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"Mr. President,

Members of the Executive Board, ladies and gentlemen,

I have the pleasure to deliver this statement on behalf of Italy, the United Kingdom and my own country, Germany. We would like to thank UNDP for the elaborate and committing presentation. Germany highly appreciates this opportunity to discuss the review of the country programme approval process and the changes to the country programme documents.

In our assessment, there is a broad desire in the UN membership to further strengthen the UN Development System by enabling an acceleration of the approval process and align the format of the CPDs. It is key to reinforce the alignment of country programmes with the strategic plans of the organisations and even more with the countries’ national development process to strengthen national ownership. In line with the overall objective of the QCPR we have to reduce transaction cost of all partners. In a best case scenario, we will save about one year time in the approval process of the country programmes.

We are convinced that the country level is the appropriate level for detailed coordination with all stakeholders. However, the EB has to be able to play its role and has to ensure that strategic guidance has been respected. In this regard, the new procedure must not sideline the EB. The EB needs sufficient time to comment on the draft CPDs and consult with own structures in the relevant countries. We would like to see joint informals to discuss comments with and in the boards. The boards need transparency to monitor whether and how comments have been incorporated in the revised drafts in due time before the board meetings. Unfortunately, DP/2014/8 does not contain sufficient information how the consultation process with the board ahead of the board meetings will be structured. We would like to see a process such as joint informals to discuss comments within and in the boards.

Mr. President,

Secondly, we would like to better understand how coherence of the individual agency’s CPD with other CPDs and the UNDAF will be ensured. In line with para 117 and 119 of the QCPR we need coherence from the UNDAF to the operational level. The new process and format must not impair ambitious plans to further promote the delivering as one approach and one programme at country level. In this regard, we would like to receive more information on the consequences of the new process and format.
Thank you,