



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

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/1989/SR.35  
27 June 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirty-sixth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 22 June 1989, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. PIEULSONGRAM (Thailand)

CONTENTS

Programme implementation (continued)

- (b) Implementation of decisions adopted by the Governing Council at previous sessions (continued)
  - (ii) Support to drug abuse control programmes (continued)
- (d) Special programmes (continued)
  - (ii) Assistance to the Palestinian people

/...

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.

CONTENTS (continued)

(e) Evaluation

Other matters

- (a) United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical co-operation expenditures

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

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

(ii) SUPPORT TO DRUG ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAMMES (continued) (DP/1989/19)

1. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that drug addiction and trafficking was one of the most important problems facing the world and the international community had taken important steps to deal with it. The Soviet Union took a positive view of United Nations activities to combat drugs and would support them in every way. It was revising its own domestic law with a view to combating drugs and stopping the transit of drugs through Soviet territory. Multilateral and bilateral co-operation between the customs authorities of the Soviet Union and other countries was increasing, but more was needed. His country would do its part by organizing seminars for developing countries and offering the services of its experts.

2. Ms. LEE (Australia) said that her country supported the narcotic control activities of the United Nations system, and especially those of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, which needed increased resources. The financial rules and procedures under which the Fund's projects operated were good, but the projects required ongoing review to monitor their effectiveness.

3. Miss DOHERTY (United Kingdom) said that her country strongly supported all United Nations activities designed to combat drug abuse, including UNDP assistance to the projects of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. The Fund's activities in Asia and Latin America were especially welcome.

4. Mr. KING (Deputy Assistant Administrator and Deputy Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation) said that he appreciated the comments made with respect to the need for training and the assistance offered by the Soviet Union.

(d) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

(ii) ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

5. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) said that the past year had been marked by the need to carry out activities in an area not only under occupation but also in a state of unrest, and there was concern as to whether UNDP could carry out meaningful activities under the circumstances. It had therefore been impossible to produce the traditional annual report, which would have been out of date even before printing. He would instead give an overview of the programme.

6. Programme delivery in 1988 had been lower than he had hoped - just over \$2 million - but even that was an impressive achievement given the unsettled

(Mr. Draper)

political situation, which had been marked by border and schools closings, curfews and obstacles to the launching of some planned activities. It also reflected well on the small but dedicated staff of UNDP in Jerusalem. Efforts were under way to improve the record in 1989.

7. Some activities had been implemented none the less. They included a business development centre to help Palestinian entrepreneurs, a sewage and recycling system to improve sanitation, a grape-processing facility, a citrus-processing facility and an industrial zone to benefit craftsmen and small businesses. UNDP was concerned, however, about delays in allowing the implementation of projects designed to contribute to the economic and social development of the Palestinian people and he had sought assurances of co-operation from senior Israeli officials.

8. Special mention must be made of the increasing co-operation UNDP received in the occupied territories from Governments, international organizations, United Nations agencies and voluntary organizations. It was UNDP's policy to encourage such participation. Consultation and co-operation with the Palestine Liberation Organization had also become more systematic. With the support of the Governing Council, UNDP had performed a difficult and important task in the occupied territories and would continue its efforts to improve the situation of the Palestinian people.

9. Mr. ABU KOASH (Observer for Palestine) said that he appreciated UNDP's assistance to the Palestinian people and noted that UNDP agreed with the PLO in concluding that it was almost impossible to deal with the Israeli occupation authorities. The fact that the Administrator could not submit his annual report showed that UNDP was dissatisfied with the way the Israeli occupation authorities impeded his efforts to help the Palestinian people.

10. The Palestinians welcomed all United Nations assistance. It seemed that UNDP had considered suspending its activities in the territories as a protest against Israeli practices and efforts to impede its activities. A more effective step would be to stop or reduce assistance provided to Israel by those major UNDP contributors who had influence on Israel and could exert useful pressure.

11. He welcomed the fact that UNDP was also encouraging other bodies to help the Palestinian people and drew attention in that connection to the suffering of Palestinian children, whose schools had been closed two years previously by the occupation authority and who continued to suffer the ravages of war. It was regrettable that UNICEF had shown no concern for the trauma and psychological effects of the occupation on Palestinian children. UNICEF should instead publicize their plight and assist them. It should also respond to the invitation to participate in UNDP's assistance to the Palestinian people.

