

**United Nations
Development Programme**Distr.
GENERALDP/1983/ICW/8
28 December 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL
INTERSESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Second session
9-11 February 1983, New York
Agenda item 5(a)

OTHER MATTERS WHICH WOULD FACILITATE RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND
STRENGTHEN THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WORK OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Strengthening the role of the Council and participating
Governments in programme planning and programme review

Note by the Administrator

Summary

Concern has been expressed at the ability of the Governing Council under present arrangements to have sufficient involvement in programme matters. Accordingly, in the present document, the effectiveness of the Governing Council in fulfilling its role with respect to programme planning and implementation is examined. The evolution of the legislative framework is traced, and in particular the relevant provisions of the Consensus with respect to preparation of country programmes are reviewed and the specific characteristics of UNDP are described, such as the scope of its geographic and sectoral coverage, the number and diversity of size of projects, and the degree of delegation of authority to the country level. The working of the Governing Council is reviewed and the changes over time are identified: these include an increasing focus on general policy issues rather than on specific country programmes and projects.

Alternative modalities which may strengthen the role of the Governing Council in programme matters are outlined. Consideration is given: (a) to changes involving a minimum departure from existing methods of work, such as improved reporting and information consultations; (b) to alternatives still within the present basic legislative framework, such as the establishment of a Programme Committee, special meetings, and participation of Governments at intergovernmental and country levels in programme planning and implementation; and (c) to alternatives involving significant organizational changes, such as the setting up of an Executive Board or similar body. The broad financial implications of any change in the methods of governance are pointed out and the need is underlined to relate the cost of such changes to derived benefits, bearing in mind the level of resources available to UNDP.

/...

INTRODUCTION

1. This paper is presented in response to the various concerns expressed in the Governing Council and at the first session of the Intersessional Committee of the Whole (ICW) in September 1982, concerning the effectiveness of the Council, under its present procedures and modalities, in dealing particularly with programme planning and programme review.
2. In responding to these concerns, the paper is divided into various sections, beginning with a historical review of the legislative framework for the Council's work in these respects, and proceeding to the effect of the specific characteristics of the Programme, the evolution of the actual work of the Council, and finally possibilities for the strengthening of its role in programme matters.
3. In this connection the Committee will recall that at its twenty-eighth session the Council dealt extensively with proposals for the rationalization of its work, and it is therefore recommended that members should examine this paper in conjunction with document DP/562 and the Council's decision 81/37 thereon.
4. The paper focuses on the role of the Council with respect to programme planning and implementation rather than on its responsibilities for overall policy guidance. It does not deal either with the other funds placed under the aegis of UNDP or with those United Nations technical assistance activities financed from the regular budget for which the Council, under the Consensus is given responsibilities.
5. A number of recurring factors are interwoven through the chronology contained in this paper, and the Committee may wish to bear these in mind in its examination of this agenda item. These recurring factors include: the prerogatives of the Governing Council and those which it has historically delegated to the Administrator, which are in turn related to the decentralization within UNDP which it has directed; the nature of the reporting which the Council has requested and modifications thereof (or inadequate compliance) which have occurred; the number and length of Council sessions per year in relation to its assumed workload; and the relative emphases it has placed on matters other than programme planning and programme review in the course of its history.

I. THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

6. The responsibilities and functions of the Governing Council are set forth in General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX) of 22 November 1965 on the consolidation of the Special Fund and Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, and in resolution 2688 (XXV) of 11 December 1970 on the capacity of the United Nations development system, hereinafter referred to as the "Consensus". Further legislative developments have not substantially modified the role of the Governing Council, although, as in the case of resolution 3405 (XXX) of 28 November 1975 on new dimensions in technical co-operation or resolution 32/197 of 20 December 1977 on the restructuring of the economic and
/...

social sectors of the United Nations system, they have certainly influenced the way in which the Council has exercised its functions and responsibilities. Other directives of the General Assembly applying to its subsidiary bodies have also had an impact on the organization of the Council's work. This is the case, for example, with the resolutions concerning the frequency and length of sessions and the control and limitation of the documentation.

7. According to General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX), the Council is to consider and approve projects and programmes and provide "general policy guidance and directives" to UNDP. The Consensus also reiterates that the Council has "over-all responsibility for ensuring that the resources of the Programme are employed with maximum efficiency and effectiveness in assisting the developing countries"(paragraph 35). It further specifies that, in accordance with the principle of country and intercountry programming set forth in the same resolution, the Council is to "consider and approve country programmes, including indicative country planning figures, approve certain projects ...exercise effective operational control, including periodic review of the country programmes and make broad allocations of resources and control their use" (paragraph 36).

8. According to the Consensus, programme planning and implementation take place within the framework of the "United Nations development co-operation cycle" which includes the setting of indicative planning figures, project formulation, appraisal and approval, implementation, evaluation and follow up.^{1/} In the following paragraphs a review is made of the principles set forth by the Consensus and of the further legislative developments.

A. Indicative planning figures

9. The first step in the process of the programming of UNDP assistance "at the country level", a principle pervading all the provisions concerning the United Nations development co-operation cycle, is the establishment by the Governing Council of indicative planning figures (IPFs) for a given period of time (paragraph 13). IPFs should not be construed as representing a commitment, but as a reasonably firm indication for the purpose of forward programming" (paragraph 14). They are proposed for each country by the Administrator on the basis of criteria and guidelines established by the Council and the final figures are approved by the Council. IPFs are to be "reviewed periodically by the Administrator and the Governing Council, in consultation with the Government concerned, in the light of progress in implementation of the country programme" (paragraph 17).

10. For the first cycle, the IPFs of individual countries were essentially based on the volume of assistance provided in previous years, with appropriate corrections for least developed and newly independent countries. For the second and third programming cycles, the Council devoted considerable attention to the criteria for the determination of individual country IPFs. Readjustments in the IPFs of some countries were made within a given cycle in accordance with criteria approved by the Governing Council, particularly with regard to least developed or newly independent countries.

/...

11. As envisaged in the Consensus, the Council also made adjustments in the distribution of funds between intercountry and country programmes, devoted considerable attention to the compensation of executing agencies for support costs and replaced the system of assessed local costs with one of voluntary payments by recipient governments. Such actions were taken under the Council's responsibility to "make broad allocations of resources and control their use" (paragraph 36).

B. Country programming

12. The overriding principle of country programming, as defined in the Consensus, is the programming of UNDP assistance at the country level in accordance with the national development plan, or priorities and objectives of the recipient country, which are "the exclusive responsibility" of the Government. The UNDP country programme itself is formulated by the recipient Government "in co-operation, at an appropriate stage, with representatives of the United Nations system" (paragraph 7). While efforts are to be made to co-ordinate all sources of assistance of the United Nations system, it is for the Government to take into account "other external inputs, both multilateral and bilateral" (paragraph 10).

13. According to the Consensus, the formulation of a country programme involves a broad identification by sectors of the needs within the country's over-all development objectives which may be appropriately met by UNDP assistance, precise indications of the government inputs and, if possible, of other United Nations inputs, and a preliminary list of projects to be subsequently developed.

