



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

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/1988/SR.32  
19 October 1988

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirty-fifth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 24 June 1988, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Leenstra (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

programme implementation

e) United Nations Development Programme co-operation with non-governmental organizations and grass-roots organizations

ther funds and programmes

g) United Nations Capital Development Fund

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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

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.

CONTENTS (continued)

Programme implementation

- (a) Implementation of decisions adopted by the Governing Council at previous sessions
  - (iii) Support to drug control programmes

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 1987

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (agenda item 4)

(e) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME CO-OPERATION WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GRASS-ROOTS ORGANIZATIONS (DP/1988/15)

1. Ms. TIMPSON (Director, Division for Non-Governmental Organizations) said that, since 1979, the Governing Council had on several occasions requested UNDP to involve grass-roots organizations and non-governmental organizations in activities sponsored by the Programme. Over that period, the concept of development had evolved, with the realization that development could not be limited to economic growth and material gains, but also needed to encompass human resources development, the quality of life and environmental protection. Questioning the merits of "supply-driven" development, the international community had found increasing evidence that actions taken by people to help themselves led to a more viable and independent process of development. Efforts had thereafter been focused on entering into a dialogue with the recipients and using local capabilities instead of imposing inappropriate concepts and techniques. Those strategies had been applied first to primary health care, support to the informal micro-infrastructure, community forestry and rural development. Intermediaries had been needed, of course, to bring together technical experts and villagers. UNDP had found that non-governmental organizations, both indigenous and external, had often been best able to perform that role. Moreover, those organizations served as a kind of laboratory, trying out new ideas which, if successful, could then be applied more widely. It had also become clear that, in emergency situations, non-governmental organizations in donor countries were able to mobilize private resources far beyond those available from Governments. In addition, those organizations could help a wider audience in the donor countries to appreciate the problems of the developing world: for example, several important European NGOs had taken a strong position on debt relief.

2. The Administrator's report showed that the response to co-operation with grass-roots organizations and NGOs had been enthusiastic in a number of countries. Many government officials had appreciated the considerable advantages of enlisting the support of NGOs for national development efforts and almost half of the field offices had been involved in initiatives of that kind. All the same, UNDP was not imposing such co-operation, but merely responding to specific requests.

3. Perhaps because of UNDP's neutrality, Governments had frequently asked it to establish initial contacts with the NGO sector. In 27 countries, the Programme had assisted in organizing workshops or consultations with the participation of Governments, UNDP, the specialized agencies and NGOs. Several countries had requested UNDP to provide support to NGO associations, on the understanding that it was easier to enter into dialogue with a sector which was itself co-ordinated. In those countries, UNDP was supporting government/NGO liaison units and one Government had set aside 10 per cent of its IPF for NGO activities.

4. UNDP had also assisted Governments in following up the donor round-table meetings with NGO round-table meetings, with the result that a number of donors had committed additional resources to grass-roots projects, in

particular for poverty alleviation. Moreover, experiments were being carried out with new mechanisms for channelling resources directly to community groups to support their initiatives. While most of the above activities had been initiated in a spontaneous manner by Governments and UNDP offices, the Administration had nevertheless recognized the need for closer study of the potential benefits and possible constraints of collaboration between Governments, UNDP and non-governmental organizations. In 1988, therefore, the Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific had organized a government/UNDP/NGO workshop in Bangladesh to identify areas of mutual interest and concrete steps for joint action. UNDP intended to hold one or two more such workshops in the African region in 1988, if possible, in association with the specialized agencies.

5. The Partners in Development Programme, launched earlier in the year in 40 countries, also served to promote better understanding of the ways in which NGOs could contribute to the development process. Grants had already been provided for eight projects relating to such diverse activities as the pilot programme to combat youth drug abuse in Uruguay and a community group's dried meat enterprise in Botswana. Those initial explorations had brought forth a number of innovative proposals and expressions of interest in other countries. To pursue the programme, the Administrator recommended an allocation of \$1 million from special programme resources in 1989, 1990 and 1991 for those activities.

