

# Report

## on the workshop of the National Focal Points on the Implementation of the Programme of Action For The Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010

18 July 2005, UN, New York, Conference Room 3

1. The one-day workshop for the National Focal Points of the Least Developed Countries on the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade of 2001-2010 was organized on 18 July 2005 in New York by the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States in conjunction with the annual review of the implementation of the Programme in the general segment of the Economic and Social Council under item 6 (b) of the agenda at its 2005 substantive session.

2. The main objective of the workshop was to continue the process of building national capacity for the effective follow-up, implementation, monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted at the Third United Nations Conference on the LDCs held in May 2001 in Brussels. Other objectives included the briefing of participants on recent activities of the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLLS), providing guidance for the national preparations for 2006 comprehensive review of the implementations of the Programme of Action in the General Assembly and serving as a forum for the exchange of national experience in the implementation of the Brussels Programme.

3. These objectives were emphasized in the opening statement of **Ms. Harriet Schmidt**, Director of the UN-OHRLLS who explained that it were the objectives that had determined the structure of the workshop. Accordingly, the workshop consisted of three main parts. Part I included the briefing of the National Focal Points by the High Representative on the mandate and work of the UN-OHRLLS and its role in the preparations for the 2006 comprehensive review of the Brussels Programme, as well as the presentation on the national review of the Brussels Programme, with special emphasis on the role of the National Focal Points and national forums in the review process at the country level and in preparations of national inputs to the regional and global reviews. Part II of the workshop included the panel discussion on national implementation of the Brussels Programme and provided opportunity for sharing national experience, lessons learned and best practices. Part III, jointly prepared by the UN-OHRLLS and UNDP aimed at discussion of challenges and opportunities in good governance in LDCs.

4. **Mr. Ossou Edouard Aho-Glele**, Chairman of the LDC Group Coordination Bureau in Benin, very warmly welcomed the participants of the workshop. He emphasized the importance of the workshop held one day prior to the session of ECOSOC that would undertake the annual review of the implementation of the Brussels Programme in its general segment, by providing the opportunity for the exchange of views and

harmonizing common position of the national focal points of the LDCs. He further emphasized the importance of result-orientation and called on the participants to work towards achieving tangible, quantifiable, and measurable results in their home countries while implementing the Brussels Programme. He said that they should keep questioning themselves, if they had really achieved good results since 2001. If not, they should discuss how they could catch up and what further measures all responsible actors involved need to adopt in the process ahead. In this regard, Mr. Ossou Edouard Aho-Glele mentioned some positive results achieved in some areas along the way. Thus, the LDC-specific (0,15-0,20) GNI/ODA goals were reached in 2003 by Norway (0.36%), Belgium (0.35%), Denmark (0.32%), Sweden (0.27%), the Netherlands (0.26%), Ireland (0.21%), and France (0.17%). However, while discussing commitment 7 of the Brussels Programme the question needed to be asked, what further commitments were lying ahead?

5. In his opening remarks to the participants of the workshop, **Mr. Anwarul K. Chowdhury**, Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, welcomed the participants and outlined the mandate of UN-OHRLLS with regard to the LDCs : 1) promoting and advocating for the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action, 2) mobilizing international support for the Programme, and 3) monitoring and reporting on its implementation to ECOSOC and the General Assembly. He mentioned that advocacy was a not an easy task because LDCs are marginalized in the international attention.

6. Nonetheless, some positive steps have taken place during the last year. Thus, ODA to LDCs has increased by 17 % between 2003 and 2004. In this regard, he commended those countries that had already reached their commitments and assured that he would keep reminding other donor countries of the 0.15%-0.20% GNI/ODA by 2015. He also mentioned progress achieved this year on external debt of the LDCs. In this regard, he mentioned the decision of G8 adopted at their summit in Gleneagles, Scotland on cancellation of debt to 18 HIPC countries, including, 13 LDCs. Other positive results mentioned by Mr. Chowdhury were references to the LDCs in the outcome documents of the G8 2005 Summit and a new focus on Africa.

