



**United Nations
Development Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/SR.726
7 January 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Twenty-eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 726th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York
on Monday, 22 June 1981, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago)

CONTENTS

Programme planning and preparation for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986
(continued)

(c) Assistance to specific countries (continued)

Other funds and programmes (continued)

(f) Interim arrangements for energy exploration and pre-investment surveys

Other matters

(c) Further consideration of the organization of the sessions of the Council

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

PROGRAMME PLANNING AND PREPARATION FOR THE THIRD PROGRAMMING CYCLE, (1982-1986
(continued))

(c) ASSISTANCE TO SPECIFIC COUNTRIES (continued) (DP/520, DP/564, DP/565)

1. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator, Regional Director for Africa) said that since the issue of documents DP/520 and 564 there had been new developments in some of the African countries. A mission led by Mr. Farah, Under-Secretary-General, Co-ordinator for Special Economic Assistance Programmes, had visited Benin in May 1981 and its report would provide useful information for the preparation of Benin's country programme. The Government of Benin had requested UNDP to organize a conference of donor countries and financial institutions, the convening of the conference had, however, been deferred for various reasons, but it was expected to take place in May 1982. In the meantime, the Government would, with the assistance of various agencies in the United Nations system, prepare detailed projects for certain priority sectors concerning which detailed studies had been requested. Invitations to the conference would be sent to Governments and financing institutions in due course.
2. Equatorial Guinea had also requested UNDP to assist it in preparing for a conference of donor countries and financing institutions, which would be held in November 1981, probably in Geneva. He would make a second visit to Equatorial Guinea in July 1981 to complete negotiations concerning the content of the programme to be submitted to the conference.
3. Since the preparation of document DP/520 the Economic and Social Council had formally added Guinea-Bissau to the list of least developed countries. The Governing Council had earlier agreed to grant that country the advantages and preferential treatment applicable to the least developed countries.
4. The Administrator had recently appointed a Resident Representative to Sao Tome and Principe, who had already taken up his duties.
5. As a result of the mission sent by the Secretary-General to Chad in March 1981, UNDP had approved an emergency technical assistance programme for rehabilitating certain vital infrastructures. The programme dealt with repairing the water supply and electricity systems in the capital, N'djamena, restoring the airport at N'djamena to normal operation and repairing the ferry linking the capital with Kousséri in the United Republic of Cameroon. The total estimated cost of the operations was \$4,076,090. The UNDP office in N'djamena resumed operations in May 1981.
6. With reference to Uganda, members of the Council would recall that the Government had in 1980 submitted a request to borrow from its third-cycle - and possibly fourth-cycle - IPF the resources needed to finance its rehabilitation and reconstruction programme during the period 1980-1986. A co-ordinated effort by the United Nations and other relief agencies had eased the emergency situation created in Uganda by an extended drought and internal dislocation. During the first three

(Mr. Doo Kingue)

months of 1981, after the establishment in January of the Relief Co-ordination Unit in Kampala, headed by the UNDP Resident Representative, more than 9,000 tons of food had been moved into the stricken areas, and a further 23,556 tons of food shipments scheduled by WFP from April through August 1981 had either already arrived or was expected during June and July. A Swedish special unit of relief specialists, operating since April 1981 mostly in West Nile, had reinforced the relief effort and was participating regularly in the meetings of the Relief Co-ordination Unit. With the phasing out of UNHCR operations in Karamoja, UNICEF had become responsible, under the direction of the Relief Co-ordination Unit, for the operation and management of all transport and related activities for emergency feeding in Karamoja until the end of 1981. According to the latest information received, the Unit required \$1.44 million to continue operations from the beginning of June to the end of August 1981 and \$3.36 million to continue operations until the end of the year. The Secretary-General was trying to mobilize those funds and to that end a donors' meeting had been held in New York on 2 June under the auspices of the Headquarters Co-ordination Committee for Emergency Relief to Uganda.