6. The Africa 2000 Network Programme had been started up in 1988 under UNDP auspices, with contributions from the Governments of Canada, Denmark and Italy. At a meeting in Nairobi in March 1988, NGO representatives and technical experts had approved a two-pronged strategy to channel funds through African NGOs for specific community-defined activities and, at the same time, to strengthen the technical capabilities of those organizations, as well as communication between them and governmental and intergovernmental technical services.

7. UNDP's associated funds and programmes, particularly the United Nations Volunteers and UNIFEM, had shown the way in those new directions through their own pioneering grass-roots and NGOs activities. The interest generated by the action described above could be judged from the increasing number of Governments requesting assistance, the growing number of NGOs becoming aware of the advantages of co-ordinated efforts and the expanding perception of the enabling role which UNDP could play in that regard.

8. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that active community participation in the development process was the best guarantee of sustainable progress and it was therefore important to exploit the capabilities of NGOs, which were, for the reasons given in paragraph 3 of the Administrator's report (DP/1988/15), the most effective means of reaching out to communities. In such circumstances, there was a need to define the role that a body such as UNDP, which provided technical assistance mainly at the governmental level, should play in relation to those organizations. In his view, UNDP could mobilize resources for activities which were suitable for multilateral financing and which NGOs were best able to carry out. It could also, within the framework of regional programmes, encourage Governments to collaborate more widely with non-governmental organizations and, lastly, it could make its executing agencies better aware of the capabilities of NGOs to implement some projects alone or to assist the major agencies in programme implementation. At the

same time, it was clear that any support provided by UNDP to NGOs in the field must correspond to the development priorities established by the Government concerned.

9. Mr. OMAR (Sudan) said that, in his country, several NGOs were successfully implementing bilateral and multilateral technical co-operation projects, as well as training projects focused mainly on rural development. Those organizations were playing an important role in various economic and social sectors in many countries and could thus give grass-roots communities the benefit of their very wide-ranging experience. He paid a tribute to the NGOs and urged them to continue their effective work.

10. Mr. MATSVAYI (Zimbabwe) said that his Government's development policy emphasized consultation and participation at all stages in the selection, design and implementation of projects so as to involve the entire population and make sustainable development possible. The NGOs, working closely with specific target groups of the population to assist them in overcoming particular difficulties, were a logical extension of such a policy. His Government had been greatly appreciative of the contribution to national development efforts made by the grass-roots organizations and NGOs which had undertaken bilateral assistance projects and it was keen to make wider use of such organizations through UNDP. He therefore wished to know what procedure was to be adopted for that purpose. He would also be grateful to receive the case studies and other training materials referred to in paragraph 8 of the document under consideration, as well as the report of the training seminar on NGO and grass-roots matters held recently in Bangladesh. Those documents would undoubtedly help to provide national managers with a better understanding of how that system of assistance worked.

11. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) noted with satisfaction that greater emphasis was to be placed on grass-roots approaches and NGO collaboration, and that the particular role of NGOs in development activities had been more clearly defined. He welcomed the very constructive idea of placing \$25,000 at the disposal of Resident Representatives for awards to selected NGOs activities under the Partners in Development Programme (DP/1988/15, para. 17). That was one way to extend some of UNDP's responsibilities to the forefront of development. He hoped that the Resident Representatives would make full use of those resources and felt that consideration could be given to increasing those resources by a modest amount as required.

12. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) supported UNDP's approach to co-operation with NGOs. He inquired whether the amount of \$25,000 would be allocated to Resident Representatives each year or for the whole of the period covered by the country programme and would be grateful for more information about the functions of the national screening committee referred to in paragraph 17 of the report.

13. Mr. TOMINO (Japan) welcomed the initiatives taken by UNDP to promote grass-roots autonomy and NGO participation in various technical co-operation projects. In that connection, Japan anticipated that it would participate with UNDP in financing a power network project in Nepal. He congratulated the NGO Division on the results it had already obtained and encouraged it to pursue those efforts.

