1. What are the current and emerging challenges in meeting the MDGs and in sustaining
development gains in the future, for low- and middle-income countries respectively?

- The largest challenges in meeting the MDG is the State’s capacity to provide the
  services—we call this Statebuilding—
- To provide the services which will eradicate poverty and hunger
- To provide the services that will provide health care, reduce infant mortality,
  increase maternal care and decrease diseases
- To provide not only the legislation but implementation of those laws and regulations
  which will promote gender equality, and global partnerships
- These are not things that can be done without effective institutions and if we bi-pass
  those institutions we do not strengthen our capacity to reach the MDG, we weaken
  it
- I believe the result speak for themselves
- And we as an international community cannot exempt the role of Peace in
  development—without peace there can be no development and without
  development there can be no peace.
- the Foundations to accelerated development and achievement to the MDG is
  peacebuilding and statebuilding
- And while many believe that Peace can encroach on sovereignty I would argue that
  it is far better for a nation to own their own peace trajectory than to wait until an
  interminable situation is taken to the Security council and out of the hands of
  national ownership
- In saying that, the challenges we face now are making peacebuilding and
  statebuilding a VIABLE SOLUTION
- That does not encroach on sovereignty but enriches each States ability to own its
  own development trajectory, recognize when internal strife could become a
  challenge and intervene appropriately—for these States must have the tools
- The New Deal for engagement in fragile states gave us some of these tools
- I believe Timor-Leste is a case study in accelerated development. We approached
  development with accelerated economic social and fiscal policies while integrating
  inclusivity and transparency
- This did not in any way impede the political currency but enhanced it.
- My biggest fear is that we will once again create a situation where we do not
  address the core of what is prohibitive in reaching the MDG
- And I don’t believe this is what was intended in the Millennium Declaration which
  clearly puts peace as a foundation to global sustainable development.
- And without effective institutions, peace cannot be maintained
- Paul Collier said it best when he said that the single most important conduit to
  peace is the economy, not military spending, not democratization or the almighty
  vote but the economy.
- Money must move, the most vulnerable and disenfranchised must see promise.
  Opportunity must be a viable option—
- So I will continue to be a proponent to peacebuilding and statebuilding—And I urge all
  member states and UN systems to commit to supporting building impenetrable
  bureaucracies that can serve people with the most basic of needs and accelerate
  what we know in Timor-Leste to be achievable.
Lastly I will remind everyone why “war” is on the decrease, internal conflict is on the rise. In 2012 there were 110 internal conflicts. This is not a localized challenge to the “fragile” nations any longer—it is a global challenge that we all must address—

• Setting peace as a conduit to effective global outcomes is in the best interest of not only the developing but also the developed.

• Thankyou

How is a unified and universal agenda focused on sustainable development in a post-2015 era likely to affect the role and relevance of the UN system in global development cooperation?

• The UN is only as relevant as it is effective and applicable—
• The UN is also only relevant in its role to cooperate and not compete
• The UN is a unique body like none other, so should not try to work like others
• It must focus on supporting, not implementing—this is the role of the State
• It must focus on being a conduit for State to State , regional and global participation in capacity building, trade, education, technology...every sector...
• Global integration is the name of the game!
• If the agenda is relevant and is universally not only accepted but adaptable then the UN will be paramount in assisting national planning which not only supports the country locally but through global integration
• But to do this the UN MUST simplify and GO BACK TO BASICS
• We need architectures that anyone can embrace and implement in the most remote place or the most urban city-centralized, country owned and globally endorsed
• The role and relevance of the UN I believe is to provide us all with commonalities that we can utilize IN our planning, and I don’t believe many of these commonalities are systemic yet-. Put the systems in place and practice
• By example, the human development reports are complex in their mathematical equations; I am not sure any developing country can even begin to understand the complexities of equations—this should not be the case— the information then becomes irrelevant
• The GREATEST RELEVANCY THE UN CAN HAVE IS ADDRESSING THE DATA DROUGHT
• Across UN systems at any given time you can find different data on the same country.
• At one point I was looking up some data for Timor-Leste and India’s statistics were put into the model instead of Timor-Leste’s—Can you imagine how confused we were?
• You cannot plan locally or globally without relevant information—
• The UN did a very good job in assisting Timor-Leste with the census
• What we discovered what, where and when to target specific projects then money was better spent targeting particular challenges in different regions
• With this information and ONE plan country owned, fragmentation and duplication of aid can be reduced.
• Global integration is the name of the game post 2015—and the UN is in a very good position to be not only a conduit but a facilitator.