14. Reference to areas of concentration for the UNDP country programme was made in the Consensus only indirectly. A request was also made for the Programme to develop expertise to ensure from the planning stage onward assistance in investment follow-up. Subsequently in 1975, in its decision on new dimensions in technical co-operation, the Council referred to "the need for the Programme to respond favourably to requests for meeting the most critical needs of each developing country, taking into account the importance of reaching the poorest and most vulnerable sections of their societies and enhancing the quality of their life" (E/5703/Rev.1, paragraph 54). Several decisions have since then requested Governments to give priority or particular attention in their country programmes to specific subject areas such as, for example, food production and rural development, the role of women in development, water supply and sanitation. Moreover, in a series of decisions the Council has also stressed the need for Governments to give priority to pre-investment studies in their country programmes, reflecting the concern expressed in the Consensus for a proper linkage between technical co-operation and capital investment.

15. The country programme, transmitted by the resident representative, is submitted with the recommendations of the Administrator to the Council for consideration and approval. While the programme for each country is to be approved for its whole duration (three to five years), the Consensus foresaw

/...

"periodic reviews aimed at possible adjustments" (paragraph 11). In this connection, it stipulates that the assistance must be "sufficiently flexible to meet unforeseen needs of recipient countries or exceptional situations which country programmes could not take in account (paragraph 12).

16. Since adoption of the Consensus, the Governing Council has devoted considerable attention to the process of country programming and the methodology to be applied and, on the basis of the experience acquired, has introduced increasing flexibility into the process so as to respond closely to the countries' evolving needs.

17. In 1975 the General Assembly by its resolution 3405 (XXX) endorsed the decision of the Governing Council on new dimensions in technical co-operation which further defined the objectives of technical co-operation and the means of achieving them. The decision stressed self-reliance as the basic purpose of technical co-operation, reiterated that the selection of priority areas for assistance should remain the exclusive responsibility of the recipient governments and emphasized that technical co-operation "should be seen in terms of outputs or results to be achieved, rather than in terms of inputs"(E/5703/Rev.1, paragraph 54). These concepts were duly reflected in the guidelines and instructions for the second programming cycle: in particular, the country programme documents were to identify technical co-operation requirements mainly "in terms of objectives and activities"(E/5779, paragraph 283).

18. With respect to the consideration of country programmes by the Council, it was agreed that while comments could continue to be made on individual country programmes, the Council's review of the programmes was to focus on "issues of broad significance raised by the country programmes" (Ibid). The Administrator was therefore requested to report on particular problems and trends of a general policy nature. He was also to furnish to the Council "on a regular basis, with information on the actual implementation of previously approved programmes" (Ibid).

19. This approach to country programming and the documentation to be prepared was reaffirmed in 1977 by the Council in its decision on the role and activities of UNDP (E/6013/Rev.1, paragraph 139), and the following year, at its twenty-fifth session, the Council identified further areas which were to be considered and taken into account in the preparation of country programmes to be submitted for its approval.

20. Furthermore, in 1977 the General Assembly adopted resolution 32/197, which urges the organizations of the United Nations system to ensure coherence of action and effective integration at the country level, in accordance with Governments' development plans and priorities, using the UNDP country programming process as a frame of reference for their operational activities. The resolution gave new impetus to the implementation of paragraphs 9 and 63 of the Consensus on the co-ordination of the United Nations system assistance "with a view to achieving integration of the assistance at the country level" (paragraph 9).

/...

21. The concept of programming by objectives and, within those objectives, of identifying projects through "continuous programming" was introduced in 1975 for the second cycle and reaffirmed in 1979. The process envisages continuous assessment of the needs and resources available by the Government, UNDP and the agencies in consultation, through periodic reviews of ongoing and planned activities in individual country programmes and, on the basis of such reviews, the elaboration of the programme for the subsequent one or two years. The results of the periodic reviews are to be reported to the Council "on a selective basis" (decision 80/7).

22. Detailed instructions for the preparation of country and intercountry programmes for the third cycle were approved by the Council in its decision 81/15. In addition to the simplification of country programme documents for country programmes of less than \$20 million, they provide for "annual progress reports on programme implementation in each region, highlighting significant developments in selected individual programmes". The first such report is to be presented to the thirtieth session of the Governing Council and, in the light of the Council's further directives, it is expected that the reports will have an impact on the way in which the Council discharges its responsibilities with respect to the provision in paragraph 11 of the Consensus which specifies that "approval will cover the entire period of the programme, with provision for periodic reviews aimed at possible adjustments".

C. Intercountry programming

23. Intercountry programming, which the Consensus defines as the programming of assistance for groups of countries on a subregional, regional, interregional, or global basis, is to be based broadly on the same general principles as those applying to country programmes. Intercountry programming should therefore be "systematically related to the development priorities of the countries concerned and, as far as possible, planned in advance over a period of years" (paragraph 22).

24. For the first and second cycles the regional programmes were developed by the UNDP Regional Bureaux concerned in consultation with the Governments of the region, United Nations agencies and other organizations, including the regional economic commissions concerned. Starting in 1977, regional programmes were submitted to the Council, which took note of them.

25. More formalized and systematic procedures were developed by the Council for the third cycle when it decided, in June 1979, to "enhance the collective involvement of developing countries of each region in determining the priorities for the intercountry programmes presented to the Governing Council" (decision 79/10, V)). Proposals for such enhancement were subsequently requested by General Assembly in its resolution 34/206 of 19 December 1979.

26. Taking into account the importance of intercountry programmes "responding to global and regional priorities", as noted in decision 79/10, and according to the consultative process endorsed by the Council in its decision 80/9, Governments, agencies and other organizations and regional commissions are consulted at an early stage of the programming exercise. In the case of
/...

regional programming, the draft programmes prepared by the Administrator are reviewed at a special meeting of the Governments of the region, convened by the Administrator in collaboration with the executive secretary of the regional commission concerned. The regional programmes thus developed constitute a broad framework of priority areas within which regional and subregional projects are to be formulated. The final programme for each region is submitted to the Council for its consideration.

27. In the case of the interregional and global programmes, the collective involvement of governments takes place at the level of the Governing Council which, in this instance, is regarded as a representative inter-governmental meeting at the global level, having regard to the fact that observer delegations are able to participate freely in the discussions. Moreover, global projects have to be approved individually by the Council in accordance with paragraph 23 of the Consensus.

D. Project formulation, appraisal and approval

28. The development co-operation cycle as reflected in paragraph 1 of the Consensus includes a phase of "project formulation, appraisal and approval". The main principles laid down by the Consensus are that the process is to be carried out at the country level and that association of various kinds of expertise will be "only at the specific request of the government" (paragraph 18).^{2/} An integral part of project formulation, project appraisal is carried out by the Administrator for the larger projects and the resident representative for the smaller ones (paragraph 19).

29. With respect to project approval of UNDP assistance, the Consensus states that the "Governing Council alone is empowered to approve projects submitted by countries to the Programme for consideration" (paragraph 20). Except for, global projects, the Council has delegated from the outset its project approval authority to the Administrator, initially for a period of three years. However, the Council or a recipient government may request that a project of whatever magnitude be submitted to the Council for approval. Further, the Consensus provides that notwithstanding the delegation of authority to the Administrator to approve projects for three years, the Administrator may also bring certain types of projects to the Council for consideration and approval (paragraph 20). These were defined by the Council in 1972 at its thirteenth session as "projects which a) break new ground or involve unfamiliar or advanced technology; b) have important policy implications; c) involve a substantial continuing commitment (E/5092, paragraphs 1 and 2). Except during the period of transition before country programming became fully operational, very little use has been made of these provisions by the Council, the requesting Government, and the Administration.

