



# Chief Executives Board for Coordination

19 December 2011

English only

---

## Report of the High-Level Committee on Programmes on its twenty-second session

(United Nations Headquarters, 15 and 16 September 2011)

### I. Introduction

1. The High-Level Committee on Programmes of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) held its twenty-second session at United Nations Headquarters on 15 and 16 September 2011. The agenda of the meeting (annex I) and the list of participants (annex II) are attached.

### II. Moving towards a fairer, greener and sustainable globalization

2. The Vice-Chair introduced the preliminary draft report, entitled “Greener, fairer and more sustainable globalization”, which he had prepared together with the representatives of the current and previous Chairs of the Committee, Angela Cropper (United Nations Environment Programme) and Raymond Torres (International Labour Organization (ILO)). The report reflected discussions that had taken place in the Committee since 2009, as well as at two technical meetings convened by Juan Somavía in Santiago and Geneva during the course of 2011. The report now before the Committee began with a diagnosis of the factors behind unsustainable globalization in section 1, provided in section 2 an approach for integrating and ensuring the coherence of policies, both domestic and international, across the three pillars of sustainable development — economic, social and environmental policy — that would be necessary for making globalization fairer, greener and more sustainable; and set out in section 3 possible reform options of global governance that would help build consensus and foster action towards a policy coherence package.

3. The report looked at the root causes of unbalanced globalization leading up to the global financial and economic crisis that began in 2008, and the cost of inaction. It identified three areas of weakness in the process of globalization: (a) excessive reliance on inadequately regulated markets as drivers of globalization; (b) the insufficient integration of macroeconomic, social and environmental policies within countries; and (c) the inability of global institutions to tackle effectively some of the most significant global problems. It considered a set of principles for rethinking globalization that could guide future priorities and policies in addressing those



weaknesses. These included the recasting of economic, labour market, social and environmental policy at the national level, addressing the international aspects of policy on trade and finance, macroeconomic policy coordination and managing global imbalances, reform of the global financial and monetary system, international tax coordination, equitable rules for foreign direct investment, social policy, agricultural development and food/nutrition security, global health, education and environmental protection policies. The report made the case that governance and institutions should operate to maintain the positive impacts of globalization, seek new pathways to a greener, fairer and more sustainable globalization, and reframe success in terms of a focus on human well-being, social equity, environmental sustainability and participatory governance. To that end, it noted the need for better measures for achieving an integrated approach, for enabling and oversight of implementation and for accountability at the global, regional and national levels, and the role of the United Nations in this regard.

4. The Vice-Chair requested Committee members to share their views on the content and approach of the report. On the basis of the discussion at the present session of the Committee and further written contributions to be received by the end of September, the writing team would revise the text which, following review by Messrs. Steiner and Somavía, would be submitted to CEB, at its forthcoming fall 2011 session, for further consideration and feedback. It was expected that a second and final report would be presented to CEB for its endorsement at its spring 2012 session as a contribution to the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, and that it would also be tailored as a strategic reflection for a post-2015 development framework.

5. In opening the floor for comments, the Chair thanked the Vice-Chair and colleagues for their solid work and stressed the value of the Committee's effort in support of the priorities of the United Nations Secretary-General. He underscored that the report should articulate a vision of the Organization in a changing world and its recommendations should position the United Nations as an integral and effective actor in meeting the needs and aspirations of people around the world.

6. A number of speakers addressed themselves to the approach taken by the report. Some felt that the text needed to provide more analysis with regard to both the positive and negative aspects of globalization, which would then lend greater credence to the policy prescriptions. The report should also deepen the reflection on what the implications of ongoing structural transformations would be, particularly with a view to ensuring the system's effective contribution towards engendering a fairer, greener and more sustainable development. Several stressed that "fairer" globalization needed to be cast in terms of inclusiveness. The value added of the United Nations system should be backed up in the analysis and evidence provided.

7. It was also suggested that in discussing institutional issues, a distinction should be made between structural gaps, where there were no existing structures of governance, and functional gaps, where the existing structures were not delivering what was needed. The costs of inaction, including by the United Nations, needed to be made more explicit. In addition, there was a need for more discussion on the role of the State, including within the intergovernmental system. It was pointed out that while much of the delivery of social services was at the local level, this aspect had not been adequately reflected in the text on recasting national policy.

8. Some participants felt that the report should identify new sources of growth in the future; clearly unfettered liberalization of financial markets and their activities would not be a sustainable option. The emergence of the “New South” as well as regional integration would be important drivers of future progress. To the extent possible, the report should give a perspective on what the world might be like in the future, and what the United Nations role might be in that scenario. Population and demographic changes were among the megatrends that would be future drivers of globalization, marked by migration, transportation and connectivity.