7. It would be remembered that in 1979 UNDP, at the request of the Ugandan Government, had suspended all projects. Projects approved prior to the 1979 liberation war had generally not been continued, with the exception of assistance to Makerere University. Most of the specialized agencies of the United Nations had responded to the request of the Government for programming missions during late 1979 and early 1980, and the Government had invited UNDP to be associated with its rehabilitation efforts. Its intention had been that the period remaining in the second cycle, i.e. September 1979 to December 1981, should be devoted largely to projects for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the country's infrastructure, physical plant and institutions. Uganda had continued to operate without a country programme during that period.

8. At that time the financial status of the IPC had been the following: for the second cycle Uganda had been allocated \$30 million, of which, after deducting funds borrowed for the first cycle, \$28.355 million had remained. During the first three years of the second cycle, 1977-1979, total expenditures had amounted to only \$8.872 million, and UNDP and the executing agencies had accordingly been called upon to design projects capable of expending the remaining \$19.483 million during the two years 1980-1981. After the liberation of the country, general optimism about development prospects had led the Government and United Nations agency missions to think in terms of a rapid return to normal economic and social advancement, and agreements on 32 new projects and 4 major extensions of projects had been signed. Matters had developed differently, however. Security had remained a problem; economic and social advancement had been set back and the investment of external capital in the private and public sectors had been far slower than initially expected. The news from Uganda had not been conducive to rebuilding confidence and had made it extremely difficult to recruit experts and to assemble the necessary capital inputs. As a result, only \$2.725 million had been expended in 1980 leaving a balance of \$16.758 million to be expended in 1981. The UNDP assistance programme was therefore increasingly taking the form of the

(Mr. Doo Kingue)

provision of equipment necessary to make an impact on the economy and sustain technical assistance, and it had consequently been necessary to revise several projects.

9. The most striking changes were those in projects related to the transport sector, a priority for land-locked Uganda. Transport-oriented projects included assistance to civil aviation and the rehabilitation of the country's only international airport at Entebbe, a vital link to the rest of the world for trade and for tourism, a major foreign exchange earner. Other projects covered advisory services to the Ministry of Transport, equipment, vehicles and radio communications. As a result of the revisions, the equipment component of the total programme amounted to 51 per cent, compared with the former figure of 28 per cent.

10. In the Uganda programme UNDP had established an excellent relationship with other donor agencies, including the European Economic Community. The donor community had, in fact, requested UNDP to act as the secretariat for co-ordination and the exchange of information on development assistance and plans were being made for government participation in periodic meetings of the donor community. The EEC was particularly eager to increase its collaboration with UNDP in strengthening the Uganda national parks system and rehabilitating the Government Printing Department.

11. Uganda was not devoid of highly qualified manpower, and UNDP felt that there were numerous opportunities in Uganda for government execution. A TCDC project relating to rice production was being discussed by the Uganda Government, the Government of the People's Republic of China and UNDP; capital donors such as EEC had shown interest in being associated with the project. Under a project for supporting administrative services, UNDP was providing the services of a national expert to the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development. Other pipeline projects envisaged the use of national consulting firms, particularly for architectural consultancy.

12. In view of all those activities, UNDP had started discussions with the Government on the preparation of Uganda's first country programme, which would be submitted to the 1983 session of the Governing Council. The IPF for Uganda in 1977-1981 had been \$30 million, and it had been granted \$3,537,000 under the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries, of which \$1,059,000 had been available for the years 1979-1981. Of that amount, \$954,000 had been spent on improving the housing situation in the country. In response to requests received from the Government in May 1981, the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) had provided assistance to Uganda amounting to \$2,545,000 for the procurement and delivery of nearly 900,000 imported hoes urgently required by farmers. UNCDF was considering assistance for the rehabilitation of a plant for the manufacture of agricultural implements and to that end a UNIDO feasibility mission had been sent to Uganda. In addition, UNCDF was planning a programming mission to Uganda in August or September 1981.

