

# UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



# UNDP

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/1982/ICW/4/Add.1  
16 August 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL  
INTERSESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
First session  
13-15 September 1982, New York  
Agenda item 4

S U P P O R T

## CONCISE PRECIS OF VIEWS RELATING TO MATTERS BEFORE THE INTERSESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AS EXPRESSED IN THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

### Addendum

#### Note by the Administrator

During the consideration of agenda item 19, on operational activities, by the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee of the Economic and Social Council in the course of the second regular session of 1982, 25 delegations made statements which were largely devoted to matters pertaining to UNDP. A summary of the relevant sections of those statements was prepared by the Governing Council secretariat and has served as the basis for the following concise precis, which deals with matters of specific interest to the Interessional Committee of the Whole.

#### A. Observations on the resource situation of UNDP

1. The establishment of the Interessional Committee of the Whole to discuss options and recommendations for the mobilization of increased resources for UNDP on an increasingly predictable, continuous and assured basis was welcomed by various representatives, including those of Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Norway, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries. The representative of Poland urged the President of the Governing Council to seek contacts with the Chairman of the Second Committee of the General Assembly to examine the financing of UNDP in the light of the 1982 Pledging Conference. The representative of Australia expressed confidence that the crisis would be overcome through the generous response of a wide range of donors.
2. The view that the UNDP present situation has both financial and structural dimensions was reiterated (Austria, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Netherlands). Structural problems were seen to include the question of the effectiveness of the work of the Governing Council as well as the role of UNDP in the United Nations development system (Federal Republic of Germany).

In this regard, the strong reaffirmation of the central funding and co-ordinating role of UNDP contained in Governing Council decision 82/5 was welcomed by the representatives of Austria, Poland and the United Kingdom and the spokesman for the Nordic countries. The representatives of Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Peru and Portugal also emphasized their support of the central role of UNDP. It was recalled that the central funding and co-ordinating role of UNDP had been endorsed by Governments, particularly in the Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/59 (Canada). The Programme was viewed as the "main axis" for co-operation within the United Nations development system (Peru). Of all the institutions within the system, it was the one most likely to maintain the necessary integrated approach to the planning and implementation of technical assistance (Federal Republic of Germany).

3. Reference was made to the erosion of the role envisaged for UNDP by the decline in resources and multiplication of special funds (Federal Republic of Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland). The representative of the Netherlands stated that donors should carefully watch against any further encroachment upon the role of UNDP. His Government would strive for the co-ordination by UNDP of the extrabudgetary resources which were flowing directly to the agencies rather than being channelled by UNDP. He hoped that activities of the agencies financed from such extrabudgetary sources could be included in the country programming process. With specific regard to central co-ordination, the representative of Belgium suggested that programme and project implementation be left to the relevant States, institutions and agencies. UNDP should concentrate on defining its own work, namely, funding, strengthening the role of the resident co-ordinator and evaluating project implementation; in his view, the Programme should be an external independent evaluator reporting to the General Assembly.

B. Remarks relating to documents DP/1982/15 and DP/1982/35 and matters contained therein

4. Reversal of the current resource situation was considered urgent and indispensable (Nepal, Yugoslavia). The Nordic countries found it difficult to understand that an organization like UNDP, which was respected by donor and recipient countries alike, should face serious fund-raising problems. Increased contributions were called for in response to the gravity of the situation (Peru, Yugoslavia). In the view of the representative of China, reversal of the situation depended on the political will of the developed countries. The representative of the Netherlands considered that the future of UNDP was a responsibility to be shared jointly. In this context, more equitable burden-sharing was urged by several delegations (Netherlands, Nordic countries and United Kingdom). The fact that 52 per cent of UNDP resources were contributed by five donors only was considered a fundamental weakness of the Programme (Netherlands). UNDP clearly needed a wider base of support to which other groups of countries would contribute to a degree much more commensurate with their ability to pay (United Kingdom).

/...

5. Reference was made to the structural problem of planning for five-year periods on the basis of uncertain annual pledges (Bulgaria, Netherlands). Willingness to explore ways and means of funding the Programme on a more stable basis was expressed (France, Switzerland). The Nordic countries appreciated the endeavours to strengthen the resource base of UNDP without endangering the Programme's basic principles. The representatives of Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany expressed preference for the existing system of voluntary contributions. The representative of the USSR stated that any move from voluntary to mandatory contributions would completely change the nature of UNDP. The representative of Belgium wondered whether the measures for the long-term financing of UNDP to be considered by the Intersessional Committee of the Whole involved voluntary contributions or statutory payments.

6. With regard to the suggestions for additional and alternative ways of financing and providing development assistance as contained in document DP/1982/35, the delegate of France reiterated his Government's support for multi-bi methods. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the UNDP field network should be used not simply to sustain the central role of UNDP but to ensure that developing countries were assisted with effectiveness and efficiency. Opposition to closer ties between UNDP and commercial organizations was reiterated (Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, USSR).

C. Remarks pertaining to the work of the Council  
and related matters

7. The representative of Austria welcomed the broad mandate of the Intersessional Committee of the Whole which would allow for in-depth discussion of measures concerning the effectiveness of the work of the Governing Council. Noting that the resources problem could not be addressed in isolation, the representative of Japan hoped that the Committee would make a critical and complete review and reappraisal of the structure and management of the Governing Council and of the mechanism of intergovernmental control as well. The representative of Belgium considered that the efficiency of the whole of UNDP, not just that of the Governing Council, should be reviewed. Reference was made to the desirability of continuing the practice of consensus decision-making (Federal Republic of Germany, Nordic countries). The representative of the USSR stated in this regard that the decision to establish the Intersessional Committee of the Whole despite the position of his Government had created a dangerous precedent of taking decisions without real consensus.

8. Several delegations commented on the importance of strengthening the Governing Council's involvement with the UNDP programming process and of improving the participation of Governments in the implementation of UNDP activities (Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom). In this regard, one topic for discussion by the Intersessional Committee of the Whole should be the need to reconcile sovereign priority-setting by recipient countries and the substantive review of country programmes by the Governing Council (Netherlands).

Also, a special programme committee could be established to make better use of the donor's collective expertise (Netherlands). The Committee should also consider the advisability of planning country programmes on the assumption of a constant flow of resources rather than on one of their automatic increase (United Kingdom).

9. The study to be undertaken by the Administrator on the feasibility of establishing an independent evaluation unit was mentioned by the representatives of Japan and the Netherlands. In addition, the latter welcomed the creation of a screening process aimed at evaluating the performance of resident representatives and their staff.

-----