

**UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMME**Distr.
LIMITEDDP/L.335
22 February 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING ON PREPARATIONS FOR THE
THIRD PROGRAMMING CYCLE, 1982-1986
11-15 February 1980
Agenda item 1

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD PROGRAMMING CYCLE, 1982-1986

The requests* for calculations referred to in paragraph 2 of decision 80/6 are the following:

(i) Growth in resources, 14 per cent; relation of country to intercountry IPFs, 82:18 per cent. Regarding country IPFs: (a) 82 per cent to countries with per capita GNP below \$500, with special treatment given by allocating higher increases in IPFs to countries with per capita GNP of \$250 and below; (b) 18 per cent to countries above \$500 per capita GNP, with special treatment given by allocating higher increases in IPFs to countries with per capita GNP between \$500 and \$750; (c) no floor; (d) a "transfer point" at \$1,500 per capita GNP; and, (e) a ceiling at \$750 per capita GNP.

(ii) Growth in resources, 14 per cent; relation of country to intercountry IPFs, 82:18 per cent. Regarding country IPFs: (a) 82 per cent to countries with per capita GNP below \$500, with special treatment given by allocating higher increases in IPFs to countries with per capita GNP of \$250 and below; (b) 18 per cent to countries above \$500 per capita GNP, with special treatment given by allocating higher increases in IPFs to countries with per capita GNP between \$500 and \$750; (c) countries with a per capita GNP above \$1,500 should have a "floor" of approximately 70 per cent, and "released resources" should be redistributed to countries in the \$500-\$750 bracket; (d) countries in the \$1,500-\$2,000 per capita GNP range should pay from 50 per cent and up for their IPFs; countries in the \$2,000-\$3,000 range should pay from 75 per cent and up for their IPFs; and countries with per capita GNP above \$3,000 should pay 100 per cent for their IPFs; and (e) a ceiling for countries with \$750 per capita GNP and above.

(iii) A calculation, as a variant of DP/L.334, should include the floor concept in a manner that the value of the floor used (relation of 1982-1986 IPF to the 1977-1981 IPF) varies in inverse proportion to the per capita GNP of the "floor country". (This proposal is made as an alternative to such proposals as those including the idea of a "cut-off" or "transfer point".)

* Submitted by Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States of America with the understanding that the requests for further calculations contained herein should in no way be considered as reflecting the final positions of the Governments concerned with respect to the question of preparations for the third cycle.

(iv) As a variant of DP/L.334, the calculation should assume: an average annual growth rate of contributions of 12 per cent; 80 per cent of country IPFs to countries with per capita GNP below \$500 and 20 per cent to countries with per capita GNP above \$500; a "transfer point" or "cost-bearing point" at \$1,500 per capita GNP; and no "floor".

(v) DP/L.334 with the added assumption, in relation to 1 (g) of that paper, that resources mobilization falls short of the 14 per cent target and is assumed equal to 12 per cent.

(vi) DP/L.334, with the two modifications that (a) there is to be no floor, and (b) there is to be a "transfer point" or "cut-off" at \$3,000 per capita GNP.

(vii) Same as (vi), except that there is to be a "transfer point" at \$1,500 per capita GNP.

(viii) DP/L.334, with the modification that the floor should be set at 80 per cent of 1977-1981 IPFs.
