

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



UNDP

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/REU/1
1 March 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL
Special meeting
24-28 May 1982, Geneva
Agenda item 3(d)

COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

THE REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR EUROPE 1982 - 1986

Summary

This is the first regional programme for Europe to be presented to the Governing Council of UNDP. When the regional programmes were being prepared for the second programming cycle, Europe was still part of the region covered by the Regional Bureau for Europe, Mediterranean and the Middle East. The present programme was prepared in close consultation with Governments and with participating and executing agencies. An inter-governmental consultative meeting on priorities took place in Geneva from 11-13 May 1981, attended by the 12 Governments eligible to receive UNDP assistance; several other member Governments of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) participated as observers. The present programme reflects the views on priorities as expressed by the Governments concerned at that time. The sectoral distribution of resources for the regional programme for Europe as proposed by the Administrator of UNDP is as follows: energy, 24 per cent; environment, 22 per cent; transport and communications, 24 per cent; science and technology, 20 per cent; and others, 10 per cent.

While the Administrator will be guided by the targets for the several priority areas as expressed in the programme, his ability to achieve them is limited by two factors. The first is the momentum of the ongoing programmes, in the sense not only of already approved projects but also of the need to carry to meaningful conclusion projects that cannot be completed adequately during their initial phase. The second potential obstacle, the impact of which cannot be measured at this time, is the resources situation of UNDP. The regional programme is submitted to the Council for its consideration.

1/ The previous regional programme for Europe is contained in the regional programme for Europe, the Mediterranean and the Middle East which was issued under the symbol DP/218.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. GENERATION OF THE 1982-1986 REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR EUROPE	3 - 4
II. REGIONAL PROGRAMMES IN EUROPE TO DATE	4 - 7
III. THE 1982-1986 REGIONAL PROGRAMME	7
A. METHODS	8 - 9
B. PROGRAMME PRIORITIES	9-12

I. GENERATION OF THE 1982-1986 REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR EUROPE

1. Because of the uncertainty regarding the amount of resources to be made available for UNDP programmes in Europe during the third programming cycle (1982-1986), formal consultation with Governments and participating and executing agencies was initiated only after the twenty-seventh session of the Governing Council of UNDP in June 1980. On the basis of decisions on regional programmes taken at that time, an illustrative regional indicative planning figure (IPF) for Europe was fixed at US\$16.2 million. In its decision 80/9, the Governing Council also decided on changes in the regional programming process which were aimed mainly at enhancing the collective involvement of the Governments concerned in the final determination of priorities.^{1/} To this end, the Administrator was to "...convene, in collaboration with the Executive Secretaries of the regional commissions, a special meeting of the Governments in each of the areas covered by the regional programmes to discuss and review the draft programme prepared by the Administrator..."(document DP/435, paragraph 9(e)).
2. In the case of Europe, this consultative meeting was held in Geneva on 11-13 May 1981 in close co-operation with the Executive Secretary of ECE. The 12 European countries that are recipients of UNDP assistance participated in the consultation, together with a number of members of ECE that are not recipients of UNDP assistance and which had been invited to participate in the meeting as observers. Many of these latter Governments are, or in the future may be, actively associated with regional programme activities under one or another of various arrangements which are more fully described in paragraph 25(e) below. Also invited ^{2/} to participate in the meeting as observers were the participating and executing Agencies, inter-governmental and regional groupings included in the consultative process (i.e. the Commission of the European Communities (CEC), the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the resident representatives of UNDP in Europe.
3. The time required for preparation of the programme did not permit its presentation to the Governing Council of UNDP before its twenty-ninth session in June 1982. It was felt desirable, however, to hold the inter-governmental consultation at an early date for the reasons given below.
4. As pointed out in Chapter II, in the past regional programme priorities for Europe were not considered on a systematic basis, as was the case in the other regions. It was felt, therefore, that there should be ample time after the consultation to reflect the consensus of the meeting in the final document to be presented to the special meeting at the Governing Council of UNDP in May 1982. Thus, changes and adjustments were allowed for in the draft programme discussed by the Governments in May 1981; the Governments, moreover, were invited to express their views on a number of alternative approaches and possibilities.

