



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

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1988/SR.6
29 February 1988
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 19 February 1988, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi)

later: Mr. LEENSTRA (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

Report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

UNDP response to emergencies in Africa

The role of UNDP in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip

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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (DP/1988/L.4)

1. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary) said that paragraph 6 of document DP/1988/L.4 should read: "The Committee held three meetings between 17 February and 18 February 1988".
2. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendations in paragraph 10 (a) of document DP/1988/L.4 concerning trends and problems in the country programmes.
3. It was so decided.
4. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the country programmes of Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone and Yemen mentioned in paragraph 10 (b) of document DP/1988/L.4.
5. It was so decided.
6. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council accepted the recommendation in paragraph 10 (c) of the same document and took note of the report of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole.
7. It was so decided.

UNDP RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES IN AFRICA

8. Mr. DAMIBA (Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Africa), introducing document DP/1988/10 on UNDP response to emergencies in Africa, said that the development problems and current circumstances on that continent demanded special attention and co-operation. The Governing Council had charged the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with responding to those priorities in a variety of ways. Nevertheless, it was becoming increasingly clear that there was a serious mismatch between the tasks entrusted to it in Africa and the budgetary resources with which it had been endowed.
9. The resurgence of emergencies in Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola, the Sudan, Somalia, Malawi, Uganda and to a certain point in the Sahel belt had placed enormous burdens on the financial and human resources of UNDP.
10. UNDP's medium and longer-term strategies were based on General Assembly resolutions and Governing Council decisions requesting UNDP to respond to the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development. They were also based on the medium-term recovery, adjustment and stabilization programmes adopted by the African States and supported by various donors, multinational organizations, and organs and agencies of the United Nations system.

(Mr. Damiba)

11. UNDP had accordingly adopted various initiatives and, in particular, had increased the frequency of round-table sessions; it had consolidated the initial phase of the national technical co-operation assessments and programmes (NatCAPs) in 12 countries and would launch new assessments and programmes in other African countries by the end of the cycle; it had redoubled efforts to participate systematically in the stabilization and structural adjustment programmes of the African countries in co-operation with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the donor community, and had adopted a more dynamic private sector policy in response to requests from African Governments and the policies they had agreed on, organizing, for example, various national and regional seminars.

12. It was important to strengthen the field offices in view of the growing needs created by the emergencies. UNDP was therefore seeking the Council's agreement to undertake a detailed examination of those issues in terms of staff requirements in the field and at headquarters, modalities for financing and overall resource requirements, and to report in that respect to the Council at its thirty-fifth session.

13. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) said that the volume of work in the Regional Bureau for Africa had increased considerably. Even though the substantive aspects of much of the work, such as the organization of round tables, had been entrusted to consultants, the increase in that work had consequences for UNDP and the Administration. Since the Council had decided that the Administration should not submit budgetary proposals for its consideration in the years in which no budget was submitted, the Administration was not authorized to submit any proposal of that type at the thirty-fifth session. However, in view of the gravity of the situation, the Administrator requested the Council to authorize him to make an exception and to submit a budgetary request at the thirty-fifth session.

14. As paragraph 5 of document DP/1988/10 showed, in 1984, the Governing Council had for the first time approved \$1.5 million to finance United Nations Volunteers to assist with the emergencies in Angola, Ethiopia and Mozambique. Those reserves had been used up and emergencies were still arising, making it necessary to continue resorting to Volunteers. The Administrator was therefore seeking Council authorization to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers amounting to \$368,500 in Ethiopia and \$404,000 in Angola.

15. Mr. DAH (Burkina Faso), speaking on behalf of the African States, said that the content of document DP/1988/10 did not correspond exactly to its title, since although it dealt with the drought prevailing in some African countries, it did not address the other basic and long-term problems and concerns of the African States. From paragraph 6 onwards, for example, reference was made to various issues distinct from the emergencies.

