



American Model United Nations
Committee of Experts on Public Administration

CEPA/I/1

SUBJECT OF RESOLUTION: Effective governance for sustainable development: putting principles into practice and reviewing outcomes

SUBMITTED TO: The Committee of Experts on Public Administration

The Committee of Experts on Public Administration,

1 *Keeping in mind* the necessity for all member states to reach the United Nations Sustainable Development
2 Goals (SDGs) by 2030,

3 *Acknowledging* the importance of ensuring the effective and appropriate allocation of funds and reliable
4 reporting of country level data,

5 *Reaffirming* of the importance of upholding and acting with full respect for state sovereignty throughout all
6 processes,

7 *Emphasizing* the need for global equity through utilizing regional bodies for accountability,

8 *Recognizing* the importance of strong educational groundwork amongst the international community,

9 *Recalling* the 2018 Committee of Experts on Public Administration (CEPA) principles of effective governance
10 and indicators,

11 *Remembering* the United Nations Convention against Corruption and its necessity in forming anti-corruption
12 measures,

13 *Underlining* the importance of fully utilizing the various United Nations committees, commissions and offices
14 as well as the importance of collaboration between them,

15 *Takes note of* the varied and substantive collection of research and data previously and currently done
16 through CEPA,

17 *Understanding* the importance of fostering transparency and accountability in order to combat corruption
18 and encourage effective governance throughout all member states,

19 1. *Calls* for a creation of a committee for allocation and assessment of funds, henceforth titled the Monetary
20 Aid, Allocations, and Assessment of Truth Committee, in collaboration with the United Nations Office on Drugs and
21 Crime, to further the development of sustainable and effective government institutions with respect to fulfillment of
22 the SDGs and the previously determined 11 principles of effective governance:

23 (a) *Recalls* the funding requirements for United Nations monetary support and suggests that these
24 be used in determination of funding countries and recipient countries;

25 (b) *Emphasizes* the necessity of the use of the Human Development Index and the Global Climate
26 Risk Index in determining recipient countries, especially amongst previously colonized nations;

27 (c) *Advocates* for the creation of a commission within the United Nations Statistics Division in
28 collaboration with the Division for Sustainable Development Goals, called the Data Review Collective, that assesses
29 the realities of the impacts of CEPA funding and compares them to the nation's self-reported statistics to ensure the
30 truthful reporting of funding impacts. The commission would be formatted as such;

31 (i) The commission shall be composed of ten unbiased members, acting independent of their own
32 interests, from ten separate regions of the world;

33 (ii) There shall be one unbiased member who is appointed by the nation that is being observed for
34 the sake of transparency and cooperation;

35 (iii) This commission is not in place to evaluate the effectiveness of practices, provide insight on the
36 nation or to revoke funding, the commission serves as a form of checks and balances to ensure the
37 truthful self-reporting of funding uses and related statistics;

38 (iv) Reiterating that national sovereignty must be fully respected by the commission at all times
39 and therefore requires it to work in tandem with the nation it is analyzing;

40 (v) With intent to review and analyze the use of funds on a seven year cycling basis, with case-by-case
41 exceptions allowed when mismanagement of funds is identified outside of that cycle;

42 A. If the offending government is proven to have mismanaged allocated funds then a strike will be
43 issued against them and report sent to the funding committee;

44 B. If the accused government is found to have failed to report truthfully the use of funds and actions
45 taken therewith, a strike will be issued and a report sent to the funding committee;

46 C. If the accused government wishes to petition to have the case reviewed by the funding committee,
47 they may do so;

48 (d) *Recommends* that the two strike evaluation system is considered for implementation within the
49 funding committee;

50 (i) Clarifying the system as follows;

51 A. If the Data Review Collective concludes a failure to truthfully report the use of funds and actions
52 taken with them or fails to cooperate during the first evaluation, then the evaluated state is required
53 to make a plan to address the issues that caused that failure and to readdress their planned goals
54 towards effective governance;

55 B. If the state fails to pass the second evaluation, then funding will be paused until further reapproval
56 by the committee;

57 C. Further reapproval will require a exhaustive plan to coordinate where funding will be allocated
58 in order to be considered to return to receiving funding;

59 (e) *Notes* that should a recipient country wish to deny funding, in general or from a specific source,
60 they may do so;

61 (f) *Affirms* that should a funding country wish to withdraw funding from a nation without the strike
62 system being used that they must have provided at a minimum five years of funding or a to be later determined
63 amount of funding to said nation;

64 (g) *Celebrates* the commitment to provide funding made by the United States of America, the United
65 Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Germany, China and the Russian Federation plus other willing delegations;

66 2. *Reaffirms* the need for accountability and collaborative forums:

67 (a) *Recommends* on a local level, invites citizens to participate in forums to voice any concerns they
68 may have on the public expenditure data;

69 (i) In the case that citizens recognizes that funding is being allocated to areas of development the
70 community has not designated as important, they bring this up to their local government to be
71 taken into consideration;

72 (ii) In the case that citizens find themselves dismissed by the forum that they report the suspected
73 misuse of funds to be analyzed by the next level regional body forum and have it brought up for
74 discussion in order to analyze the validity of the concern and/or effectiveness of monetary allocations;

75 (b) *Suggests* Member States on the national level create national high level coordinating bodies
76 specifically tailored to the SDGs and the 2018 CEPA Principles and Indicators;

77 (c) *Calls for* regional bodies to be formed alongside both bloc lines and regional groupings, such
78 as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), African Union, Eurasian Block, South American Bloc or
79 Western Bloc;

80 (i) Once created, they are encouraged to work on a variety of actions including but not limited to;

- 81 A. Designating a regional body agenda to clarify and define regional context in relations to the SDGs
82 and 2018 CEPA Principles and Indicators, with an example of the African Vision for 2063;
- 83 B. Collaborating to analyze the effectiveness of each nations governance through observations on
84 released public expenditure data, such as seen with the African Peer Review Mechanism;
- 85 C. Creation or continuation of regional workshops;
- 86 D. With note that if the body identifies mismanagement of funds that they will bring it to the at-
87 tention of the CEPA Allocations and Assessment Committee discussed previously in this resolution;
- 88 3. *Suggests* that the 2018 CEPA Principles and Indicators be brought to consideration for recognition by
89 the United Nations Statistics Commissions, as to further solidify the measures of which countries are analyzed on by
90 CEPA and other organizations on the same basis;
- 91 4. *Highly encourages* that recipient countries self-report data relating to their sustainable development
92 practices, progress obtained toward set goals, and allocation of expended funds for these purposes - via both the
93 existing processes of reporting and through new ones created - to ensure transparency and accountability.

Passed by consensus, with 0 abstentions