



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

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1989/SR.2
24 February 1989
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2nd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 21 February 1989, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. PIBULSONGGRAM (Thailand)

CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda

Other matters:

(c) Report of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole

Fourth programming cycle: programme planning:

(a) Management Development Programme

(c) Categorization of Special Programme Resources Activities

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 3.30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (DP/1989/L.2/Rev.1 and L.2/Add.1/Rev.1)

1. The PRESIDENT declared open the special session of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
2. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, under item 2 (d) of the English version of document DP/1989/L.2/Rev.1, "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" should be read for "Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands". The English version of document DP/1989/68 had already been corrected accordingly.
3. The PRESIDENT suggested that the provisional agenda, as amended at the Council's organizational meeting and taking account of the correction made by the Secretary of the Council, should be adopted. It was proposed that the organization of work contained in document DP/1989/L.2/Add.1/Rev.1 should be followed, on the understanding that it would be applied with the necessary flexibility.
4. The provisional agenda, as amended, and the organization of work were adopted.

OTHER MATTERS:

(c) REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

5. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since a number of the matters considered by the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole at its two most recent sessions were related to items that would be taken up at the current special session, the meeting should be suspended in order to allow the Committee of the Whole to take note of the reports of its Working Group.
6. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

7. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take into consideration in its work the reports submitted to the Committee of the Whole, at its 1st meeting of 1989, by the Working Group.

FOURTH PROGRAMMING CYCLE: PROGRAMME PLANNING:

(a) MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (DP/1989/4 and Corr.1)

8. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said that, while the guidelines for the implementation of the Management Development Programme provided the necessary basis, they could be modified in accordance with circumstances and would be applied with considerable flexibility.
9. The first principle on which the programme was based was that the action undertaken should have a long-term perspective, should employ a comprehensive approach and should aim at a sustainable enhancement of public sector management

(Mr. Draper)

capabilities in the beneficiary countries. Those countries would, accordingly, be helped to assess their needs, to formulate programmes especially designed to meet those needs and offering a good basis for fund-raising, and to co-ordinate more effectively their own efforts to improve the functioning of the public sector.

10. The funds allocated to the Management Development Programme were seed money to be used to finance missions, key inputs and the services of such consultants as might be needed to monitor the implementation of the country programmes. Since, during the fourth programming cycle, no more than \$2 million from the programme could be committed to any one country, and since normally only \$1 million would be available for each country, bilateral and multilateral donors were urged to give their full support to the programmes to be developed.

11. So far, Bolivia was the only country to which a mission had been sent. Two more missions would be sent, to Guyana and Tunisia, in the near future, and a number of missions were in preparation for other countries, including Bangladesh, Honduras and Uganda. UNDP was encouraging more of the least developed countries to apply for such missions.

12. A number of points required to be clarified. Despite the concerns expressed, participation in the Management Development Programme would not be subject to conditions and would not be tied to agreements between the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the Governments concerned. UNDP would not abandon its independence and neutrality and had no intention of imposing any specific ideology or management model. Some believed that the possibility of financing from the indicative planning figure (IPF) would work against the principle of additionality, on which the Management Development Programme was based. Ideally, the survey carried out would result in a government programme. Only some key elements of that programme could, however, be financed from the funds available to the Management Development Programme, and the remainder would have to be financed from other sources. UNDP was ready to assist with the necessary fund-raising, but it would ultimately be for Governments themselves to decide whether their IPF would have to be used.

13. In view of the similarities between the Management Development Programme, the Special Action Programme for Administration and Management (SAPAM) and the national technical co-operation assessments and programmes (NatCAPs), the Administration would endeavour to avoid duplication of missions. Whenever possible, use would be made of the frameworks of co-operation already established and of the surveys already available. The risk of duplication was reduced by the fact that SAPAM had almost exhausted the funds at its disposal. The NatCAPs were also more general in scope than the Management Development Programme, their task being to assess the general needs of countries for technical assistance while that of the Programme was to focus exclusively on the public sector.

14. It was certainly the intention of UNDP to make use of national consultants wherever feasible, in accordance with its general policy. The concrete development activities to be carried out under the Management Development Programme would necessarily lead to co-operation with other organs of the United Nations system in matters relating to the public sector. At the same time, UNDP wanted to be able to

/...

