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The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

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

(a) REVISED ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES
(continued)

(iii) Request from the Government of Liberia to be accorded treatment as if it had been included in the list of least developed countries (continued)
(DP/1983/30, DP/CP/LIR/3)

1. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that he wished to explain the procedures followed by the Governing Council in the past in dealing with requests from countries to be accorded treatment as if they had been included in the list of least developed countries. The Council had always acted on the basis of General Assembly resolutions addressing special pleas to take the special circumstances and needs of the countries in question into account. He wished to refer to paragraph 3 of the note by the Administrator on the request from the Government of Liberia (DP/1983/30) in that connection. As stated in that paragraph, four countries were being treated as if they had been included in the list of least developed countries, in accordance with Council decisions based on General Assembly resolutions, even though none of them was being considered by the Committee for Development Planning as candidates for designation as least developed countries. Paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 37/149 on assistance for the development of Liberia dealt with the question of emergency assistance for that country. However, paragraph 10 of that resolution was similar to appeals by the General Assembly in respect of which the Governing Council had, in the past, taken the type of action currently under consideration. Moreover, in the past the fact that the Committee for Development Planning had not designated a country as a least developed country had not prevented the Council from taking action. If the Council accorded the treatment requested by Liberia, that country would be entitled to have the supplementary criteria applied to it, to have access to the Capital Development Fund and to benefit from a portion of the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries.

2. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation was in favour of according Liberia treatment as if it had been included in the list of least developed countries.

3. Mr. NEUBAUER (Federal Republic of Germany), supported by Mr. BIDAUT (France), and Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Denmark), said that his Government had reservations with regard to Liberia's request.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Governing Council should take note of documents DP/CP/LIR/3 and DP/1983/30 and of the statement made by the Deputy Administrator at the 23rd meeting in which he had indicated that, after careful consideration, the Committee on Development Planning had concluded that Liberia did...
(The President)

not qualify for least-developed-country status on the basis of the existing
criteria and in the light of the data presented.

5. It was so decided.

(iv) Assistance to Anguilla (DP/1983/10)

6. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Administrator on assistance to
Anguilla (DP/1983/10).

7. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator), responding to a point raised by the
representative of the Soviet Union, said that the Administrator had followed the
normal UNDP procedure in respect of the proposed establishment of a separate
illustrative indicative planning figure (IPF) for 1982-1986 for Anguilla of
$800,000, referred to in paragraph 3 of document DP/1983/10.

8. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Governing Council wished to adopt the
proposal put forward by the Administrator in document DP/1983/10, paragraph 3.

9. It was so decided.

(v) Independence bonus for St. Kitts-Nevis (DP/1983/51)

10. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Governing Council wished to adopt the
recommendation made by the Administrator in document DP/1983/51, paragraph 2, that
it should authorize the increase of the illustrative 1982-1986 IPF for
St. Kitts-Nevis from the currently set amount of $1.3 million by $695,000, to
$1,995,000, conditional upon actual accession to independence.

11. It was so decided.

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

12. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Observer for Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of
reply, recalled that the representative of Turkey, in a statement made at the
22nd meeting, had invoked the Geneva Declaration of 30 July 1974 in an effort to
prove that the Government of Cyprus was not a Government. He pointed out that the
Declaration was not binding upon Cyprus because Cyprus had not been represented at
the conference which had adopted it and the Government of the island had not been
consulted. Moreover, the quotation cited by the representative of Turkey had been
part of a cease-fire arrangement which had been made subject to an undertaking that
the area controlled by opposing armed forces on 30 July 1974 would not be
extended. Turkey, had violated that undertaking just 15 days later by occupying
nearly 40 per cent of the area of Cyprus. The representative of Turkey was
therefore invoking an agreement which his country had been the first to violate.
In any event, the agreement had been superseded by subsequent events, decisions and
resolutions. The fact that all Ambassadors posted to Cyprus presented their
credentials to the President of Cyprus demonstrated that their Governments
recognized the President as head of that State.
13. The premeditated Turkish provocation in Cyprus dated back to June 1958, as had been proved during the trial of the Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister.

14. Mr. GÖKÇE (Turkey), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Cyprus was speaking out of context, and should keep to the subject before the Council.

15. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Observer for Cyprus) answered that he was merely replying to points raised earlier by the representative of Turkey.