7. On the 2006 comprehensive review of the Brussels Programme he stressed that the review process would become an important step towards reaching the goals of the Programme. Preparations would take place on three levels. The broad-based and inclusive review of the implementation of the Brussels Programme at the national level should conclude by the preparations of a brief (not more than 10 pages) report summarizing the progress on the implementation. These national reports would serve as inputs to the regional meetings to be convened in March 2006 by ECA in Addis Ababa, ESCAP in Bangkok and regional meetings of ECLAC for Haiti and ESCWA for Yemen. The outcomes of all regional reviews will feed into the comprehensive review at the global level by the 61<sup>st</sup> session of the General Assembly, hopefully, during a 2-day plenary meeting.

In conclusion Mr. Chowdhury expansive a great potential of South-South cooperation, in particular in the areas of trade and market access and technical cooperation, for the implementation of the Brussels Programme and achieving its goals.

8. **Mrs. Zamira Eshmambetova**, Senior Programme Officer, UN-OHRLLS focused in her presentation on the review of the Brussels Programme at the country level and the role of the national focal points and national forum in the preparations for the 2006 comprehensive review. She emphasized that the Brussels Program of Action was a comprehensive poverty reduction strategy tailored to the special needs of the least developed countries. It was designed as a framework for partnership between the LDCs and their development partners and was based on mutual commitments of the LDCs and their development partners in seven interlinked areas: 1. the fostering of a people-centered policy framework, which implies that poor people are the most active agents and beneficiaries of growth, 2. good governance at national and international levels, 3. building human and institutional capacities, 4. building productive capacities to make globalization work for LDCs, 5. enhancing the role of trade in development, 6. reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment, as well as, 7. the mobilization of financial resources.

9. It includes 30 international development goals including almost all MDGs and has 10 cross-cutting issues: poverty eradication, gender equality, employment, governance at national and international levels, capacity-building, sustainable development, special problems of landlocked and small island LDCs, and challenges faced by LDCs affected by conflict.

10. The follow-up and implementation of the Programme is a three-tier process (national, regional/subregional and global) and is guided by 5 key principles. The first principle is that of an integrated approach that implies a holistic, comprehensive, coherent, coordinated and long-term approach that takes into account all aspects of development including economic, social and environmental. The second principle is that of genuine partnership between LDCs and their development partners and implies the involvement of all stakeholders including governments, citizens of society, the private sector, academia, and NGOs in the follow-up, implementation, monitoring and review of the implementation at the national, regional, sub-regional and global levels. The third principle of country ownership recognizes that the primary responsibility for the development in LDCs lies with the LDCs themselves. They have to ensure country-led development and donors should align their assistance to the national priorities of the LDCs. The fourth principle of market consideration states that a stable economic and legal framework for the operation of the market and the promotion of public-private partnership is to be followed. The fifth principle of result orientation recognizes that only positive outcomes can sustain public support and that the progress in the implementation of the programme will be judged by the progress on the targets and on actual graduation from the LDCs.

11. The overarching objective of the program is to halve the number of people living in extreme poverty and hunger. Achieving this objective requires growth that is fast (at least

7% of annual GDP), sustained and inclusive. It also requires export-led growth. In this regard, Mrs. Eshmambetova mentioned that relationship between growth and poverty in the LDCs has never been either automatic or straightforward. She referred to the 2004 UNCTAD report that analyses 51 cases of export growth in the LDCs during the periods 1990-1995 and 1995-2000 and singles out three types of trade-poverty in the LDCs:

- a) a virtuous trade effect, where average private consumption per capita is rising along with export growth (22 from 51 cases)
- b) a impoverishing trade effect, where average private consumption per capita is falling along with export growth (11 from 51 cases)
- c) an ambiguous trade effect where there is no clear trend in average private consumption per capita along with export growth (29 from 51 cases).

The three major reasons for that are: a) lack of human, institutional and productive capabilities of the LDCs; b) weak investment-export nexus and balance-of-payment constraints and c) enclave-led growth, a form of growth that is concentrated in a small part of economy, both geographical and sectorally, without forward and backward links to the rest of the economy.

12. Among other challenges faced by the LDCs, Ms. Eshmambetova mentioned the demographic challenge. The population of the LDCs grows at the annual rate of 2.4 per cent. It has reached 759 million people in 2005 and will increase up to 951 million in 2015 and 1.7 billion in 2050. Between 2005 and 2050 population will at least triple in 11 LDCs (Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Chad, the DRC, Timor-Leste, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger and Uganda). Weak infrastructure is one of the major obstacles in the LDCs development. Its role on trade, delivery of social services, social integration and rural development is fundamental. Currently, the average length of roads in the LDCs is only 25 centimeters as compared to 1 m per person in developing countries. The dependence of the LDCs on primary export commodities and vulnerability to external shocks is another challenge.

