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The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

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

(b) COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS (continued)

(i) RESOURCES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR PROGRAMMING (DP/1983/66) (continued)

(ii) TRENDS AND PROBLEMS IN THE COUNTRY PROGRAMMES (DP/1983/60 and Add.1) (continued)


(iv) CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES (INCLUDING REQUESTS FOR EXTENSIONS) (continued)

(v) CONSIDERATION OF REGIONAL PROGRAMME (DP/RAB/1) (continued)

(vi) GLOBAL AND INTERREGIONAL PROJECTS (DP/PROJECTS/REC/11, DP/1983/39) (continued)

(vii) APPROVAL AUTHORITY (DP/1983/32, DP/1983/52) (continued)


1. Mr. McBARNETTE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had taken note of the innovations introduced to improve the quality of country programming by closer co-ordination of the inputs from various agencies. That would allow the maximum benefit to be obtained from scarce resources. There was no need, for the time being, to stress the importance of technical aid and co-operation within the framework of the United Nations system. Finally, he trusted that all the country programmes before the Council would be approved.

2. Mr. CHEN Xingnong (China) said that his delegation agreed that country programmes for Latin America and the Caribbean should be extended.

3. Ms. CLEAVER (Brazil) said that her delegation was pleased to note that the country programmes before the Council reflected the national priorities of the States concerned. The reductions in IPFs would undoubtedly cause problems, although the increase in cost-sharing funds, which demonstrated the importance attached to UNDP by the recipient countries, would mitigate them. It was important for the role of the Governing Council in country programming to be extended. Her delegation considered the country programmes before the Council to be important.
4. Mr. HARE (Canada) said that the absence of documents made it difficult to debate the matters before the Council. Additional financial data on projects contained in the country programmes would have been welcome. In the country programme for Colombia (DP/CP/COL/3) there was little indication of the size of many of the projects. It was, however, of note that 44 per cent of the resources required would be met by cost sharing. It was not clear to what extent project COL/82/033 was action-orientated and what degree of complementarity there was under project COL/82/027. Finally, Canada supported the independence bonus for St. Kitts and Nevis and the proposed separate IPF for Anguilla.

5. Mr. FLEMING (United States of America) said that the analysis of trends and problems in country programmes (DP/1983/60) was a valuable tool in programme review. Yet the late receipt of programme documentation had seriously hampered his delegation's review of the programmes. Efforts should be made to resolve that problem.

6. The attempts made to relate UNDP programme activities to national development plans were welcome, even though in general such programmes coincided with IPF cycles rather than the respective national plans. The use of sectoral studies, assessment of earlier UNDP assistance and agency missions in formulating programmes was commendable. His delegation welcomed the Administrator's intention to prepare more comprehensive discussion papers for the preparation of future country programmes.

7. The endeavours made to co-ordinate UNDP activities with those of other donors to avoid wasteful duplication were welcome, as were efforts to prepare for donor round-table conferences. His delegation also welcomed the continuing efforts to allocate UNDP resources to the most crucial development objectives. Continued attention should be given to increasing the role of women in development both as participants and as beneficiaries. The number of projects specifically benefiting women had increased over the years, although only a fifth to a quarter of the programmes before the Council included such projects.

8. Project planning and execution should take account of the concept of technical co-operation among developing countries wherever possible. The emphasis placed on pre-investment and investment support activities was encouraging. His delegation welcomed the analysis provided by the Administrator of the financial aspects of programmes, and particularly the data on cost-sharing trends. Continued efforts should be made to achieve cost effectiveness in development activities, and short-term consultants should be used where appropriate. The use of United Nations volunteers would be an appropriate way to achieve cost effectiveness.

9. Although country programme documents needed to be brief, there was considerable scope for improvement in the data they presented. Information on co-ordination and complementarity with other programmes should be provided.

10. His delegation welcomed the information provided by the Administrator on the use of programme resources for equipment, and was gratified that such information would continue to be provided in the relevant report. Such information would be
particularly welcome from the Directors of UNDP Regional Bureaux and the Chief of the Unit for Europe in their annual reports on programme implementation.

11. It seemed from the country programmes before the Council that efforts had been made to avoid project duplication. The trend towards increased cost sharing was gratifying, as was the increased concentration on key sectors. It was curious that one country in need of technical assistance could spend money on the suppression of democracy.

12. Ms. TOMOVA (Bulgaria) said it was pleasing that the country programmes before the Council had been based on national development plans in accordance with the 1970 Consensus. Her delegation agreed with others that future reports of the Administrator should contain more information on the percentage of government-executed projects in country programmes. In addition, information should be provided on any UNDP co-operation in the private sector; such use of UNDP funds was not permissible. Her delegation supported all the country programmes before the Council, particularly that of Nicaragua.

13. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that the task of the Council would have been facilitated had delegations offered a more penetrating analysis of programmes and projects. It was, however, difficult to obtain a clear idea of technical co-operation merely by considering the various country programmes, since each Government had its own development priorities with different programme emphases, which limited the effectiveness of further analysing the programmes before the Council. It was gratifying that the Programme had sought to co-ordinate all the development initiatives in the region into a concerted whole.

14. The aims set forth in the programme for Colombia, namely to promote social change and to consolidate development, underlay the philosophy of development in all Latin American countries. The scope of the tasks undertaken inevitably meant the involvement of the public sector. The programme for Nicaragua concentrated on agricultural and agro-industrial development, reflecting the need to increase food supply in that country. The programme for Trinidad and Tobago was also largely concerned with the agricultural sector and rural development. Such priorities demonstrated the intrinsic worth of UNDP assistance in the region. The countries of Latin America greatly appreciated the Programme, which provided helpful and impartial assistance.

Asia and the Pacific (DP/CP/IRA/3 and DP/CP/IRA/NODE/3, DP/CP/KIR/1, DP/CP/NIU/2, DP/CP/SRL/3 and DP/CP/SRL/NODE/3, DP/CP/TOK/1, DP/CP/TUV/1)

15. Mr. JOSEPH (Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific), introducing the country and intercountry programmes and projects for Asia and the Pacific, said that the emphasis placed by the Government of Sri Lanka on human resources development was reflected in that country's programme now being submitted to the Governing Council for approval. The third country programme had been prepared on the basis of 80 per cent of the 1982-1986 illustrative IPP of $76 million, which had been the level of programming in effect
at the time that the country programme was being formulated. With the recent decline in the resources available for programming, increasing emphasis was being given to programme and project monitoring and evaluation in order to make more effective use of limited resources.

16. The new country programme for Iran was the result of an in-depth review by the national policy-makers of the nature of Iran's future participation in UNDP and an extended series of consultations between the Government and UNDP since 1981. There was no representative of any other United Nations agency resident in Iran at present. The UNDP Office had provided essential services, as needed, to all executing agencies. UNDP's relationship with the Government had been cordial and process of consultation, based on mutual understanding, was being established.

17. Of the four Pacific area country programmes submitted to the Governing Council, those for Kiribati and Tuvalu were their first since independence. The only one of the four that was a second country programme was that for Niue, which had become internally self-governing in 1974 in free association with New Zealand. The fourth country programme was that for Tokelau, which remained a dependent territory of New Zealand. There were great similarities and also obvious disparities between the entities covered by the four country programmes. In terms of economic development, they all faced obstacles that were common to all small developing island countries. Throughout the Pacific, with authorized budget levels reduced to 55 per cent of illustrative IPFs, UNDP found it necessary to expand the use of United Nations volunteers in order to retain some meaningful impact for its activities in the countries whose reduced IPFs would no longer support the assignment of full-cost, UNDP-financed experts.

18. A round-table meeting between five Asia and Pacific least developed countries (LDCs) and their development partners had been held in Geneva from 9 to 18 May 1983 and had been attended by 37 donor Governments, 11 funding institutions, 26 United Nations specialized agencies and 7 non-governmental organizations. The participants had felt that the resolution and capacity of the Asia and Pacific LDCs to be architects of their own development strategies, plans and programmes had been clearly demonstrated. The exposure of the international community to an organized presentation of the economic strategy of those LDCs had been invaluable in terms of mutual understanding. The documentation prepared for the meeting by each LDC, presenting its development strategy and the related external assistance needs, had been a significant achievement. The combination of the documentation prepared for the meeting and the discussions that had taken place during it, formed a sound basis for continuing exchanges between each LDC and its development partners. Finally, it was important to note that the meetings held in Geneva did not constitute the culmination of a process; instead, they signalled the commencement of a continuing process of consultations between the LDCs and their development partners. The LDCs had asked UNDP to organize a regularly spaced series of consultations to protect the realism and validate the resolution evidenced at this important meeting.
19. With regard to the status of country programme implementation in Asia and the Pacific, 31 of the 37 country IPFs and the intercountry programme for Asia and the Pacific were all covered by programmes approved by the Governing Council in 1980 or later. That coverage of 32 programmes accounted for as much as 95 per cent of the established IPF for the entire region. The six remaining countries and territories, accounting for only 5 per cent of the regional IPF were Democratic Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Hong Kong, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Nauru and Brunei. In all of those cases, the Administrator would report again to the Council or would submit country programmes to it at its thirty-first session. The Council would note, however, that with the 95 per cent coverage mentioned above, the overall situation in the region was clearly satisfactory in terms of preparation and submission of country programmes.

