



## United Nations Development Programme

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/SR.729  
5 November 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### GOVERNING COUNCIL

Twenty-eighth session

### SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 729th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 24 June 1981, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago)

### CONTENTS

Programme of implementation (continued)

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

Manifesto Against Hunger and Underdevelopment

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

- (c) Assistance to specific countries (continued)
- (d) Report on pre-investment activities (continued)

Country and intercountry programmes and projects

- (b) Country programmes

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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

PROGRAMME OF IMPLEMENTATION

(b) ASSISTANCE TO THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS RECOGNIZED BY THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY (continued) (DP/513, DP/L.356)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision DP/L.356.
2. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator, Regional Director for Africa), replying to questions from Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Council had been given information in the past on the Nationhood Programme for Namibia which was referred to in the report of the Administrator (DP/513). The purpose of the Programme, which had been prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia in co-operation with UNDP and all the agencies of the United Nations system, was to prepare Namibians to take over when their country became independent. As he had pointed out at the previous meeting, the intention was to finance the participation of representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by OAU in meetings covered by UNDP from the IPFs, as had been done in the past. Moreover, it was clear from paragraph 11 (d) of the report that the procedure was not new.
3. Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) suggested that the Administrator should bear in mind the possibility of eventually using extrabudgetary funds for the purpose mentioned in paragraph 4 of the draft decision and that the number of participants should be limited. While realizing the difficulties which certain national liberation movements encountered in their work, his delegation believed that IPFs should, in principle, be utilized to implement development-oriented projects rather than to meet for travel expenses.
4. Mr. AMOKO (Uganda) said that, in response to the request made by a number of delegations, he had decided to add the words "out of the IPFs of the national liberation movements" after the word "financing" in paragraph 4 of the draft decision.
5. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator, Regional Director for Africa), replying to a question from Mr. WINDSOR (United Kingdom), said that at present, the attendance at Governing Council sessions of one representative per liberation movement recognized by OAU was financed under the regional project for the liberation movements. Paragraph 4 of draft decision DP/L.356 merely requested that there be more than one representative per movement and suggested that participation by such representatives in other meetings covered by UNDP be financed in the same manner.
6. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that while his delegation did not wish to block a consensus, its concern was similar to that expressed by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. His Government fully supported

(Mr. Zimmerman, United States)

the goal of assisting the peoples of southern Africa in the fields of social and educational development. Given the circumstances in that area of the world, the Council had to pay special attention to the needs of people who were displaced as a result of conflict or who were unable to participate fully in the educational and economic systems of their own countries. His Government had donated generously to programmes directed towards those people and felt that the funds could be used more properly for such programmes rather than for travel expenses. Accordingly, it objected strongly to the assistance to liberation movements requested in paragraphs 3 and 4.

7. While abhorring the system of apartheid, his Government accepted the Government of South Africa as legitimate and it rejected the approach of the liberation movements, which advocated its forceful overthrow. Likewise, his Government rejected the General Assembly's designation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and considered it inappropriate for the United Nations system to aid SWAPO on that basis.

8. Mr. WINDSOR (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the concern of the Federal Republic of Germany. It very much appreciated the difficulties experienced by national liberation movements in meeting the costs of attending meetings of United Nations bodies and recognized the legitimacy of their desire to be adequately represented. However, he urged that the number of representatives of those movements be carefully considered since resources which would otherwise go to development in the field would be diverted for the purpose of financing their participation in meetings of United Nations bodies. His delegation would, of course, join in the consensus on the draft decision.

9. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by previous speakers. Judging from the projects listed in paragraph 11 of the report of the Administrator (DP/513) it would appear that there were other more essential training programmes which deserved more attention than they were getting. He urged that the number of representatives of national liberation movements funded by the IPFs be kept to a minimum.

10. Mr. TUAN (Liberia), referring to the statement by the United States representative, said that the issue in southern Africa involved human dignity, human rights and social justice. There had been no mention of overthrowing any Government. Apartheid was incompatible with the present international order and no attempt to condone that policy could be accepted. The basis for the Council's discussions on Namibia should be Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Moreover, given the periodicity of Governing Council sessions, he did not see that the economic implications of the draft decision were so serious. Delegations should give the draft decision their wholehearted support. His delegation totally supported the liberation of Namibia and the continuation of UNDP support for the national liberation movements in Africa.

