



**Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1984/21

10 April 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-first session
June 1984, Geneva
Agenda item 5(b)

S U P P O R T

COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

RELEVANT TRENDS AND PROBLEMS IN THE COUNTRY PROGRAMMES
PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL IN JUNE 1984

Report of the Administrator

Summary

This report examines the trends and problems which are evident in the seven country programmes which are being submitted to the Council for approval at its thirty-first session.

The report is divided into seven sections, dealing, respectively, with the timing of the country programmes and related aspects, the nature of the preparatory work, the financial aspects, the major development objectives and orientation, the allocation of resources, the pre-investment and investment support activities and the global priorities.

Although this report covers only seven country programmes, the smallest number for which such an analysis has ever been made, it is interesting to note that many of the common characteristics observed in previous analyses of much larger numbers of programmes also exist in the present programmes. For example: the Governments prefer to align their UNDP country programmes to the IPF cycle, even though it may not synchronize with their development plans; the co-ordination of UNDP-assisted activities with those financed by other sources continues to receive emphasis; the allocation of resources to various sectors follows generally the same pattern as was seen in earlier programmes. The significant difference observed in the present programmes is the much lower allocation of resources by broad objectives. This is because most of the available resources are required to implement ongoing and identified projects during the short programming period.

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. TIMING OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND RELATED ASPECTS	3
III. NATURE OF PREPARATORY WORK	4
IV. FINANCING OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMMES	5
V. MAJOR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND ORIENTATION OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES	7
VI. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES	8
VII. PRE-INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES AND INVESTMENT SUPPORT	10
VIII. GLOBAL PRIORITIES	10

Annexes

I	Basic information on timing of country programmes and related aspects
II	Basic information on the nature of the programming exercise
III	Financial aspects of country programmes
IV	Abstract of major national development objectives, country programme orientation and relationship with bilateral, other multilateral programmes and regional programmes
V	Distribution of resources by sector
VI	Attention to global priorities

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is the eleventh in a series produced in response to a request of the Governing Council at its twenty-first session to be kept informed of relevant trends and problems of country programmes. It is based on the analysis of seven country programmes which are being submitted to the Council for approval at its thirty-first session. The present set of country programmes is the smallest group analyzed for these reports, the first of which was submitted to the twenty-third session in January 1977. General conclusions from such a small sample of programmes are difficult. However, some of the characteristics emerging from the present seven programmes are common with those found in the earlier analyses of much larger groups.
2. With the submission of the seven programmes to the current session, 142 country programmes for the third programming cycle will have been submitted to the Council for approval. This leaves only four third cycle programmes to be submitted to future sessions: Guatemala; Indonesia; Qatar; and Suriname. The present submission includes programmes from all regions except Europe. There are two from Africa: Benin and Swaziland; two from Asia and the Pacific: Afghanistan and Singapore; two from Latin America: Bolivia and El Salvador; and one from the Arab States: Lebanon. Requests for extension of the second cycle programmes of two countries are submitted separately - Guatemala (DP/CP/GUA/EXTENSION) and Suriname (DP/CP/SUR/EXTENSION).
3. In the case of El Salvador and Lebanon, where the economies are disrupted greatly and programme implementation is limited throughout their entire territories, the present programmes were prepared with the expectation that the situation will change in such a way as to permit their implementation. The Afghanistan programme is composed of projects which, taking into account the guidelines established by the United Nations Security Co-ordinator, are located within specified areas, and can be realistically carried out and adequately meet their objectives.

II. TIMING OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND RELATED ASPECTS

4. Basic information on timing and related aspects of the country programmes is provided in annex I. Five of the seven programmes submitted represent the third country programmes of the respective countries. The exceptions are Lebanon and Singapore. For Lebanon, it is the second country programme. Due to circumstances beyond its control, the Government of Lebanon was unable to submit a programme for the second cycle; consequently, during the period 1978-1983 the Administrator approved projects under the authority given to him by the Governing Council in its decisions 82/4 and 83/14. Singapore is submitting its fifth country programme; the fourth having covered the first three years (1982-1984) of the third IPF cycle.
5. In accordance with Governing Council decision 81/15, no country programme is to be submitted to the Council for retroactive approval for a period longer than six months. The present programmes, except for the programme of Singapore, which is for 1985-1986, commence in January 1984. The Council is requested to approve retroactively the programme activities during the first six months, with the exception of Singapore, in order to facilitate continued activities and timely implementation. The duration of the Benin country programme, 1984-1987, extends beyond the third IPF cycle and includes the first year of the fourth cycle. All

the other submitted country programmes are completely within the third IPF cycle, with the previous country programmes covering the first two years of this cycle, mostly by extension. The fact that most of the programmes have been deliberately kept within the third IPF cycle, even though it made their duration relatively short, demonstrates once again and more conclusively the preference of the Governments to align their country programmes to the IPF cycle.