20. The operational and ongoing country programmes were all moving forward strongly and the process of committing available resources in approved or hard pipeline projects was well advanced. The personnel component remained more or less without change, at about 38 per cent of all project expenditures. There was a notable increase in training from 11.8 per cent to 18.4 per cent and a sizeable decrease in the equipment component from 35.4 per cent for the second cycle to 30.1 per cent for 1982. With regard to resource management, an excellent trend had been established in the ratio of budgets to actual programme delivery. That ratio had consistently improved in the past three years. Steady and satisfactory improvements were also being made with respect to delivery trends, government execution, use of qualified national professional staff and the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries.

21. With respect to evaluation and monitoring, the principal formal instrument for monitoring was the tripartite review. For the Asia and Pacific region, the annual total was as much as 850 such reviews, each of which required two to five days to prepare, convene and write up. In many countries of the region, project sites were hundreds, even thousands of kilometres away from each other. Some individual countries had a formidable load of tripartite reviews each year. Staff time in the co-ordinating authority of the Governments and UNDP simply could not cope with that load. Accordingly, UNDP was consulting with those Governments to evolve a more selective, yet representative formula that would observe the spirit of the Council's views on that subject and protect the Administrator's accountability. To date 450 projects of over $1 million, or 100 per annum based on a four-year duration average, had been subjected to intensive evaluation. The Regional Bureau would seek to organize those evaluations so that each year's crop was not a haphazard mix, related only by a common chronology. Instead, the Regional Bureau would seek a design for each year's evaluation portfolio, with some kinship among the projects in substance or in methodology.

22. Mr. POTVIN (Canada) said that the small islands in the Pacific were marked by clear characteristics. They were geographically isolated, some were independent and their populations were very small. Accordingly, experts from the Commonwealth countries were important for them in various sectors, in particular, food production, marketing, administration and arts and crafts. In that connection, in
preparing country programmes, regionalization and TCDC should be taken into account. The four projects mentioned were clearly defined with good sectoral orientation and, his delegation noted, would be the subject of periodic evaluations.

23. The programme for Sri Lanka was also well defined and his delegation was particularly happy to note that the major part of resources would be devoted to essential needs and particularly to support of national programmes, especially in the area of food production and nutrition. Another area in which UNDP had placed emphasis, and which his delegation regarded as being well chosen in the light of its bilateral experience with Sri Lanka, was that of human resources development, including education, training and other forms of technical co-operation. UNDP performance in that field had been meritorious and should continue. His delegation noted that there was already in the pipeline a large number of projects for pre-investment studies. His delegation believed that the action taken by UNDP to obtain a reduction of new activities in that field was well based. Given Canada's interest in questions of the environment, his delegation took special note of the initiatives mentioned in paragraphs 27 to 29 of document DP/CP/SRL/3 and supported them.

24. His delegation shared the views of the Government of Sri Lanka as reflected in paragraphs 12 to 15 of document DP/CP/SRL/3 and noted that that Government programme constituted one of the better examples of co-ordination in the field. Finally, his delegation believed that better results would be obtained by concentrating UNDP resources on the food production and human resources development sectors. His delegation also wished to encourage the Secretariat to continue to distribute documents on project evaluation in the various regions because it was precisely that type of information that would give substance to the debates.

25. Mr. Gibs0n (Observer for New Zealand) said that Kiribati, Niue, Tokelau and Tuvalu shared specific problems with other countries in the South Pacific region. The challenge of development was immense for those countries, and the response of UNDP to that challenge had become an important contribution to development in the region. The Programme had taken a careful and sensitive approach, paying close attention to priorities set within the region and to co-ordination with the work of other bodies, particularly the regional agencies. However, the resource situation of UNDP was a matter of great concern. Since downturns in the level of IPFs had a significant impact on small-scale economies, such as those in the South Pacific, UNDP would need to work closely with Governments in order to make the best possible use of resources. In some areas there might be a need to rethink policies and criteria to ensure that they fully reflected different needs and different stages of development.

26. UNDP had given the Geothermal Institute at Auckland valuable financial and professional assistance, and his Government would see to it that the Institute continued to offer courses and training in the geothermal field that would meet the needs of countries seeking to develop their geothermal expertise.
27. **Mr. TSHERING** (Bhutan) said that his delegation supported adoption of the country programmes under consideration. With regard to the Geneva meeting between five Asia and Pacific least developed countries and their development partners, UNDP was to be commended for having taken steps to promote contacts between donor countries and the least developed countries. However, his delegation wished to urge the Programme and the donor countries to ensure that follow-up action was taken, so that the momentum generated was maintained.