11. Mr. RAMOS (Observer for Cape Verde) said that, since the national liberation movements recognized by OAU would eventually be governing their countries, the use of IPFs to finance participation of representatives of such movements in United Nations activities was an investment in human resources. Accordingly, it could not be argued, as some delegations had sought to do, that the money would be better spent on training individuals. Everyone would surely agree that there was no substitute for experience.
12. Mrs. BALLESTER (Cuba) said that the position of her delegation concerning apartheid had been explained clearly in the political bodies of the United Nations. Her delegation attached much importance to familiarizing officials of the national liberation movements with the procedures employed in United Nations bodies so that, when they eventually came to represent their countries in the Council, they would have a complete grasp of the mechanisms involved. Her delegation fully supported the draft decision.
13. Mr. AHLANDER (Sweden) said that his Government felt that the use of resources available to the United Nations to finance any travel expenses should be very restricted. He requested that great restraint should be used in implementing the draft decision since it meant diverting money which should be used for training and similar activities for other purposes. He recalled that Sweden had been the first Western country to support the liberation movements in Angola and Mozambique and that it supported those in Namibia and South Africa. His Government merely wished to ensure that the most efficient use possible was made of very scarce resources.
14. Mr. MAYIRA (Rwanda) said that he had been greatly shocked at the statement of the United States representative. It was common knowledge that Namibia was illegally occupied and helping Namibia through its SWAPO representatives was not a subversive action. It was time that the Council adopted the decision.
15. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that he had pointed out that his Government abhorred the system of apartheid and his delegation could not accept language which indicated that the United States Government somehow was supportive of that policy. His Government was hopeful of finding a just solution to the problem of Namibia and seeing Namibia represented in the Council as an independent entity.
16. Mr. AMOKO (Uganda) expressed regret at the controversy that had arisen over the draft decision. Recalling the statement by the United States representative to the effect that the racist South African régime was legitimate and that the United States opposed violence, he pointed out that the racist régime in South Africa was a minority régime and that the minority could not legitimately rule the majority. Secondly, the world community had recognized that South African rule over Namibia was illegal and constituted a colonial régime. The responsibility for Namibia lay with the United Nations. Apartheid and colonial régimes were violent régimes and he did not see how anyone could object to the means used to remove an illegal and violent régime.
17. The PRESIDENT, said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council was prepared to adopt draft decision DP/L.356 as orally amended.
18. It was so decided.

19. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 4 (b).

#### MANIFESTO AGAINST HUNGER AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT

20. Mr. MORSE (Administrator) informed the Council that a unique Manifesto Against Hunger and Underdevelopment, signed by 53 Nobel Prize Laureates had just been issued in Rome, Geneva, Brussels and Paris. The Manifesto testified anew to the importance of UNDP's role in the struggle to achieve freedom from want and a decent quality of life for two thirds of the world's population. It was an impassioned plea to all to realize that through hunger and the deprivation of underdevelopment the human species was condemning to death tens of thousands of children, women and men each day - silently and relentlessly. By the end of that day alone between 50,000 and 80,000 persons would have died of physical deprivation and disease. The authors of the Manifesto were asking that such a silent massacre be declared to be beyond acceptance and beyond tolerance.

21. One of the signatories, Professor Abdus Salam, joint winner of the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1979, was present in New York, and he asked that the Council permit Mr. Salam to address the Council.

22. At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salam took a seat at the Council table.

23. Mr. SALAM (Nobel Prize Laureate for Physics 1979) said that he particularly valued the opportunity to present the Manifesto to the Council, since UNDP, within the United Nations system, epitomized humanity's maximal moral and political response to the problems of development and of the application of science and technology to development. The Manifesto invited individuals and nations to re-examine and renew their moral and political commitment to the solving of those problems.

24. Nine hundred years before, a distinguished Islamic physician had compiled a pharmacopoeia which he had divided into two parts: Diseases of the Rich and Diseases of the Poor. If he were writing today, he would probably make a similar division; half of his treatise would speak of the one affliction of rich humanity, the psychosis of nuclear annihilation and nuclear armaments; and the other half would be concerned with the want and hunger of the poor. In diagnosis he might perhaps add that the two afflictions sprang from a common cause: excess of science in the one case and lack of science in the other. Scientists, and in particular physicists, were often blamed for inflicting that nuclear psychosis on mankind, but there was less appreciation of the fact that they also had created in science and technology an instrument which could, given the political will, completely eradicate hunger and want. Those who took the decisions continued to allocate hundreds of billions of dollars for mutual destruction, whereas the resources made available for science and technology for development were smaller by a hundred-fold.