^{1/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1980, Supplement No. 12 (E/1980/42/Rev.1), p.28, para.2.

^{2/} Ibid., para.3. See also DP/435, para.9(b).

5. During preparation of the draft programme, the Governments covered by the regional programme, the participating and executing agencies, and the inter-governmental and regional groupings referred to above were asked to submit their views on priorities and proposals. These views will be taken into account in the actual implementation of the Programme.
6. The inter-governmental consultative meeting endorsed the basic approach proposed by the Administrator in document DP/ECE/RER/2. A consensus emerged on adjustments in the allocations to the several priority areas, which resulted in a significant increase for transport and communications and a marginal increase for science and technology; these were balanced by a decrease for environment.
7. Suggestions were made to include more traditional sectoral categories, such as industrial development and agriculture. It was recognized, however, that these fields of activity, although not included as separate categories, were well represented in several of the priority areas proposed by the Administrator.
8. Mention was made at the meeting of the relevance of the Helsinki Final Act for the regional programme in Europe. In the context of financial constraints, it was suggested that maximum use be made of national staff in the countries participating in a project. Cost-sharing was endorsed as a suitable way of counteracting financial stringency provided it remain voluntary and be done on an individual project basis.
9. The stress on maximum benefits for developing countries in other regions received the support of the meeting, as did the participation of non-IPF countries in individual regional projects under suitable arrangements. Some participants supported a further inter-governmental review meeting half-way through the third programming cycle.
10. The report of the inter-governmental consultative meeting issued on 4 June 1981 as document DP/ECE/RER/3 is available to members of the Governing Council.

II. REGIONAL PROGRAMMES IN EUROPE TO DATE

11. When considering UNDP regional programmes in Europe to date, one must distinguish between the situations before and after 1 January 1978. During the first period, which includes the first programming cycle and the first year of the second cycle, regional activities in Europe were part of the regional programme for Europe, Mediterranean and the Middle East. The regional IPF for that region during the first cycle was small (US\$19.6 million), and it was used almost entirely for projects in the Arab States. Only two large-scale projects were operational in Europe during the first cycle, viz., Building Construction under Seismic Conditions in the Balkan Region (RER/79/015) and the Integrated Development of the Vardar/Axios River Basin (RER/71/203).
12. For the second cycle, an IPF of \$44.3 million was allocated to the Europe, Mediterranean and Middle East region. This was the first time that regional programme documents were prepared for submission to the UNDP Governing Council. The regional programme for Europe, Mediterranean and the Middle East (DP/218) was presented to the Governing Council at its twenty-third session in January 1977.

13. This programme continued the heavy concentration on the regional development needs of the Arab countries. It did not set aside a specific share of the available funds for activities in Europe. References to such activities were limited and identified two areas of concern: (a) co-operation in the Mediterranean between European countries and Arab States; and (b) intra-European co-operation in areas identified by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Given the limited availability of funds, UNDP took the initiative in proposing to Governments that they agree to finance the latter type of activities largely through national IPF inputs with catalytic inputs from the regional IPF.

14. Some limited success had been achieved with this approach, called the European Co-operative Programme, when, on 1 January 1978, the present Regional Bureau for Arab States and the Unit for Europe came into being. The balance of the regional IPF for Europe, Mediterranean and the Middle East, uncommitted as of the end of 1977, was divided between the two regions following the criteria set by the Governing Council. The result was an allocation of US\$9.3 million for Europe for the four remaining years of the second programming cycle, i.e. 1 January 1978 through 31 December 1981.