14. Mr. PASQUIER (Switzerland) pointed out that, since the international community gave priority to the most well-known NGOs, financial resources were always channelled towards the same organizations, which, however competent, were no longer able in many cases to cope with the additional burden. To avoid that risk, UNDP should also support NGOs which were less well known but which had capacities that could be exploited. One purpose of the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries was to finance projects such as those of NGOs and grass-roots organizations and he wondered whether UNDP could use the Fund to that end. The management of small contributions to NGOs in recipient countries was a fairly large administrative task and he wished to know whether UNDP planned to reinforce its field office staff to deal with the additional workload, perhaps by hiring locally recruited personnel.

15. Mr. KATES (United States of America) congratulated UNDP on the initiatives it had taken to promote community participation in the planning and execution of local development activities, while at the same time requiring the integration of such activities with government policy. He was pleased to note that UNDP was placing more emphasis on collaboration between NGOs and field offices and that it was endeavouring to mobilize its staff, executing agencies and Governments towards grass-roots development. He noted also that the Division had issued a memorandum on grass-roots approaches (para. 7), had prepared case studies for staff training and was compiling a computerized data base. He welcomed the activities being carried out in that area under UNDP's associated funds and programmes (paras. 20 to 26) and encouraged UNDP to pursue its efforts to collaborate with the other United Nations bodies working with NGOs, in particular, UNICEF, FAO, IFAD and the World Bank.

16. Mr. KAIRO (Observer for Kenya) said that the Division for Non-Governmental Organizations was working in the right direction. His country knew from experience that the viability of a project was virtually assured when the local community was involved in it from the outset. Furthermore, the association between UNDP, NGOs and grass-roots organizations was designed in such a way as to enable NGOs to participate from the inside in the preparation and implementation of projects, an approach which was bound to be fruitful, provided that the NGOs involved were required to work in the region in which they were established. He was firmly convinced, moreover, that UNDP would be well advised to turn first to NGOs which had a wide audience in the country concerned.

17. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) approved the measures taken by UNDP to involve NGOs and grass-roots organizations in its activities and strongly hoped that such co-operation would be further intensified. Nevertheless, like the representative of Switzerland, he felt it necessary to warn UNDP against the danger of entrusting very large sums to grass-roots organizations. Lastly, he had the impression, at least from reading document DP/1988/15, that the NGO Division had not undertaken as many activities in Latin America as in other regions and he would like to know why.

18. Mr. LI Yang (China) said that his country had very recent experience of co-operation with UNDP through non-governmental organizations and the results obtained could already be regarded as positive. China was therefore inclined to support such co-operation, as long as it was consistent with the general agreement concluded between UNDP and the recipient Government. Such co-operation was still in its infancy and would certainly have to be improved. China would participate in the initiatives to be taken along those lines.

19. Ms. TIMPSON (Director, Division for Non-Governmental Organizations), replying to the questions raised during the discussion, said that she would provide the representative of Zimbabwe with all the information required concerning training courses and workshops organized at the grass-roots level. It might be useful to organize a similar operation in Harare, for that would no doubt convince the representative of Zimbabwe of the usefulness of such training activities.

20. The representatives of Switzerland and the Federal Republic of Germany had been right in advising caution regarding the selection of NGOs to be associated with UNDP's activities and in wishing to avoid too many resources being entrusted to them. It was through UNDP's field offices that the NGO Division contacted small and medium-sized grass-roots organizations to which it might be useful to allocate resources because the major donors were unaware of them.

21. UNDP also wished to avoid any duplication with activities already undertaken by other bodies. For that reason, at the Nairobi meeting on the establishment of a regional network of African NGOs engaged in collective forestry, UNDP had above all sought to gather information before considering what activities could be undertaken. Resources for non-governmental organizations were, however, already available, since 20 per cent of the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries was reserved for NGOs.

22. Some delegations had questioned whether the field offices had the required capacity to administer projects undertaken with NGOs. Projects of that kind were usually entrusted to the United Nations Volunteers or to grass-roots organizations. In the longer term, those projects would be entrusted exclusively to grass-roots or national organizations.

