



United Nations  
Development Programme

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/1983/SR.39  
1 July 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirtieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 24 June 1983, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. SLIM (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

Programme implementation (continued)

- (a) Annual report of the Administrator for 1982 (continued)
- (c) Special programmes of assistance (continued)

Other funds and programmes (continued)

- (i) Activities of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) and other assistance to drought-stricken countries in Africa (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 this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

CONTENTS (continued)

(j) United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries

Other matters

(a) United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures

(b) Action taken by other organs of the United Nations system in 1982

Report of the Chairman of the Drafting Group

Policy review: measures to mobilize increased resources for UNDP on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis (continued)

Financial, budgetary and administrative matters (continued)

Matters relating to the work of the Council in 1984

Concluding statement by the Administrator

Closure of the session

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

(a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR 1982 (continued) (DP/1983/L.18)

(c) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ASSISTANCE (continued) (DP/1983/L.12/Rev.1)

1. The PRESIDENT called the Governing Council's attention to draft decision DP/1983/L.12/Rev.1, on assistance to the Palestinian people, and announced that Bangladesh had joined its sponsors.

2. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) introduced draft decision DP/1983/L.12/Rev.1, expressing the hope that the Council would adopt it by consensus.

3. It was so decided.

4. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to express its admiration for the exemplary manner, perhaps unique within the United Nations system, in which UNDP had provided assistance to the Palestinian people by channelling it to those who were actually in need, without becoming enmeshed in extraneous issues. The Governing Council had treated the technical projects in a responsible manner and therefore the United States had joined the consensus on the draft decision just adopted. It hoped that in the future no extraneous issues that might strain that consensus would be introduced and that UNDP would continue to provide assistance in a manner that brought tangible benefits to the Palestinian people and credit to the Programme itself.

5. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), as one of the sponsors of the draft decision, paid tribute to the Administrator for his efforts to bring about a consensus and expressed his thanks to all delegations who had worked to achieve it.

6. Mr. MORSE (Administrator) thanked the Council, and especially the parties directly affected by the draft decision, for their close co-operation and good will, and for the splendid support UNDP had received throughout the implementation of the programme in question.

7. The PRESIDENT called the Council's attention to draft decision DP/1983/L.18 on the annual report of the Administrator for 1982.

8. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although he had no objection to the adoption of the draft decision, he regretted that the text did not reflect the opinion expressed in the report of the Administrator, namely, that there was a link between disarmament and the development of developing countries.

9. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt draft decision DP/1983/L.18.

10. It was so decided.

OTHER FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES (continued)

(i) ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SUDANO-SAHELIAN OFFICE (UNSO) AND OTHER ASSISTANCE TO DROUGHT-STRICKEN COUNTRIES IN AFRICA (continued) (DP/1983/L.19)

(j) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (DP/1983/42 and Corr.1)

11. The PRESIDENT called the Council's attention to draft decision DP/1983/L.19, on other assistance to drought-stricken countries in Africa.

12. Mr. BLAIN (Observer for the Gambia) announced that Mauritania had joined the Gambia in co-sponsoring the draft decision.

13. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) expressed the enthusiastic support of the Latin American Group for draft decision DP/1983/L.19. The drought-control projects sponsored by UNDP were a model of multilateral assistance and the Latin American countries, especially those in South America which had recently become victims of disastrous floods, were taking careful note of the excellent scheme that had been used to aid a part of Africa to cope with a natural disaster.

14. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt draft decision DP/1983/L.19.

15. It was so decided.

16. Mr. VAIDYANATHAN (Director, Planning and Co-ordination Office), introducing the report of the Administrator on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (DP/1983/42 and Corr.1), said that the main issue that concerned the Fund was the fact that there were not enough funds to carry out any meaningful programming. Pledges to the Fund had decreased and, as could be seen from the annex to the report, had totalled approximately \$71,000 in 1981 and \$68,000 in 1982. Notwithstanding an appeal from the Secretary-General, the total would decline to approximately \$67,000 in 1983. Moreover, the pledges received had come largely from the land-locked countries themselves. Since there were 21 such countries, it was clear that the Fund at its current level could provide only the most marginal assistance and that it was difficult even to identify viable projects under the circumstances. Since the report was prepared, Lesotho, Mongolia, Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda had become beneficiaries of new projects. As the report indicated, most resources would be committed by the end of 1983, and unless the pledging conference scheduled for November radically changed the situation the very existence of the Fund would be called into question.

