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

(b) COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS (continued) (DP/1983/CRP.3, CRP.4 and CRP.5)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to an amendment to section V, paragraph 1, of the draft omnibus decision (DP/1983/CRP.4) contained in document DP/1983/CRP.5. That amendment was proposed by Australia and the Philippines. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished to adopt sections V and VI, as amended, of that decision.

2. It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft omnibus decision as a whole.

4. It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should ask the secretariat to include in the decision the recommendations made by the Administrator in document DP/1983/39, which the Council had already approved.

6. It was so decided.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)


7. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that the purpose of the General Assembly's adoption of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons and proclamation of the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons was to sustain the impetus of the International Year of Disabled Persons towards the prevention of disability and the equalization of opportunities for the disabled. A new inter-agency initiative, involving UNDP, UNICEF and WHO, was under way: the "Impact" programme.

8. Four fifths of the world's disabled lived in developing countries where the high incidence of disability caused special hardship. It was estimated that almost half of all the disability in developing countries could have been prevented. The means existed, and could be surprisingly inexpensive, especially when applied on a large scale. Multisectoral approaches to the prevention of disability also had to be developed, however, using alternative systems — primary education, for example — to support the primary health care system. UNDP would be in a strong position to add disability-prevention components to existing development programmes.
9. The Director of the "Impact" programme was Mrs. Wells, the UNDP Resident
Representative in Uganda during the period of relief operations. Sir John Wilson,
President of the International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness, had agreed
to serve without fee as the Senior Consultant.

10. Sir John Wilson (Senior Consultant to the "Impact" programme) said that it was
startling to realize that the disabled of the world numbered 450 million - a tenth
of the world's population, and more than the population of the United States or the
Soviet Union, or Africa, or Latin America. Disablement on that scale was not just
a major cause of suffering but a loss of the human potential for development.
Simple and inexpensive technologies to prevent or cure most of that disablement
were now available. In India in 1982, 800,000 blind people had had their sight
restored by cataract operation at an average cost of $8. Operations had recently
been demonstrated in Thai villages to prevent, and often cure, deafness. Yet,
throughout the developing world there remained millions of people blind or deaf for
lack of such treatment. At previous meetings, the Governing Council had discussed
high-cost equipment. In Africa, simple surgery was straightening deformed limbs
and village carpenters were making devices out of wood and used tiles to help
crippled farmers walk and and work again. The average cost was about $6.

11. The disabled, in uncounted millions, lived in the underprivileged communities
which were the special target of UNDP. At least 20 million people each year were
disabled by a characteristic mix of malnutrition, infection and ignorance. Yet the
disabling factor in such diseases was often so specific that it was now possible to
intervene long before any radical change was possible in the economy. Systematic
action at the primary level would save millions from impairment at insignificant
cost and give a keener motivation to development programmes. Disablement from
environmental hazards could often be controlled at ludicrously small cost. A
microscopic grain of iodine added to a daily diet could control the appalling
disabilities resulting from goitre, and Guinea worm disease could be eradicated as
just one spin-off from the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation
Decade. The onchocerciasis control programme co-sponsored by UNDP was controlling
the scourge of river blindness across seven countries. A WHO study of 75 villages
in 1982 had found not a single child that had gone blind in the preceding
three years.

12. Disablement had always been part of the pattern of underdevelopment, but
revolutionary simplification had now made it possible to provide, at minimal cost
in remote villages, treatment which had once been the prerogative of rich countries
and great hospitals. What was also new was "Impact", the international initiative
against avoidable disablement. It was jointly sponsored by UNDP, WHO and UNICEF as
their contribution to the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons. The disabled
of the world could have no better partnership. The new programme had been launched
at a time of shrinking resources because it was believed that, if conducted
sensibly at the country level, it need not add significantly to national and
international budgets. Even the basic administration costs were currently being
financed from extrabudgetary funds, with quite a lot of the money coming from the
disabled themselves.
13. The aim was emphatically not to set up a new structure: there were enough structures already. Using existing mechanisms and resources, "Impact" aimed at achieving an inexpensive shift in the emphasis of current health and development programmes. With that approach it should not be an unattainable objective for any developing country to halve the amount of avoidable disablement over the coming 20 years. But that could come about only through the development and health programmes of member countries, assisted by UNDP and its partner organizations. He accordingly appealed to Council members to give all the support in their power to "Impact", to study the available information on the programme and, if it appeared to be relevant, to study its implications seriously in relation to their own health and development programmes. He also appealed to members to consider whether the prevention of disablement deserved a place within national, bilateral and multilateral development plans and aid programmes. By any standard of cost-effectiveness, the measures the programme was seeking to introduce deserved some aid priority. At the international level, all that was needed to sustain the small administrative facility was $150,000 a year.

