



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

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/1993/55/Add.2  
12 April 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session  
1-18 June 1993, New York  
Item 10 (b) of the provisional agenda

OTHER MATTERS

Proposal concerning location of United Nations Development  
Programme and United Nations Population Fund headquarters

Impact for Member States

Report of the Administrator

SUMMARY

The present addendum to the report on the proposal concerning the location of the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund headquarters contains the findings of the examination of the impact for Member States of a relocation to Bonn. This examination has been undertaken in accordance with paragraph 2 (b) of Governing Council decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992.

1. In paragraph 2 (b) of its decision 92/44, the Governing Council requested the Administrator "to consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation". The implementation of this paragraph was discussed with representatives of Germany and of the United States of America as host Government. As a result of these consultations, the questionnaire reproduced in the annex to the present report was elaborated and forwarded to all members of the Programme with a note from the Administrator of 4 August 1992.
2. The questionnaire was sent to all members of the Programme, i.e., 179 Members of the United Nations and 3 members of the specialized agencies. By 23 March 1993, replies to the questionnaire had been received from or on behalf of 72 States: Australia; Austria; Barbados; Botswana; Brazil; Canada; China; Czechoslovakia (before the dissolution of Czechoslovakia and the formation of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic); Colombia; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Denmark; Equatorial Guinea; Finland; France; Germany; Guyana; Iraq; Israel; Japan; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Liechtenstein; Malaysia; Maldives; Marshall Islands; Mexico; Micronesia (Federated States of); Netherlands; New Zealand; Niger; Norway; Oman; Papua New Guinea; Philippines; Poland; Romania; Russian Federation; Solomon Islands (on behalf of the nine South Pacific Forum United Nations Members); Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; Uganda; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Vanuatu (including the position of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)); Zimbabwe.
3. The 35 AOSIS members, whose common position is stated in a letter of 26 October 1992 from the Chairman of AOSIS to the Secretary-General, attached to the replies from Vanuatu (Chairman) and Papua New Guinea, are the following: Antigua and Barbuda; Bahamas; Barbados; Belize; Cape Verde; Comoros; Cook Islands; Cuba; Cyprus; Dominica; Fiji; Grenada; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Jamaica; Kiribati; Maldives; Malta; Marshall Islands; Mauritius; Micronesia (Federated States of); Nauru; Papua New Guinea; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; Sao Tome and Principe; Seychelles; Singapore; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tuvalu; Vanuatu.
4. The nine South Pacific Forum United Nations Members, whose common position is stated in a letter of 3 March 1993 from the Solomon Islands Mission to the United Nations, are the following: Australia; Fiji; Marshall Islands; Micronesia (Federated States of); New Zealand; Papua New Guinea; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Vanuatu.
5. The questionnaire left it open to members how they would reply to the following four questions:
  - QUESTION 1 What is the structure of your Government's representation to the United Nations in the United States?
  - QUESTION 2 What is the structure of your Government's diplomatic presence in Germany and other European countries?

**QUESTION 3** What will be the additional representational, logistical, financial and administrative consequences, if any, for your Government in case the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM would move to Bonn?

**QUESTION 4** What is the overall assessment of the logistical, financial, administrative and representational implications for your Government of a relocation to Bonn of the headquarters of UNDP, its affiliated funds and UNFPA?

6. The replies are very different in form. Some Member States give general remarks covering all questions, others reply specifically to some or to all of the four questions. While the answers to questions 1 and 2 are mainly factual, the answers to questions 3 and 4 tend to be more analytical.

7. The replies fall into four groups:

**Group A:** Only advantages of a relocation stated.

Replies of four Member States fall into group A.

The advantages stated range from better communications and proximity to German Federal Ministries and the North-South Centre, Bonn, to shorter travel distance to European capitals and Africa.

**Group B:** Only disadvantages of a relocation stated.

Replies covering 58 Member States fall into group B.

The disadvantages include the views of the AOSIS members and others that a move away from New York would seriously hamper the developing countries in their efforts to interact with UNDP and UNIFEM; the lack of representation in Germany/Europe; functional difficulties when the same representative covers the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council as well as UNDP and UNFPA; financial burdens of different degrees, from opening a new mission or maintaining some form of diplomatic presence in Bonn to increased travel expenditures.

**Group C:** Both advantages and disadvantages stated.

Replies of four Member States fall into group C.

The range of advantages and disadvantages in these replies is not so wide as in group A and B: on one side savings in official travel, on the other side the need for additional personnel.

Group D: Neither advantages nor disadvantages stated.

Replies of seven Member States fall into group D.

The replies in this group are neutral. They point neither to advantages nor to disadvantages which a relocation to Bonn would bring to Member States.

8. One Member State, whose individual reply included in group D only states that it will not object to a decision of the Governing Council to relocate the headquarters of UNDP and UNFPA, is also registered in group B since it is covered by the common AOSIS position. Apart from this case, all other Member States are registered in only one of the four groups above.