(Mr. Doo Kingue)

13. The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) had sent a desertification control planning and programming mission to Uganda in May 1981 to examine the drought-stricken Karamoja region. The mission's draft report had been submitted to the Government for review. It dealt with the nature, causes and consequences of desertification in Uganda, and in an annex, contained a detailed description of 14 priority desertification control projects that had been identified jointly by the Government and the mission as part of a pragmatic action-oriented programme. That programme included projects for the repair and improvement of roads and bridges in the region, afforestation, agricultural development, the management, development and conservation of water resources, improved range management, and the establishment and initial operation of a desertification control and arid land development authority to co-ordinate and expedite projects in the region, and projects on improving the country's game parks and reserves were also envisaged. UNSO's planning and programming activities in Uganda would be continuous and carried out with the full collaboration of the Government, and they would be fully co-ordinated with those of UNDP and other agencies of the United Nations system.

14. Mr. MBAZOA (Observer for the Central African Republic) said that his delegation had been gratified to note from the Council's deliberations that no delegation questioned either the purpose or the philosophy of UNDP, which had become a symbol of active co-operation between developed and developing countries. Such differences of view as had arisen related to the methodology applicable to UNDP's activities and how to provide it with the necessary resources. Two diametrically opposed viewpoints had emerged which reflected the age-old North-South split as to what co-operation should entail. On the one side were the rich countries which in the current economic crisis, were unwilling to raise their contributions to UNDP. On the other side were the developing countries whose tremendous difficulties and needs made development impossible without external assistance. The Administrator had rightly expressed concern about a possible decline in available resources when requests for assistance to developing countries were steadily increasing. Any development assistance would have a catastrophic effect on the poorest countries. Increased resources were clearly essential and must come largely from donor countries.

15. His country, as one of the least-developed was a priority country for UNDP assistance. It was a land-locked country and one of those most seriously affected by the current economic crisis. Its huge budget deficit and a massive foreign debt seriously threatened any development effort on which the Government embarked. The critical economic and social situation inherited from the previous régime had deteriorated so drastically that there was a structural imbalance in all major areas of its national life. Industrial and agricultural production had fallen to a very low level, while imports had increased, aggravating the chronic trade deficit.

16. The General Assembly, by adopting resolution 35/87 on assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of the Central African Republic, had once again testified to the solidarity among members of the international community and fulfilled the United Nations commitment to social progress and improved living conditions. In pursuance of that resolution, the Secretary-General had sent an inter-agency mission to the Central African Republic to determine

(Mr. Mbazoa, Observer, Central African Republic)

its immediate and long-term assistance needs and, in transmitting the report of that mission to Member States, international organizations and specialized agencies, had described his country's critical economic situation in some detail. The mission report had recommended that three forms of assistance should be provided: immediate humanitarian assistance, emergency assistance for rehabilitation and reconstruction projects and medium- and long-term assistance. The Secretary-General had reported that some \$148.79 million would be needed if the Central African Republic was to carry out a programme of reconstruction, rehabilitation and economic development which would bring it back to the stage of growth reached in 1965, when the former régime had not yet come to power. In other words, his country's current growth rate was zero.

17. That critical situation demanded the active solidarity of the international community, especially of donor countries, and he therefore urged members of the Council to respond favourably to the General Assembly's appeal. His delegation also believed that his country's indicative planning figure for 1982-1986 was far too low and would not be adequate for implementing the projects provided for in the government's two-year recovery programme. After deducting from the IPF of \$25.5 million a 20 per cent compulsory operational reserve of \$5.1 million and the \$1,335,000 borrowed by the Government against the third cycle, only \$19,065,000 would remain. His delegation therefore hoped that the Council would increase his country's IPF for the third programming cycle or grant it emergency assistance over and above that IPF.

OTHER FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES (continued)

(f) INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS FOR ENERGY EXPLORATION AND PRE-INVESTMENT SURVEYS (DP/540)

18. Mr. HARLAND (Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation), introducing document DP/540, observed that the Administrator had also circulated to members for information a paper on UNDP proposals for new and renewable sources of energy which he intended to submit to the forthcoming United Nations conference on that subject. Since document DP/540 had been prepared, the Administrator had met several representatives of donor countries with a view to soliciting additional contributions to the Energy Account and had provided them with a list of energy-related projects received by UNDP for financing either from the Account or from the Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development.

