



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

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1988/SR.7
29 February 1988
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 19 February 1988, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. MANGWAZU (Malawi)

CONTENTS

Other matters (continued)

- (f) The role of UNDP in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (continued)
- (g) Financing of technical co-operation among developing countries
- (b) Indicative planning figures for the fourth programming cycle (continued)

Closure of the special session

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 3.05 p.m.

OTHER MATTERS (continued)

(f) THE ROLE OF UNDP IN THE WEST BANK AND THE GAZA STRIP (continued)

1. Mr. MANZOU (Zimbabwe) observed that the situation in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was continuing to deteriorate. The report submitted to the Security Council by the Secretary-General (S/19443) also gave an idea of the urgency of the needs of the Palestinian population of those territories and the PLO observer had confirmed those facts. The Palestinian population must therefore be given greater support, and his Government was glad to see that in his note (DP/1988/13), the Administrator had requested the Council to authorize him to earmark an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources to enable UNDP to commence the projects mentioned in paragraph 5, but it felt that the use of that amount should in no case be linked to the provision of matching funds.
2. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) thanked UNDP for the steps it had taken to help the Palestinian population of the occupied territories. He hoped that the international community would provide much more than the \$4 million in matching funds requested in the note by the Administrator (DP/1988/13) and would respond without delay to the appeal made to it. He wondered, however, why it was necessary to defer confirmation of the earmarking of the \$4 million until June and to deprive the Palestinians of the limited amounts earmarked from UNDP programme resources if, in a worst case scenario, matching funds were not forthcoming. He therefore proposed that paragraph 6 of document DP/1988/13 should be amended in the following way. The third sentence would end with the words "... at this session to agree:", the word "provisionally" in subparagraph (a) would be deleted and subparagraph (c) would be amended to read: "To inform the Governing Council at its thirty-fifth session on developments relating to the implementation of this decision".
3. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) took note of the statement made by the PLO observer and welcomed the important role that UNDP was playing in the occupied Arab territories. He wished, however, to emphasize that UNDP should undertake activities only in its own sphere of competence and should leave it to other agencies of the United Nations system to deal with considerations of a general nature. With regard to paragraph 6 of the note by the Administrator (DP/1988/13), he supposed that it was because the Special Programme Resources were inadequate that the Administrator spoke of earmarking "provisionally" an amount of \$4 million and that the question would be the subject of a report in June. He considered that UNDP, demonstrating the importance it attached to the fate of the Palestinian population, should not link the granting of the additional \$4 million to the provision of matching funds.
4. He did not think that the wording of paragraph 6 should be amended, for the Council was not a drafting committee. He wondered whether it would not be possible, if the \$4 million were not available immediately, to do more than plan the projects and to take immediate practical action rather than waiting for

(Mr. Payton, New Zealand)

official confirmation of the earmarking of the additional funds at the June session. Lastly, he called on all Governments and international institutions to provide the Palestinian people with additional funds through UNDP.

5. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) thanked the Administrator for the very precise information given in his note (DP/1988/13) and said that he would like complete information on UNDP's role in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. The Secretary-General in his report (S/19443) and the PLO in its statement had described the deterioration of the situation in the region, and he therefore welcomed UNDP's decision to undertake economic and social development projects there, taking into account the recent events which provided proof of the injustices to which the Palestinian people were subjected. It was currently widely acknowledged that the occupying authorities had been negligent about providing essential services to the Palestinians, particularly those living in camps. However, the amount of \$21.5 million earmarked from UNDP general resources for the period 1980-1991 should be reviewed in order to take into account the evolution of the political and social situation in the occupied territories and the need to implement economic development projects for the Palestinian population. His delegation supported the proposal to eliminate the link between the earmarking of an additional \$4 million from Special Programme Resources and the provision of matching funds; it also supported the report under consideration as a whole. He called on the occupying authorities to allow UNDP to carry out its mandate.