30. The delegation of authority to the Administrator for project approval was extended throughout the first and second cycles. The Council in its decision 81/16 at its twenty-eighth session extended it through 1986 subject to review within that period and subject to the provisions in paragraphs 20 and 23 of the Consensus regarding the submission to the Council of certain country projects and of global projects.

/...

31. The Consensus authorizes the Administrator to extend the delegation of authority for project approval to resident representatives to "the maximum extent feasible" (paragraph 20). First limited to projects with a UNDP contribution of up to \$100,000, the delegated authority was raised in 1975 to \$150,000 and in 1977 to \$400,000.

32. The Consensus requires the Council to be kept informed "as soon as possible of all project decisions completed under its delegation of authority" (paragraph 20). During the first cycle, the Council was informed of project approvals at each of its sessions. This voluminous documentation was replaced by "project fact sheets" issued seriatim for projects with a UNDP contribution of \$150,000 or more. Since 1978, all approvals of \$50,000 or above are reported in the annual report of the Administrator. Since 1979 fact sheets are issued in one of the working languages of UNDP for projects with approval of \$250,000 and above are distributed in accordance with the requests of individual Governments and other interested entities.

33. With the development of the Integrated Systems Improvement Project (ISIP) updated information on individual projects is centralized to serve as a data base for programme monitoring as well as for the several financial and other reports required by the Council and other organs of the United Nations. Perennially concerned with the volume of documentation, the Council discontinued the submission of official documents providing information at the project level and considerably reduced the volume of those relating to individual country programmes. Indeed, by now the only document providing information on all projects is contained in the compendium of projects issued annually as an internal UNDP document and circulated informally. It gives the title of the projects, the executing agent and cost. Little use, if any, has been made in the Council's meetings of more detailed data contained in project fact sheets.

34. In view of the broad delegation of authority to the Administrator in the Consensus and of subsequent Council decisions for project formulation, appraisal and approval, and taking into account the far-reaching decentralization to the resident representatives, particularly close attention has been given throughout the years to the field directives designed to enable the Administrator to meet his over-all responsibility for the Programme operation and accountability to the Governing Council. These directives were progressively improved in the light of experience, inter alia, by ensuring that the project document serves as a management tool facilitating the appraisal of the project prior to its approval and providing milestones for the monitoring of project activities and results through tripartite reviews and for project evaluation.

35. It is at the project level that the guidance given from time to time by the Council and other United Nations bodies on specific subject matters can be translated into concrete action. The instructions include therefore the checks and controls required for proper project preparation and appraisal from a financial and managerial viewpoint, but also more substantive directives for

/...

project development. Included in the directives given to UNDP field offices are programme advisory notes, evolved from project evaluation, for certain sectors of assistance and special instructions concerning certain types of project such as pre-investment projects, or areas of emphasis, such as environment, women in development, assistance to the poorer segment of the population, rural development, safe drinking water and sanitation etc.

E. Implementation

36. The Consensus gives to the Administrator the responsibility for the selection of the executing agent for each project, consulting the Government in each case (paragraph 39). The appropriate organizations of the United Nations system have "first consideration as executing agents" (paragraph 40). However, paragraph 42 defines the circumstances in which the Administrator is entitled to make arrangements for other forms of execution. The role of the executing agents in implementation is "that of partners, under the leadership of the Programme" and "their advice should be available to the Administrator in the implementation of all projects, as appropriate, whether executed by them or not" (paragraph 38). While the Administrator is fully accountable for the management of all aspects of the Programme (paragraph 56), the executing agents are accountable to him for "the implementation of Programme assistance to projects" (paragraph 43). Monitoring of UNDP assistance is carried out at the country level by the resident representative on behalf of the Administrator.

37. A number of principles are set forth in the Consensus with respect to programme implementation. They include the principle of international competitive bidding: the possibility of using services from governmental and non-governmental institutions and firms, particularly within the recipient countries if available; the designation of nationals of the country as project managers; flexibility in the proportion of UNDP resources allocated for personnel, fellowships and equipment in any one project.

38. Within the context of these guidelines the Council in its decision of 1975 on new dimensions in technical co-operation stressed, inter alia, the need to entrust increasingly to Governments and institutions in recipient countries the responsibility for project execution and, more generally, the use of human and material resources from developing countries.

F. Evaluation

39. The developments relating to the Council's action on evaluation are examined in a separate report (DP/1983/ICW/6) under Item 5(b) of the ICW agenda.

II. SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDP

40. As emerges from the above review of the legislative framework within which UNDP operates, the Programme is characterized by the programming of assistance at the country level according to the governments' priorities, the tripartite involvement (Government, UNDP, executing agencies) in nearly every aspect of programme operations and a high degree of decentralization

/...

under the authority of the Administrator, who is fully responsible and accountable to the Governing Council.

41. According to the Consensus, the Council itself has all encompassing functions as it was given "over-all responsibility for ensuring that the resources of the Programme are employed with maximum efficiency and effectiveness in assisting the development of the developing countries" (paragraph 35).

42. Other characteristics are given to the Programme by its quasi-universal coverage and the variety of its sectors of assistance. Indeed, it serves the largest number of countries and territories (154), has the largest number of field offices (114), is involved in assistance to more projects than any other (more than 4,800), and covers the largest number of sectors of technical co-operation activities contributing to economic and social development (nearly every sector of the ACC classification of economic and social activities). With 4,862 projects budgetted as of 16 November 1982 and representing financial commitments of the order of \$3.5 billion, the Programme remains the largest organization for multilateral grant technical co-operation. Another characteristic is that the size of its assistance to individual projects ranges considerably from a few hundred dollars to over \$11 million.^{3/} A large number of projects has to be approved each year. Thus in 1981, 1,162 projects were approved and 1,050 approvals had already been recorded as of 1 November for 1982.

43. Another feature which has an impact on the work of the Council is the number of funds and programmes which have been placed under the aegis of UNDP and for which the Council assumes responsibility at the intergovernmental level.

44. The Programme's geographical coverage, the variety of its sectors of interventions, the number of projects involved, the country planning process and the large measure of delegation of authority to the field level are some of the main features of the UNDP organizational structure. The over-all responsibility and accountability of the Administrator to the Council for all aspects of the programme is another organizational feature which has to be taken into account in assessing the way in which the Governing Council discharges its responsibilities for programme matters.

III. THE WORKING OF THE COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO PROGRAMME PLANNING AND REVIEW

45. Prior to the adoption of the Consensus, the Council, which met twice a year for about two weeks each time, reviewed and approved individually the projects of the Special Fund (larger projects), while approval of projects of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (EPTA) (smaller projects) was delegated to the Administrator within the "country target".

/...

