



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

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1989/SR.1
3 March 1989
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Organizational meeting for 1989

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 21 February 1989, at 10 a.m.

Temporary President: Mr. DRAPER (Administrator)

President: Mr. PIBULSONGGRAM (Thailand)

CONTENTS

Opening of the meeting

Election of officers

Adoption of the agenda

Progress report on rationalization of the work of the Governing Council, including measures taken concerning documentation

Matters relating to the work of the Council in 1989

Questions relating to the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole

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 record of this meeting will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT declared open the organizational meeting of the Governing Council for 1989, emphasized the excellent work done by outgoing members of the Council and welcomed new and re-elected members.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

2. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect a Bureau consisting of a President and four Vice-Presidents, due account being taken, in accordance with rule 11 of its Rules of Procedure, of the need to ensure equitable geographical representation in the Bureau and geographical rotation of the office of President among the different regional groups.
3. In accordance with that principle, the President of the Governing Council in 1989 should be elected from among members of the Group of Asian and Pacific States. That Group had nominated Mr. Pibulsonggram (Thailand) for the office of President.
4. Mr. Pibulsonggram (Thailand) was elected President by acclamation.
5. Mr. PIBULSONGGRAM (Thailand) took the Chair.
6. The PRESIDENT said that, as the central funding and co-ordination body of the United Nations development system, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) performed a very valuable and critically important task. At its previous session, the Governing Council had adopted a number of very significant decisions with the valuable participation of its members. The current year would also be one of intense activity for the Council, which would have to consider a number of very important issues, including those related to the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole, the Management Development Programme, UNDP participation in the preparations for the second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, preparations for the fifth programming cycle and the future role of UNDP.
7. The following candidates had been nominated by their respective regional groups for election as Vice-Presidents of the Council: Mr. Langenbacher (Switzerland) by the Group of Western European and Other States, Mr. Kufuor (Ghana) by the Group of African States, Mr. Salazar Sancisi (Ecuador) by the Group of Latin American States and Mr. Popescu (Romania) by the Group of Eastern European States. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the candidates by acclamation.
8. Mr. Langenbacher (Switzerland), Mr. Kufuor (Ghana), Mr. Salazar Sancisi (Ecuador) and Mr. Popescu (Romania) were elected Vice-Presidents by acclamation.

9. The PRESIDENT announced that he intended to convene a meeting of the Bureau as soon as possible to discuss and take a decision on the assignment of tasks to the Vice-Presidents. Pursuant to Council decision 81/37, the Bureau and the Administrator were also required to consult with Member States both before and during Council sessions in order to facilitate completion of the Council's work. He intended to make full use of such consultations.

Statement by the Administrator

10. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said that in 1989 UNDP would once again have a solid financial base, as pledges for the current year exceeded \$1 billion, not including pledges to the funds administered by UNDP and co-financing, which brought the total to over \$1.3 billion, the highest level in the history of UNDP. He reiterated his appreciation to all the Governments that had contributed to the Programme and, in particular, to the major donors and to the developing countries, whose efforts were very great by comparison with their resources.

11. At its organizational meeting and during its special session, the Council would have to consider a number of very important issues. He was sure that it would do so with its customary intelligence, perseverance and spirit of consensus.

Statement by the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund

12. Dr. SADIK (Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)), said that in the two decades of the Fund's operations there had been some remarkable changes. When UNFPA had started out, barely half a dozen countries had adopted population policies; the figure was now over 70. In 1969, the Fund had three donors; in 1988 it had 99 and in 1989 it hoped to have over 100. However, it would particularly like to have one additional donor which had previously been its traditional largest donor.

13. Owing to the generosity of the international community, UNFPA had received over \$2 billion in contributions in the past 20 years. It now estimated its 1989 income at between \$190 million and \$195 million, depending on fluctuations in rates of exchange. That range of projected income was fully in line with the \$190 million forecast for 1989 by the Fund and endorsed by the Governing Council in its decision 88/34 and would permit UNFPA to implement the programme level for 1989 proposed by it and authorized by the Council during its previous session.

14. She thanked both donor and recipient participant Governments for their generous voluntary pledges to help finance the Fund's work programme. Many Governments had increased the amount of their pledges both in terms of local currency and in United States dollars. Those increases ranged from 6 per cent to 100 per cent.

