

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



UNDP

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1982/11
25 March 1982

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL
Twenty-ninth session
June 1982, Geneva
Agenda item 4(b)

P O L I C Y

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT PREVIOUS SESSIONS

Government execution

Report of the Administrator

Summary

This report responds to decision 81/21 of the Governing Council at its twenty-eighth session.

The report and its addendum provide a descriptive and analytic account of the factors affecting the progress made in the application of government execution, including a review of the performance of government-executed projects until the end of 1981, and the reasons for the progress or lack of progress in its use. It also draws attention to attitudinal factors affecting this progress and examines the adequacy of the financial and administrative arrangements for government execution, as well as such questions as the compensation to Governments for additional costs resulting from government execution and the involvement of UNDP field offices in government execution.

The results of the review confirm the continued validity of the concept of government execution as an additional modality for implementing UNDP assistance and of the approach adopted in present UNDP guidelines towards its application. These stress, *inter alia*, that the important multilateral character of technical co-operation provided through UNDP should be preserved and that the technical experience and accumulated knowledge of the organizations of the United Nations system should be brought to bear on government execution.

The Administrator recommends that the Council adopt the measures proposed in paragraphs 26, 36, 41 and 46, which are designed to improve and facilitate the further use of government execution.

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
INTRODUCTION	1 - 6
A. Origin of the report	1 - 2
B. Methodology	3 - 6
I. ANALYSIS OF THE REASONS FOR PROGRESS OR LACK OF PROGRESS IN THE APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTION	7 - 21
1. Review of performance until the end of 1981	7 - 9
2. Unfamiliarity with the concept, its implications and procedures	10 - 12
3. Increased relevance to self-reliance and national needs	13 - 15
4. Exercise of increased management control by Governments	16
5. Preference for agency execution	17 - 18
6. Technical and administrative capability of Governments	19
7. Summary and conclusions	20 - 21
II. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTION	22 - 36
A. Financial procedures, reporting and auditing requirements	22 - 28
(i). Improvement of financial guidelines	22
(ii). Reporting and auditing requirements	23 - 27
(iii). Maintenance of separate accounts for UNDP funds	28
B. Administrative procedures	29 - 32
(i). Streamlining of administrative procedures for government execution	29 - 30
(ii). Complications caused by Governments' internal policies and procedures	31 - 32
C. Designation of a single Government authority to assume over-all responsibility for government execution	33 - 36
III. SUPPORT TO GOVERNMENTS IN ASSUMING THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ARISING FROM GOVERNMENT EXECUTION	37 - 46
A. Additional costs to Governments	37 - 41
B. Training of Government staff	42
C. UNDP field office involvement in government execution	43 - 46

INTRODUCTION

A. Origin of the report

1. At its twenty-eighth session, the Governing Council reviewed the Administrator's report on government execution (DP/558) which proposed a number of fundamental changes in the approach to the implementation of UNDP assistance by Governments. At that session, concern was expressed by some members that the proposals represented a too radical reversal of the more cautious and selective approach to government execution first adopted by the Council at its twenty-second session. They suggested that this experimental approach should be continued until more experience had been gained. At the same time, a number of other members of the Council endorsed the recommendations in DP/558 and considered that UNDP should be fully responsive to the initiatives proposed for the wider application of this method of implementing UNDP assistance.

2. In the light of the discussion, the Council, in its decision 81/21, requested the Administrator, in co-operation with the organizations of the United Nations system, "to give full consideration, in discharging his responsibility for the designation of executing agents, to implementation of United Nations Development Programme assistance by the host Governments, bearing in mind the views expressed by members of the Council on proposals contained in his report."^{1/} In the same decision, the Council also requested the Administrator (a) "to review and analyse in greater detail the reasons for the lack of progress in implementing government execution and to report to the Governing Council at its twenty-ninth session on proposals for amendments to the financial and administrative arrangements for the implementation of UNDP assistance to projects, with a view to further increasing the use of government execution." It was specified that the report (b) should include proposals for any change in financial and administrative procedures which might be necessary, and (c) should identify the elements for which compensation for additional costs to Governments resulting from government execution should be considered and the manner in which such costs might be met. The Administrator was further requested (d) to examine how the implementation of UNDP assistance by Governments would affect the workload of UNDP field offices, particularly in the least developed countries, and (e) to report to the Council, at its twenty-ninth session, on any proposals for additional staff that might be considered necessary, as well as on any other administrative measures that might be taken in the meantime. This report has been prepared in response to the Council's decision.

