



United Nations  
Development Programme

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/SR.728  
11 January 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Twenty-eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 728th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 23 June 1981 at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago)

CONTENTS

Other funds and programmes (continued):

(i) United Nations technical co-operation activities (continued)

Programme of implementation (continued):

(b) Assistance to national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity (continued)

Other matters (continued):

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

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

(c) Assistance to specific countries (continued)

---

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 3.20 p.m.

OTHER FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES (continued):

(i) UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (continued) (DP/L.353)

1. Mr. RANIGA (Fiji) said that in the light of changes that had been proposed since his delegation submitted draft decision DP/L.353, his delegation had revised paragraph 3 to read:

"3. Invites the Administrator to take fully into account the special competence, experience and expertise of the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development in its fields of specialization when selecting executing agencies for implementation of UNDP-financed projects or projects financed by other funds already managed by UNDP or by such new funds as may be entrusted to UNDP in future as a result of international conferences such as the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy;"

Paragraph 4 of DP/L.353 had been deleted and the words: "paragraphs 50 and 51 of" had been added before the words "document E/1981/23" in paragraph 5.

2. His delegation had been prompted to submit the draft decision by the many favourable comments made on the reports of the Secretary-General on United Nations technical co-operation activities (DP/RP/23 and DP/RP/24) and believed that it would be adopted unanimously.

3. Mr. CHEN Xingnong (China) and Mr. MAYIRA (Rwanda) expressed the support of their delegations for the draft decision.

4. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt draft decision DP/L.353, as orally revised by the representative of Fiji.

5. It was so decided.

PROGRAMME OF IMPLEMENTATION (continued):

(b) ASSISTANCE TO NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS RECOGNIZED BY THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY (continued) (DP/L.356)

6. Mr. AMOKO (Uganda) said that in paragraph 2 of the draft decision submitted by his delegation (DP/L.356), the words ", taking also into account the activities under the Nationhood Programme for Namibia" should be added at the end of the paragraph.

7. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that since paragraph 4 was found to have financial implications, his delegation believed that the draft decision should be considered by the Budgetary and Finance Committee before the Council acted on it. Should that Committee be unable to consider the financial implications of the draft decision at the current session, his delegation would propose that it should be deferred until the twenty-ninth session.

8. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator) said that the intention was, if the draft decision was adopted, that the attendance at UNDP meetings of additional representatives of national liberation movements should be funded from the indicative planning figures of those movements; no administrative costs would be involved.

9. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had doubts about the advisability of financing the costs of attendance at meetings from IPFs, which were intended to be expended for the promotion of economic and social development. His delegation needed time to consult other delegations on possible alternative wording for the relevant paragraphs of the draft decision. While the Assistant Administrator's statement had clarified the issue of financial implications, his delegation would welcome an opportunity to consult others in order to be able to join the consensus that was building up on the proposal.

10. Mr. AMOKO (Uganda) said that, though his delegation had expected no difficulties with the draft decision, it was, in a spirit of compromise, prepared to agree that the Council should defer action on it until the following meeting.

OTHER MATTERS (continued):

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

11. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Governing Council) said that the Department of Conference Services had been asked to provide a statement of the financial implications of draft decision DP/L.355, since the costs involved would be met from the regular budget of the United Nations and not from the UNDP budget. The information was expected to be available shortly.

12. Mr. HARE (Canada), supported by Mr. N'KIET (Gabon), suggested that the draft decision should be referred to the working group on decisions for consideration, as had been done with similar proposals.

13. It was so decided.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to discuss the draft decision recommended by the Administrator in paragraph 65 of document DP/562 paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 (a)

15. Paragraph 1 (a) was adopted.

Paragraphs 1 (b) and 1 (c)

16. Mr. N'KIET (Gabon) said that his delegation had the impression that paragraph 1 (b) was a duplication of paragraph 1 (a); at any rate, they seemed to cover the same ground.

17. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that subparagraph (a) reflected the Council's intention to set aside part of its deliberations for consideration of

(Mr. Kirdar)

major policy issues and emerging developments in operational activities, whereas subparagraph (b) set forth its decision to include policy reviews in its agenda each year as a main item.

18. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) noted that subparagraph (c) stated that the Council would define policy areas or subjects at each session for consideration at later sessions. She was under the impression, however, that the Council had already decided that at the twenty-ninth session it would consider the question of fund-raising. She therefore requested clarification of the relationship between subparagraph (c) and subparagraph (b). For the sake of clarity, it might be better to change the order of the subparagraphs so as to proceed from general to the particular.

19. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) observed that a typing error in subparagraph (c) had obviously caused confusion. The text should require the Council to define policy areas or subjects at each session for consideration at the regular session in the following year, and not "at the following sessions", as stated in the subparagraph.

20. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) suggested that the subparagraph should be redrafted in the light of the Secretary's explanation. Moreover, the request to the Administrator to prepare documentation on the topics selected by the Council might be placed in a separate subparagraph.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that subparagraph (c) should be amended to read: "(c) To define at each session which policy area or subject will be reviewed at the following session", and that a new subparagraph (d) should be added, to read as follows: "(d) To request the Administrator to prepare relevant documentation on the priority topic selected by the Council for policy review, including options and possible courses of action for its consideration."

22. Paragraph 1 (b), paragraph 1 (c), as amended, and new paragraph 1 (d) were adopted.

Paragraph 2 (a)

23. Paragraph 2 (a) was adopted.

Paragraph 2 (b)

24. Mr. DUVERNEY-GUICHARD (France) observed that it might be best to defer a final decision on paragraph 2 (b) until the Council knew what its financial implications would be for the United Nations budget.

25. He asked what the Secretariat understood by a "subject-oriented" session and how such sessions would fit in with paragraph 1 (c). If at each session the Council singled out a priority topic for consideration at the following regular session, such subject-oriented sessions were probably unnecessary.

26. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) asked whether the subject-oriented sessions would in fact form part of the Council's regular sessions.
27. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that, although the Council had decided two years earlier that it would normally hold only one regular session each year, the rules of procedure allowed for additional or special meetings. From the technical point of view, such meetings would constitute special sessions. The Administrator had suggested that such sessions should, as a general rule, immediately precede or follow the regular sessions in order to avoid additional travel costs. In view of the large number of country programmes which would come before the Council in 1982, he had also suggested that a three-day session should be held prior to the twenty-ninth regular session for the purpose of considering those programmes.
28. The Council would, of course, have to take into account any financial implications when it decided to hold a subject-oriented session.
29. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) said that her delegation was not opposed to the idea of subject-oriented sessions but simply felt that it would be more logical to regard them as extensions of the regular session. If the subject-oriented sessions were to be regarded as organically distinct, it might be necessary to issue separate reports, and that would have additional financial implications.
30. Mr. SCHMID (Austria), supported by Mr. N'KIET (Gabon), said that the preferable course was to devote part of the Council's regular session to specific subjects rather than to hold a separate subject-oriented session. The subparagraph should be amended accordingly.
31. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that the financial implications would be the same whether the subject-oriented meetings were considered to be part of the regular session or a separate special session. The proceedings of those meetings would have to be reflected in either the Council's annual report or a separate report. It was for the Council to decide whether to consider the country programmes in 1982 at a separate session or to extend its regular session for that purpose.
32. Mr. DUVERNEY-GUICHARD (France) said that he was satisfied with the explanations given by the Secretary. He suggested that subparagraph (b) should be divided into two parts. The first would read as follows: "(b) To hold immediately before or after its regular sessions such short sessions as the Council may convene to consider specific subjects". The third sentence of existing subparagraph (b) should form a new subparagraph (c), the remaining subparagraphs being relettered accordingly in the final text.
33. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) said that his delegation considered the Secretary's explanations to be satisfactory. It therefore preferred paragraph 2 (b) as it stood.
34. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) asked whether the Council could accept the amended text of paragraph 2 (b) proposed by the French representative.