13. Given these specific constraints and special needs of the LDCs in development the Brussels Programme includes goals on growth and transport infrastructure, in addition to other international development goals, including these contained in the Millennium Declaration. In this regard, Ms. Eshmambetova emphasized a crucial of goals in result-oriented planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Brussels Programme. She said that time bound and measurable goals provide benchmarks for measuring progress, they serve an effective means for planning, policy making and institutional reforms as well an investment framework for the mobilization of domestic and external resources. They also ensure transparency, accountability, and result orientation. Furthermore, they mobilize national and international partners into action and help forge partnerships and alliances.

14. With regard to result-orientation, Ms. Eshmambetova presented a matrix that could serve as an effective tool for results-based monitoring and reporting of the implementation of the Programme, both at the national and global level. The results

matrix reflects both the progress on mutual commitments of the LDCs and their development partners in seven interlinked areas and their progress on all 30 development goals agreed at LDC III. Under the outcomes it should list policies and measures adopted by the LDCs and their development partners and under impact it should show the progress of the LDCs and their development partners on goals. Both outcomes and impact are at the top of the results chain in the result-orientation (inputs-activities-outputs-outcomes-impact-goals/objective). Hence, the name of the matrix is a results matrix. Additionally the matrix has a separate column for comments on the obstacles, constrains accounted, further actions needed, role of various relevant stake holders in the implementation of the Programme, lessons learned, best practice, etc. The matrix is complemented by the guidelines for reporting on the implementation of the Brussels Programme.

15. Further, Ms. Eshmambetova spoke on the role of the national focal point in the comprehensive review of the national implementation, which had to organize an open and transparent review of the implementation of the Programme at the country level in the broad based and inclusive national forums and prepare a results-oriented national report based on the outcomes of those reviews. Ms. Eshmambetova reiterated that the review ought to focus on implementation: on progress, obstacles and constraints and further actions. The outcomes of the national reviews would then feed into the regional reviews and, finally, into the global review.

16. In the discussion that followed, the representative from **Nepal** drew attention to the fact that many LDCs were facing immense difficulties in the national development process due to civil unrest and the on-going difficulties with the international economic and trading system. He also stressed the importance of the mobilization of the focal points in permanent missions in New York for the success of the implementation process of the Brussels Programme. The National Focal Point of **Senegal** gave a quick overview of the implementation of the Brussels country in his country. He also informed that three days before the workshop Senegal held a national seminar with participation of 50 representatives from government, civil society, NGOs as well as members of the Parliaments and local elected officials. The seminar was highly successful in achieving its goals, particularly in identifying challenges faced in the national implementation, as well as responses to them. He emphasized the importance of the ECOSOC documents, the Secretary General's report and the previous UN-OHRLLS workshop in ensuring the success of that seminar. In his view, one of the major impediments to national implementation of the Brussels Programme was lack of staff and expertise for the managing of the implementation of the Programme. He also stated that the reporting format for national implementation should also include progress on goals. He added that measuring progress in key to proper monitoring.

17. The National Focal Point of **Ethiopia** drew attention to the fact that certain goals such as the one on transport infrastructure were not specified in the Brussels Programme the way they could be monitored. The National Focal Point of **Burkina Faso** emphasized that measuring progress was a major challenge for the LDCs due to the lack of statistical data. He also proposed an increasing sectoral commitment of ODA. The National Focal

Point from **Sierra Leone** proposed that more detailed guidelines would be needed for monitoring progress on the Programme of Action.

18. In response to the issues raised by the National Focal Point of Senegal the High Representative proposed to hold a further dialogue on the specific needs of the LDCs in the follow-up and implementation at the country level and to work closely with UN country teams that could and should provide technical and logistical assistance in the implementation efforts of the LDCs. He also mentioned the lower turn out of the National Focal Points for the second UN-OHRLLS workshop and urged them to make the best use of the offer of UN-OHRLLS to provide assistance to the LDCs in their efforts to implement the Brussels Programme. With regard to sectoral commitment of ODA to the LDCs the High Representative responded that the World Bank, the UN Statistics Division and the OECD, would be able to provide this statistics. He agreed on the importance of transport infrastructure for the LDCs development, in particularly for rural development, access to social services and local markets and informed about the latest work of the World Bank in this areas.