19. Even with the limited resources available to the Energy Account, the Administrator had approved a number of projects which could prove vital to developing countries in developing their energy resources. A report on one of them, entitled "Co-ordination of Energy Policy in the Caribbean" would be made available to members of the Council shortly for information. Other projects financed under the Energy Account included the 60-country energy assessment survey carried out by the World Bank and the pre-feasibility study for the establishment of an international network for training and energy planning, which had been executed partly through consultants and partly by UNESCO. Through its Natural Resources and Energy Division, the Department of Technical Co-operation for

(Mr. Harland)

Development was participating in some of the country missions with the World Bank, and UNDP could assist Governments in mobilizing public and private investment in both new and renewable sources of energy in the follow-up phase to which the individual country assessments were expected to lead. UNDP had also carried out a study of new and renewable sources of energy in 102 developing countries, and the full report of that study would be made available to the Nairobi Conference. The preparatory meetings for the Conference had confirmed many of the findings of the study, in particular the fact that the dearth of energy planners and assessors left many developing countries unaware of potential energy resources which could be developed in order to reduce their dependence on oil imports.

20. The Administrator had recently addressed the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy and had informed the Committee of UNDP's preparations for the Conference and its readiness to respond to any recommendations on strengthening its role in developing the energy resources of the developing countries.

21. He drew attention to the draft-decision in paragraph 18 of document DP/540.

22. Mr. WINTOP (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that energy problems, especially those of low-income oil-importing countries, were very serious and that the energy sector of most countries was characterized by a balance-of-payments burden arising from energy imports and the high risks involved in energy exploration. They therefore welcomed the UNDP action described in document DP/540, in particular UNDP missions to prepare programmes and projects for financing under country IPFs and UNDP-managed funds, and the establishment of the Energy Policy Group under the chairmanship of the Deputy Administrator. The Nordic countries were confident that the Group would ensure that UNDP played a significant role in the preparation and follow-up of the Nairobi Conference.

23. The Nordic delegations welcomed the growing recognition within the Council that the establishment of new funds and institutions did not automatically lead to additional resource flows to the developing countries and that the establishment of new funds actually reduced the scope for recipient countries to choose their own priorities with regard to the utilization of multilateral aid. In that connexion, the Nordic delegations fully supported the "umbrella" concept whereby new funds would, where appropriate, be administered by UNDP.

24. Although there was much to commend the treatment of the energy sector as an exception to the rule, the Nordic delegations were somewhat sceptical about creating a new fund. They none the less believed that paragraph (a) of the draft decision in document DP/540 should be considered in a favourable spirit. While paragraph (b) was interesting, it would be premature to discuss its substance at the current session. The proposal might, however, be placed on the agenda of the twenty-ninth session.

25. Ms. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands) observed that her Government was the largest donor to the Energy Account, with a 1981 contribution of approximately \$2.5 million. Her

/...

(Ms. Scheltema, Netherlands)

Government maintained close contact with the Administrator regarding the management of those monies and was gratified that many good projects had been implemented.

26. Her delegation attached considerable importance to the prospects for using the Energy Account to ensure a follow-up to the Nairobi Conference. It therefore supported paragraph (a) of the Administrator's recommendation (DP/540, para. 18) but could not fully endorse paragraph (b) for the reasons it had already expressed in the discussions on the Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration. If the Nairobi Conference did not make clear recommendations regarding the Energy Account, her delegation would expect the Administrator to consult donors to the Account with regard to its future.

27. Mr. ZOTTA (Italy) expressed appreciation for the activities described in document DP/540, in particular in paragraph 5. As far as future activities in that connexion were concerned, however, he believed, that UNDP should await the results of the Nairobi Conference and the decisions to be taken by the World Bank on the energy affiliate. He therefore agreed with the Nordic and Netherlands delegations that, while paragraph (a) of the Administrator's recommendation was acceptable, paragraph (b) was premature.

28. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Denmark. UNDP had done valuable work in preparing for the Nairobi Conference, and she had no doubt that its preparatory work would play a vital role in the Conference itself. Her delegation could support the first paragraph of the Administrator's recommendation but believed that it was too early to take a decision on the second paragraph. It could not, however, fully endorse the Netherlands suggestion that the Administrator should consult donors to the Energy Account about the future of the Account. In such cases, all members of the Council were normally consulted.