9. The United Nations needed to position itself relative to the emerging and proliferating governance structures, and the role of civil society needed to be stated more clearly. Much of the progress towards sustainable development had occurred through partnerships with different stakeholder groups, which varied in composition according to the issues. It was noted in this connection that while the United Nations had been successful in some of the functions of a global governance system in the past, by building consensus around the issues, identifying appropriate policies and encouraging compliance, it had not generated the necessary degree of accountability, with the appropriate enforcement mechanisms to engender compliance among Member States. It was suggested that the Organization’s convening power could be used to strengthen its accountability function. In this connection, it was also noted that as the force of globalization constrained national policy autonomy, there had been an increasing tendency for Member States to take positions reflecting concerns of national self-interest, which similarly constrained consensus-building and mutual accountability. Regionalism, a de facto forum of political integration and economic coordination, could be another means of regulating this tension.

10. Participants cited issues that they felt warranted greater attention in the report. It was noted that information and communications technology was an important driver of globalization, an essentially “green” technology, a central force in social change and education, and a means of facilitating participation in governance structures. The importance of gender equality was paramount; its multiplier effect needed to be emphasized. It was felt that the report had portrayed social protection as the social protection floor plus labour markets and some social services, while neglecting many other important aspects, such as energy, water and housing. It was suggested that energy poverty and energy access should be addressed more explicitly, both for poverty reduction and sustainable development. While global health and education had been stressed, elements needed to be added with regard to systems and delivery mechanisms. The area of agriculture required strengthened treatment in the report, given its contribution to sustainable development and inclusiveness. The report needed more emphasis on food and nutrition security. It was also important to look at the impact of aid flows on sustainable development, as well as to explore the link between natural resource management and the three pillars.

11. With respect to trade, it was felt that the report needed to recognize the many collective achievements of the multilateral system of rules and disciplines in trade that had evolved over six decades and had served the global community well. These should be preserved in any future system of global governance. The perspective of trade in services and goods needed to be provided in the text, which should also recognize that multilateral trade rules offer space for Member States to adopt measures in pursuit of legitimate policy objectives, provided that these measures are

not used as disguised restrictions to trade. The impact of the proliferation of bilateral trade agreements needed to be appraised in this context.

12. A number of participants underscored that the human dimension required greater focus as an element in transformation. Several areas were mentioned: the rule of law, capacity-building, social dialogue and the dissemination of knowledge for global consensus-building; human rights as the bedrock of all change; and the need for metrics that related more closely to human well-being. There was strong support for the concept of social outlays as an investment in human and productive capacity, which would also lead to more effective development and lessen the ultimate cost of humanitarian assistance. At the same time, it was important to bear in mind those vulnerable populations whose lives and livelihoods needed to be supported by humanitarian organizations. Social protection should be treated as a global public good, underpinned by the notion of social rights. The argument needed to be made more forcefully that building human capital was essential for successful sustainable development. The United Nations had a central normative role to play in globalizing the acceptability of the obligation of social protection, given that some 80 per cent of the world's population had little, if any, such protection. It was suggested that more focus needed to be given to the movement of people, including the human rights issues associated with migration.

13. It was recalled that the trigger for the Committee's work on moving towards a fairer, greener, sustainable globalization was the "crisis before the crisis" and the limitations of the existing system to respond effectively to pre-existing imbalances and to the crisis itself. In looking at the policy linkages among the pillars, the report would move the discourse from the notion of policy space to policy integration. An important outcome would be a sense of how the international framework could best support policy integration at the national level.

**14. Committee members agreed to provide further comments in writing by the end of September, for incorporation into the draft that would be presented to CEB at its fall 2011 session. The report would be prefaced by a short note that would set forth its provenance and purpose, as well as the next steps.**

### **III. Preparations for the Rio+20 Conference**

#### **A. Rio+20 Conference**

15. The Chair introduced the draft joint preamble statement on the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development for consideration by the Committee (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.2). He recalled that this work had been elaborated upon the request of the Secretary-General. His Principals Group — which had been established following the spring CEB 2011 session to advise him on the contribution of the United Nations system to the two themes of the Rio+20 Conference: the green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and the institutional framework for sustainable development — was also tasked to focus on the interlinkages among the three pillars of sustainable development and deliver its report to CEB at its fall 2011 session. The Principals Group has been considering an evolving paper outlining the Secretary-General's strategic approach to Rio+20.

16. As a member of the Group, and following the suggestions put forward by the Committee at its informal meeting held on 7 July 2011 in Geneva as to how the United Nations system could contribute to the preparatory process, the Chair had received agreement for the Committee to assist in working jointly with the Principals Group to draft a common “preamble” to respective organizations’ submissions to the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development by 1 November 2011. While not replacing the submission of individual agencies, it was intended to be a shared, succinct visionary statement that avoided prescription, yet called for a high level of ambition for the Rio+20 outcome. To this end, on 30 August he had convened a small group, which had prepared the document now under consideration by the Committee.

17. Before opening the floor for comments, the Chair stressed the need to ensure that the statement, for the further consideration of CEB, would highlight a “One United Nations” approach, be responsive to the political nature of the outcome document, and provide a sense of priorities without being prescriptive. He asked participants to signal whether their organizations would be in favour of using the draft, with amendments to be agreed, as a joint introduction for their submissions.

18. The majority of Committee members endorsed the concept of using the “preamble” as a common United Nations system statement. Several indicated that they could not signal agreement, however, in absence of a finalized text to be reviewed within their institutions.