2. How can then system best serve at a time when ODI is rapidly evolving?

• Even though ODI is evolving, evolution should only take place when the foundations are firmly in place—like any institution if expansion goes faster than the stakeholders can manage—the evolution itself becomes ineffective
• I still believe that coordination and effective national management of ODI is a major barrier to progress in development.
• The UN should Focus on being a facilitator and a conduit between and amongst member states
• Embrace a “new globalization”
• By doing this we stop putting countries into BLOCKS and start putting nations into a world
• Stop attempting to do everything and focus on the UN strengths
• The strength IS the Members
• Allow them to lead, follow and assist in supporting their development trajectory
• Be a facilitator and a conduit rather than an implementor
• Streamline facilities and processes and Go BACK TO BASICS-strengthen the basics so Un is a more accessible facility and adaptable to different situations and contexts
• Don’t expand too far outside the mandate until you get the original “harmonization” and “delivering as one” better streamlined

3. What are the greatest challenges to the UN system?

Three MAJOR challenges I CALL:
1) STATE RATING
2) DATA DROUGHT
3) FRAGMENTATION
• I believe the greatest challenge we have is actually redefining our challenges that are no longer just applicable to certain contexts but have become global challenges,
• We call this State Rate...we have virtually become used to “rating states” against and between each other as well as silo-ing them into formal blocks-
• But with the world today State Rate is ineffective-because local problems are now global problems
• They need to be addressed laterally across systems and not in a parallel context-so for instance-while war has decreased...internal conflict has increased as I said earlier in 2012...there were 110 internal conflicts ranging in severity
• -what we used to think is just applicable to the “conflict affected and fragile” is very much applicable to all countries...this was caused by global shocks, economic upheavals, food shortages, austerity measures- all global problems, granted with differing effects
• We need to stop State rating and look at nations as an interactive league in the context of globalization
• if we look at the global cost of violence for instance- it is around the seven trillion dollar mark-these are big dollars wasted in a world that has 20% of its population already in extreme poverty.
• We need to stop siloing or labelling States and begin to work in tandem cross borders, regions and continents and the UN should be the first to facilitate a modern way of working.
• The silo or labelling of States stops progress and becomes a barrier to sustainable development-
• Lastly unless we address the “data drought” we cannot properly do our work –the data drought is our second biggest challenge-
• We are operating on assumptions and we cannot-
• We operate on comparing the incomparable and incompatible and we must stop
• We measure the unmeasurable and accept third party perception as a benchmark but don’t bother to see first hand numbers like-how much will it cost to electrify this nation?
• Let’s change the way we do business and enhance international engagement
• And of course fragmentation is a major problem...
• There are 168 committees, commissions, boards, councils, panels, working groups, programmes, Funds, Bodies, specialized agencies, organizations, related organizations, secretariats, trusts, entities … **If we are going to deliver as one** then we need to go back to the basics—streamline and coordinate because as a minister of a state emerging from conflict after a decade, I can tell you first hand you cannot expect us to navigate and utilize your systems as they stand now, it is so very difficult.

4. **How can accountability and funding within the UN system be improved in a post-2015 era?**

• **Well, ONE** the new deal for engagement in fragile states is clear about some crucial aspects—take risk and manage risk

• If money **Cannot** be executed and quickly where and when needed then there is no point to having global assistance especially in zones affected by global shocks or internal conflict-

• It has been proven economic stimulus is more important than military spending or even democratization—it can be the one thing that provides the difference between war or sustainable development

• **Make** money move and fast where and when it is needed—especially if it the difference between life and death

• **TWO** transparency works both ways...when the UN mission left Timor-Leste we really had very little idea of what was spent, the real term economy was not clear to us—this needs to be fully explored...without this information it is very difficult to plan effectively and the UN needs to provide an example of transparency for its member States

• **THREE** funding cannot be conditional to UN planning it must be transformed into funding for national planning and this must be a priority—ownership is not conditional, it is a sovereign right and we must be conduits for effectiveness—whether that effectiveness translates into western systems or not—we must change our way of thinking about funding and the effectiveness of money because way too much is spent discussing rather than doing

• **FOUR** The UN must stop competing amongst and between for funding...it is apparent to member countries and makes it difficult for us to deal with the UN agencies. There must be rules and regulations that guide this and help member states navigate the vast systems created—and it becomes confusing when you come to us with hat in hand—when the hand is not trusted in the first place.

• **FIVE**—we must stop the inequity amongst and between funding and evaluating peoples worth on where they come from, where they were educated—it send messages of discrimination and in a world where we are promoting equity amongst people, nations and regions—we must create a solid renuneration systems which are fair, equitable and do not alienate but embrace the countries we are in and serve.

• 

**General discussion questions**

1. How can results-orientation in the work of UN entities in countries in transition from relief to development be improved? What can be done to enhance coherence and cohesion among entities of the UN development system and the Secretariat in such country contexts?
Firstly I think the question itself demonstrates the need for a transformational culture shift at the UN.