29. Mr. DUVERNEY-GUICHARD (France) said that UNDP clearly had an important part to play in helping developing countries to select energy projects and in providing them with planning assistance in order to attract loans from the World Bank and regional financing institutions. UNDP's contribution to preparations for the Nairobi Conference was clearly very important, and his delegation commended the Administrator on the work already done in that connexion. His delegation was confident that UNDP would be made responsible for helping to ensure the follow-up to the Conference.

30. His delegation had some difficulties with the recommendations in paragraph 18 of document DP/540. At the time of the establishment of the Energy Account, his delegation had voiced some scepticism as to the possibility of attracting significant new financing simply by establishing a new fund. It could not, therefore, endorse paragraph (a) of the recommendation and believed that paragraph (b) was premature, inasmuch as it prejudged the outcome of the Nairobi Conference.

31. Mr. KUMAMARU (Japan) said that his Government was opposed to the establishment of a new fund. In its view, greater use should be made of the United Nations

(Mr. Kumamaru, Japan)

Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration. If a new fund was to be established, however, it should be under the auspices of UNDP.

32. Mr. RILEY (World Bank) said that the Energy Account was making an important contribution to meeting the needs of developing countries. The World Bank was pleased to be associated with the work of the Administrator in that field.

33. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) said that OPEC had already made substantial contributions for energy exploration, and other donors should come forward to enable UNDP to play a role in the field of energy. His Government supported co-operation between OPEC and UNDP. Regrettably, the content of some of the documentation on energy submitted to the Council was inaccurate. Greater care should be taken to ensure balance.

34. Mr. MOUMOUNI (Niger) said that the question of energy was important in the economies of all countries, particularly the non-oil-producing developing countries, which had seen their energy costs soar. Co-operation should be promoted between oil-exporting and oil-importing countries with a view to assisting developing countries to deal with energy problems. His Government had strongly supported the establishment of an Energy Account within UNDP to meet the needs of the oil-importing developing countries, and welcomed the contribution made by the Netherlands to that Account. It was to be hoped that other countries would also contribute.

35. Petroleum was a non-renewable resource and would be exhausted within a few decades. It was therefore important to promote investment in alternative sources of energy and energy conservation. The Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, promised to mark a turning-point in energy management. His Government welcomed the Administrator's proposals in document DP/540.

36. Mr. HARLAND (Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) said, with regard to the comments of the representative of Kuwait, that the statistics relating to oil contained in the documentation before the Council came from United Nations sources, but could be corrected if the representatives of Kuwait could specify where errors had occurred.

37. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) said that his Government could accept the proposal contained in paragraph (a) of the Administrator's recommendation, but that it considered paragraph (b) premature.

38. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt paragraph (a) of the draft decision recommended by the Administrator (DP/540, para. 18).

39. It was so decided.

OTHER MATTERS:

(c) FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL
(continued) (DP/562 and Corr.1, DP/L.355)

40. Mr. HUTTON (Canada), introducing draft decision DP/L.355, said that it represented a constructive approach towards the issues to be faced by UNDP in the 1980s. The share of all multilateral aid financing which UNDP received had diminished, despite its important role and the great need for multilateral technical assistance. If UNDP was to continue to play a central role, some evolution would be necessary.
41. UNDP had a limited membership, so that delegations represented both themselves and other countries. There were no regional groups, which encouraged delegations to be flexible and made it possible to work by consensus - a practical example of the North-South dialogue. Nevertheless, UNDP's work was inadequately publicized in donor countries, and the questions it had to deal with were complex. The purpose of the draft decision was to rationalize the work-load: for example, the fact that pledges were generally made in November for the following year was an obvious weakness in UNDP's financing system. It would likewise be preferable to elect the Council's officers earlier in the year.
42. Ms. POULSON (Denmark) said that the Nordic delegations welcomed the draft decision recommended by the Administrator in document DP/562, paragraph 65. Nevertheless, they had doubts concerning the proposals in paragraph 2 (f), (g) and (i) of the draft decision. The proposal for a time-limit on statements was reasonable provided that it applied to all delegations participating in the work of the Council; delegations themselves could make a major contribution to the work of the Council by exercising self-restraint.
43. Procedures at the current session of the Governing Council had been less than satisfactory. The practice of making introductory statements on several agenda items at once was confusing. The Nordic delegations supported the idea of holding short, subject-oriented sessions when justified, but such sessions should not be too frequent; otherwise the planned reduction in the length of the session would serve no purpose.
44. The proposals of Canada on intersessional activities left something to be desired, although there was admittedly a need for more formal intersessional contact between the Administrator and member countries. The arrangements for such contact should not, however, be too elaborate. The preparatory work on questions to be considered by the Council might be done in working groups, rather than by the Budgetary and Finance Committee, as was proposed in draft decision DP/L.355.
45. The Nordic countries supported attempts to limit documentation. As matters stood, the volume of documents produced was out of all proportion to the information they contained.