14. The first major event in the programme would be held in India in October, on the anniversary of the birth of Mahatma Gandhi. Similar inaugural events were planned to take place in Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and South-East Asia.

15. Over the past three years, the United Nations had given the leaders of the disabled an opportunity to bring their aspirations before the world community. But the mass of the disabled were not rehabilitated or educated or eloquent. They were destitutes, mendicants, outcasts at the bottom of every economic and social heap — victims, often, of diseases which ought to be an anachronism in the modern world. The International Year of Disabled Persons and the Programme of Action recognized the claim of the disabled to share with all humanity the right to grow, to learn, to work and to participate. To the disabled of the world, however, the interest taken in their plight might well seem transient and abstract. Development was about people. Human rights must surely include something as basic as the right of a human being to move, to hear and to see.

16. The message of "Impact" was that disablement need no longer be an inescapable part of the human predicament. Its prevention, on an unprecedented scale and at no great cost, was one of the options available to the international community in the remainder of the current century.

17. Mr. WIESEBACH (Assistant Administrator, Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation), introducing document DP/1983/11 concerning the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, said that allocations from the UNDP core programme and UNDP-administered funds to least developed countries had increased threefold between 1977 and 1981, much faster than other bilateral official development assistance or spending by the entire United Nations system. As a result, UNDP's share of the assistance to the least developed countries had risen markedly between 1972 and 1981, making it probably the leading agency, either bilateral or multilateral, in terms of its allocations to such countries. The volume of operations of multilateral aid institutions had been adversely affected,
however, in recent years. If the growth in voluntary contributions to UNDP continued to erode in the present fashion, the promising trend of the late 1970s and early 1980s could not be restored.

18. The report also indicated that other funds and programmes managed by UNDP with special relevance to the least developed countries - the Special Measures Fund, the Capital Development Fund, the United Nations Volunteers and the United Nations Sahelian Office - were facing difficulties. Pledges to the Special Measures Fund and UNCDF were down considerably from the 1982 level. UNDP, on the other hand, had stepped up its efforts to support the least developed countries in the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action and had involved those countries, as the lead agency for implementation of that Programme of Action, in the organization of country review meetings known as "round tables". It had already responded to requests from many countries, including the five new ones designated as least developed by the General Assembly. World Bank consultative groups had been established in three least developed countries; the remaining 21 had requested UNDP assistance in organizing round tables, and a number of such meetings had already been held.

19. UNDP's role in preparing the round-table conferences was determined by the requirements of the country concerned. Those requirements naturally varied. So far the participation of donors in the round tables had been reasonably satisfactory. Although such meetings were not pledging conferences they were useful in mobilizing resources and in giving an indication of the level of resources which could be expected to become available for programmes. They were also a means of setting in motion discussions, consultations and negotiations.

20. Follow-up activities to obtain firm commitments and co-ordination were crucial to the ultimate success of those meetings. Use could be made in that connection of the UNDP field offices network. It was encouraging to see that so far every round-table meeting had led to an agreement between host country and donors on some kind of follow-up mechanism. UNDP could assist countries by, for instance, engaging in preliminary negotiations prior to the round tables. Such preliminary contacts had been used very successfully in the round table for Africa and the Pacific. At the same time donors should try to determine, prior to the meeting, the extent of their possible additional participation and to make a commitment at the meeting.

21. Recalling that external aid was simply complementary to the Governments' own efforts to promote development, he pointed out that co-ordination of aid was very important in order to achieve maximum benefit. Governments had sought the assistance of UNDP resident representatives in co-ordinating external aid more closely. Successful co-ordination required agreement between the host Governments and UNDP and a willingness on the part of the donor countries to have their local representatives assist by providing the necessary information. He urged bilateral organizations to commit themselves to participate actively in the new efforts. As a corollary the Administrator was taking steps to make the field offices network available to the World Bank and bilateral aid agencies as well as to the entire
22. Mr. GREENSHIELDS (Canada) said that his delegation strongly supported UNDP's lead role in implementing the Substantial New Programme of Action (SNPA) and welcomed the initiatives just outlined by the Assistant Administrator. It also welcomed UNDP's role in helping the least developed countries organize round-table meetings, which were an important means of achieving the objectives of the SNPA. His delegation would continue to participate in those meetings and hoped that the schedule and documentation for them would be available well in advance. He agreed with the need to ensure that the documentation was of high quality and that the development priorities were well defined. His Government had committed itself to allocating 0.15 per cent of its GNP for aid to the least developed countries. His delegation attached importance to the measures adopted by the developing countries to implement the SNPA and it welcomed the reference made in the report of the Administrator (DP/1983/II) to the primary responsibility of Governments.

