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The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)


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

(i) USE OF PROGRAMME RESOURCES FOR EQUIPMENT (continued) (DP/1982/3, DP/1982/12)

(iii) PRE-INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES (continued) (DP/1983/9)

(c) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(i) ASSISTANCE TO NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS RECOGNIZED IN ITS AREA BY THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY (continued) (DP/1983/13, DP/1983/L.10)

(ii) ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE (continued) (DP/1983/14)

(iii) ASSISTANCE TO SPECIFIC COUNTRIES (continued) (DP/1983/15)


1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision DP/1983/L.10 regarding assistance to Namibia, which Venezuela had introduced at the previous meeting, and informed the Governing Council that Guinea, Pakistan, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia had joined the sponsors.

2. Mr. SIIMAL (Nepal) and Mr. LIMA (Brazil) expressed support for draft decision DP/1983/L.10.

3. Mrs. BALLESTER (Observer for Cuba) said that Cuba's position regarding co-operation with national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity was clear: Cuba had traditionally supported all initiatives to assist them and, in general, it supported all those who were fighting for their independence against oppression and racism. Her delegation supported draft decision DP/1983/L.10 and hoped that the three executing agencies mentioned in it would act in accordance with its recommendations.

4. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) pointed out that paragraph 1 of draft decision DP/1983/L.10 was based on a false assumption, namely, that support costs fell under the indicative planning figure for Namibia and that if the support costs were waived, more funds would be available for Namibia. The support costs were in
fact met by a different budgetary line and their waiver would, therefore, bring no benefit to Namibia.

5. Moreover, paragraph 2 of the draft decision contained a decision regarding the United Nations Fund for Namibia which the Governing Council was in no position to take, since it had no jurisdiction over that Fund, which was administered by the General Assembly. On the other hand, it would not be out of order for the Governing Council to request or invite executing agencies to waive support costs in respect of contributions from the Fund or apply the 3.5 per cent limit recommended in paragraph 2. However, even that would not be appropriate unless the Council had first taken a decision that the executing agency under its own jurisdiction, the Office for Projects Execution (OPE), should be instructed to waive or limit such support costs; after that, the Council could ask other executing agencies to do the same.

6. Mr. GIDLEY (United States of America) asked the Deputy Administrator to clarify why, if the indicative planning figure did not bear support costs and a waiver of such costs would not benefit Namibia, there were any advantage in having OPE waive its support costs except by way of setting a precedent, and what the further advantage would be of having the other agencies subsequently waive their support costs.

7. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) explained that he had been addressing two separate issues: first, the fact that the indicative planning figure, which was under the control of the Governing Council, did not bear support costs and their waiver would therefore be of no benefit to Namibia; and second, the fact that projects under the United Nations Fund for Namibia had their own support costs under the control of the General Assembly and that OPE, as executing agency for some of those projects under the Fund, could be instructed by the Governing Council to waive its support costs, thus providing more money for Namibia and allowing the Council to invite other agencies to do the same.

8. Mr. RINGNALDA (Netherlands) asked whether the Council intended to submit draft decision DP/1983/L.10 to the Budgetary and Finance Committee for its advice on the financial implications. The Council should not consider the draft decision until that Committee and the agencies involved had commented on it.

9. Ms. UNSWORTH (United Kingdom) said that she, too, wished to know whether the Council intended to consider the financial implications of draft decision DP/1983/L.10 more fully.

10. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Governing Council wished to submit draft decision DP/1983/L.10 to the Budgetary and Finance Committee for consideration of its financial implications and for subsequent referral to the Drafting Group.

11. It was so decided.
12. The **President** said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that the Governing Council wished to take note of the report on assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area by the Organization of African Unity (DP/1983/13).

13. It was so decided.

14. Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador) took the Chair.

15. Mr. **Olver** (Senior Adviser to the Administrator), introducing the report of the Administrator on assistance to the Palestinian people (DP/1983/14), said that in the rather sombre situation in which UNDP found itself throughout the world it was a special event to be able to report on the positive outcome of a programme which from its inception had been surrounded by political complications that had compounded the usual programme delivery difficulties. The Palestinian people themselves had been most understanding of the constraints under which UNDP had labour because the programme involved assistance to a non-self-governing people; and they, too, had proved very flexible in working with UNDP to develop quite novel and often unprecedented methods of assistance.