35. Paragraph 2 (b), as amended, was adopted.
36. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) observed with regard to the French proposal for a new paragraph 2 (c) that if the Council was to meet in 1983 to consider country and intercountry programmes, as envisaged in the text of the proposed new paragraph 2 (c), it should surely be required to approve the programmes and not merely to refer them to the regular session.
37. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) suggested that, in order to deal with the point raised by the representative of Belgium, the new paragraph 2 (c) should read "To hold a short special meeting prior to its twenty-ninth regular session to consider country and intercountry programmes", in order to make it clear that the meeting was being convened solely to consider country and intercountry programmes. At such a meeting the Council would, of course, have the authority to approve the programmes. It would be recalled that in 1980, owing to the timing of the submission of country programmes, the Council had approved programmes at a special winter meeting.
38. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that he could endorse the Secretary's proposal but wished to make it clear that the consideration of country and intercountry programmes formed an important part of the work of regular Council sessions. He asked how the Secretary intended to include the consideration of country and intercountry programmes in the agenda of the twenty-ninth regular session, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (d).
39. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) observed that paragraph 2 (d) provided a model for the agenda of future sessions but would not be applicable in 1982 if a special meeting was held to consider country and intercountry programmes; the item would in that case not be included in the agenda of the twenty-ninth regular session. In years when no special, subject-oriented meeting was held, the approval of country programmes would come under the agenda item "Programme planning" suggested in paragraph 2 (d).
40. Mrs. BALLESTER (Cuba) observed that the phrase "subject-oriented" in new paragraph 2 (c) was superfluous since it was clear that the short special meeting would be considering country and intercountry programmes, and she suggested that it should be deleted.
41. It was so decided.
42. The French proposal for a new paragraph 2 (c) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 2 (c)

43. Mrs. BALLESTER (Cuba) asked what the "pending matters" were which might be considered at the Council's organizational meeting.
44. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that the organizational meeting would, of course, deal in principle only with organizational matters. However, if

(Mr. Kirdar)

the Council so decided some matter left pending by it might also be included in the agenda of the organizational meeting.

45. Mr. TUAN (Kuwait) observed that the Secretary's explanation placed delegations in a difficult position. Normally, developing countries sent special representatives to regular sessions of the Governing Council but would not do so for an organizational meeting. The consideration of substantive matters at such a meeting would therefore create problems and he therefore suggested that the phrase "and the disposition of any pending matters" should be deleted.

46. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Kuwait. The phrase in question could give rise to ambiguities and open the door to the discussion of substantive issues at a non-substantive meeting.

47. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council agreed to delete the phrase "and the disposition of any pending matters" and to adopt paragraph 2 (c) as amended.

48. It was so decided.

Paragraph 2 (d)

49. Paragraph 2 (d) was adopted.

Paragraph 2 (e)

50. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) suggested that in paragraph 2 (e) the words "beginning in 1983" should be substituted for the phrase "in years when it does not consider the biennial budget of UNDP".

51. That amendment was adopted.

52. Paragraph 2 (e), as amended, was adopted.

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

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

53. Mr. ODAKA (Uganda) said that Uganda had experienced extremely difficult economic and social events over the previous 10 years. Economic development had been totally disrupted. Fortunately, the international community had taken practical action in helping the country to overcome those problems, as exemplified by General Assembly resolution 35/103.

54. The response from institutions outside the United Nations system had been similarly encouraging. Emergency financial and technical assistance had been granted to Uganda in addition to normal development aid. The task of reconstruction was enormous, however, and so was the need for additional aid. UNDP assistance to Uganda during the current and the third programming cycles should represent a significant contribution to the reconstruction effort.

(Mr. Odaka, Uganda)

55. There had been delays in utilizing resources during the second programming cycle, although measures to speed up the use of funds had recently been decided on. They included an increase in the equipment components of Uganda's programme and the introduction of rapid-disbursement high-priority projects. His Government had identified 28 projects involving some \$30 million, which would utilize the outstanding balance by the end of the current programming cycle.

56. His Government had already identified and documented high-priority rehabilitation and emergency projects for execution under the third programming cycle. Since, in order to have an impact on Uganda's economic recovery efforts, those projects would have to be implemented during the early years of the cycle, and since their total cost was likely to be far in excess of Uganda's IPF for that cycle, his Government was requesting the Council not only to approve expenditure of the major portion of Uganda's IPF in the early years of the third cycle but also to provide an early opportunity for reviewing Uganda's IPF. When Uganda's IPF for the third cycle had been established, basic data on per capita GNP and population had not been available. Such data had since been published. Several additional factors also needed to be taken into account in determining Uganda's IPF.

57. In the view of his delegation, Uganda's IPF for the third programming cycle should, in fact, be between \$70 and \$80 million, whereas the Council was being asked to approve an IPF of \$59.5 million, which fell short of the country's requirements. Since his delegation was aware that the resources available to UNDP for the third programming cycle were inadequate, partly as a result of the reluctance of major UNDP donors to increase their contributions, it urged the Administrator to pursue his consultations with member Governments with a view to convincing them of the need substantially to increase their contributions in order to reach the \$6,714 million target recommended by the Council at its twenty-seventh session.