23. Mr. ROHNER (Switzerland) said that the strengthening of international assistance to the poorest countries was very important. In that context his Government had increased its contributions to UNDP and to the United Nations Capital Development Fund and the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. He drew attention, in that connection, to the special pledge made by his delegation the previous week.

24. His delegation had been impressed by UNDP's efforts in organizing the round-table meetings. Such meetings were useful in many respects; however, simpler follow-up meetings - sectoral meetings, for example, and meetings on subjects of common interest, such as the financing of local and recurring costs - were needed in order to maintain the momentum and deepen the dialogue which had thus been started. Much of the work could be done by the countries themselves with the representatives of aid agencies on the spot. The experience of CILSS was very interesting in that regard and his delegation would support any efforts made in that direction.

25. Mr. HOHWU-CHRISTENSEN (Sweden) said that his delegation attached great importance to aid to the least developed countries and to the Substantial New Programme of Action, as was demonstrated by its contribution to UNCDF and to the Special Measures Fund, and it supported the central role of UNDP in the follow-up activities related to that Programme.

26. His delegation agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that UNDP was taking on a new responsibility by acting as lead agency in the organization of round-table meetings. It was too early to judge the usefulness of those meetings. In the view of his delegation round-table meetings devoted to individual countries were more useful and informative than meetings at which several countries were discussed. His delegation would revert to that subject at a later stage.
27. Mr. WANG Jinren (China) said that UNDP had made a good beginning in organizing round-table meetings during the past year and should be commended. Such meetings had so far been generally successful and should be continued. He hoped that UNDP and the other organizations would reflect on the lessons learned so far, so that future meetings could be even more successful.

28. Miss DEVAUCHELLE (France) said that her delegation had followed the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s with particular interest and, in 1983, her Government had contributed 10 million francs to the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries. Unfortunately, changes in the exchange rate had lessened the value of that contribution.

29. UNDP's role in preparing the round-table meetings and arranging consultations among the donors was very important. Her delegation had endorsed the objectives of the Substantial New Programme of Action and was trying to increase the proportion of its assistance to the least developed countries in accordance with that Programme.

30. It was clear from the report of the Administrator (DP/1983/8) that expert costs were too high. She supported the measures proposed by the Administrator in order to reduce administrative costs but stressed that cost reductions must be achieved without any lowering of standards of expertise. Regarding the report of the Administrator on the use of programme resources for equipment (DP/1983/12) her delegation approved all the steps outlined in paragraph 7 and was pleased to hear that the project fact sheets for new projects would reflect a justification for equipment in future when such component exceeded $1 million. Concerning document DP/1983/9, she expressed support for the seminars organized by UNDP on pre-investment activities and was pleased at the positive results mentioned by the Administrator.

31. The PRESIDENT suggested that item 4 (b) (v) should be referred to the Drafting Committee, which would draft a decision for adoption by the Council.

32. It was so decided.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

(c) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ASSISTANCE

(i) Assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area by the Organization of African Unity (DP/1983/13; DP/1983/L.10)

33. Mr. OLCESE (Acting Assistant Administrator and Regional Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa) said that, with respect to assistance given to the national liberation movements (NLMs) recognized by the OAU, 1982 had been a year of re-appraisal and reorientation. Following the broad-based evaluation of the entire NLM programme that had taken place in the latter part of 1981, it had been agreed by all concerned to complete all ongoing projects by June 1982 and to replace them by new projects based on the realistic and most up-to-date needs of the movements...
concerned, namely, the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azani (PAC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Emphasis had been placed on the programme approach and the NLMs had been advised to draw up a comprehensive package of their technical assistance needs, to be submitted to UNDP. They had also been informed of the amount of IPF resources available during the 1982-1986 programme cycle.