16. It should be noted that after consultation with the recipients, it had been decided to concentrate activities under the programme exclusively in the West Bank and Gaza, with the exception of one project administered through FAO in Syria. That geographical concentration had made it possible to produce a meaningful impact in areas where the international community, aside from the work being done by UNRWA, had few opportunities to render assistance. UNDP itself had had to devise new approaches as it was working not with a recipient Government, as was usually the case, but rather with a recipient people.

17. Another departure from the norm was the fact that the projects had been executed directly by UNDP rather than by an executing agency, as would have been preferable. The programme was currently being managed by the Office for Projects Execution (OPE), which reported directly to the Administrator and himself. He was happy to report that the executing agencies themselves understood the situation and had offered to help by sharing their long experience with UNDP, which was now being permitted to call upon the human resources of some of the agencies from time to time.

18. Another situation peculiar to the programme was the fact that it was being operated without the usual field office machinery and supporting services. UNDP had had to rely largely on periodic visits for programme planning and implementation. The recent outposting of an OPE staff member in Jerusalem on a permanent basis would, however, aid considerably in project implementation. The United Nations offices in the area, especially the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Jerusalem, had been of great assistance in keeping overhead costs low - about 4 to 5 per cent - failing which the programme could probably not have continued.
19. Four of the original list of projects had been completed at a cost of $1.7 million. The projects related primarily to education and health, with a few relating to agriculture. In addition, $500,000 had been spent on two projects not yet completed, to make a total expenditure of $2.2 million. Commitments for future projects had used up the $3.5 million allocated, and there were already firm commitments for about $3 million of the total $4 million allocated from Special Programme Resources for the programme through 1986.

20. It now had to be decided whether the pace of the programme was to be slowed or whether an effort should be made to exploit such an excellent beginning. He intended personally to approach delegations to emphasize the Governing Council's call for further contributions of voluntary funds in the recommended amount of $8 million to the programme during the current cycle. If the funds were forthcoming, the programme of assistance to the Palestinian people already had blueprints ready for projects which would be carried out in full co-operation with the beneficiaries first and foremost, as well as with the administering authorities. It was to be hoped that once donors had made their share of contributions to central UNDP resources they would be able to make a special contribution to the worthy Palestinian programme.

21. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) thanked the Administrator of UNDP and his assistants for their efforts on behalf of the Palestinian people. The Palestine Liberation Organization, as the representative of that people, would continue to facilitate UNDP's work in every way.

22. The report of the Administrator on assistance to the Palestinian people had unaccountably not referred specifically to General Assembly resolution 37/134, paragraph 4 of which was particularly germane. The report also referred, but not clearly, to the obstacles that had been put in the way of the programme. The fault lay with the occupying Power. It was part of Israel's expansionist policy to destroy the national economy of the Palestinian people, to wreak destruction on their land, with a consequent shift of thousands of peasants to serve as cheap labour for the Zionists, and to stifle their educational institutions and thereby reduce the Palestinians' employment possibilities, forcing many of them to leave their homes and seek a livelihood elsewhere. The UNDP programmes and all other projects seeking to help the Palestinian people contributed to their cohesiveness and kept them on their land and therefore Israel sought to obstruct them.

23. The international community, with the exception of the United States and Israel had joined in deploring the Zionist annexations and calling for respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and an independent state on Palestinian soil. He urged Governments and intergovernmental organizations to support the struggle of the Palestinian people, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, their sole legitimate representative. The Palestinian people urgently needed assistance with regard to health and medical care, the development of fisheries, and the expansion of higher education and vocational secondary education, especially in agricultural subjects. The UNDP projects provided an opportunity to translate expressions of support for economic and social assistance to the Palestinian people into concrete action. The PLO stood ready to co-operate in achieving that objective.
24. **Mr. KAABACHI** (Tunisia) commended UNDP on its untiring efforts to provide direct assistance to the Palestinian people. Tunisia was deeply concerned about the obstacles to programme delivery in the West Bank and Gaza, obstacles which persisted despite the fact that UNDP was directly responsible for project execution. Every effort should be made to identify the sources of the obstacles and to eliminate them without delay.

25. UNDP assistance to the Palestinian people needed to be strengthened. The Governing Council should expand the programme and reiterate its appeal to Governments and intergovernmental organizations to supplement the resources available from the Special Programme Resources to carry out the programme.