(Mr. Salam)

25. He read out the Manifesto, signed by 53 Nobel Prize Laureates, men and women of science and literature dedicated to peace, who in their work expressed their search for universal understanding, for brotherhood and a shared civilization that was to be found in peace and progress. Through the Manifesto they appealed to all men and women of goodwill to bring back to life millions who were suffering from hunger and privation in the world.
26. Currently, in a single year, more people suffered than all those who had died in the holocaust of the first half of the century. The causes of that unprecedented situation were primarily political; what was urgently needed was a new political determination to deal with its causes and to mitigate its effects, without delay.
27. The great international organizations, together with States and their peoples, must take action to combat and overcome starvation, to refute the false idea of reality that accepted as inevitable what has in fact a result of current politics, and must do so realistically so that what was possible was not sacrificed to barren dreams which could never be realized.
28. Current aid policies, which served merely to lighten mankind's burden of guilt, must be challenged, and measures must be effected immediately, nationally and internationally, to save hundreds of millions of people from malnutrition, backwardness and death by starvation, so that they might not die through mankind's inertia, failure to act, or indifference.
29. Those who wielded power bore the greatest responsibility, but the weak were not helpless; the right to life was primordial among the rights of man, and ordinary people could help to avert the catastrophies of the day by co-operating with one another in the use of whatever democratic weapons they possessed, or in organizing small-scale projects of their own.
30. The news media had the responsibility to publicize what was being done; if only people were told what was happening, then the world's dark future might be changed.
31. Now was the time to act, to create, and to live in a way that would give life to others.
32. Mr. MORSE (Administratory), said that the Manifesto should serve as a spur to the consciences and the common humanity of all present. If it were to fade from memory, fellow human beings would continue to die in great numbers from hunger, disease, or deprivation of development support. It was to be hoped that it would inspire the will, the determination and the conscience to conquer world poverty once and for all. He pledged himself and his colleagues in UNDP to even greater efforts to help to banish such conditions from the face of the earth.
33. The PRESIDENT said that the Manifesto had been signed at a time when the Council was seeking to ensure that the world community continued its co-operation to alleviate poverty and hunger, and to develop the vast resources, especially human

(The President)

resources, required in that endeavour. He was sure that the inspiring message carried by Professor Salam would renew the determination of the members of the Council to provide those resources, and to work for the ideals which Professor Salam and his colleagues represented.

34. Mr. Salam withdrew.

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

(c) ASSISTANCE TO SPECIFIC COUNTRIES (continued) (DP/L.359)

35. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision DP/L.359, submitted by Uganda.

36. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that his delegation, together with those of Uganda, Egypt and Rwanda, active in the true spirit of African unity, had sponsored draft decision DP/L.359 in response to Uganda's plea that the Council increase its IPF so as to reflect adequately the true social and economic conditions prevailing in that country. Cuba had subsequently joined the list of sponsors. He strongly urged the Council to adopt the draft decision.

37. Mr. RUKIRA (Rwanda) said that his country was very well placed to speak of the problems of Uganda, since it had a common frontier with that country and had been able to observe daily the difficulties which it had suffered. The courageous and patient Ugandan people were determined to work to rebuild their country, and the draft decision was the last opportunity for the international community to lend its support and to provide the massive assistance which was urgently needed.

38. His country would continue to co-operate with the Ugandan authorities and to give them all the support they required in carrying out the difficult task of rebuilding the Ugandan economy. The recent accession of Uganda to the Kagera Basin Development Organization, the major objective of which was the development of the subregion in terms of energy, agriculture, industry and related infrastructures, was an unprecedented commitment and a decisive step forward. He appealed to the Council to grant special UNDP assistance to Uganda, and expressed his delegation's full support for the draft decision.

39. His delegation also supported the request made by Lebanon for increased assistance.

40. Mr. SEALY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had noted the current economic situation in Uganda and endorsed all efforts on the part of the international community, and in particular by UNDP, to give assistance to that country. It therefore endorsed the draft decision.

41. Mr. ELFAKI (Observer for Sudan) said that, as a neighbouring country, his delegation was aware of the difficulties that Uganda had suffered; it consequently strongly supported the appeal made by the Ugandan Minister for Planning and Development, and also the draft decision currently before the Council. He appealed to the international community to come to the aid of Uganda as quickly as possible.

42. Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country had a long-standing record of co-operation with Uganda and had contributed substantially to bilateral programmes over the years, in addition to its support for multilateral efforts.
43. He would be grateful for some clarification from the Assistant Administrator as to the import of operative paragraph 3 of the draft decision. His delegation had always understood that the mandate of UNDP was restricted to technical co-operation and, considered that that mandate should be observed very carefully as far as the convening of international conferences was concerned. Presumably, it would be the Ugandan Government which would eventually convene the Donor Conference, and the request to the Administrator would then relate only to those aspects of the Conference which fell within the scope of UNDP's mandate. However, some clarification as to the role of UNDP in that process was desirable.
44. Mr. CHEN XINGNONG (China) said that the Chinese people were very sympathetic to the distress of the people of Uganda. His delegation believed that the international community should provide maximum assistance to the Ugandan Government in its task of reconstruction and recovery. He therefore supported the draft decision.
45. Mr. DIRIE (Somalia) said that increased assistance, through augmented IPFs, should be given to countries experiencing serious natural and man-made difficulties. It consequently believed that the Government of Uganda should be given all possible assistance in its rehabilitation and reconstruction work.
46. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) said that Uganda was situated in a high-priority area in terms of his Government's bilateral co-operation programme. In view of its pressing needs, caused by its traumatic experiences and exacerbated by natural disasters, increased assistance should be a major priority for both international organizations and national Governments. His country was currently considering a number of major bilateral projects in conjunction with the Kagera River authorities.
47. His delegation could accept draft decision DP/L.359, on the understanding that the implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 3 was given very careful attention, and that the resources earmarked for those purposes were kept to a minimum, since the assistance to which it referred was certainly no more than marginal to the responsibilities of UNDP.
48. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation endorsed the request that the IPF for Uganda, together with that for Lebanon, should be increased if possible. However, he agreed with the previous speaker that some clarification of operative paragraph 3 was desirable.
49. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Observer for Kenya) said that his delegation had welcomed the important statement made by the Ugandan Minister for Planning and Development, at the 728th meeting of the Council. Uganda was a fraternal and neighbouring State, consequently, his country strongly supported the appeal for increased assistance and urged the Council to support the draft decision.



50. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Assistant Administrator, Regional Director for Africa), replying to the questions raised by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, said that UNDP had already assisted many African countries in organizing donor conferences. For example, in 1974 a conference of donor countries and bilateral and multilateral sources of financing had been held under the auspices of the Organization for the Development of the Senegal River. UNDP had prepared a technical report for that meeting, which had then been used for the financing of feasibility studies and technical assistance projects. Round-table discussions among major donor countries were often held at the start of the implementation of development plans in least-developed countries. UNDP's role on those occasions was to furnish studies permitting Governments to submit dossiers to their development partners in order to mobilize resources for financing their development activities. Equatorial Guinea, for example, was being assisted in preparing dossiers for a donor conference to take place soon. UNDP had also helped the Zimbabwe Government to prepare dossiers concerning technical assistance, preinvestment and investment for the Donor Conference in March 1981. Those examples proved that UNDP did nothing more than render technical assistance and assist in the preparation of dossiers and studies. It could not be reproached for being overly involved in financing.

51. Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States) said that in the light of the Assistant Administrator's reply, their delegations were prepared to support the draft decision.

52. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision DP/L.359.

53. It was so decided.

54. Mr. AMOKO (Uganda) thanked the Council for its unanimous support. The problems of his country were well known. The Ugandan people were doing everything possible to reconstruct their country. Although they recognized that the greatest responsibility lay with them, assistance by the international community was definitely required. Attention was given in the reconstruction activities both to Uganda's internal concerns and to the promotion of regional projects. In the spirit of TCDC, the Government had taken practical steps to cement cordial relations with its neighbours. A number of intercountry commissions had been established and, at a recent summit between Zaire, the Sudan and Uganda, a decision had been taken to convene a conference to establish a Nile River Authority. It was expected that all countries bordering on the Nile or using it would take part in the conference, and that the relevant United Nations agencies would provide active assistance in that connexion.

55. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report of the Administrator on assistance to specific countries (DP/520) and of the report of the Administrator on assistance for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Uganda (DP/564).

56. It was so decided.

(d) REPORT ON PRE-INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES (DP/521, DP/L.345/Rev.1) (continued)

57. The PRESIDENT, referring to draft decision DP/L.345/Rev.1, said that the Chairman of the Budgetary and Finance Committee had indicated that it would have no financial implications, for the UNDP administrative and support budget, since the additional amount of \$100,000 proposed for preinvestment work would be authorized out of the programme reserve funds in 1981.

58. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that the following amendments had been agreed upon. In paragraph 4, the words "and also to associate them with UNDP-assisted projects at an early stage" should be inserted after the words "sources of finance". In paragraph 10, the word "thirtieth" should be replaced by "twenty-ninth".

59. Mr. FILIMONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at an earlier meeting his delegation had proposed that the words "with appreciation" should be deleted from paragraph 1, and that the words "taking into account the experience gained in 1981" should be deleted from paragraph 7.

60. Mr. ASRANI (India) proposed that in paragraph 4, the words "or private" should be deleted. In June 1979, his delegation had expressed its apprehension that if UNDP's pre-investment activities were designed to encourage private investment, they might be used by multinational and other large corporations to conduct studies that would ultimately lead to their own investments. The Administrator had stated at that time that he did not intend to seek private investment, but would solicit funds from multilateral official funding organizations like the World Bank. For that reason, the draft decision should not refer to private sources of finance.

61. Mrs. BALLESTER (Cuba) endorsed the amendment proposed by the representative of India.

62. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) recalled that his delegation had proposed an amendment to paragraph 8, whereby the words "study the possibilities of extending" would be replaced by the word "extend". In that way, the Administrator would be given a clear mandate.