B. Methodology

3. The main findings and conclusions contained in the report are based upon an analysis of the results of various fact-finding activities undertaken in carrying out the more detailed review requested by the Council. These activities included three UNDP field missions, with the participation of members of the UNDP Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) and a staff member of the

^{1/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1981 Supplement No.11 (E/1981/61/Rev.1).

World Bank, which, in the fall of 1981, visited 12 countries in four regions. The countries selected either had some experience with government execution or had decided to continue to rely on the traditional methods of implementing UNDP assistance. The purpose of the missions was to hold discussions on all aspects of government execution with government officials in the countries concerned at both the policy and operational levels and to review experience with field office staff and local agency representatives. In view of financial constraints, UNDP was compelled to limit the number of countries visited, but the sample selected was considered to be both representative and large enough to permit, with the additional information provided by UNDP field offices referred to below, a reasonable assessment of Governments' thinking on the subject.

4. In order to obtain a more complete picture of the current state of government execution and to better understand the issues involved and how existing problems might be overcome, all Resident Representatives were requested by a letter from the Directors of the respective Regional Bureaux to provide detailed information on the views of the Government in their country of assignment and their own perception, among other things, of government execution as a modality for implementing UNDP assistance, of constraints in the application of the concept, the role of the agencies, compensation to Governments for additional costs incurred, and other specific financial and administrative aspects of government execution. In addition, questionnaires were completed for all government-executed projects approved since the inception of government execution in 1975. Similar requests were made of the participating and executing agencies.

5. In setting forth his conclusions and recommendations, the Administrator has borne in mind the still modest and relatively brief experience with government execution, which was clearly reflected in the responses from Governments, field offices and the agencies' headquarters.

6. In the preparation of this report, the Administrator has also taken into account many of the comments and the advice of the IATF, as well as the observations made by agencies at the Interagency Consultative Meeting (IACM), held in New York from 6-8 January 1982.

I. ANALYSIS OF THE REASONS FOR PROGRESS OR LACK OF PROGRESS IN THE APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTION

1. Review of performance until the end of 1981

7. In analyzing the reasons for the lack of progress in the application of government execution, the Administrator has undertaken to review the over-all experience with government execution, and has tried to obtain a deeper insight into Governments' perception of government execution as a modality for implementing UNDP assistance as well as the various advantages and constraints which Governments have encountered in its application. The results of the examination of the performance in government execution to date are discussed in chapter II of DP/1982/11/Add.1, and are summarized below.

8. The over-all experience with government execution has been positive. There has been slow but steady progress in terms of both the number of projects approved and the resources dedicated to them. The activities carried out under government execution are mainly concentrated in the four economic

/...

sectors of natural resources, development planning, agriculture and employment. Government-executed projects include the usual assortment of small-and large-scale projects; they reflect a preference to use government execution for projects with large subcontracting and equipment components. The design of the projects generally meets the required standards. While there has been a serious lack of expenditure and progress reporting, the information received from field offices and discussions with responsible project staff during the field missions indicate that the substantive performance of projects, where government execution is being applied, has been generally satisfactory and, in some cases, very good. There has been a lack in associating the agencies with government-executed projects in the preparatory stages and in project monitoring. In this regard, the Administrator, bearing in mind the importance attached by the Governing Council to the maximum utilization in government execution of the knowledge and accumulated experience available in the United Nations system, will reaffirm to the Resident Representatives the need to fully observe the requirements concerning agency involvement when negotiating with Governments the implementation of UNDP assistance to projects by the latter. Improvement in this respect should contribute to further enhancing the quality of those projects. Also, the Administrator shares the view of the agencies that the appointment of national project directors/co-ordinators and the assumption by Governments of responsibility for the implementation of selected components of projects executed by agencies are useful steps in the process of fostering self-reliant development and are consonant with the principle of Governments' over-all management responsibility for their projects.