6. Mr. ROSELLO (Spain) thanked UNDP for the efforts it was making in the occupied territories despite difficult circumstances; those efforts had earned it the respect and trust of all parties concerned. He associated himself with the previous speakers who had supported the proposals made in the note by the Administrator (DP/1988/13), and felt that UNDP could make a special effort on behalf of the Palestinians, but rejected the idea of establishing a link between the granting of the additional \$4 million and the provision of matching funds.

7. Mr. GLAZER (United States of America) reaffirmed that his Government was concerned about the economic and social problems peculiar to the Palestinian people living in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, which were exacerbated by the deterioration of the political situation. He approved of the proposal to grant an additional \$4 million, especially since UNDP, by remaining in contact with all the parties concerned, continued to be a neutral and credible interlocutor. Recent events had highlighted the importance of taking steps to help the Palestinians and, even though it must be acknowledged that UNDP could not single-handedly solve all a people's problems, its activities in the occupied territories proved that the international community was concerned about the Palestinians' situation and were bound to promote reconciliation and the establishment of lasting peace.

8. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) reaffirmed the importance which his country attached to UNDP's activities in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and said he supported the proposals made in the note by the Administrator (DP/1988/13), although he hoped that the link between the granting of an additional \$4 million and the provision of matching funds would be eliminated.

9. Mr. AL-KHATANI (Observer for Saudi Arabia) thanked UNDP for the efforts it was making to help the Palestinian population of the occupied territories, despite the various difficulties it was facing. The economic situation in those territories was deteriorating while the occupying authorities were seeking to mobilize the resources of the territories for their own benefit. The recent national uprising had simply caused the situation to deteriorate more rapidly, as had been confirmed by the Secretary-General in his report (S/19443) and by many leaders who had gone to the territories and been horrified by what they had seen. The leader of the British Labour Party, in particular, had said that the situation in the camps resembled hell rather than the paradise on earth described by the occupying authorities.
10. The situation made it necessary for UNDP to continue its efforts to expand its programme and to implement projects in such diverse fields as health and hygiene, housing, employment, education, agriculture and industry. UNDP should focus its attention on the local labour force, promote the economic development of the occupied territories, obtain the resources necessary for projects and implement the projects already identified and approved. The Council should authorize the earmarking of an additional \$4 million from Special Programme Resources without requiring the provision of matching funds.
11. Mr. LADJOUZI (Observer for Algeria) noted the Administrator's intention to use an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources in order to enable UNDP to undertake projects on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. The situation in occupied Palestine called for vigorous action, and he doubted whether the amount earmarked for the 1987-1991 programming cycle could meet the considerable needs of the Palestinian people. He agreed with the Italian delegation that implementation of projects should not be linked to matching funds and that that condition should be abolished. Lastly he endorsed the statement by the Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).
12. Mr. ALPTUNA (Turkey) said that the report submitted to the Security Council by the Secretary-General on the situation in the occupied territories (S/19443) demonstrated the plight of the Palestinian people. He therefore supported the Administrator's request, while regretting that the additional amount earmarked was so small. On the other hand, the earmarking of that sum should not depend on matching funds, and he therefore proposed that the provision to that effect in paragraph 6 of document DP/1988/13 be deleted.
13. Mr. LEENSTRA (Netherlands) supported the request for authorization submitted by the Administrator, as urgent measures were called for to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestinian people. He supported those delegations which felt that the provision of matching funds should not constitute a pre-condition.
14. Mr. AL-MABRUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) endorsed the statement by the Observer for the PLO and supported the request for authorization submitted by the Administrator.