16. In 1963, the Turkish Cypriots, acting on Ankara's instigation, had rebelled against the Government and the strife had subsequently become generalized. The Greek Cypriots could not be blamed for all that had happened. Many of them had been killed, wounded or forced to seek refuge - a fact which the Turkish representative had failed to mention.

17. Concerning the allegations regarding besieged Turkish Cypriots living in enclaves who were deprived of basic needs, he said that certain of those words called for clarification. By "enclaves" the Turkish representative obviously meant towns fortified with Turkish assistance into which no Greek Cypriot was allowed to enter. The term "besieged" gave the impression that there was a state of war. In fact, what was involved was defensive lines which Government forces had set up because the Turks were armed. As to why the Turkish Cypriots were living in enclaves, he said that it was an isolation imposed on the community by its leaders in line with the segregationist policy dictated by Ankara. Concerning the alleged deprivations, it was not clear who was responsible for them. He had been in Cyprus at the time and had seen Turks both in mountain resorts and on the seashore. He failed to see how they could have been deprived unless they had chosen to be so.

18. Finally, he quoted from paragraph 113 of a report (document S/5764) in which it was stated that the lack of movement of Turkish Cypriots outside of their areas was also believed to be dictated by a political purpose, namely, to reinforce the claim that the two main communities of Cyprus could not live peacefully together without some sort of geographical separation. He left it to the Council to decide who was lying.

19. Mrs. CARRASCO (Observer for Bolivia), stressing the importance of UNDP programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean, expressed her country's gratitude to the Governing Council for the favourable way in which it had dealt with its request to extend the second country programme for Bolivia. The special representative appointed by the Secretary-General to consider the economic problems facing Bolivia had visited her country and had made a number of recommendations which had been approved by her Government. One of those recommendations had been to hold a round-table meeting with the participation of all countries wishing to co-operate to overcome the difficult situation facing the country. That meeting had made it possible to gauge the growing interest of the countries participating in co-operation to overcome those problems. In addition the recent ECLA session had adopted decision 4/56/16 requesting the Secretary-General to urge all specialized agencies to devote the greatest possible resources to extend programmes for Bolivia...
and recommending that, although Bolivia was not counted among the least developed countries, it should, as far as possible, be accorded treatment as if it were.

20. By way of illustrating her country's need for international co-operation, she said that, although an average economic growth rate of 5.6 per cent had been recorded from 1970 to 1977, that rate had fallen since 1978. According to the World Bank, the per capita GNP of Bolivia had fallen from $US 570 in 1980 to $US 497 in 1982 and would continue to decline. The economic crisis was accompanied by inflation and unstable exchange rates: it was estimated that in 1982 the consumer price index had increased by more than 300 per cent and the wholesale price index by 600 per cent, while the value of the Bolivian currency had fallen by 700 per cent compared to the United States dollar in less than a year. One of the most serious obstacles to economic recovery was Bolivia's dependence on the rest of the world and its inability to sustain the level of imports of the second half of the 1970s. In 1982, for example, the volume of imports had fallen by 33 per cent compared to the previous year. Nor could the country meet its debt-servicing requirements. The crisis had affected the welfare of the population, with per capita consumption falling in real terms by 15.5 per cent over the previous two years. Such a decline was disastrous for a country with such low levels of income. There was also a chronic lack of food staples and medicines. The situation, which had become critical, was being aggravated by natural calamities, particularly in the eastern part of the country. Her delegation intended to inform the Council whenever it felt that the economic situation called for a decision by the Council changing Bolivia's status to one which would enable Bolivia to obtain the greatest possible international co-operation and support.


22. Mr. KENEALLY (Australia) proposed that the following should be added at the end of section V, paragraph 1:

"This action notwithstanding, requests the Administrator, subject to his determination that the necessary resources are available, to apply 80 per cent of the respective illustrative IPFs for countries entitled to supplementary criteria, whose illustrative IPFs are $1.5 million or less, and a 'floor' of $1.2 million (80 per cent of $1.5 million) for other such countries with illustrative IPFs above $1.5 million."

23. Mr. KIBANDA (Central African Republic), supported by Mr. BIDAUT (France), said that the wording of the French version of the draft omnibus decision was in need of improvement.

24. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take up the matter again the following day.