46. The first discussion of the Council on the modalities of implementation of the country programming system focused on the decentralization required, including the role of the resident representatives in the new programme process. From the outset, the resident representative was to bring to the Government's attention, after a review of ongoing projects and consultations with Government and agency personnel, a note outlining the way in which UNDP could best assist the Government according to the plans and priorities it had established. At the conclusion of the consultation process, and in most cases with the assistance of the resident representative, the Government was to submit the detailed country programme document for approval by the Council. Information was provided on the over-all economic and social situation, including its development objectives plan and priorities. The document also identified current and planned project activities for the duration of the country programme.

47. During its consideration of the first set of country programmes, it was agreed that the comments made would be brought to the attention of the recipient Government. Since then the record of the meetings where a country programme is considered have been communicated to the Government, through the resident representative, at the same time as the notification that the country programme has been approved.

48. At subsequent sessions of the Council, country programmes were considered in private meetings of the Council itself, while the more general discussions on the assessment of the experience with country programming took place at open meetings of the Council. At the conclusion of each such review the Council provided further guidance to the Administrator for improvement of the country programming process. For example, at the fourteenth session in June 1972 the Council provided guidance on the timing of country programme submissions, linkage with government development priorities, co-ordination with the World Food Programme (WFP) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), evaluation of ongoing activities, periodic review of country programmes, co-ordination of external inputs, reserve programming, front loading, unprogramme reserves, staggering of country programme presentation. Governments having bilateral programmes were informed of the new programming system and encouraged to explore with the recipient governments concerned the possibility of participation in the exercise. Beginning with its twenty-fourth session held in June 1977, the Council decided to consider country programmes at open meetings so that the presentation of the programmes and the comments made could be included in the records of the session. Although closed meetings could be held if requested, no such meetings were convened thereafter.

49. During the early years of country programme implementation, every project approved by the Administrator under his delegation of authority was reported at the following session of the Council, and the specific features of some of the projects were brought to the Council's attention. This reporting was discontinued in view of the size of the documentation involved, and of the delays in its distribution. It was replaced by the issuance of fact sheets for the larger projects and the listing of all projects of \$50,000 and above in the annual report.

50. When in 1975, at its twentieth session, the Council reviewed the experience of programming procedures in the light of its decision on new dimensions in technical co-operation, several expressions of concern were voiced with respect to the way in which the Council was considering country programmes, particularly as regards the length of time and the voluminous documentation involved. A study undertaken later that year at the Council's request (DP/157), pointed out that the Council was spending less time on country programme matters than in earlier years, and that the length of the discussions on country programmes was not correlated to the number of programmes presented but to other factors involving specific country programmes.

51. Various alternative proposals were examined in response to the concern expressed. One of these was that country programme approval would be given on the basis of the summary note of the Administrator and that country programme documents would be issued in one language only and serve as a working document available on request. Another suggestion was the circulation of country programme documents to Council members and temporary approval by the Administrator if no objection was raised within 60 days, it being understood that the Council would formally approve the programme at its next session. Another proposal was that, while maintaining consideration of programmes in private meetings, non-policy-oriented comments be made in writing by members of the Council to the Administrator, who would then forward them to the resident representatives and, as appropriate, to the Governments concerned.

52. At the conclusion of its reviews of the suggestions made, the Council decided at its twenty-first session in 1976 to continue, for the time being, consideration of country programmes on the basis of the country programme document but to approve a shorter format, specifying that information on projects should be kept to a minimum. Emphasis was to be placed on the consideration of particular problems and trends of a general policy nature relating to country programmes. The Administrator was requested "to furnish the Council on a regular basis, with information on the actual implementation of previously approved country programmes" (E/5779, paragraph 283).

53. At each session thereafter, the Administrator presented a report on trends and problems when submitting country programmes for approval. Such reports paid particular attention to the way in which the country programmes reflected priority areas of activity such as alleviation of poverty, the transfer of technology, self-reliance, technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC), economic co-operation among developing countries (ECDC), the new international economic order (NIEO), women in development, etc.

54. During the second programme cycle, country programme submissions were somewhat staggered, sometimes even with a hiatus between the first and second programmes of individual countries. The Council's attention focused on problems and trends in programming and major issues relating to implementation, for example, government execution of projects and use of national personnel. Its requests to the Administrator were for analytical documentation on selected topics with a view to giving policy directives on the general orientation of programme planning and activities.

55. It is also to be noted that the Council has hitherto interpreted the Consensus requirement for "periodic reviews of country programmes" as broad analytical reviews of country programmes issues. The Council had not followed up on its previous requests for the resubmission for approval of specific programmes when substantial adjustments had to be made, and it was only at its twenty-seventh session that, following up on previous suggestions, it decided to undertake country programme reviews "on a selective basis".

56. Similarly, although the strict limitation placed on the length of each document (32 and now 24 pages) did not apply to country programme documents, a related Council decision (81/15) to present in a short format programmes of less than \$20 million, and in an even shorter document those of less than \$5 million, has of necessity curtailed the amount of information on individual country programmes presented to the Council in 1982.

57. While the Consensus recommended that country programmes "coincide, where appropriate, with the period of the countries' national development plans", a very large number of programmes were concomitant with the beginning of the third cycle, as they were prepared as soon as the illustrative IPFs became known. This had been actually encouraged by the Council to avoid gaps between the programmes of the second and third cycles. As a result, the Council had to consider and adopt within a single year some 74 programmes, most of which presented in a short format providing limited information, particularly as regards the proposed activities in relation to those of the second cycle, the specific issues faced in the past and the readjustment needed.

58. Despite oral presentations of the programme by the Directors of the Regional Bureaux, a number of Council members had difficulties in visualizing what was, in practical terms, the specific contribution which UNDP was to make to the development objectives and priorities of the country, except in terms of amounts expected to be allocated for various sectors, and what steps were taken by the Programme to build on experience and improve performance.

59. The remedying of this situation without adding unduly to the length of the Council's sessions, to the volume of documentation and to the time which has to be spent on UNDP matters by Governments and UNDP officials, has been an issue recurrently mentioned and requiring further examination.

60. As mentioned above, since the consolidation of the Special Fund and EPTA in 1966, the Governing Council had always met twice a year. Although decisions had been taken to ensure that the January session lasted for one to two weeks, in practice it averaged three weeks; the June session was always approximately three weeks. ^{4/} In 1977, the Council decided to recommend to the General Assembly that, on an experimental basis, from 1978 onwards the Council would hold only one annual session. In 1978 it met for three weeks, in 1979 for six weeks and in 1980 for four weeks. By its decision 80/55, the Council expressed the conviction that it would be desirable to examine the possibility of shortening the duration of its session to the maximum extent possible without prejudice to the necessity of being fully informed, as in the

/...

past, on the matters normally reported to it and to the full exercise of its policy and supervisory role. It was decided that the Council should meet for three weeks in 1981 on an experimental basis, which it duly did. In June 1981 at its twenty-eighth session, the Council considered the streamlining and the rationalization of its work, in depth. In this context, the Council decided in paragraph 3(b) of its decision 81/37, that, whenever required, short sessions must be held, immediately before or after regular sessions, to examine specific matters. The rationale behind having these sessions as near as possible to the Council was to avoid the excessive travel costs of delegations. Hence, immediately before the twenty-ninth sessions in June 1982, a special meeting was held to consider and approve country and intercountry programmes. By decision 81/37, it was also decided that an organizational meeting of one or two days would be held in early February each year to elect the Bureau and, if necessary, consider organizational matters.