9. In spite of the wide support that the concept of government execution enjoys in international fora, the review revealed considerable differences of attitude towards government execution, and mixed opinions about its practical application. This was true of Government officials, UNDP field office staff and agencies. The continuing debate at the operational level about the acceptability of government execution is an important factor in the lack of progress made with its use. The following paragraphs discuss the various reactions to government execution and how they have affected its application.

2. Unfamiliarity with the concept, its implications and procedures

10. Governments that are generally conversant with the concept of government execution and its implications are mostly those which have had some experience with it. Few of the others consulted have given thought to government execution, and a fair number have little or no knowledge of it. In a number of cases, UNDP field offices and agencies also expressed their unfamiliarity with it due to lack of experience.

11. Unfamiliarity with government execution sometimes causes undue concern about its administrative and procedural implications on the part of Governments as well as UNDP field offices, and thus leads to premature rejection of its use. Only in relatively few instances have Governments and UNDP field offices carefully examined the advantages and disadvantages of government execution, and in fewer still has an effort been made to experiment with it.

12. Although the large majority of countries has no experience with government execution and many have not yet decided whether to adopt it, the number and variety of government-executed projects approved to date and the

different circumstances in which they operate have provided sufficient opportunity to learn from the experience and to enable the Administrator to take steps for the wider use of government execution and for increased efficiency in its application during the third programming cycle.

3. Increased relevance to self-reliance and national needs

13. Governments in most of the developing countries consulted in the course of the review regard government execution as an important step towards self-reliant development. Those which have introduced government execution in their programmes generally consider it a welcome arrangement to enhance their own involvement in the technical co-operation provided by UNDP and in some cases as an essential means of exercising full management control over their projects. They see it as a phase in the process of developing national capability and as a logical sequence to the increased assumption of management responsibility by Government staff in UNDP-supported projects. By making the step from government management to government execution, these Governments feel that they are coming closer to realizing self-reliance in their development effort.

14. Some Governments expressed the view that government execution by itself will not contribute significantly to self-reliance because government execution can only be effective if the necessary administrative capability already exists in a country. This view is also shared by some UNDP field offices and agencies. Self-reliance aside, these Governments consider that their direct involvement in and responsibility for effective execution may lead to greater commitment on their part and that this will help to improve their administrative performance, both in the mobilization and effective application of resources. Their administration will have to rise to the new situation and ensure a good response to the demands made of it. At the operational level, an increased sense of commitment will make national staff more aware of their responsibilities and perform better. In the view of these Governments, government execution will thus contribute to increased confidence of government staff in their own capabilities and foster closer involvement and better grass-roots results.

15. Similarly, some Governments are of the opinion that when they themselves assume full responsibility for the design and implementation of a project, including the selection and use of UNDP-financed inputs, the project will more likely respond to specific requirements determined by local norms, values and conditions, which are not always fully appreciated by an outside agent.

4. Exercise of increased management control by Governments

16. In the relatively more developed countries, Governments usually are confident that they possess the technical knowledge and administrative capability necessary to assume full responsibility for the implementation of UNDP-assisted projects. While these Governments frequently show a desire to acquire greater control over the choice and utilization of UNDP-financed inputs and to exercise full management responsibility over all aspects of project implementation, they do not always consider government execution as a necessary means of achieving this. Moreover, administrative constraints (discussed in chapter II, section B below) can cause such Governments to refrain from government execution and seek solutions by exercising control over the selection of project inputs and technical control and supervisory responsibility over project activities at the country level, while entrusting

the responsibility for the mobilization of UNDP-financed inputs to an external agent (United Nations organization or other). In these instances, the role of the executing agency is largely administrative.

5. Preference for agency execution

17. Some Governments have decided, as a matter of policy, to continue to adhere to the traditional method of implementing UNDP assistance to their projects. While not denying the usefulness of government execution in other countries, they feel that the present system of technical co-operation is well suited to the identification and mobilization of the high-level technological expertise they require. They attach great weight to the involvement of the United Nations agencies because of their technical contribution.