19. In concluding, Ms. Eshmambetova emphasized that it was very important in the implementation of the Brussels Programme to take into account general special needs of the LDCs, particular needs of the groupings of the LDCs (landlocked, small island, post conflict), including those of regional/subregional (African, Asian, etc.) groupings and country-specific needs. Brussels Programme provides only a general framework. It further needs to be tailored to the specific needs of a country. In other words, it is not a “one-size-fits-all” Programme. It needs to be localized, put in the specific development context of a given country. It also needs to be anchored in poverty reduction strategies and linked to the long term development strategies of the country, to ensure its sustained growth and sustainable development. Finally, macroeconomic strategies should be coherent with sectoral development strategies and both should aim at achieving the goals of the Brussels Programme.

20. The afternoon session opened with a panel discussion on the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001- 2010 on the country level. The main objective of the panel was to take stock of the progress in the implementation of the Brussels Programme at the country level since the last workshop hosted by OHRLLS. **Mr. Oman Noman, Senior Advisor to the Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific, UNDP** served as a moderator for the panel that included **Mrs. Abie E. Kamara, National Focal Point of Sierra Leone and Mr. Adama Dieye, National Focal Point of Senegal.**

21. In her presentation, Mrs. Abie Kamara gave an overview of the implementation of the Brussels Programme at the national level, including a short country background, overview of the progress made on various commitments, challenges, recommendations as well as the linkages between the PRSP and the Brussels Programme. She mentioned that the PRSP of Sierra Leone has three pillars: 1) good governance, security and peace building, 2) prosperous and sustainable growth in a healthy macroeconomic environment, 3) human resources development. There are also cross-cutting issues to support the

various pillars including youth, gender, HIV, the environment, etc. Over the past five years, Sierra Leone has experienced an average annual GDP growth of about 5%. Efficiency in the public sector is improving, due to the introduction of new measures such as an Anti-Money-Laundering Act and an Anti-Corruption Commission. There has been an increased focus on the social sector with success measured by a decrease in the infant mortality rate. Additionally Sierra Leone has introduced a national policy on gender development, mainstreamed gender and child issues in the PRSP, established the HIV/AIDS secretariat and focused on improving its infrastructure.

22. Mr. Adama Dieye of Senegal stated that in order to achieve a people-centered approach, his country had introduced a framework for policy that hinged on the PRSP and took into account the Brussels commitments. As a result, the GDP grew at the rate of 6, 9 % in 2003 and 6, 2 % in 2004 respectively, with investments reaching 22%, just a little short of the target of 25%. Senegal also started a process of decentralization and introduced a sound governance programme. It accorded high priority to education and health and saw improvements in school enrollment, child mortality and other sectors. Senegal was determined to fulfill its commitments under the Brussels Programme. A question it faced was how to expand the capacities for absorbing more resources. Improving the infrastructure will enable Senegal to mobilize and absorb more resources.

23. Their presentations were followed by discussion. Thus, National Focal Point of **Tanzania** mentioned in his statement that the greatest challenge faced by Tanzania was how to translate growth into poverty reduction over the coming years. Other challenges include the high reliance of the Tanzania's economy on agriculture as well as market access of agriculture produces in developed countries. The National Focal Point of the **Central African Republic** focused on methodological issues and stated that indicator based monitoring of the implementation of the Brussels Programme should be robust and comparable. The National Focal Point of **Cape Verde** emphasized that one needs to coordinate actions at the country level, to turn the programme in reality.

24. On the issue of statistics raised by the National Focal Point of CAR Mrs. Kamara of Sierra Leone said that the national census helped them not only to collect necessary information but also in monitoring progress in development. As for coordination, it was the National Forum of Sierra-Leone that coordinated efforts of all stakeholders in her country. Mr. Adama Dieye of Senegal emphasized a large convergence between the MDGs and Brussels Programme. The Chair concluded the discussion by saying that the Brussels Programme of Action was a holistic programme which required an integrated approach of all stakeholders involved.

25. In her opening remarks to the segment on **Governance in LDCs: Challenges and Opportunities**, Mrs. Zahra Nuru, UN-OHRLLS stressed that it aimed at providing a forum for discussion and sharing best practices on good governance among the LDCs.