16. His delegation would welcome clarification concerning paragraph 10 of document DP/1988/10, according to which the administrative costs involved in the process of aid co-ordination could not be financed from Special Programme Resources (SPR). It

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

was therefore difficult to have a clear idea of the initiatives UNDP intended to adopt and how it proposed to finance them. It was surprising to see that paragraph 9 of the document apparently proposed a change in the mandate of UNDP, assimilating that body with the Bretton Woods bodies, which had different standards and traditions. UNDP must help countries to prepare, finance, execute and, where necessary, assess their development programmes and projects. It would therefore be unwise for it to embark on structural adjustment activities which came within the purview of bodies such as IMF. Neither could his delegation agree, without having a complete study of the question, to the role assigned to the United Nations Volunteers in paragraph 5 of the document. It would be preferable to use a slightly different system which would permit the Governments concerned to take an active part in the process.

17. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that he supported the request for a new allocation for the United Nations Volunteers. Concerning the issue of deeper UNDP involvement in structural adjustments and macro-economic policy reform, paragraph 8 stated that such involvement had been demanded by the recipient Governments themselves. Deeper involvement was appropriate, out of respect for the sovereign will of States. However, paragraph 9 made it clear that the initiative had been proposed by the Administrator, who had proposed the concept of a management facility at a recent meeting of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). His delegation wanted to know, firstly, why that initiative had been proposed first to DAC and not to the African Governments or the Governing Council itself; secondly, whether the non-IPF resources mentioned in paragraph 9 were resources provided by DAC or resources of another kind belonging to UNDP; and thirdly, whether the second stage of the initiative would be the establishment of structural adjustment advisory teams for regions other than Africa.

18. His delegation needed more time and information in order to adopt a position on the role of UNDP in the sphere of structural adjustments and reform of macro-economic policies.

19. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) agreed with the representative of Burkina Faso that the title of document DP/1988/10 did not adequately reflect its content, as it dealt with problems which did not constitute emergency situations. He said that the report to be submitted to the thirty-fifth session could be entitled "UNDP contribution to the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development".

20. While he was pleased with the UNDP response to emergencies in Africa, he considered that its work could extend beyond the mere financing of United Nations Volunteers in only two countries. Although he agreed with the policy innovations proposed in the document under consideration, he felt that they should be based on the priorities established by the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development. The management facility proposed by the Administrator should complement the programmes implemented by the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development in the sphere of African public administration.

(Mr. Mohamed, Observer, Somalia)

21. He called upon the Administrator to clear up the misunderstanding concerning UNDP's involvement in the monitoring of aid flows, debt-management and other such activities.
22. His delegation supported the proposal to be submitted by the Administrator to the thirty-fifth session, requesting the approval of additional budgetary resources to aid the African States affected by emergencies.
23. Ms. KORHONEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said they regretted the limited scope of document DP/1988/10, as defined in paragraph 3. The Nordic countries would welcome a more thorough discussion of the issue at the forthcoming meeting of the Working Group and at the thirty-fifth session of the Governing Council.
24. The Nordic countries supported the Administrator's request for authorization to use Special Programme Resources (SPR) funds to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola, on the understanding that that would not prejudice the Nordic countries' position on the future role of the United Nations Volunteers, which was to be discussed at the thirty-fifth session.
25. Section III of document DP/1988/10 sketched the outlines of UNDP's orientation with regard to policy innovations. It was still too early for the Nordic countries to take a firm stand on the question. Careful consideration should be given to the advantages and disadvantages of the Administrator's plan to develop the concept of a management facility in UNDP to address the technical co-operation needs of low-income countries. It would be preferable for such assistance to be an integral part of the country programme. It was the Nordic countries' understanding that some fourth-cycle country programmes already contained funds for such purposes.
26. Mrs. LAURENT (France) said that her delegation approved of authorizing the Administrator to ask the Council to examine and adopt a decision in June regarding additional budgetary resources to support UNDP operations in Africa.
27. France had given bilateral assistance to the sub-Saharan African countries in the adjustment process and had recently become a participant in the World Bank's special programme for the most indebted African countries. France therefore felt that it was most important that UNDP action be reviewed, as it played an important role in facilitating the adjustment process in African countries, through both technical assistance and the co-ordination of aid.
28. She concurred with the comment made the previous day by the representative of Switzerland concerning the Policies and Procedures Manual. It was very important that the document should be distributed in French to all French-speaking countries, including those in Africa.