While strengthening national ownership during the transition process is part A of this question B/C/D/E/and F are focused on building the UN .not the State it serves

The objective is not to strengthen the UN, their capacity, their strategic and operational planning and coordination, or their operational partnerships with other multilateral organizations etc.-

the objective in any country is to build a State- to build the Government – To strengthen THE States capacity, THE States strategic and operational planning and coordination, or the States operational partnerships with other multilateral organizations

AND EVERYTIME THE UN DOES THIS OUTSIDE THE STATE SYSTEM, IT WEAKENS THE STATE ITSELF and creates a cyclical round of dependence and confusion

Part of the problem is that the UN sits outside the Government as its own mini Government-a parallel system which erodes the State’s ability to navigate –because the government not only has to contend with building their own State but coping with a second semi-Government that is bigger than Ben Hur-

And here in lies the problem-sometimes when you think you are helping you are hurting-

This question exemplifies the problem in each State with the UN..State first, UN support-

If we look at TL , up until the day of UN departure , they sat outside our Government building with better internet (if we as a government had it at all) electricity, with newspapers from around the world, with computers, capacity and connectivity.

Often we would be called to leave our buildings to come to yours....this in itself is not conducive to building a State..so we must look at HOW WE DO BUSINESS...and it starts with FOCUS and TRUST...

The New Deal of Engagement for Fragile States is a powerful document that went back to basics and brought simplicity to an otherwise overly complex world of aid that few in country understand, it becomes a burden not a blessing...

So post 2015, we must think local –and provide the support with least resistance easily accessible, easy to navigate , easy to take the hand that you offer without fearing your own will get bitten.

Lastly result-oriented can only be a reality if providing results is mandatory and uniformed-

We never did see a transparent amount or results matrix from our UN mission and while we know they provided much-how do we take any lessons learned if we don’t have the transparency to learn.

Lastly-I want to address something I dub the DATA DROUGHT

If the UN is to be truly helpful, the must address the data drought that stops us as States from planning-

The Timor-Leste Census was a huge success, it was nationally owned with each town and village receiving the information, it was the first comprehensive data from a drought which saw information on our country fragmented between agencies and statistics often manipulated fit for purpose
Lastly we were saddened that after all the reforms, social and fiscal expansionary policies—until 2013 we never did see a human development report reflective of our efforts..consistently information merged from as far back as 2001, 2004 and 2007—giving us little to gauge exactly how we were performing in human development

In the fragile and conflict effected environment when circumstances can change rapidly—it is vital to have an understandable, rapid and contextualized report that does no harm but adds value to the state and it development process

2. How can national ownership of transitional activities be strengthened? What has been the experience with establishing country-led and inclusive mechanisms to coordinate support to national priorities in countries in transition from relief to development? What are the main challenges in this regard?

The main challenges are

1. Lack of institutions
2. Lack of capacity
3. Lack of training
4. Lack of coordination to support one and two

If I look at my own Ministry the reforms have been miraculous, nationally owned within their own understanding and ability. We had a Ministry where people had no understanding of what they were actually doing, trying to navigate a language they did not know-English and without an education-One of my director generals is proud to have received his equivalent 8th grade certificate and when I began average math proficiency was at a third grade level.

If this is the reality then you must not bi-pass this reality but confront it head on

You must not take the capacity we do have for UN programming but instead support the Statebuilding process inside the system

You cannot sit outside the system and claim you are capacity building or have meetings ABOUT the country WITHOUT any country members in them

Ownership means accelerated institution building of the State, not the aid organization

Ownership means accelerated capacity side by side not across the street

Ownership means training should be at the forefront and each time an advisor comes in and does the job instead of supports the job, we are weakened, dollars are wasted and the State is burdened with a parallel track which eventually ends in a road never travelled

I understand many times this process cannot happen in the immediate but the time to start is at the onset not after confusion and mayhem between and amongst aid and donors begins and we, who run a country have to deal with not only you but our own national capacity confused at the unnatural and irrelevancy of the process
Now we had a very strong process set up from the beginning—we had yearlong reviews and every project had to fit into those—

Donors wanted to see a long term plan but emerging from conflict you are in reactionary mode not planning mode—it took us five years to get to the point we could start long term planning

When we did do the SDP strategic development Plan, we were ready, peace had been restored and national consultation could lead to a national vision—but this cannot be hurried and we must work to the pace and context of the nation

3. How can cooperation between the UN system and other multilateral organizations in such country contexts be strengthened?

It can only be strengthened through the institutional capacity of the country itself—with ownership from the States, projects and alignment don’t happen—there is simply no way to bypass this and deem a successful conclusion

I can’t tell you how difficult it is for us to navigate competing agendas and even compatible agendas; each donor or organization comes in with THEIR plan and we are meant to tailor our Government to it—it is simply not feasible

We cannot believe that if we don’t centralize this operation within the state system we will succeed and even if we are able to make small successes the end game is still institutional weakness. This coordination must firmly be in the hands of national ownership. And all efforts must be made to create that effective system of centralizing aid and coordination-

I have to say in some of the G7+ countries I have visited as chair I have been shocked at the complacency of donors and organizations who meet outside the system and without Government leaders; this must not be allowed to continue—no matter how difficult the conditions and trust me no one understands more how difficult these conditions can be. But ownership means coordination by the State and for the State and as I have said before if this is undoable then it is better to not do the work then to do it under conditions which ultimately will do more harm than good-

If countries don’t cooperate then they will if you up and leave…but someone must give…and sadly it must be you first.