(Mr. Draper)

secure the participation of the mostly highly qualified consultants, both within and outside the system.

15. The terms of reference of the missions contained instructions regarding activities for the advancement of women in the context of the programme, particularly under the heading of human resource development and training.

16. It was expected that, by the June 1989 session of the Governing Council, seven or eight missions would have been in the field. UNDP would make special efforts for the least developed countries and, in line with the understanding reached at Geneva in 1988, would devote close to 50 per cent of the resources of the programme to sub-Saharan Africa.

17. Miss ALAWADI (Observer for Kuwait) said that her delegation supported the allocation of \$60 million for the Management Development Programme during the fourth programming cycle, and did so for a number of reasons. First, the programme had the aim of improving public sector management in the developing countries in accordance with the strategies drawn up by their respective Governments. Secondly, the countries wishing to participate received UNDP assistance, but the activities involved were of a purely consultative character and it was for Governments themselves to decide on the administrative reforms to be undertaken. Thirdly, the programme took account of the particular needs of women in developing countries. Fourthly, care had been taken to avoid waste, which should be a constant concern of UNDP, as of other institutions. Fifthly, an evaluation was to be undertaken at the end of the fourth programming cycle, which would make it possible to determine whether the needs of the developing countries had been met while making optimum use of available resources.

18. Mr. POWER (Canada) said that, in approving paragraph 11 of Governing Council decision 88/31 A, it had been the understanding of his delegation that the Governing Council must approve the guidelines and not merely have them presented for information. Canada supported the decision in question, under the terms of which the general principle of universality observed by UNDP would apply to the Management Development Programme. As indicated in paragraph 20 of document DP/1989/4, a choice would have to be made between candidates for support because of the limited resources available, which should be allocated to the countries most in need of such special assistance. To date, only one of the seven countries that had applied was included in the category of the least developed countries. It was to be hoped that, with time and an appropriate information campaign by UNDP, that situation would be corrected.

19. Concerning conditions which could affect participation in the programme, his delegation saw nothing threatening in document DP/1989/4. There was no question in it of requiring countries requesting assistance to implement structural adjustment programmes inspired by Bretton Woods. The principle of sovereignty was not called into question by the fact that UNDP responded to requests for assistance from countries that needed to design, negotiate or implement structural adjustment programmes. With regard to "proposed areas of activity", his delegation felt that the global approach based on essential functions of the public service seemed

(Mr. Power, Canada)

somewhat in contradiction to the carrying out of sectoral studies in such areas as municipal management and presumed that they would not be included in the programme.

20. With regard to the organization of the programme, there was something of a grey zone between the responsibilities of the Management Development Support Unit and those of the Regional Bureaux. One might also ask whether the location of the Support Unit within the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation (BPPE) was not liable to be interpreted as a new organizational trend giving rise to a confusion of the functions of the departments entrusted with formulating guidelines and those responsible for managing operational activities.

21. Concerning mobilization of resources, paragraph 27 (d) indicated that, after the programme had been evaluated, the Administrator might ask donors for general financial support. His delegation was curious as to why, in the current early phase, co-financing should be favoured, as suggested in paragraph 27 (b). On the whole, the Canadian delegation supported the Programme but would welcome a clarification of the points which it had raised.

22. Mr. KELLAND (Observer for Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that the implementation of the Management Development Programme would be useful in the further elaboration of ideas pertaining to management and the future role of UNDP in that field. The guidelines under discussion might not be ideal and the concrete mechanisms were still not entirely clear, but they formed a useful basis for further work. In any case, the guidelines could be revised in the light of experience.

23. The main purpose of the programme was to create management capacity. UNDP should by no means manage the public sector but rather help the recipients to improve their management methods, paying close attention to their circumstances and needs, which varied increasingly. The least developed countries should be encouraged to formulate requests for support under the programme and in accordance with the reassurance given by the Working Group, efforts should be made to ensure that by the end of the year the aid provided would be geographically better balanced.

24. The upper limit of \$2 million set at the thirty-fifth session implied a thin spread of resources and was a modest amount. Funds allocated to the programme should be regarded as seed money whose purpose was to mobilize finance from other sources than UNDP. Should such finance prove insufficient, the recipient countries would decide whether the activities recommended by the Programme justified financing from the IPF.