19. With regard to the text itself, a number of participants felt that the human element needed to be stressed, in an approach towards “sustainable human development”. It was suggested that reference be made to Principle 1 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, which stated: “Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature”. Members emphasized the importance of referring to human rights, including the right to development, equitable access to resources, meeting the needs of the most vulnerable through an urgent scaling up of efforts, addressing the hopes of youth, and qualifying economic growth as inclusive and high-quality.

20. Several members made reference to ways in which the world had changed since 1992 that might find reflection in the draft. There were new challenges but also new opportunities. Indeed, over the past 20 years, consciousness of issues related to sustainable development had grown significantly among Governments and civil society, particularly with regard to the environment. In addition, there had been normative advances. The draft needed to make a link between lessons learned and gaps in implementation, in order to express the new potential.

21. It was noted that an open rule-based multilateral trading system was critical for the transition to the green economy. It was necessary to address issues related to green protectionism in this context.

22. Some members felt that lessons learned indicated that, contrary to what the draft posited, there were indeed real trade-offs among the three pillars of sustainable development that needed to be addressed by the United Nations system. This issue would be a fundamental element in a United Nations system-wide strategy on sustainable development that would also examine means to improve how organizations worked together.

23. A number of participants also highlighted specific areas that they felt needed more focus in the statement. These included food security, nutrition, the role of scientific research, natural wealth and ecosystem services, forests and the regulatory framework, forests and fisheries in a green economy, population dynamics and the importance of the regional dimension as an enabler.

24. Several members raised questions about the purpose of the preamble, noting that the text was inward-looking. Given that the United Nations system was one, albeit universal, multilateral actor, there was a need for its voice to be clear and distinct. In addition, it was pointed out that there was also a need to ensure a coherent thread among the individual submissions.

25. In response, the Chair noted that the draft before the Committee was at this stage not a public statement but rather an internal document to be used by CEB as a frame for the collective voice of the United Nations system, to couch the specific submissions. As Chair, he would convey to the Board that the Committee felt that the “preamble” provided a good way for the United Nations system to signal with one voice what it felt that Rio+20 should address; and that the Committee recommended that the Board consider issuing a strong communiqué at its spring 2012 session, as a “clarion call”. Regarding the initiatives to be put forward, he cited for emulation the example of sustainable energy for all, which was politically mature. Some time remained to refine the proposals under consideration.

**26. The Chair requested organizations to send further comments on the document in writing; a revised version of the draft would be then circulated. He urged members to bear in mind that the document needed to be brief and speak to the greater collective voice of the United Nations system as a common preamble that all could work from. Looking ahead, he expected that the Committee would continue its efforts to develop a common understanding of how the United Nations system would deliver sustainable development collectively and effectively.**

## **B. UN-Oceans**

27. The representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) recalled that, in 2003, CEB had endorsed the creation of an Oceans and Coastal Areas Network (subsequently renamed UN-Oceans) to establish an effective, transparent and regular inter-agency coordination mechanism on ocean and coastal issues within the United Nations system. At the spring 2011 session of the Board, the Director-General of UNESCO had put forward a proposal to broker a “new deal” on oceans as a means of giving the required critical emphasis on this issue in the context of the global sustainable development agenda. In her letter of 4 July, which had been circulated to Committee members on 7 July at its informal meeting on Rio+20, she had informed CEB members of her exchange with the United Nations Secretary-General on improving the effectiveness of UN-Oceans. Given the nature of ocean issues, where management responsibilities were fragmented, there was a strong need for the United Nations system to provide leadership through the fostering of dialogue, coordination and cooperative action among all members.

28. The representative added that the idea of a substantive review that could also make a contribution to the debate over the institutional framework for sustainable

development at Rio+20 had been shared among the UN-Oceans membership. The initial agreement among UN-Ocean members was to pursue a review by either the Joint Inspection Unit or the Office of Internal Oversight Services. What was clear, however, was that the immediate need was for a short-term substantive review of UN-Oceans, allowing the United Nations system to demonstrate better focus on effectiveness at Rio+20, without prejudice to a longer-scope evaluation at a later stage.

29. The Committee was informed by the CEB secretariat that the General Assembly was currently considering a draft resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, which contained a proposal for the Joint Inspection Unit to carry out a review of UN-Oceans for the sixty-seventh session of the Assembly.

30. The Chair distinguished between a technical review of the functioning and effectiveness of UN-Oceans as an inter-agency mechanism, and a substantive assessment by UN-Oceans on what the United Nations system could propose as a forward-looking initiative on oceans for Rio+20.

31. The Committee concurred that oceans played a critical role, along with water and energy, within the overall framework of sustainable development. The forthcoming Rio+20 Conference was an important opportunity for developing greater integration and coherence as well as enhancing coordination in how the international community and the organizations of the United Nations system addressed the issues of water, energy and oceans.

32. The Chair announced his intention to consult with all interested and relevant stakeholders to determine how best UN-Oceans could make a signal contribution to Rio+20, and to report to CEB on the outcome of these consultations.