23. In reply to the question raised by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, she pointed out that the NGO Division was in no way neglecting Latin America. She had very recently been involved in the work of a study group on activities in Latin America under a number of projects to combat poverty. In Peru, UNDP was assisting a community organization to establish an industrial park for microenterprises and helping a national NGO to expand its credit scheme.

24. The representative of the Netherlands had asked whether the allocation of \$25,000 under the special Partners in Development Programme to each Resident Representative was renewable annually or whether it was intended to cover the whole IPF period. The NGO Division had taken the initiative to make such an allocation on an experimental basis, for 1988 only, reserving the right to judge from the results obtained whether to renew the payment each year for three years. The national screening committee established to participate in the selection of sponsored activities would be composed of representatives of the country concerned, voluntary associations and international and local NGOs. Under the circumstances, it was necessary to adapt very exactly to local situations, which varied considerably. For that reason, the NGO Division had tried as far as possible to decentralize its activities to field offices.

25. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 4 (e). He suggested that the Council should entrust the Drafting Group with the task of preparing a draft decision.

26. It was so decided.

OTHER FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES (agenda item 8)

(g) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

27. Mr. EVERTS (Executive Secretary, United Nations Capital Development Fund) said that, in principle, the Governing Council had not been due to consider the situation of the Fund in 1988. However, in response to repeated requests during the Council's previous session, UNCDF had distributed a report providing an account of its activities and policies.

28. The Fund's performance in 1987 had been encouraging. Quantitatively speaking, there had been considerable growth all round as compared with 1985: pledges and disbursements had both increased by 40 per cent and new project commitments had risen by 55 per cent to a record level of \$59 million. But gains had also been made in quality, since, after the Council's approval in 1987 of a new funding formula, there had been a larger supply of project proposals, which in turn had allowed UNCDF to be more selective and to aim for higher standards.

29. UNCDF had felt the need to pay more attention to the implementation of its capital assistance projects: some 20 implementation officers had been posted at various UNDP field offices and UNCDF was organizing supervisory and review missions, as well as evaluation. It was currently evaluating the results of its credit activities and low-cost housing efforts, two sectors in which it was likely to expand its role considerably in the near future.

30. The Fund's rapid growth, together with increased quality control and monitoring requirements, placed a considerable burden on its staff, particularly as UNCDF was bound by its mandate to be involved with small-scale projects that were just as labour-intensive as large-scale projects, especially in developing countries. In fact, the Fund was currently dealing with a large number of projects, including 192 ongoing projects, 30 under active preparation and many others in the pipeline. To consolidate the gains in 1987, it would need to recruit additional programming officers.

31. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) asked whether the 55 per cent rise in the Fund's commitments represented an increase in volume terms or in the total dollar amount. Aside from that consideration, the Fund deserved praise because it was endeavouring to respond to the demands made of it with clearly insufficient staff. While errors could always be corrected at Headquarters, it was more difficult to take remedial action in the field and it was in the field that the lack of staff posed a problem. It would therefore be useful for UNCDF to provide a detailed account of its workload and staffing requirements to the Governing Council in good time so that the Council could take a decision on the matter in June 1989.

32. Ms. GREDER (Observer for Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries had always been very interested in UNCDF and continued to be major contributors. They reiterated their support for the



Fund, whose unique mandate was to provide small-scale capital assistance to low-income populations in the least developed countries. The Nordic countries were pleased to note that, after the "shortfall" in the mid-1980s, contributions were continuing to increase and that expenditures and commitments had also risen impressively in 1987.

33. Mr. BABINGTON (Observer for Australia) considered that UNCDF had developed into a highly efficient organization despite its meagre resources. Furthermore, its geographical focus fit in perfectly with Australian priorities in the Asia and Pacific region. It would be advisable to increase the Fund's staff in recognition of the increased resources it had to administer, provided that its efficiency was not impaired as a result.