26. His delegation firmly supported the statement made by the PLO observer.

27. **Mr. ZLATANOV** (Bulgaria) said that his delegation welcomed the special programme of assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area by OAU and the special programme of assistance to the Palestinian people. While Bulgaria was satisfied with the measures to promote responsible self-reliance among the national liberation movements, it was concerned at the delays in the preparation and submission of new project proposals. The executing agencies should be more active in the preparatory process. The fact that some project documents had had to be reformulated reflected the lack of experience of certain executing agencies.

28. As to the project proposals for the West Bank and Gaza, his delegation questioned the advisability of increasing assistance to the private sector. UNDP assistance should go primarily to activities in sectors benefiting the majority. The plans to lend support to health care in the private sector would benefit only a small segment of the Palestinian population.

29. **Mr. BASAGA** (Turkey) said that the annex to document DP/1983/14 contained valuable information regarding new project proposals for the West Bank and Gaza. His delegation was pleased that, by March 1983, $2.1 million had been spent out of the initial allocation of $3.5 million for assistance to the Palestinian people in a variety of sectors. It was also pleased that the parties directly concerned with such activities had indicated their strong desire to continue to enlarge the programme (DP/1983/14, para. 2). Turkey hoped that all aspects of the programme would be implemented so that the aspirations of the Palestinian people would be fulfilled.

30. **Mr. SANGARE** (Mali) commended UNDP on its support for the Palestinian people and on its efforts to provide assistance that would promote improvements in their living conditions. Those efforts should continue.


...
32. Mr. KROUSTALE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union supported the assistance UNDP was providing to the Palestinian people in co-operation with the PLO. The long-suffering people of Palestine were waging a just struggle for their rights and were in desperate need of such assistance. On a number of occasions, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies had condemned Israel's acts of aggression and repression. In paragraph 4 of Assembly resolution 37/134, the relevant programmes, organizations, agencies and organs of the United Nations system had been requested to intensify their efforts, in co-operation with the PLO, to provide economic and social assistance to the Palestinian people. UNDP was to be applauded for elaborating and implementing a programme of assistance.

33. However, the effectiveness and scale of UNDP activities in that area left room for improvement. His delegation had doubts regarding the criteria for the selection of project proposals set forth in paragraph 3 of document DP/1983/14. Two of the criteria were that the activities should reflect the true needs of the Palestinian people and that they should be likely to receive the support of all parties concerned. The implications of those formulations had to be spelt out. His delegation wondered whether those criteria had been adopted because of Israel's opposition to the implementation of the programme of assistance.

34. The Soviet Union was alarmed at the fact that the governing arrangements as agreed with the parties concerned had not permitted execution of projects in the West Bank and Gaza in the usual manner by organizations of the United Nations system (DP/1983/14, para. 6). The difficulties created by Israel should be decisively condemned.

35. The expansion of the technical assistance programme would lay the groundwork for the economy of a future independent Palestinian state and would be welcomed by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine.

36. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) commended UNDP on its untiring efforts on behalf of the Palestinian people. Guinea unreservedly endorsed the Administrator's recommendations regarding the expansion and diversification of the programme of assistance. It also fully supported the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people and would be co-sponsoring the draft decision on the subitem.

37. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation appreciated UNDP's assistance to the Palestinian people. He inquired whether it was because of the difficulties facing UNDP in delivering assistance or because of other factors that, by March 1983, only $2.1 million had been spent out of the $3.5 million allocated by the Governing Council in June 1979. It was stated in paragraph 2 of document DP/1983/14 that the Council had provided $4 million from the Special Programme Resources for further activities up to 1986. His delegation hoped that no effort would be spared to use those funds efficiently.
38. Pakistan consistently supported the Palestinian people in their struggle to secure their inalienable rights and establish a sovereign State under the leadership of the PLO. It hoped that UNDP would increase its assistance to the Palestinian people, who were still being persecuted and denied their basic rights. Greater assistance was fully justified because of the hardships imposed on the Palestinian people by the illegal occupation.

39. His delegation welcomed the Administrator's recommendation that the Governing Council should reiterate its appeal to Governments and intergovernmental organizations to supplement the resources available from the Special Programme Resources to carry out the programme of assistance (DP/1983/14, para. 8). It wished to know, however, what action was taken by UNDP to ensure that the assistance was exclusively for the benefit of the Palestinian people.