15. Mr. KAZEMBE (Observer for Zambia) supported the Administrator's proposal, but felt that the amount earmarked was very small. He agreed with previous speakers that there should be no link between that amount and the provision of matching funds.
16. Mr. FU Xijie (China) expressed support for the Administrator's proposal which would help solve an urgent problem. The atrocities perpetrated in the occupied territories were inflicting new sufferings on the Palestinian people and were a subject of deep concern to the international community. UNDP could and should help promote the economic recovery of those territories.
17. Mr. KELLAND (Denmark) agreed with those speakers who had supported the proposal to dispense with the condition attached to the earmarking of additional amounts from Special Programme Resources.
18. Mr. AHMED (Observer for Bahrain) said that the tragic events of recent months in the occupied territories were exceptional. The amount of \$21.5 million earmarked by UNDP for its activities on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip for the period 1980-1991 was very small, and not commensurate with the needs. Furthermore, the additional amount of \$4 million was also very small. He called upon the international community to co-operate with the Administrator to increase contributions, so that the Palestinians' dire situation be alleviated. While he supported the Administrator's proposal, he felt that the earmarking of the additional amount should not be linked to the provision of matching funds.
19. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the provision of UNDP assistance to the Palestinians living on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. The allocation of an additional amount for that purpose was a good idea and should not be subject to any conditions.
20. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his delegation was impressed by the activities carried out by UNDP under difficult circumstances on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. It supported the Administrator's request for authorization to levy an additional amount of \$4 million from the Special Programme Resources.
21. Mr. ZIELINSKI (Poland) supported the Administrator's request and echoed those speakers who had asked for the link between the earmarking of \$4 million and the provision of matching funds to be abolished.
22. Mr. TALADRIO-SUAREZ (Cuba) supported the Administrator's request and agreed that the earmarking of the additional sum should not be linked to the provision of matching funds.
23. Mr. BORG-OLIVIER (Observer for Malta) supported paragraph 6 of document DP/1988/13, subject to the amendment proposed by the Italian delegation, and hoped that additional funding would soon be forthcoming in order to strengthen UNDP's role on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

24. Mr. FREE (Canada) said that support should be given to the development of the occupied territories, and endorsed the Administrator's request. However, he agreed with the Italian delegation that there should be no linkage between earmarking the additional amount of \$4 million and the provision of matching funds.

25. Mr. MULLER (Observer for Australia) supported the Administrator's request, but considered that all links between the additional amount and counterpart funds should be abolished; the best way to do that would be to delete the last phrase of subparagraph 6 (c) in document DP/1988/13, from "subject to" to the end of the sentence.

26. Mrs. ABBAS (Observer for Pakistan) reaffirmed the importance of UNDP assistance to the Palestinian population of the occupied territories and expressed whole-hearted support for the Administrator's proposal to earmark an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources. That amount was, however, insufficient to meet the needs, and her delegation requested clarification regarding the possibility of obtaining contributions from other sources, or even of increasing the additional amount. It was unable to accept the condition attached to the earmarking of Special Programme Resources, and recommended the deletion of subparagraph 6 (c) in document DP/1988/13.

27. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said he was pleased to note that all delegations endorsed his proposal to earmark an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources to strengthen UNDP activities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

28. In reply to the question from the Observer for Pakistan, he stated that the reason why the request for earmarking that additional amount had been linked to the provision of matching funds was that, as had been apparent in recent years, appeals launched by UNDP rarely elicited any response. Apart from a contribution of \$1 million from the Arab Gulf Programme for the United Nations Development Organizations (AGFUND) four years before and the recent announcement of a contribution of \$1 million from Japan, UNDP had received only very meagre contributions. The matching funds mechanism was aimed at calling attention to the problem and provoking a multiplier effect which would have enhanced the impact of UNDP's admittedly far from sufficient contribution.

29. He was heartened by the optimism shown by some delegations, especially those of Italy and the Netherlands, which had indicated that other contributions could be expected. In response to a question from the representative of New Zealand, he stated that the Special Programme Resources were sufficient to allow earmarking of the funds in question. Noting that delegations wanted to see the linkage to matching funds abolished, he said that document DP/1988/13 would be amended accordingly.

30. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Council) said that, in accordance with representatives' wishes, subparagraph 6 (a) of document DP/1988/13 was amended to read as follows:

(Mr. D'Orville)

"(a) To authorize the Administrator to earmark an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources to undertake projects and also to enable planning and project formulation activities to commence on the types of projects described in paragraph 5;"

Subparagraph (b) would read as follows:

"(b) To make an urgent appeal to all Governments and intergovernmental institutions to respond immediately through additional funds in the form of special voluntary contributions for the UNDP programme of assistance to the Palestinian people."

Subparagraph 6 (c) was deleted.

31. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) suggested that subparagraph 6 (c) should be amended to read as follows:

"(c) To inform the Governing Council at its thirty-fifth session of new developments relating to the application of this decision."

32. The PRESIDENT said that the Administrator would automatically report to the Governing Council and that Somalia's proposal appeared to be redundant.

33. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) said that he had made the proposal in the light of the Administrator's remarks concerning the additional funds which could be provided in the future. However, he accepted the President's opinion and withdrew his proposal.

34. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) wished to know whether the Council was taking the initial steps towards a decision which would be taken at its June session or whether it was intended that a decision should be taken at the current session to authorize the Administrator to earmark an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources.

35. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) confirmed that he was asking the Governing Council to take an immediate decision on the question in order that the funds might be put to use as soon as possible. The status of Special Programme Resources would be reported in June, and it would be possible to consider topping up Resources at that time.

36. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that, in that case, paragraph 6 must be considered to be the text of a draft decision submitted for approval by the Council at its current session. He therefore proposed that the words "in principle" in the third sentence of paragraph 6 should be deleted.

37. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said that the overall situation of Special Programme Resources would be considered in June. For the time being, it was a matter of getting on with the job.

38. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Council) took note of the deletion of the words "in principle" and added that the first part of subparagraph 6 (a) should read as follows:

"(a) To authorize the Administrator to use an additional amount of \$4 million from Special Programme Resources to ...".

39. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that, if a draft decision was being taken, it should begin with the words: "The Governing Council decides", and the reference to paragraph 5 in subparagraph (a) should be deleted.

40. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Council) said that the amendments would be incorporated into the final version of the decision, which would be issued in due course.

41. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the draft decision as amended.

42. It was so decided.

43. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the preceding debate led him to conclude that there was a determination to devote additional resources to assistance for the Palestinian people, that it would be possible to do so and that the Governing Council was not opposed to the idea. His delegation was pleased to note that the Administration wished to act as quickly as possible. With regard to the proper presentation of all the points raised by the representative of New Zealand, he had no doubt that members of the Council would be able to deal with that issue at the Council's thirty-fifth regular session. He expressed the hope that the text of the amendments to the draft decision would be recorded by the Secretariat and distributed to delegations.

(q) FINANCING OF TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

44. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had decided during its organizational meeting, at the request of the Somali delegation, to include the item entitled "Financing of technical co-operation among developing countries" on the agenda of its special session.

45. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) recalled that the General Assembly had, in its resolution 33/134, assigned a catalytic role to UNDP in the implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, and that the Plan contained provisions which related directly to the Programme.

46. More than 10 years had elapsed since the Buenos Aires Conference, and TCDC had become an operational instrument for development. The international community had again reaffirmed its support for that type of co-operation at the fifth session of the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries. Although there had never been any lack of political support for the

(Mr. Mohamed, Observer, Somalia)

idea, much still remained to be done in practice. In particular, work was needed to make TCDC a system-wide reality. The financial crisis of 1981-1982 was no longer anything more than a memory, and UNDP now had at its disposal the resources required to carry out activities which had been deferred as a result of budgetary problems.

47. It must however be recognized that the fulfilment of TCDC objectives was not dependent on financial resources alone. Those objectives should be incorporated into the UNDP Policies and Procedures Manual. Furthermore, the resident representatives should stop making exclusive use of traditional methods in the programming and formulating of projects to be financed by regional and country IPFs. It was high time to provide new impetus to technical co-operation among developing countries.