61. The present note on the Council's practice indicates that the Council has increasingly focused attention in considering country programme on broad terms and problems which enable it to formulate policy directives. It has reviewed programme implementation mostly through the annual reports of the Administrator, which provide global, financial and statistical information on the main aspects of programme implementation. It has also received more detailed information on specific issues which it has identified as requiring special consideration. Thus, in recent years, the Council has requested reports on government execution, pre-investment activities, equipment in UNDP-supported projects, recruitment of project professional staff, etc. Little use has been made of the provision in the Consensus for the submission of some projects for the Council's approval or to the resubmission of programmes when some substantial changes had taken place. The presentation in 1983 of annual progress reports on programme implementation in each region highlighting significant development in selected individual programmes, will be a departure from the previous practice.

IV. THE CONCERN WITH THE STRENGTHENING OF THE COUNCIL'S ROLE IN PROGRAMME MATTERS

62. The above account of the evolution of the Council's practice concerning programme matters indicates clearly that, in the years since the Consensus, the Council has placed increasing emphasis on discharging its responsibilities under the Consensus to provide policy directives to the Administrator and to review their implementation on a global, selective or subject matter basis in terms of trends, issues and general compliance.

63. Taking into account the number and variety of programmes and projects as well as the recipient Governments' responsibility for deciding on their own priorities for seeking UNDP assistance, the Council has only occasionally concerned itself with specific country projects, relying essentially on the Administrator's accountability to it to bring matters which at the level of individual programmes or projects require its attention. The Council has also

concerned itself with broader issues of technical co-operation which it had identified as of relevance for UNDP activities, such as self-reliance, TCDC, the response of the Programme to NIEO, the role of Governments in project execution or the use of national personnel in projects.

64. At a time when the Council's workload and supervisory responsibilities were developing as a result of the increasing number of programmes and funds placed under its aegis, including TCDC, it had to streamline its agenda, shorten its sessions and reduce substantially its documentation, as all organs of the United Nations were requested to do.

65. The effects of these developments at the beginning of the third cycle, when the Council's responsibility for individual country programmes approval was the heaviest, led a number of members of the Council to express concern, with various degrees of emphasis, that within the period of time available and with the current type of documentation and working methods, the Council could not discharge adequately its responsibilities for programme matters and that its role in this respect should be strengthened. This concern, though not shared by all members, was taken into consideration and the Council decided to include the strengthening of the role of the Council in programme matters in its comprehensive examination of UNDP resource mobilization.

V. PROPOSALS FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF THE COUNCIL'S ROLE IN PROGRAMME MATTERS

66. While a number of proposals have been made in the past for strengthening the Council's role in programme matters, they have been concerned mostly with work methods and organizational issues and have dealt only indirectly with the question of the level of supervision which the Council wishes to exercise over programme planning and implementation.

67. The strengthening of the Council's role in programme matters can be examined, first, in terms of desired improvements in reporting by the Administrator and, secondly, to the extent still deemed necessary, in terms of organizational changes or additions.

68. The examination made below of various alternatives, some of which are not mutually exclusive, begins with those which involve a minimum change in the Council's present work methods but might alleviate some identifiable current shortcomings. A review is then made of other alternatives which would require more significant modification of the present system and consideration is then given to those alternatives which imply more far-reaching changes in the Programme's organizational structure.

A. Improved reporting

69. The Committee may wish to bear in mind Governing Council decision 81/15 whereby, henceforth, the Administrator will present "annual progress reports on programme implementation in each region, highlighting significant development in selected individual programmes" and the extent to which such reports may meet expressed concern.

/...

70. With reference to an earlier Council decision requesting the Administrator "to furnish the Council, on a regular basis, with information on the actual implementation of previously approved country programmes" (E/5779, paragraph 283), the Committee may also wish to consider whether full implementation of this request might provide the Council with further improved information on the impact of the Programme and thus further serve to meet expressed concerns. Proposals for improved evaluation and reporting thereon, discussed in document DP/1983/ICW/6, may also be borne in mind in this connection.

B. Briefings of and informal consultations with delegations

71. The convening of informal meetings of delegations prior to the Council's sessions for the purpose of briefing them on the Council's agenda has already been encouraged by the Council and is contained in its decision 81/37.5/ Such informal meetings have been convened to keep delegations informed of major developments regarding the programme.

72. Greater use could be made of this device to keep the Council's members abreast of UNDP matters, including, for example, information on the measures taken to implement major Council directives or on the preparatory work being carried out for comprehensive or selective review of programme implementation matters. The main purpose of such meetings would be to keep delegations better informed and familiar with the working of UNDP and therefore to facilitate their appreciation of the rationale for proposals presented to the Council and the constraints and other factors influencing programme operations. The meetings would be prepared in consultation with the members of the Bureau and short notes identifying the issues to be discussed would be circulated informally in advance so that individual delegations could decide as to their interest in the matters to be discussed. Informal meetings could also be used to identify issues which appear to require particular attention on the part of the Council or on which the positions of delegations are likely to differ. Such meetings would make it possible for delegations to seek guidance from their Governments well in advance of the sessions and for the Administrator, in consultation with the members of the Bureau when need be, to take into account the members' first informal reactions when presenting his proposals to the Council itself. Such meetings would therefore at times go beyond the mere briefing of delegates but would remain short of reaching conclusions and would in no way bind delegations to specific positions. An important aspect of this arrangement would be in the participation in the meetings of all Bureau members as they could follow up informally the issues discussed with government representatives.

C. Informal meetings on programme matters

73. Should the form of consultations outlined above prove useful, the concept might be expanded into meetings of permanent missions designed to discuss in an informal setting and in greater detail various substantive matters, including, for example, the country programmes of a region or intercountry programmes prior to the Council's session. Such reviews for a limited number of programmes would provide the Administrator with the possibility of keeping
/...

the Council members informed in greater detail of the specific features of the programmes to be presented and of main developments in programme implementation in the region. It would afford Council members the occasion of requesting informally clarifications or additional information. On the basis of the notes taken at these meetings, the presentation of the programmes to the Council would take into account the comments made. The Council's discussions could thus appropriately focus on issues of common interest or on policy matters raised by the programmes submitted for its approval.

74. An obvious drawback of any such proposals would be to add to the workload of the permanent missions as well as of the secretariat without proportionate savings of the Council's time, particularly if non-technical issues were involved. Another constraint could be the availability of documentation 6/ well in advance of the Council's session as well as of the meeting facilities with interpretation in several languages.

D. Programme committee

75. The question of establishing a programme committee of the Council which could meet just before the Council sessions or during other periods of the year was suggested on various occasions when the Council examined the organization of its work. It has not been retained in the past on the grounds that it could lead to duplication of discussions and to statements for the record more appropriately made at the level of the Council. Other United Nations programmes, however, have used successfully this device for examination of programme matters in greater detail.