34. The new projects approved in 1982 constituted for each NLM a programme of assistance designed to respond to specific needs and long-term objectives. Of the seven new projects approved, five were educational and two were in the field of health, and were executed by UNESCO and WHO respectively. Since the preparation of document DP/1983/13, a number of other projects had been approved on the basis of the broad guidelines indicated in the document. Currently, all projects submitted had been approved, with the exception of two projects of assistance to PAC which were under active appraisal by UNDP at headquarters. The total financial commitment covering the approved projects amounted to $4,709,474 against the IPF for NLMs and $450,000 against the United Nations Fund for Colonial Territories and Peoples. That commitment covered activities for the period 1982-1984. A project-by-project mid-term evaluation for all projects was being organized.

35. Mr. MFAXA (Observer, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania) said that PAC appreciated the recent guidelines given to the national liberation movements (NLMs) which were intended to improve the design, formulation, appraisal, implementation and monitoring of projects before they were accepted for approval by UNDP. PAC also wished to express its appreciation to the executing agencies for their efforts at all times to place their expertise at its disposal. PAC would nevertheless suggest that it would be preferable to use experts from countries in which projects for NLMs were located.

36. Although co-operation and understanding between PAC and the UNDP Administration were generally good, of late there had been considerable delays before projects were approved for funding. Another disappointing experience was the shelving of projects previously submitted for funding because of financial constraints in the budget of UNDP. It was hoped that delays in approving projects for NLMs would be minimized wherever possible. That criticism was directed more towards the policy-makers of UNDP, not its administrative personnel. It was from the Governing Council that PAC felt that special consideration and even more flexibility must emanate for the expeditious approval of projects for NLMs.

37. Mr. NKOBI (Observer, African National Congress) said that the objectives of UNDP developmental assistance to the national liberation movements (NLMs) coincided with those of ANC, which was striving to build a corps of specialists capable of taking over all key administrative and managerial positions in the post-liberation era. For that reason, ANC attached great importance to the education and training of all its members and the youth of the country. However, unlike governmental bodies, which could plan their development projects with a large measure of certainty and accuracy, ANC was handicapped by factors over which it had no control.
38. ANC had some difficulty in understanding how UNDP determined which projects to fund and at what level. For instance, in December 1981 at a meeting of UNDP and NLMs held in the United Republic of Tanzania, ANC had submitted several projects, all of which had been turned down. In its view, those projects were of the kind that UNDP had committed itself to support because they either offered training facilities or were intended to make settled communities self-reliant. ANC was also very perturbed that primary and secondary education outside Africa would no longer be financed after June 1984.

39. ANC welcomed UNDP's suggestion that UNDP personnel should visit the projects of the NLMs which it funded. It also wished to suggest that decisions of whether or not to fund projects submitted by NLMs should be influenced by, inter alia, the ability of the NLMs to account satisfactorily for the utilization of UNDP funds granted to it, concrete evidence of how those funds had been used, the existence of the necessary infrastructure to sustain the project suggested, and the extent to which the project would meet the general objectives of UNDP developmental assistance to NLMs. In determining the level of assistance to NLMs, UNDP should make adequate provision for the inflationary situation prevailing in most African countries where NLMs had settled communities. To meet the ever-increasing demands made on it, ANC urgently appealed to UNDP to meet the requests set forth in the projects submitted by ANC since December 1981. Such a commitment would help to ensure that ANC was able to cater for the many thousands dependent upon it.

40. Mr. ANGULA (Observer, South West Africa People's Organization) said that the appeal by liberation movements for assistance from the United Nations system was exclusively for the development of the creative potential of their peoples. SWAPO was faced with serious challenges of creating the necessary national base for a viable nationhood and self-reliant development. In that respect, it had embarked on a number of programmes in various fields aimed at developing that national base. It regarded the following projects to be of utmost importance: establishment of a full-fledged secondary technical school for Namibian children; educational development; health education; establishment of a school for the deaf; training of agricultural workers; and development of building and construction skills. In view of the urgency of and the importance attached to, those projects, SWAPO appealed to the Governing Council to allocate more resources to the IPF for liberation movements.

41. SWAPO was heartened by the fact that at the start of the implementation of projects approved for 1982-1984, a tripartite review would take place. It hoped that such a review would work out operational machinery which would strike the correct balance between flexibility, monitoring and control. SWAPO accepted with humility international assistance from whatever source, as appropriate to the interests of its people. It expected in return that international assistance should recognize its people's profound sense of autonomy and independence of action.