### **C. Global Sustainability Panel**

33. The Committee was briefed by Janos Pasztor, Executive Secretary, on the work of the Global Sustainability Panel. He noted that the first draft report had been presented to the Panel for review of recommendations and identification of gaps. The report was divided into five parts on: (a) the social, economic, and environmental drivers of change; (b) how to forge a sustainable economy and to mobilize public and private resources; (c) how to empower people, in particular vulnerable groups, with a focus on gender and infrastructure issues; (d) how to collaborate better to achieve systemic transformation; and (e) a number of initiatives in areas such as food and agriculture, energy, urbanization and oceans. The report would also touch on issues of accountability.

34. In terms of the process going forward, the last meeting of the Panel would be held on 13 and 14 December 2011. The handover of the report was scheduled for 12 January 2012 in New York, with simultaneous releases in capitals of members of the Panel.

## **IV. Follow-up to decisions of the High-Level Committee on Programmes/Chief Executives Board for Coordination**

### **A. Disaster risk reduction**

35. Margareta Wahlström, Assistant Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, provided the Committee with an overview of the salient points contained in the document before the Committee (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.3/Rev.1). She recalled that CEB had agreed at its spring session of 2011 to commit to a coherent approach to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in programmes and operations through the development of a common agenda, and to give disaster risk reduction the highest political support. The Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General had demonstrated their strong support through their participation at the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, held from 8 to 13 May in Geneva. Member States were similarly committed to disaster risk reduction, highlighting its importance as a critical element of any development strategy and referring to it regularly in General Assembly resolutions.

36. Notwithstanding such support, challenges remained in taking this work forward. Ms. Wahlström stressed that while disaster risk reduction was a priority for the United Nations system, including the need to safeguard and protect development gains, the time had come to look at it in a holistic and cross-cutting manner encompassing humanitarian and development programming. A significant improvement in the effectiveness and coherence of United Nations action in risk reduction was required; this was especially so at the field level, where the issue was well understood as a strategic opportunity to support Governments. She noted that the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction had conducted a review of how well disaster risk reduction had been mainstreamed in ongoing United Nations system programmes in the light of the Hyogo Framework for Action. She added that some organizations had already undertaken an internal review of their roles in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

37. Ms. Wahlström recalled that the consideration by the Committee of disaster risk reduction was a continuation of the further implementation of the Committee's recommendations from its fourteenth and sixteenth sessions in 2007 and 2008, respectively. She stressed the importance of building on the existing work of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction in disaster risk reduction and, in this regard, proposed that the Committee endorse an International Strategy-led working group on disaster risk reduction, with periodic reporting back to the Committee. The Group would help to translate the momentum and agreed political support into a strategic plan of action to ensure the highest possible degree of coherence and effectiveness of the United Nations system and ways to continue to pursue the mainstreaming of risk reduction into development programmes.

38. In the ensuing discussion, members noted that prevention was instrumental to the work of the United Nations system as a whole. The question, therefore, was how to mainstream disaster risk reduction strategies across the system, particularly taking risks into account in the programme delivery of services. Most participants welcomed initiatives at mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and noted that a plan of action or checklist on how to go about mainstreaming would be useful. In this regard, it was important to highlight the importance of data, in particular country

typology, disaster proneness and areas where the system could collaborate. Participants cautioned against a process-oriented approach to mainstreaming and noted the need to focus on ensuring sufficient capacity to minimize the impact of natural hazards, as well as simplifying the ways in which advice was provided to deal with reducing disaster risks. It was noted that Governments had an obligation to take action for prevention and mitigation, and it was a good sign that most were heeding calls for action in this area. The experience of the approach of Bangladesh to disaster risk reduction was highlighted as proof of the investment needed in risk reduction, in particular investments in disaster-proof infrastructure. It was important to look at investments in disaster risk reduction in both a strategic and technical manner, given the costs associated with not taking them into account in the programme delivery of United Nations system activities.

39. Some participants expressed that further clarity was needed on the rationale and added value of the proposal for a working group. The results expected, and how the working group would build on existing mechanisms on preparedness and contingency planning, needed to be spelled out. The decent work toolkit was highlighted as an example of the type of resource that could serve as a model for efforts in taking forward work to mainstream disaster risk reduction.

**40. The Committee agreed that the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction would make available a tool for members of the Committee to “X-ray” their institutions for information on the state of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction. On that basis, the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction would provide recommendations to the Committee for further action at its spring 2012 session. The Committee also encouraged members to consider ways to increase their strategic leadership and support for coherent United Nations action for disaster risk reduction, and to continue to pursue the mainstreaming of risk into development programmes.**

## **B. Climate change**

41. The Chair recalled the decision by the Committee at its previous session to extend the mandate of the Working Group on Climate Change for another year under the continued chairmanship of Henning Wuester. It was agreed that during this period, the Working Group would aim to forge a unified approach to Durban and develop programmatic approaches to support the implementation of climate change action.