17. Mr. SIIWAL (Nepal) said that he appreciated the candid report of the Administrator. Nepal was very concerned over the low level of resources of the Fund, which since its inception had not had a good response from the major donor countries, whose stated position on the matter was well known. Nepal was grateful to those developing countries which had contributed to the Special Fund. His delegation questioned whether the usual appeals, such as those contained in the

(Mr. Silwal, Nepal)

recommendation of the Administrator in paragraph 13 of the report, would do anything to help the situation. It felt that the next Governing Council should have something more specific available. It therefore proposed the addition to the recommendation of a new subparagraph, to be inserted after subparagraph (a), which would read:

"Requests the Administrator to carry out a study of the various reasons for the very low levels of the resources of the Fund since its inception and to report his findings to the thirty-first session of the Governing Council together with his suggestions;".

The current subparagraph (b) would become subparagraph (c), and he proposed the addition of the words "in the meantime" after the word "Appeal".

18. The PRESIDENT pointed out that such a report could not be submitted until the thirty-second session of the Governing Council, and the amendment should be revised accordingly.

19. Mr. DORJEE (Bhutan) observed that despite the serious geographical handicaps of the land-locked countries, which were also for the most part least developed countries and therefore particularly vulnerable, the Fund set up to assist them had not received even the minimum level needed to implement projects. It was distressing that never more than 17 countries had pledged assistance and that most of those were themselves land-locked. The level of contributions was, moreover, decreasing yearly. He urged all donors to review their position in order to allow the Fund to fulfil its mandate. Bhutan supported the amendment proposed by Nepal, as modified by the President.

20. Mr. LICHILANA (Zambia) agreed that the Administrator's report gave no cause for optimism. Six years after the Fund had been set up, not one developed country had contributed to it, and the handful of developing countries that had done so had contributed minimally. Zambia's own contribution had represented 49 per cent of total contributions in 1981 and 58 per cent in 1982. The problems of the land-locked countries deserved special attention, since most of them could not afford to divert funds from essential development sectors, such as health and education, in order to meet their transport needs. He supported the Administrator's idea of making a further appeal for contributions.

21. Miss QOANE (Lesotho) concurred with the comments made by the representatives of Nepal, Bhutan and the Gambia and supported the Nepalese amendment.

22. Mrs. VERVALCKE (Belgium) said that she supported the amendment proposed by Nepal, but thought that it would also be useful to request a summary report recapitulating the resources received by the Fund since its inception and the activities financed under it. //

23. Mr. VAIDYANATHAN (Director, Planning and Co-ordination Office) said that, since the land-locked countries had especially serious economic development

(Mr. Vaidyanathan)

problems, it was certainly the Administrator's hope that contributions would be more generous than in the past.

24. His Office would have no difficulty in preparing a report for submission to the thirty-second session of the Governing Council furnishing the information requested by both Nepal and Belgium.

25. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that, in order to incorporate the proposals of the representative of Belgium, new subparagraph (b) of the recommendation in paragraph 13 of the report should read:

"Requests the Administrator to submit to the Governing Council at its thirty-second session a report on the resources of the Fund and its activities since its inception and on the various reasons for the very low level of the resources of the Fund since its inception, and to make pertinent suggestions;"

26. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt the recommendation contained in paragraph 13 of document DP/1983/42, as amended by Nepal and Belgium.

27. It was so decided.

#### OTHER MATTERS

(a) UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM REGULAR AND EXTRABUDGETARY TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION EXPENDITURES (future DP/1983/57, DP/1983/63)

(b) ACTION TAKEN BY OTHER ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN 1982 (DP/1983/58 and Add.1)

28. Mr. HAVORD (Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation), recalling that a report on United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures containing data for 1981 (DP/1982/63) had been submitted to the Council in 1982, said that a report containing such information for 1982 had also been prepared in English and was currently being translated. Subject to the agreement of the Council, it would be distributed informally until it was issued formally as document DP/1983/57. The report was late because expenditure data from one of the five largest UNDP executing agencies, without which the comprehensive overview would have been incomplete, had not been received until mid-May. The growing complexity of the United Nations development system made it increasingly difficult to assemble and check the detailed data involved.