42. The IPF for Namibia did not fall directly within SWAPO's field of operations. However, it augmented SWAPO's efforts through activities such as those of the
United Nations Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia. In that connection, SWAPO urged the Governing Council to strengthen the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia with respect to the administration of the IPF for Namibia. SWAPO echoed the call by the General Assembly to United Nations agencies to waive their overhead costs for the IPF for Namibia. That action would give the Council for Namibia resources which could be used to strengthen its assistance to Namibians.

43. Mrs. RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, said that the Council had been established as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. The United Nations, having assumed responsibility for the Territory, had undertaken to assist and prepare the Namibian people for self-determination. The United Nations Fund for Namibia had been established to that end.

44. The Fund for Namibia operated through the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the Institute for Namibia and the General Account of the Fund. The Nationhood Programme was, in effect, a country programme, providing assistance in key fields. It would, inter alia, provide an independent Namibia with trained administrative personnel. The primary role of the Institute for Namibia was to train middle-level administrators and to conduct research in various socio-economic fields. The activities of the two bodies were closely co-ordinated. The General Account of the Fund for Namibia provided individual grants for Namibians and financed group training and social assistance. The Fund was financed mainly by voluntary contributions, although the Nationhood Programme and the Institute for Namibia were supported by UNDP through the IPF for Namibia. In that sense, the Council for Namibia represented the "recipient Government".

45. Namibia's IPF was SUS 7,750,000 of which 55 per cent was available for programming. With funds brought forward from previous cycles a total of SUS 7.9 million was available for 1982-1986. The funds had been committed to technical assistance and various projects on labour legislation, fisheries, land use, economic policy and training. The possibility of additional aid for the Institute for Namibia was being discussed with UNDP. UNDP would also assist in the administration of various Nationhood Programme projects.

46. Reference had been made in the report on assistance to national liberation movements (DP/1983/13) to the preparation of a comprehensive report on the development problems of an independent Namibia. In that regard it should be noted that the Institute for Namibia was preparing, in co-operation with other interested entities, a comprehensive document on all aspects of economic planning in an independent Namibia.

47. Repeated requests had been made by the General Assembly to executing agencies to waive their support costs with regard to projects for Namibians. Only a few agencies had done so, and UNDP should call upon other agencies to heed those appeals. Furthermore, as the Council for Namibia was the de jure Government of Namibia, the resources of the Fund for Namibia should be treated as Government cash
counterpart contributions. In view of the special relationship of the United Nations with Namibia, a separate report should be submitted to the Governing Council at its next session concerning the use of the resources made available under the IPF for Namibia.

48. **Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela)**, introducing the draft decision in document DP/1983/L.10, said that Guinea, Pakistan, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia had joined the list of sponsors. The Council for Namibia was, in effect, the "Government" of the Territory, and the funds under its management should be treated like other government funds, in accordance with standard UNDP policy. The draft decision requested executing agencies to waive support costs in respect of projects financed from the United Nations Fund for Namibia or the IPF for Namibia, and established that contributions from the United Nations Fund for Namibia should be treated as Government cash counterpart contributions and that agency support costs in respect of those contributions should not exceed 3.5 per cent where agencies had not yet waived them. His delegation trusted that the draft decision would be adopted by consensus.

49. **Mr. McBARNETTE (Trinidad and Tobago)** said that his Government had consistently supported the right of peoples under colonial domination to self-determination and had financed the training of members of national liberation movements (NLMs). The projects referred to in document DP/1983/13, focusing primarily on education, health, human settlements, planning and construction, would help to prepare oppressed peoples for self-determination.

50. It was gratifying that the Administrator had continued to reduce general objectives to more specific ones and that he was reviewing UNDP financing of the above projects, while defining acceptable parameters for such assistance and improving project documentation, implementation and monitoring. His delegation was pleased that UNDP was engaged in consultations with the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and SWAPO concerning the preparation of a study on the development problems of an independent Namibia. The study should be carried out by the Institute and the Commissioner for Namibia. His delegation also concurred with the conclusion contained in paragraph 23 of the report on assistance to national liberation movements, and supported the separation of assistance to Namibia from other programmes in recognition of the fact that the Territory was one for which the United Nations had a special responsibility. His delegation commended the front-line States which had afforded sanctuary to NLMs. Trinidad and Tobago would continue to support, through UNDP, the NLMs recognized by the Organization of African Unity.