42. Before turning the floor over to Mr. Wuester to introduce the progress report of the Working Group on Climate Change (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.4), the Chair informed the Committee that he had become aware that Mr. Wuester had been assigned new and extremely demanding tasks in the lead-up to Durban that had impacted on his ability to devote the required level of attention to the Working Group. Following consultations, the Chair was pleased to report that Elena Manaenkova, Assistant Secretary-General, World Meteorological Organization, was willing to volunteer her services for the remainder of the Group’s mandate. The Chair expressed his warm appreciation on behalf of the Committee to Mr. Wuester for his excellent stewardship of the Group.

43. Mr. Wuester recalled that since 2007 the Working Group had focused its work on three levels of activity: (a) information- and knowledge-sharing, which had

generated a community of practice and a sense of complementarity among agencies; (b) coordinated external outreach, which had resulted in a joint and coherent set of messages on the United Nations system “delivering as one” at the annual climate conferences; and (c) the coordination of specific activities and overall programmatic approaches, an area that could usefully be expanded but would require an investment in resources by the membership.

44. He noted that the Cancun Agreements had set the basis for establishing an implementation architecture. The United Nations system should therefore be guided by this architecture as it developed its programmes and activities for 2011 and beyond so that it could better support the implementation of climate change action, in particular in developing countries. In that light, the Group had agreed earlier in 2011 to continue its work, focusing on specific deliverables and providing a more strategic response to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change process through promoting delivery on the ground and by giving priority to capacity-building and adaptation. Since the previous session of the Committee, the Working Group had met twice; in addition, the Chair had convened meetings with the lead agencies in the focus and cross-cutting areas and with the co-chairs of the United Nations Development Group Task Team on Climate Change, Environmental Sustainability and Rio+20 to discuss the plan of activities and strengthened cooperation.

45. With regard to the United Nations system’s preparations for the climate conference in Durban, the Working Group had agreed that the focus should be on further developing the implementation architecture of the global climate regime. Regarding the side events, while the requests had been reduced from over 35 to the present list of 15, there was a need for greater collaboration among agencies in organizing the joint events; the deadline for finalization would be the following week. He noted that the Committee needed to also consider whether it should proceed with an overall high-level CEB event, as it had in past years. In this regard, he noted that the event of 2010 had been particularly successful, as it had brought the Secretary-General and United Nations system leaders in direct dialogue with the parties. He thanked the agencies that had provided resources to the Working Group and stressed the urgent need for renewed and substantive commitments going forward, to allow the Group to fully implement its planned activities.

46. In the ensuing discussion, Committee members highlighted initiatives in which they were engaged, such as measures to reduce emissions from ships by 30 per cent by 2030, and the insertion of human rights and gender considerations into climate policy measures. The importance of the humanitarian dimension of climate change was stressed, and it was suggested that it needed to be brought out more clearly in the side events that were being proposed.

47. A number of speakers addressed the importance of a jointly agreed policy framework that allowed for operationalization at the country level, and the role of the United Nations system in strengthening the linkages through a two-way dialogue. To this end, the United Nations Development Group guidance note to country teams entitled “Integrating climate change considerations in the country analysis and the UNDAF” was recalled. It was suggested that collaboration between the Working Group and the United Nations Development Group Task Team should be enhanced, and that the Committee might request a report from the United Nations Development Group at its next session on priority setting on climate change. It was

also suggested that the Working Group be used for high-level strategic debates to position the United Nations in the climate negotiations, for example, on the issue of the Green Fund.

48. **With respect to preparations for the United Nations Climate Change Conference to be held in Durban, it was stressed that the United Nations system should be strategic in its engagement. To that end, the incoming Chair of the Working Group was requested to sharpen the focus of the system to contributing towards the consideration of the key policy issues on the climate agenda. There was strong support for convening a high-level CEB event along the lines of the successful event of 2010, when the Secretary-General and executive heads spoke with one voice, engaging in dialogue with the parties. It was suggested that the incoming Chair of the Group might wish to consider these and other issues in taking forward the Committee's work on climate.**

49. Ms. Manaenkova thanked Mr. Wuester for his efforts, and expressed appreciation to the Committee for selecting her to continue to lead the work of the Working Group. The period leading up to Durban was critically important, and she expected to be convening a meeting of the Working Group in October to finalize preparations for the United Nations system's engagement in Durban, including coordination of the joint thematic side events and messages. In addition, following Durban, she anticipated convening a workshop for the Working Group to reflect on its further programmes and initiatives.

### **C. Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries**

50. At its twentieth and twenty-first sessions, the Committee had considered means of supporting the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held from 9 to 13 May 2011 in Istanbul. The Committee looked at ways of mobilizing the participation of relevant organizations of the United Nations system, their intergovernmental bodies and substantive stakeholders. It discussed the launch of institutional and thematic initiatives, such as the Global Initiative and Partnership for Building Productive Capacity in the Least Developed Countries, and it considered the effective follow-up and monitoring mechanisms arising from the Conference.

51. At its spring 2011 session, CEB endorsed a statement of support to the Conference with the understanding that the statement could be followed by another that would build on the outcome of the Conference. The statement underscored the system's commitment of support to the least developed countries and a new programme of action for the next 10 years. It focused on productive capacity and the role of the United Nations system as a whole in supporting it.