12. UNDP's increased consultation and co-operation with the Palestine Liberation Organization was extremely welcome and should be intensified even further. He would like UNDP to prepare a country programme for the Palestinian people in co-operation with the PLO.

(Mr. Abu Koash, Observer,  
Palestine)

13. When the PLO contacted sources of aid, including Western countries, it stressed the importance of UNDP's role and asked them to channel their assistance through UNDP. It did not speak of the difficulties in providing aid. That information should be provided by UNDP.
14. He had been asked to invite the Administrator and his senior staff to meet with Mr. Arafat to discuss ways of overcoming difficulties and of assisting the Palestinian people as effectively as possible, pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the Governing Council and the General Assembly.
15. He hoped that someday the Palestinians would themselves be full members of the Council and in a position to help others in need.
16. Mr. AL-ZUNNI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that there was a need for increased international co-operation in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Everyone was aware of the terrible conditions facing the Palestinian people as a result of the occupation and he urged the international community to shoulder its responsibility to the Palestinian people by increasing its support.
17. Mrs. HAMODI (Observer for Iraq) said that the whole international community was aware of the sufferings of the Palestinian people. The occupying forces were trampling underfoot human rights that were guaranteed under all legal systems, especially the rights of women and children. UNDP must act more intensively to salvage the situation and provide better conditions for the Palestinian people.
18. Mr. OGAWA (Japan) expressed appreciation to the UNDP field and headquarters staff who had been carrying out the Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian people under difficult circumstances. Japan intended to expand its support for those living in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and would like to be regularly informed by the Administration of the progress it was making under volatile conditions.
19. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he spoke for the majority in expressing the hope that military activities in the occupied territories would end and the situation would be normalized, so that programmes could be implemented more easily. The extremely complex situation in the Middle East demanded immediate action by the international community to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestinian people. The United Nations would not be able to help them overcome their economic difficulties until Israeli occupation ended. His Government supported UNDP action to assist them and hoped that its refugee assistance would be expanded in a neutral manner. It also hoped that UNDP assistance was being correctly used, to respond exclusively to the needs of the Palestinian people.
20. Mr. LIU Lianke (China) reiterated China's consistent support for UNDP's Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian people.

21. Mr. CABEIRO QUINTANA (Cuba) reaffirmed his Government's total support for what UNDP was doing for the Palestinian people under rather difficult circumstances.

22. Mr. EL ZUBEIR (Sudan) commended UNDP's efforts to assist the Palestinian people, who were living in tragic circumstances that were unprecedented in modern history. Despite the obstacles that Israel was placing in its path, UNDP could play a significant role under the occupation, and the Sudan supported its endeavours in all fields.

23. His delegation agreed with the Observer for Palestine that UNDP should co-ordinate with the PLO to establish a country programme for Palestine.

24. Ms. COLLOTON (United States of America) said that the United States was committed to improving the living conditions of the Palestinian people. It had its own bilateral assistance programmes for them: in 1988 the total direct United States assistance had been \$7 million; in 1989, \$15 million had been approved and her Government hoped to have \$7 million more in supplemental funds as well. In addition, there was a supplementary food programme amounting to \$2.5 million annually for 1988-1990. The United States supported an active UNDP programme in the West Bank and Gaza, with a wide range of projects emphasizing basic development.

25. Mr. ALOM (Observer for Bangladesh) said that his Government had always supported UNDP's sincere efforts to provide assistance that mitigated the sufferings of the Palestinian people, and that it looked forward to the day when there would be a self-sustained development programme in Palestine.

26. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that his Government fully supported the UNDP Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian people.

27. Mr. DRAPER (Administrator) thanked all delegations for their encouragement. Referring to the suggestion that UNDP should work towards establishing a country programme for Palestine, he pointed out that since there was no IPF for Palestine there could be no country programme. Funds had thus far come from SPR and all projects had necessarily been on an ad hoc basis.