51. **Mr. SANGARE (Mali)** said that his delegation commended UNDP for its assistance to NLMs recognized by OAU. The training they received would better fit them to assume their future responsibilities.

52. **Mr. KROUSTALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)** said that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had always supported NLMs fighting for African peoples. UNDP assistance to such movements was appropriate and should be
expanded to assist oppressed peoples in southern Africa to fight against colonialism, racism and apartheid. The support given by UNDP was in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

53. It should not be forgotten that the criminal South African régime, in blatant disregard of the United Nations and the majority of States, was still pursuing, with external assistance, its policy of apartheid and terror. The Soviet Union supported the just struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and the fight for liberation in South Africa headed by ANC. All aid to the people of Namibia should be channelled through SWAPO, their sole legitimate and authentic representative. UNDP should make every effort to execute projects through SWAPO in order to make them more effective.

54. It was apparent from the report before the Governing Council that there had recently been problems which had led to delays in approving projects. That state of affairs was regrettable. UNDP should take more effective steps to ensure the implementation of technical aid programmes for NLMs.

55. Mr. BASAGA (Turkey) said that his delegation welcomed the report on assistance to NLMs. Turkey supported the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence, including the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. His Government endorsed the provision of United Nations assistance to ANC, PAC and SWAPO and other NLMs. It was to be hoped that the draft decision before the Council would be adopted.

56. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that his delegation welcomed the endeavours made by UNDP to help Namibia achieve independence. Africa was an indivisible whole, and while any part of the continent suffered no other African was free. His delegation trusted that the draft decision would be adopted by the Council.

57. Mr. WANG Jinren (China) said that China had always supported the provision of aid by UNDP to African NLMs and the Council for Namibia. The report before the Governing Council indicated that the total amount of funds available for the third cycle was more than $20 million, of which approximately $4.5 million had been committed, leaving a balance of some $16 million. In the light of the needs of the region he trusted that UNDP would commit the remainder of the funds without delay. China was sure that the African NLMs, through their own endeavours, would win a victory over racial discrimination and secure independence for their nations.

58. Mr. MONDAL (Observer for Bangladesh) said that Bangladesh supported the efforts made by UNDP to provide technical aid to NLMs recognized by OAU.

59. Mr. KRSTAJIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation endorsed UNDP aid to NLMs and would like to see it increased. The proposals contained in the draft decision on technical aid for Namibia were particularly meaningful, in view of the funding problems faced by the Territory.
60. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that his country's policy of support for NLMs recognized by OAU was well known. Pakistan supported the peoples of Azania in their struggle to establish majority rule in their country and end apartheid. Pakistan also fully supported the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO. UNDP assistance to NLMs would reduce the misery of the peoples of Azania and Namibia, which was caused by the minority South African régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia. His delegation supported the request by the Council for Namibia for a separate IPF, and trusted that the draft decision before the Council would be adopted by consensus.

61. Mr. HAMDI (Tunisia) said that his delegation supported UNDP aid to NLMs recognized by the Organization of African Unity.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

(d) EVALUATION PROGRAMME (continued) (DP/1983/5, 16 and 68; DP/1983/ICW/6; DP/1983/CRP.2)

62. Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden), speaking on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that evaluation had to be built into projects, and there was a need for feedback from projects to UNDP and project partners. Much had been done in that respect - and the Nordic delegations wished to register their thanks to the Administrator and the heads of the regional bureaux for their serious approach to the subject - but more efforts were needed. Evaluation had to include participating Governments. The Council must draw on its past experience of project execution, and UNDP needed an institutional memory to record promising areas and approaches. The Council had been presented with valuable descriptions of several evaluation exercises, and more benefit had been derived from the informal discussions than would have been the case in many days of formal proceedings.

63. The Nordic countries attached great importance to improving evaluation in UNDP. They agreed with JIU that UNDP was in a unique position to provide leadership on evaluation in the United Nations system. It was time for UNDP to exercise that leadership. It was not always easy to select evaluation procedures and criteria. The people working on a project could easily feel that they were being watched over by people who had nothing directly to do with the project. It was, therefore, important to secure backing for the evaluation process as high in the organization as possible, and to integrate evaluation into project design. The Nordic countries therefore supported the establishment of a central evaluation unit, and suggested that making the unit directly accountable to the Council might further enhance its effectiveness.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.