25. There should be close co-operation with other United Nations agencies as well as with the international financial institutions, without detracting from the independence of UNDP. Where assistance was provided under the programme in relation to the formulation and implementation of overall economic reform programmes, the main purpose should be to strengthen the negotiating capacity of the recipient to ensure that options were identified which were efficient and minimized adverse social effects. Efforts in that area should not be incompatible with the essentially long-term aims of the Management Development Programme.

/...

26. Mr. OGAWA (Japan) said that Japan strongly supported the establishment of the Management Development Programme as a distinct centrally managed mechanism to assist recipient countries, particularly the least developed countries, to carry out economic reforms and to implement structural adjustment measures. Regrettably, that original concept had been much diluted since the adoption of decision 88/31. Document DP/1989/4 lacked clarity and specificity in defining the basic concept of management, the objectives of the programme, criteria for the selection of countries and projects and the co-ordination modalities with other management-related activities of UNDP as well as other organizations. That programme should not be a mere addition to existing management-related programmes. His delegation understood that the working mechanism of the programme would be gradually developed and elaborated in the light of experience gained. It would watch with great interest the way in which the programme was implemented.

27. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Liberia) said that the Management Development Programme should be considered in the context of the future role of UNDP. The relevant document stated that national technical co-operation assessments and programmes, round tables and other such mechanisms would be brought together so as to avoid duplication and that one of the new roles of UNDP would be to use the Management Development Programme to advise national management officials.

28. Mr. DUHALT (Observer for Mexico) said that, from the outset of the preliminary consultations on the setting up of a management service for development, his delegation had expressed certain misgivings, which sprang from two basic concerns. First, Mexico remained attached to the fundamental principle whereby it was for developing countries to identify their own priorities and to choose their development projects freely, unilaterally and without restriction as to activity sectors. Recipient countries should thus utilize UNDP resources in accordance with their national objectives and with the criteria stated in decision 85/16 concerning the fourth programming cycle.

29. Secondly, his delegation felt that the development process was a highly complex phenomenon and that government management could not be taken to be the main obstacle to renewed economic growth in the developing countries. If UNDP resources were concentrated on a management development programme, there was a risk that resources would be diverted from other priority sectors of the economy.

30. His delegation thought that the principles contained in document DP/1989/4 were at variance with the spirit and the letter of the decisions adopted by the Governing Council at its thirty-fifth session, which excluded all conditionality or exclusiveness in the allocation of resources and reaffirmed that recipient countries could freely choose their internal economic policies. Thus paragraph 14 stated: "Requests will be given positive consideration only if the missions and the projects to be developed will be assured direct access to senior policy-making level in the host country". That was a further condition which encroached upon the sovereignty of the recipient Government and could be used as an excuse to intervene in administrative decisions that lay exclusively within its competence. In any case, the recipient Government should itself determine to what levels of administration the missions should have access.

(Mr. Duhalt, Observer, Mexico)

31. In paragraph 20, the Administration introduced certain criteria for the selection of recipient countries, stating: "... priority will be determined by the relative poverty of the country, the need for the types of assistance offered and the commitment to management improvements". His delegation was unable to see how the need for different types of assistance could be evaluated, far less the commitment to management improvements. A country's request for assistance constituted sufficient proof of its commitment to management improvements, and it was not for the Council to decide on the sincerity of a Government's intentions.

32. In paragraph 27, the Administration stated that the resources available to the programme were limited and the possibility of financing from the IPF should be explored. That suggestion was contrary to the basic principles underlying the programme. Since currency fluctuations had resulted in a slight increase in resources for UNDP, it had been decided to allocate a fixed amount to the programme, independently of the IPF mechanism which was governed by clearly defined rules. It was not proper to divert resources from the IPF towards programmes of more limited scope whose operational norms were more rigid. In any case, the recipient countries should decide whether they wished to use their IPFs for the programme.

33. Mexico reaffirmed its commitment to maintaining and strengthening the principles of flexibility, universality, non-conditionality and free identification of priorities by recipient countries for all activities of UNDP. Given that a great many developing countries had gained useful experience in such fields as external debt management, administrative streamlining and reform and privatization of public enterprises, the mechanisms of technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) should be incorporated in the Management Development Programme. His delegation hoped to find proposals along those lines in forthcoming documents concerning the programme.