III. NATURE OF PREPARATORY WORK

6. Annex II provides basic information on the nature of the country programming exercise. According to the Consensus (General Assembly resolution 2688(XXV)), a major guiding principle for country programming is that the country programme should be based on the Government's development objectives and priorities, preferably as formulated in the national development plan, where available. Almost all the present country programmes are related to the respective Governments' development objectives and priorities. However, only the country programme of Benin is based on a formal development plan, its Second State Plan for 1983-1987. Indeed, Benin's national development objectives and priorities were thoroughly reviewed and defined in connection with the round-table meeting held in February-March 1983 in the context of the Substantial New Programme of Action (SNPA) for Least Developed Countries. UNDP being the lead agency to assist the Government in the preparation of the round-table meeting, the country programme preparation immensely benefitted from the preparation, deliberations and outcome of the round-table meeting. For three countries - Bolivia, El Salvador and Swaziland - medium-term development plans were under preparation at the time their country programmes were being formulated, and these programmes are based on the national objectives and priorities being developed for the ensuing plans.

7. Three sectoral studies were carried out in Benin as part of the preparatory work for the 1983 round-table meeting. Such in-depth sectoral studies were not undertaken for other country programmes, although a few project identification missions were carried out by some United Nations system agencies. The limited UNDP resources available for programming, after the reduction of the illustrative IPF by 45 per cent for programming purposes, and the relatively short duration of the programmes did not justify in-depth sectoral studies. Moreover, the abnormal political and social conditions prevailing in some countries precluded undertaking such studies.

8. An overall assessment of technical co-operation requirements was made systematically only in Benin in connection with the round-table meeting. The Lebanese Government prepared a document entitled "Technical Assistance Fund for Development Planning", which was useful in determining the scope of the UNDP programme in that country. For the preparation of the other country programmes, no such overall assessment of technical co-operation was made. The reason is that the total requirements of technical co-operation obviously far exceeded what the UNDP resources could finance, and the Governments found little reason to invest resources and efforts to make an overall assessment of their needs.

9. A joint review of the implementation of the previous UNDP country programme was carried out by the resident representative with the Government in most of the countries, although not always formally. In Afghanistan, the resident representative and the Government jointly reviewed the second country programme, as a step toward the preparation of the third country programme. In Benin, the

preparation for the round-table meeting and the UNDP country programme made a review of the previous country programme essential. In Bolivia, the exercise for the extension of the second country programme provided an opportunity for review of that programme. The El Salvador country programme mentions that it has been based on the experience gained in the implementation of the second country programme. In Singapore and Swaziland, the ongoing projects were subjected to tripartite reviews before the formulation of the new country programmes.

10. A note by the resident representative in the form of an informal written communication to the Government offering his considered views and suggestions on the orientation of the UNDP programme in the country, was prepared for only two programmes: for Benin, before the request for the second extension of its previous programme; and for Lebanon, for the preparation of its present programme. The resident representative's note was not deemed necessary in other countries because of extensive consultation with the Governments.

11. With regard to agency programming missions, the situation varies from country to country. In Benin, project identification missions were also organized, in addition to sectoral studies, for the 1983 round-table meeting, which provided valuable inputs for the UNDP country programme. In El Salvador, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) undertook project identification missions. For Lebanon and Singapore, the agencies provided views and suggestions. Agency participation in country programming for Afghanistan and Bolivia was concentrated in the identification and preparation of certain projects by their field representatives in these countries. In Swaziland, the agencies were not encouraged by the Government to send any programming missions in view of the very low level of resources available for new projects. However, in all cases, extensive consultations took place between the agency representatives, project experts, Government officials and the officials of the UNDP field offices.

