



United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1983/SR.29
22 June 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirtieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 18 June 1983, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. SLIM (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

Programme implementation (continued)

(c) Special programmes of assistance (continued)

(i) Assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area
by the Organization of African Unity (continued)

(iii) Assistance to specific countries (continued)

(d) Evaluation programme (continued)

Programme planning: the third programming cycle, 1982-1986 (continued)

(c) Use of Special Programme Resources (continued)

Matters relating to the work of the Council in 1984 (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

(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)

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

(d) EVALUATION PROGRAMME (continued) (DP/1982/5; DP/1983/ICW/6; DP/1983/16, 68; DP/1983/CRP.2; DP/1983/L.13)

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

(c) USE OF SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES (continued) (DP/1983/29 and Corr.1, DP/1983/L.14)

MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL IN 1984 (continued) (DP/1983/L.11)

1. Mr. GIDLEY (United States of America), speaking with reference to assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area by the Organization of African Unity, and assistance to specific countries, said that, while his Government certainly supported assistance to the people of Namibia, it did not recognize the South West Africa People's Organization as the sole representative of the people of Namibia and could not therefore condone the channelling of UNDP assistance through that organization.

2. His delegation supported the general thrust of the report of the Administrator on assistance to specific countries (DP/1983/15). The role of UNDP in providing donor co-ordination and in organizing donor conferences, such as the round-table conferences, was very useful. His delegation concurred in the basic idea of holding a donor conference for the Central African Republic in mid-1983 and supported UNDP's focus there on external assistance to address the financial situation, humanitarian assistance and projects for rehabilitation and reconstruction. His delegation noted the complementarity of UNDP and US/AID activities in such countries as Botswana and Lesotho. He hoped that the appointment of a new Resident Representative in the Gambia would enable UNDP to play a greater role there in promoting co-ordination among donors, a matter of particular concern given the number of donors involved. Liberia was experiencing an increasingly severe economic and financial crisis and effective donor co-ordination was important in overcoming that crisis. A UNDP round table for Liberia was scheduled for later in 1983, and UNDP efforts in its organization and planning should be encouraged. Tonga suffered from a number of constraints, including geographical isolation, restricted land resources, limited managerial and technical skills and inadequate administrative machinery. US/AID also had a modest programme of non-bilateral assistance to Tonga, through American private and voluntary organizations and the Peace Corps.

3. Mrs. BALLESTER (Observer for Cuba) said that her country supported the measures recommended by the Administrator for assistance to specific least developed countries as outlined in document DP/1983/15.
4. Mr. OLCESE (Acting Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) said that the support expressed by the delegations of the United States of America and of Cuba for the recommendations on assistance to specific countries contained in the document before the Council had been gratifying. UNDP co-ordination efforts in the African countries and the donor conferences which it had organized had been most successful.
5. Mr. ULA (Observer for the South West Africa People's Organization), supported by Mr. PEKANE (Observer for the African National Congress), referring to the statement made by the representative of the United States, said that both the Namibian people and the international community recognized SWAPO as the national liberation movement of Namibia. In that respect SWAPO was the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. However, assistance was given to Namibia not on the basis of SWAPO being the legitimate representative of the Namibian people but on the basis of the humanitarian needs of that people.
6. Referring to the comment made by the Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa to the effect that only about \$4 million of the IPF resources allocated to national liberation movements had been programmed, he asked whether UNDP would consider raising that figure to meet the expressed needs of the liberation movements.
7. Mr. OLCESE (Assistant Administrator and Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) pointed out that the figures given in annex I of document DP/1983/13 reflected a reduction of only 20 per cent whereas the reduction currently being applied to IPFs was 45 per cent. The unprogrammed balance that should have been deducted from the IPF was not \$3 million but \$6.75 million. Accordingly, the balance of uncommitted resources was not \$16,170,193 as shown in the document, but approximately \$12,420,000. That was the amount of money available for the entire programming cycle and resources must, of course, be kept available for the coming years. Projects amounting to approximately \$1.5 million had been approved since the document was prepared.
8. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council, having taken note of the report of the Administrator at a previous meeting, had now completed its consideration of the subitem on assistance to specific countries.
9. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Council) said that, in the course of its consideration of the subitem on assistance to national liberation movements recognized in its area by the Organization of African Unity, the Council had had before it a report of the Administrator (DP/1983/13) which had addressed itself to that subject and, at the same time, to the subject of assistance to Namibia. The Council might like to decide that, as of its thirty-first session, two separate reports should be before it, one on assistance to the national liberation movements and the other on assistance to Namibia. In view of the procedural nature of that suggestion, it had not been referred to the Working Group in writing.

10. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to accept the suggestion put forward by the secretariat.
11. It was so decided.
12. The PRESIDENT called the attention of the Council to document DP/1983/L.14, which contained a draft decision submitted by the Budgetary and Finance Committee on the use of Special Programme Resources for promotional activities for technical co-operation among developing countries and for support for the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade. He took it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision, on which consensus had already been achieved in the Budgetary and Finance Committee.
13. It was so decided.
14. The PRESIDENT called the attention of the Council to document DP/1983/L.11, which contained the note on conclusions reached at informal consultations on documentation, in connection with matters relating to the work of the Council in 1984.
15. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraph 3 of the document stated that if the United Nations Department of Conference Services could not process all of the session documents, consideration would be given to contracting out the processing of such documents as it could not handle. He would like information on the costs involved in such a step and on the possibility of imposing some limit on them.
16. Ms. McASKIE (Canada) said that her delegation was somewhat concerned at the amount of \$200,000 mentioned in paragraph 5. It was her understanding that the Department of Conference Services (DCS) did have the authority to contract out for special services of the kind involved. It need not be assumed that such costs would necessarily be borne by UNDP. If the DCS knew that UNDP had special authority to make that payment, there was a risk that UNDP would receive lowest priority in the preparation of documents.
17. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that, with regard to the question asked by the representative of the USSR, it did not necessarily follow that such contracting out would be more costly. Lack of staff was sometimes a reason for the inability of DCS to meet all demands and, in certain circumstances, it might be less costly to have work done outside the Department. Any additional costs for translation would be met from the provision referred to in paragraph 5, which consisted of \$100,000 for each of the two years.
18. With regard to the point raised by the representative of Canada, it should be pointed out that it was not translation alone that was involved, but also the typing, editing and printing of documents. As for the priority accorded by DCS to UNDP documentation, consultation would be taking place with the DCS, as stated in paragraph 3, and only when the estimates provided by DCS required it would recourse be had to some special procedure. Delegations should ask themselves whether the

(Mr. Brown)

possibility, which was by no means a probability, of spending \$100,000 a year in order to ensure that documents were available three or four weeks in advance was worthwhile.

19. Ms. McASKIE (Canada) asked whether the \$200,000 in question was to be an addition to the biennial budget for the current year and whether it should therefore be considered in the context of the approval of the budget as a whole by the Budgetary and Finance Committee.
20. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that it was to be hoped that, within the context of a budget of more than \$100 million, it would be possible to accommodate the amount in question without the need to request additional appropriations.
21. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that, when similar difficulties had been encountered four years previously, it had been the members themselves who had proposed the allocation of that amount. The authorization now being requested was of the same kind.
22. The PRESIDENT said that, in the light of the explanations given, he took it that the Council wished to adopt the text of document DP/1983/L.11 for later incorporation into a decision.
23. It was so decided.
24. Mr. KUMARAKULASINGHE (International Labour Organisation) said that ILO attached increasing importance to enhancing the impact of its operational activities and had taken measures to further improve its project monitoring and its evaluation service. Those measures included strengthening of the special evaluation unit which had been set up in 1978, development of new and simplified evaluation procedures, training of operational staff and improvement of project design. The measures concerned had been adopted following exchanges of experience with ILO's partners within and outside the United Nations system and had been facilitated by a very welcome initiative taken by the Joint Inspection Unit.
25. He expressed appreciation for the spirit in which consultations on document DP/1983/ICW/6 had been undertaken. That type of consultation should be extended to a broad range of issues of concern to the United Nations development system. In that connection, he drew attention to the current system-wide consultations on the broader aspects of evaluation within the framework of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. Those consultations also dealt with the question of overlapping and duplication. His delegation endorsed the view that the role of the recipient country in the evaluation procedure was essential. As a consequence, ILO was paying more and more attention to strengthening national evaluation capacities. He endorsed the comments made by the Assistant Administrator concerning the preliminary report on the study on industrial training being carried out by UNDP and ILO and pointed out that ILO was engaging in evaluations of other industrial training projects.

26. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), reporting on the informal consultation on the joint UN/UNDP/UNIDO evaluation on manufactures, said that agreement had been reached on the text of the Chairman's summary (DP/1983/L.13) following certain amendments to the text. The amendments were as follows: in paragraph 2 the words "an excellent one" at the end of the first sentence should be replaced by "a very useful one". The rest of the paragraph should be deleted and replaced by the following: "They felt that the conclusions and recommendations should be considered in depth. Many delegations expressed the view that UNDP should consider all the recommendations and conclusions of the report in a constructive manner even those which raised delicate questions." Paragraph 3 should start with the word "Many" instead of "Some". In the first sentence of paragraph 4, the words "and long-term" should be added before the word "improvements". At the end of the second sentence of the same paragraph the following should be added: "because they are the ones responsible for such programming". In the second line of paragraph 6 the word "many" should be replaced by "a number". Finally, the second sentence of paragraph 6 (f) should be deleted and replaced by the following text: "In practice, the perception of governments, resident representatives and agency personnel with regard to the operation of the tripartite system may vary. It was suggested that the observations of the evaluation team on the functioning of the tripartite system be examined carefully in order to determine if improvements can be made". He urged the Council to approve the text.

27. Mr. GALLITZ (German Democratic Republic), supported by Mr. BARAMOV (Bulgaria), referring to paragraphs 5 and 10, said that while his delegation accepted the text as it stood, no substantive matters should be referred to organizational meetings.

28. Mrs. BALLESTER (Observer for Cuba) said that her delegation, too, was concerned at the possibility that substantive items might be dealt with at organizational meetings.

29. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the text with reservations because such important issues should not be discussed at organizational meetings. At the same time he urged that a final decision on the question of evaluation should be taken as soon as possible.

30. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the text of the Chairman's summary (DP/1983/L.13) and to have the reservations placed on record.

31. It was so decided.

32. Mr. WIESEBACH (Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) said that while all delegations supported in principle the evaluation function and were in favour of strengthening it there appeared to be some misunderstanding of the role of the central evaluation unit. The establishment of such a unit would not detract from the principle that evaluation should be carried out mainly at the field level by Governments, agencies and UNDP acting together. When requested, the unit would assist Governments in strengthening their own evaluation services, in addition to strengthening the evaluation system at headquarters and at the field level. At the present time

(Mr. Wiesebach)

there was a general evaluation function in the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation but it was not as cohesive as would be desirable. The unit would prepare methods and procedures for strengthening field work and relate it to the work of the agencies in order to avoid overlapping of the functions of UNDP and of the agencies. Not only was it necessary to have feedback from evaluation into the project operations, it was also necessary to have centralized feedback so that UNDP could learn from its experiences in one country and try to adapt those lessons to other countries, making such adjustments as were needed in order to take account of the specific conditions of each country. That could only be done through a centralized mechanism which monitored the entire evaluation system and was empowered to make suggestions if the system did not work. As the representative of China had pointed out there was a need for selectivity in evaluation. A central institution was needed which would set the criteria for such selectivity.

33. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Denmark), referring to paragraph 6 of the progress report of the Administrator (DP/1983/16), asked when it was envisaged that the evaluation on telecommunications training would be undertaken.

34. Mr. WIESEBACH (Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) said that, owing to a major conference held in Nairobi the previous year, the International Telecommunication Union had not been able to begin the study with UNDP and the latter had therefore decided to postpone it. A new programme for thematic evaluation studies would have to be drawn up and he would assume that the telecommunications study would be one of the first studies scheduled.

35. Ms. VAZQUEZ-DIAZ (Mexico) welcomed the comments made by the Assistant Administrator concerning the central evaluation unit. A short paper outlining the specific objectives which the central evaluation unit expected to achieve and showing the importance of global evaluation as compared with the evaluation of country programmes would be most helpful. Delegations would then have some criteria for judging the importance of the unit.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