28. **Mr. LAWTON** (World Health Organization) said that the regional programme for Asia and the Pacific was well balanced, particularly from the health point of view, and there had been no difficulties with co-ordination. Furthermore, the World Health Organization (WHO) was in favour of the tripartite reviews.

29. WHO was interested in establishing links between round-table meetings, such as the one held recently at Geneva, and current WHO health resources activities. Round-table meetings should be kept under constant review, and the specialized agencies should be kept informed of the entire process.

30. **Mr. VERCELES** (Philippines) said that the country programmes for Sri Lanka and Iran were well presented. With regard to the country programmes for Kiribati, Niue, Tokelau and Tuvalu, it was hard to see how much impact the low IPFs for such countries could have on their development. He wondered whether the specific situation of small island developing countries had been taken into consideration in policy preparation and the allocation of IPFs. Moreover, it was important to ensure that bilateral assistance to such countries did not detract from multilateral assistance. Round-table meetings such as the one held recently at Geneva were a good vehicle for drawing attention to the plight of small island developing countries. His delegation supported adoption of the country programmes before the Council.

31. **Mr. WANG Jinren** (China) said that the country programme for Sri Lanka was in keeping with that country's needs. Since the four island countries under consideration had particular problems, UNDP should adopt specific measures to assist them. His delegation was in favour of adoption of the country programmes before the Council.

32. The first country programme for China was being implemented smoothly, and his Government was ready to co-operate with UNDP with a view to improving implementation yet further.

33. **Mr. KENEALLY** (Australia) said that his delegation supported adoption of the country programmes for Iran and Sri Lanka. The country programmes for the four island developing countries under consideration placed emphasis in the necessary areas, but it was a matter of great concern to his delegation that the IPFs for those countries were so low. UNDP should consider the particular problems of the countries concerned at the current session. The matter could not be left until the middle of 1984. He would be interested to know what UNDP could do for the island countries in question. The impact of raising their IPFs to 80 per cent of the original level of programmed resources would have a minimal impact in terms of the Programme's total resources.
34. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Observer for Bangladesh) said that his delegation supported adoption of the country programme for Sri Lanka.

35. With regard to the recent round-table meeting held at Geneva, UNDP was playing an important role in promoting contacts between the least developed countries and the donor countries. It should place even greater emphasis on such consultative meetings, and the views of the least developed countries should be taken into account in the establishment of the relevant machinery. His delegation believed that the resources required for playing that catalytic role would be available to UNDP.

36. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation supported adoption of the country programmes under consideration. However, it believed that UNDP should place greater emphasis on the use of indigenous resources in the implementation of those programmes. There should also be close co-operation in programme implementation among all the parties concerned. UNDP had played an extremely useful role in organizing the round-table meeting held recently at Geneva. Such meetings were extremely beneficial to all the countries concerned.

37. Mr. AKAO (Japan), referring to document DP/1983/60 and specifically to sections B and C on the nature of preparatory work and the role of UNDP in co-ordination, said that Japan welcomed the efforts of UNDP resident representatives to co-ordinate the Programme's activities with those of other donors, since that was indeed necessary if the limited resources available were to be allocated effectively. A particularly interesting instance of such co-ordination were the Sri Lanka programmes mentioned.

38. Regarding the financial aspects of country programmes, discussed in section D of the report, Japan had noted with great interest the trend toward cost sharing, which should be encouraged, particularly among countries with high per capita incomes.

39. Regarding the equipment component in country programmes, section E of the report gave no specific figures or percentages and it would be useful if such information were supplied later.

40. Japan agreed that continuous country programming required flexibility, as stated in section G. It might well be difficult for countries to identify specific projects at the outset, but it was important that they should do so eventually.

41. Regarding global priorities, discussed in section I, while it might be difficult to accommodate both global and national priorities, it should be borne in mind that it was the United Nations, with the endorsement of Member States, which set the global priorities and that they should therefore take precedence.

42. Mr. JOSEPH (Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific), said that he wished to reply to questions that had been raised regarding the implementation of the country programmes for Asia and the Pacific. With regard to the co-ordination of UNDP assistance in the Pacific...
islands, mentioned in particular by Canada, one of the distinguishing features of the Pacific region programmes had indeed been the satisfactory co-ordination of UNDP assistance with that of the major bilateral donors. The UNDP officers responsible for the various Pacific island countries and Territories were the Resident Representatives in Fiji and Samoa, who regularly visited all of them.

There were two reasons why co-ordination in the region worked so well: first, the UNDP officers and bilateral co-ordinators were supportive of national planning advisers in each small country or Territory - in fact, the advisers were often financed under UNDP projects - and second, UNDP followed the useful practice of sending representatives on regular visits to the capitals of the major bilateral donors - Australia and New Zealand - and of consulting regularly with the Commonwealth secretariat, the regional bodies of the Pacific area and government aid co-ordinators in the region regarding the implementation of the regional programme.