15. This created a paradoxical situation. While the amount available was modest in absolute terms, no significant new projects were ready for approval, since Governments and executing agencies had not been encouraged to propose new projects for Europe. In an effort to develop meaningful activities for the second cycle as quickly as possible, consultations were initiated on a number of project ideas put forward by agencies and projects were developed and submitted to Governments for their views and possible support on an ad hoc basis.

16. The regional projects that have resulted from the procedure followed since 1 January 1978 have been carefully appraised by UNDP and the agencies concerned. They have received the support of the participating Governments, which consider that each of these projects meets a regional development need. However, these projects do not constitute a regional programme in the sense of reflecting an inter-sectoral balance laid down in broad outlines. While the Administrator has tried to avoid undue imbalance in the programme, the ad hoc approach that had to be taken made over-all programme planning impossible and, in any case, there was no set of sectoral priorities endorsed by the Governments concerned or by the Governing Council.

17. The following table, using the classification adopted by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, shows the sectoral breakdown of the UNDP regional programme in Europe for the period 1972-1981. A separate analysis for the first cycle would not be meaningful because, as noted above, there were only two large-scale intra-European projects, viz., the Seismicity Survey of the Balkan region (REM/70/172), executed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Integrated Development of the Vardar/Axios River Basin (RER/71/203), executed by the United Nations. For the rest, the programme consisted of small-scale incidental training courses or seminars and participation by a few European countries in projects designed basically for the Arab States region. For the table, an estimated percentage of the cost of the latter type of project has in each case been assigned to Europe.

Table 1

Sectoral distribution of UNDP inputs into regional projects in Europe, 1972-1981

	<u>Number of projects</u>			<u>Expenditure 1972-1981 a/</u>	
	<u>Large-scale b/</u>	<u>Small-scale c/</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
General development issues	3	1	4	718 000	6.1
Natural resources	3	8	11	2 027 000	17.2
Agriculture, forest and fisheries	6	2	8	1 420 000	12.0
Industry	1	2	3	332 000	2.8
Transport and communications	4	7	11	2 590 000	22.0
International trade and development	-	1	1	14 000	0.1
Population	1	-	1	519 000	4.4
Health	5	4	9	2 217 000	18.8
Education	-	2	2	33 000	0.3
Employment	-	1	1	29 000	0.2
Science and technology	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1 886 000</u>	<u>16.0</u>
TOTAL	26	30	56 d/	11 785 000 e/	100.0

18. It is clear from what was stated above that the table does not reflect planned sectoral priorities. At the same time, the distribution is not entirely accidental. In an effort to avoid pronounced imbalances, in a number of cases the Administrator discouraged the development of major projects in sectors in which important large-scale projects had already been approved.

19. Apart from the sectoral distribution, it is important to note the distribution of expenditures by types of project, as shown in Table 2:

a/ Including estimated expenditure for 1981 and actual expenditure for previous years.

b/ Projects with UNDP inputs above \$50,000; average UNDP input of \$430,000.

c/ Projects with UNDP inputs of \$50,000 or less; average UNDP input of \$19,000.

d/ Of which 41 were approved in the second cycle (1977-1981).

e/ Large-scale projects accounting for 95 and small-scale projects for 5 per cent of total UNDP expenditure.

Table 2

UNDP inputs into regional projects in Europe, 1972-1981, by project type

	Number of projects	\$	Percentage of Expenditure
Surveys and feasibility studies	11	4 670 000	39.7
Research	28	6 787 000	57.6
Advisory services	1	29 000	0.2
Seminars and training courses	<u>16</u>	<u>299 000</u>	<u>2.5</u>
TOTAL	56	11 785 000	100.0

20. Tables 1 and 2 both show totals only, not trends over time. With regard to trends, as a result of the initial small size of the programme and the ad hoc basis on which it has developed to date, no meaningful conclusions can be drawn from the sectoral distribution as shown in Table 1. Governments have been willing to endorse certain projects and reject others; in doing so, their decisions seem to reflect judgements on the relative soundness of the project at hand and its immediate relevance to the country in question rather than a general preference for certain sectors as against others.