34. Mr. ROHNER (Switzerland) said that his country had consistently made relatively high contributions to UNCDF because it was the most important United Nations Fund for its size, as well as the most dynamic. For that reason, his country considered that the Council might be well advised to revert to annual consideration of the situation of the Fund. On the question of staffing, he supported the suggestion made by the representative of the United States: the Governing Council should be provided in 1989 with a detailed statement on the matter in order to be able to assist UNCDF in resolving the most pressing aspects of that problem.

35. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said that his delegation had been in favour of maintaining the rule of biennial consideration. The representative of Switzerland had just proposed that, as from 1989, the question of the United Nations Capital Development Fund should be examined each year. He wished to point out that the Council's agenda was very heavy and that it was necessary to establish priorities. Even if the biennial rhythm was maintained, that would not prevent the Executive Secretary of UNCDF from submitting full reports on the work of the Fund each year, perhaps under another agenda item. But that was a matter to be discussed at the next organizational session.

36. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) said that it ought to be possible to apply the two-year rule with some flexibility. The submission of an annual report made it possible at least to be aware of the situation concerning UNCDF or any other fund.

37. Mr. EVERTS (Executive Secretary, United Nations Capital Development Fund) answered various questions raised during the discussion.

38. As to the division of labour between the field offices and Headquarters, he agreed with the representative of the United States that, if there was to be any limitation on staff, it should certainly not be in the field. The Fund had always endeavoured to maintain a large enough presence in the field to ensure proper project implementation. During the past two years, the field offices had, in fact, been strengthened.

39. Concerning the periodicity of reports, he confirmed that it was very useful for the Fund to provide an account of its activities each year. If the Council approved its initiative, the Fund would in future submit such a report annually. The staffing situation was indeed the most serious problem confronting the Fund and he noted with satisfaction that the Governing Council was aware of it. He had himself made comparisons with other similar

organizations and had found that there were considerable differences and that the constraints on UNCDF were particularly heavy. He would report to the Council in February 1989 on the existing and projected volume of work and on the related problem of staffing.

40. The growth rate indicated in the report related to the total amount in United States dollars. Nevertheless, the number of projects had also increased and all country programme officers were now required to submit at least three projects per year. That represented a considerable amount of work, since programme officers were responsible for identifying, formulating and evaluating projects, drawing up project agreements and preparing for project implementation. They also supervised about 20 projects in the field. In conclusion, he indicated that the answers he had just given, as well as other information, would be issued later in more detailed form.

41. The PRESIDENT said that the discussion of agenda item 8 (g) had been completed. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to entrust the Drafting Group with the task of preparing a draft decision on that matter.

42. It was so decided.

#### PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (agenda item 4)

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

(iii) SUPPORT TO DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMMES (DP/1988/21)

43. Mr. HIRONO (Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) introduced the report of the Administrator (DP/1988/21) on UNDP activities related to drug abuse control. The activities undertaken in Africa were still relatively modest, but it appeared that countries were showing greater interest in drug abuse control and the number of projects was increasing. The highest concentration of activities was in the Latin America and Caribbean region and in Asia. In Thailand, one Norwegian NGO had provided greatly appreciated support.

44. He then read out the text of a statement by Mr. Di Gennaro, of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC). According to Mr. Di Gennaro, if there had been any doubts that drug abuse was a greater problem for developing than for industrialized countries, events of the past year had surely removed those doubts. Even in such countries as Nigeria, which had previously been little affected by that problem, there had been a dramatic increase in both trafficking and addiction. In others, production or trafficking had reached such proportions that the very fabric of society was under attack.

45. Just as drug trafficking knew no national boundaries, so the response to the drug abuse problem must be on an international scale. The international community had substantially increased UNFDAC's resources, which now totalled \$60 million. That was very little compared with the revenues of the major drug traffickers. UNFDAC was therefore seeking to use those resources as effectively as possible, for example by devoting more attention to education, especially among young people.