52. The representative from the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, Erdenebileg Sandagdorj, introduced the document before the Committee (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.5) noting that the Conference had resulted in the adoption of a bold Political Declaration and a comprehensive and action-oriented Istanbul Programme of Action. The task ahead was one of ensuring that the commitments contained in the Programme of Action were matched by actions. In this regard, his Office had engaged and consulted with other United

Nations system and international organizations to maintain the momentum through a brainstorming meeting of the Inter-Agency Coordination Group. The meeting produced a road map for the implementation of the Programme of Action to guide least developed countries and their development partners towards a path of coordinated, coherent and effective implementation of the Programme of Action. It spelled out activities that needed to be undertaken by all stakeholders to ensure that the objectives of the Programme of Action would be met.

53. In addition, Mr. Sandagdorj introduced a draft statement (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.5/Add.1) that conveyed a strong commitment by the United Nations system to the successful implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, and underscored the urgency and importance of the new global partnership in support of development for least developed countries. The draft also affirmed the recognition by the United Nations system's leaders of the key priority areas for action and their willingness to make a strong contribution to the implementation, monitoring and follow-up of the newly adopted Programme of Action by better targeting and synergizing their policy and programmatic support to least developed countries.

54. In the ensuing discussion, members deliberated on the added value of a further statement by CEB at this juncture. Some members expressed that other forms of action by CEB could be explored; others noted that the use of existing mechanisms to follow up on the mainstreaming of the Istanbul Programme of Action would be useful. In this regard, the use of the Inter-Agency Consultative Group, chaired by the Office of the High Representative, was highly recommended.

**55. The Committee agreed to consider the progress made by the United Nations system in mainstreaming the Istanbul Programme of Action at the five-year review mark, and also agreed to incorporate the following actionable elements of the draft statement in its report:**

#### **Statement of the High-Level Committee on Programmes**

- **The United Nations system welcomes the successful convening of the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries and the adoption of a comprehensive and action-oriented Programme of Action as well as a bold Political Declaration.**
- **The Committee takes note of the eight priority areas of the Istanbul Programme of Action that encapsulate the development challenges before least developed countries as well as the emphasis put on productive capacity as their defining challenge and opportunity for sustainable and equitable development in the next decade.**
- **It recognizes that actions by all stakeholders are required for success and welcomes the commitments by least developed countries and their development partners to undertake actions in all priority areas contained in the Istanbul Programme of Action.**
- **It commits to contribute to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action in a coherent and synergistic manner and to integrate the Programme of Action into work programmes of the United Nations system as appropriate and in accordance with respective mandates and to participate fully in its review at the national, subnational, regional and global levels. To this end, the Committee commits to fully utilizing its**

**analytical, technical and operational capabilities and resources as well as existing coordination mechanisms/initiatives.**

- **The Committee also welcomes the endorsement by the Inter-Agency Consultative Group meeting of the road map for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, which provides a strategic direction as to the role and contribution of various stakeholders in the implementation stage. To this end, it recommends that the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States utilize the Inter-Agency Consultative Group to follow up on the mainstreaming of the Programme of Action and commits to fully support it in this regard.**

#### **D. Cybersecurity**

56. At its twentieth session, the Committee discussed the impact of cybercrime and cybersecurity and requested the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), in collaboration with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, to organize a meeting of focal points to examine the policy and technology dimensions related to these issues. The Committee was briefed on developments since then by Doreen Bogdan (ITU) and Sandeep Chawla (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime).

57. The ITU/United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime-led meeting, held on 1 July 2011 in Geneva, brought together focal points on cybercrime and cybersecurity from 35 United Nations system organizations to discuss possible directions for the system in these areas. The meeting offered participants the opportunity to discuss the impact of cybercrime and cyberthreats on United Nations constituencies, and assess the level of preparedness of the system against the potential risks posed by coordinated cyberattacks, identifying cooperative responses to mitigate such threats.

58. The summary of the meeting (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/CRP.6) included a proposal for the establishment of a United Nations group on programme policy aspects of cybercrime and cybersecurity, which would explore the development of a harmonized and common policy framework for combating cybercrime and ensuring cybersecurity. The group would foster coordination and collaboration within the United Nations, as well as complement the more technical work undertaken by the Special Interest Group on Information Security within the Information and Communications Technology Network.

59. The representatives of ITU and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime noted that the two issues, cybersecurity and cybercrime, while distinct in some ways, required a combined approach by United Nations system entities, and could not be adequately addressed only through global infrastructure management. They pointed out that this was done through an international legal framework that normally took the form of a convention. Thus far, this has been difficult to achieve, given the different views held by Member States as to how to address these issues. To better understand the issues involved in the cybercrime area, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime had begun preparations for a study on the subject which would include not only Member States, but also the private and social sectors. This study was meant to compile good practices and determine the need for an international convention. In that connection, it was pointed out by the Office of the

United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights that carefully conceived human rights safeguards needed to be included in any policies and directives, with particular attention paid to protecting privacy rights and the freedom of information, opinion, expression and association.