18. Countries which are increasingly resorting to government cost-sharing as a means of augmenting UNDP assistance are not expected to resort to government execution to any significant extent. In these countries, agency execution will also remain the preferred mode of implementing UNDP assistance.

6. Technical and administrative capability of Governments

19. The lack of the requisite technical, administrative and managerial capability and of sufficiently strong national institutions in less developed countries has restrained some Governments in those countries from assuming the responsibilities involved in government execution. A number of the Resident Representatives concerned have concluded that the introduction of government execution would be premature and should be deferred until a minimum level of technical and administrative capability can be assured to meet the various obligations arising from government execution. However, others have worked out arrangements to help Governments obtain the necessary technical backstopping and carry out the administrative tasks involved.

7. Summary and conclusions

20. While many Governments react favourably to the concept of government execution, very few envisage immediate large-scale application of the concept in their own UNDP programmes. They see government execution not so much as an alternative to execution by an external agent as another execution modality which will be advantageous in certain circumstances, but which also needs further experience before it can be applied effectively on a larger scale. In addition, the shifting of responsibility for the implementation of UNDP assistance from an external agent to a national organization or institution may pose problems which need to be addressed and resolved before government execution can be adopted on a larger scale. Many of the Governments introducing government execution therefore wish to rely on UNDP assistance during an initial period when certain administrative constraints must be overcome. Such assistance would provide them with the opportunity of familiarizing themselves with UNDP requirements and of properly organizing themselves to perform the various administrative functions connected with government execution. In countries which envisage an increase in government-executed projects, the process is also expected to be gradual. For some time to come, Governments will continue to carefully scrutinize and select projects and fully examine and assess their technical and administrative implications before deciding to use government execution for their implementation. A few countries, after careful consideration of the

advantages and disadvantages of government execution, have decided to continue to use the traditional method of execution of UNDP assistance. Countries making extensive use of government cost-sharing will also rely on agency execution for the implementation of a large part of their programmes.

21. The use of government execution, therefore, will not assume very large proportions immediately and in some countries, will remain untried. However, by consistently giving full consideration to this modality when designating an executing agent, its steady growth is anticipated, both by a gradual increase in its use in countries presently familiarizing themselves with the new concept and by its introduction in other countries.

II. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTION

A. Financial procedures, reporting and auditing requirements

(i) Improvement of financial guidelines

22. Following further consultations with Governments during the recent review, it now appears that UNDP financial procedures (see paragraph 12 of DP/1982/11/Add.1) are not considered by them to be unduly cumbersome or difficult to apply, nor do they constitute a particular obstacle to the greater use of government execution. The difficulties encountered in the initial stages of introducing this modality arise mainly from the unfamiliarity of Governments with UNDP procedures and the lack of detailed documentation describing these procedures. Thus, there is scope for further improvement by providing more specific guidance on certain aspects, in particular financial administration and reporting requirements.

(ii) Reporting and auditing requirements

23. Although improvements were achieved in 1981, the response to UNDP financial reporting procedures has not been fully satisfactory. Requirements with respect to periodic financial statements during the year have not been promptly complied with by many Governments. In order to obtain such statements, repeated follow-up by UNDP field offices has been necessary.

24. With regard to the annual submission by Governments of audited statements of expenditures (see paragraph 12 (e) of DP/1982/11/Add.1), recent experience indicates that in approximately one-half of the projects, no audited financial statements were due from the Governments concerned since no funds were advanced by UNDP to them.^{2/} All the payments in respect of these projects were made by UNDP directly on instructions from these Governments. The accounting records for these projects have been maintained by the UNDP field offices, which also prepared the required reports based upon those records. The Administrator expects that with the necessary training, discussed in section C below, Governments will become more familiar with UNDP procedures and requirements and that this will reduce the number of Governments seeking UNDP help in financial administration as well as the need for field office involvement in record keeping and reporting. In the interim, UNDP records of

^{2/} For the year ending 31 December 1980, out of a total of 60 projects, funds were advanced to Governments in respect of 29 projects only. Audited financial statements were submitted for nine of these projects; for ten others, financial statements were received without audit certificates and, for the remaining ten, no annual financial statements were received.

such projects will remain subject to the normal UNDP procedures for internal and external audit.