43. Replying to the questions regarding UNDP assistance under the regional programme, he said it had amounted to $12 million in the second cycle and had nearly doubled in the third cycle to $22 million.

44. A number of representatives had commented on the low IPFs for country programmes in the region. It should be noted that in many cases intercountry programme resources were used to reinforce the IPFs; a case in point was the telecommunications project in Tokelau, where technical services and training had been financed from intercountry programme resources.

45. As the WHO representative had observed, the primary object of the round-table meeting for least developed countries had not been to secure pledges but to bring the least developed countries and their development aid partners together; however, the fact that a number of pledges had materialized had indeed been satisfactory. He had taken note of all the points made by delegations regarding follow-up to the round-table meeting and assured them that he intended to pursue the follow-up with vigour and care and planned to hold a regular succession of consultations in the next few months to ensure that the good beginning would evolve into a continuing process.

46. Regarding the comments of the Philippines and Australia on the small island countries, the Deputy Administrator would address the points they had raised at the end of the discussion, since they also involved the Latin American and Caribbean region.

47. The President said he would take it that the Council wished to take note with appreciation of the report on the status of country programme implementation in the Asia and Pacific region.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. Szeremeta (Poland) took the chair.
50. Mr. OLCESE (Acting Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa), introducing the report on implementation of country programmes for Africa in 1982 (DP/1983/61), said that he would begin by reviewing general UNDP programme implementation and specifically how UNDP resources were being programmed to assist African Governments in solving some of their staggering economic and climatic problems before going on to consider the individual country programmes in the region.

51. The impact of the recent reduction in available programme resources for Africa from the more than $1.8 billion originally expected to about $995 million had obviously been dramatic, and the report devoted considerable space to the crushing consequences for African development programmes and to the specific ways in which UNDP, its agency partners and African Governments had dealt with the necessary programme adjustments and reductions. The reduction in UNDP financing was a frustrating setback and a bitter irony in the light of the quality of the African country programmes approved and the high capacity of African Governments to absorb United Nations-system assistance and of the United Nations to deliver assistance effectively in the region.

52. At the same time, the current financial situation had brought UNDP's technical co-operation under more rigorous scrutiny by the three partners in order to improve its quality and effectiveness still further. Consultations, often intensive, and evaluations of country programmes were currently under way in virtually every country of the region, and the process of collaborative self-evaluation was expected to continue into 1984 as more country programmes advanced and could be assessed.

53. Regarding UNDP's role in the planning, organizing and follow-up of country review meetings, UNDP had been asked by nearly 20 Governments of African least developed countries to serve as lead agency for donors' round-table meetings and had been requested to play the predominant role among United Nations organizations in Africa in preparing and carrying out country reviews. The schedule for such activities already extended into 1984, and documentation had been distributed to the Council on the five round-table conferences already conducted by UNDP, with encouraging results, in Benin, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali and Rwanda. Such conferences were, of course, not an end in themselves: follow-up to secure firm commitments and to launch development projects was the goal. UNDP field offices had already begun to help Governments to monitor the results of the review meetings and to strengthen follow-up mechanisms, and UNDP could enhance its catalytic role in that important process if requested to do so, as called for in the recent welcome resolution adopted by the Conference of Ministers of African Least Developed Countries.

54. Another area of priority in which UNDP-supported activities in Africa had continued to provide a range of responses in the face of limited resources was food production. Agricultural development in all its aspects continued to receive the
largest sectoral share of UNDP resources in Africa. UNDP had extended its assistance in developing national food strategies and organizing agricultural sectoral missions for both programming and evaluation. Moreover, national development projects were often made to tie in with UNDP-financed regional agricultural projects in order to enhance their impact.

55. Energy development was another priority for African nations. The Council had before it document DP/1983/37 on that question. Africa accounted for 8 of the first 15 energy-sector assessments completed with the support of the joint UNDP-World Bank programme; another 8 energy assessments in Africa were well advanced and the Regional Bureau for Africa was helping Governments to capitalize on those excellent analyses and recommendations.

56. Technical co-operation among developing countries had been the subject of some innovative initiatives taken by the Regional Bureau for Africa. Four specific examples demonstrated how with limited resources UNDP had played a useful catalytic role in that highly cost-effective practical approach. The Regional Bureau for Africa and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean had brought together Brazil and the four Portuguese-speaking African countries - Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique - to plan collaborative ventures. Similarly, Equatorial Guinea had been assisted in establishing close working relations with several Latin American countries and institutions, particularly the Central American Institute for Public Administration, which was currently providing it with technical assistance in a large project designed to strengthen its public administration sector. At the request of several African countries, the two Regional Bureaux had undertaken to try to revive formal but dormant agreements between those countries and Latin American States and to assist in the implementation of the agreements. Lastly, new institutional links had been established between several leading development institutions in Latin America and Africa providing for co-operation in economic planning and training, public administration and vocational training. The Regional Bureaux for Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean had also established a working group, together with ITC and UNCTAD, to study ways of developing trade between Africa and Latin America. Such initiatives and many other examples that could be given of technical co-operation among developing countries within Africa itself were unconventional ways of stretching and sharing scarce resources and knowledge and building future development.