29. The report focused on technical co-operation expenditures financed from sources other than UNDP and on the extrabudgetary contributions for technical co-operation activities reported by the agencies. Non-UNDP-funded extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures had amounted to \$585 million in 1982, a decline of 1.5 per cent from 1981. That compared with a figure of \$661 million for

(Mr. Havord)

UNDP-financed technical co-operation, or a decline of almost 10 per cent from 1981. In addition, agency regular budget technical co-operation expenditures had amounted to \$200 million, a decrease of 7 per cent from 1981. The annexes to the report provided information on expenditures by agency, by source of funds, by sector and by country, as well as data on expenditures by UNICEF and WFP and country-by-country data on 1982 extrabudgetary contributions for technical co-operation purposes.

30. The possible future use of a common data base for the production of data for the expenditure report in question, as well as for other cross-organizational expenditure reports, was currently being reviewed in the United Nations system. In such a case, agencies would not need to submit separate data to UNDP and the reports could be more quickly produced in the future.

31. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of documents DP/1982/63 and DP/1983/57. Document DP/1983/57, as yet available only in English, contained important information which would be out of date if the Council was to insist on simultaneous distribution in all languages. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished document DP/1983/57, entitled "Information on United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures in 1982 financed from sources other than UNDP", to be circulated informally pending its translation into all the official languages.

32. It was so decided.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of documents DP/1983/58 and Add.1 concerning action taken in 1982 by organs of the United Nations and related agencies.

34. It was so decided.

Report of the Chairman of the Drafting Group (DP/1983/L.16 and Add.1-4)

35. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines) speaking as Acting Chairman of the Drafting Group, introduced the report of the Chairman of the Drafting Group contained in documents DP/1983/L.16 and Add.1-4. He drew attention to section IV of the draft decision contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.2, the source of which (indicated in a footnote) had not been reviewed by the Drafting Group. During the Drafting Group's consideration of the draft decision concerning the United Nations Fund for Population Activities contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.3, the representative of Venezuela had expressed objections to some elements in the section on family planning research; in a spirit of accommodation, that representative had agreed that the present text should be submitted to the plenary Council on the understanding that his delegation would be free to make comments in that forum. A number of editorial changes were required in the draft decision on United Nations technical co-operation activities contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.4.

36. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the first of the draft decisions contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.1, that concerning the recruitment and reduction of cost of project professional personnel.
37. It was so decided.
38. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Council wished to adopt the second draft decision, that on the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action, contained in the same document.
39. It was so decided.
40. The PRESIDENT called attention to the draft decision entitled "Arrangements for the evaluation of the results and effectiveness of the Programme", contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.2.
41. Mrs. BELEN (Argentina) said that all were familiar with the position of her delegation with regard to the establishment of a central evaluation unit. For that reason, it had supported a proposal within the Drafting Group that, in section I of the draft decision, paragraph 1 should be placed in square brackets as a way of avoiding conflict on the substance of the matter and making a consensus possible. Since that had not been done and in order to ensure that the draft decision reflected the opinions of members of the Council more truly, her delegation proposed that section I, paragraph 1, should be introduced by the words "Takes note of" rather than "Welcomes". That wording would also accord with the language that had been used by the Intersessional Committee of the Whole in paragraph 58 of document DP/1983/5.
42. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America) said that, while his delegation had no wish to reopen a debate that had gone on for several months, he wished, for very good reasons which were of great importance to his delegation to see the language of the draft decision retained.
43. Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden) said that the present formulation had been reached after very careful discussions and negotiations. In the light of the explanations given by the secretariat as to what the proposed unit would do, all delegations could join in welcoming the Administrator's decision.
44. Mr. ROJAS (Venezuela) said that the problem might be one of translation. The Spanish version seemed not to accord fully with the English. The Spanish "Acoge con beneplácito" was perhaps stronger than the English "Welcomes". His delegation supported the suggestion made by the representative of Argentina that the Council should simply take note of the Administrator's decision.
45. Mr. BOHNET (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation supported the statements made by the delegations of the United States and Sweden. The understanding reached in the Drafting Group and in discussions on the conclusions of the Intersessional Committee of the Whole had been that the Council should welcome the Administrator's decision and not merely take note of it.

46. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) regretted that neither of the proposals discussed in the Working Group - namely, a text whereby the Council would simply take note of the Administrator's decision or the placing of the paragraph in square brackets - had been reflected in the draft decision, even though both had received support. A compromise wording might be "Takes due note".

47. Mr. POTVIN (Canada) said that his delegation favoured the wording of the text as it stood, since it more accurately reflected the opinion of a large number of delegations. However, his delegation would accept the phrase "Notes with satisfaction" in place of "Welcomes".

48. The PRESIDENT said that the problem of wording was compounded by difficulties in finding equivalent expressions in all working languages. He therefore suggested that, if there were no objections, the Governing Council should adopt the wording proposed by the representative of Canada, which seemed to accommodate most of the concerns expressed.

49. It was so decided.

50. Mrs. BELEN (Argentina) said that, for the sake of the consensus, she had agreed to the President's suggestion and was willing to let the paragraph stand as adopted, without brackets. Nevertheless, she wished to have her delegation's fundamental objection to the establishment of a central evaluation unit reflected in the Council's report on the present session.

51. The PRESIDENT reminded the Governing Council that section IV of the draft decision in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.2 had been adopted previously, and consequently suggested that the Council should adopt the draft decision as a whole.

52. It was so decided.

53. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft decision contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.3 and invited the Governing Council to consider section I of it.

54. Ms. HILTON (United Kingdom) proposed that the phrase "including activities related to women" should be added at the end of paragraph 7, in order to reflect the Drafting Group's intentions more fully.

55. Mrs. REBONG (Philippines) said that in a statement which her delegation had made during the consideration in plenary meeting of UNFPA activities it had emphasized the usefulness of reviewing the criteria used to determine the priority countries receiving the bulk of UNFPA assistance. Whether or not some countries, including her own, were considered to be priority countries, depended on the rigidity with which those criteria were applied. Her delegation had agreed to the text of the draft decision under consideration, and would refrain from asking the Administrator or the Governing Council to review those criteria. However, her delegation believed that Governments ought to be able to conduct their own reviews

(Mrs. Rebong, Philippines)

of the matter and therefore wanted the Executive Director's progress report, requested in paragraph 4 of the draft decision, to contain as much information as possible to assist member States in that respect.

56. Mr. BLAIN (Observer for the Gambia) said that, although his delegation supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 18, it none the less believed that the regional demographic centres in Africa would continue to require UNFPA assistance for at least another 12 years. He therefore proposed that the following words should be added at the end of that paragraph: "taking into account the need for UNFPA to continue to provide adequate support to the demographic centres in Africa in the foreseeable future". He was supported by the representative of Mauritania, and perhaps by others, in proposing that amendment.

57. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Governing Council wished to adopt section I of the draft decision contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.3, as amended.

58. It was so decided.

59. Mr. ROJAS (Venezuela), referring to section II of the draft decision under consideration, said that he was unable to support the allocation of new resources for research in the area of family planning, since he had objections to certain aspects of the research itself. During the drafting process, his delegation had attempted to propose an amendment that would have reflected the concern of his own and other delegations, but unfortunately its proposal had not been acceptable to the majority.

60. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Governing Council should adopt section II of the draft decision contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.3 by consensus, taking note of the reservation expressed by the representative of Venezuela.

61. It was so decided.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Governing Council should adopt the draft decision contained in document DP/1983/L.16/Add.4.

63. It was so decided.

64. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in participating in the consensus on the draft decision which had just been adopted, his delegation wished to reaffirm its position that all United Nations technical assistance must be financed from voluntary sources.

65. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) drew attention to two paragraphs concerning UNFPA activities which had been adopted by the Governing Council earlier in the session. Those paragraphs would be included as paragraphs 9 and 10 in section I of document DP/1983/L.16/Add.3; the paragraphs currently numbered 9 to 18 would subsequently be renumbered as paragraphs 11 to 20.

**POLICY REVIEW: MEASURES TO MOBILIZE INCREASED RESOURCES FOR UNDP ON AN INCREASINGLY PREDICTABLE, CONTINUOUS AND ASSURED BASIS (continued) (DP/1983/L.22, L.23 and L.24)**

66. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland), speaking as Vice-President of the Council, introduced the draft decision contained in documents DP/1983/L.23 and L.22. With regard to section III.B of that draft decision, it had been agreed that the wording would be taken from the report of the Drafting Group. In accordance with the decision taken by the Governing Council during the current meeting, he proposed that the word "welcomes" in section III B should be replaced with the words "Notes with satisfaction".