25. Although audited annual statements should have been submitted for all other projects for which funds were disbursed to the Governments concerned, this requirement was not always met.^{2/} Clearly more care should be given, prior to approval of government execution of a project, to the review by the Resident Representative and the Government of the proposed arrangements for the Government's financial management of the project (see paragraph 6 of DP/1982/11/Add.1). The Administrator intends to add a provision to the present procedures which would require the Resident Representative to review and reach agreement with the Government concerned on formal auditing arrangements before the approval of government execution.

26. In order to ensure that he will at all times be fully informed of the use of Programme resources and with respect to the exercise of his accountability to the Council, the Administrator recommends that he be empowered, in the event of repeated default by a Government in its financial reporting to UNDP, to withhold further approval of the modality of government execution in that country, until he is satisfied that UNDP reporting requirements will be complied with by the Government.

27. The Administrator brings to the Council's attention the provision relating to independent audits for government-executed projects (see paragraph 12(f) of DP/1982/11/Add.1) and wishes to inform the Council that consultations have been initiated with the United Nations Board of Auditors to ascertain their views on this subject. After completion of these consultations, the Administrator will determine the scope and periodicity of audit reports for projects of different duration and magnitude.

(iii) Maintenance of separate accounts for UNDP funds

28. An additional problem in some cases relates to the receipt and disbursement of UNDP funds by Governments. UNDP financial procedures require, inter alia, that Governments maintain separate accounts for UNDP resources and submit, at regular intervals, financial statements on funds received and spent. However, the budgetary systems of some countries require funds received from external sources to be reflected in the national budgets and accounted for as such. This results in co-mingling of funds and an inability to isolate UNDP-financed expenditures. To avoid this difficulty, the Governments concerned have found it convenient to request UNDP to make disbursements on their behalf and provisions for this procedure have been made in the current instructions. Since this arrangement has obvious workload implications for UNDP field offices, the Administrator will do his utmost to assist Governments that wish to assume execution responsibility for implementing UNDP assistance to their projects in adopting solutions within their existing administrative framework that will enable them to assume responsibility for the management and administration of UNDP project funds in a manner that will meet UNDP requirements.

B. Administrative procedures

(i) Streamlining of administrative procedures for government execution

29. As in the case of the financial procedures, Governments have not found the administrative procedures used for government execution particularly difficult to apply. However, some Governments and UNDP field offices expressed

disappointment with the delays encountered in the approval of assistance to government-executed projects.

30. By streamlining some of the current procedures, especially at the preparatory stage of a project, the process can be improved without affecting the quality of projects.

(ii) Complications caused by Governments' internal policies and procedures

31. As explained in paragraph 12(a) of DP/1982/11/Add.1, Governments are expected to adopt their own administrative arrangements for the execution of UNDP-assisted projects. However, existing Government policy and administrative procedures sometimes constitute major impediments to the introduction of government execution. For example, many Governments do not exempt imports for government use from normal import formalities or customs duties. Consequently, if a Government which has adopted this policy is to procure UNDP-financed equipment and supplies from abroad, it will have to raise additional funds in the budget of the Ministry concerned to meet the sometimes considerable customs charges. Another obstacle is existing legislation which precludes most Governments from exempting the salaries of foreign experts contracted by them from income tax. Sometimes a surcharge must be paid by the contracting Government agency. In such cases, recruitment by the Government not only leads to higher costs for experts from abroad but also to additional charges against the budget of the Government agency concerned. Another important constraint is the reluctance of many individuals to accept a Government contract which does not provide the same benefits and protection as those of a United Nations or a bilateral agency. Because of administrative obstacles such as these, some Government departments hesitate to subject UNDP-financed inputs in government-executed projects to their own rules and regulations, and are inclined to seek the intervention of a United Nations organization, usually UNDP.