63. Ms. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands) said that she could not endorse the Soviet amendment to paragraph 1. She endorsed the amendment to paragraph 4 read out by the Secretary, and suggested a subamendment to the Indian amendment to that paragraph, by which the words "public or private" would be deleted from paragraph 4. Her delegation endorsed the Soviet amendment to paragraph 7. With regard to the Liberian amendment to paragraph 8, she agreed that it was desirable to extend training as soon as possible, but it was her understanding that under the current financial circumstances, it would be impossible to do so for the next year. She requested clarification from the Secretariat on that point. She supported the amendment to paragraph 10 on the understanding that the report referred to in that paragraph would be brief.

64. Mr. ASRANI (India) said that his delegation could accept the Netherlands subamendment to its amendment, provided that in implementing the draft decision, the secretariat have in mind the Administrator's assurance that it was not his intention to seek investment from multinational corporations.

65. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) said she supported the Netherlands subamendment to paragraph 4 as well as the amendment to that paragraph read out by the Secretary. With regard to paragraph 8, she understood that the Administrator was requested to study the matter not only from the financial point of view but also in terms of the competence and responsibilities of Governments and agencies. Her delegation could not support the proposed amendment to that paragraph, but endorsed the proposed amendment to paragraph 10.

66. Mr. N'KIET (Gabon), referring to the Liberian amendment to paragraph 8, said that the Council had recognized the need to involve government officials in UNDP activities at the project level. Although the proposed amendment was very much to the point, the problem required negotiations with the Governments concerned.

67. The PRESIDENT said that since there seemed to be no consensus on the draft decision, the sponsors should meet with delegations which had made comments to see if the difficulties could be resolved.

#### COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS (DP/522)

68. Mr. AHLANDER (Sweden) said that the country programmes were the very core of UNDP's activities. A number of characteristics distinguished UNDP assistance from most bilateral activities, including those of Sweden. It had very extensive geographical coverage, as a result of which its resources were dispersed in numerous country programmes of fairly modest size and comprising many small projects. That made the programme administratively bulky and costly to execute. In contrast, Swedish bilateral assistance was extended to a limited number of countries in which efforts were being made to achieve a high degree of sectoral concentration. UNDP had access to a vast reservoir of skills and experience in all areas of development, and through it, developing countries were able to obtain human and material resources from virtually every corner of the globe and a selection of technologies which few bilateral programmes were able to offer. His delegation was concerned over the persistent tendency in country programmes to disperse UNDP resources in a multitude of projects with very broad sectoral coverage, but it welcomed the sectoral concentration reflected in the global research programme.

69. Document DP/522 was very useful, although it represented too small a sampling of country programmes for any trends revealed in it to be generally valid. It would be interesting to have a similar report covering all or nearly all of the country programmes in the third cycle.

70. The Administrator seemed to have restricted himself deliberately in the report's treatment of global priorities. Country programmes were measured against only a limited sample of global strategies adopted by the United Nations, in which the strategy on agricultural reform and rural development and the strategy on primary health care were not included. Those strategies were highly relevant and should be included in the next report. The six global priorities mentioned were included in just over half of the 14 country programmes under consideration. That

(Mr. Ahlander, Sweden)

low average was not very impressive. The Administrator's comments in paragraph 36 led his delegation to conclude that it would be interesting to have a report on the extent to which global priorities established under the auspices of the United Nations system were reflected in the development efforts and national priorities of countries receiving UNDP assistance.

71. The country programme documents generally contained little or no information about past experience relating to technical co-operation activities, although such feed-back ought to have served as an important basis for the formulation of new country programmes. It would be very useful if brief general accounts of such experiences were included in the country programme documents in future.

72. With respect to global research programmes, his delegation would welcome a general discussion on the role of research in the development process, the development of national research institutions as opposed to international research centres and the question of basic research as opposed to applied research for specific purposes.

73. With respect to the individual country programmes, his delegation was always surprised to see that European countries still received assistance from UNDP, and he hoped that those which did would make every effort to become UNDP contributors, in readily usable currencies, as soon as possible.

74. The country programmes of Bangladesh, Kenya and Viet Nam illustrated the trend toward dispersal of UNDP resources over many projects in many sectors. The Kenya country programme document indicated that projects scattered in many areas with probably marginal impact had been curtailed. While that was welcome, his delegation believed that an even higher degree of concentration would have been desirable, since the available IPF resources were very limited. His delegation was happy that a few projects in the Viet Nam programme were relatively large and well-concentrated by UNDP standards. The Bangladesh programme had satisfactory linkages to the contents and time-frame of the national development plan and appeared to be well related to its priorities. The periodicity of the Viet Nam programme also coincided on the whole with that of the national development plan and it was well aligned with that plan's priorities. UNDP assistance was to be concentrated on interlinked sectors, which should allow the country programme to have a significant impact in supporting the Government's efforts to improve the situation of the majority of the population.