76. One modality could be that a programme committee be set up as a permanent body to meet simultaneously with the Budget and Finance Committee immediately before or during Council sessions. However, account has to be taken of the fact that the Council has also to deal with various other funds and programmes under UNDP. If the Council were to discuss such matters at the time the Programme and the Budget Committees met, delegations might have difficulties in covering three simultaneous meetings, as well as informal consultations among delegations. If meetings of the Programme Committee took place outside of Council sessions, the main advantage of convening an open-ended Programme Committee rather than the Council itself would be that it could work more informally and in a way somewhat similar to that of an executive committee.

E. Special meetings

77. The convening of special meetings of the Council was recommended by the Governing Council in its decision 81/37 and used on occasion, such as in May 1982 and February 1983. The device is certainly a means for the Council to concentrate attention on substantive subject matters, provided such meetings do not become simple additions to the length or frequency of the regular sessions and are therefore planned sufficiently far ahead of time with a well-delineated agenda allowing the UNDP secretariat and the delegations to prepare themselves for the discussions. In order to keep the length of such special meetings to a minimum, while ensuring that they lead to conclusions,

/...

it is essential that there be prior briefings of delegations, and the convening of informal groups on specific aspects of the questions might also be considered.

78. In this context, the Committee's attention is drawn to the fact that, since the Council will consider certain funds and programmes under its supervision on a biennial basis, from 1983 onwards 7/, it may have time at its disposal which could be devoted to programme matters.

F. Participation of Governments at the inter-governmental level

79. It has been mentioned in the past that the consideration of programme matters by the Council is enhanced when officials from developing countries who are directly in charge of UNDP and other technical co-operation programmes participate in meetings. So far little use has been made of the Council's sessions to provide an opportunity for meetings between officials dealing with UNDP matters at the working level, although discussion on such items as government execution or use of national personnel would benefit from such an approach. A more systematic approach to ensuring such participation might be considered. However, this would most likely imply helping financially with travel and related costs, especially for representatives of the least developed countries, and should probably be limited in the cases when the Council or a programme committee deals with major but practical issues of technical co-operation related to those countries.

80. The Technical Assistance Committee of EPTA, when considering matters of direct relevance for field activities, on occasions requested resident representatives and their Government counterparts to attend meetings. This device might be considered when the Council proceeds with programme reviews, as such individuals could provide when needed additional information based on their direct experience.

81. Other informal arrangements designed to bring to the Council's members direct and independent information on programme activities or specific aspects of them would be to provide the possibility for some of its members, particularly Bureau members, to make field visits and to report thereon to the Council. Such a suggestion was considered by the Council at its twenty-fifth session in June 1978 but was not pursued.

82. The governing bodies of some operational programmes, when meeting in a developing country, have encouraged representatives of Governments not only to visit programmes and projects in the host country but also, with the agreement of the Governments concerned, to make similar visits in other countries.

G. Participation of Governments at the country level

83. As previously mentioned, contacts were encouraged between the recipient Governments, the resident representatives and officials of donor countries at the time of the preparation of the first UNDP country programme exercise, in line with the concept of the Capacity Study that the UNDP country
/...

programming process should eventually be used for the programming of all external inputs which a country required in its development efforts.

Particular attention was to be given by the resident representative, as an integral part of his/her role in the programming process, to ensuring that the relations between proposed UNDP activities and those of other external aid programmes be covered in his/her note to the Government, giving the views of UNDP on the future programme, as well as in consultations with the recipient Government and in his/her comments on the country programme. Information on the relations between UNDP activities and other external assistance was included in the country programme document presented by the Government.^{8/}

The principle that it is for the Government to take into account, while preparing the country programme, other external inputs both multilateral and bilateral, does not detract from the Administrator's accountability to the Council and his responsibility for recommending the country programme to the Council for approval. Information on the relation between the UNDP activities and other external inputs is one of the elements which he has to take into account in his recommendation. An example of the implementation of the principle is provided in the current roundtable exercise for the least developed countries in which bilateral donors, multilateral organizations and the recipient country participate in the programming of external inputs.

84. In this connection, mention should also be made of the annual reporting by resident representatives to the Administrator on assistance provided by other external aid programmes; this information, which has always been a requirement is taken into account by UNDP in project assessment and implementation.

85. At the project level, the resident representatives are also required to take into account related external activities when assessing a project before its approval. Moreover, when the Council considered the implementation of the new programming procedures, it was noted that, in order to facilitate co-ordination with bilateral programmes, the Administrator would keep the participating governments responsible for such programmes informed, at their request, of relevant project proposals under consideration by UNDP and that all Governments were free to request such information.^{9/} Except for requests for early circulation of projects involving subcontracts for a substantial amount of equipment, little use has been made of this device.

86. The type of arrangements developed at the country level to facilitate the co-ordination of external inputs with the agreement of the recipient Government, and in a number of cases with its active participation, have been reported periodically to the Council. Consideration could be given to having resident representatives, with the agreement of the recipient Government, inform other Government representatives of the development of the country programme at an early stage of the process.

87. As previously mentioned, arrangements for improved co-ordination and harmonization of activities are now given attention within the broader context of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system and for the least developed countries as a result of the recommendations of the Paris Conference.

/...

88. Some Governments have developed direct independent assessment of UNDP activities. As indicated from time to time during the Council's debate, individual donor countries, mostly those having programmes of technical aid, have evolved their own arrangements to follow UNDP activities and require their aid representatives or other officials to report periodically on UNDP programme activities. Account has to be taken, however, of the possible work-load on the UNDP local office if a multiplicity of requests for information were addressed to them.

89. While some of the arrangements mentioned above are obviously strictly for individual countries to consider, the Committee might wish to examine whether, while abiding by the principles of the Consensus, some of the existing or other devices to enable all Governments to have more direct information on UNDP planned implemented activities could be more effectively used. Proposals to this effect are made in document DP/1983/ICW/6.

VI. OTHER STRUCTURES INVOLVING SIGNIFICANT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

90. A series of alternatives relating to the Council's organizational arrangements and work methods which needs also to be examined would involve more significant organizational changes. The centre-fold table summarizes the organizational structure of other funds, including financial institutions.

91. It can be seen from this table that the functions and responsibilities of the Council are similar to some of those entrusted to the governing bodies of these institutions, particularly with respect to general policy directives, while other Council functions, such as country and intercountry programme approval and review of operations, are similar to those assigned to their executive bodies. For example, under the Consensus, the Council exercises operational control and makes broad allocations.

92. Another option for achieving closer involvement of Governments in the Programme's operations would be the setting up under the Council's authority of an "Executive Board" or "Executive Committee" or a "Management Committee" which would meet as often as required. Suggestions to this effect have been made in the past. The board or committee's functions would be defined by the Council and would include matters on which it could take decisions and other matters for consideration and for inclusion of recommendations to the Council. Still other matters would be reserved to the Council itself.

93. One proposal was that the Executive Board or Committee be composed of the members of the Council's Bureau with 10 or 12 other members selected under the same distribution as those applying to the Council's membership. Under this arrangement, the Council would meet for a short period each year with either its present membership, with the participation of observers, or even as a body composed of all countries participating in UNDP. The Council's role would then be that of over-all policy guidance for UNDP and its related programmes and funds.

94. The establishment of an Executive Board or Committee with power of decision would obviously involve a modification of the basic institutional structure of UNDP as established in the Consensus, not only as regards the Council itself but also with respect to the functions and responsibilities of the Administrator who, under the Consensus, is fully and directly accountable to the Governing Council. Should the Board be only advisory, the arrangement would have a different implication as the Administrator would retain his present responsibilities vis-à-vis the Council; and the Board's role would be limited to that of a consultative mechanism to the Administrator.