29. Mr. PERRY (United States of America) agreed with the comments by the representatives of Burkina Faso, Somalia and Indonesia concerning the title of the document, which should be changed.
30. His delegation commended UNDP for attempting to respond to the emergencies in Africa through existing mechanisms such as round tables and national technical co-operation assessments and programmes (NaTCAPs). It regretted that the initiative described in paragraph 9 had not reached an advanced stage, and that not enough information had been supplied for a reply to be given at the current stage.
31. His delegation recognized UNDP's capacity in the field of structural adjustments, but it was a limited one. The structural adjustment work should be undertaken on the understanding that a significant co-ordinating role had been worked out well in advance between the World Bank and the Fund.
32. His delegation recognized the need for increased field staff in the Africa region. However, it would also like to see detailed justification for additional staff resources at headquarters. The work to be done by June could proceed through the redeployment of staff.
33. His delegation supported the Administrator's proposal to request additional budgetary resources from the Governing Council in June 1988 and approved of the request to use SPR funds to finance the costs of the United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola, as well as in other emergency situations should the Administrator deem it necessary.
34. Mr. ZIELINSKI (Poland) said he agreed that the emergencies in Africa could require a new type and level of UNDP participation in the development process. He supported the idea that the Council at its thirty-fifth session should consider and decide on budgetary resources in support of UNDP operations in Africa, and requested a detailed proposal on the subject. He approved of the use of SPR funds to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers amounting to approximately \$360,000 in Ethiopia and \$400,000 in Angola.
35. He was pleased that UNDP had assumed the function of Secretary of the Steering Committee of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development and that it had become active in the Inter-Agency Task Force and its technical subcommittees.
36. With regard to paragraphs 8 and 9, he shared the concerns expressed by other representatives and requested further clarification. It was essential that additional budgetary resources should be made available in order to respond adequately to Africa's problems. The seriousness of the needs undoubtedly justified the submission to the Governing Council at its thirty-fifth session of a request for additional resources.
37. Mrs. FRANKINET (Belgium) said that, although she did not oppose the proposal on the use of SPR to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola, she believed that, when the situation in Africa was reviewed at the

(Mrs. Frankinet, Belgium)

thirty-fifth session, an assessment of the use made to date of certain Volunteers in emergency assistance programmes should be made available, since the report which evaluated the work of the Volunteers contained certain reservations on the efficiency of the Volunteers in those circumstances.

38. Her delegation shared, in principle, the reservations on the presentation of budgetary proposals during an off-budget year. However, in the light of the seriousness of the situation in Africa, she had no objections to the Administrator formulating certain proposals in that regard. The documentation submitted in June should establish a link between the various initiatives adopted to provide assistance to Africa, in particular the authorization which the Council had given to hire economists, and the achievement of those objectives. The documentation to be submitted to the Council in June should deal with how UNDP perceived its role, in particular in relation to other aid agencies, including those providing financial assistance. Emphasis should be placed on the UNDP mandate in the area of technical assistance and co-ordination.

39. MR. LADJOUZI (Observer for Algeria) said that his delegation supported the work and role of the Associate Administrator and Regional Director for Africa on all the matters pertaining to the region. He endorsed the statement made by the representative of Burkina Faso on behalf of African countries, and would be grateful if the Administrator could provide more information on the means of implementing the recommendations contained in document DP/1988/10. Before expressing his views on that document, he would wait until the Administrator had replied to the questions raised by the representative of Burkina Faso. He had doubts as to whether it was appropriate for UNDP to adopt the work methods of international finance institutions such as the Bretton Woods institutions. The fact that some countries had requested UNDP to assist them in the structural adjustment of their economies should not be taken to mean that all African countries required such assistance. He supported UNDP activities to assist Africa, which were in keeping with the Programme's mandate.