21. With respect to types of projects, the situation is different. The evolution of the programme has shown continuation of the trend already identified (document DP/218, paragraph 24) in the second cycle programme for Europe, Mediterranean and the Middle East. The small advisory services project as well as the individual seminar and training course have virtually disappeared from the European programme, where already before they were less common than in the Arab States region. In the areas of research and surveys, the networking approach has been gaining over the regional project that itself carries out research or surveys. Apart from being consistent with the UNDP policy of relying more on national institutions, the networking approach is a logical one in a programme of limited financial resources. The only way in which UNDP could engage in the more traditional research or survey type of regional project in Europe would be through cost-sharing. This issue is dealt with further in the section (paragraph 25 (d) below) on proposals for the third cycle.

22. Due to the relative newness of the regional programme in Europe, it is too early to draw many lessons from past experience - failures and achievements alike. Now that funds, however limited, are available, a wealth of project proposals has come forward. This compels all concerned - Governments, executing agencies and UNDP - to exercise great selectivity.

III. THE 1982-1986 REGIONAL PROGRAMME

23. The shape and content of the regional programme has been determined by two main considerations. The first concerns the choice of methods; the second, that of programme priorities. These considerations are dealt with separately in the following two sections.

/...

A. Methods

24. The European region has a number of characteristics that have led the Administrator to propose an emphasis that differs from the more traditional type of regional programme. In the first place, the countries concerned have in general developed national capabilities that on the average are well above those in UNDP recipient countries in other regions of the world. Related to this is the ability and, in several countries, the clearly expressed intention to develop projects that have a component of potential or actual benefit to developing countries in other parts of the world. In terms of both the transfer of technology and technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC), several European IPF countries occupy a special place that is sometimes closer to the highly industrialized non-IPF countries than to the average UNDP recipient in other regions. Finally, the type of regional projects that UNDP can support in Europe is determined in part by the modest size of the regional IPF.

25. In the light of the above, the Administrator proposes to favour the following types of projects, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive:

(a) Networks - co-operation among national institutions dealing with problems that a number of countries have in common: UNDP participation in such projects will normally be limited to organizing and facilitating the necessary co-operative arrangements. Any assistance to national institutions that may be needed in the process would be expected to come from other sources, such as national IPFs, direct cost-sharing by the Governments concerned or contributions from agencies or other inter-governmental organizations. While in the past projects of this type sometimes included an element of assistance to national institutions participating in the network, and a few Governments expressed the wish at the inter-governmental consultation that this practice be continued, the many competing claims on the regional IPF make such assistance no longer feasible in Europe;

(b) Joint endeavours - projects dealing with activities that can only be undertaken jointly by two or more Governments: Projects in international transport and communications or those dealing with international rivers are examples of this type of project. In this case, also, UNDP will normally support only the strictly international aspects of the activity; any concomitant national components should be financed from other sources. The Administrator accepts the view expressed at the inter-governmental consultation that projects of this type should normally be supported by at least three Governments. He wishes to retain a flexible position, however, in cases where a specific activity directly involves only two countries but ultimately will benefit many others;

(c) Benefits for other regions - projects in which several European countries participate and which offer actual or potential benefits to developing countries in other parts of the world without requiring IPF inputs for that aspect of the projects: Different modalities can be considered, including TCDC. In the latter case, the guidelines for IPF inputs in TCDC projects will naturally have to be adhered to. It should be noted in this context that several country programmes in Europe state explicitly the intent to pursue TCDC in the context of national projects;

(d) Cost-sharing - projects in which catalytic inputs from the regional IPF

are supplemented by cost-sharing by Governments or regional or subregional organizations: It was suggested at the inter-governmental consultation that the utilization of staff in the national organizations participating in a regional project be maximized. The Administrator welcomed this suggestion as a meaningful form of cost-sharing in kind. To the extent that the priority areas of this programme are also of interest to inter-governmental, regional and subregional organizations, joint financing of projects will be actively pursued by UNDP. Proposals for cost-sharing by inter-governmental organizations, of course, will have to be supported by those participating Governments that are members of the organizations concerned; and