15. In 1969, the Fund had started work in a handful of countries; in 1989, it was co-operating with 131 countries. Nearly every developing country had had a co-operation programme with UNFPA. In that time, family planning practice had increased from 9 per cent to 45 per cent, total fertility had decreased from 4.5 to

(Dr. Sadik, UNFPA)

36 and the global rate of population growth had decreased from over 2 per cent annually to 1.74 per cent.

16. The Fund was not alone in providing population assistance and most of the credit for the advances made in the past 20 years obviously went to the men and women in developing countries, the Governments, the non-governmental organizations and the growing number of individuals throughout the globe who had recognized the need for balance between population growth, prospects for socio-economic development and use of natural resources.

17. In any given year, UNFPA supported a number of conferences and meetings, usually in co-operation with Governments, non-governmental organizations or international agencies. The events planned for 1989, which included parliamentarians' conferences in Asia, Africa and Latin America and regional conferences and national meetings on a variety of topics, would all provide an opportunity for others to join in marking the Fund's anniversary. A number of information events were planned throughout the year, the first of which had been a recent global broadcast of a two-hour documentary entitled "Without Borders". The State of World Population 1989 report would take as its theme women, population and development. As such, it would focus on the Fund's major concerns and draw attention to the central role of women in development.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (DP/1989/L.1)

18. The PRESIDENT, referring to agenda item 6, "Questions relating to the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole", said that, following informal consultations among Council members, it had been decided that the election of members of the Working Group would take place during the current organizational meeting.

19. Mr. CABEIRO QUINTANA (Cuba) said that the Group of Latin American States had not been consulted about the election of members of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole and was opposed to holding the election during the current organizational meeting, since it was stated in document DP/1989/3 that the term of the members of the Working Group would be extended until June 1989, when the mandates of the Committee of the Whole and its Working Group were scheduled for review. The Group of Latin American States therefore believed it would be better to hold the election during the thirty-sixth session of the Governing Council. Document DP/1989/3 also indicated that no meetings of the Working Group would be held before June 1989, which was another reason not to hold the election until that time. He also hoped that during the 1989 session the Council would bear in mind a resolution from the Group of 77 concerning the Working Group, which the General Assembly had already considered.

20. Mr. VARDACHARY (India) endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Cuba; it was clearly stated in document DP/1989/L.1 that the Council might postpone the election of members of the Working Group until June. Furthermore, no reason had been given for holding the election during the organizational meeting, rather than as stated in the document.

21. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) emphasized the importance of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole and said that her delegation did not want to postpone the elections, which were traditionally held in February.
22. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator), replying to the representative of India, said that the proposal to elect members of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole had come from the Administration and not from the Council, which was responsible for deciding whether the elections would be held in February or in June.
23. Mr. SALAZAR SANCISI (Ecuador) said that one of the most controversial items before the Council was the item on the Working Group. The Administration had met informally and had agreed that the Working Group would continue until June and that its future would be determined at that time. Since the discussion on that item appeared to be unproductive, he suggested that the question should not be dealt with until it had been considered informally. His delegation agreed with the representatives of India and Cuba that it was inappropriate to appoint new members of the Working Group and favoured extending the Group's mandate until June.
24. The PRESIDENT suggested that a decision on the matter should be postponed, as he wished to consult Council members in order to submit a proposal at a later date.
25. Mr. LEENSTRA (Netherlands) said it was unfortunate that the work of the Council should be held up by arguments of a political nature; he urged Council members to take a decision on the Working Group in June, in accordance with the rules of procedure. He also supported the President's proposal to have the matter first considered by the Bureau.
26. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the provisional agenda of the organizational meeting for 1989, contained in document DP/1988/L.1, was adopted.
27. It was so decided.

PROGRESS REPORT ON RATIONALIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, INCLUDING MEASURES TAKEN CONCERNING DOCUMENTATION

28. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council), underscoring the importance of rationalizing the work of the Council, recalled the various measures taken since the adoption of Governing Council decision 81/37, particularly the holding of an organizational meeting and the presentation every two years of reports on UNDP funds and programmes. He noted also that it was the Council which decided whether debates were to be held on substantive issues - the role of UNDP, for example - during the organizational meetings.
29. With regard to the need to make optimum use of the time allocated by the Department of Conference Services, he stressed that meetings must begin punctually.
30. In 1982, the Drafting Group had been established, thereby making it possible to adopt much clearer and more concise decisions. As for documentation, Governing

(Mr. Kirdar)

Council decision 87/51 requested that documents should be distributed simultaneously in all working languages. That was difficult to accomplish on schedule because of the financial constraints of the United Nations. The UNDP secretariat was the only body to issue the draft version of documents in yellow. The number of pages of documentation received by the Council had decreased from 1,581 to 1,439 between 1987 and 1988, and advanced publishing technology was used, including word processing of texts, which would be used even more extensively in the coming year. The UNDP Governing Council was one of the most effective governing bodies in the United Nations system.

31. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) said that the orderly and timely manner in which documents had been issued constituted an improvement; he also commended the usefulness of the yellow documents. The manner in which delegations in New York had been kept informed of the status of documentation had been very beneficial.

32. Mr. RHONER (Switzerland) suggested that the annual report should be issued in a bound format, as had been done in the past, as such a collection of Council documents was very useful and convenient.

33. Mr. CHEKAY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, according to document DP/1989/2, the report concerning agenda item 10 would be issued nine weeks beyond the deadline, i.e. during the session. He wished to point out that delegations needed adequate time to consider documents. With regard to the document containing statistical information on item 7 (United Nations technical co-operation activities), it should be noted that delays in the appearance of documents occurred at every session. In the case of that particular report, there was not even a scheduled publication date. The reason for the delay was that the necessary statistical information would be available only towards the end of March, when the accounts were closed. He hoped that did not mean that the document would not appear until late April.

34. Miss COURSON (France) said that the problem of late documents existed in all bodies and asked the secretariat to do everything possible to solve that problem. The yellow documents were of no use to French-speaking delegations because they required them to work in a language other than their own.

35. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the documents which, according to note DP/1989/2, were delayed because the necessary data would not be available until March, April or even May, asked whether it was possible to change those deadlines. In the commercial sector and in many Governments there were systems which made it possible to obtain such data in February, and UNDP ought to try to get other branches of the United Nations system to move the date for the preparation of those data forward.

36. Mr. CABEIRO-QUINTANA (Cuba) said that year after year his delegation had expressed concern because most of the documents, if not all of them, were received only at the time of the meeting. Delegations needed instructions from their Governments and, if they received the documents late, they could not obtain them in

(Mr. Cabeiro-Quintana, Cuba)

time. The Secretariat must try to solve this serious situation so that delegations would have at least the yellow versions of documents ahead of time. The ideal would be for each country to receive the documentation in good time in the official language it used so as to be able to make adequate preparations for participating in sessions. The Secretariat must take the necessary steps and accept the challenge of translating and distributing documents in the various official languages on time. It might be worth using the pouch service to accelerate the distribution process.

37. Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) endorsed the request made by other delegations for documents to be prepared in all languages as quickly as possible.

38. Mr. PAYTON (Observer for New Zealand) said that the problem of delays in the distribution of the information needed by the Council was very complex; to solve the problem, it was not enough to suggest that the Department of Conference Services should receive more money than was allocated to it by the General Assembly or for the Council to try to carry out a very heavy programme of work in the limited time available.

39. He was grateful to the secretariat of the Council for pointing out to delegations that, although it had been decided to hold a full session every year, it seemed that the earlier system of holding two sessions was being reverted to and the work that had to be completed each week was being constantly increased.

40. As to document DP/1989/10, it was regrettable that the synopsis of what the system in general hoped UNDP would carry out with existing resources had not been provided. Until that synopsis was available, it would be difficult to determine whether the constant increase in what UNDP was asked to do was realistic and how those demands could be met with available resources.

41. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that the bound document requested by the representative of Switzerland, which would contain the report of the Administrator with its addenda and other important documents, would be prepared when all those documents were available. The explanations regarding the document mentioned by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany (DP/1989/2), which referred to the waiver of the 10-week rule, would be provided during the consideration of item 5. The timely distribution of documents in the various languages really depended on the capacity and priorities of the translation services of the United Nations. The secretariat of UNDP, for its part, had managed to send out the documents for translation earlier than in the past. The delays anticipated and the reasons for them were being communicated to the Council, and that was precisely the purpose of document DP/1989/2. So that delegations received documents as quickly as possible, they were being distributed to them in the yellow version, but that could only be done in the original language. Documents were sent to missions and it was up to them to transmit them to Governments. Document DP/1989/10 had been included in the organizational session because it contained three matters related to item 5; however, the substantive deliberations about that document would take place during the

(Mr. Kirdar)

consideration of the last item on the agenda of the special session, as had been decided.

42. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) asked whether, in cases where delays were envisaged, it was possible to send out documents for external translation.

43. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that external translation was sometimes used but that did not prevent delays because when UNDP sent a document for translation to the Department of Conference Services it was not immediately informed that there would be a delay; moreover, the firms which were used for external translation were not in the United States, precisely because they were concerned with languages other than English.

44. Miss COURSON (France) said that it was strange that the Department of Conference Services did not indicate in advance if there would be delays in the translation of documents. The secretariat of UNDP, in agreement with that Department, should establish a system which would enable it to be informed in good time of the dates on which documents would be available.

45. Mr. BAGBENBI (Zaire) said that the Department of Conference Services was able to meet the needs of the various bodies in respect of documents; he was very concerned about the statement made by the Secretary of the Council because it raised doubts about the possibility of ensuring that delegations received documents in time in the official languages as required so that they could participate actively, efficiently and on an equal footing in the work of the Council. Naturally, if the Department of Conference Services was to have the various language versions ready at the appropriate time, it had to receive documents in good time.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL IN 1989 (DP/1989/L.2/Rev.1 and Add.1/Rev.1, DP/1989/L.3, DP/1989/1 and Add.1, DP/1989/2)

46. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council), introducing documents DP/1989/L.2/Rev.1 and Add.1/Rev.1 concerning the provisional agenda for the special session, said that in those revised documents two additional items were introduced, namely: item 7 on the United Nations Population Fund and item 8, Other matters, with three subitems: Alternative strategies for desert locust control, Preparations for the fifth programming cycle and Report of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole.

47. Document DP/1989/L.2/Add.1/Rev.1 was concerned with the organization of work of the special session, while the organization of work of the thirty-sixth session of the Council appeared in document DP/1989/L.3, reflecting the decisions and requests made by the Council at previous sessions, especially in the annex to Council decision 87/50. The Administration was proposing a programme of work for the period from 5 June to 30 June 1989. The draft provisional agenda appeared in annex I.

(Mr. Kirdar)

48. In relation to item 10 (d) of the agenda for the thirty-sixth session, Issues of concern to the Governing Council arising from General Assembly action at its forty-third session, the Council had before it document DP/1989/10; chapter 3 of that document contained a list of the questions that the General Assembly had requested the Council to consider that year. They included the venue of Council meetings, the change of name of the Council in accordance with General Assembly resolution 43/199, and the timing of meetings of the Council in accordance with resolution 1988/77 of the Economic and Social Council. The Council might wish to add those three items to the agenda as subparagraphs 1, 2 and 3 of item 10 (d) of the provisional agenda.

49. Another item which must be taken into account was the international development strategy for the fourth United Nations Development Decade. The Council might wish to include it in the general debate of the high-level meetings when the role of UNDP in the 1990s was to be considered, or in a separate debate.

50. In the light of the current situation in Namibia, the Administrator would make a statement to the Council, and the Council might wish to add an item on Namibia to the agenda for its thirty-sixth session.

51. Annex II of document DP/1989/L.3 contained the schedule of work for the thirty-sixth session of UNDP. In view of the considerable volume of work of the Budgetary and Finance Committee, which had to adopt a new budget that year, a timetable for a more detailed agenda would have to be provided and that Committee should be assured of services for a maximum of 30 meetings, as had been done in earlier Governing Council sessions. Also, in the second week, the meetings of the Drafting Group would have to be scheduled, as far as possible, so as not to overlap with those of the Budgetary and Finance Committee. Towards the end of the session, it might, however, be necessary to hold their meetings simultaneously, as had happened the previous year. It should also be borne in mind that, although it was revised and complete, the programme of work was to be considered as provisional and indicative in nature, so that the Council could take up items on a flexible basis, depending on how the work progressed during the session.

52. The high-level segment would be held during the second week of the session, from 12 to 14 June. Debate would focus on the role of UNDP in the 1990s and, if the Council so desired, the question of a development strategy could be taken up. Delegations could also consider the annual report of the Administrator and other policy questions before the Council, some of which were listed in paragraph 16 of document DP/1989/L.3. It was proposed that on 24 April the list of speakers for the high-level segment would be opened and that it would be closed on 12 June in the afternoon. Furthermore, the Council might perhaps wish, as in the past, to consider setting a 15-minute time-limit on statements in the general debate.

53. As to the meetings of the Committee of the Whole, it was being proposed in paragraph 11 of document DP/1989/L.3 to allocate specific subjects, following the previous year's practice, to the Committee of the Whole, including UNFPA country

(Mr. Kirdar)

and inter-country programmes. The Council would review the reports as well as the statutes and mandate of the Committee of the Whole itself.

