

**Speaking points of the Brazilian delegation to the
Operational Activities for Development Segment
of the Economic and Social Council**

2 March 2017

Speaking points for the interactive discussion “From coordinated to integrated implementation of the 2030 Agenda: the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus”

- Thank you, Mr. Moderator. We would like to thank also the panelists for the very interesting presentations. We would like to support the remarks made by G77 and China, and to add the following remarks in national capacity.
- Brazil agrees with the need for greater coordination between development cooperation, humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts. We also support the notion of sustaining peace.
- We understand that there is some level of frustration coming from people dealing with real challenges in the field – as expressed by the panel – regarding the dynamics of negotiations in New York. One cannot underestimate the real challenges for ensuring better coordination on the ground. For the real people suffering with humanitarian crises, development challenges and conflicts, these deprivations are experienced together, and not separately.
- However, our job here in New York is to find institutional ways to improve the response, consistently with the different mandates. The QCPR provides a good starting point for that.
- It is important to get it right when operationalizing ideas such as “breaking silos”, “bridging divides” and “tearing down walls”, as mentioned by the panel. Processes such as addressing the root causes, preventing conflicts, building and sustaining peace are both political and developmental. Some institutional boundaries have a reason to exist, and what is relevant for the QCPR process is to ensure clarity on the role of the UNDS in this bigger context. This role is development itself.
- During the QCPR negotiations, Member states have preserved the non-politicized scope of the UNDS. While there is a need to better coordinate different activities across pillars in countries where these activities take place, the

response should be, above all, country-specific. One cannot mainstream in all country programmes aspects on peace and security, creating a confusion between addressing violence and addressing conflicts. Our main concern is to protect country programme documents, and development cooperation itself, from unnecessary politicization in settings that are not affected by crises.

- Thank you.