(e) Participation by non-IPF countries - while this aspect is neither new nor limited to the European region, its development within the context of the regional programme in Europe warrants special reference. Twelve European Governments are recipients of UNDP assistance. In the Balkan subregion, where the centre of gravity of the regional programme lies at present, there are a number of projects that are of interest mainly or exclusively to a group of geographically contiguous recipient countries situated in that subregion. Many other projects in the programme, on the other hand, are also of interest to a number of European countries that are not UNDP recipients, and their association with such projects has always been encouraged. The guiding principle of such association must be that the non-IPF countries concerned cannot be net beneficiaries of UNDP IPF-financing. Whatever benefits they may draw from their participation in any project cannot exceed the contribution they make to such a project, over and above the normal contribution that all Governments participating in the project, IPF and non-IPF countries alike, must make. In some cases, the non-IPF participating countries make a special cash contribution that becomes part of the external inputs provided by UNDP. In other cases, the participation in kind by non-IPF Governments, by virtue of their advanced level of development in the field covered by the project at hand, is considerably higher than that made by the participating IPF Governments. The Administrator intends to continue encouraging the association of non-IPF European Governments in regional projects wherever appropriate, especially where such association may enhance the potential of the project in question for providing benefits to developing countries in other regions. The size and nature of the special contributions to be made by non-IPF countries to regional projects in which they participate will be decided in each case on an ad hoc basis, taking into account the nature of the project concerned. This element of financial participation will also be carefully considered in the case of projects carried out in association with inter-governmental, regional and subregional groupings, the membership of which includes both UNDP recipient and non-recipient countries.

B. Programme priorities

26. The second important choice in determining the shape and content of the first regional programme for Europe concerned the number of programme areas. While references to specific projects have been kept to a minimum in this Programme document, the Administrator feels that the Governments, UNDP and the agencies should have a framework within which to develop specific projects, allocating percentage shares of the total funds available to broad priority areas. While such percentages will be used in a flexible manner and can be modified over time in the light of changing circumstances with the agreement of the Governments, they will guide UNDP in managing IPF resources.

27. In arriving at the suggested percentage distribution shown below, the following considerations were taken into account: (a) development priorities for the region as expressed in the Governments' proposals for the programme; (b) global development priorities; (c) relative relevance for Europe of global priorities; (d) proposals submitted by participating and executing agencies; (e) suitability of regional priorities for solutions on an intercountry rather than national basis; and (f) sectoral distribution of successful ongoing projects.

28. On the basis of the above considerations, the Administrator proposes to be guided in developing the regional programme for Europe for the third cycle by the indicative breakdown by programme area described in the following text. Under each heading, a number of project proposals are listed. All of these received a measure of support from IPF Governments at the inter-governmental consultation. While some of the projects listed received more support than others, no listing has been maintained of proposals that received no support from any of the IPF Governments represented at the meeting. Proposals mentioned by one and sometimes two Governments were also omitted if, for financial or substantive reasons, there was no realistic prospect for their implementation. Depending on developments in the course of the cycle in respect of resources and other circumstances, the programme to be developed in the framework of the agreed priorities may contain projects not identified at this time; similarly, some of the projects now listed may not materialize.

(a) Energy

29. The worldwide concern over energy supplies is reflected in Government and agency proposals for the first regional programme for Europe. Adverse developments in energy and fuel supplies for the region have had negative effects on economic performance in almost all countries of the region. Increases in the price of fuel in world markets, followed by domestic price increases, have aggravated an already strained economic situation. These serious difficulties in energy and fuel supplies have led all countries to work out long-term energy development programmes. However, these programmes have progressed slowly, so that rapidly increasing requirements for energy cannot yet be met. Therefore, current actions are oriented not only towards rapid energy development, but also towards new programmes to conserve the use of coal, oil, natural gas and electricity. The development and conservation of energy is thus crucial to the performance of the industrial sector. Ongoing projects include electric power transmission in the Balkan region and preparatory work on renewable sources of energy. New proposals under serious consideration in the energy field deal with farm energy development and low-calorie coal research.