95. If this executive body were patterned on those of existing financial institutions, it would place on an intergovernmental body some of the responsibilities which, under UNDP legislation, are given to the Council - such as programme approval - and to the Administrator - such as project approval. In the case of financial institutions, the executive heads chair the executive body while in other institutions the chairman is elected among board members. Although it can be seen that such an organizational arrangement can be set up without affecting the principle of country programming as defined in the Consensus, the modification involved in the structure of the Programme would be very significant. While the frequency of the executive body's meeting would, to an extent, be determined by the degree of delegation of authority it gave to its executive president, it is likely that, taking into account the characteristics of UNDP assistance both as regards the type and number of projects, the board's work would be particularly heavy. The cost of such a collegial direction for the Programme would significantly increase, whether its members came from their capitals periodically or were permanently stationed at UNDP headquarters.

96. Proposals for an executive body have also included the idea of a small representative body of less than 20 members, as well as a body composed of 48 members. It is difficult to foresee in this second alternative how such a board could function with dexterity and be different from the present Council sitting in executive session. In particular, if such a Board met only three or four times a year, for perhaps a week, the organizational arrangements would be those of a "Programme Committee" of the Council, to which it would have delegated some of its responsibilities (i.e. Programme approval or review subject to confirmation) and some of those hitherto delegated to the Administrator (approval of some of the projects).

VII. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

97. At present, by far the largest portion of the cost of the governance of UNDP is borne by the regular budget of the United Nations and individual Governments for their representatives at meetings. With an average cost of over \$16,500 per meeting of the Council and over \$400 for each page of document in six languages, the financial implication of any increase in the number of meetings can be substantial. A one-week meeting costs from \$200,000 to \$250,000, depending on the documentation. In a period of financial stricture for the United Nations, it is doubtful that additional expenses could be absorbed in the present budget. At the same time the resources of

/...

UNDP must be used to the maximum extent for field activities. There appears therefore, at this juncture, only a narrow margin of flexibility for new measures without affecting the present work relating to financial and administrative questions, as well as with respect to the other programme funds placed under the Council's authority. Suggestions made above for the travel of resident representatives and their government counterparts should be considered in this light.

98. It is unlikely that such far-reaching reforms as the establishment by the Council of a permanent executive committee could be entertained unless justified by a quantum jump in resources, which would then place the Programme, because of the size of its activities, on a par with larger financial institutions which have such an organizational framework. Should the Programme resources increase substantially, the Council might then consider further the cost benefit and feasibility of more fundamental changes, if these changes are still deemed necessary for the discharge of its over all responsibility for ensuring that the resources of the programme are employed with maximum efficiency and effectiveness in assisting the development of the developing countries.

Notes

1/ It was envisaged in the Consensus that, in the country programming process, efforts should be made to "co-ordinate all sources of assistance in the United Nations system with a view to achieving integration of the assistance at the country level". This concept was given renewed emphasis with the adoption of resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

2/ The wording of this provision was influenced by an issue noted in the Capacity Study, which included a number of comments on circumstances which, it was felt, led to project selection on an ad hoc basis rather than within the framework of a well-planned country programme.

3/ Of the 4,862 projects on the books as of 16 November 1982, 636 or 13 per cent were of less than \$50,000; 744 or 15 per cent ranged from \$50,000 to below \$150,000; 1,148 or 24 per cent from \$150,000 to below \$400,000 (which is the limit for project approval by resident representatives); 1,181 or 25 per cent from \$400,000 to below \$1 million and 1,103 or 23 per cent projects were of \$1 million or more.

4/ See document DP/256, paragraph 13

5/ In sub-paragraphs 3(n) and 3(o) of decision 81/37, the Council decided "...to request the (Bureau) officers, in co-operation with the Administrator, to hold consultations, as required, with the member states both before and during the sessions of the Council, for the purpose of organizing and facilitating the completion of the work of the Council;" and "...to authorize the Administrator to convene when he considers it necessary, in consultation /...

with the Council's elected officers, informal briefing sessions for the members of UNDP in order to ensure that members are kept fully informed on issues to be discussed in the Council;"

6/ The issuance of documents, including country programme documents, well before the Council's sessions has proved so far impracticable as the load of United Nations documentation services is such that the Council's documents are scheduled for issuance only within a short period before the formal meeting.

7/ See decision 81/37, paragraph 3(f) and General Assembly resolution 36/200, paragraph 11.

8/ See, for example, the country programme documents presented by Thailand (general comments and project) and Egypt (project). The role of the resident representative, as reflected in the standard basic agreement, includes the provision of assistance to the government on the co-ordination of external inputs.

9/ See in particular DP/L.198, paragraph 11.

- - - - -

GOVERNANCE OF VARIOUS MULTILATERAL FUNDS:
STRUCTURE, COMPETENCE AND METHODS OF WORK

DP/1983/10W/8
English

	UNICEF	IFAD	UNHCR	World Bank	ADB	Commonwealth Fund
<u>A. Structure</u>						
1. Membership of funds	Any state member of UN, its specialized agencies, or IAEA.	Any state member of UN, its specialized agencies, or IAEA.	Any state member of UN, its specialized agencies, or IAEA.	Open to all IMF members; currently 142 countries.	Members and associate members of ESCAP. Other regional countries and non-regional developed countries, members of the UN, its specialized agencies, or IAEA. Total currently 45 countries.	Open to all Commonwealth countries; current membership: 36 countries.
2. Bodies	<u>Executive Board</u> 41 members elected by ECOSOC. Categories: Africa 9 Asia 9 Eastern Europe 4 Latin America 6 Western Europe and others 12 plus 1 seat rotated among regional groups. Programme Committee) Administration and Finance Committee) of the Whole	<u>Governing Council</u> Each member appoints a governor and an alternate. <u>Executive Board</u> 18 members (6 for each category); provision for 18 alternates, 1/3 elected at each annual session of the Council.	<u>Executive Committee</u> 41 members elected by ECOSOC. Members have to be "States with a demonstrated interest in, and devotion to, the solution of the refugee problem". <u>Sub-committee on Administrative and Financial Matters</u>) <u>Sub-committee on International Protection</u>) of the Whole	<u>Board of Governors</u> One governor appointed by each member country. <u>Executive Directors</u> 21 Directors and provision for 21 alternates; each of five largest shareholders (USA, UK, FRG, France, Japan) appoints a single Executive Director. The remainder elected by Governors for other member countries, according to regional distribution. A single Executive Director appointed also by China.	<u>Board of Governors</u> Each member appoints one governor and one alternate. <u>Board of Directors</u> 12 Directors: 8 elected by governors representing regional members, 4 by governors representing non-regional countries. <u>Audit Committee of the Board</u> <u>Committee on Administrative Matters relating to Members of Board</u>	<u>Board of Representatives</u> Each participating Government is represented on the Board. <u>Committee of Management</u> 10 members: 3 permanent representing the major donors, Canada, UK, Australia; 7 rotated among developing countries.
3. Directorship of funds	<u>Executive Director</u> is appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Executive Board, to whom he/she reports.	<u>President</u> is elected by a two-thirds majority by the Governing Council to whom he/she reports.	<u>High Commissioner</u> appointed by General Assembly, on the nomination of the Secretary-General. He/she is responsible to the General Assembly.	<u>President</u> , who is never a governor or executive director or alternate, is selected by the Executive Directors. <u>Director-General of Operations Evaluation Department</u> appointed by and reports directly to Executive Director.	<u>President</u> , who is never a governor or director or alternate, elected by the Board of Governors to whom he/she reports.	<u>Managing Director</u> of the Fund is responsible to the Commonwealth Secretary-General, head of the Commonwealth Secretariat, has the rank of Assistant Secretary-General. The Fund functions as part of the Commonwealth Secretariat.