54. The Drafting Group would meet on 12 June to consider the UNFPA item, and again later from 15 to 29 June. As in previous years, there would be audiovisual presentations to supplement the debate on certain items.

55. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) suggested that the Management Development Programme sub-item, to be introduced that very day, was open for discussion in the course of the session by other speakers with more time for preparation.

56. After a brief discussion in which Mr. CABEIRO QUINTANA (Cuba), Mr. VARDACHARY (India), Mr. KUFOUR (Ghana) and Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain) took part, the PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt the agenda contained in documents DP/1989/L.2/Rev.1 and Add.1/Rev.1 and agreed to the suggestion made by the Associate Administrator.

57. It was so decided.

58. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) asked for clarification as to whether the detailed agenda for the Budgetary and Finance Committee was to be adopted at the current organizational meeting or at the thirty-sixth session of the Governing Council.

59. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that once items were allocated to the Budgetary and Finance Committee at the first meeting of the Council's thirty-sixth session, the Committee would be in a position to adopt its own programme of work.

60. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) asked what the Budgetary and Finance Committee was scheduled to be doing on the Wednesday of the first week, since apparently the biennial budget (item 9 (b)) was to be considered before the high-level segment was held. He was concerned by the fact that the budget would be considered before the members of the Committee had formed an opinion about the objectives to be achieved in the decade. He wondered if what was intended was a preliminary review, during which the secretariat would explain the contents of the budget and if time would be allowed to analyse the budget before taking a decision.

61. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) replied that, indeed, since the biennial budget was a voluminous document, an effort had been made to give delegations time to familiarize themselves with it before beginning the substantive debate, which would take place the following week.

62. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) observed that, in the work schedule for the Committee of the Whole, two meetings had been allocated for consideration of item 5 (b), Programme planning, comprising mid-term reviews, selected country programmes and global projects. His delegation wondered whether two meetings were enough for an in-depth analysis of all the sub-items.

63. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) said that the current time-table was flexible and illustrative and, once adopted, would be modified according to the pace of the deliberations. If it was not possible to complete consideration of that item on Friday of the first week, the Committee of the Whole could continue considering it on subsequent days. For the moment, an attempt had been made to allocate the available time equitably.

64. Mr. LANGENBACHER (Switzerland), referring again to the mid-term review, said that, since the organization of work for the June session would be discussed during the special session, it was preferable to leave the question open until that discussion was over. The same applied to the kind of reports to be submitted by the Administrator and to the report on the mid-term reviews referred to in agenda item 5 b (i); it could happen that there would be not merely one but several reports.

65. With regard to agenda item 4 (a) (ii), Procurement from developing countries, he asked the Administrator, in his reports on the matter, to address the question of organizational measures adopted by the Inter-Agency Procurement Services Unit (IAPSU) and the financial implications of such measures.

66. Mrs. COURSON (France), referring to item 4 (a) (ii) of the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session of the UNDP Governing Council, regarding procurement, requested a detailed report on the circumstances and cost of transferring IAPSU to Copenhagen.

67. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) said that she favoured keeping the item regarding programme implementation open and that she hoped that before the end of the meeting an illustrative revised agenda would be available that allocated more time to the mid-term reviews of country and regional programmes.

68. Mr. VARDACHARY (India) proposed that procurement from developing countries should be made a separate main sub-item rather than being sub-item (ii) to main sub-item (a) of item 4 of the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session of the UNDP Governing Council. He also proposed including main sub-items (c) and (d) of item 4 and main sub-item (d) of item 10 as sub-items to main sub-item (a) of item 4.

69. Mr. PAYTON (Observer for New Zealand) agreed that item 4 (a) (ii) should be given the Council's special attention. The question of procurement from developing countries was very significant for UNDP.

70. Also important was item 10 (d) on the environment. Bearing in mind that a conference on the environment might be held in 1992, his delegation favoured giving more weight to that question.

71. Mr. BROWN (Associate Administrator) recalled that it had been suggested that any decision regarding the time allocated to the mid-term country programme reviews should be taken during the special session because in that session various country programmes would be submitted and it would be possible to know if one or two days were needed for their consideration.