57. Considering the African country programmes as a whole, the report had noted that because so many country programmes, as well as the regional programme, had been approved for commencement in 1982 and 1983, a formal mid-term substantive programme review had been premature for nearly all countries. However, resident representatives and government officials, in full co-operation with executing agencies, had undertaken the normal extensive review to monitor, evaluate and adjust the programme and the projects during the past year. A second principal focus in 1982 had been the painful process of realigning resources and deferring activities on a project-by-project basis to conform to reduced budget levels, and a third focus had been the launching of scheduled new projects and the implementation of ongoing projects.
58. Some 22 per cent of the aggregate African authorized budget levels (ABLs) for the period 1982-1986 had been spent in 1982 and another 24 per cent was projected for expenditure in 1983, leaving little for the period 1985-1986. Indeed, one country had no ABL available for 1986. Clearly cuts and adjustments in the programmes were still needed.

59. African programmes continued to reflect a significantly higher than average demand for experts and a correspondingly lower demand for equipment and subcontracts. That trend was projected to continue during the next cycle. Accordingly, efforts were being made to explore the use of fewer and less costly long-term experts. The Regional Bureau was examining — and would continue to examine — other ways of ensuring that projects contributed as effectively as possible to increasing the self-reliant capacity of national personnel, inter alia, through the utilization of the training component in projects. Cost sharing was also increasing in Africa and, as noted in the report of the Administrator (DP/1983/61, para. 15 (j)), Resident Representatives had increasingly carried out a variety of functions to help mobilize non-IPF resources. Efforts continued to be made to link activities in country programmes with those of the regional programme so that they reinforced one another.

60. An extension had been requested for the Benin country programme (DP/CP/BEN/EXTENSION), in order that the Government might take into account information generated as a result of the donor round-table conference held in Cotonou earlier in 1983. The sectoral objectives remained the same as before but there was a small change in the financial distribution of the programme by sector. The Administrator was asking the Council to approve the one-year extension and to authorize him to approve projects within the framework of the programme pending approval of a new country programme, which it was expected would be submitted the following year.

61. Concerning the programme in Swaziland, (DP/1983/32) the Administrator was requesting authority to continue to approve assistance to projects submitted by the Government, as he had done the previous year, within the limits of the authorized budget levels. The Government was currently formulating its country programme for the period 1984-1986 and expected to submit it to the Council at its next session.

62. Introducing the eight new country programmes which were being submitted for approval, he said that the programmes had been prepared by the various Governments and that every effort had been made to relate them to the national development plans. In their capacity as Resident Co-ordinators, UNDP Resident Representatives had made extensive efforts to help Governments co-ordinate the country programmes with those of other United Nations funds and with other external sources of assistance. Consultations and intersectoral or sectoral reviews had been held with the executing agencies of the United Nations system and the recommendations of the agencies had been carefully considered. In addition, programming missions had been mounted as required. All eight programmes had taken into consideration the Lagos Plan of Action and several other intergovernmental agreements establishing common development objectives. However, the extent to which the international themes and
objectives outlined in those agreements were included in the country programmes had been decided by the Governments. The programmes all placed considerable emphasis on agricultural and human resources development.

63. In the process of formulating the programmes, the Resident Representatives had continued to explore the possibilities of government execution. Chad and Uganda had included government-executed projects in their programmes and other countries were considering the matter. It was worth noting that, as of the end of 1982, 13 African countries and the Regional Programme for Africa accounted for one fourth of UNDP's ongoing government-executed projects. All the country programmes save that of Uganda had been prepared on the basis of ABLs set at 80 per cent of the illustrative IPFs for the third cycle. Government officials and UNDP were currently reviewing the impact of the reduced financial resources and their decisions would be reflected in individual project actions and revised programmes. Naturally, everyone hoped that circumstances would permit the implementation of the country programmes with resources of at least 80 per cent of the illustrative IPFs.

64. The third country programme for the Central African Republic (DP/CP/CAF/3) emphasized the promotion of rural development with a view to improving living standards, strengthening economic infrastructure and developing human resources. Although the illustrative IPF for the period 1982-1986 had been increased to $29.5 million - almost triple that of the previous cycle - the level of resources available for programming was $18,370,000, due to the current financial constraints. That figure excluded an amount of $3.9 million which represented expenditures already incurred during 1982.