12. Regarding co-ordination with other technical assistance programmes, all the country programme documents refer to activities of other donors. Co-ordination with the programmes of other organizations of the United Nations system is greater than with the sources outside the system. The country programme of Bolivia has particularly taken into account the activities of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Decade for Women, the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development (UNFSSTD) and the World Food Programme (WFP). The El Salvador country programme, in addition to the programmes carried out by some of these organizations and funds, mentions the programmes of the United States Government and the Inter-American Development Bank. Such co-ordination of UNDP programmes with other programmes is not limited to the avoidance of duplication, but attention has also been given to the complementarity between programmes assisted by various sources.

IV. FINANCING OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

13. The financial resources of the submitted country programmes comprise the illustrative IPFs of the respective countries for the third cycle, reduced by 45 per cent in the light of availability of funds, minus the amount already expended in the years of the cycle covered in the previous country programmes, plus any balance available from the IPF allocations of the second cycle, plus Government

cost-sharing and third-party cost-sharing, and plus allocations from special funds administered by UNDP. Financial information regarding the individual countries is contained in annex III. A financial summary regarding the seven countries as a whole is presented below:

Financial resources of the seven submitted country programmes

	(Millions US dollars)
Illustrative IPFs for the third cycle (1982-1986)	166.2 ^{a/}
<u>Minus</u> unprogrammed balance (45% of IPFs)	(73.1)
<u>Minus</u> expenditures in earlier years of the cycle	(36.9)
Balance from IPFs for second cycle (1977-1981)	16.3
Government cost-sharing ^{b/}	7.4
Third-party cost-sharing ^{c/}	12.3
Special funds administered by UNDP ^{d/}	<u>2.3</u>
Total programmable resources	<u>94.5</u>

^{a/} Includes \$3.7 million representing Benin's provisional programming level for 1987.

^{b/} Bolivia, El Salvador, Lebanon, Singapore and Swaziland.

^{c/} Bolivia.

^{d/} Afghanistan (LDC), Swaziland (LLDC).

14. The total resources available for the seven country programmes amount to \$94.5 million, ranging from \$2 million for Swaziland to \$37.6 million for Afghanistan.

15. The total illustrative IPFs of the seven countries for the third cycle amount to \$162.5 million. However, as much as \$73.1 million representing 45 per cent of the total illustrative IPFs is not available for programming, in accordance with Governing Council decision 80/30 (paragraph 4(a)). The total amount of illustrative IPFs actually programmed is a little more than what the above figures indicate, since in the country programme of Benin the unprogrammed IPF represents 20 per cent, and not 45 per cent as for the other country programmes. This is because Benin's country programming exercise was completed before the decision to base country programmes at 55 per cent of illustrative IPF, rather than 80 per cent, was communicated to the Government. However, project approvals will be kept within the limit of 55 per cent of the illustrative IPF. Since the Benin country programme extends to the first year of the fourth IPF cycle, an amount equivalent to one fifth of Benin's illustrative IPF for the third cycle, reduced by 45 per cent, has been added to represent the UNDP resources available for the country in that year (1987). For Lebanon, in accordance with Governing Council decision 83/13, the illustrative IPF for the third cycle was retained at \$10 million, equal to the amount for the second cycle. The country programme of Lebanon has been prepared on this financial basis, subject to the adjustments as mentioned.

16. Since all the country programmes submitted to the Council begin around the middle of the third IPF cycle, the estimated actual expenditures for the years of the cycle preceding the start of the country programmes had to be deducted in order to derive the net amounts available for programming. In addition to the third

cycle IPFs, appropriately adjusted, unused balances from the second cycle IPFs have been added for the purpose of programming. Such balances amount to \$16.3 million or 17.3 per cent of the programmed resources of the seven countries.

17. Other resources programmed include \$7.4 million Government cost-sharing, \$12.3 million third-party cost-sharing and \$2.3 million from other sources of funds administered by UNDP. The proportion of Government cost-sharing is relatively low for the countries in the present submission, as compared to previous submissions. For the present seven countries, Government cost-sharing constitutes 7.8 per cent of programmed resources compared to 10 per cent in the 117 programmes approved during 1982 and 1983. Government cost-sharing features in the programmes of Bolivia, El Salvador, Lebanon, Singapore and Swaziland. The third-party cost-sharing in the amount of \$12.25 million in Bolivia far exceeds the total Government cost-sharing in five countries. The main source of this third-party cost-sharing is the Government of Italy, but some contributions are also expected from Spain and the Federal Republic of Germany. Contributions from other funds administered by UNDP include \$2.27 million for Afghanistan from the Special Measures Fund for Least Developed Countries and a small amount of \$55,000 for Swaziland from the Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

V. MAJOR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND ORIENTATION OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

18. Abstracts of the major development objectives and strategies of the Governments, the objectives selected to orient UNDP country programmes, and the relationship of the country programmes with other multilateral and bilateral programmes of technical co-operation in the individual countries are contained in annex IV.