34. Mr. JASINSKI (Poland) said that, if properly implemented, the Management Development Programme should substantially increase the effectiveness of all United Nations technical co-operation activities and, consequently, improve international economic relations. It was also an opportunity for UNDP to enhance its comparative advantage in supplying quality assistance at minimum cost. Since it was well aware that the external and internal factors responsible for massive economic and financial problems were closely interrelated, UNDP was well placed to provide solutions, particularly given the improvement in the international political climate.

35. His delegation noted with satisfaction from paragraph 13 of document DP/1989/4 that there was "no intention to impose any particular model or philosophy of management" upon developing countries and that it was the Governments that would decide which reforms were to be undertaken. Poland had embarked upon far-reaching reforms of its economic and political systems and was ready to co-operate with UNDP in the context of the programme, both to receive advice and to share its own experience.

(Mr. Jasinski, Poland)

36. His delegation noted with interest that UNDP had started to develop a network of experts and institutions in the field of public sector management. Those contacts should be broadened so that the expertise existing in both developed and developing countries could be used in the preparation and implementation of projects. Such networking should be done in a systematic way and could be facilitated by sending questionnaires to all interested countries. Some thought might also be given to publishing a directory of consultants and national focal points co-operating with UNDP in the management field.

37. In the same vein, his delegation welcomed the statement in the new paragraph 23 of document DP/1989/4/Corr.1, to the effect that in the implementation of the new programme UNDP would co-operate with other United Nations system agencies active in the field of management. In fact, such co-operation already existed; by way of example, he cited a number of projects implemented within the framework of a UNDP regional programme for Europe, which included a component on management and in the concept of networking. The fact that some of those projects associated countries in Europe which had IPFs with countries that did not proved that there was much merit to such co-operation.

38. Mr. PETTIT (United Kingdom) said that the guidelines set forth in document DP/1989/4 and Corr.1 constituted an appropriate starting-point at the present stage. The Council should take note of them with satisfaction and invite the Administrator to refine them in light of experience.

39. Mr. KUFOUR (Ghana) noted that some delegations were concerned that very few African countries, particularly among the least developed, had asked to benefit from the programme. Yet African countries had been given to understand, from the very beginning, that the programme was primarily a regional programme for Africa. That was why the programme had been approved at the meeting of African Ministers of Planning and why African countries had supported it in UNDP, in the hope that a certain amount of money would be allocated for Africa in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development. Although it was not a regional programme as such, the Administrator had given assurances that new projects would be undertaken in Africa and that 50 per cent of the resources allocated to the programme would be allocated to that region.

40. In so far as the guidelines were concerned, his delegation felt that the additional resources should not come from IPFs. It was also concerned at the risk of duplication between the programme and other mechanisms such as NaTCAPs. With regard to the last sentence of paragraph 14 it would be better to express the hope that missions would have access to the senior policy-making level in a country rather than making such access mandatory. His delegation furthermore hoped that the text of paragraph 24 would remain as it was. Finally, he asked how resources would be allocated between missions and management development projects.

41. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation endorsed the programme and wished to draw the Council's attention to three points: firstly, least developed countries, particularly those in Africa, should benefit from a major portion of the resources and the Administrator should be asked to make sure

(Mr. Sahlmann, Federal Republic of Germany)

that 50 per cent of the resources were allocated to Africa; secondly, when formulating national management development programmes, account should be taken of the cultural aspects; thirdly, in order to enhance its effectiveness, the programme should concentrate initially on a limited number of countries.

42. Mr. YUJNOVSKY (Argentina) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of the adoption of decision 88/31 in which the Governing Council had decided that the programme would be available to all countries wishing to participate and that no conditionality would be applied in the execution of the programme. The principle of universality must therefore be maintained. The guidelines must be consistent with that decision and the objective of the programme should be to improve the recipient countries' management of the development process in the long term rather than to resolve their public sector problems in the short term. Argentina believed that it was the countries which should decide whether their IPFs should be used in the context of the programme.

43. Mr. ELKADHRY (Observer for Saudi Arabia) noted that the field of activity mentioned on page 5 of document DP/1989/4 was very important and that, if development efforts were to produce results, it was essential to give sustained support to the Management Development Programme.

44. Mr. YENEL (Turkey) said that in that area also, the TOKTEN formula could be used to advantage. With regard to organizational matters he wondered whether the unit which was scheduled to be set up could be expected to carry out all the tasks referred to in paragraph 25. Finally, he expressed the wish that the programme should be evaluated starting in 1990.

45. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) recalled that his delegation had supported the establishment of the programme and it viewed the tentative guidelines as a step in the right direction. Like Denmark, Australia hoped that the efforts to promote the programme among the least developed countries would be directed at a very wide variety of targets. It requested inter alia that efforts be made to maintain a balance between the regions. UNDP must also work in close co-operation with the other United Nations agencies and with the multilateral assistance institutions. The political, social and cultural features of each country must be taken into account at the project formulation stage. Finally, although the document under consideration touched only briefly on the subject, evaluation should play an important role. Australia supported the Turkish proposal in that regard. Furthermore, it hoped that the members of the Governing Council would be informed of the criteria that were adopted for the selection of projects.

46. Mr. MATOS (Spain) said he was pleased to see that the Administration had termed its guidelines "tentative". It would, indeed, be most unfortunate if the programme's potential were to be jeopardized by misunderstandings among the parties concerned, arising from undue haste. His delegation therefore hoped that, when drafting the final guidelines, the Administration would take into account the comments made by members of the Council. He fully endorsed the terms used by the Council in decision 88/31 in establishing the programme and supported the comprehensive approach which UNDP had adopted, according to paragraph 8 of document DP/1989/4.

(Mr. Matos, Spain)

47. In the absence of sufficient data, his delegation could not comment on the overall amount of resources allocated to the programme, nor on the principles governing their apportionment among regions and countries. Nevertheless, it was pleased to see that UNDP activities were intended to act as a catalyst. He could not say, at that stage, whether there was any need to make the guidelines more specific, particularly those relating to relations to be established between the programme under consideration and other similar programmes. It would be necessary to revert to those issues later in the light of experience.

48. His delegation, like others which had preceded it, would like to see an initial evaluation of the programme take place in 1990. As far as possible, use should be made of local experts who had the necessary qualifications and who were thoroughly familiar with the social, economic and cultural features of countries wishing to improve their management capacity.

49. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said that he was pleased to note the positive approach taken by delegations. He particularly welcomed the fact that the representative of the United Kingdom had endorsed the provisional guidelines. In response both to the concerns voiced by various delegations and to the points raised by delegations, he wished to confirm that the purpose of the programme was not to establish a standard structure in each country but, rather, to provide all countries with management capabilities, in keeping with their own characteristics. Moreover, since programme implementation took place under the supervision of Member States, there could be no threat to their sovereignty. The only requirement to be met by States wishing to participate in the programme was that they should be genuinely interested in the programme. Although it was not absolutely essential, the principle that members of missions should have access to the recipient country's senior policy-makers was important owing to the nature of the assistance planned. With regard to programme content, there were no plans to carry out sectoral studies (on local management, etc.), but there was a possibility, for example, that a mission would be prompted to stress the need for greater decentralization at the local level.

50. Where the selection of the participating countries was concerned, he wished to confirm that Africa and the least developed countries would be the principal recipients. He was already in a position to indicate that most of the nine African countries in which a mission was planned in 1989 were least developed countries. In giving priority to least developed countries, the Administration was simply carrying out the instructions given to it by the Governing Council in Geneva. There was therefore no reason to say that it was not acting in accordance with decision 88/31. Its chief concern was to give priority to the countries that were most in need of assistance, and not necessarily to the countries that were the first to request assistance. UNDP would take care to improve the geographical distribution of projects.

51. On the issue of organization, the support unit that was to be set up in BPPE should be able to carry out its tasks despite its very small size, since it would to a great extent rely on the operational network of UNDP. Its specific role would be to accelerate the execution of activities, to give advice and to carry out

(Mr. Draper)

quality control. Furthermore, UNDP would naturally work in close co-operation with other institutions whose activities concerned management. The proposals put forward by the Polish delegation for expanding the network of consultants were excellent. Pending their implementation and in order not to delay implementation of the programme, countries could bring the names of qualified consultants to the attention of UNDP. Use of the TOKTEN formula, as suggested by Turkey, was another way of obtaining the services of local consultants, whose importance had also been stressed by the representative of Spain.