26. Ms. Gita Welch, DGG/UNDP addressed the issue of governance in the context of the report the UNDP was preparing on the challenges of governance. She said it was more important, however, to hear from the LDCs about the lessons learned in their own

countries. She went by saying that UNDP had 135 country offices around the globe and ongoing programmes in 166 countries. In this regard, it considers interaction between the countries' officials and the agency as an essential part of its work. The UNDP works on various themes and governance is one of them. Governance in countries emerging from conflicts is also crucial but the issue of governance must be looked at in a different angle in such cases.

She then spoke in more practical terms and said that what the UNDP might need to provide to countries was multi task teams which have different expertise. She said that in governance, the UNDP works the following areas:

- (i) Parliaments
- (ii) Elections
- (iii) Justice and human rights (Rule of law)
- (iv) E - Governance ( and how it can support public administrative reform)
- (v) Local governance (many countries go through decentralisation without decentralising corruption).

27. By referring to the UNDP report under preparation on challenges of governance, Mrs. Welch said that the UNDP would need the input of the LDCs. The UNDP would need to know the specific issues that were relevant to LDCs in strengthening their governance. In all 50 LDCs, UNDP country offices had been searching for this type of information so as to provide an appropriate response.

28. She then started a Questions and Answers session with Focal Points:

- (i) How governments puts in place processes / systems to interact with their own citizens, to protect their rights, to provide the basic social services, to fight against poverty, diseases (HIV/AIDS), etc?
- (ii) How has good governance at international and national level enabled the reduction of human poverty, protection of human rights, and inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable groups?
- (iii) What are the lessons learnt, the good practices, recommendations for the LDCs?
- (iv) What kind of national leadership roles can promote good governance?

**29. Mr. Alphonse Mekolo, UNDESA** started his speech by bringing to the attention of the workshop the fact that governance was controversial at times and had to be properly understood. He defined governance, in practical terms, as action oriented tools to achieve objectives. However, he said that governance differs from management in that governance is not about overcoming obstacles but instead viewing challenges as opportunities.

30. He then described how governance could be viewed through the following aspects:

1. Governance is a set of dynamic factors which must be managed by the leader (the person who is in charge). Therefore, there is a need for a system of leadership based on a vision, e.g. on health, trade.
2. Governance requires leadership where it is essential to have standards and norms to be set up by the country which must be translated into actions,
3. Governance is also a matter of principles, set of rules where the rule of law must be respected
4. Governance requires action, “performance”. Productivity in different institutions is crucial, thus the importance of capacity strengthening.

30. Mr Mekolo emphasised that governance was more than mere management. To make people more productive, he said the LDCs must also strengthen education system. Given that good governance is related to challenges and opportunities, it must be jointly analysed to identify what are the strengths and weaknesses. As regards to opportunities, many things can be seen as such and the countries must be prepared and ready to make the best of it, for example through the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and debt reduction appeals of the LDCs. He concluded by making a recommendation to all LDCs to take actions individually or in concert, in good governance, so as to achieve the MDGs.

31. He further explained that the UNDESA has 5 axes around which its actions revolve:

1. Country led actions where the UNDESA gives support and counselling in governance. In this project, it works closely with governments at their request and it does not initiate actions on its own since all reforms must be country owned and led, in accordance with the key principle of country ownership of the Brussels Programme. Countries currently benefiting from this support are Togo, Djibouti, Mauritania, and Burkina Faso.
2. Studies, surveys, documentation which are made available to the LDCs in the field of good governance, including in sensitive areas such as post conflict situations.
3. A dialogue within the UN focussed on the exchange of experience among the development partners on the international or the national levels. A global forum on good governance under a specific theme. Last year global forum’s theme was “A New Way of Managing the State”.
4. Development of innovative forms of public administration, through a programme called “PRIM Programme”, which allocates awards to innovative ways in public administration. They are awarded every year to the countries that seek innovations and improvement of their public administration.

5. Development of three management and governance tools, namely (i) Public administration network, (ii) Inventory of governance in Africa (website bringing together all governance initiative taken in Africa, and (iii) Innovations in the Mediterranean area (INOFMED).