19. Governments normally formulate their country programmes within the framework of their national development objectives and priorities which vary according to the prevailing national development situation in the individual countries. In the countries which are afflicted by political and social conflicts resulting in the destruction of economic assets and physical facilities as well as in the loss of income, the natural preoccupation of the Governments is to grapple with the negative effects of the conflicts by providing basic services, e.g. housing, health, education, etc. to the affected population and by rebuilding the physical infrastructure. The other countries also have their own special development priorities. For example, in Bolivia, adverse economic factors, financial stringencies of the public enterprises, effects of natural disasters, volume of public debt, drug traffic, etc. are the priority problems to be tackled by the Government's development plan and policies. Singapore, which is relatively richer and much more industrialized than the other countries, is concerned with further upgrading and restructuring the economy to achieve a higher value added of its products and to remain competitive in the international market. On the other hand, the development strategies of Benin and Bolivia seek economic growth through the expansion of the internal market. However, there are some development objectives which are common to all the seven countries. These are: to improve the living conditions of the population, especially the less favoured sections, through increased production and better distribution; to attain economic self-reliance; to make the public sector more efficient; and to develop human resources for the maximum exploitation of their potential within the given period of time.

20. A country programme formulated by a Government to use UNDP resources should, of course, reflect the national development objectives and priorities pursued by the Government. However, the relationship between national development objectives and the UNDP country programme orientation is confined to the technical co-operation aspects of development, whereas the range of national development objectives is much broader and involves activities for which external assistance may not be essential. Furthermore, the technical co-operation programme supported by one single source cannot relate to as many development objectives as the total technical assistance received from all sources.

21. In the country programmes before the current session of the Council, the dominant areas for UNDP co-operation are human resources development and institution-building, especially strengthening Government entities. Individual programmes, however, vary especially in terms of sectoral allocations which is discussed later in this report. Governments also exercise varying options to attain the highest possible development impact from the use of UNDP resources. Some Governments, such as Bolivia and El Salvador, have opted for short-duration projects. These Governments have preferred to deploy UNDP resources in areas where assistance through the United Nations system is considered especially appropriate, or where UNDP can play an effective catalytic role by assuring co-operation between various sources of assistance. The programmes for El Salvador and Lebanon reflect the reconstruction needs of these countries; the Benin programme gives importance to the realization of the investment programmes generally endorsed by the round-table meeting and a substantial amount of IPF resources have been allocated by the Government for concrete follow-up activities. The Singapore programme is focussed on manpower development and upgrading of technology.

22. Some of the country programmes give consideration to cost-effective implementation. Most of the programmes note the preference for increased government execution of projects, increased role of national counterparts and increased use of national professionals.

VI. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

23. Information on the allocation of programmable resources to ongoing projects, new projects, broad objectives and reserve is contained in annex III. For the seven programmes combined, the weighted percentage allocations to these categories are 39, 47, 6 and 8 respectively.

24. While 39 per cent of the total UNDP resources programmed has been allocated to ongoing projects, this percentage is substantially higher for Afghanistan, Lebanon and Swaziland. The reason for the relatively higher allocation to ongoing projects in Afghanistan is the decision of the Government to continue UNDP support for the institution-building projects which have started recently. In terms of number of projects, however, 30 out of 53 projects contained in the Afghanistan programme are new. In Lebanon, in addition to continuing support for institution-building projects, resources have been demanded by ongoing activities to provide basic services to the population affected by the social conflict and to repair and restore damaged physical infrastructure. For Swaziland, the explanation for a very high - 74 per cent - allocation to ongoing projects lies in its very small volume of resources available for programming, which is largely pre-empted by the demands from ongoing projects.

25. The average allocation to new projects is 47 per cent, but it is the highest for Bolivia - about 76 per cent - due to the Government's intention to submit new projects requiring a high percentage of cost-sharing to a donors' conference scheduled for 1984. The weight of new projects in the Benin programme owes to the identification of many such projects for the round-table meeting held in 1983.

