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Distinguished Colleagues,
Members of the Secretariat,

On behalf of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) Bureau, I am honoured to report you on the activities of the works of the CPR Working Groups towards the 23rd Session of the Governing Council. There was a total of 5 Working Groups, which met for a total of 22 times. Please allow me to introduce the work of each Working Groups.

1. The Working Group on Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP)

The 23rd Session of the Governing Council in its Resolution 22/7(7), called upon “the Executive Director to report, using a results-based framework, on a half-yearly basis on progress made, challenges encountered, foreseeable issues and next steps in the implementation of the medium-term strategic and institutional plan to Governments through the Committee of Permanent Representatives and to the Governing Council at its twenty-third session.” Similarly, in Resolution 22/7 (8) the Governing Council also called upon the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to conduct a midterm review of the medium-term strategic and institutional plan and to present the results to the Governing Council at its twenty-third session.

These meetings were chaired by Mr. Sergey V. Trepelkov of Russian Federation, and met four times. The Objective of this Working Group is to discuss the Draft MTSIP Peer Review Report, which is to be presented at the 39th CPR Regular Session. Members noted that the Secretariat accepted most of the recommendations and was already implementing some of them. They also noted that the Secretariat was seeking donor support for the implementation of some aspects of the report because of the financial implications. The Secretariat took note of members’ questions regarding the “partially accepted” recommendations and why the acceptance was only partial.

The Working Group noted the report that the MTSIP had forced Divisions and Sections in UN-Habitat to work together and that this matrix approach would be strengthened. The Working Group noted the fact that the report was good, fair, open and honest.


In its Resolution 22/7(9) the Governing Council requested the Executive Director, in keeping with resolution 21/10 of the Governing Council, to continue the implementation of the experimental reimbursable seeding operations and other innovative financial mechanisms and to commission an external evaluation to assess the progress of the implementation of these activities, building on paragraphs 7 (g) and 7 (i) of the said resolution and the principles contained in paragraph 6.36 of the operational procedures and guidelines for the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation experimental reimbursable seeding operations as endorsed by the Committee of Permanent Representatives on 3 April 2008.

This Working Group was also chaired by Mr. Bruno Garcia-Dobarco Gonzalez of Spain. It held three meetings. The objective of this Working Group is to receive updates on the Experimental Reimbursable Seeding Operations (ERSO) and the Slum Upgrading Facilities (SUF) Programmes. Working Group observed that a lot of what was intended for ERSO had been accomplished, therefore,
the Working Group would welcome proposals from the Secretariat on how to best implement lessons learned from ERSO following receipt of the external evaluation.

Working Group called for the strengthening of the financial rules to accommodate ERSO and proposals on how ERSO and SUF initiatives might be aligned. Working Group also wanted to know how ERSO would feature in the budget. Some members suggested that ERSO should be in the budget so that there would be no problem of continuity, in the event that the Governing Council in April 2011 approves ongoing support of UN-Habitat for partnership or other support of slum upgrading and low income housing investments.

3. Working Group on Preparations for the 23rd Session of the Governing Council (GC23)

This Working Group was set up to plan and prepare for the 23rd Session of the Governing Council, and chaired by myself and Mr. Sergey V. Trepelkov of Russian Federation. This year, the Working Group on Preparations for GC23 met three times and discussed the various aspects of our preparation for the GC23 including the proposed theme for the GC23. Members noted that the approved theme for GC23 is: “Sustainable Urban Development through Expanding Equitable Access to Land, Housing, Basic Services and Infrastructure.” This theme was approved by the President of the Governing Council in consultation with the Bureau of Governing Council. Another issue raised during the meeting was a proposal to shorten GC23 meeting from 5 to 4 days. Members also proposed that on 15 April 2011, the Governing Council should close in the morning to allow Muslim colleagues time to pray. Members also proposed that a Ministerial meeting could be held during the session of WUF to compensate for the reduction in the duration.


The 22nd Session of the Governing Council in its Resolution 22/10 (2), requested the Executive Director, in consultation with the Committee of Permanent Representatives, to carry out an early lessons-learned review of all previous sessions of the World Urban Forum to be submitted to the Committee prior to its September 2009 session, drawing on their respective evaluations. This is with a view to improving the planning, organization and effectiveness of future sessions.