46. Being a small organization compared with UNDP, UNFDAC recognized that there was much to be gained from close collaboration with the Programme; that was why it had chosen UNDP to execute about 30 per cent of its projects. The UNDP/UNFDAC working agreement signed in 1987 was a model for co-operation between agencies of the United Nations system. UNDP Resident Representatives were entrusted to represent UNFDAC and to be the channel of communication between UNFDAC and Governments. The agreement also provided for UNFDAC field staff to be administered by UNDP and for rotation of professional staff between UNDP and UNFDAC.

47. Mr. PASQUIER (Switzerland) said that drug production was a reflection of demand and that the effect of crop substitution projects was simply to displace crops that were meant to be eliminated. That was precisely what had happened in the case of the Yungas project in Bolivia, for example, a project with which Switzerland was very familiar. The report of the Administrator was therefore much too optimistic in that regard. In fact, the key element in UNDP and UNFDAC activities was attitude-formation and education to make people aware of the effects of drug abuse.

48. Ms. DOHERTY (United Kingdom) said that she approved the activities which had just been outlined and was pleased to see that UNDP was providing support for the implementation of UNFDAC projects. The Fund could benefit from UNDP's experience. Furthermore, such collaboration should enable the Fund to reduce its own staff engaged in support activities, an approach that was fully consistent with UNDP's co-ordinating role in the operational activities of the United Nations.

49. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) welcomed the fact that UNDP was participating in a number of drug control activities. None the less, she believed that much more should be done in that area, particularly in the context of other UNDP-funded development projects. Having provided inputs to the preparation of the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking, UNDP should now undertake more specific follow-up activities, as should other bodies of the United Nations system. Her delegation would like the Administrator to report to the Council, at its next session, on the implementation of the Conference's recommendations. It also wished to emphasize the need in crop-growing areas to subordinate development assistance to the eradication of crops from which drugs were derived; otherwise real progress would be impossible.

50. Mr. HIRONO (Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) agreed with the representative of Switzerland that reduced consumption was essential for the success of drug control activities and that the most effective means of reducing consumption was certainly to focus on education and attitude-formation. Nevertheless, the delegation of the United States was also right to emphasize the importance of controlling production. Drug control was an excellent opportunity for UNDP and other United Nations agencies to strengthen their collaboration.

51. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Governing Council took note of document DP/1988/21.

52. It was so decided.

OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 10)

(a) UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM REGULAR AND EXTRABUDGETARY TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION EXPENDITURES (DP/1988/55; DP/1988/59)

53. Mr. HIRONO (Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) said that, for 1987, as in previous years, the report of the Administrator (DP/1988/55) had been prepared on the basis of detailed information supplied by the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The agencies had been requested not to provide data on expenditures incurred by them against funds administered by UNDP and UNFPA, since those data were being obtained from the funding organizations. The expenditures had been classified in accordance with the programme classification approved by ACC. The funding sources had been indicated according to the classification scheme adopted in 1980. The report also contained data made available by two non-technical co-operation bodies, namely, UNICEF and WFP, as well as information on disbursements made by the World Bank and the International Development Association.

54. Discussions were taking place on the establishment of a common register of development activities which would contain summary information in computerized form on the development activities of the entire United Nations system.

55. The PRESIDENT said that the consideration of agenda item 10 (a) had been completed. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to take note of documents DP/1988/55 and DP/1988/59.

56. It was so decided.

OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 10)

(b) ACTION TAKEN BY OTHER ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN 1987 (DP/1988/56 and Add.1)

57. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) pointed out that the two documents submitted to the Governing Council contained masses of instructions given to UNDP and other organizations of the United Nations system. To be sure, General Assembly resolution 42/196 must guide UNDP in its activities. Nevertheless, the numerous resolutions adopted during the past year by the General Assembly and by other organs such as the Economic and Social Council meant a considerable increase in UNDP's workload. In that connection, he would like to know what method UNDP used to determine how it could implement all those resolutions.

58. Referring to document DP/1988/56/Add.1, he recalled that, at its seventh session, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had also made many suggestions that were directly relevant to UNDP's activities on behalf of developing countries. However, there was little information on how those UNCTAD recommendations were being implemented. With regard to decision 604 (XXII) of the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), dealing with the United Nations Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, he asked whether it would be possible to know what was being done by UNDP and, in particular, by the Regional Bureau for Africa, in response to the requests of the Conference, in view of the considerable resources allocated to the programme for the Decade from the Special Programme Resources.