48. For all those reasons, his delegation had decided to request the Council (i) to decide to include an item entitled "Strengthening of the capacity of UNDP to promote and support TCDC, including its financing" on the agenda of its thirty-fifth session; and (ii) to request the Administrator to submit a report under that agenda item, bearing in mind the special needs of the least developed countries as participants in and beneficiaries of technical co-operation among developing countries.

49. Since his delegation had consulted most members of the Council before making its proposal, it did not believe that the Council needed to undertake a substantive consideration of the item; all that was required was a procedural decision. His delegation hoped that the two proposals would meet with the agreement of all members of the Council.

50. Mr. GLAZER (United States of America) recalled that the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries had held a meeting in 1987, and that another meeting was planned for 1989. He therefore wondered if it was really essential for the Council to consider the question of TCDC between those two meetings, particularly since the agenda for its thirty-fifth session was extremely heavy.

51. Mr. FU Xije (China) said that since the United Nations Conference on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, held in Argentina in 1978, TCDC had entered an active phase. Thanks to the efforts of UNDP and the constructive attitude of certain developed countries, progress had been made in that area; however, much still remained to be done. The developing countries had devoted several meetings to the issue and had adopted a number of guidelines. The funds they had managed to put together had enabled them to carry out a good many projects.

52. In the past few years China had provided training for 1,200 technicians from developing countries; they were now contributing, in their respective fields, to the economic development of their countries.

53. Knowing the importance of TCDC, his delegation whole-heartedly endorsed the proposal of the Somali delegation.

/...

54. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) endorsed the proposal of the Somali delegation. The report of the High-level Committee had not been given the attention it deserved at the Council's thirty-fourth session. Inclusion of TCDC in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session would enable the Council to consider the item more thoroughly and, above all to evaluate implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, 10 years after its adoption.
55. Like China, India was implementing a vast technical co-operation programme with the developing countries, as part of its own economic and technical co-operation programme and the Colombo Plan and in the context of ESCAP.
56. He wondered whether it was necessary to keep the phrase "as participants in, and beneficiaries of, TCDC" in the proposal, since all developing countries participated in, and benefited from, such activities.
57. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) in reply to the representative of the United States, said that in his introductory statement he had listed all the arguments in favour of including TCDC as an item on the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. Consideration of that issue would enable member States of the Governing Council and observer States to go beyond mere statements of support and to take specific action to make TCDC really operational. Since the delegation of the United States had not, as far as he knew, objected to the proposal when it was submitted at the organizational meeting and since other members of the Council supported it, he hoped that the Council would be able to adopt the proposal.
58. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) endorsed the Somali proposal. The issue of technical co-operation among developing countries had, of course, been considered in other forums, but by including it in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the Governing Council UNDP would be able to demonstrate in a succinct document that TCDC was an operational tool, to evaluate what had been accomplished and to determine all that still remained to be done in that area.
59. His delegation had no objection to mentioning the least developed countries specifically; however, if members of the Council insisted, it was prepared to go along with the other wording. Replying to the delegation of the United States, he pointed out that if the item was included in the agenda of the June 1988 session TCDC could be looked at from UNDP's standpoint; there was therefore no danger that consideration of the item by the Council would duplicate the work of the High-level Committee.
60. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that he endorsed the proposal of the Somali delegation. If the proposal was adopted, documents on the item should be prepared from an operational standpoint and should indicate whether there were any obstacles to the development of TCDC activities funded from the IPFs and, if appropriate, what means had been used to identify TCDC possibilities at the project formulation stage.

61. Mr. GLAZER (United States of America) said that, in view of the convincing arguments in favour of considering the issue of TCDC and in view of the keen interest which the issue aroused, his delegation would have no objection to the item being included in the agenda of the Council's thirty-fifth session.

62. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) endorsed the Somali proposal and pointed out that it would be appropriate, since 10 years had elapsed since the adoption of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action, for the report of the Administrator to focus on the activities carried out by UNDP under the terms of reference given to it in the Plan.