(c) USE OF SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES (continued) (DP/1983/29)

25. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that, according to a letter he had received from the Acting Chairman of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, that
Committee had not concluded its consideration of document DP/1983/29. Agreement had, however been reached on the proposal that the Governing Council should approve an allocation of $610,000 from the Special Programme Resources of the third cycle for information and communication support for the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade during the period 1 July 1983 to 31 December 1985.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION:

(d) EVALUATION PROGRAMME (DP/1983/ICW/6; DP/1983/5, DP/1983/16, DP/1983/68, DP/1983/70 and Add.1; JIU/REP/83/5; DP/1983/CRP.2 and CRP.3; E/AC.51/1983/5 and Add.1)

26. Mr. WIESEBACH (Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) recalled that, at the twenty-ninth session of the Governing Council, the Administrator had indicated his intention to study the further improvement of the system of evaluation in UNDP, including the possibility of establishing a separate evaluation unit. In decision 82/15, the Council had welcomed the Administrator's initiative and had invited him to submit relevant proposals to the Council at its next session. Subsequently, the Intersessional Committee of the Whole had considered the question of improving the evaluation of the results and effectiveness of the Programme, as one of those matters which could facilitate resource mobilization and strengthen the effectiveness of the Governing Council. The Committee had considered the Administrator's proposals in document ICW/1983/6, and the views expressed by delegations on the subject were contained in paragraphs 50 to 57 of its report (DP/1983/5). The Committee also took note of the Administrator's proposal to establish a central evaluation unit in 1983, covering the costs during that year from existing resources. Financing for the proposed unit, on a modest scale, was included in the budget estimates for 1984-1985 currently before the Council.

27. The Council also had before it the report on the subject prepared by JIU (JIU/REP/1983/5), which strongly endorsed the establishment of a central evaluation unit, and the Administrator's preliminary views on the subject (DP/1983/CRP.3). While it appeared that most delegations agreed with the proposal to establish a central evaluation unit, some appeared to feel that evaluation was something extraneous to the Programme. It was, however, one of the basic tenets of the report in document ICW/1983/6 that monitoring and evaluation were indispensable management tools, especially at a time of resource scarcity when the available IPFs must be stretched and their use optimized. He was therefore particularly grateful to JIU for its unceasing efforts to improve the performance of UNDP in that respect. He stressed that the cost of evaluation was money well spent, since the full cost of the central evaluation unit could be easily covered if one large programme was prevented from going wrong. That gain would never appear in project statistics but would make itself felt in a higher intrinsic value of the dollars spent in the field.

28. It would be wrong to assume evaluation to be exclusively in the interests of the donors. On the contrary, it was, first and foremost, in the interest of the recipient countries for the simple reason that they needed resources and must
insist that the activities undertaken and funded through the United Nations system should yield optimum results. That was all the more so as their own financial share in the Programme's activities was very high and since projects were part of wider development schemes and their success or failure would have repercussions far beyond the project itself. The more evaluation could be made a truly tripartite undertaking, the more the Government would take the lead, the more confidence one could have in the success and the future of the Programme. The Administrator, therefore, especially welcomed the JIU report on developing the evaluation function by Governments (JIU/REP/82/12), which proposed a considerable extension of assistance in the field of evaluation, and fully endorsed the idea in his own report. Indeed, it was considered that if the evaluation unit had a direct operational responsibility, it would be to assist Governments in establishing evaluation units or improving evaluation standards and practices. UNDP therefore stood ready to support the initiatives of recipient Governments to enhance their own evaluation system and had been very encouraged by the excellent work done in that respect by the governmental evaluation units it had worked with. He was also heartened by the wide measure of support in preparing the report from the executing agencies, a number of whom had shown a greater awareness of the importance of the evaluation function in general and had strengthened their own evaluation units or had even created new ones.

29. Turning to the wider thematic evaluation reports, three of which had been summarized for presentation to the current session of the Council, he said that they were part of the Programme endorsed by the Governing Council in decision 80/20 and were the subject of a progress report contained in document DP/1983/16. Of the 16 studies endorsed in 1980 and 1981, 10 had been formally completed and another 3 had been summarized and were being prepared for publication. A study on primary health care had been completed and a summary of the results was annexed to document DP/1983/16. Brief summaries of the main findings of the studies on national agricultural research institutes and on industrial training had been informally circulated to the Council. Although it had not been possible to initiate the studies on public administration and on telecommunications training institutions, which were part of the original programme, the programme could be considered to be completed, and he proposed that the future evaluation unit should draw up a work programme of its own, which might incorporate those two topics. In formulating a new programme of thematic evaluations, the new unit could take into account the experience acquired in implementing the current programme. An exercise had already been initiated to assess the practical value of the studies and a great number of suggestions had already been made for new thematic evaluations by resident representatives in consultation with Governments, and by specialized agencies and UNDP staff.