32. In the discussion that followed a representative of **Senegal** said the issue of good governance is marred by complexity. He referred to different aspects of governance such as leadership, the difficulty to evaluate good governance in qualitative or quantitative terms, and the difficulty to measure the impact of good governance, for example on economic growth. He said that perhaps there needs to be a hierarchy of priorities for the LDCs and that good governance may not be at the top of that list. A representative of **Haiti** said that too much attention was given to the public sector and the role of the private sector and the civil society in contributing to good governance was overlooked in the presentation.

33. **Mr. Alessandro Motter, IPU** said that his organisation focused on a parliament as a key instrument of democracy and governance. He acknowledged that although parliaments are not a sufficient condition for good governance and development, they are still a necessary condition. He said that a well functioning and representative parliament can ensure that all actors and partners work in a consultative way. Parliaments lay down the legal framework of the governance of the society and ensure accountability and good management where there is representation of the people. Parliaments also ensure that the interests of all segments of society are articulated in policies and action. However, he noted that in LDCs that was not the case. Therefore, the IPU with the support of the UNDP runs a technical cooperation programme aimed at strengthening parliaments and harnessing resources for development in emerging democracies.

34. He further mentioned the 4 areas of attention of that Technical Cooperation Programme:

1. Building and strengthening existing parliamentary capacities by training MPs, providing advisory services (e.g. in Equatorial Guinea).
2. Helping parliaments to create a system known to the people (e.g. in Afghanistan)
3. Providing basic parliamentary tools
4. Budget process
5. Gender equality

35. Mr Motter went on by describing the challenges faced by the LDCs in good governance:

- Relationship between the executive and the legislative remains weak. The parliaments often play a rubber stamping role. The relationship between parliamentary oppositions and the government needs to be better articulated.
- Interface between the parliament and their constituents must be improved.

- Parliaments must acknowledge the importance of civil society organisations
- In post conflict situations, parliamentary institutions are non existent, therefore there is a need to provide comprehensive plan of parliamentary assistance.
- Aggravation of the age of globalisation and supra- national decisions that affect the LDCs.

**36. Kadmiel Wekwete, UNCDF** spoke mainly about the importance of involving the local population and local government in the discussion (local participation / elections). When moving from upper level down to the lower level, governance must address what affects people in their everyday lives, e.g. access to water, access to services. Governance at this level must be also connected to economic issues and there must be more integration between the two. He said that in terms of model, local governance was seen as part of local development (local economic development). When established, the UNCDF was meant for capital assistance for the LDCs but since then it shifted its model (besides setting up infrastructure) to create a local governance capacity for planning and investment that create a holistic framework for development.

**37. Ejeviome Eloho Otobo, OSAA** said that political governance, economic governance and corporate governance are inextricably related. Political governance has a direct impact on economic governance, which in turn affects corporate governance, and as production occurs at the corporate level, this level, should not be neglected.

38. He further explained that there are 5 attributes to governance:

- (i) Transparency,
- (ii) Rule of law
- (iii) Accountability
- (iv) Predictability, and
- (v) Participation where the governance at the local level can involve key actors.

39. The challenge for LDCs is to have a technical expertise in the corporate sector, which needs:

- (i) Strong regulatory processes
- (ii) Institutions to regulate the private sector
- (iii) Parliament and funding of the institutions

**40. Mr. Alphonse Mekolo, UNDESA** reminded the workshop participants about the report on governance which was under preparation and invited them to contribute to the justification and content of the report. Referring to Commitment 2 in the Brussels Programme he said that it is important for good governance to produce data and enable result monitoring. He also said that human and institutional capacity cannot be realised without good governance at the national level. Good governance is also relevant in the

area of poverty reduction, trade and development, and protecting the environment. At the international level, he said that Commitment 2 of the Brussels Programme refers to the following:

- (i) Transparency
- (ii) Accountability
- (iii) Financial monitoring and trading systems
- (iv) Effective LDC participation

At the national level, he said that the same issues had to be addressed, namely transparency, efficient dialogue, accountability, state institutions, civil society, fundamental freedom, the right to development and local governance.

41. Mrs. Zahra Nuru wrapped up the workshop by thanking both the panellists and the National Focal Points for participation in the discussion and said that the workshop was only the beginning of a dialogue with the LDCs on good governance. This dialogue will continue since there is recognition among LDCs of the crucial importance of good governance for their development.