Mr. Chairman,
Excellencies and Distinguished Delegates,

I would like to brief you now on our preparations for the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) Mid-term Review.

You may recall that in paragraph 21 of resolution 21/2 on the MTSIP, the Governing Council requested the Executive Director, in collaboration with the CPR, to conduct a mid-term review of the MTSIP and to present the results of that review to the Governing Council at its 23rd Session.

As discussed under the previous agenda item, the CPR endorsed the Secretariat’s proposal to carry out a peer review covering the whole first two-year phase, which is from 2008 to 2009, plus the first quarter of 2010. The mid-term review would have covered the same period, given the time that would have been needed to prepare, discuss and submit the report to the 23rd Session of the Governing Council.

I would also like to draw your attention to the Terms of Reference of the Peer Review, which are attached as annex 1 to the Peer Review Report contained in document HSP/CPR/38/9. The Peer Review assessed both institutional and programmatic aspects of the MTSIP. The purpose, scope and focus of the Peer Review are broadly similar to what the mid-term review would have covered.

As you may be aware, the MTSIP is being implemented in phases. The first phase, 2008 to 2009, focused more on institutional reforms in order to build a foundation for programme delivery in the next phases. For this reason, it was expected that an assessment of the MTSIP in its first phase would pay particular attention to institutional aspects. The Peer Review has adequately addressed institutional aspects.

However, the Peer Review also assessed the strategic and programmatic focus of all MTSIP focus areas. I am happy that the report recommends, in para. 257, that programmatic aspects of the MTSIP should receive more attention, such as setting priorities in the work programme and budget, to create a more strategic UN-Habitat, while continuing with institutional reforms. The Peer Review also made specific recommendations with regard to the content of the focus area policy papers.

Distinguished Delegates,

The Peer Review followed an extensive participatory and consultative process, involving the CPR, UN peers and Habitat Agenda partners. The review was facilitated by professional evaluators. This participatory approach was useful, taking advantage of panel members with experience in formulating and implementing strategic plans similar to the MTSIP, and at the same time adhering to core principles of evaluation.

The Peer Review Report raises a number of important issues relevant to achieving MTSIP results. The 19 recommendations provided vary in nature. The Secretariat realizes the need for serious reflection on these recommendations, leading to the formulation of a realistic management response and action plan.

One of the lessons highlighted in paragraph 272, page 65, of the Peer Review Report is that major reviews at the organizational level are complex, involve multiple stakeholders, varied
sources of information and therefore require considerable time and resources. The Panel proposes that such reviews should not be undertaken annually.

We need, however, to ensure procedural and substantive compliance with decisions of the Governing Council. This is why the Secretariat needs to urgently proceed with the preparation of a management response and action plan, which will be discussed with the CPR Working Group. It is intended that these discussions will determine whether the Peer Review, together with the management response and action plan, could serve the purpose of a mid-term review to be presented to the twenty-third session of the Governing Council.

Excellencies,

We would be grateful for you guidance on this matter.

Thank you for your attention.