ECOSOC Operational Segment 2017

From coordinated to integrated implementation of the 2030 Agenda:

The development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus

Talking points for panel discussion

Berit Fladby, Policy Director UN development activities

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

The **rationale** for applying a whole of system approach is obviously to contribute to better **common results** in the conflict-affected countries concerned. As member states, we have an interest in ensuring that the different parts of the UN are pulling in the same direction, with as little transaction costs as possible.

The **whole-of-system approach** is not new with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the sustaining peace resolutions or the 2016 QCPR. There were already policies and instruments for integration in place, applying in cases where a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation or a special political mission is deployed alongside a UN country team. Let us hope that there is now a stronger momentum for discussing these approaches among Member States.

However, it seems to be a **knowledge gap** in terms of systematic and comprehensive analyses of what has been achieved and of the actual collaboration between missions and country teams. The evaluation report published by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in 2016 on *Integration between Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Country Teams* in three countries provides some insight.

ECOSOC – as the principal organ responsible for operational activities for development – should have evidence-based discussions on the role of the UN development system in different types of conflict-affected countries. Due to the knowledge gap, we expect that the annual reports of the Secretary General on implementation of the QCPR deal with these issues in some detail. Also the mentioned OIOS report could be brought to the attention of ECOSOC.

Some more specific observations and comments on the question raised for this panel:

1. Regarding roles and mandates of the different entities, I have two basic questions: One is whether the arrangements work smoothly, with clear distribution of responsibilities and clearly defined modes of collaboration. This is in particular the case when the missions and members of the country teams are engaged in the same type of activity – elections is a typical example. What precisely does "collaboration" mean?

The other question is whether **the UNDS entities do the right things**, focusing not only on short-term peace building efforts but also on **long-term development**, including capacity development to improve core public administration functions and promotion of inclusive economic growth.

With regard to these long-term efforts, we believe that the collaboration between the **World Bank** and other multilateral finance institutions is critical. We welcome the enhanced engagement of the World Bank in fragile contexts and the closer collaboration between the UN and the World Bank in such settings. It is crucial that this collaboration is institutionalized.

- 2. We recognize that every crisis situation is unique. There are, however, *Integrated Strategic Frameworks* that may serve as **good examples**. The *United Nations Strategic Framework 2017-2020 for Lebanon* is promising. It is also consistent with the Lebanon Humanitarian Response Plan for the same period. It is worth noting that the distinction between "the mission" and "the UN country team" is abolished all are presented as *members* of the UN country team. This also applies to the World Bank, which is rare.
- 3. With the stronger emphasis on prevention and sustaining peace, it may be necessary to develop further guidance, which also includes the role of the UN in non-mission settings.
- **4.** In order to substantially improve integrated approaches across the three pillars of the UN, some bold steps need to be taken:
 - Ensure institutionalization of the collaboration through enhanced leadership and mutual accountability within the UN
 - Harmonize administrative policies and procedures between the Secretariat and the UNDG
 - Increase the authority of the multi-hatted DSRSG/RC/HC
 - Address the fragmented funding patterns.