Annex

NOTE VERBALE OF 4 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF  
THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TO MEMBERS OF  
THE PROGRAMME WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ATTACHED

The Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme presents his compliments to the Permanent Representative of ... to the United Nations and has the honour to inform him/her that the Governing Council on 26 May 1992 adopted the following decision 92/44 entitled "Proposal concerning location of United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Population Fund Headquarters":

"The Governing Council,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme, of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund in Bonn from 1996 onwards;
2. Requests the Administrator:
  - (a) To examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of such relocation on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and on cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions;
  - (b) To consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation;
  - (c) To examine in consultation with the relevant departments of the United Nations Secretariat all programme-related, budgetary, legal and administrative implications of the offer;
  - (d) To provide a written report on the results of the implementation of the present decision to the members of the Governing Council, if possible by the end of 1992 but not later than 1 February 1993;
  - (e) To report on the matters to the Governing Council at its fortieth session (1993)."

Following the adoption of this decision discussions have been held with officials from the German Government and the United States of America as host Government as well as with the United Nations Secretariat concerning action to be taken in the implementation of decision 92/44. During these discussions the following has been agreed:

Paragraph 2 (a), which requests the Administrator to examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of such relocation on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development, will require a major input by the United

Nations Secretariat as it relates to the United Nations system of operational activities for development. A relocation of headquarters would have implications going beyond the competence of UNDP and UNFPA. The United Nations, and also the Agencies, would be directly affected. The Administrator will therefore need to receive guidance from the United Nations Secretariat, which will take the lead in the examination required by the Council in paragraph 2 (a).

As a result of consultations with representatives of Germany and the United States of America, the attached questionnaire relating to paragraph 2 (b) has been elaborated. It would be appreciated if the replies to the questionnaire could be received by 1 October 1992.

The implementation of paragraph 2 (c) will involve a number of units in the United Nations Secretariat. A working group of representatives from these units, chaired by UNDP, will prepare the report concerning paragraph 2 (c).

As requested in paragraph 2 (d), the Administrator will provide a written report on the results of the implementation of decision 92/44 if possible by the end of 1992 but not later than 1 February 1993.

The proposal concerning relocation of headquarters has been included in the provisional agenda for the fortieth session of the Governing Council in accordance with paragraph 2 (e) of decision 92/44.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

ON THE FULL RANGE OF LOGISTICAL AND RELATED FINANCIAL,  
ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPRESENTATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR  
MEMBER STATES OF A RELOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OF  
THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, OF ITS  
AFFILIATED FUNDS AND OF THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION  
FUND TO BONN FROM 1996 ONWARDS

#### BACKGROUND

In its decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council took note with appreciation of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Bonn from 1996 onwards.

In paragraph 2 (b) of this decision, the Governing Council requested the Administrator to consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation.

The attached questionnaire will be used to obtain the views of the Member States on the matters referred to in paragraph 2 (b). In order to meet the

requirements of the Governing Council, it would be appreciated if replies to the questionnaire could be received by 1 October 1992.

Please return the questionnaire to Mr. Jean-Jacques Graisse, Secretary of the Governing Council, 1 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The situation as it now stands:

1. What is the structure of your Government's representation to the United Nations in the United States?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- representation to United Nations development agencies
- representation to international and regional financial institutions located in the United States
- presence in New York
- presence in Washington, D.C.
- personnel (total number, number working on UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM issues)
- communication links back to capital (type, time and costs involved)
- other aspects)

2. What is the structure of your Government's diplomatic presence in Germany and other European countries?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- presence in Bonn
- presence in other European cities when responsible for relations with Germany
- presence in other European cities when responsible for relations with international and regional financial and other institutions located in Europe
- personnel (total number, number covering other European countries, if any, number working on United Nations matters, if any)
- communication links back to capital
- other aspects)



The German Parliament has decided to move its seat to Berlin which presumably will require your Government to review its location of diplomatic representation in Germany: 1/

3. What will be the additional representational, logistical, financial and administrative consequences, if any, for your Government in case the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM would move to Bonn?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- presence, if any, and personnel in Bonn (number expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM)
- personnel in Berlin expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM questions
- personnel in other European cities (please specify number and cities) expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM
- logistical consequences for your Government of a relocation of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM
- financial implications for your Government of a relocation of the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM from New York to Bonn)

4. What is the overall assessment of the logistical, financial, administrative and representational implications for your Government of a relocation to Bonn of the headquarters of UNDP, its affiliated funds and UNFPA?

(This may include specific requests and suggestions or general comments. The assessment should not include those implications resulting purely from a relocation of the German parliament and partial relocation of the German Government to Berlin).

#### Notes

1/ On 20 June 1991 the German Bundestag (Parliament) decided to move its seat to Berlin, the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Government was also called upon to transfer the core of central government to Berlin. In order to ensure a fair division of labour, Bonn is to remain the administrative centre of the Federal Republic of Germany and retain the majority of jobs within the highest administrative authorities of the Federation.

For this reason, the Federal Cabinet took the decision on 3 June 1992 that Bonn would remain a political centre of the Federal Republic of Germany even after the seat of parliament and core of Government have moved. To this end several interconnected policy areas, in particular development policy and the corresponding Ministries, including certain Ministries of key importance for developing countries (Economic Cooperation, Environment, Research and Technology, Education and Science, Agriculture), will remain in Bonn. The Federal Chancellery and all the other Ministries will retain offices in Bonn. Each country is free to decide whether to locate its diplomatic mission in Berlin or Bonn or maintain missions in both cities.