30. In accordance with Governing Council decision 82/12, steps had been taken to initiate an evaluation of women's involvement in technical co-operation for presentation to the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women. It had been agreed that the study should be the joint effort of 13 United Nations organizations with a substantial interest in women's role in development. Owing to the complex nature of the undertaking, it would not be possible to complete it in time for presentation to the thirty-first
session of the Council, but he would suggest that the report should be submitted to the thirty-second session and that a brief progress report should be presented to the thirty-first session. In that way, the information in the report would be more up to date at the 1985 World Conference.

31. With respect to the study on manufactures industries, conducted jointly by UNDP, UNIDO and the United Nations Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, he said that informal consultations were taking place on the results of the study and drew attention to document DP/1983/CRP.2, which contained the relevant section of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, and to the Administrator's comments on the subject in paragraph 5 of DP/1983/16.

32. Turning to the quarterly UNDP data report to Governments, he said that it had taken some time to find the proper format for data presentation but the first issue of the report had just been circulated and it was intended to arrange for circulation of future issues on a quarterly basis approximately six or seven weeks after the end of each quarter. He stressed that the report did not constitute a Governing Council paper or document but was an informal set of data designed to keep Governments abreast of the daily activities of UNDP. Future issues of the report would be sent directly to the permanent missions in New York. The report consisted of 17 tables specifically designed to provide additional data or information on important activities which had been reflected in the Administrator's annual report or which had been briefly touched upon in other Governing Council documents. He believed that, by providing such information on a regular quarterly basis, UNDP would help Governments to monitor closely the various activities of UNDP between sessions. The new report was not expected to provide an answer to all questions but it was hoped that it would help bring Governments up to date, which might be useful, especially in preparing for sessions of the various United Nations bodies dealing with operational activities. Additional items could be added to the report at a later stage, if Governments so desired. Specifically, once the central evaluation unit became operational, certain qualitative aspects of UNDP activities, such as evaluation fact sheets, could gradually be added to the report. The first, and possibly the second, issues of the report should be viewed as an experimental exercise, and he urged delegations to convey their comments and suggestions on such topics as the format of the tables, the usefulness of the information provided and the need for additional data. Those comments would be taken into account in preparing the next issue of the report for the second quarter of 1983.

33. Mr. BARK (Netherlands) said that the importance of the evaluation activities already undertaken should not be underestimated. At the thirty-first session, his delegation had spoken in favour of and had joined in the consensus to request the Administrator to put forward proposals on the establishment of a central evaluation unit in UNDP. Those proposals were elaborated in document DP/1983/ICW/6, which gave a concise account of what could be done within UNDP. His delegation wished to stress the importance of measures to ensure that the Unit would be able to operate in an independent way, setting its own priorities and choosing the projects to be evaluated and the methodology to be applied. In addition, there should be adequate provisions for feedback on those evaluations.
34. His delegation was impressed by the joint United Nations/UNDP/UNIDO evaluation on manufactures as set forth in documents DP/1983/70 and Add.1, although it was somewhat disappointed by the Administrator's comments. He would not, however, give his views on those comments since the informal consultations had begun only the day before.

35. Mr. LAWTON (World Health Organization) said that WHO was pleased to have been associated with the important thematic evaluation reported on by the Administrator in document DP/1983/16. He had also been encouraged to hear a number of delegations place emphasis on technical co-operation in developing human resources and health. Of course, that thematic evaluation was only one of a series already carried out by UNDP, but it was natural that WHO attach special importance to it. The involvement of a major donor, the Federal Republic of Germany, had given the study new importance since it had been able to look at the primary health-care picture in various countries from the national vantage point of the countries concerned, the multilateral standpoint and the point of view of the bilateral approaches of a major donor which shared the commitment to technical co-operation in health.

36. It was interesting that the field visits carried out in the selected developing countries confirmed almost totally the principles of the 1978 Alma Alta declaration on primary health care. WHO hoped that the study itself and the programme advisory note that was to be issued would help Governments, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations to understand the thrust of primary health care and what its human resource requirements really meant in programme terms. It also hoped that the distribution of the new programme advisory note to countries and multilateral and bilateral technical co-operation agencies would result in additional support becoming available for primary health care work in the years to come as the key element in its global strategy of Health for All by the Year 2000.