28. The PRESIDENT said that, before the Council concluded the item, he wished to propose the following draft decision:

"The Governing Council,

"1. Takes note of the statement of the UNDP Administration covering the current status of the UNDP Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian people, and

"2. Calls upon the Administrator to continue his steadfast efforts to provide meaningful development assistance to the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza Strip."

29. Mr. ABU KOASH (Observer for Palestine) suggested that, in order to bring the language of the draft into line with that customarily used in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, the words "Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza Strip" at the end of paragraph 2 should be amended to read "Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories".
30. Ms. DOPTE RIGGELSEN (Observer for Denmark) suggested that, since the issue was so important, the amendment was best treated in the Drafting Group.
31. Mr. POPESCU (Romania) said that he did not agree with the suggestion. It was clear that the Programme had the full support of the Council, and he proposed that the President's draft decision should be adopted with the proposed amendment.
32. Ms. COLLOTON (United States of America) said that the representative of Denmark was not alone. Ordinarily the Council either took note of a report in plenary meeting or considered a decision in the Drafting Group.
33. Mr. CABEIRO QUINTANA (Cuba) supported the position of the representative of Romania. It was not the first time that the President proposed draft decisions directly to the Council; they did not always go through the Drafting Group first.
34. Mr. ROTHERMEL (Director, Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People), replying to a question from Mr. LADJOUZI (Observer for Algeria), said that the language suggested by the observer for Palestine did indeed conform to language previously used in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.
35. Mr. ABU KOASH said that, to make a difficult situation easier, he would have no difficulty in concluding paragraph 2 of the draft decision with the words "Palestinian people" in place of the phrase "Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza Strip", since UNDP assistance was not limited to occupied Palestine but extended to all Palestinians.
36. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision with the amendment just suggested.
37. It was so decided.

(e) EVALUATION (DP/1989/71)

38. Mr. RAHEEM (Director, Central Evaluation Office), introducing the report of the Administrator (DP/1989/71), said that it summarized the results of a wide variety of evaluation-related activities undertaken by UNDP in 1988 and 1989 which corresponded to the work plan outlined in DP/1988/18. The work plan for 1989-1990, which was included in paragraphs 75-77 of the report for the Council's consideration and comments depended on increased staffing resources for its fulfilment. Given the existing staffing of the Central Evaluation Office (CEO), it had not been possible to respond fully to the demands of field offices and regional bureaux for support at the country level, although every effort had been made to balance central evaluation work with the requirements of regional bureaux and Governments.

(Mr. Raheem)

39. He drew attention to the outcome of work carried out in 1988/1989 and to work currently in progress. Project evaluations undertaken by the decentralized system were improving in quality and covering a wider range of development issues. Evaluation results were systematically taken into account in the follow-up phases of project activity. The process of using evaluation results in new project design continued to require attention in order to become fully institutionalized. To that extent, feedback was an operational and not an evaluation issue. Sustained efforts were being made to produce useful materials from the evaluation process in a form readily usable by both operational units within UNDP and its partners in the tripartite system. Better methods would be explored for quantifying the outcome of technical assistance and a rating scale for project evaluation would be developed.

40. Project completion reporting needed improvement as to timeliness, content and utilization. Some of the measures proposed to that end were greater government involvement in terminal report completion, more systematic monitoring of the use of such reports in end-of-project tripartite reviews, and ensuring their utility with respect to future decisions. Furthermore, the administrative burden on field offices and Governments would be reduced by planned changes in the reporting format. The complex task of evaluating the impact of projects on the institutions assisted would continue. Institution building required varying amounts of time, according to the individual circumstances. More attention must be given to specifying the expectations for each phase of institution-building activities, given the increasing complexity of the environments in which institutions operated. Strengthening of institutional capabilities in the informal sector, in rural industrial development, and in entrepreneurship, in local income-generating projects required innovative approaches. Work would be undertaken in 1989 and 1990 with a view to evaluating and seeking to understand the issues involved. CEO would examine institutions in the areas of urbanization, the soil sector, and development of information systems and services, and would also try to understand the specifics of institutional strengthening in high technology institutions. The various forms of twinning of institutions would likewise be examined.

