in paragraph 29 of resolution 59/250. The analysis would require close consultation with all members of HLCP, in particular through focal points on capacity development and capacity-building where they can be identified and will maximize the use of experience accumulated in this domain by each organization of the system, including in the development of national technical and technological capacities. In undertaking this analysis, HLCP should not duplicate what the UNDG working group on capacity development was currently doing in supporting United Nations country teams but should coordinate with it and with all organizations of the United Nations system that are engaged in significant initiatives in this domain, ensuring system-wide coverage of this analysis and added value to the initiative;

(b)   On evaluation of operational activities for development, recognizing the value of the initiatives promoted by UNEG in the area of system-wide collaboration in evaluation and the need to avoid duplication with its activities, the Committee agreed to promote the formulation of an overall policy statement to be submitted to CEB for endorsement, which should provide broad guidance to all member organizations of CEB in supporting the evaluation function and encouraging system-

wide collaboration on evaluation. In order to define the content of such a policy statement, appropriate consultation should be undertaken with all organizations that are members of the Committee, including both representatives of evaluation offices and units as well as officers representing departments or units that define corporate policies, requesting key suggestions and contributions from all these sources. That consultation would involve, in particular, the chair of UNEG and the representatives of the existing UNEG task forces currently involved in collaborative efforts in the area of evaluation.

## B.  Gender mainstreaming

25.    The Committee recalled that at its retreat at Greentree in July 2005, it had agreed to review an information note on the extent to which a comprehensive gender strategy existed within the United Nations system in order to assist it in determining the next steps on this issue. The Secretary of CEB, on behalf of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, introduced a note on accelerating United Nations system-wide gender mainstreaming. The note elaborated a number of systemic challenges, indicating that the system as a whole lacked a clear coordinated approach to gender mainstreaming, leading to inconsistencies in policies, approaches and performance. He observed that despite the extensive inter-agency machinery in place, progress on gender mainstreaming had been slow and there was a sense among specialists that the issue had not been raised sufficiently at the level of top management. He also noted that while the background note had suggested the establishment of an HLCP task force, what was important was for HLCP to mandate the Special Adviser to undertake inter-agency consultations as necessary and to bring the results of those consultations to the attention of the Committee at its next session. The Committee could, in turn, identify initiatives and propose actions, as appropriate, for the attention of CEB at its spring 2006 session.

26.    In the ensuing discussion, members of the Committee acknowledged that there were different levels of management commitment to gender mainstreaming among the organizations of the system and that the problems articulated in the note stemmed from a lack of deep commitment across the board. The gap between rhetoric and action, it was felt, would not be bridged through the issuance of a statement of political support alone, but would require changes in institutional culture and policies. In this connection, the Committee noted that the 2005 World Summit Outcome made explicit the importance of promoting the mainstreaming of a gender perspective in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and social spheres and of strengthening the capabilities of the United Nations system in the area of gender.

27.    The Committee decided to return to this issue at its next session. In the interim, members should engage in active consultations within their own organizations on the note before it.

28.    It was agreed that the Special Adviser should be invited to consult with member organizations as she saw fit and present an analysis of the action necessary to move the issue forward at the Committee's next session.

## C. Knowledge management

29.    At its retreat in Greentree, HLCP decided to pursue the issue of knowledge management and asked the CEB secretariat to consult with organizations on the elaboration of a system-wide knowledge-sharing strategy. Reporting on progress, the Director of the CEB secretariat informed members that draft terms of reference for a knowledge-management task force were currently being considered by specialists. It was expected that the terms of reference would be finalized and circulated electronically to HLCP members for their endorsement prior to the Committee's next session. It was also anticipated that a progress report on the work of the task force, once established, would be made available at that session. It was observed that a knowledge-management group would be composed of experts in development content, information technology and communications.

30.    The Information and Communication Technology Network met in Geneva on 26 and 27 September 2005. As one of its eight priority areas, it agreed to elaborate a business case for knowledge sharing in the United Nations system, as part of the development of the system-wide strategy noted above. Collaborative efforts were already under way to develop this business case for consideration by HLCM in conjunction with other knowledge-sharing bodies, including the UNDG working group on knowledge sharing.

## D. Progress report by the task force on economic development

31.    The representative of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) provided an update on the activities of the open-ended task force on economic development, which HLCP had established at its ninth session. The task force held its first meeting at the UNIDO headquarters in Vienna on 3 June 2005. The representative introduced the draft concept paper, "Towards a basic architecture for joint multi-agency programming in specific fields", inviting comments from the Committee. Three priority areas on which the organizations involved would focus their efforts towards developing a common programmatic framework for joint action had been identified. Issue leaders had also been chosen for: (a) market efficiency and integration (UNIDO); (b) environment (United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)); and (c) science and technology knowledge (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)).