52. With regard to financing, he could already confirm that the allocation of \$60 million for the programme would not be sufficient. Co-financing possibilities must therefore already be considered at the current stage, since some donors might be willing to finance a particular project component of special interest to them. He wished to assure the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany that the resources allocated for the programme would not be dispersed over a great number of countries; however, UNDP wished to have a wide enough range of countries in order to be able to extend the experiment subsequently. He acknowledged that the IPFs should be used only as a last resort.

53. The programme was intended as a way of setting in motion a process that would gain momentum. Management development was an ongoing activity that would be adjusted in the light of experience, with due care not to lose sight of the programme's initial goal - a risk that had been referred to by the representative of Japan. He was willing to carry out an evaluation exercise in 1990, particularly since he had planned to carry out such an exercise on an informal basis in 1990. He fully endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Liberia on the role to be played by the programme in the context of future UNDP activities. He also wished to stress that Member States could always request any changes that they might consider appropriate and that their co-operation and suggestions would be crucial in ensuring the programme's success.

54. Mr. PALMLUND (Co-ordinator, Management Development Programme), responding to a point raised by the representative of Canada, said that the Administration considered it preferable to launch the programme immediately with the funds allocated for it and to request additional resources subsequently under specific programmes. He could not provide a precise answer to the question posed by the representative of Ghana concerning the distribution of resources among missions and projects proper, but missions should absorb only a small proportion of the funds, even although they were a necessary activity.

(c) CATEGORIZATION OF SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES ACTIVITIES (DP/1989/64)

55. Mr. TAL (Director, Planning and Co-ordination Office) introduced document DP/1989/64, which reported on the follow-up to decision 88/31, in which the Council had approved the allocation of \$110 million to increase activities financed from Special Programme Resources (SPR) in the remainder of the fourth cycle. The breakdown of the additional amount in question was: \$60 million for the Management Development Programme, \$20 million for the Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America and \$30 million for activities previously agreed by the

/...

(Mr. Tal)

Council, as listed in paragraph 35 of document DP/1988/26. In most cases the distribution of the latter amount of \$30 million among the various categories of activities was exactly the same as it had been earlier, as the Council had requested. However, since the Administrator's proposals for an \$80 million increase had been reduced to \$30 million, the percentage allocated to some activities had had to be adjusted in order to take account of operational requirements. For example, the allocation for "Other activities" had not been increased. The Administrator's proposals also took account of the level of priority assigned to activities, as well as of a realistic assessment of capacity to commit and expend funds.

56. The level of resources allocated to programme development, particularly round tables and NaTCAPs, had been increased substantially. The same was true in the case of the activities in the subcategory "New initiatives/innovative approaches" - the proposed increase being intended to cover the cost of previously authorized activities (such as private-sector conferences) and the new environmental activities. The partners in development programme had been so successful that an additional \$3 million had been earmarked for the phase beginning in 1989. The earmarking for the Project Development Facility (PDF) had been increased by \$3.5 million in view of the PDF's importance. The PDF had been especially effective in increasing the number of projects introduced into the pipeline for 1988, 1989 and 1990 and was greatly appreciated by both resident representatives and recipient countries. The additional funds authorized by the Council in July 1988 had been almost entirely committed. With the concurrence of the Council, the Administrator intended to release the balance of the PDF resources available for the cycle - namely, the additional \$875,000 (100 per cent of the increase under decision 88/31) - in 1989. That release notwithstanding, the overall level of SPR commitments would be maintained at the level authorized by the Council. With a view to ensuring both a smooth transition to the fifth cycle and adequate pipeline development in 1991, the Administrator would like to propose to the Council at its June session that the amount available for the PDF should be increased.

57. The earmarking for TCDC had been raised by 50 per cent, an increase that was well above the total increase in SPR of 38 per cent. In the case of disaster relief, the increase was almost 30 per cent. The Administrator was carefully monitoring the level of allocations for that category, since it was possible that - owing to the growing number of disasters - the earmarkings would be depleted before the end of the cycle. Lastly, an amount of \$1.7 million had been left unearmarked in case the allocations already made proved insufficient.

58. A provisional table showing the status of SPR as at 31 December 1988 would be circulated to delegations. Furthermore, in accordance with decision 88/31, paragraph 14 (a), the Administrator had released an additional 25 per cent of the increase in IPFs and other resources authorized by the Council. The Council would be provided with a report on that subject at its June session.

59. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would continue consideration of the item under discussion at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.