32. Governments cannot in all cases enact legislation to overcome these administrative encumbrances; the relatively small size of the UNDP programme does not always justify a major effort towards obtaining such legislation. That Governments have tended to rely on the UNDP field offices to avoid such difficulties is understandable. In a number of cases, the UNDP field office was requested to place the orders for equipment in accordance with specifications provided by the Government and from suppliers indicated by it. In other cases, Resident Representatives have accommodated Governments by contracting individuals selected by the Government for consultancy services. It is the Administrator's view, however, that obstacles caused by the administrative procedures and policies of a country that cannot be solved by legislative or other Government action should be overcome by using the modality of the Co-operating Agency (see paragraph 10(b) of DP/1982/11/Add.1) and not by involving UNDP field offices.

C. Designation of a single Government authority to assume over-all responsibility for government execution

33. Governments have indicated their general agreement with the present UNDP policy which calls for the adoption by Governments of internal arrangements for the execution of UNDP-supported projects (see paragraph 12(a) of DP/1982/11/Add.1). Almost all Governments expressed the view that Government

implementing agencies should be responsible for the mobilization of UNDP-financed inputs. However, opinions differed over the provision in the present procedures regarding the designation and responsibilities of a single authority within Government which would assume over-all financial responsibility vis-a-vis UNDP.

34. The designation of such an authority has been put into practice in only a few cases. In discussions with Governments during the course of the study, the point was made by UNDP that if the number of government-executed projects in a country grows, it would become increasingly difficult for UNDP to deal with individual ministries as executing agents. The designation of one Government authority to assume over-all responsibility at least for the financial aspects of all government-executed projects in the country would then be desirable, in order to facilitate efficient financial management and to assure the Administrator's accountability to the Governing Council. Governments would thus be called upon to develop a system which would facilitate centralized receipt of UNDP funds and disbursement to individual projects as well as centralized financial reporting and accounting for the use of such funds. UNDP has further stressed to Governments that the solution should be sought within their existing administrative structures, since it would not be realistic to expect them to create separate structures at considerable cost for the sole purpose of satisfying UNDP administrative needs.

35. Governments were generally responsive to this concern of UNDP and several reacted positively to the possibility of finding appropriate solutions. The functions of the authority to be charged with the over-all financial administration would include the receipt of funds from UNDP, their allocation to the Government implementing agency, and reporting on the use of the funds. In most cases, such an arrangement would not conflict with the normal practice of Governments in dealing with external aid resources.

36. A special effort is needed in all countries using government execution to make the necessary provisions for vesting a single Government authority with the responsibility for financial reporting and accountability for UNDP funds provided to the Government. The Administrator therefore recommends that, where government execution is expected to assume substantial proportions, Governments should make the requisite arrangements in time to meet the demands which increased government execution will make on their administrations.

III. SUPPORT TO GOVERNMENTS IN ASSUMING THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ARISING FROM GOVERNMENT EXECUTION

A. Additional costs to Governments

37. In the course of the study, attention was paid to the question of additional costs to Governments arising from government execution and how they should be met. Under present procedures, Governments are not compensated for support costs from UNDP resources, although provision may be made for UNDP-financed administrative support to be charged to the IPF (see paragraph 12(b) of DP/1982/11/Add.1).

38. Most Governments expect government execution to make some additional demands on their administration, in terms of both time and the need to familiarize Government officials with UNDP procedures and requirements. However, practically all Governments consulted on this subject expressed the opinion that their assumption of execution responsibility should be considered a function of Government and that therefore special compensation in the form of a lump-sum payment or otherwise would be inappropriate. They consider the provisions referred to in paragraph 12(b) of DP/1982/11/Add.1 for administrative support from UNDP to enable a Government to meet UNDP requirements quite adequate and find it proper to defray the cost of such support from IPF funds.

39. Some Governments expressed the view that UNDP support cost resources which remain unutilized as a result of government execution should be credited to UNDP's IPF resources, so as to benefit countries according to the extent to which they assume responsibility for implementing UNDP assistance. Thus, the unspent portion of UNDP support cost resources would directly augment the resources of those countries available for development.