67. Appropriate language for section IV had been arrived at with the assistance of the Administrator and the delegations concerned and was contained in document DP/1983/L.22, with a proposed amendment to the latter contained in document DP/1983/L.24. He commended the spirit of compromise in which all delegations had contributed to the drafting of the documents under study.

68. Mr. DAHL-HANSEN (Denmark) proposed that paragraph 2 (a) of section IV should be amended to read, "To take into account the views expressed by Governments during the Intersessional Committee of the Whole and in the Governing Council during its thirtieth session".

69. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the amendment proposed by the representative of Denmark and further proposed that the word "essentially" should be eliminated from paragraph 2 (b) of the same section.

70. Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden) proposed that the following words should be added at the end of paragraph 2 (a) of section IV: "in particular, with regard to paragraphs 17 (a) and (e) of document DP/1983/ICW/13". By singling out those individual paragraphs of the Intersessional Committee's report, the Governing Council would draw attention to those areas which were considered worthy of exploration, thereby guiding the Administrator in his implementation of the decision.

71. Mr. TETTAMANT (Argentina) said that his delegation had serious reservations with regard to the draft decision under study, which appeared to emphasize bilateral assistance rather than strengthen UNDP. He endorsed the proposals made by the representatives of Denmark and Ecuador.

72. Mr. BARK (Netherlands) said that, since paragraph 1 of section IV already referred to document DP/1983/ICW/13, the amendment proposed by the representative of Sweden was superfluous. In addition, paragraphs 1 and 2 made specific references to support services.

73. Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden) said that, since the Danish amendment required the Administrator to take into account the views expressed by Governments in the Intersessional Committee of the Whole, he was prepared to withdraw his amendment.

74. Mr. SORZANO (United States of America) said that, on the understanding that the Danish amendment was accepted, he would not urge the Council to adopt the Swedish amendment.

75. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador), supported by Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden) suggested that the words "in particular subparagraphs (b), (c) and (d)" should be added at the end of paragraph 1 of section IV and the rest of the text left as it stood.

76. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the amendments proposed by Denmark and Ecuador and the text contained in document DP/1983/L.24.

77. It was so decided.

78. Mr. SKLYAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was not opposed to the adoption of the draft decision by consensus but continued to have doubts about the value of bilateral assistance conducted by United Nations bodies.

79. Mr. BLAIN (Observer for the Gambia) expressed his delegation's view that section IV of the draft decision should cover trust funds conditioned on procurement from a donor country.

80. Mr. SKLYAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, in the interests of consistency, section I, paragraphs 1 (a) and (c) of the draft decision, should refer not to "all Governments" but simply to "Governments" and paragraph 1 (c) should specify that the calculation referred to should be made not by "each Government in respect of its own contribution" but by "Governments themselves in respect of their own contributions".

81. Ms. McASKIE (Canada) said that her delegation would prefer to keep the wording of section I, paragraph 1 (c), as it was.

82. Mr. SCHUTZE (German Democratic Republic) said that even with the proposed amendment, the term "real value" as used in paragraph 1 (c) was unclear. He wished to register a formal reservation to that effect.

83. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that his delegation would prefer to keep the current wording of paragraph 1 (c), since it had been the result of careful negotiations among all delegations.

84. Mr. BACKMAN (Sweden) said that he would be prepared to accept the second Soviet amendment, since it did not greatly affect the sense of the English version of the draft. However, he was opposed to the deletion of the word "all".

85. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) suggested that the Council should adopt the text of the draft decision as it stood and that any reservations should be entered in the records of the Council.

86. Mr. SKLYAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was prepared not to insist on the second amendment, but maintained his objection to the word "all" which, in his view, was far too peremptory in tone for the Governing Council to use to sovereign Governments.

87. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the draft decision as a whole, as amended, and should take note of the Soviet reservations.

88. It was so decided.

FINANCIAL, BUDGETARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued) (DP/1983/BFC/L.2 and Add.1-19, including annexes, and L.5 and Add.1)

89. Mr. SCHMID (Austria), speaking as the Chairman of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, introduced the draft report of that Committee (DP/1983/BFC/L.2 and Add.1-19, including annexes). The Committee had had many complex issues to deal with; it had agreed on recommendations on most of them, and reached consensus on all, a fact which indicated the commitment and spirit of compromise with which the Committee had worked.