60. Ken Herman, the CEB secretariat Senior Adviser on Information Management Policy Coordination, informed the Committee of the risks faced by the United Nations system on cybercrime and cybersecurity. He reiterated that a Committee-related group would focus on programme policy and complement the activities of the Information and Communications Technology Network, which had a focus on internal agency operational cybersecurity. Mr. Herman noted that the issues presented by the Information and Communications Technology Network to the High-Level Committee on Management related to cybersecurity included the need to integrate information and communications technology training as a core part of required orientation for staff and the harmonization of internal cybersecurity policies and standards.

61. Participants expressed support for the group, as well as the need for it to work closely with the Information and Communications Technology Network. They felt that the terms of reference of the proposed group should be refined to specify its programmatic goals more precisely.

62. In their reply to the Committee, Ms. Bogdan and Mr. Chawla agreed on the need to refine the terms of reference of the proposed United Nations group along the lines of the comments from the Committee. They cautioned against treating the two issues separately and noted they would continue to steward this discussion on behalf of the Committee.

**63. The Committee endorsed the proposal of setting up one single group, the United Nations Group on Cybercrime and Cybersecurity, and agreed that ITU, in collaboration with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, would refine further its terms of reference. The Committee would revert back to this issue in one year.**

## **V. Other matters**

### **A. United Nations system-wide coordination on the Global Jobs Pact**

64. Jane Stewart, the representative of ILO, introduced a note (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/INF.2), which put forth a proposal for the Committee to consider organizing an inter-agency workshop in early 2012. She noted that the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 2011/37, had requested that United Nations system organizations continue to take into account the Global Jobs Pact in their respective policies and programmes and include, as part of the Secretary-General's report, the use of the Pact by the United Nations system. She noted that the Secretary-General, in coordination with ILO, had also been requested to assess and review job-intensive investments and strategies that support job creation and promote sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth. To that end, the Committee was encouraged to consider further measures to promote system-wide policy coherence.

65. ILO was proposing to convene a workshop in early 2012 to fulfil the mandated requirements identified for the 2012 substantive session of the Economic and Social

Council. Ms. Stewart recalled that the Committee had already done considerable work in this area, referring to the development of the Toolkit for Mainstreaming Employment and Decent Work, the Joint Crisis Initiative on the Global Jobs Pact, and the time-bound cluster group, led by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat, on the preparation of a system-wide plan of action in relation to the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty, with a focus on full employment and decent work for all.

66. Ms. Stewart emphasized that the workshop would be an opportunity to take stock of the various strands of policy coherence in the policies and programmes of agencies and identify additional opportunities to broaden collaboration and coherence, with a particular focus on the elements contained in the Global Jobs Pact. The outcome of the workshop could be prepared and submitted as a contribution to the report of the Secretary-General for the 2012 annual ministerial review of the Economic and Social Council, which would focus on the theme “Promoting productive capacity, employment and decent work to eradicate poverty in the context of inclusive, sustainable and equitable economic growth at all levels for achieving the Millennium Development Goals”.

67. In the discussion that followed, members expressed support for the efforts of ILO on decent work and employment and noted the opportunity to work together in this important area. In this regard, the World Bank indicated that the next version of the *World Development Report* would focus on jobs. Some members expressed that in addition to the workshop, accelerated action on the ground was needed, particularly to showcase results in areas such as the green economy and green job growth.

**68. The Committee endorsed the ILO proposal to host a workshop in early 2012. It requested ILO to provide a set of proposals that would challenge the system to look at what can be done jointly to amplify decent work and employment issues, building on the previous work of the Committee on this issue.**

## **B. Regional dimension of development and the United Nations system**

69. Amr Nour, Director of the Regional Commissions New York Office, gave an update on the content of an independent study (CEB/2011/HLCP-XXII/INF.2) sponsored by the commissions on the regional dimension for development and the United Nations system. At its twentieth session, the Committee had emphasized the importance for the United Nations system to reflect on its repositioning and its interaction with the new regional dynamics, bearing in mind the growing regionalism and role of regional institutions, including the regional commissions. To this end, the Coordinator of the regional commissions informed CEB, at its spring 2011 session, about the intention of the regional commissions to introduce the study at the Board’s next session.

70. Mr. Nour noted that the study examined some of the issues that drove and spearheaded the accelerated pace of regional developments, including the regional development architecture that was evolving as a result. It aimed to promote a greater understanding of these processes to determine how the United Nations, in particular, the regional commissions, could collectively better serve and support Member States within this rapidly evolving context. It revealed a great degree of

commonality among the regional and global issues, as well as regional and global agendas for dealing with those issues at the national level. This was a clear indication of the need and the importance for the United Nations system to work horizontally, in a coherent and effective fashion at the regional level, as well as vertically at the national and global levels.

71. Mr. Nour added that the study also indicated that there was a significant degree of engagement of United Nations system organizations with the regional intergovernmental bodies and entities, and that the United Nations was able to provide them with valuable support in a number of substantive areas. He cited as an example the more than 150 different memorandums of understanding, agreements or other structures for collaboration with more than 30 different organizations in all regions, which suggested that whenever there was a high degree of collaboration among United Nations system agencies to support regional initiatives or processes, the outcomes were highly effective and successful, in terms of both impact and implementation.