58. Mr. MORSE (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) welcomed the fact that Uganda's rate of programme implementation had increased and that precise information on population and per capita GNP had become available. Such information would be passed on to the World Bank, whose statistics UNDP must use to determine country IPFs. During his recent visit to Uganda, he had explored with the Government other ways of helping the country in its current plight, and he looked forward to holding fruitful consultations with Uganda's Minister of Planning and Economic Development during the Minister's stay in New York.

59. With regard to the request by Lebanon for an illustrative country IPF for the third programming cycle, extensive consultations with the Lebanese Government had already taken place prior to the current session. It was proving difficult, however, to compute the IPF, because it was not easy to determine Lebanon's per capita GNP - the World Bank had yet to make such a determination. In accordance with Council decision 80/30, the Administration was trying to calculate Lebanon's per capita GNP for 1978 by other means and hoped to submit a firm recommendation for its third-cycle IPF to the twenty-ninth session. As stated in document DP/519, for the time being Lebanon's IPF for the second cycle was being used as a guide so that the execution of UNDP programmes could continue in the third cycle.

60. Mr. SAGHIYYAH (Observer for Lebanon) said that his Government was prepared to continue discussions with the Administrator in an endeavour to reach a final settlement of outstanding issues. If there was no probability of approving an increased IPF for Lebanon at the current session, the Council should defer any decision until the following session, at which the matter should be considered as a priority matter and with a view to increasing Lebanon's IPF or granting some other form of assistance to meet its urgent development needs.

61. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) said that his delegation sympathized with the plight of Uganda. The situation in Lebanon was also serious. The inadequacy of statistics was a handicap, but not an insuperable one. The question might be made the subject of a draft decision.

62. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that the increased IPFs requested by Lebanon and Uganda should be considered sympathetically by the Council. The situations prevailing in those two countries involved a great deal of human suffering. It was gratifying that the Administrator was considering action to alleviate the plight of the two countries.

63. Mr. HAGGAG (Egypt) said that because of the problems besetting the Ugandan economy, the Governing Council should consider Uganda's needs sympathetically. The case of Lebanon was similar, with serious problems caused by external intervention and the destruction of the country's infrastructure. His delegation urged the Council to review the country programme for Lebanon and to increase its IPF.

64. Mrs. BALLESTER (Cuba) said that Lebanon and Uganda were faced with major problems, which explained their requests for increased IPFs. If, as the representative of Kuwait had proposed, a draft decision was to be submitted on the question of Lebanon and Uganda, her delegation wished to be one of the sponsors.

65. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that the war which had ravaged Lebanon since 1975 had destroyed the economy, sharply reduced its GNP and caused great hardship for the Lebanese people. His delegation would have preferred the country programme for Lebanon be revised at the current session, but it could agree to postponing action until the following session on the understanding that it would then be considered as a matter of urgency. His Government also supported the Ugandan request for increased aid.

66. Mr. MINAH (Sierra Leone), Mr. ASRANI (India), Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) and Mr. MOUMOUNI (Niger) expressed support for the Ugandan and Lebanese requests for increased assistance.

67. Mr. DUVERNEY-GUICHARD (France) said that his country had already demonstrated its concern to play a part in the reconstruction of Uganda, and supported the Ugandan request. France was also concerned over the problems facing Lebanon and was prepared to consider favourably in due course measures whereby UNDP aid to Lebanon for reconstruction might be increased.

68. Mr. MBAZOA (Observer for the Central African Republic) said that his own country's IPF should be increased. The economy was in a state of disruption and

(Mr. Mbazoa, Observer,  
Central African Republic)

the country faced many grave problems, and should be added to the list of countries which were receiving additional assistance.

69. Mr. N'KIET (Gabon) said that he supported the Ugandan request for increased assistance.

70. Mr. SALLAH (Gambia) said that Uganda's economy had been dislocated. The Governing Council should consider increasing aid to that country as soon as possible. His delegation was also concerned over Lebanon, which should be given assistance at at least the level of the second-cycle IPF.

71. Mr. MITO-BABA (Observer for Benin) said that his Government strongly supported Uganda's plea for special assistance. Emergency aid should also be granted to Lebanon.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.