30. The Administrator considers an earmarking of 24 per cent appropriate for this area. This percentage, which represents a marginal reduction of the percentage proposed to the inter-governmental consultation, should be seen against the background of the situation discussed in paragraph 44 below.

(b) Environment

31. While environmental concerns are worldwide, it is felt that they may require more urgent attention in Europe, where relatively advanced industrialization poses

serious immediate problems. It is also an area where co-operation between IPF and non-IPF countries can be particularly useful.

32. The field of environment is less precisely defined than that of energy. For instance, the Priority Actions Plan for the Mediterranean co-ordinated by United Nations Environment Programme deals, inter alia, with activities in renewable sources of energy and aquaculture. Without attempting the precise definition of environmental projects that has eluded others, for the purpose of the regional programme the Administrator is taking a fairly broad approach which includes activities with a significant environmental component but leaves out those which are primarily concerned with energy.

33. Subject to the above reservation, the projects or proposals cited under this rubric have been grouped, to the extent possible, under two headings: (a) protection of the environment; and (b) management of the environment. Under the first heading, projects under implementation deal with monitoring control of toxic chemicals, conservation of plant genetic resources and preparatory work on water quality assessment and control of the Danube (recently completed). Under the second heading, which includes proposals linking environmental management with public health, are an ongoing project on zoonoses control and preparatory work on aquaculture in the Mediterranean.

34. The Administrator deems an earmarking of 22 per cent appropriate for this programme area. This figure represents a reduction from the 25 per cent proposed to the inter-governmental consultation, where several delegations suggested such a reduction. A more drastic reduction was not possible, given the situation described in paragraph 44 below.

(c) Transport and communications

35. While many projects in this sector are purely national in scope, it is equally true that the sector lends itself readily to projects of a transnational nature: the development of inland waterways cannot stop dead at a border point; the construction and operation of long-distance motorways for passenger and goods traffic require common action by neighbouring states; the improvement of international telecommunications traffic is, by definition, regional or interregional in scope. Important ongoing intercountry projects in this area include the Trans-European North-South Motorway (RER/81/005), the European component of the Implementation of Middle East and Mediterranean Telecommunications Network (RER/79/022), and the Navigable Waterway between the Danube and the Aegean Sea (RER/81/001). Among new proposals presented by Governments and/or agencies is, in addition to follow-up to the above, a project for the improvement of intra-European telecommunications.

36. The Administrator deems an earmarking of 24 per cent appropriate for this area. The views expressed at the inter-governmental consultation on the proposed allocation of 20 per cent were mixed. The increase to 24 per cent was inevitable as shown in Table 3 and paragraph 44 below.

(d) Science and technology

37. Here, again, the problem of overlapping categories arises. This category refers

to projects not already covered by any of the three preceding ones. In this area, there are ongoing projects on Earthquake Risk Reduction in the Balkan Region (RER/79/014), the Use of Computers for Statistical Purposes and the Design and Development of Automated Statistical Information Systems (RER/78/008), a Training Course on Patent Information (RER/80/013) and a Network of Research Institutes dealing with Building Construction under Seismic Conditions in the Balkan Region (RER/79/015). Proposals have been made for a project on Earthquake Risk Reduction in the Ibero-Maghreb Region (jointly with the Regional Bureau for Arab States), for the establishment of the European component of a worldwide network on hydrological information and for cross-border computerized data exchange in science and technology.

38. The Administrator deems an earmarking of 20 per cent appropriate for this area. This is the allocation proposed to the inter-governmental consultation.