40. Mr. MANZOU (Zimbabwe) said that, contrary to the Governing Council's expectations when it adopted its decision 87/43, the situation in Africa had continued to deteriorate. He therefore supported the Administrator's request to use SPR funds under the fourth cycle to assist countries of the region. He took note of the Administrator's intention to provide the Council at its June session with detailed proposals on the form such assistance was going to take.

41. The report also underscored some measures UNDP had taken to meet Africa's long-term development needs. He therefore considered that the proposal made by the representative of Burkina Faso to change the title of the report was justified. In that respect, UNDP should be guided by the priority areas defined in the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development.

42. He was concerned at the increasing involvement of UNDP in the structural adjustment process through structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa.

/...

(Mr. Manzou, Zimbabwe)

Perhaps that concern would be allayed when the Administrator explained the issue in more detail.

43. His delegation supported the request for the use of SPR funds to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola. He asked why Mozambique, which was mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph, had been denied such assistance. Was Mozambique among the countries which had made the additional requests mentioned at the end of the paragraph?

44. Mr. MUGUME (Observer for Uganda) said that he supported the decision to authorize the Administrator to submit a budget proposal in June.

45. Referring to paragraphs 8 and 9 of document DP/1988/10, he said that much care had always been taken to prevent UNDP from assuming the functions of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund with respect to the structural adjustment process. UNDP should help alleviate the negative effects of that process by identifying problems and assisting African countries in the formulation of policies to counteract them, in particular in the areas of health and education. In order to support the process of structural adjustment it was necessary to channel resource flows to Africa, as was reflected in Governing Council decision 87/23.

46. The Administrator had recommended the establishment of structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa in order to strengthen the capacity of African countries to negotiate and administrate their programmes. However, many experts had already been sent to Africa and the situation on that continent was well known. Instead of sending, for a year or six months, teams which would be needed again after they left, resource flows to Africa should be increased. Moreover, UNDP should not be overly enthusiastic about introducing NaTCAPs in Africa, since any efforts made in that regard might come to nothing once the UNDP teams departed.

47. He asked why the capacity which had been created to date had not been effective. The more it was strengthened, the more it required. He wondered whether a form of dependence was not being created. In transferring management know-how, UNDP should bear in mind the uniqueness of Africa's problems and the cultural aspects of management. Nationals should be trained to manage its economy. However, owing to the situation caused by structural adjustments, such persons, once trained, emigrated. UNDP should consider what could be done in that respect.

48. In preparing his proposal on the strengthening of management capacities, the Administrator should bear in mind that the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development established certain priorities. The management facility should endeavour to increase resource flows to Africa and should strengthen and inculcate management capacities in African countries. Governments, not UNDP headquarters, should determine the priorities of the management facility.

(Mr. Mugume, Observer, Uganda)

49. With regard to the second sentence of paragraph 8, the Consultative Group mechanism predated the round-table process. He wished to know what agreement was involved and what it meant in terms of co-operation between UNDP, the World Bank and recipient countries.
50. Mr. Leenstra (Netherlands) took the Chair.
51. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) supported the statement of the representative of Burkina Faso. Despite Governing Council resolutions on Africa, UNDP resources were becoming dangerously low, to the detriment of that continent. The Council should therefore adopt special emergency measures, including the allocation of additional budgetary resources in support of UNDP operations in Africa, on the basis of the more detailed report to be submitted at a later date, as indicated in document DP/1988/10.
52. With that in mind, and in the light of the emergency situation in some African countries, including the Sudan, he supported the proposal to request the Council's early approval of the use of SPR funds under the fourth cycle.
53. His delegation did not oppose the participation of United Nations Volunteers in the provision of assistance to Angola, Ethiopia and Mozambique. However, maximum use should be made of African experts.
54. His delegation wished to know how the round-table process and national technical co-operation assessments and programmes (NatCAPs) were financed. With regard to paragraph 12, he supported the proposal that a supplementary budget request should be prepared for the Council at its thirty-fifth session.
55. Mr. FREE (Canada) said that he had also been surprised at the title of document DP/1988/10, which dealt not only with the UNDP response to emergencies in Africa but also with long-term development problems.
56. He supported the request for the use of SPR to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola. It could be anticipated that similar requests would be submitted for other countries, and more information should be provided and a broader discussion held on the use of Volunteers in emergency situations in other countries. He also wished to know whether other options had been considered.
57. He inquired about the degree of efficiency with which UNDP implemented its programmes to assist African countries in solving their long-term problems, while at the same time endeavouring to meet the most pressing needs of those countries, such as the co-ordination of assistance to NatCAPs and the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990.
58. Knowing Africa's serious structural problems and of the major role of UNDP in that continent, he was prepared to consider the proposals which the Administrator would submit to the Council in June to increase staff resources, and welcomed the intention of UNDP to strengthen the round-table process and NatCAPs.