40. Pakistan expected to introduce a draft decision on the subitem at the 28th meeting.

41. Mrs. BALLESTER (Observer for Cuba) said that UNDP assistance to the Palestinian people was essential if their basic needs were to be satisfied and if the ills caused by the insatiable ambitions of the occupation authorities were to be remedied, at least partially.

42. Her delegation understood how difficult it was for UNDP to carry out its programme of assistance. It hoped, however, that the assistance efforts would be intensified, so that the Palestinian people could be prepared for the time when they would recover their territory and establish a sovereign State with full rights.

43. Cuba recognized the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

44. Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

45. Mr. WANG Jinren (China) commended the programme of assistance. China hoped that UNDP would continue striving to overcome the obstacles to effective programme delivery.

46. The Governing Council had provided $4 million from the Special Programme Resources for further activities up to 1986. UNDP should ensure that those activities were carried out on schedule so that the Palestinian people could enjoy the benefits as soon as possible.

47. His delegation endorsed the Administrator's recommendation in paragraph 8 of document DP/1983/14. The Government and people of China steadfastly supported the just struggle of the Palestinian people to recover their territory and secure their inalienable rights. China consistently supported UNDP's assistance to the Palestinian people and hoped that the programme would make an even greater contribution in that area.
48. **Mr. MONDAL** (Observer for Bangladesh) said that Bangladesh too was a consistent supporter of the Palestinian cause. It took note of UNDP's proposals for future assistance and was concerned at the obstacles to programme delivery. His delegation was very much in favour of UNDP technical assistance to the Palestinian people. It would welcome the provision of even greater assistance and was pleased that a staff member from the Office for Projects Execution had been outposted to Jerusalem.

49. **Mr. SILWAL** (Nepal) said that UNDP was to be specially commended on its programme of assistance to the Palestinian people, considering the many obstacles to effective programme delivery. Nepal appreciated the Administrator's efforts to raise funds for the projects planned for the third programming cycle. The Administrator deserved every encouragement in his exceptionally difficult task, and Nepal fully endorsed the recommendation he had made in paragraph 8 of document DP/1983/14.

50. **Mr. KRSTAJIC** (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation applauded UNDP's continuing efforts, in such difficult circumstances, to provide technical assistance to the Palestinian people. The obstacles faced by UNDP were a matter of great concern and should be eliminated promptly in the interest of the effective provision of technical assistance to the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza. Yugoslavia would like to see such assistance further expanded. It supported the just cause and struggle of the Palestinian people, whose sole legitimate representative was the PLO.

51. **Mr. ABDEL-GHAFFAR** (Observer for Egypt) said that his delegation welcomed UNDP's programme of assistance to the Palestinian people.

52. It was stated in paragraph 6 of document DP/1983/14 that the governing arrangements as agreed with the parties concerned had not permitted execution of projects in the West Bank and Gaza in the usual manner by organizations of the United Nations system. Egypt had requested clarification regarding that statement. It had also asked about the implications of using the services of ILO experts in their individual capacities. The Assistant Administrator's clarifications, though helpful, had not been as explicit as Egypt would have liked.

53. His delegation questioned the wisdom of outposting to Jerusalem a staff member from the Office for Projects Execution. Jerusalem was an occupied city in which an illegitimate capital had been established.

54. In paragraph 3 of its decision 82/13, the Governing Council had appealed to Governments and intergovernmental organizations to provide at least an additional $8 million during the third programming cycle to supplement the resources available from the Special Programme Resources for the purpose of helping to meet the economic and social needs of the Palestinian people. Egypt was interested in learning whether the response to that appeal had been negative or positive and what was the total value of contributions pledged.
55. **Mr. HILLEL** (Observer for Israel) said that his Government favoured legitimate forms of assistance to the Palestinian Arabs and was fully co-operating with UNDP and other international organizations in programmes that would directly benefit the Palestinian inhabitants of the administered territories. Additional measures recently adopted to strengthen co-operation with UNDP had met with success, and the statements made at the current meeting would not deter Israel from future efforts in that direction.

56. His Government was opposed to any form of assistance to or co-operation with the PLO. It believed that the Governing Council should concentrate on issues that were truly within its jurisdiction and competence and should not be carried away by statements of hostility.