46. Mr. TARRAGO (Brazil) said that the draft decision submitted by the representative of Canada deserved special attention. However, his delegation had difficulties with the idea of intersessional meetings of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. He hoped that action on the draft decision could be postponed in order to give delegations more time to study it.
47. Miss BELEN (Argentina) said that her delegation had difficulties not only with the financial implications of the draft decision but with the principle of the decision itself. Like Brazil, her delegation would prefer consideration of the draft decision to be postponed.
48. Ms. SCHILLING (Venezuela) said that her delegation shared the views expressed by the representatives of Brazil and Argentina and needed time to consider the draft decision submitted by the representative of Canada.
49. Mr. GIOVANNINI (Switzerland) said that the Council should try to reduce the work-load of UNDP and of its own members and to maintain the climate of confidence that was indispensable if the Programme was to survive. At the current session, for example, the Budgetary and Finance Committee had probably been assigned too little time to deal thoroughly with the questions before it.
50. While his delegation shared the view that convening the Budgetary and Finance Committee one week before the annual session of the Council had its advantages, it believed that organizing an intersessional meeting of that Committee would create difficulties. Nevertheless, the Council's recent experience had shown the dangers of allowing an unduly long period to elapse without organized contact between UNDP and the Governments members of the Council, and an intersessional meeting of the Committee would enable Governments to be better informed of UNDP problems and allow UNDP to work in due awareness of the positions of Governments. His delegation accordingly supported the experimental arrangement proposed in draft decision DP/L.355. His delegation found the Administrator's proposals in document DP/562, paragraph 65, acceptable.
51. His delegation endorsed the comments of the delegation of Denmark on the advisability of separate introductory statements on individual agenda items.
52. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) said that her delegation agreed with the ideas concerning special sessions of the Council expressed in paragraph 2 (c) of the draft decision recommended by the Administrator (DP/562, para. 65). Such sessions would provide a forum for delegations to obtain specific information on questions normally discussed only in the Budgetary and Finance Committee. Her delegation shared the concern of other delegations with regard to paragraph 2 (f), however; experience at the current session did not suggest that the proposed arrangement would be helpful. Her delegation saw no need for the extra documentation proposed in paragraph 2 (i) of the draft decision.
53. Since the draft decision submitted by Canada had not been distributed in all the working languages, she supported the view of earlier speakers that consideration of the proposal should be postponed. Her delegation was not in favour

(Mrs. Vervalcke, Belgium)

of the draft decision because it ran counter to the Council's efforts in recent years to reduce the volume of its work and documentation. In any event, the proposals reinforced her delegation's impression that the Budgetary and Finance Committee was becoming more independent of the Council. The Committee should remain a consultative, subsidiary body.

54. With regard to the Administrator's proposals on documentation, her delegation realized that the production of the country programme documents was burdensome, and that UNDP should find a way to decrease the cost of that documentation. However, the method of reducing the cost proposed in paragraph 3 (c) of the draft decision could adversely affect the Council's work. In that connexion, she asked whether the "language of submission" was to be the working language of the recipient country.

55. Mr. CABEIRO-QUINTANA (Cuba), supported by Mr. BOSQUEZ (Mexico), said that his delegation agreed with the views of the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela. The draft decision proposed by the delegation of Canada should be made available in all working languages before the Council was asked to take action on it.