41. Activities aimed at helping Governments to strengthen their evaluation capability were proceeding apace. For example, a review of the evaluation system of the United Republic of Tanzania had led to follow-up by the Government and UNDP to develop systems for the implementation of monitoring. Useful studies of well-established systems such as those in Malaysia and India had been conducted. Requests had recently been received from the Governments of Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire and Zimbabwe for assistance in revitalizing their monitoring and evaluation systems. It was important to recognize that the building of capacity in monitoring and evaluation required sustained national attention to produce useful results. Maintaining, operating and adjusting the system appeared to require the greatest effort, while the designing and monitoring of systems were comparatively easier tasks.

42. The evaluation of the mid-term country programme review process had begun and would focus on the effectiveness and utility of that process; the results of the study would be presented to the Council in 1990. In its evaluation work, UNDP



(Mr. Raheem)

collaborated actively with Governments and OECD and co-sponsored or actively participated in seminars and workshops. It collaborated continuously with the United Nations specialized agencies and the Joint Inspection Unit. In fact, UNDP would chair the forthcoming Sixth Inter-Agency Working Group meeting on evaluation. It would continue to seek to exploit those relationships to the full with a view to strengthening evaluation work in the service of development projects.

43. Mr. VARADACHARY (India) said that the Administrator's report, although informative, did not go far enough. India had recently completed its mid-term review, which had brought together project authorities, sectoral development officers, members of the Planning Commission, and multilateral and bilateral aid agencies. The momentum from that gathering had continued, leading to a series of meetings during which each project had been examined closely and all problems identified with a view to taking corrective action. A further series of meetings to evaluate clusters of projects in several locations with representation from state Governments, project authorities, and development sectors was planned for July.

44. On the basis of his long experience as a planner, he felt that the most important problem encountered with regard to UNDP projects was that of perspective. Difficulties were encountered in fitting projects into sectoral and economic plans, as well as in linking them to other developments. That was still a weakness, and new linkages should be built in at the project preparation stage; otherwise, no amount of evaluation would help.

45. Referring to paragraph 30 of the Administrator's report, he said that the need to build capacity to use available technology applied to all fields, not just civil aviation, and he would like to see the principle of such capacity-building more generally applied.

46. With regard to the post-evaluation stage, he said that tripartite reviews involving the relevant Departments, UNDP and the Ministry of Finance had begun in India. In the context of paragraphs 65 and 76 of the report, he observed that such tripartite exercises should be used not only for terminal reviews, but also for concurrent project evaluation. It was not possible to foresee all the implications of a project at the preparation stage, but if projects were reviewed at mid-term, course corrections could be made and the nature of a project could even be changed, if necessary. Such concurrent evaluations should be built into the system, and combined with the feedback and system strengthening activities referred to in the annex to the report.

47. The problem of project planning and evaluation was shrouded in a certain amount of uncertainty, and the longer the term of the project, the greater the uncertainty. As was recognized in paragraph 40 of the report, evaluations often reflected too closely the development concerns and perceptions of the moment; that was a serious but unavoidable problem. Some projects with excellent design and planning failed, while other projects with a more uncertain outlook succeeded beyond all expectations.

48. Mr. BREVIK (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said they attached great importance to the work of CEO and had noted with much interest that the concept of evaluation had been given more weight in operational activities. The Administrator's report was highly informative, but could have been improved by the inclusion of references to the review activities mentioned therein, which would have made it possible to formulate independent observations on the content on the basis of the original material.

49. Close co-operation between the evaluation units of the various multilateral programmes was necessary if the lessons of evaluation were to be learned and the work in that area was to have maximum impact. Frankness was required, especially in regard to failures, so that recipients as well as donors could benefit from the experience gained.

50. The Nordic countries appreciated UNDP's continued systematic efforts to strengthen its evaluation system, and would welcome quantification of the resources currently devoted to evaluation as compared to 1983 levels. They would also welcome further information about the Administrator's commitments and plans for the future of CEO, particularly its possible role in evaluation of the activities of the UNDP-administered funds. They supported the Administration's intention to increase evaluation of activities within those funds, but questioned whether the funds should establish their own evaluation functions. They therefore proposed that the Administrator should include in his report to the next session of the Governing Council proposals on the organization of evaluation activities in UNDP-administered funds, and requested further information on the relationship between the field office evaluation network and CEO.