(Mr. Free, Canada)

59. Like other countries, Canada hoped that in June more details would be submitted on the management facility mentioned in paragraph 9 of document DP/1988/10. Since that facility was aimed at addressing the technical co-operation needs of low-income countries, the initiative could also be applied beyond the African continent, and should therefore be considered in a separate document. UNDP had an important role to play in the area of structural adjustment, and that role should focus on the strengthening of respective national capacities.

60. Mr. TANAKA (Japan) said that, on the whole, Japan supported the UNDP response to emergencies in Africa. He welcomed the fact that UNDP had given attention to the new and emerging technical co-operation needs of African countries, and, in particular, he supported the round-table process and NatCAPs and the decision to increase their frequency in future. He was pleased that plans were under way to complete the pilot NatCAP exercise and to launch the process in other African countries, as indicated in paragraph 7 of the document.

61. It was too early to express an opinion on the management facility mentioned in paragraph 9. There was not enough information on the functions, objectives and the mechanisms of that initiative. Because of its importance, the subject of structural adjustment called for in-depth analysis, and he hoped that such an analysis could be made at the thirty-fifth session.

62. Japan would be ready to consider, in June, the Administrator's intention to prepare a supplementary budget request (para. 12), and hoped that the Administrator would submit a detailed report on the subject.

63. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) said that UNDP had a very important role to play in emergency situations in Africa. He associated himself with other representatives who had expressed their support for the proposal that the Council should approve the use of SPR funds under the fourth cycle. The current excellent financial situation of UNDP should make it possible for the Programme to make a significant response to emergencies in Africa.

64. Italy would examine the management facility initiative objectively, but it wished to have details about the functions of that facility and the exact role the Administrator had in mind for UNDP in the area of structural adjustment. He hoped that in June details would be provided about possible co-operation between UNDP and the World Bank in that area.

65. Mr. ROHNER (Switzerland) expressed the hope that, at the thirty-fifth session, all available information and a description of needs and of bilateral and multilateral resources would be submitted in as complete and comprehensible a form as possible. Switzerland supported the conclusions and procedural recommendations contained in document DP/1988/10.

66. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the general feeling that, at the current session, only general opinions could be expressed on the UNDP response to emergencies in Africa, and that more information

(Mr. Chekay, USSR)

would be needed before a detailed reply could be made. While an organization as important as UNDP had to take charge of organizing initiatives, it was unacceptable that the Administration should arrogate full authority to itself, to the detriment of the opinions of the Council and the recipient countries.

67. Mr. MUKHERJEE (India) supported document DP/1988/10, which underscored the need to give special attention to Africa, in the light of the situation in that continent. However, since UNDP activities in Africa were intended for countries of that continent, it would be interesting - and it was necessary - to hear the opinions of the recipient countries themselves on specific issues. Although India agreed with the spirit of the document, it supported the request made by other delegations for more information, which it would be useful to have at the next session.