56. Mr. DUVERNEY-GUICHARD (France) said that his delegation welcomed the Administrator's proposals for streamlining the work of the Governing Council, as outlined in document DP/562, paragraph 65. The tendency for working groups to proliferate and to work without interpretation services posed difficulties for some delegations. He would therefore like note to be taken of the wish of Council members that in future working groups should be set up only when absolutely essential and should be provided with interpretation.

57. The proposal, in paragraph 2 (c) of the draft decision, for bringing members together before the regular sessions of the Council so that delegations could seek clarifications from the Administrator would facilitate the work of the Council. His delegation did not support such autonomy for the Budgetary and Finance Committee as was contemplated in paragraph 2 (i), and agreed with the representatives of Denmark and Belgium that there was no need for a separate agenda for that Committee.

58. His delegation had not had the opportunity to study in detail draft decision DP/L.355 because the document was not available in all the working languages. However, his delegation was not in favour of intersessional meetings of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. The Governing Council itself was limited to a single session per year, and he felt it inopportune in times of financial stringency to impose the substantial financial burden of intersessional meetings on UNDP.

59. With reference to paragraph 3 (c) of the draft decision recommended by the Administrator (DP/562, para. 65) he said that his delegation had been surprised to receive country programme documents for French-speaking countries in languages other than the official language of those countries. His delegation would prefer "language of submission" to be understood to mean the language of the country concerned and not the working language in which the responsible UNDP staff member chose to draft the programme.

60. Mr. KUMAMARU (Japan) said that his delegation found the draft decision submitted by the representative of Canada helpful. It could not, however, accept the UNDP Administrator's recommendation concerning the preparation of country programme documents. His Government had difficulty assessing country programmes not drafted in English. While his delegation was in favour of limiting the volume of documentation, it felt that that should not be done in a way that would adversely affect the role and responsibility of the Governing Council.
61. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand) said that his delegation regarded the Administrator's recommendation concerning the presentation of country programme documents as a sensible compromise in view of the Council's interest in reducing the volume of documentation. The other suggestions, such as the categorization of documents into policy papers and support papers, should work as well in UNDP as they had in UNCTAD. The approach advocated in paragraph 2 (e) of the recommendations had not succeeded in other United Nations agencies but might be tried. On the question of holding subject-oriented sessions, his delegation agreed that the periods immediately preceding or following the regular sessions of the Council were most suitable.
62. His delegation welcomed the proposal submitted by the representative of Canada. He saw a great deal of merit in having at least one special session of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. Experience had shown the desirability of enabling the Administrator to consult members of the Budgetary and Finance Committee at least once between sessions of the Governing Council.
63. Mr. POPOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had difficulty accepting the proposal for a separate session of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. Such an arrangement would vitiate the effort to reduce meetings and documentation. He could agree, however, to having the Committee meet a few days before the Governing Council's session if the need arose. He agreed in general with the views expressed by the representatives of Denmark, France and Belgium.
64. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that his delegation supported the Administrator's recommendations in document DP/562 on streamlining and rationalizing the work of the Governing Council. The proposal made by the representative of Canada should be duly discussed in the working group on decisions so that delegations would have the opportunity to give proper thought to the matter. He asked what the financial implications of the proposal would be.
65. Mr. LAWLESS (United Kingdom) expressed the support of his delegation for the proposals submitted by the delegation of Canada.
66. Mr. KIRDER (Secretary of the Governing Council) said, with regard to the draft decision recommended by the Administrator (DP/562, para. 65), that the proposal in paragraph 2 (f) was modelled on a decision taken by the Second Committee of the General Assembly in the interest of rationalization. In proposing a separate agenda for the Budgetary and Finance Committee, the only concern had been to facilitate the work of the Council, not to make the Committee more independent of the Governing Council. In response to the representatives of France and Belgium,

(Mr. Kirder)

he explained that the "language of submission" referred to in paragraph 2 (c) meant whichever of the three working languages was used in drafting a country programme by the country whose programme was being described. The arrangement proposed in that paragraph would not only make it possible to submit documents in time but save the United Nations at least \$1 million in document production costs.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.