51. The report presented a mix of reviews, studies and evaluations, but it would have been easier to gauge their value if they had been more clearly identified.

52. The new series of evaluation studies on the performance of technical assistance in regard to public administration of infrastructure and research management in the productive sector, along with the many positive initiatives relating to the environment, were most welcome, and the Nordic countries hoped the results of those evaluations would be used in future planning.

53. The Nordic countries welcomed the work of UNDP in regard to the establishment of a common and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system for all the partners in the United Nations system, which was of particular importance with a view to tackling the differences in procedures, reporting systems and such which impeded co-ordination between UNDP and the specialized agencies and interaction with recipients. It was a matter of concern that the specialized agencies appeared to be slow in responding to that important issue. Such efforts should be carried out in such a way as to support the activities of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

54. In conclusion, the Nordic countries urged that continuous assistance should be given to recipient countries to strengthen their capacity to monitor and evaluate their own development.

55. Mr. CRUSE (France) said that UNDP's efforts in the vital area of project and programme evaluation were commendable and should be expanded. In addition to evaluating the cost-effectiveness and benefits of projects, it was also necessary to assess their social impact. Projects which were not very cost-effective sometimes provided very useful social benefits. An evaluation should also be made of the secondary impact of projects in areas such as poverty alleviation, environmental protection, human resources development and the informal sector.

56. His delegation attached great importance to the evaluation methods used. It was essential to know what methods were used to evaluate specific types of projects. Feedback was indispensable in order to ensure that policies were effective and to determine what projects should be changed, strengthened or terminated. In that regard, he stressed that there should be no hesitation in terminating a project whose impact was insufficient, too costly or otherwise unsatisfactory. Lastly, his delegation would like to be kept informed of the impact of evaluation on project execution.

57. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that the report of the Administrator focused attention on the relevance of incorporating evaluation into project preparation and implementation at all stages and levels and stressed the practical results of employing evaluation techniques. Evaluation was of special importance in light of the growing interdependence of economic issues and problems in general and of UNDP programmes and projects in particular. It was useful as a means of limiting the impact of negative factors and increasing the positive elements in plans and programmes.

58. High quality should continue to be the hallmark of UNDP activities. Referring to the work plan for 1989-1990 for the Central Evaluation Office, he stressed that quality should not be sacrificed for quantity. Work should be completed on the Evaluation Handbook and consideration should be given to the question of evaluating projects and programmes involving the transfer of technology and scientific co-operation, especially to determine their environmental impact. Evaluations should serve as the basis for recommendations which should be implemented promptly. That would enhance the effectiveness of projects and promote efforts to achieve development objectives.

59. Mr. LINCOLN (World Meteorological Organization) said that the report of the Administrator referred to meteorology as a good example of a field where there was evidence of widespread impact of technological co-operation. The report drew attention to critical problems in maintaining advanced technology in full operation because of the lack of spares or of access to them. Unfortunately, there was no easy solution to that long-term problem.

60. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America) commended the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) for its many efforts to improve UNDP evaluation and strengthen government capacity to evaluate and monitor development programmes and projects. The evaluation of programme and project impact should become an integral part of the UNDP evaluation system, including the systematic use of ex-post evaluations and their integration into thematic evaluations.

(Mr. Graham, United States)

61. The conclusions of CEO's 1988 review of the utility of project evaluations confirmed his belief that the use by UNDP of "lessons learnt" did not extend beyond the project level. That was clearly demonstrated by the Programme's apparent inability to assess its past programme performance in the context of its policy review on the role of UNDP in the 1990s.

62. In order for UNDP evaluation to move beyond aid management concerns and to assess more clearly the contributions of projects or programmes to the sector or sub-sector concerned, there must be greater emphasis on the collection of baseline data and the systematic ex-post evaluation of impact at the institutional, sectoral or thematic level.

63. He supported efforts to harmonize evaluation policies and procedures within the United Nations development system, and encouraged UNDP to learn from the experience of agencies which had developed good evaluation systems of their own. In addition, while fully supporting the Office's 1989-1990 work plan, he urged CEO to undertake a study of ways to improve the monitoring and evaluation of programme and project impact and sustainability.