90. Mr. BHANDARI (Bhutan), speaking as the Rapporteur of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, explained the layout of the report before the Council. There had been no time to include a number of changes approved by the Committee that same morning, but they would be incorporated into the final version of the report, which would appear as document DP/1983/73.

91. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the recommendations contained in the various parts of the report and to the amendments to the report contained in documents DP/1983/BFC/L.5 and Add.1.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.1, paragraph 9

92. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.2, paragraph 5

93. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.3, paragraph 8

94. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.4, paragraph 9

95. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the relevant amendment in document DP/1983/BFC/L.5, paragraph 15.

96. The recommendation, as amended, was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.5, paragraph 8

97. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.6, paragraph 3

98. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had already considered the recommendation.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.7, paragraph 14

99. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the relevant amendment in document DP/1983/BFC/L.5/Add.1, paragraph 10.

100. The recommendation, as amended, was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.8, paragraph 6

101. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had already considered the recommendation.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.9, paragraph 8

102. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the relevant amendment in document DP/1983/BFC/L.5/Add.1, paragraph 11.

103. The recommendation, as amended, was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.10/Annex

104. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.11

105. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the relevant amendments in document DP/1983/BFC/L.5/Add.1, paragraphs 12 and 13. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Governing Council approved chapter II, section A, of the draft report dealing with UNFPA financial matters.

106. Chapter II, section A, as amended, was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.12, paragraph 7

107. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.13/Annex

108. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.14, paragraph 13

109. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had already dealt with the recommendation.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.15, paragraph 9

110. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.16, paragraphs 14 and 23

111. The recommendations were approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.17, paragraph 17

112. Mr. BARK (Netherlands) said that, while his delegation would join in the consensus on the recommendation, it would have preferred more stringent safeguards, including indicative ceilings. He hoped that the comprehensive report on the trust funds to be submitted to the Governing Council at its thirty-first session would enable the Council to review the matter thoroughly.

113. Mr. BLAIN (Observer for the Gambia) said that his delegation felt that trust funds conditioned on procurement from a donor country were viable and should become a permanent feature of UNDP because every effort should be made to obtain resources for international economic development.

114. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.18, paragraph 7

115. Ms. HILTON (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United States and her own country, said that the members of the Governing Council would be aware that the five Governments were engaged in negotiations to bring Namibia to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It was of course the objective of those negotiations that Namibia should have a lawful and internationally recognized Government.

116. Because the delegations of the countries concerned did not wish to delay the work of the Governing Council, they would participate in the consensus on the recommendation. However, they wished it to be recorded that that consensus did not represent a change in the positions which they had set out elsewhere. Namibia did not have the attributes of a State and, as a result, the United Nations Council for Namibia was not in a position to exercise effective control within the Territory. ?

117. The recommendation was approved.

DP/1983/BFC/L.2/Add.19, paragraph 7

118. The recommendation was approved.

119. The PRESIDENT invited the Governing Council to approve the draft report of the Budgetary and Finance Committee as a whole.

120. The draft report, as a whole, was approved.

121. Mr. SKLYAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in an earlier statement the representative of Canada had distorted the manner in which the Soviet Union provided aid to developing countries. That statement lacked logic and was couched in terms which his delegation found inadmissible.

#### MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL IN 1984

122. The PRESIDENT suggested that the provisional agenda for the Council's thirty-first session should contain the same items as the Council had agreed, by its decision 82/41, to include in the provisional agenda for its thirtieth session.

123. It was so decided.

124. The PRESIDENT said that, for the general policy debate at the Council's thirty-first session, the Bureau suggested the topic "Measures to be taken to meet the changing technical co-operation requirements of the developing countries".

125. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question arose as to what was meant by the word "measures" in the title of the proposed topic. Did the word refer to organizational efforts or technical efforts or financial efforts, or to all three?

126. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau had merely proposed the subject for the debate. It was up to each delegation to decide the nature of those new measures which it considered necessary and wished to see adopted.

127. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that such a situation would lead to delegations talking at cross purposes. A greater degree of orchestration would lead to a more productive debate.

128. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Committee) said that by its decision 81/37 the Council had determined that, at each of its sessions, it would decide on the policy review topic to be considered at the following session. In order to facilitate that review, the Council had, by the same decision, requested the Administrator to prepare relevant documentation on the topic, including options and possible courses of action, for its consideration.

129. If the Council decided to adopt the topic suggested by the Bureau, the Administrator would prepare the necessary documentation. The "measures" concerned would naturally be measures to be adopted by UNDP and the debate would include the possible contributions of Governments to such measures, whether they related to finances or programmes.

130. Mr. GREBER (Switzerland) said that the question of the policy review topic for 1984 was of great importance to his delegation. For the moment, however, his delegation had some difficulty in conceiving how it would contribute to a discussion of the topic proposed and it would therefore have a little more time for reflection.

131. The PRESIDENT said that the Administrator had indicated a topic which he considered to be of interest but was open to other suggestions and there could be no objection to reverting to the item at a little later stage in the meeting.

132. In 1982, the Council had decided that the indicative quota for the documentation to be submitted to it at its thirtieth session, excluding documentation on country and intercountry programmes, should be 1,300 pages: 300 pages for policy papers and 1,000 pages for support papers. He took it that the Council wished to maintain the same rule for its thirty-first session.

133. It was so decided.

134. The PRESIDENT said that it had been suggested to the Bureau that the Council should hold its thirty-first session from 4 to 29 June 1984 in Geneva. The Budgetary and Finance Committee would meet during the same period, and the Drafting Group from 15 to 29 June 1984. The organizational meeting, lasting one or two days, would be held in February 1984 in New York on date(s) to be determined after consultations with the Department of Conference Services. The Administrator would inform delegations accordingly.

135. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council), replying to questions posed by Ms. McAskie (Canada) said that the dates given for the thirty-first session, 4 to 29 June 1984, covered four rather than three weeks. Informal consultations were in progress and the dates as announced anticipated a decision in February to extend the duration of the session to four weeks, the first week to be devoted to meetings of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. The Budgetary and Finance Committee would therefore meet from 4 to 28 June. Subject to a decision on the matter in February, the Council would meet as a Committee of the Whole to discuss programme matters at the same time as the Budgetary and Finance Committee, during the week of 4 to 8 June. The general policy debate would be held from 11 to 15 June. In accordance with Council decision 81/37, the Drafting Group would meet only in the third week, from 18 to 28 June.

136. Ms. HILTON (United Kingdom) said it appeared that an additional week of meetings had been scheduled for the Governing Council even though the decision on that subject would not be taken until the organizational meeting in February 1984 and throughout its discussion the Intersessional Committee of the Whole had assumed that meetings of the Committee of the Whole to discuss programme matters should not require additional time.

137. Mr. GREBER (Switzerland) said that his delegation was now prepared to endorse the topic for the general policy debate proposed by the Bureau.

138. The PRESIDENT said that the dates and arrangements suggested for the session would of course be subject to confirmation at the organizational meeting in February 1984. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished at its next session to debate the topic "Measures to be taken to meet the changing technical co-operation requirements of the developing countries".

139. It was so decided.

140. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had thus concluded its substantial work for the thirtieth session.

#### CONCLUDING STATEMENT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR

141. Mr. MORSE (Administrator), said that the decisions adopted by the Council laid the foundation for renovation and progress. The Pledging Conference in November and the mid-cycle review of the Programme at the thirty-first session of the Council would be the first tests of those decisions. The review would be meaningful only if resources over and above the current programming level of 55 per cent of IPFs were available. He stressed that it would not be possible to maintain even the 55 per cent programming level if contributions did not grow at an annual minimum of 7.5 per cent. The response to the ICW recommendations on short-term financing had been a disappointment in spite of the generosity of a number of countries. Furthermore, exchange rates had continued to be unfavourable over the past several months. He, therefore, urged all Governments in a position to do so to demonstrate their commitment to help restore UNDP's resource base as quickly as possible. He appealed to all Governments with unexpended development assistance funds in donor programmes to consider transferring those funds to UNDP.