26. It may be noted that programming by objectives is very limited in the currently submitted country programmes - only 6 per cent of the total programmed resources. A high allocation in El Salvador - 57 per cent - is due to the decision of the Government that priorities should be thoroughly revised by the new Government after the 1984 election. This aspect of programming in the presently submitted country programmes does not imply any less readiness on the part of the Governments to resort to continuous programming. It really implies that there is little scope to apply this principle in the present cases where the duration of the programme is shorter than usual. The provision of reserves is also low for the same reason, i.e. short duration of the programmes. It is 8 per cent for the programmed resources as a whole, but for Benin it is much higher - 19 per cent. In the Singapore country programme, the total amount programmed for projects exceeds available resources, resulting in a small negative balance. In the event of any major changes in priorities during the programming period in this country, a thorough reprogramming may become necessary.

27. The allocation of resources by sector in the seven country programmes, as shown in annex V, is similar to that revealed in the analysis of country programmes approved by the Council in the past. Agriculture continues to be the largest claimant, receiving 30 per cent of the total resources. This percentage is somewhat higher than what was seen in the 72 country programmes examined for the May 1982 meeting of the Governing Council (26 per cent), but it is exactly the same as was found in the 20 country programmes considered by the Council in June 1983. The sectoral distribution in the individual programmes varies; three countries have allocated a greater share of their resources to sectors other than agriculture. Bolivia has allocated as much as 52 per cent to the natural resources sector and 19 per cent to the industries sector, compared to only 12 per cent to agriculture; Lebanon has allocated 32 and 26 per cent, respectively, to the transport and communications and health sectors, compared to 14 per cent to agriculture; and Singapore has allocated nothing to agriculture, as its programme is practically limited to human resources (53 per cent) and industries (45 per cent). Natural resources development and human resources development (education and employment sectors) each receiving 14-15 per cent, follow agriculture in resource allocation, for the seven programmes combined. The share of development policy and planning remains 11 per cent, as previously. Next in importance is the transport and communication sector, receiving 10 per cent of the combined resources.

28. The Governing Council expressed interest in being informed of the amount of the equipment component in the country programmes submitted for its approval. From the descriptions given in the country programme documents, it is not possible to make an estimate of the equipment component envisaged in the currently submitted programmes. Information on input costs will be firmed up when the project details are spelled out; however, it is expected that the equipment component for the country programmes presently submitted will not be unduly high.

VII. PRE-INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES AND INVESTMENT SUPPORT

29. The emphasis on pre-investment projects, which was found in the country programmes for the third cycle already approved by the Council, is also present in the group of country programmes now under consideration. A majority of the country programme documents contains evidence of pre-investment activities. Even where it is not specifically mentioned in the country programme document, proposed activities in the form of natural resources surveys and identification of industrial or mineral development projects imply the expectation that such activities would be followed by capital investments. Among the programmes under consideration, the documents of Benin, Bolivia and El Salvador contain statements expressing the importance accorded to pre-investment activities. No estimation of the approximate level of pre-investment activities contained or implied in the programmes is possible from the available information, but the previous estimates of 10 per cent or higher made for the country programmes submitted to the earlier sessions of the Council may well apply to the programmes presently submitted.

30. The use of UNDP resources in support of investment projects is proposed also in the submitted programmes. This was the case with regard to the programmes approved previously. There are specific UNDP technical co-operation projects often in conjunction with other financing institutions, such as development banks and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which are designed to promote investment in some key sectors. The Benin country programme specifically indicates that the realization of investment proposals presented to the 1983 round-table meeting is an important objective of the programme.

VIII. GLOBAL PRIORITIES

31. Generally, the support of national objectives has been the primary concern in the formulation of country programmes. The country programmes now submitted have taken into account as much as possible, and to varying degrees, the global or regional development objectives as the basis for the deployment of UNDP resources. Some global priorities, such as the needs of the poor, technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) and women in development have received greater attention than other global priorities. Annex VI contains information on the attention given to some specific global priorities. Food security is indicated as a priority area both generally and for projects in two country programmes, and only generally in another programme. Two country programmes have mentioned the objective of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (IDWSSD) both generally and in specific projects. Environment and the International Year for Disabled Persons (IYDP) have not been mentioned as a concern in the present set of country programmes.

32. The productive and economic linkages between the country programmes now submitted and the intercountry programmes of UNDP are somewhat limited. Some of the country programmes have mentioned participation in certain intercountry projects, and some programmes have taken into account the existence of relevant intercountry facilities in determining the need for equivalent services at the national level.