64. Mr. SAHLMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he fully supported the statements made by the representatives of India and France and felt that CEO should be further strengthened. In that connection, he inquired how many Professional staff members were working in the Office and whether full use was being made of posts. He stressed the need to centralize evaluation units in CEO for all UNDP activities. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the Office had provided its work plan for 1989-1990, which would facilitate co-operation and the sharing of experience in the field of evaluation. According to paragraph 54 of the report, integration of evaluation results into UNDP operations continued to require the collective involvement of operational units and technical support services. In that regard, he asked through which UNDP channels feedback was provided to management and operational units.

65. Mr. SKLIAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that project evaluation reports had been simplified and were more comprehensible. The framework for conducting mid-term evaluations of country programmes were clear and the role of recipient Governments in evaluations had been strengthened. All that should enhance the effectiveness of the Programme's work. Unfortunately, there were still many unresolved questions regarding the use of the results of evaluations in UNDP activities. There was no reliable organizational method for analysing experience gained. That issue should be the focus of efforts for the period 1989-1990. In that connection, he stressed the need to avoid setting up additional, unwieldy machinery and giving special attention to evaluations, analyses of evaluations and other monitoring activities.

66. The mechanism for the mid-term evaluation of country programmes was somewhat overly formalized. There was perhaps no need to insist on formal mid-term evaluations in cases where it was not considered necessary by the recipient Government or the UNDP field office involved. In such cases, an informal review of

(Mr. Skliarov, USSR)

programme execution could be conducted, with attention focused on sectors and projects. Steps must be taken to ensure that executing agencies submitted high-quality final reports in good time. Lastly, the work plan for 1989-1990 met his delegation's expectations and its implementation would help enhance the effectiveness of UNDP activities.

67. Miss DOHERTY (United Kingdom) said that her delegation also attached importance to the use of evaluation to enhance the effectiveness of UNDP operations, particularly with regard to institution building. The Programme was in a good position to compare different development styles and approaches to establishing sustainable institutions. Evaluation should lead to guidelines to increase project effectiveness. There should be more emphasis on the lessons learnt in presenting the results of evaluation studies. Evaluation should focus on impact as well as procedures. Her delegation agreed with the comments made in paragraph 47 of DP/1989/71 and supported the Programme's participation in the DAC expert group on aid evaluation. Her country valued its contacts with UNDP at that level. Lastly, she inquired when the Evaluation Handbook would be published.

68. Mrs. BERNAL (Colombia) expressed satisfaction at the progress made in efforts undertaken in the field to ensure the success of projects. In that connection, she stressed the important role played by recipient Governments in developing their own evaluation capacities. Government commitment was essential in order to ensure continuity of implementation of a country's development plans.

69. Mr. RAHEEM (Director, Central Evaluation Office), responding to the comments and questions put forward by delegations, said that he agreed that cross-referencing and indication of textual material was a very important aspect of the Office's work. Evaluation should proceed further to include new fields through thematic studies and greater involvement of national authorities in joint evaluations beyond operational projects. He was aware of the importance of the operational use of feedback, especially at the mid-term level, and the value of taking a second look at data after preliminary evaluations.

70. CEO had a director and three professional staff members. All professional posts had been filled for the past two years. Through help from recipient countries and the skilful use of consultancy funds, it had been possible to increase the Office's staffing capability. The total evaluation resources at the central and programme level were less than one per cent of the total programme cost. By clustering evaluations, conducting more systematic field reviews and combining programme and project evaluations, the cost of evaluation had not risen, while evaluation activities had increased.

71. The evaluation networks linked CEO to the UNDP Regional Bureaux and the field offices. In field offices the network operated largely through the resident representatives or their senior assistants. When conditions permitted, there was continuous contact with the networking officials. CEO had tried to keep the network informal. UNDP did not support the proliferation of evaluation officers. CEO, however, had not yet been provided with sufficient staff to carry out its

/...