59. The ECA Ministers had also adopted decision 620 (XXII) on support to the island countries of the south-western Indian Ocean in their efforts to forecast cyclones and to reduce the adverse effects of such disasters. His delegation was pleased that mention had been made of that problem. The question was mainly of concern to the Asia and Pacific region, where discussion on that matter had led to the conclusion that there was not much UNDP could do at the present time. However, since the problem now affected not only the Asia and Pacific region, but Africa as well, UNDP might be able to make further efforts.

60. In conclusion, turning to the report of the FAO Conference cited on page 13 of document DP/1988/56/Add.1, he deplored the reference in paragraph 231 to the FAO "share" of UNDP-funded programmes. It was understandable that FAO should regret that it no longer benefited from massive UNDP funding, but there were very good reasons for that situation. Times were hard, programmes were becoming increasingly numerous and diversified and resources had to be shared.

61. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) said that the problem raised by the representative of New Zealand was also of concern to her delegation. The report submitted by FAO providing an account of its operational programme in fact stated that the FAO share of UNDP resources had increased during the Fourth Programming Cycle. During the discussion of that report, her delegation had pointed out that it was not possible to speak of a "share", since the proportion of UNDP projects to be executed by FAO or any other specialized agency was a matter for sovereign Governments to decide. In any event, it would be useful for the recipient Governments to make their views known on the matter, since they were the most directly concerned.

62. As to the quality of the projects in question, her delegation had noted that the problems raised in New York, within the framework of the UNDP Governing Council, regarding project quality, as well as project support and design, had not been mentioned in the FAO report, although it evidently dealt with the same projects. There ought to be no such discrepancy between the document submitted by FAO to its Council and its Conference regarding implementation of the UNDP programme, and what was said to the Governing Council. There, too, the countries receiving such assistance had a role to play.

63. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said that he was disturbed by the way in which the Governing Council was considering, or had to consider, action taken by other organs. Documents DP/1988/56 and Add.1 contained an impressive list of texts of decisions and resolutions, but no indication of what interested the Council members, namely, the specific measures taken by UNDP to implement those decisions. His delegation would have preferred the Administrator to compile a document indicating clearly what had been done by UNDP in response to particular decisions, rather than to enumerate and reproduce texts with which Governments should already be familiar.

64. Mr. PASQUIER (Switzerland), referring to the point raised by the United States delegation concerning the type of report that should be submitted by a specialized agency, said that the member countries of the UNDP Governing Council were also represented at the FAO Conference; it would therefore be more rational for the reports submitted to the organs which considered the FAO programme to be reproduced and submitted to the Governing

Council, and simply complemented by the observations of the UNDP Administration. That would provide a consistent picture of the relationship between the specialized agency and UNDP, and also between the governing body of the specialized agency and the UNDP Governing Council. Such rationalization was justified not only from the point of view of responsibility, but also from the administrative standpoint: there was no reason to present twice, in different forms and to the same Governments, activities that were being carried out under the same projects.

65. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that his main concern was to stress the very important role played by UNDP within the United Nations system. In his view, UNDP could do more to inform the international community about the excellent and essential work it was carrying out at the request of the United Nations system.

66. Document DP/1988/56, pages 25 to 32, provided an impressive list of resolutions and decisions "of interest to UNDP", covering all problems without exception. It ought to be possible for UNDP to inform the members of the Governing Council, as well as the public at large, about what it was doing to implement the instructions of the General Assembly. His delegation felt that the Division of Information should be able to issue a document containing a brief description, in respect of each resolution cited, of what UNDP was doing, what it could do and what it wished to do.

67. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) supported the proposal made by the delegation of Switzerland and endorsed a number of the comments made by the delegation of New Zealand. With regard to the question of the discrepancy between the documents submitted to the governing bodies of FAO and UNDP, she said that the report submitted to the FAO Council was more comprehensive, more informative and also very selective and that UNDP might do well to consult it to have an idea of what was desired by the members of the Governing Council. It might also be useful to explore ways of establishing liaison between the various governing bodies. It was to some extent the responsibility of the members themselves to ensure such liaison, of course, but the secretariat could certainly make matters easier through analytical work. To take a specific example, one extract from the report of the FAO Council (DP/1988/56/Add.1, p. 13) stated that the FAO Council had noted that co-ordination was working well at country level between FAO and UNDP. Yet the FAO Conference, which brought together 150 countries, had discussed possible problems of co-ordination in the field and the need to improve the situation. It would be interesting to know the opinion of UNDP on those two diverging views and also on the question of locating FAO field offices within UNDP complexes that was referred to in the same decision.

68. Mr. KIRDAR (Director, Division of External Relations), commenting on the useful suggestions and comments just made by delegations, pointed out first of all that, as its name indicated, the United Nations Development Programme existed to implement, in its operational activities, the policies laid down by the Economic and Social Council and by the General Assembly in the economic and social fields. UNDP thus differed in nature from the specialized agencies, whose competence was confined to specific fields. In practice, the UNDP secretariat closely followed the discussions in the General Assembly and, in particular, in the Second, Third and Fifth Committees. On most of the items on the agenda of the General Assembly concerning economic and social development, UNDP was required to give effect to the decisions taken.

69. There were three different ways in which the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council might concern UNDP. Some resolutions had to be applied through operational activities; in other cases, a report was requested from the Secretary-General, from UNDP or from another organ of the system; lastly, there were resolutions whose content had to be communicated to the Resident Representatives, who were at the same time system co-ordinators, since they related to decisions taken by Governments and directly concerned the system's country representative. To keep the Resident Representative and Co-ordinators informed of such decisions, the Division of External Relations sent them several newsletters each year, usually after the main meetings.

70. When a resolution by the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council involved operational activities, the UNDP Administration communicated the resolution to the Regional Bureau or the Resident Representative concerned in an "advisory note". Governments also had to be informed of decisions taken so that they could take them into account in their national priorities; that was an important point because intergovernmental organizations had at times established priorities at the global level that were not always consistent with those set at the national level.

71. It could therefore be seen that information on measures taken by UNDP to implement resolutions of the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council could not be provided in a document of 15 or 30 pages: documents DP/1988/56 and Add.1 had been prepared in accordance with a fairly longstanding directive by the Governing Council requesting the UNDP Administration to inform Governments about decisions taken system-wide so that they could consider what action to take in response to them at the governmental level.

72. Three delegations had referred specifically to the resolution adopted by the FAO Conference (DP/1988/56/Add.1, p. 13), which raised the question of the co-ordination of Governments' positions in the various governing bodies of the United Nations system. Indeed, there had been several instances in which a Government, represented by different ministerial officials on the various governing bodies concerned, had taken different and sometimes contradictory positions in each body, and the UNDP Administration had then been held responsible. In the example cited, the FAO Conference must know that no organization had a "share" in UNDP activities; UNDP served Governments, not the United Nations system.

73. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) asked whether the Secretariat could not submit to the Governing Council, at its February session, a brief document indicating the action to be taken by UNDP in response to decisions by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

74. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) supported that request. He would nevertheless like to know from a senior official of the Office of the UNDP Administrator, such as the Director of the Division of Information, whether the information Governments needed regarding action to be taken on decisions by organs of the system could be presented in another form to convince capitals that UNDP was really useful and effective. His country considered that UNDP was not devoting enough attention to its own publicity.

75. Ms. SUGGS (United States of America) associated herself with the requests made by the delegations of the Netherlands and New Zealand.

76. The PRESIDENT said that the Governing Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 10 (b), subject to the replies that might be provided by the Director of the Division of Information to the questions raised by the delegation of New Zealand. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Governing Council wished to entrust the Drafting Group with the task of preparing a draft decision on item 10 (b).

77. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.