Annex I

Basic information on timing of country programmes and related aspects

Country	Sequence of country programme	Duration of country programme	Time frame of national dev. plan, if any	Overlap of CP with national dev. plan	Overlap of CP with third IPF cycle	Number of months included retroactively
Afghanistan	Third	1984-1986	-	-	Partial	6
Benin	Third	1984-1987	1983-1987 Second State Plan	Partial	Partial	6
Bolivia	Third	1984-1986	1984-1987 (under prep.)	Partial	Partial	6
El Salvador	Third	1984-1986	1984-1985 (under prep.)	Partial	Partial	6
Lebanon	Second	1984-1986	-	-	Partial	6
Singapore	Fifth	1985-1986	-	-	Partial	-
Swaziland	Third	1984-1986	(Fourth Plan under prep.)	-	Partial	6

Annex II

Basic information on the nature of the programming exercise

Country	National plan or other guiding documents	Sectoral studies	Assessment of overall external assistance requirements	Res.rep. formal assessment of prior country programming exercise	Res.rep. note	Agency programming mission for country programming exercise	Co-ordination with other sources of assistance
Afghanistan	Annual Plans 1982/83 1983/84	No	No	Yes Jointly with Government	No	No New projects originated from identification and formulation that preceded CP	Yes with United Nations organizations
Benin	Second State Plan for 1983- 1987 and docs for 1983 round-table meeting	Yes For round- table meeting, 1983	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes for round-table meeting	Yes
Bolivia	National Dev. Plan under preparation	No	No	Extension of second CP provided oppor- tunity for joint review with Government	No	Agency participation concentrated on identification/ formulation of certain projects	Yes With programmes of UNFPA, UNCDF UNVFDW, UNFSST and WFP

Country	National plan or other guiding documents	Sectoral studies	Assessment of overall external assistance requirements	Res.rep. formal assessment of prior country programming exercise	Res.rep. note	Agency programming mission for country programming exercise	Co-ordination with other sources of assistance
El Salvador	National Emergency Plan for 1980, National Reactivation Plan for 1983 and National Plan for 1984- 1985 under preparation	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes Project identification missions by FAO and UNIDO	Yes
Lebanon	Reconstruction Assessment by World Bank and Tech. Assist. Fund for Dev. Planning by Government	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Singapore	Annual Budget Plan for 1980s	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (with United Nations system organizations)
Swaziland	Fourth Plan under prep.	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

/...

Annex III
Financial aspects of country programmes

Country	Illustrative IPF for third cycle (1)	Unprogrammable balance ^{a/} (2)	Expenditures in earlier years of third cycle (3) (Thousands US dollars)	Balance from second cycle (4)	Other resources (5)	Total resources available for programming (1-2-3+4+5) (6)	Allocation of resources			
							Ongoing projects	New projects	Broad objectives	reserve
							%	%	%	%
Afghanistan	71 500	(32 180)	(10 875)	6 880	2 270 <u>b/</u>	37 600	67.5	31.8	0.7	-
Benin	33 500	(6 700)	(7 831)	-	3 685 <u>c/</u>	22 654	22.3	59.1	-	18.6
Bolivia	19 500	(8 775)	(4 161)	820	3 129 <u>d/</u> 12 250 <u>e/</u>	22 763	9.4	75.8	3.7	11.1
El Salvador	12 250	(6 863)	(3 806)	927	1 500 <u>d/</u>	7 008	2.8	35.0	57.2	5.0
Lebanon	10 000	(4 500)	(4 524)	5 524	1 925 <u>d/</u>	8 425	50.9	27.3	12.8	9.0
Singapore	7 500	(3 375)	(4 214)	1 916	642 <u>d/</u>	2 469	46.8	54.4	-	(1.2)
Swaziland	5 750	(2 588)	(1 505)	271	208 <u>d/</u> 55 <u>f/</u>	2 191	75.9	-	24.1	-

- ^{a/} Forty-five per cent of illustrative IPF, except for Benin where 20 per cent of illustrative IPF.
^{b/} Special Measures Fund for Least Developed Countries.
^{c/} Estimated IPF for 1987 (one-fifth of third cycle IPF, reduced to 55 per cent).
^{d/} Government cost sharing.
^{e/} Third-party cost sharing.
^{f/} Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

Annex IV

Abstract of major national development objectives, country programme orientation
and relationship with bilateral, other multilateral programmes and regional programmes