(Mr. Raheem)

entire mandate. Accordingly, he requested support for the strengthening of the Office and its capacity to respond to the needs of Governments and field offices at the operational level. The response by United Nations agency partners to harmonization efforts had been excellent. The harmonization process had begun at the field office level. At the operational level there had been harmonization in some programmes in the area of special activities, research publications and seminars. CEO was looking forward to consultations with its bilateral partners on harmonizing evaluation practices in multilateral/bilateral projects.

72. He welcomed the comments by the representative of France on impact evaluation and the need to go further in addressing the conditions in which the projects operated. CEO was developing a manual on participatory evaluation, and had gained considerably from the work of non-governmental organizations and the experience of many developed and developing countries with that process. He was also fully in agreement with regard to the operational benefits of evaluation. Evaluation had no purpose if it did not aid in decision-making.

73. He had noted the comments on the work plan by the representative of Poland, and endorsed his emphasis on the need for quality and priority-setting, and for organizing each programme in such a way that the conclusions drawn from it could be used as feedback.

74. He thanked the representative of WMO for the excellent co-operative relations which CEO enjoyed with WMO. Such co-operation was all the more important in embarking on a study of disaster-prone countries.

75. He agreed with the representative of the United States of America that the progress on impact evaluations had been slow, although several impact evaluations were currently in progress, and endorsed the latter's comments regarding systematic use of ex-post evaluations; CEO needed to strengthen its capacity to extract useful data quickly.

76. Concerning the need to go beyond case studies, he noted that the case studies had in fact been drawn from evaluations. The issues of programme and project sustainability and the need to strengthen the design, appraisal and monitoring process would be raised at a meeting with United Nations agencies to be held in October 1989.

77. He thanked the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his support for the further strengthening of the Office. He agreed that feedback was an operational issue. The use of Programme Advisory Notes and training seminars were aspects of the feedback process. Another method was to involve advisers in counselling visiting missions on project formulation. CEO's computerized evaluation data base was now beginning to produce results in terms of making data more widely available to the system at large.

78. He agreed with the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that evaluation should be linked directly to the feedback process. Replying to the

/...

(Mr. Raheem)

representative of the United Kingdom, he said that the Evaluation Handbook, to be issued by the end of 1989, would highlight the lessons learnt. He also agreed with the representative of Colombia that programmes and projects should derive from government decisions.

79. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to request the Drafting Group to begin the elaboration of decisions reflecting the debate just concluded.

80. It was so decided.

#### OTHER MATTERS

(a) UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM REGULAR AND EXTRABUDGETARY TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION EXPENDITURES (DP/1989/55 and DP/1988/60)

81. Mrs. SCHIEBER (Chief, Documentation and Statistics Office), introducing documents DP/1989/55 and DP/1988/60, said that the latter, instead of giving an annual review, covered the period 1982-1988. The aim was to present in a single document pertinent data for several years and to attempt to discern emerging trends from the data. The annex contained the detailed data for 1988.

82. The main highlights of the report could be grouped into two categories: those relating to 1988 and those relating to the period 1982-1988.

83. For 1988, the total grant assistance provided by the United Nations system had reached \$3.1 billion, compared to \$2.8 billion in 1987, an increase of 13 per cent. The total technical assistance flowing through the United Nations system in 1988 had been almost \$1.9 billion; in 1987, the corresponding figure had been \$1.7 billion. The expenditures from regular agency budgets had declined by 15 per cent, from \$320 million in 1987 to \$272 million in 1988. Extrabudgetary expenditures had increased by 12 per cent from \$687 million to \$779 million over the same period. Contributions to extrabudgetary resources had totalled \$817 million in 1988 compared to \$667 million in 1987.

84. Total grant assistance provided by the United Nations system had increased from \$2.3 billion in 1982 to \$3.1 billion in 1988. The sectors classified by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) - health, agriculture, forestry and fisheries, population, natural resources, and transport and communications - had accounted for 75 per cent of non-UNDP technical co-operation expenditure. WHO and FAO together had accounted for approximately 57 per cent of non-UNDP technical co-operation expenditure.

85. Expenditures from all sources, although growing, displayed an erratic pattern with no apparent stability. The same was true for contributions.

86. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the Administrator's reports contained in documents DP/1988/55 and DP/1989/60.

87. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.