37. WHO's experience in tripartite reviews had on the whole been positive and had been an incentive to both the co-operating Government and WHO. He agreed that clearer guidelines could well be developed for such tripartite reviews and looked forward to a closer integration of those reviews with WHO's own routine evaluation process. WHO believed that the major role and responsibility for evaluation devolved on the co-operating Government itself and it hoped that growing emphasis would be given to that aspect. It was therefore important that UNDP, as the central co-ordinating agency of the system, should assist Governments in carrying out evaluation to meet the needs of Governments and those of the different international sources of support.

38. Evaluation in principle should be mandatory and axiomatic and a part of the basic project design. Output targets should be insisted upon whether in projects (which was UNDP's approach) or in programmes (WHO's approach) in support of government activities. The UNDP project document format had been a valued and helpful vehicle and over the years had served as a model in a far wider context than one would have expected. However, it was obviously time to modify, simplify and streamline the project design format and WHO was pleased that that was in
hand. It agreed that, to be effective as milestones, the evaluation aspects of a project design should be reviewed at the outset with the responsible national authorities and the executing agency. A central evaluation unit in UNDP could not pretend to be omniscient in every field of endeavour but could play an essential role in organizing, co-ordinating and carrying out evaluation of a field programme. WHO would do everything to support the new evaluation effort that was now being undertaken and would continue its normal collaboration with the regional bureaux in monitoring and evaluating the field programme.

39. Mr. HARE (Canada) said that his delegation had always pressed for improved evaluation of UNDP projects, and the thematic approach was a helpful start. He was, however, concerned that document DP/1983/16 stated that the use of thematic evaluations was somewhat limited. There was value in the lesson to be drawn from such evaluation and his delegation would follow developments closely. Canada believed that it was essential to ensure that the central evaluation unit was reasonably independent and that its approach would include feedback mechanisms. With respect to the results of the joint United Nations/UNDP/UNIDO evaluation on manufactures, his delegation did not believe that there should be too much concern about the resulting data. All that was necessary was for the necessary adjustments to be made.

40. Mr. FLEMING (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to add its voice to those that had supported the general thrust of the proposals to improve the evaluation system of UNDP. Evaluation was an essential tool in the development process, especially in an era of scarce resources. His delegation took note of the progress report of the Administrator (DP/1983/16) on the implementation of Council decision 80/22. In that connection, it believed that thematic evaluations were helpful in project design and that there was a need for clear overall standards in the field. His delegation agreed with the field offices that had suggested that there should be more training based on the thematic studies, as mentioned in paragraph 11 of the progress report. He also noted with pleasure that some Governments had commented favourably on thematic evaluations and his delegation welcomed the fact that studies would be undertaken to help Governments in that regard.

41. Ms. ARCHBOLD (United Kingdom) said that her delegation agreed with the Assistant Administrator on the importance of evaluation. The point of view of WHO, as an executing agency, was especially valuable in assessing the impact of project evaluation and her delegation was encouraged by what the WHO representative had stated with respect to co-operation with UNDP on thematic evaluations. Her delegation regretted, however, the tendency to consider the issue as if it was of concern to donor Governments only. While donor Governments had an interest in project evaluation, it was for the Governing Council to ensure that recipients obtained the maximum gain from scarce resources. Her delegation supported the establishment of the central evaluation unit and, in that connection, regarded the necessary expenditure as an investment that would eventually be repaid. She agreed that it was necessary to have some feedback mechanism; however, while the lessons learned in self-evaluation of a given project could be fed back into that project, she wondered whether they would be applicable to UNDP as a whole. Her delegation
therefore looked forward to receiving information on developments in that regard. Her delegation noted that it was suggested in document DP/1983/ICW/6, paragraph 56, that UNDP and the agencies could take a number of steps to encourage and assist recipient Governments in setting up their own evaluation units. Her delegation supported that suggestion and believed that such assistance could be an important function of the new central evaluation unit.

42. Mr. WANG Jinren (China) said that evaluation was indeed an important link in project implementation. However, certain questions of principle should be borne in mind. Firstly, since external assistance played only a supplementary role in a country's economic and social development, evaluations of such aid should not overestimate the effect which it could have on a sector or subsector. To expect a foreign-aid project to have a tremendous impact was unrealistic. Secondly, evaluation should be based on the specific conditions of the recipient country concerned. It was not possible simply to transfer models used in the developed countries to the developing countries. Accordingly, standards of evaluation should be applied flexibly. Thirdly, evaluation must have the full participation of the recipient country since the aim was to identify problems and work out solutions. No one was more familiar with the situation and with the various factors that must be taken into account than the recipient country itself. Without its full participation conclusions and recommendations were likely to be one-sided, impractical and even irrelevant. Fourthly, given the number of technical co-operation projects funded by UNDP, evaluation must proceed on a selective basis. A few representative projects - both successful and problematic - must be selected in order to see what lessons could be drawn. Those four principles should be applied to all evaluation efforts. Finally, while his delegation did not oppose the idea of a central evaluation unit, it was concerned that such a unit might overlap with existing bodies and result in extrabudgetary costs.

43. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said that while everyone agreed on the necessity for evaluation, his delegation was among those which were satisfied with the existing system and had doubts concerning the desirability of establishing a special unit. He was somewhat surprised that the Council was discussing the item since the same item was being discussed elsewhere in the building. Perhaps the Council should wait until the informal consultations on the matter had been completed before proceeding with the discussion.

44. Miss DEVAUCHELLE (France) said that her delegation attached importance to evaluation as a necessary management tool. She agreed with the representative of Canada concerning the need for evaluation to include a feedback mechanism. Her delegation believed that thematic evaluations should be strengthened and, in that connection, it endorsed the views expressed in paragraph 10 of document DP/1983/16.

45. The PRESIDENT said that the item would remain open until the informal consultations on the subject had been completed.
PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION:

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT PREVIOUS SESSIONS

(ii) Recruitment of project and professional staff and consultants (DP/1983/8 and Add.1 and Corr.1)

46. Mr. WIESEBACH (Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation), introducing the item, pointed out that in accordance with the concern expressed by the Governing Council in its decision 82/7, the report dealt with (a) measures to improve the recruitment of professional project personnel and (b) measures to reduce the cost of internationally recruited professional project personnel. Pursuant to paragraph 9 of the decision, UNDP had transmitted the previous report on the subject to all the agencies, with relevant excerpts from the summary records, asking them to provide information on how they expected to improve the recruitment of technical co-operation personnel for UNDP-financed projects. That information could be found in document DP/1983/8/Add.1.

47. On the whole, progress was being made in the recruitment of technical co-operation personnel in the United Nations system. However, resource difficulties had slowed the approval of new projects and that, of course, had had an impact on the recruitment of personnel to fill UNDP-financed project posts. As requested in paragraph 8 of Council decision 1982/7, UNDP had prepared guidelines for the field offices and executing agencies. Those guidelines were contained in one of the chapters of the UNDP policies and procedures manual for project personnel.

48. He drew attention to the suggestions for further action contained in paragraphs 6 to 11 of the report of the Administrator (DP/1983/8). Those suggestions were reflected in the draft decision prepared by the secretariat. One suggestion was that the information contained in the various rosters should be shared among the sister agencies. It was the agencies, not UNDP, which recruited the experts and each agency had its own recruitment system and its own roster. A series of preliminary steps would have to be taken in order to achieve agreement concerning common issues, such as the classification of consultants into categories. That would be done with the co-operation of the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions and the International Civil Service Commission. A second suggestion was that the practice of "matching" current project personnel with new vacancies should be limited since, as observed in paragraph 9 of the report, that practice was not in the best interest of the projects. Thirdly, it was suggested that national recruitment services should be involved in identifying suitable candidates. One possibility would be to adopt the approach used by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, which periodically provided national recruitment services with information regarding possible openings for personnel. Lastly, as noted in paragraph 11, measures should be taken to speed up the clearance procedures used by host Governments.
49. The debate on the subject of the cost of project personnel had led to the Joint Inspection Unit's preparing an extensive report on alternatives to the current system of payment of international project personnel. In that connection, he drew attention to Council decision 79/48 which, inter alia, asked that use should be made of such alternatives as the recruitment of national personnel and twinning arrangements between host country institutions and more developed institutions abroad. The use of national project personnel was already having an impact. Preliminary data seemed to indicate that such persons performed similar functions to internationally recruited personnel but at a much lower cost. It was too early as yet to draw any firm conclusions, but it was becoming increasingly clear that use of national personnel was a significant factor in reducing expert costs. Accordingly it was proposed that that approach should be more fully utilized. In that connection, he drew attention to table A, which showed that the increase in the cost of experts and consultants had more or less kept pace with general inflation over the period 1972-1981.

50. Agency suggestions for future measures to reduce costs could be found in paragraphs 21 to 29 of the report. They included better utilization of existing arrangements in projects and improved project design.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.