63. Mr. SALAZAR-SANCISI (Ecuador), while endorsing the inclusion of TCDC in the agenda of the Council's thirty-fifth session, said that UNDP should put greater emphasis on the operational aspect of the issue, since a good many ideas which had been put forward in Buenos Aires 10 years earlier had, unfortunately, yet to be acted upon.

64. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) asked for information regarding the kind of document which the secretariat should submit. He pointed out that it would be virtually impossible to prepare a comprehensive report on the activities of Governments and all the organizations of the United Nations system for the June session. That would require a survey of all the parties concerned.

65. Furthermore, he drew the Council's attention to paragraph 13 of decision 5/5, adopted by the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries at its 1987 session, whereby the Committee had decided to include in the agenda of the sixth session of the Committee, to be held in 1989, an item entitled "Overall appraisal and assessment of the implementation by the United Nations development system of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action". The Special Unit for TCDC (UNDP), was gearing up for that assessment which would be a monumental task.

66. If the Council decided to include the item in the agenda of its thirty-fifth session, consultations would have to be held to determine what kind of a document should be prepared.

67. Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) pointed out that the decision of the High-level Committee referred to the entire United Nations development system whereas his proposal referred only to UNDP's efforts to make TCDC an operational instrument. He agreed that the Council should consult with the secretariat to decide on the content of the document requested.

68. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Council), replying to a question from the New Zealand delegation, said that if the Council decided to include the TCDC item in the agenda of its June session it would be sub-item (f) of item 8 (other funds and programmes).

69. After an exchange of views between The PRESIDENT, Mr. MOHAMED (Observer for Somalia) and Mr. KELLAND (Denmark) on whether the least developed countries should be mentioned in the second paragraph of the Somali proposal, the PRESIDENT

(Mr. D'Orville)

suggested that the Council should: (1) decide to include an agenda item at its thirty-fifth session entitled "Strengthening of the capacity of UNDP to promote and support TCDC, including its financing"; and (2) request the Administrator to submit a report under that agenda item, on the understanding that the content of the report would be decided in consultation with the Assistant Administrator.

70. It was so decided.

(b) INDICATIVE PLANNING FIGURES FOR THE FOURTH PROGRAMMING CYCLE (continued)
(DP/1988/9, DP/1988/L.5, DP/1988/L.7)

71. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft decision contained in document DP/1988/L.5.

72. Mr. SALAZAR-SANCISI (Ecuador) said that he had held informal consultations with a number of delegations on draft decision DP/1988/L.5. On behalf of the delegations in question, he proposed that the three operative paragraphs should be replaced by the following single paragraph:

"Decides to consider at its thirty-fifth session the situation with regard to resources available to the programme to date, and the resource outlook for the remainder of the fourth programming cycle, 1987-1991, in accordance with the provisions of decision 85/16, particularly paragraph 4. To assist this consideration, the Council requests the Administrator to report to it on programme delivery, implementation rates for the various parts of the programme and utilization of resources thus far in the cycle; further requests the Administrator to provide his best estimate of the resource outlook for the remaining years of the cycle, as well as recommendations for utilizing the resources available in accordance with the criteria in decision 85/16 and taking into account the views expressed at the special session."

73. Mr. AL-KHATANI (Observer for Saudi Arabia) said that, since his delegation had not been consulted about the draft amendment proposed by the Ecuadorian delegation, he would like to study the new text before expressing an opinion.

74. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision DP/1988/L.5 as amended.

75. It was so decided.

76. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that there was still a great deal of uncertainty regarding Programme resources for the fourth programming cycle, contributions forthcoming to the Programme, which - it should be remembered - were annual and voluntary, and exchange rates. One thing was certain, however: the situation of many developing countries was continuing to deteriorate, and UNDP therefore had to respond to those countries' needs and requests. Another noteworthy point was that in the past important activities had been financed on an ad hoc basis, in particular national technical co-operation assessments and programmes (NATCAPs) and

(Mr. Kramer, Canada)

round tables. Consideration should be given to the possibility of financing such activities on a permanent basis. The Canadian delegation would give favourable consideration to any innovative proposal concerning development assistance which the Administration might make to the Governing Council. It believed, however, that decision 85/16 remained the basic framework for the execution of the fourth programming cycle.