75. In contrast, the Kenya country programme overlapped with the country's fourth and fifth development plans. Although the document pointed to that as an advantage, his delegation believed it was also bound to have significant disadvantages. Furthermore, with the exception of annex IV, the Kenya programme was not presented according to UNDP's standard classifications, so that it was difficult to compare it with other country programmes as well as the previous programme for Kenya. However, it did appear to be well related to the current Government's priorities.

(Mr. Ahlander, Sweden)

76. The size of the equipment component in the Viet Nam country programme had been a cause for concern in the past, and it was expected to remain significant. His delegation regretted that not even a tentative estimate of the exact proportion had been provided and that the document did not furnish information about experience in handling the equipment component in the first country programme. In general, the Council's concern over a large equipment component was legitimate if it reflected doubts about the recipient's ability to make effective use of the equipment, particularly if advanced technical and scientific equipment was included. If developing countries were free to translate all of the IPFs into equipment delivery, one might question whether country programmes would really come under the heading of technical co-operation, which was UNDP's sole vocation. The Administrator's ongoing attempts to define technical co-operation for the purpose of handling certain aspects of agency support costs should take account of the relative size of equipment components in UNDP assistance. His delegation hoped that the formulation mission would give careful consideration to the amount of equipment that could be put to effective use by the Government of Viet Nam, taking into account such constraints as lack of trained personnel and absence of adequate servicing and maintenance facilities. Sweden's bilateral development co-operation with Viet Nam had demonstrated the great importance of those aspects, and had revealed serious constraints with regard to enterprise and institution management as well as repair and maintenance facilities. For that reason, his delegation had noted with satisfaction that such problems were likely to receive considerable attention in many of the projects under consideration for inclusion in the Viet Nam programme. He wondered whether the Administrator and the agencies felt that adherence to the standard UNDP procedure whereby equipment and supplies remained the property of the executing agency until the project was finished provided additional safeguards in terms of effective maintenance and utilization of scientific and technical equipment.

77. His country had long co-operated with Bangladesh, Kenya and Viet Nam in development efforts, and accordingly believed that those countries had the capability and will to maintain an effective dialogue with UNDP in order to ensure that its resources were put to the best possible use in consonance with national priorities. Over the years, co-operation between Sweden and Viet Nam had been carried out in a growing spirit of openness and recognition of short-comings and constraints on both sides, which had led to more flexibility and realism in the planning process. His delegation was glad to note that UNDP-supported development activities in Viet Nam were being planned and executed in a similar atmosphere. Direct links could be established with Swedish bilateral assistance in two of the country programmes. For a number of years, Sweden had financed a project on export promotion in Bangladesh, but that financing would cease by the end of the current financial year. Informal consultations with UNDP had indicated that it might be able to finance the continuation of the project, which was given high priority by the Bangladesh Government. His delegation would greatly welcome such financing and would be prepared, as a bridging arrangement, to continue financial support through the financial year 1981-1982.

/...

(Mr. Ahlander, Sweden)

78. The Vietnamese Government and UNDP had noted that some of the projects proposed for that country would lend themselves to Swedish financing under multi-bi arrangements or to co-financing; particularly, projects in the fields of forestry development and rehabilitation of the paper industry, which were closely linked to the Swedish-supported project on establishment and operation of a modern pulp and paper plant. His Government was prepared to consider those possibilities in planning its future assistance to Viet Nam, particularly for the next three years.

79. His delegation fully supported the Administrator's recommendations concerning the Bangladesh, Kenya and Viet Nam country programmes as well as the other country programmes before the Council.

80. Ms. POULSEN (Denmark) said that the country programmes would benefit greatly from a systematic discussion of the experience gained from the execution of projects as well as of the project results. Presentation of past performance would be of great assistance in evaluating new programmes.

81. Since it was essential that a country programme should be related as closely as possible to other development efforts, her delegation noted with satisfaction that all the country programmes submitted at the current session had been formulated within the framework of a national development plan. While fully recognizing that it was the prerogative of the Government to set the priorities for its country programme, her delegation felt that UNDP had a role to play in promoting global development priorities. It welcomed the increased emphasis on activities benefiting the poorer strata of the population and suggested that more emphasis should be given to self-reliance activities.

82. It was important that consideration be given to enhancing the role of women in development as an integral part of general development activities. The great difference in emphasis on pre-investment activities should be noted with interest. Her delegation welcomed the increased emphasis on pre-investment concerning alternative energy projects. The use of UNDP resources for activities in support of investment projects was very important and showed that UNDP was successfully performing its role as the central technical co-operation organization of the United Nations system.