68. Mr. MULLER (Observer for Australia) said that, in paragraph 9 of document DP/1988/10, it was not clear whether the management facility to address the technical co-operation needs of low-income countries had already been established. Mention was made of the existence of a UNDP Inter-Agency Task Force and, further on, it was said that a first step was the establishment of structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa. He wished to know whether such teams had already been established or would be established in the event of the adoption of the management facility initiative, whose establishment would depend in turn on the adoption of the supplementary budget request to be submitted at the thirty-fifth session. Australia supported the latter idea and hoped to have more information at the thirty-fifth session.

69. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) associated himself with the expressions of support for the Administrator's initiative of preparing a supplementary budget request for the Council at its thirty-fifth session. He reserved the right to ask questions at that time, on the basis of extensive documentation, including information on linkage with other activities and an analysis of the special role of UNDP in the sphere in question.

70. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana) said that he did not object to the submission by the Administrator of a supplementary budget request, but that the request should specify what percentage of the additional resources would actually be devoted to programme execution and not to administrative costs, as well as what type of programme would benefit from the additional resources.

71. With regard to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the document under consideration, he noted the UNDP had already taken certain initiatives without holding either formal or informal consultations with the recipient Governments through their representatives in New York or their Governments at the respective capitals. He supported the use of SPR to finance the cost of United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola. Nevertheless, like the representative of Zimbabwe, he wondered why Mozambique had been omitted from the list of countries in which SPR were used, although it had initially been included.

72. Mrs. PERKOVIC (Yugoslavia) shared the concern expressed by the representatives of Burkina Faso, Zimbabwe, Algeria, Indonesia and India. With regard to paragraphs 8 and 9, she asked whether there was simply some misunderstanding or whether UNDP really intended to exceed the powers conferred by its mandate as regards its role in the process of structural adjustment. Her delegation agreed that the Administrator should prepare an additional budget request for the Council at its thirty-fifth session and that SPR should be used to finance the costs of United Nations Volunteers.

73. Mr. BAI Xingji (China) said that he was well aware of conditions in Africa and approved of the use of SPR to finance United Nations Volunteers in Ethiopia and Angola. Although UNDP was to be commended for its contribution in Africa, it was regrettable that the Administrator did not in his report mention the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator or the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. In the report which he was to submit in June, it would be desirable for the Administrator to explain how UNDP worked with those offices to respond to the emergency in Africa. His delegation could agree to the change in the title of document DP/1988/10.

74. Mr. DAMIBA (Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) noted that there was general agreement on the procedure to be followed in relation to the question of improving UNDP capacity in Africa and making the services of United Nations Volunteers available to the countries in question. Mozambique had not been mentioned because its needs had already been met using the sizeable contribution from Norway.

75. As the representatives of Burkina Faso and Algeria had stated, the questions of procedure involved four aspects: the role of UNDP in structural adjustment programmes; the question of the management facility; the question of the role of UNDP within the Consultative Group process, at least in the sphere of technical assistance; and the question of the financing of all those operations, particularly the round-table process and national technical co-operation assessments and programmes. When the Working Group considered the role of UNDP in the execution of United Nations programmes in Africa, it would be possible to study in depth and in detail questions such as the experience of UNDP in national technical co-operation assessments and programmes.

76. The initiatives taken by UNDP were based on resolutions and decisions of the Governing Council and of the General Assembly or on government requests. With regard to the management facility, there had been no decision, but only a suggestion that was to be considered. It might be possible to revert to the matter at the thirty-fifth session.

77. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) said that the question of the management facility had been considered in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and not with the recipient countries, simply because at the most recent meeting of the Council UNDP had been asked to take the necessary steps to help countries to evaluate possible negative effects of the adjustment programme and to formulate and implement their economic reforms and sectoral plans. Once a decision was adopted,

(Mr. Brown)

it would have to be implemented and additional resources were needed for that purpose. That was why a meeting had been held with DAC: to try to mobilize resources outside the system of indicative planning figures. The document to be submitted in June would include all the information requested and the reasons for the staffing requests.