65. The country programme for Chad (DP/CP/CHD/3 and DP/CP/CHD/NOTE/3) had a strong rehabilitation element. Although 90 per cent of the population was rural, the agricultural sector would receive only about 12 per cent of the programmed resources. However, because of the extraordinary flexibility built into the phasing of the programme's implementation, the share of the agricultural sector would jump to one third of resources once the immediate emergency assistance gave way to more development-oriented activities. The number of projects was rather large and involved many types of activities, and there was a real danger of underfinancing in several cases. However, UNDP procedures allowed, inter alia, for the approval of extensions of short-term projects of the highest priority. It was hoped that UNDP assistance would serve to attract financial assistance from other donors.

66. The country programme for Equatorial Guinea (DP/CP/EQG/2) was based on an illustrative IPF of $11,750,000, although the level of resources actually available for programming, based on 80 per cent of that figure was only $9.6 million. The Government had designated certain key sectors and projects for which it had requested UNDP collaboration. Accordingly, the programme focused on a limited number of relatively large-scale projects. Most resources had been allocated to economic planning and strengthening of public administration. One recently-approved project in the latter field incorporated a very strong TCDC orientation with a Latin American institution. Although the Government had requested that 17 per cent of UNDP assistance should go to the agricultural sector it seemed likely that part of those new projects would have to be deferred or cut.
67. The country programme for Ghana (DP/CP/GHA/3 and DP/CP/GHA/NRTE/3) was based on an illustrative IPF of $40 million, more than double that of the previous cycle. It had been reoriented to assist the Government in basic economic rehabilitation and reconstruction. It emphasized agricultural production, strengthening of government machinery, promotion of industrial development and assistance to the mining sector. Particular attention should be drawn to Ghana's special development problems, namely, acute shortage of technical and management personnel, acute shortage of foreign currency, foreign exchange problems involving the value of the cedi vis-à-vis other currencies and, of course, the emergency created by the sudden influx of Ghanaian nationals from Nigeria. Given the long-term nature of the problems, Ghana's economic situation would have to be kept under continuing review to ensure that the adverse conditions did not unduly affect the implementation of the country programme.

68. The country programme for the Ivory Coast (DP/CP/IVC/3) was based on illustrative IPF of $16.5 million, although the amount available for programming was about $12 million. That figure included $1,756,000 which represented a Government commitment to provide cost sharing to four projects. The programme sought to focus on a few major themes, to ensure that UNDP support went primarily to activities affecting the poorest strata of the population and to further enhance the capabilities of the country's human resources. The major objectives were the same as those of the second country programme - modernization of agriculture to achieve food self-sufficiency, strengthening of production-oriented organizations, promotion of industry through traditional handicrafts activities and enhancement of human resources.

69. The third country programme for Liberia (DP/CP/LIR/3) was the result of extensive consultations with all United Nations agencies and an in-depth project-by-project review of all ongoing activities. More than 45 per cent of the projects were new project proposals. The programme emphasized agricultural development, planning and resource mobilization, employment-related activities, education and training. It should be remembered that the economic situation in Liberia was serious. A special interagency mission had visited Liberia in 1982 to investigate the country's needs. Its report had been issued under the symbol A/37/123. UNDP was currently actively engaged with the Government of Liberia in organizing a donors conference to be held in October, in Geneva, to mobilize external financial resources for the country. The Government had applied to be designated as a least developed country and, pending a final decision on the matter, was seeking an "as if" status from the Governing Council. The matter was described in document DP/1983/30.

70. The second country programme for Uganda (DP/CP/UGA/2 and DP/CP/UGA/NRTE/2) coincided with a particularly difficult period. Not only was Uganda both a least developed and a land-locked country, but its economic situation had been exacerbated by the war in 1979, the ensuing political instability and the recent drought. The international community, as a whole, had failed to come to Uganda's assistance. It was hoped that other donors could be encouraged to increase their assistance to Uganda either before or as a result of a consultative group meeting...
scheduled to be held later in 1983. No single sector dominated the country programme. The diversity was explained by the criteria which had been used in selecting projects. Greatest weight had been given not only to the relationship of projects to the Government's development policy and the Recovery Programme but also to the desirability of continuing a group of successful ongoing projects. The first two years of the programme could be considered a recovery phase which would prepare the way for a development phase closely related to the country's longer-term development plan. There were a number of linkages between projects, one being the labour-intensive employment programme which was directly related to the UNDP interregional Special Public Works Programme and to inputs from bilateral donors. Detailed information on the Government's requests and on UNDP reactions could be found in document DP/1983/15.