83. Her delegation supported the proposal of the representative of Sweden regarding a comprehensive report covering all or nearly all the country programmes relating to the third cycle. Concerning the equipment component of such programmes, her delegation believed it was important to keep in mind that UNDP was the central organization for technical co-operation; it should not turn away from technical co-operation towards capital development. Her delegation supported the Deputy Administrator's proposal that the equipment component should be discussed in depth at the next regular session of the Council on the basis of a report by the Administrator.

(Ms. Poulsen, Denmark)

84. The deliberations on country programmes and on the trends in such programmes should be viewed in the over-all context of the country programming process. In that respect, her delegation fully supported the efforts and suggestions made in document DP/518 concerning continuous programming. Finally, her delegation fully supported all the country programmes presented at the current session.
85. Mr. BIDAUT (France), noting that the procedures for the preparation of UNDP country programmes had improved over the years, said it was essential that Governments should establish their own development priorities and determine the level of co-ordination with the representatives of multilateral and bilateral sources of assistance. Different approaches had been adopted for the respective country programmes. The programme for Nepal represented an attempt to combine the efforts of all the United Nations organizations concerned with the development of that country. Such an approach deserved support because it involved the specialized agencies in a joint and multidisciplinary undertaking.
86. The Administrator had sought to synchronize IPF cycles with national planning cycles. It was more important to take socio-economic realities into account than to seek uniformity in procedures.
87. Continuous programming of projects should make periodic course corrections possible and enhance project effectiveness.
88. The content of the country programmes was often linked to the level of economic development attained by the countries concerned. There was no reason, however, to reserve more sophisticated technologies for any one category of countries. The developing countries were increasingly in need of assistance with regard to financial and budgetary management and computer programmes. His delegation fully agreed with the remarks made by the representative of Mexico concerning the role of the Intergovernmental Bureau for Informatics in relation to UNDP projects.
89. It was often more effective to strengthen existing government institutions in the developing countries than to establish new ones. A plethora of new agencies during the project implementation stage was no guarantee of sounder management.
90. His delegation agreed with the IPFs determined for the least developed countries at the current session. It also welcomed the emphasis in the country programmes on the development of rural areas, food security, food production and food processing. Egypt, for example, allocated more than one third of its IPF to the food and agricultural sector.
91. Within the IPFs, a balance should be sought between technical assistance inputs, expertise and the equipment component. It was important that the economic inputs should be put to effective use.
92. The global and interregional programme would be of particular importance in the third programming cycle and would require considerable resources. Agricultural research was receiving high priority from the Consultative Group on

(Mr. Bidaut, France)

International Agricultural Research. Health projects were being implemented with the participation of WHO, and support for the special public works programme, executed by ILO, would be continued. More emphasis would be placed on science and technology, and energy.

93. France supported those trends. However, it objected to the proposal, contained in paragraph 72 of document DP/524, to include in the interregional programme for 1982 to 1986 activities relating to the indebtedness of the developing countries. There were international organizations that were fulfilling perfectly their responsibilities in that area. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and regional development banks could play a role in debt rescheduling. UNDP resources should not be mobilized for activities that were likely to duplicate those of other organizations.

94. It appeared that UNDP was considering withdrawing its funding of the technical assistance activities under the generalized system of preferences. His delegation believed that that programme should continue to enjoy UNDP's support.

95. France supported the principle of adopting an indicative programme for Viet Nam, on the understanding that the Vietnamese Government would be informed in advance that certain projects might be modified or deferred. Subject to some reservations, his delegation supported all the country programmes presented.

96. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Governing Council agreed to take note of the Administrator's report on relevant trends and problems in the country programmes proposed for approval in 1981 (DP/522), as well as the comments made thereon by the representatives of Governments.

97. It was so decided.

(b) COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

European States (DP/GC/BUL/R.3; DP/GC/POL/R.3; DP/GC/BUL/R.3/RECOMMENDATION, DP/GC/POL/R.3/RECOMMENDATION)

98. Mr. PRINS (Chief, Unit for Europe) said that the third country programme for Bulgaria (DP/GC/BUL/R.3) reflected the same priorities as the second country programme. Two thirds of the funds available were in fact to be used for projects which either continued second cycle activities or were closely linked to projects carried out in the past. Support to research and development institutions for science and technology constituted approximately one half of the programme. Industries to benefit in particular were those in the fields of chemistry, machine-building, electronics and ship-building. An important project in the ship-building field would be executed by the Government. It was based on an earlier project for which the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) had been the executing agency. It had been decided, in full agreement with IMCO, that the related third cycle project should be executed by the Government.