Country	Special classification	National development objectives and strategy	Objectives selected for UNDP assistance and CP orientation	Relationship with bilateral, other multilateral and regional programmes
Afghanistan	Least developed country; Land-locked dev. country; Most seriously affected	Overall development goal is to improve the living conditions of the people. Twin objectives of increased production and a better distribution of economic benefits.	Institution building and human resources development are given high priority on a cross-sectoral basis. Agricultural sector remains dominant for UNDP assistance, but, compared to second CP, the industrial sector has been given a greater emphasis in third CP.	The programming exercise has led to the establishment of closer and substantive linkage between activities supported by United Nations system agencies. Country programme is related to activities of UNFPA, UNICEF and United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.
Benin	Least developed	Development strategy aimed to attain self-reliance, creation of internal market, strengthening absorption capacity, and increased capital formation.	UNDP programme to support activities for rural development, mass participation, greater regional balance, increased production and realization of investment programme presented to the round-table meeting.	UNDP CP is prepared in the context of the programmes of other sources as indicated in the round-table meeting.
Bolivia	Land-locked developing	Development policy addressed to the problems of economic disorganization, financial crisis of public enterprises and the volume of public debt. Growth to be generated through expansion of internal market. Tackling the problem of natural disaster and arresting the deterioration in the living condition of the people are given high priority.	Apart from supporting Gov't general development objectives, UNDP activities are to meet the criteria of short duration, concentration on limited area for highest impact and greater role of national professionals. Emphasis given on exploration of natural resources.	UNDP activities to serve as catalysts of other sources of multilateral and bilateral assistance.

Country	Special classification	National development objectives and strategy	Objectives selected for UNDP assistance and CP orientation	Relationship with bilateral, other multilateral and regional programmes
El Salvador	Most seriously affected	Government's development objectives to be defined clearly after the Presidential election scheduled for 1984. Interim policies are directed to overcome the negative effects of the prevailing political and economic instability.	UNDP assistance oriented to projects which are productive in the short term, having a longer term impact on the living condition of the rural population.	Government wishes to make UNDP country programme as a frame of reference for the programmes of other United Nations system organizations.
Lebanon	-	Government's major development preoccupation is to reconstruct the economy destroyed by the social conflicts.	UNDP programme is formulated in the overall context of the reconstruction needs and is specially concentrated on the strengthening of government institutions, manpower resources and providing "seed money" to attract investment.	UNDP programme is formulated considering its complementarity with the activities of other sources of assistance.
Singapore	-	To upgrade and restructure the economy to achieve higher value in production, and to remain competitive in the international market.	UNDP programme concentrates on manpower resources development and upgrading of technology.	UNDP programme takes into account the various technical assistance activities financed by multilateral, bilateral donors especially United Nations system agencies.
Swaziland	Land-locked developing	Plan under preparation. CP does not discuss national development objectives.	In view of very limited programmable resources, CP approach is project-oriented, mainly to continue priority ongoing activities.	In selecting projects for UNDP assistance, account has been taken of the activities of other sources of assistance, especially United Nations system organizations.

Annex V
Distribution of resources, by sectors
(percentages)

Country	Planning & adm.	Natural resources	Agriculture	Industry	Transport & comm.	Trade	Human Settlement	Health	Education	Employment	Social condition	Science & technology	Other
Afghanistan	7.5	2.4	36.1	9.3	8.9	4.2	-	4.7	14.3	5.2	-	3.4	4.0
Benin	16.6	9.3	41.2	5.6	8.9	-	-	-	15.9		-	-	2.5
Bolivia	12.2	52.2	11.6	18.5	-	-	2.3	-	-	2.5	0.7	-	-
El Salvador	11.8	-	35.2	28.3	-	8.6	8.1	-	6.9	-	-	-	1.1
Lebanon	7.8	-	13.6	2.6	31.6	2.6	-	25.7	13.0	-	-	-	3.1
Singapore	-	-	-	44.8	2.6	-	-	-	52.6		-	-	-
Swaziland	7.3	-	34.2	-	31.1	-	7.1	-	8.4	10.6	1.3	-	-
All countries (weighted)	10.8	14.3	30.0	8.4	9.7	2.5	1.2	4.0	14.7		0.2	1.4	2.8

Annex VI

Attention to global priorities

(Country programmes were examined with respect to whether seven selected global priorities were highlighted as being a national or country programming objective, and whether the country programmes included projects specifically related to these objectives)

[illegible]