142. The Council's decision on longer-term funding for the Programme was a major step towards the goal of an increasingly predictable, assured and continuous resource base. The possibilities now available to the Programme could serve as a concrete measure of the willingness of Governments to give practical effect to their assertions concerning the importance of development assistance and international co-operation. UNDP would continue to work closely with all Governments until its resource problems were satisfactorily resolved. Many delegations had expressed their strong support for the role of UNDP in the Substantial New Programme of Action. Additional contributions to the Special Measures Fund were sorely needed. Every effort would be made to ensure that the funds received were used to bring the maximum benefit to developing countries. To that end, the programme would do its utmost to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDP field network and operational activities. Enhanced evaluation work would be conducted in the field with the full participation of the recipient Governments concerned and in collaboration with the Programme's agency partners. The central evaluation unit would not become an example of bureaucratic proliferation but would stimulate qualitative improvements.

143. An integrated development effort required a multi-sectoral approach at the level of each individual country and a greater cohesiveness of the types of development assistance provided, particularly where capital assistance and technical

(Mr. Morse)

co-operation were concerned. The continuing efforts to integrate UNDP technical co-operation with the co-operation extended by funds under UNDP administration required the fullest co-operation of recipient Governments and UNDP's agency partners. The support demonstrated by the Council for increased UNDP collaboration with the World Bank would help to further strengthen the Programme's investment-oriented activities. In view of the fact that development co-operation had grown more complicated and World Bank lending for technical co-operation had increased so dramatically, UNDP with its network of country offices and its field-level co-ordinating function had become an important resource for enhanced cohesion and collaboration in that area. He expressed satisfaction at the Council's support for the integrated and complementary roles to be played by technical co-operation and capital assistance.

144. An equally gratifying development was the Council's decision in support of making UNDP's managerial services available to bilateral programmes at the country level, which would truly enhance the Programme's effectiveness as a co-ordinator and a servicing agent, to the benefit of the entire development effort and UNDP's role as a key agent in that effort.

145. The Programme would act in accordance with the Council's decision to ensure that in the design of projects special care was taken to choose the most cost-effective option by avoiding the use of over-qualified experts and encouraging the use of short-term experts. The current efforts to make greater use of national project personnel and United Nations volunteers, to facilitate government execution of projects and to support TCDC would all improve that situation.

146. The agreement reached on the future of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development was a significant achievement; it was hoped that the international community would help the Financing System to realize its potential by providing the requisite funding. The support expressed by delegations for the United Nations Volunteers programme was particularly gratifying. The Special Voluntary Fund needed and deserved the increased support of Governments. The Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration had an amazing record of success in most of the exploration projects already undertaken; nevertheless, the Fund would be forced to reduce its activities without increased support. Similarly, the work of the United Nations Capital Development Fund also required substantially increased support. All of the funds administered by UNDP had been created by the international community for the purpose of responding to important development needs. He urged the members of the Council to examine the benefits which those Funds could bring to the development process.

147. The troubling question of documentation would be taken up at an early session of the Executive Management Committee of UNDP. The responsibilities of the Programme in that regard would be thoroughly examined and, where possible, performance would be improved.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

148. The PRESIDENT noted with great satisfaction that throughout the session the members of the Council, in spite of their diverse points of view, had shown a high degree of solidarity and commitment to the need to strengthen UNDP in its efforts to promote economic and social development. All countries, both developed and developing, had sought to find common ground in dealing with the various questions under consideration. It was particularly gratifying to note the consensus achieved on the recommendations of the Intersessional Committee of the Whole.

149. It was hoped that the measures to be adopted for the mobilization of resources and the strengthening of the role of the Governing Council would further reinforce the Programme and increase its credibility among donor and recipient countries. The general agreement achieved on the basis of consensus would enable the Council to continue to work to find real solutions to urgent problems.

150. He expressed satisfaction at the spirit of co-operation which had prevailed within the Intersessional Committee of the Whole. A number of difficult problems were beginning to be solved. With regard to activities for promoting technical co-operation among developing countries, he expressed confidence that the Administration would take all possible steps to ensure that the special unit concerned carried out its role as effectively as possible.

151. It was gratifying to note the excellent work carried out by the officials of UNDP and the high quality of the documents and reports submitted on the various agenda items. The delay in the distribution of documentation in all working languages had been the sole difficulty which had arisen. It was to be hoped that efforts would be made to ensure that all documentation was issued on time in future.

152. Lastly, he expressed particular satisfaction at the work carried out by UNDP personnel in the field and at headquarters, which had made the Programme an invaluable instrument of technical co-operation for development.

153. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador), on behalf of the Latin American members of the Council, paid tribute to the President and other officers.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.