(Mr. Brown)

72. With regard to item 4 of the provisional agenda of the thirty-sixth session, it should be pointed out that the items were arranged as had been decided by the Governing Council and that procurement from developing countries belonged under sub-item (a), Implementation of decisions adopted by the Governing Council at previous sessions. The Council could decide to amend the item so that sub-item (ii) would read "Procurement from developing and underutilized donor countries". That was, in effect, what was being requested in paragraph 4 of decision 1988/20 of the Governing Council and was in keeping with the wishes expressed by some delegations. With regard to that revised title, the Administrator would submit a report on the transfer to Copenhagen of the Inter-Agency Procurement Services Unit, including an account of the expense involved and any new developments.

73. With regard to the proposal of the representative of India, it was up to the Council to decide if it wanted to rearrange its agenda accordingly.

74. Mr. ROHNER (Switzerland) said that it was generally agreed that the report of the Administrator on the role of UNDP in the 1990s should be reviewed under agenda item 3. None the less, the Administrator's report must also contain other elements which had received no attention in the past two years. As a result, on the present occasion there should be an agenda item which would allow for consideration of all of those matters.

75. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Switzerland. In the past, when the Administrator's report had been considered it had not always been clear to delegations why certain decisions had been adopted. Time must be devoted to considering aspects of the Administrator's report which were not related to the future of UNDP.

76. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to add the sub-items on the date and place of meetings, the name of the Council and the international development strategy for the Fourth United Nations Development Decade, as the Secretary of the Council had suggested.

77. It was so decided.

78. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the provisional agenda contained in annex I of document DP/1989/L.3, as orally amended.

79. It was so decided.

80. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed the proposed work schedule, on the understanding that it was provisional and indicative in character so that the Council could take up items on a flexible basis, and that it entrusted the Bureau with the task of adjusting the schedule of meetings as required, depending on the availability of services.

81. It was so decided.

82. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that, as had been customary in recent years at the special session, the Council would decide not to apply rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure on the quorum requirement.

83. It was so decided.

84. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to endorse the suggestions contained in paragraph 11 of document DP/1989/L.3 concerning the reports which the Committee of the Whole was to consider in June 1989.

85. It was so decided.

86. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that the Council decided that the list of speakers for the high-level segment of the thirty-sixth session, scheduled for 12-14 June 1989, would be open from 24 April to 12 June 1989.

87. It was so decided.

88. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would further take it that the Council agreed that, as in previous years, statements would be limited to 15 minutes during the high-level segment, as very little time was available for the general debate.

89. It was so decided.

90. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to allocate the items mentioned in paragraph 19 of document DP/1989/L.3 to the Budgetary and Finance Committee.

91. It was so decided.

92. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to reiterate the principles guiding the work of its Drafting Group as contained in section III of decision 83/1 and mentioned in paragraph 21 of document DP/1989/L.3.

93. It was so decided.

94. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) drew attention to paragraph 21 (c) of document DP/1989/L.3, which stated that all delegations could submit draft decisions on any agenda item, and to paragraph 21 (d), which stated that in cases where both delegations or the Chairman had circulated draft texts, the Drafting Group would give precedence to the consideration of texts submitted by delegations.

95. Mr. LEENSTRA (Netherlands) said that his delegation wished to draw the Council's attention to an additional document which had been requested and for which the 10-week rule should also be waived. The document in question was that on the future role of UNDP. It was his understanding that the Secretariat would shortly be circulating the consensus decision arrived at during the lengthy debate in the Working Group the previous year, according to which the revised draft of the document would be prepared by UNDP and submitted to the Department of Conference Services for translation by 9 May. That deadline meant that the Council would have to authorize a waiver of the 10-week rule for the distribution of the document.

96. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom), referring to the document under agenda item 10 (a), Other matters: United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures, asked whether it was necessary that it be distributed nine weeks beyond the deadline, in other words, one week before the meeting. His delegation had noted in previous years that the document was rarely considered, chiefly because it was received late. He wondered whether it would not be better to do away with it or to produce a less ambitious version. The reason given for the delay was that data from executing agencies would not be available until early May. Since the data base had reportedly been revised in 1988, he wondered whether the document could be produced earlier so that it would be of more use to the council's debates.

97. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to waive the 10-week rule for submission of the documents indicated in document DP/1989/2.

98. It was so decided.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORKING GROUP OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (DP/1989/3)

99. The PRESIDENT said that there were three parts to the item - the review of the mandate of the Working Group, the review of the Committee of the Whole itself and the election of 26 members of the Working Group. Pending the adoption of decisions by the Bureau, consideration of the item would be postponed.

100. The PRESIDENT said that if there were no other matters which the Council wished to consider, he would declare the 1989 organizational meeting adjourned.

101. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.