32.    The Committee members welcomed the progress report of the task force and suggested that its work be integrated with country team processes. It also invited the task force to consider selecting countries to collaborate with in this regard. The Committee observed that, should the task force prove to be successful in its endeavours, the implementation of similar initiatives at the country level could be considered.

## E. Tourism

33.    The representative of the World Tourism Organization recalled that his organization had convened a coordination meeting on tourism matters in Madrid on 22 and 23 November 2004. The draft report of the meeting was made available to the Committee as a conference room paper. The draft report would be finalized and

formally submitted to HLCP and CEB once comments had been received from the organizations that had attended the meeting.

34.  In reflecting on the draft report, the Committee noted that the approach suggested by the World Tourism Organization in establishing a United Nations Tourism Network was very much in line with HLCP guidelines on inter-agency coordination. It was agreed that additional comments on the draft report should be forwarded to the World Tourism Organization no later than 31 December 2005. In the absence of additional comments, HLCP would consider the report to have been endorsed.

## F.  Avian influenza

35.  In his briefing to the Committee on the latest developments on avian influenza, the representative of the World Health Organization (WHO) noted the good cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). He stated that, while several cases of transfer from birds to humans had been detected, so far there were no known cases in which the influenza had been transmitted from human to human. There was, nevertheless, concern that the virus might mutate to also acquire this capacity. The potential of such a development was seen as especially alarming given that medicine to curtail the development of the symptoms of the influenza in victims was available only in limited quantities and no vaccine cure was available at present.

36.  The past two weeks had seen intense activity in the international community and the United Nations. On 29 September 2005, the Secretary-General appointed Dr. David Nabarro of WHO to lead coordination of the United Nations response to influenza. A number of other initiatives were also under way:

- *24 and 25 October 2005*: Ministerial meeting (Ministers of Health) in Ottawa

- *28 October 2005*: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs intervention meeting

- *3 November 2005*: Special Economic and Social Council session with participation of WHO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and United Nations system coordinators

- *7 to 9 November 2005*: Technical meeting of WHO, FAO, OIE and the World Bank at WHO headquarters, Geneva

- *7 December 2005*: Council of the European Union

- *December 2005*: Pledging meeting to be scheduled

37.  Attention was drawn to the effective coordination of United Nations country teams in Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Thailand and Viet Nam and to the readiness of United Nations system entities to join forces in an emergency. The representative of FAO also acknowledged the excellent cooperation with WHO and OIE. She pointed out that while preparations to combat the further spread of the influenza to humans were extremely important, avian influenza was already a full-blown crisis affecting both wild birds and poultry. While containment of the influenza in poultry was currently one of the best ways of preventing or

reducing risk of the spread to humans, the disease had already had a devastating economic effect on poor farmers in Asia, many of whom held assets in poultry. Many of these farmers risked sliding back into extreme poverty, subsisting on little more than $1 per day. The CEB secretariat was requested to keep the Committee informed about relevant developments in the Secretary-General's office on the United Nations response.

## G. UN-Energy

38.   The Vice-Chairman briefed the Committee on the accomplishments of UN-Energy since its establishment one year ago. He noted that the 2005 World Summit Outcome contained a number of significant references to energy. UN-Energy had made steady progress in its work. It had launched the publication "The Energy Challenge for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals" in the margins of the Economic and Social Council session, on 22 July 2005. It had also engaged in a mapping exercise of what different organizations were doing in the field of energy and initiated a peer review. Recalling that its terms of reference specified that UN-Energy was to engage with non-United Nations actors, the Vice-Chairman stated that he had been approached by several private sector actors with requests to meet with UN-Energy.

39.   The Committee commended the progress of UN-Energy and the pivotal leadership role played by the Vice-Chairman, and expressed the hope that UN-Energy's success would be emulated by other inter-agency bodies. It requested UN-Water to provide an update on its work at the Committee's next session.

## III. Review of the programme of work of the High-level Committee on Programmes following the 2005 World Summit

40.   The Committee had decided, at its second Greentree retreat in July, to review its programme of work in the light of the outcome of the 2005 World Summit. To prepare for this discussion, the CEB secretariat had prepared a note on the system-wide follow-up to the 2005 World Summit and monitoring of HLCP/CEB decisions. Members expressed appreciation for the matrix contained in the background paper, which compared the Summit Outcome with the corresponding challenges in the "One United Nations" report, the priority issues identified at second Greentree retreat and the listing of relevant decisions taken by the Committee over the last three years.

41.   The 2005 World Summit articulated priorities of Member States. What was of importance for the Committee was to determine the appropriate system-wide follow-up. The CEB report, "One United Nations", was an important component in this assessment. A critical challenge remained as to how the system should enhance its support to operations, at the country and regional levels, and how it should best integrate its normative and analytical work with its operational functions. The Summit Outcome and the process envisaged for follow-up brought to the fore topical themes and issues of policy and programme coordination and delivery.