72. The study also noted that owing to their historic and multifaceted contribution, the regional commissions were well placed, not only to support regional intergovernmental processes and actions, but also to strengthen United Nations inter-agency cooperation and coordination at the regional level. The study pointed out that collaboration appeared to be deeper in some regions than in others, depending on the evolution of the regional architecture. It also emphasized the need for the United Nations system to recognize the importance of regionalism and its enormous potential as a building block for multilateralism. It also stressed that the growing importance of the regional dimension of development, and its criticality as an effective and efficient link between the global and national levels, had to be acknowledged and taken into account in all global development processes. The report advocated for a coherent regional strategy for development and emphasized the need for the United Nations system to work together regionally to develop its collective strategy of engagement with partner organizations and stakeholders.

### **C. Update on the Integrated Implementation Framework**

73. Thomas Stelzer, Secretary of CEB, gave an update on the Integrated Implementation Framework, which had been approved by the Committee and CEB earlier this year. He recalled that the Framework was the Secretary-General's initiative to create greater accountability to follow through on all the commitments of the Millennium Development Goals. He noted that despite very limited resources, the Millennium Development Goals Gap Task Force had progressed in setting up an initial version of the Framework, focusing currently on delivery by development partners on Goal 8.

74. A pilot version of the Framework and the related interactive website will be presented to focal points from all agencies in October and agencies will be requested for feedback for further improvement and development, as well as to provide relevant information to further populate the database of the Framework. While further work will be undertaken to further improve and complete the Framework, the target is to present the first operational version of the Framework to the Deputy Secretary-General by the end of November and subsequently to launch it to the public.

**D. Biodiversity**

75. Noting the work of the Issue-Management Group on Biodiversity of the United Nations Environment Management Group, the Committee agreed to consider this item on an as-needed basis, to be determined through further informal consultations among interested members.

**E. Dates of the twenty-third session of the Committee**

76. The CEB secretariat would undertake consultations on dates and venue for the twenty-third session of the Committee, tentatively scheduled during the week of 5 March 2012.

## **Annex I**

### **Agenda**

Introduction and tour-de-table

1. Moving towards a fairer, greener and sustainable globalization
2. Preparations for the Rio+20 Conference
3. Follow-up to decisions of the High-Level Committee on Programmes/Chief Executives Board for Coordination
  - (a) Disaster risk reduction;
  - (b) Climate change;
  - (c) Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;
  - (d) Cybersecurity
4. Other matters

## Annex II

### List of participants

Chair: Achim Steiner (United Nations Environment Programme)

Vice-Chair: Elliott Harris (International Monetary Fund)

Secretary: Phyllis Lee (CEB secretariat)

#### United Nations

Executive Office of the Secretary-General	Janos Pasztor Mohammad Reza Salamat
United Nations Office in Vienna	Mazlan Othman
Department of Economic and Social Affairs	Thomas Stelzer (Secretary of CEB) Navid Hanif
Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States	Sandagdorj Erdenebileg Susanna Wolf
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	Ivan Šimonović Craig Mokhiber
Regional commissions	Amr Nour
United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction	Margareta Wahlström Letizia Rossano
International Labour Organization	Jane Stewart
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Lorraine Williams Sharon Brennen-Haylock
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Jean-Yves Le Saux
World Health Organization	Andrew Cassels
World Bank	Dominique Bichara Sari K. Soderstrom Yuvan A. Beejadhur
International Monetary Fund	Elliott Harris Nriya Subramaniam
International Telecommunication Union	Doreen Bogdan Beatrice Pluchon Gary Fowlie
World Meteorological Organization	Elena Manaenkova Christian Blondin

International Maritime Organization	Zhu Jianxin
World Intellectual Property Organization	Sherif Saadallah S. Rama Rao
International Fund for Agricultural Development	Cheryl Morden Xenia von Lilien
United Nations Industrial Development Organization	Shaukat Fareed George Assaf
World Trade Organization	Karsten Steinfatt
World Tourism Organization	Marcio Favilla Kazi Rahman
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	Taffere Tesfachew Michael Clark
United Nations Development Programme	Sigrid Kaag Alison Drayton Anne-Marie Sloth Carlsen Maria del Mar Galindo
United Nations Environment Programme	Achim Steiner (High-Level Committee on Programmes Chair) Juanita Castaño Maaïke Jansen
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East	Robert Stryk
United Nations Children's Fund	Isabel Ortiz Michèle Ferenz Chris Davids
United Nations Population Fund	Mabingue Ngom Odyek Agona Rune Froseth
World Food Programme	Carlo Scaramella Pedro Medrano Karin Manente
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes	Sandeep Chawla
United Nations Human Settlements Programme	Cecilia Martinez
UN-Women	Lakshmi Puri Jean-Luc Bories
United Nations University	Luna Abu-Khadra
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization	Khaled G. AbdelHamid

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	Henning Wuester (by videoconference) Marcela Main-Shancha
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	Emelia Timpo
United Nations System Staff College	Jafar Javan
Development Operations Coordination Office	Dena Assat Gerald Daly
Secretariat of the Chief Executives Board for Coordination	Yasin Samatar

---