Advisory Body of the General Assembly: Its work reviewed annually by EDOSEC primarily on the basis of the Board's report.

Executive Board

1. reviews the work of the organization and its prospects;
2. approves a medium-term plan for the organization;
3. determines policy;
4. considers requests and commits funds for programme co-operation and for budget costs;
5. takes note of the UN External Auditor's reports; and
6. approves financial reports.

Executive Director is responsible for the administration of UNICEF as well as for the appointment and direction of UNICEF staff. UNICEF staff are United Nations officials subject to the United Nations Staff Regulations administered by the Executive Director.

Governing Council: vested in it; may delegate to the Board except:

1. amendment to the Agreement establishing the Fund;
2. approval of membership;
3. suspension of a member;
4. termination of the Fund;
5. decision on appeals relating to decisions of the Executive Board; and
6. determination of remuneration of the President

- Periodically reviews adequacy of funds available to the Fund and may invite members to make additional contributions.

- Establishes Board policies and criteria and regulations for the Fund.

President is Chairman of the Executive Board and participates in its meetings without the right to vote.

President heads the staff, and under the control and direction of the Governing Council and the Executive Board, is responsible for conducting the business of the Fund. President is the legal representative of the Fund. President or a representative designated by him/her may participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the Governing Council.

Its principal functions are:

1. to advise the High Commissioner, at his request, in the exercise of his functions under the Statute of his Office;
2. to approve the material assistance projects for refugees (General Programmes) for the present year and the financial target for the following year;
3. to authorize the High Commissioner to appeal for funds;
4. to give directives to the High Commissioner for the use of the Emergency Fund (currently set at \$10,000,000 annually), and the Special Trust Funds. Since 1974, the High Commissioner also reports to the Executive Committee on special as well as General, (i.e. annual) programmes.

The subcommittees on Administrative and Financial Matters, and on International Protection facilitate the work of the Executive Committee by focusing on specific issues falling within their respective areas of reference.

High Commissioner discharges his/her duties under the statute of his/her office. He/she is authorized by the General Assembly to appeal for funds to provide care and maintenance to refugees and to finance permanent solutions.

vested in it; may delegate except:

1. admission or suspension of members;
2. increase/decrease of capital stock;
3. decisions on appeals;
4. conclusions of formal cooperative agreements with other international organizations;
5. suspension of operations and distribution of Bank's net income;
6. approval of amendments to the Articles of Agreement.

Executive Directors - responsible for

1. interpreting the Articles of Agreement subject to appeal to the Board of Governors;
2. conduct of the Bank's general operations;
3. proposals for loans or other financing, borrowing, major technical assistance operations, budgets, reports and recommendations to the Board on matters involving policy issues.

President is Chairman of the Executive Directors but has no vote except a deciding vote in cases of equal division. May participate in meetings of Board of Governors but has no vote. President is chief of operating staff of the Bank and conducts, under the direction of the Executive Directors the ordinary business of the Bank. Subject to the general control of the Executive Directors, he/she is responsible for the organization, appointment and dismissal of the staff, with the exception of the Director-General of the Operations Evaluation Department.

vested in it; may delegate except:

1. admission of new members and conditions of their admission;
2. increase/decrease of capital stock;
3. suspension of a member;
4. decision on appeals from the Board;
5. conclusion of cooperative agreement with other international organizations;
6. election of Directors and President;
7. determination of Directors' remuneration, etc.;
8. approval, after review of auditor's report, of general balance sheet and profit and loss statement;
9. determination of reserves and distribution of net profits;
10. amendment of Agreement;
11. termination of operations and distribution of assets; and
12. such other powers expressly assigned to the Board in the Agreement.

Board of Directors - responsible for general operations; approves loans guarantees, investments in equity capital, borrowing, technical assistance.

President is the Chairman of Board but has no vote except a deciding vote in cases of equal division. May participate in meetings of Board of Governors but has no vote. President is chief of staff of the Bank and conducts under direction of Board of Directors, business of the Bank. Responsible for organization, appointment, and dismissal of staff in accordance with regulations adopted by Board of Directors. President is legal representative of the Bank.

approves the annual plan of expenditure.

Committee of Management - supervises general operations of and provides policy guidance to the Fund, with the Commonwealth Secretary-General as Chairman. Day-to-day management is the responsibility of the managing director.

C. Methods of work

Executive Board - Annual session for 2 weeks (special sessions possible).

Programme Committee)
Administration and Finance Committee)

Meet consecutively for about 2 1/2 days each after the opening of the Executive Board. The Executive Board then reconvenes to consider the Committees' recommendations.

Recommendations for country programme assistance, supported by a country programme profile document, are reviewed in the Programme Committee. On the recommendations of the Programme Committee, the Board approves commitments to programme assistance as contained in a Summary of Commitments and Notings document, known informally as the "Round-up" paper.

Voting - one vote per member of the Board. The Board has a tradition of agreement by consensus, although

Governing Council - Annual session (special sessions as decided).

Executive Board - normally four times a year (as often as required).

Voting - Total of 1,800 votes in each of the above bodies; 600 votes in each category.

In the Governing Council weighted voting in categories I and II; equal voting in category III.

In Executive Board members in categories I and II entitled to the number of votes of those countries which elected them; in category III each member has 100 votes.

In practice, decisions normally adopted by consensus.

Executive Committee - Annual session 2 weeks.

Sub-Committees on Administrative and Financial Matters, and on International Protection

Hold 2 day consecutive meetings which precede the Executive Committee meeting.

Voting - Decisions traditionally adopted by consensus.

Board of Governors - Annual meeting usually in conjunction with that of IMF.

Executive Directors - perform their duties on a full-time basis. After formal negotiations with borrowers they approve loans and credit agreements on basis of recommendations from President.

Voting rights - based on member's share in capital stock which in turn based on each member's quota in the IMF. Each member has 250 votes plus one additional vote for each share of stock held. The Bank usually operates on the basis of consensus.

Board of Governors - Annual meeting Any other meetings called for by Board of Directors at request of at least five members.

Board of Directors - normally functions at principal office of Bank; meets as often as required. (In 1981, 53 formal meetings).

Voting rights - distributed according to share of capital stock, provided share of regional members does not fall below 60 per cent of total subscribed stock.

Board of Representatives - normally meets twice a year with one meeting held in conjunction with the arrival meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers.

Committee of Management - meets between meetings of the Board in London.

Voting - the Fund usually operates on the basis of consensus.