40. Pursuant to the Council's wish that the report identify the elements for which compensation for additional costs to Governments should be considered and the manner in which such costs should be met, the Administrator reviewed the various aspects of compensation to Governments. He has concluded that compensation to Governments on the basis of actual additional costs incurred, which would vary considerably from country to country and among projects, would involve complex procedures for determination of the amount to be reimbursed in each case and would be difficult to implement both by Governments and by UNDP.

41. In the light of the above and bearing in mind the views of Governments reflected in paragraphs 38 and 39, the Governing Council may wish to consider an arrangement whereby UNDP support cost resources remaining unutilized due to government execution will be credited annually as an add-on to the country or intercountry IPF as appropriate. The amount of the add-on might be established at 13 per cent of the IPF resources expended for government execution during the preceding year by the Government(s) concerned or by UNDP on their behalf, less any charges made during the same period against the support cost resources of UNDP for services related to government execution rendered to the UNDP field office in the country(ies) concerned (see paragraph 9 of DP/1982/11/Add.1). This would not affect present arrangements for the compensation for support costs of Co-operating United Nations and other agencies and for ad hoc services rendered by them (see paragraph 10(b) and (c) of DP/1982/11/Add.1).^{3/}

B. Training of Government staff

42. In accordance with current guidelines, provision has been made in a few projects for the appointment of national administrative personnel who are trained by UNDP field office staff in the Programme's financial and administrative procedures. With respect to the concern expressed in the Gov-

^{3/} Several agencies have expressed reservations about the proposal of the Administrator discussed in this paragraph.

erning Council for the training of Government staff to enable them to assume the additional responsibilities involved in government execution, the Administrator recognizes that more formal training of such staff is needed, especially in countries where a progressive shift towards government execution is envisaged, and would contribute to more effective government execution. Such assistance could be financed from the IPF under a separate project or as a preparatory assistance stage of a government-executed project.

C. UNDP field office involvement in government execution

43. Most field offices in countries where government execution is being used reported considerable reliance of the Government on the field office for assistance in performing one or several of a variety of execution functions, including over-all financial management and accounting, financial reporting, recruitment and personnel administration, subcontracting, procurement of equipment, training abroad, and progress reporting. Such assistance might consist simply of advising Government officials about UNDP administrative requirements or in helping them to carry out some of the tasks involved. UNDP field offices have been particularly active in helping Government officials meet financial reporting requirements. In several instances, they have assumed responsibility for recruitment and procurement abroad or made the necessary travel arrangements for Government staff attending training courses, seminars or workshops. Paragraphs 28 and 31 discuss why Governments sometimes turn to UNDP field offices for assistance in overcoming administrative obstacles that are internal to the Government concerned. It should also be noted here that the study yielded no evidence that Governments in the least developed countries relied more heavily on field offices than Governments in countries where government execution was being applied.

44. Many Resident Representatives, including those who have no experience in government execution, anticipate that it will make considerable demands on their field offices. They have expressed the need for special provisions to meet the expected extra work load. Others have indicated that they are capable of coping with Governments' requests for assistance in the case of government-executed projects. Some Resident Representatives in countries with a large number of government-executed projects also indicated that they expected to be able to discharge the additional responsibilities arising from government execution within their existing establishments if the projects absorbed the additional manpower requirements.

45. Governments' reliance on UNDP field offices in government execution falls into two categories: (a) dependence on field office advice and assistance in meeting additional and often unfamiliar administrative demands; and (b) use of field office facilities for procurement abroad. The Administrator has already expressed his view that resort to UNDP field offices in the latter case should be avoided by using the modality of the Co-operating Agency (paragraph 32). He considers the assistance rendered by UNDP field offices under the first category to be temporary in nature and that it will disappear altogether as Governments become familiar with government execution and Government staff has been trained to assume the additional responsibilities involved.

46. It may therefore be concluded that, at present, there is no need to increase UNDP field office staff to meet additional requirements resulting from government execution. If, however, because of an increase in government execution in a country, the Government requires assistance from the UNDP field office during an initial period, and this calls for the strengthening of that office, the additional staffing needs should be met by the Government. The Administrator further recommends that he be authorized to approve, at the request of the Government concerned, the use of IPF resources available to the country to finance such additional administrative support.

- - - - -