(Mr. Prins)

99. The country programme for Bulgaria contained a number of instances of linkages with intercountry activities. The project assisting the Plant Introduction and Genetic Resources Centre was closely related to the important regional project for the preservation of plant genetic resources in Europe, which was in turn related to the world-wide activities of the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources. Continuation of that regional project had received considerable support at the Intergovernmental Consultation on the Third Cycle Regional Programme for Europe, held in May 1981.

100. Another project in the country programme, dealing with the utilization of low-calorie coal, was related to a proposed regional project in the same field. Whether the latter could in fact be implemented was not yet certain.

101. In the case of the country programme for Poland (DP/GC/POL/R.3), there were also important linkages with intercountry activities. The programme foresaw the continuation of a national road transport project in support of one of the most important regional projects in Europe, namely, the Trans-European North-South Motorway project. The latter was also expected to continue in the third cycle, on the basis of the strong support expressed at the recent Intergovernmental Consultation. Another national project would be implemented in co-operation with the global activities of the International Centre for Maize and Wheat Improvement in Mexico. Under that project, improved varieties of rye and triticale would be developed with a view to increased domestic food grain production.

102. Apart from those linkages with intercountry activities, the country programme for Poland showed a balance between projects involving advanced levels of science and technology and projects reflecting concern for the quality of life. Among the latter were the food grain production project, a project to improve milk processing and increase milk consumption, an occupational safety project and cancer research. The science and technology sector included projects on coal conversion and the manufacture of agricultural machinery.

103. It was hoped that in the case of both country programmes, the results of the projects would at some point be of direct benefit to developing countries in other parts of the world within the framework of technical co-operation among developing countries or under similar arrangements. The links with programmes in developing countries in other parts of the world would constitute an important feature of the regional programme for Europe.

104. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that the country programmes should faithfully reflect, as far as possible, the priorities established in national development programmes. His delegation fully supported the UNDP country programme for Bulgaria, which was in line with the priority given by the Bulgarian Government to industrialization, and science and technology. Japan hoped that in the preparation and implementation of projects, it would be borne in mind that UNDP assistance was intended to ensure wide enjoyment of the benefits of the transfer of technology and to contribute to a general improvement of the welfare of the people.

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

105. Poland's five-year plan, 1976-1980, which had been designed to improve living conditions and modernize the economy, had been adversely affected by a number of factors. The emphasis in the new five-year plan, 1981-1985, was on increased food grain production and on the diversification of sources of energy. His delegation agreed that high priority should be given to those two areas with a view to revitalizing the economy. It agreed too with the views expressed in paragraph 5 of document DP/GC/POL/R.3/RECOMMENDATION.

106. Mr. AHLANDER (Sweden) requested clarification from the Chief of the Unit for Europe regarding technical co-operation among developing countries in the context of Europe.

107. Mr. PRINS (Chief, Unit for Europe) said that UNDP had drawn up a list of countries qualifying for activities within the framework of technical co-operation among developing countries. The list included all the European countries to which IPFs had been allocated, as well as Spain. It had been decided, as a matter of policy, that UNDP would not be promoting TCDC projects among European countries. The participation of qualifying European countries in such projects would be limited to arrangements between one or more of those countries and developing countries outside Europe.

108. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the country programme for Poland. With respect to agriculture, an effort should be made to find methods of improving plant breeding, seed production and dairy production that could be used by small land-holders. One of the goals of the study on agricultural machinery should be to find ways of adapting such machinery for use by small land-holders. It was possible that the other studies on transportation, communications and energy might consume resources that could be more effectively used in tackling immediate problems whose solution would offer greater benefits in the short term.

109. In co-operation with Western European countries, the United States had sought to ease Poland's financial crisis by rescheduling debt repayments and providing for large export credits. His Government had agreed to reschedule about \$450 million in official debt repayments in 1981 and to extend almost \$600 million in food financing. Poland's current economic problems were rooted in a decade of mismanagement, poor investment planning, unrealistic pricing systems and inadequate resources for agriculture. The Polish leadership clearly recognized those problems and was seriously attempting to develop a programme for economic reform. There was a general consensus that more resources should be provided to the small private land-holders, who currently farmed 75 per cent of the arable land, and that investment should be concentrated on projects and industries offering relatively quick returns and increasing the volume of exports. The country programme might be more appropriately focused on those areas.

110. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that his delegation fully supported the country programmes for Poland and Bulgaria, which were well balanced and consistent with national development plans.

111. Mr. POPOV (Bulgaria) reiterated his Government's view that UNDP was an instrument for multilateral co-operation through which all countries, even the most developed, could benefit from the scientific and technological experience of other countries.

112. The main purpose of the country programme for Bulgaria was to promote industrialization. One major aspect of the programme was that it provided for the training of scientific and technical personnel from the developing countries and for expert services to those countries within the framework of bilateral technical co-operation. Bulgaria was grateful to UNDP for its efforts in the preparation of the country programme and to the Governing Council for its support.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.