78. Mr. MULLER (Observer for Australia) asked whether the structural adjustment advisory teams had already been set up and, if not, whether any suggestion had been made regarding their establishment before the Council considered the proposals for additional financing at its thirty-fifth session.

79. Mr. DAMIBA (Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) said that a project was being prepared for structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa. A preparatory assistance project was under way to determine what problems such groups might encounter and it was hoped that the draft of the final document would be ready by May.

80. Mr. MULLER (Observer for Australia), referring to the remarks just made by the Assistant Administrator regarding the preparation of a draft final document which would be ready in May, asked what was the relationship between that draft final document and the proposals for additional financing to be submitted for the consideration of the Council at the thirty-fifth session. He had understood that the Council would consider the question of the structural adjustment advisory teams in the context of the financing proposals.

81. Mr. DAMIBA (Assistant Administrator and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) said that the structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa would be funded with \$2.5 million from the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries, \$2.5 million from the resources of the Regional Programme and \$3.5 million from bilateral donors to be determined. That was the proposed financing for the project.

82. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would assume that the Council wished to take note of the report of the Administrator in document DP/1988/10, to request the Administrator to submit a report to the Council at its thirty-fifth session setting out his proposals for supplementary staffing and related costs in response to urgent medium-term and long-term development needs in Africa, and to approve the Administrator's proposal that Special Programme Resources (SPR) should be used to finance United Nations Volunteers in support of emergency programmes in Africa.

83. It was so decided.

84. Mr. MUGUME (Observer for Uganda) noted with satisfaction that no decision had as yet been taken regarding the establishment of structural adjustment advisory teams for Africa and that the debate on the issue had not yet ended. Referring to paragraph 8 of document DP/1988/10, which stated that agreement had been reached with the World Bank that UNDP would lead the discussion on technical co-operation within the Consultative Group process, he asked what type of agreement was involved.

85. Mr. DAMIBA (Assistant Administrator of UNDP and Director, Regional Bureau for Africa) said that there was an agreement between UNDP and the World Bank to the effect that, when the Consultative Group held a meeting organized by the World Bank, the agenda item concerning technical co-operation must be prepared by the Government concerned with UNDP assistance. That was the document which was being discussed in the Consultative Group. Likewise, when a round-table meeting was organized in which UNDP played a leading role, the World Bank supplied the documents and analyses it had concerning the countries in question so as to facilitate preparation of documentation.

86. Mr. MUGUME (Observer for Uganda) said that delegations should be provided with the text of the agreement.

87. Mr. MULLER (Observer for Australia) expressed the hope that the documentation to be submitted to the Council at its thirty-fifth session, in June, would contain details on the structural adjustment advisory teams project to support requests for additional funding to be submitted to the Council for consideration.

88. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would appreciate it if UNDP could provide delegations with the text of the agreement referred to by the representative of Uganda, and other related documents, so that delegations could examine them.

THE ROLE OF UNDP IN THE WEST BANK AND THE GAZA STRIP (DP/1988/13)

89. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator of UNDP), introducing document DP/1988/13, said that the UNDP programme of assistance to the Palestinian people continued in full operation, notwithstanding curfews, strikes and transport problems. UNDP staff in Jerusalem had continued to work on more than 20 ongoing projects valued at more than \$12 million. Although small compared to the needs of the occupied territories, the programme continued to enjoy the support of all interested parties.

90. In his report to the Security Council, which had been issued in January, the Secretary-General had referred specifically to the possibility of enhancing UNDP activities in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as an important part of the efforts to revive and expand the economy of those territories. The recent announcement by the Government of Japan of a special contribution of \$1 million to the UNDP programme of assistance to the Palestinian people testified to the confidence which donors had in the programme.

91. He proposed that UNDP funding to that programme should be increased by a further contribution of \$4 million from SPR. Given UNDP's world-wide responsibilities to developing countries, the expansion of activities in the occupied territories could not be sustained by SPR funds alone. He was therefore proposing that increased UNDP support should be subject to the commitment of matching funds through additional voluntary contributions from Governments and intergovernmental institutions. He hoped that those contributions would be in excess of the amount that UNDP could provide, since there was no question of limiting the amount to \$8 million.