71. The country programme for the United Republic of Cameroon (DP/CP/CMR/3 and DP/CP/CMR/NOTE/3) was based on an illustrative IPF of $27.5 million, which represented a one third increase over that of the previous cycle. The programme emphasized agricultural and rural development, exploration and development of mineral and energy resources and strengthening of industrial policy and industrialization.

72. The Governing Council was requested to review and approve the eight programme he had just presented, together with the special proposals concerning the programmes of Benin and Swaziland - the only two countries of the African region whose programmes had yet to be submitted.

73. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) resumed the chair.

74. Mr. KIBANDA (Central African Republic) said that it was time that the international community gave particular attention to Africa, which suffered from more natural disasters and contained more least developed countries than any other continent. Approval of the country programmes which had just been presented would constitute a sign of such attention.

75. Emphasizing the importance for the people of his country of the Board's decision on the third country programme, he said that the Central African Republic, which had vast untapped natural resources, was one of the poorest countries in the world and one of the most severely affected by the current economic crisis. Faced with enormous problems by virtue of being land-locked, his country was currently experiencing extreme difficulties, including a serious budgetary deficit and a crushing debt which jeopardized its entire development effort. The situation was getting worse, resulting in structural imbalances in all vital areas. There had been a sharp decline in agricultural and industrial output while imports had increased considerably, making the country's chronic trade deficit even greater. The mortality rate, which was aggravated by an almost non-existent infrastructure, particularly in the interior of the country, had been continually rising. Worst of all, the situation was aggravated by the disastrous drought.
76. In adopting resolution 35/87, which aimed at providing his country with financial, technical and material assistance to overcome its long- and short-term needs for reconstruction, rehabilitation and development, the General Assembly had affirmed the spirit of solidarity within the United Nations in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. The report of the mission dispatched to the Central African Republic in accordance with that resolution had drawn attention to the difficulties facing the country and had recommended three types of assistance: immediate humanitarian assistance, urgent assistance for rehabilitation and reconstruction projects and medium- and long-term assistance. The review mission which had visited in the Central African Republic from 13 to 17 June 1982, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 36/206, had noted that the situation had become even more serious, with the GDP decreasing in 1981 by 1.8 per cent at constant prices and inflation running at 14.3 per cent. It had also noted that a serious need for additional food assistance remained. In view of the current drought, such assistance was becoming urgent, to say the least. The situation demanded active solidarity on the part of the international community and, in particular, from the donor countries, which had always reacted promptly to difficult and tragic circumstances. He urged those countries in particular to respond positively to the General Assembly's appeal for assistance to the Central African Republic by approving the third country programme for the period 1982-1986.

77. He emphasized that the situation had been dangerously aggravated by the serious drought in the region, which had lasted a number of years. Bangui, the capital of his country, had been deprived of water and electricity for a number of weeks, and the flow of essential imports had been interrupted. Thousands of hectares of coffee, cotton, and tobacco, the main export crops, had been destroyed and livestock raising had been seriously affected. In short, the country had been declared a disaster area, and the UNDP office at Bangui had been informed of the situation.

78. The projects in the country programme had been drawn up in accordance with an order of priorities established by the Government after in-depth consultations with the UNDP Resident Representative at Bangui. Given the main aims of the programme - improving the economic situation and ensuring self-sufficiency in food - he hoped that it would obtain the full support of the Board.

79. In conclusion, he noted the extent and importance of the UNDP contribution to the development efforts of his country, which by 1986 would have amounted to a total of $49,100,000, and expressed his gratitude to the UNDP Administrator for his firm and renewed support for those efforts.

80. Mr. EL GHAOUTHE (Mauritania) expressed his delegation's whole-hearted support of the country programmes before the Board, which reflected the serious difficulties facing the countries concerned in particular and the African continent in general, especially at a time when national projects were being postponed or cancelled. He stressed that those countries were among the least developed and had neither the reserves nor the resources to face the crisis. The situation, which was already disturbing, was getting worse. Indeed, over the past 15 years, those
countries had almost annually had to combat various difficulties, including bad weather which had affected national production, a drop in exports or economic crises, which all increased both the difficulty and the urgency of the task of raising the living standards of the population. It was, however, fortunate that their fate lay in the hands of the Board.

81. **Mr. LIMA** (Brazil) said that his country attached great importance to international efforts to promote the development of the African countries. Indeed, it accorded high priority to bilateral co-operation with those countries and endeavoured to implement technical co-operation programmes with a number of them. His delegation was pleased with the high quality of the programmes before the Board and strongly recommended their approval.

82. **The PRESIDENT** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Board wished to take note with appreciation of the progress report on country programme implementation in Africa (DP/1983/61).

83. **It was so decided.**

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.