Consequently, the objectives of this Working Group are to receive and discuss the Management Response to: a) Evaluation Report of WUF5; and b) Management Response on the review of the first four sessions of WUF 2002-2008. The meetings of this Working Group were also chaired by myself and Mr. Bruno Garcia-Dobarco Gonzalez of Spain. The highlights of its decisions were that its members expressed satisfaction on the acceptance by management that future WUF sessions be planned using the RBM model. They called for the strengthening of the WUF and its process.

Members also received the Evaluation Report of the 5th Session of the World Urban Forum (WUF5). We also discussed the main findings and recommendation from WUF5, the purpose being to improve the planning, organizing, and managing of future WUF sessions. There was a general feeling that the evaluation of the 5th session was good and a positive reflection on the organisation.

Members called for inclusiveness in the preparation for WUF and in that respect suggested that the theme of WUF is selected through consultation within the Secretariat, with the host country and with
the CPR. The concept paper for WUF6 theme is being developed. It also noted that the working theme for WUF6 is “Prosperity for Cities: Balancing Ecology, Economy and Equity” and that it is related to Rio + 20. The next edition of “The State of World Cities Report” also incorporates the proposed WUF6 theme. The Group recommended that UNHABITAT finds means and strategies to implement the recommendations that were only partially accepted because of financial implications.

5. The Working Group on Work Programme and Budget 2012-2013

These meetings of this Working Group were chaired by Mr. Tse Hou Hew of Malaysia and Mr. Sergey V. Trepelkov of the Russian Federation. A total of eight meetings were held, 6 formal and 2 informal sessions. The objective was to review and discuss the Draft Work Programme and Budget for 2012-2013.

The Secretariat informed the CPR Working Group that the strategic framework for 2012-2013 was endorsed by the Committee on Programme and Coordination (CPC) and copies of the approved document and the report of the CPC were distributed. Members were informed about the on-going process of preparing the biennial work programme and budget, including its alignment to the six-year medium-term strategic and institutional plan (MTSIP), as well as the timelines of the budgetary process. The Secretariat also outlined the three main sources of funding for UN-Habitat and showed the revised income and expenditures for 2010-2011, as well as the projected income and proposed expenditure for 2012-2013. The Working Group was also informed of the proposed distribution of resources by focus area and the summary distribution of posts by source of funding.

The Members were informed of the delay in submitting the work programme and budget document in order to give the new Executive Director time to review the document and provide his own vision. The Executive Director later addressed the Members following the distribution of the document. During the meeting, the Executive Director briefly articulated his vision and some areas that he would like to place more emphasis on. He explained to the Working Group that he would require more time to study the organization before determining which areas required further strengthening. He also informed the Members that an organizational review was going to be undertaken and that the outcome of that process would inform the process of organizational realignment. For this he requested that he be allowed a special allocation of US$5.9 million which would be used to implement the recommendations of the organizational review and the Executive Director’s priorities.

The Working Group reviewed the work programme first and sought clarification on the results chain, prioritization, qualitative indicators and performance measures. The Members also sought information on how internal and external partners worked together in implementing the work programme, inclusion of information on the options for the experimental reimbursable seeding operation (ERSO) programme, substantive reflection of World Urban Forum (WUF) in the document, including information on strengthening of the WUF Coordination. The Secretariat provided responses, amended the document in line with the recommendations, and provided additional information through footnotes and annexes.

During the review of the budget, the Working Group raised a number of issues, including clarification on how the US$ 5.9 million would be used. Clarification was provided that of the US$5.9 million, US$3.9 million would be used to implement the recommendations of the organizational review and US$2.0 million for the four priority areas that had been highlighted. The Working Group
recommended that these amounts be incorporated within the appropriate divisions in the work
programme and budget document.

In view of the time constraint, at the last meeting of 8th December, it was agreed that final additions
and changes would be incorporated into the document and circulated electronically. The revised
document is now before the CPR for its consideration.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Working Group for their diligence
and commitment to the review process.

I thank you for your attention.