57. Israel had managed to adopt positive measures in various fields for the social and economic development of the Palestinian inhabitants. It had found a way to co-operate with UNDP on a purely professional basis, despite the attempts by some to exploit the situation for political purposes. The fact that many of the statements under the subitem had come from representatives of States which had failed to adopt measures that could help the Palestinian inhabitants showed clearly that some parties were determined to take advantage of every possible opportunity to vilify Israel. They were concerned only with achieving dubious political objectives, not with the plight of the Palestinians.

58. **Miss AL-AWADI** (Observer for Kuwait) said that her delegation supported the PLO statement and was concerned at the obstacles to programme delivery. It hoped that such obstacles would be eliminated and assistance to the Palestinian people increased.

59. **Mrs. LOPEZ-ORTEGA DE DREIER** (Mexico) said her delegation believed that the multilateral nature of UNDP co-operation should be preserved. It endorsed the Administrator's recommendation regarding the expansion and diversification of UNDP's assistance to the Palestinian people.

60. **Mr. MADRIZ FORNOZ** (Observer for Nicaragua) said that his Government supported the just struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO and welcomed UNDP's efforts in support of the Palestinian cause. It fully endorsed the Administrator's recommendations and hoped that UNDP assistance would be intensified.

61. **Mr. MASRI** (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic) expressed appreciation for UNDP's strenuous efforts to assist the Palestinian people, who were suffering great hardships since their homeland had been occupied. It was imperative for the international community to redouble its efforts and mobilize technical and financial resources to provide assistance to the Palestinian people. His delegation hoped that UNDP would work in conjunction with the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

62. **Mr. TETTAMANTI** (Argentina) said that his delegation fully supported UNDP assistance to the Palestinian people and the recommendation of the Administrator in paragraph 8 of document DP/1983/14.
63. Mr. RYO TANG Song (Observer for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation fully supported the recommendation of the Administrator on the programme of assistance to the Palestinian people. His Government also fully supported the just struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their homeland.

64. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said that his delegation welcomed the assistance provided to the Palestinian people and expressed the hope that the obstacles to the implementation of the programme of assistance to the Palestinian people would be overcome in the near future. It also hoped that the assistance provided to the Palestinian people could be increased.

65. Mr. KUECK (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation supported all the country programmes which had been submitted for approval, particularly the special programmes of assistance to the national liberation movements recognized by OAU and to the Palestinian people. Such support was particularly important in view of the latest criminal acts perpetrated by the racist régime of South Africa and the recent aggressive of attacks of Israel in Lebanon. His Government looked forward to further UNDP assistance in that regard in the future.

66. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the report of the Administrator on assistance to the Palestinian people and the introductory statement made by the Senior Advisor to the Administrator clearly refuted the lie that the Israeli occupation authorities facilitated the implementation of UNDP projects. Only four of the eighteen proposed UNDP projects had been implemented, because the occupation authorities had either refused to approve the other projects or were still studying them. The representative of the Israeli occupation authorities had also lied about the amount of assistance provided to the Palestinian people. The assistance which the Palestinian people actually received was very limited, particularly when compared with the wealth and natural resources which had been plundered by Israel in the occupied territories.

67. Mr. OLVER (Senior Advisor to the Administrator), replying to questions raised by the representatives of Egypt and the Soviet Union, said that it was undeniable that a unique situation existed with regard to the implementation of the programme of assistance to the Palestinian people. UNDP representatives had to obtain the approval of the Israeli authorities in the West Bank and Gaza before projects could be carried out. UNDP could not provide all the assistance it wished because of limited resources and the fact that certain activities were not allowed. Once a project was approved, UNDP representatives proceeded to implement it with reasonable speed. There was a certain amount of delay because UNDP personnel provided the assistance themselves directly to the Palestinian people without the use of intermediaries. To ensure the effectiveness of activities in the private sector, a special effort was made to work in accordance with the traditions of Arab life and to reach the grass roots level in communities, rather than merely subsidize public institutions.