92. Mr. TERZI (Permanent Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization) said that, although the figure mentioned by the Administrator was small compared to the needs, it had enabled UNDP to become an important factor in the economic and social development of the occupied Palestinian territories.

93. Concerning the \$1 million voluntary contribution from Japan, he expressed the hope that contributions amounting to \$4 million would be announced before the end of the day.

94. He recalled that, in resolution 42/190, of 11 December 1987, the General Assembly had expressed alarm at the deterioration, as a result of the Israeli occupation, in the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the territories occupied since 1967. The Administrator was requesting additional funds to deal with the current tragic situation. PLO was taking steps to mobilize resources for the projects of the programme in close co-operation with the Secretary-General. In conformity with resolution 42/166, all aid and assistance, and in particular, emergency additional assistance, should be disbursed solely for the benefit of the Palestinian people and in a manner that would not serve to prolong the Israeli occupation. In that context it would be necessary to put more pressure on Israel to facilitate implementation of the projects and to ensure that the occupying Power refrained from any activities which impeded such implementation.

95. He expressed appreciation for the co-operation of UNDP in the implementation of the various projects in the programme for the economic and social development of the occupied Palestinian territories. He also thanked Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations for their prompt response to alleviate the plight of the Palestinian people. However, he repeated that it was necessary to develop the economic infrastructure, particularly through income-generating projects. The Palestinian people hoped that a substantial part of any additional contributions would be used to formulate such projects. Such projects could be initiated immediately by an expansion of UNDP's existing programme.

96. He supported the Administrator's request that the Council should agree, in principle, to authorize the earmarking of an additional \$4 million from SPR for projects that would contribute to the economic development of the occupied Palestinian territories. He was sure that the Administrator's call for voluntary contributions amounting to at least \$4 million to meet the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation would be heeded. He believed that the earmarking of additional funds of up to \$4 million from SPR should not have been made subject to the Administrator's appeal being heeded. PLO would do everything within its power to ensure that the amount obtained was not less than \$4 million.

97. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) said that recent developments in the occupied territories required that all who were able to assist the Palestinian people should do so. UNDP was in a special position to do so since it had always been able to carry out its operations in the occupied territories with the acceptance of the occupying Power and to the satisfaction of the population. UNDP should therefore be given an opportunity to make a very important contribution in the occupied territories. He

(Mr. Petrone, Italy)

asked the Administrator to co-operate as closely as possible with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

98. The amount of \$8 million authorized by the Council from SPR for assistance in the occupied territories was not sufficient. The situation in those territories had deteriorated greatly since that figure had been approved. He praised the Administrator for responding promptly to the Secretary-General's call, cited in paragraph 4 of document DP/1988/13, for an expansion of the existing programme of UNDP in the occupied territories. Nevertheless, he did not see why the \$4 million should be earmarked only provisionally and why UNDP assistance should be contingent upon special voluntary contributions. He agreed with the Administrator that additional funding must be obtained in the form of special voluntary contributions of at least another \$4 million. But UNDP contributions should not be dependent upon the voluntary contributions of other donors. The Council should authorize the Administrator to earmark \$4 million for activities in the occupied territories and should ask all Member States for additional funding. His delegation would like the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the document under consideration to be amended accordingly. Furthermore, his Government would consider very favourably the list of 50 UNDP projects for the occupied territories.

99. Mr. TANAKA (Japan) supported the impartial role of UNDP in the occupied territories. He endorsed the proposal of the Administrator to earmark \$4 million, on the understanding that the \$8 million referred to in paragraph 3 of document DP/1988/13 would be used in full and that the additional \$4 million would be used for specific projects and programmes. His delegation supported the suggestion by the representative of Italy. Japan had just made a budgetary appropriation of \$1 million for the occupied territories for the financial year 1988 and was simply waiting for Parliamentary approval; that approval was likely to be forthcoming in March 1988.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.