(e) Others

39. As explained in paragraph 15, projects approved during the second programming cycle were not approved within the framework of an agreed regional programme; hence, there are inevitably one or two approved projects extending into the third cycle which cannot be included under any of the four programme priorities. Specifically, there are the regional co-operative project, Improvement of Olive Production in the Mediterranean Basin and the Near East Region (RER/78/009), and the European regional project, Second Generation Migrants from Mediterranean Countries (RER/79/001). There is also one project proposal namely, Educational Innovation and Exchange of Educational Materials, that does not fit clearly under one of the priority areas. Given the support it received at the inter-governmental consultation, the Administrator hopes to include this proposal, which has been under consideration for some time, in the regional programme.

40. The Administrator deems an earmarking of 10 per cent appropriate for these other projects. This figure was proposed to the inter-governmental consultation and endorsed by it. It is, however, not certain that the considerations set out in paragraph 44 below will permit the Administrator to stay within a 10 per cent allocation. As shown in Table 3, B. the pattern of commitments as of February 1982 already shows a 12 per cent allocation for this category.

41. The extent to which the proposed sectoral distribution can be achieved in the course of the programme period will depend largely on the evolution of the resources situation of UNDP. The limitations that have had to be imposed on new project approvals since the latter part of 1981 have made it impossible to alter significantly the sectoral balance of the existing programme by developing and approving projects in sectors, notably energy, endorsed by the Governments at the inter-governmental consultation. The problem is aggravated by the fact that several ongoing projects in the other sectors require the follow-up endorsed by the Governments concerned and by the very limited support for cost-sharing demonstrated at least up to the beginning of 1982.

42. The financial implications of the Administrator's proposals, taking into account existing commitments, are set forth in Table 3.

Table 3

Regional programme for the third cycle

<u>A. Resources</u>	<u>\$</u>
Illustrative IPF 1982-1986	<u>16 200 000</u>
Amount available for programming (80 per cent of illustrative IPF)	12 960 000
Plus carry-over from second cycle (estimate)	<u>1 400 000</u>
Total available for programming	<u><u>14 360 000</u></u>

B. Proposed use of resources

<u>Programme area</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Distribution resulting from the pattern</u>	
	<u>distribution</u>	<u>of commitments as of February 1982</u>	
	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Energy	24	1 620 000	11
Environment	22	3 190 000	22
Transport and communications	24	3 250 000	23
Science and technology	20	2 370 000	17
Others	10	1 750 000	12
Unprogrammed	-	<u>2 180 000</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	100	14 360 000	100

43. The table permits a comparison between the target distribution proposed in Chapter III, section B above, on the one hand, and the distribution resulting from the pattern of commitments as of January 1982, on the other. These commitments include both signed budgets for ongoing projects and foreseen commitments on proposals endorsed by the inter-governmental consultative meeting, in the form of either Phase II projects or entirely new activities.

44. Table 3 shows that foreseen commitments in the environment sector have already reached their target, due to essential continuations of ongoing activities. In the transport and communications sector, the distribution is virtually on target; there is still some margin in science and technology and a large margin in energy. Approvals against the unprogrammed resources listed at the bottom of the table should therefore concentrate on the last two sectors if a distribution which corresponds to the wishes expressed by the Governments is to be achieved. The Administrator, however, feels that he is not in a position to take firm decisions on additional commitments at the present time for two reasons: first, existing and foreseen commitments for 1982 and 1983 have already virtually reached the approved budget levels for these two years, and many things may change between now and 1984, rendering it desirable to maintain flexibility for the later years; and second, it

/...

is not advisable to programme the unprogrammed reserve until the resources situation for the cycle as a whole becomes clearer. Nevertheless, when new programming decisions are taken at a later stage of the programme cycle, the Administrator will continue to be guided by the views on individual projects expressed by the Governments at the inter-governmental consultative meeting.