68. Mr. OLCESE (Acting Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Africa), introducing the report of the Administrator on assistance to specific countries (DP/1983/15), recalled that in recent years the General Assembly had adopted a number of resolutions to mobilize the assistance of the international
community for developing countries facing special difficulties caused by adverse economic or political factors or natural disasters. At its thirty-seventh session the Assembly had adopted 17 such resolutions, 11 of which referred to international organizations and United Nations programmes whose mandates included the provision of assistance to those countries. The report of the Administrator dealt with those 11 General Assembly resolutions, which pertained to 10 African countries and Tonga. In the resolutions the General Assembly invited UNDP and other international organizations to bring to the attention of their governing bodies the special needs of the countries affected and to report the decisions of those bodies to the Secretary-General by 15 July 1983. The report outlined UNDP assistance to each country, with particular reference to its special requirements. Lastly, it should be pointed out that resident co-ordinators and UNDP field offices often provided significant assistance of a non-financial nature, such as assistance to Government's in preparing country programmes.

69. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation welcomed the fact that the report of the Administrator for 1982 (DP/1983/6) mentioned for the first time the influence of the arms race on the reduction of resources earmarked for development. UNDP could play a more active role in the struggle for real disarmament in order to ensure that part of the resources released were used to benefit developing countries. It was clear that the financial difficulties affecting UNDP were brought about by the crisis in the capitalist economy. Paragraphs 34 to 38 of the report showed that the Western Governments, which had earlier called for the more active participation of private commercial organizations in providing assistance, had discovered that those organizations were having serious doubts about the wisdom of providing further credit in view of the unprecedented debts of the developing countries. That situation was all the more alarming in view of the reduction in official assistance. The report made a timid attempt to demonstrate the advantages of technical assistance provided by international organizations over financial assistance provided by the private sector in the form of loans and credits. It was clear, however, that the capitalist donors were not acting out of altruistic motives. The sales by those donor countries to developing countries as a direct result of that assistance were quite profitable.

70. His delegation shared the view of the Administrator regarding the central role of human resources in the development process. However, the current situation with regard to training was far from perfect. Document DP/1983/6/Add.2 provided information on a number of successfully completed projects in the area of training, but did not give an overall picture of what had been done in that important field. According to document DP/1983/6/Add.4, the number of fellowships awarded had been reduced by 532 in 1982 compared with 1981. In view of that situation, the Council should seriously consider the question of training and prepare a report within the next two years evaluating UNDP activities in that field.

71. Document DP/1983/6/Add.2 provided useful information on project results, but failed to show any of the major problems encountered in the implementation of projects and programmes. It would be useful to have a general analysis of those problems with due account taken of the views of the host Governments.

/...
72. Paragraph 44 of document DP/1983/6/Add.1 stated that new projects must be designed so that their immediate objectives could be attained in five years or less. His delegation supported that view on the understanding that those and similar measures would ensure the effective use of existing resources and eliminate difficulties in project implementation. He stressed the need to carry out speedily the measures set forth in paragraph 44 since, according to the latest issue of the Compendium, there were dozens of projects whose implementation period would last more than five years. The slow implementation of projects was caused primarily by the poor preparation of project documents, which did not take due account of the socio-economic processes taking place in the countries concerned. That situation made it necessary to review the main objectives of projects, thus delaying their implementation and causing needless expenditures to pay for the services of experts. Furthermore, a reduction in the international experts and consultants component would be a step towards more effective use of UNDP resources. Aside from purely financial considerations, the increase in the proportion of funds devoted to consultants meant that developing countries would be increasingly less able to participate in the consultancy process.

73. The report on pre-investment activities (DP/1983/9) provided information on special training in investment development. Such training was generally carried out through the World Bank, which was an important instrument in the capitalist economic system. Many developing countries, however, had chosen to follow a non-capitalist path of development. Unfortunately, UNDP did not find the time or resources for training in that field as well. That situation reflected a certain partiality on the part of UNDP and a desire to turn that organization into an appendage of the World Bank.

74. With regard to the report on the use of programme resources for equipment (DP/1983/12), his delegation shared the view that it would be wrong to limit the equipment component. The size of that component should be determined on the basis of the receiving country's level of development and the availability of national personnel to use such equipment.

75. His delegation stressed the importance of the evaluation process in enhancing the effectiveness of the Programme. The report of the Administrator on the evaluation programme (DP/1983/16) and the report of the evaluation team were particularly interesting. Many sections of the summary of the latter report in document E/AC.51/1983/5/Add.1 merited very serious attention. It was hoped that the UNDP Administration would submit its views in that regard in the near future so that the report of the Secretary-General on that question could be considered at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.