42.   It is in this context, there were clear areas for collaboration and division of labour between HLCP and UNDG. The particular strength of HLCP was in fostering policy coherence. In this connection, it was noted that ILO and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs would report to HLCP/CEB on progress in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 59/57 on fair globalization.

43.   Members were pleased to see that the priority issues raised at Greentree found their reflection in the Outcome. Particular emphasis was placed on the significance, for the future work of the system, of the Outcome's coverage of:

(a)   The goals of full and productive employment and decent work for all, which the Summit resolved to make a central objective of macroeconomic policies and national development strategies, thus filling a basic gap in the Millennium Declaration;

(b)   Sustainable development, especially the clear connections introduced between poverty eradication, changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns and protecting the natural resource base for development, as well as the treatment of climate change, including its linkage with energy efficiency and access;

(c)   Science and technology for development;

(d)   Migration;

(e)   Gender equality and gender mainstreaming.

44.   Some of the additional issues mentioned in the Outcome for which HLCP could play a role in supporting Member States included: food security and rural and agricultural development; reduction of natural disaster risks; and promoting democracy, fighting terrorism and addressing inequalities. With particular respect to science and technology, UNCTAD, which serves as the issues leader in the HLCP task force on economic development, agreed to prepare a note for the Committee's next session on possible next steps, in full consultation with all interested organizations.

45.   With respect to the next steps, a number of participants voiced concern that the work programme was too broad and that HLCP should focus on four or five issues on which further progress was required and action might need to be taken by CEB. At the same time, the monitoring role of HLCP was stressed, as was the need for the Committee to reach out to players outside the United Nations system, such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

46.   Given that the chief task of the current session was to prepare for the CEB discussion on the 2005 World Summit and that it was likely that certain decisions would emerge from the fall 2005 CEB session regarding the next steps on system-wide coherence, the Committee decided to pursue further the elaboration of the HLCP programme of work at its next meeting. It would, in this context, also focus on enhancing the Committee's work methods. In particular, it was necessary to better utilize the authority delegated to HLCP by CEB.

## IV. Dates of and venue for the next session of the High-level Committee on Programmes

47.    In concluding the meeting, the Chairman of the Committee requested that the CEB secretariat consult with members and agree on a suitable venue and timing for the eleventh session of the Committee, scheduled to be held during the first quarter of 2006.

## Annex I

### Agenda

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. 2005 World Summit: reflection on the Summit Outcome and implications for the United Nations system

3. Follow-up to High-level Committee on Programmes decisions

    (a) Report of the triennial comprehensive policy review task group

    (b) Gender mainstreaming

    (c) Knowledge management

    (d) Progress report by the task force on economic development

    (e) Other matters

4. Review of the programme of work of the High-level Committee on Programmes following the 2005 World Summit

# Annex II

## List of participants

Chairman: Lennart Bage (International Fund for Agricultural Development)

Vice-Chairman: Mats Karlsson (World Bank)

Secretary: Phyllis Lee (Chief Executives Board for Coordination secretariat)

| | |
|---|---|
| United Nations | Patrizio Civili |
|     Executive Office of the Secretary-General | Abiodun Williams |
|     Department of Economic and Social Affairs | Massimo D'Angelo |
|     Regional Commissions New York Office | Kazi A. Rahman |
| International Labour Organization | Maria Ducci<br>Christophe Perrin |
| Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | Wendy Mann |
| United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization | Jean-Yves Le Saux |
| International Civil Aviation Organization | Lise Boisvert |
| World Health Organization | Peter Mertens |
| World Bank | Nicole Kekeh |
| International Monetary Fund | Reinhard Munzberg |
| Universal Postal Union | Grzegorz Kalicki |
| International Telecommunication Union | Art Levin |
| International Maritime Organization | David Edwards |
| World Intellectual Property Organization | Orobola Fasehun |
| International Fund for Agricultural Development | Uday Abhyankar |
| United Nations Industrial Development Organization | Andrey Lazykin<br>Francisco Sercovich |
| World Trade Organization | Willy Alfaro |
| World Tourism Organization | Rafeeuddin Ahmed |
| United Nations Conference on Trade and Development | Dan Deac |
| United Nations Development Programme | Mourad Wahba |
| United Nations Environment Programme | Adnan Amin |

| | |
|---|---|
| Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees | Martin Loftus |
| United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East | Rene Aquarone |
| United Nations Children's Fund | Ado Vaher |
| United Nations Population Fund | Jana Simonova |
| World Food Programme | Allan Jury<br>Stanlake Samkange |
| United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime | Ugi Zvekic |
| United Nations Human Settlements Programme | Daniel Biau |
| Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization | Bernhard Wrabetz |
| United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change | Mukul Sanwal |
| United Nations University | Ramesh Thakur |
| United Nations System Staff College | Aung Tun THET |
| Chief Executives Board for Coordination secretariat | Qazi Shaukat Fareed<br>Mikael Rosengren |

--------------------