77. Mrs. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) agreed with the Canadian representative that there was much uncertainty about the future. As she had stated at the 4th meeting, the Administration must continue to follow very closely the development of the situation and of requirements and must concentrate on rationalizing programmes and placing them on a more permanent footing. The Administration should implement decision 85/16 in an imaginative manner.

78. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) welcomed the decision just adopted by the Council. He wished, however, to recall that at the 4th meeting he had asked the Administrator to set out the revised IPFs in the report which he was asked to submit.

79. Mr. LEENSTRA (Netherlands) endorsed the comments of the Canadian delegation. He recalled that his country had made sizeable additional contributions to finance activities such as round tables, in the hope that one day they would be considered as part of the core activities of the Programme. The report which the draft decision just adopted asked the Administrator to submit should provide an opportunity to consider that question and others which had been raised at the preceding meeting.

80. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said that the decision just adopted by the Council provided a specific framework for the discussion on the resources available for the fourth cycle. He agreed with previous speakers that it was the provisions of decision 85/16 which should govern the fourth cycle and that there was no need to embark on further discussion on new criteria for resource allocation.

81. Mr. KELLAND (Denmark) said that it was important to realize that, when the question of resources for the fourth cycle came to be considered at the thirty-fifth session, there would still be three years remaining before the end of the cycle and that the situation was still fluid and might change. As the representative of Indonesia had already stated, it would also be necessary to take into account expenses other than those incurred in United States dollars which were expressed in United States dollars. He agreed with the United States delegation that the situation had changed since 1985 and that, within the scope offered by decision 85/16, the Administrator should take into account new developments, particularly the decisions taken by the General Assembly.

82. Mr. WILLIS (United Kingdom) said that, at the mid-term review envisaged in decision 85/16, consideration should be given to the evolution of the situation since the adoption of that decision. In fact, the Special Programme Resources were exhausted, the round-table process had evolved and the national technical co-operation assessments and programmes had been initiated. In preparing his report, the Administrator should therefore take into account all UNDP activities.

/...

83. Mr. HOPLAND (Norway) associated himself with the remarks of previous speakers who had reaffirmed that the provisions of decision 85/16 should continue to govern the fourth cycle. The Programme should, however, display flexibility in the allocation of resources so as to be able to respond to the changing needs of the developing countries. He also thought that the activities mentioned by the delegations of Canada and the Netherlands should be considered as core activities and should therefore be financed from the general resources of the Programme.

84. Mr. AHMED (Observer for Bahrain) asked whether the provisions of the third part of the new operative paragraph of the decision just adopted by the Council meant that the additional resources to be made available would be used to relieve island developing countries of the obligation to become net contributors.

85. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator), replying to the question asked by the Observer for Bahrain, explained that the review of resources would in no way alter the provisions of decision 85/16 concerning a State's acquisition of net contributor status. In view of the complexity of the various questions which had been raised, he said that he was prepared to hold informal talks with interested delegations on various possible scenarios.

86. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft decision in document DP/1988/L.7. An amendment thereto had been submitted, which the Secretary would read out.

87. Mr. D'ORVILLE (Secretary of the Governing Council) said that it had been proposed that paragraph 2 of draft decision DP/1988/L.7 should be amended to read:

"2. Further decides that, where official revision of basic data on per capita gross national product would have changed the status of the country cited in paragraph 18 of document DP/1988/9 to that of a net contributor as defined in decision 85/16, no action will be taken during the current programming cycle with regard to net contributor obligations;"

88. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision as amended.

89. It was so decided.

90. Mrs. BETHEL-DALY (Observer for the Bahamas) thanked the Governing Council for the important decision it had taken in paragraph 2, which took into account her country's position.

CLOSURE OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

91. The PRESIDENT declared the special session closed.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.