

UNITED NATIONS  
DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMME



**UNDP**

Distr.  
GENERAL

DP/SR.673  
20 February 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special meeting on preparations for the third  
programming cycle, 1982-1986

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 673rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 14 February 1980, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. VUNIBOBO (Fiji)

CONTENTS

Preparations for the third programming cycle, 1982-1986 (continued)

Transition from the second UNDP programming cycle, 1977-1981, to the third cycle,  
1982-1986: limited borrowing from the third cycle

Matters arising from action taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session:

- (a) Assistance to Nicaragua
- (b) Assistance to Equatorial Guinea
- (c) Assistance to Zimbabwe
- (d) Interim Fund on Science and Technology for Development

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 A-3550.

Any corrections to the record of the meetings of this Special Meeting will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Special Meeting.

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

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD PROGRAMMING CYCLE, 1982-1986 (DP/425; DP/GC/Feb.80/CRP.1, CRP.2 and CRP.3) (continued)

1. Mr. ZOUAOU (Observer for Tunisia) said that his country needed increased UNDP assistance, in view of the situation in the many disadvantaged regions of the country, which contained more than 50 per cent of the population and in which per capita annual income was well below \$500. Tunisia, a country with few natural resources, was forced to make heavy sacrifices in order to achieve social progress and economic justice, an enterprise which depended to a great extent on external assistance.
2. UNDP's mission was essentially to provide technical assistance to developing countries, and it must have a substantial increase in its resources in order to meet the needs of beneficiary countries as fully as possible. His delegation therefore could not agree that a 14 per cent annual growth rate in the resources of the Programme for the third cycle was excessive, and it urged all donor countries to regard that target as a vital minimum, especially in view of the erosion of IPFs by inflation. It therefore wished to make the following suggestions: all donor countries must accept the minimum target of a 14 per cent annual growth rate in the resources of the Programme and, in the interests of maintaining the principle of universality, UNDP assistance must not be denied or reduced merely because per capita income in a given country had risen beyond \$500. The country IPFs for the third cycle should be calculated in the same way as those of the second cycle, which had accurately reflected the real needs of countries. The criteria of population and per capita income should be the main considerations in determining IPFs, although specific conditions in each country should also be taken into account. UNDP assistance to the neediest countries should not be decreased, and measures should be taken, within the bounds of realism, to increase the percentage of resources allocated to countries with an annual per capita income below \$500. The IPFs of countries with insufficient natural resources should be increased as much as was reasonable, even if their per capita annual income had exceeded \$500.

TRANSITION FROM THE SECOND UNDP PROGRAMMING CYCLE, 1977-1981, TO THE THIRD CYCLE, 1982-1986: LIMITED BORROWING FROM THE THIRD CYCLE (DP/424)

3. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that at its twenty-sixth session in June 1979, the Council had asked the Administrator to submit to it at its twenty-seventh session a proposal for limited borrowing from the third cycle for certain country programmes, in order to provide a smooth transition from the current cycle to the next, provided that such borrowing was compensated by underspending in certain country programmes in the current cycle. If resources were available, a part of the likely underspending could be programmed and delivered in the current cycle in a number of countries where a significant increase in third-cycle IPFs was anticipated. However, that would be possible only if sufficient lead time was available. For that reason, the Administrator was making the submission in DP/424 at the current Special Meeting instead of waiting for the twenty-seventh session in June 1980. The Administrator believed that without the borrowing

(Mr. Brown)

arrangements now proposed, the total IPFs in the current cycle, amounting to approximately \$2.5 billion, were likely to be underspent to the extent of some \$100 to 120 million, owing to unavoidable circumstances or special situations prevailing in some countries. Of the total underspending, about one fifth was expected to be in regional IPFs.

4. The Administrator hoped that the Council would agree to his recommendation that the underspending in country IPFs should be applied to those countries in which programming circumstances justified such action and in which the IPFs were expected to increase by some 50 per cent or more if contributions were increased 10 per cent annually. The maximum amount of such borrowing against the third cycle would be 20 per cent of a country's IPF for the present cycle. Most of the countries being treated as least developed countries would be entitled to some borrowing under the arrangement. The 10 per cent growth figure was suggested merely to permit advance planning at the present stage and was without prejudice to the proposal on over-all resources for the third cycle which the Council was considering in document DP/425.

5. There were two special cases which might not fall within the general guidelines now proposed and on which the Council was being asked to take action. The case of Nicaragua was set forth in document DP/427. In the case of China, the Council had agreed in June 1979 to an IPF of over \$15 million for the remainder of 1977-1981. The IPF for China in 1982-1986 would be considerably higher than that amount, whatever formula or estimate of resources might be used. However, the 1977-1981 IPF of \$15 million could not be used as a base for determining whether China would qualify under the guidelines for borrowing now proposed. A more orderly transition of the China programme would be achieved if China were entitled to borrow up to \$15 million against the third-cycle allocation. It was estimated that that amount was less than 20 per cent of the IPF which China would have received in 1977-1981 if the formula applied to other countries had been applied to it.

6. He pointed out that the Council's June 1979 decision referred to transitional arrangements for country programmes and did not refer to the regional programmes. However, underspending was expected in three of the regional programmes as well, and the unspent amounts could be utilized in the other two regional programmes. In conclusion, he said that the proposed arrangements would be put into effect only if the necessary resources were available.

7. Mr. CHEN Xingnong (China) said that his delegation supported the measures proposed by the Administrator in document DP/424. China, for its part, was embarked on the task of modernization and welcomed any offers of technical assistance from such bodies as UNDP. It had not received IPF assistance from UNDP during the second cycle but had been granted \$15 million on a provisional basis in 1979. It therefore welcomed UNDP's decision to advance it \$15 million from the third cycle and would use that sum for urgent projects and to implement the Buenos Aires Plan of Action. Projects involving technical co-operation among developing countries to be financed from that advance would be arranged in co-operation with UNDP and other developing countries.

/...

8. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation could support the Administrator's recommendations, as stated in paragraph 7 of document DP/424. He wished to propose, however, that the word "second-cycle" should be inserted between the words "individual" and "regional" in the final line of subparagraph (a) (ii) of that paragraph.

9. It was so decided.

10. Mr. LAWLESS (United Kingdom) recalled that at the Council's twenty-sixth session, some delegations had requested the preparation of a report which gave tables showing which country IPFs had been overspent or underspent during the current cycle, and why. Document DP/424 did not contain any such tables but mentioned regional IPFs which had been underspent although regional IPFs had not even been mentioned at the twenty-sixth session. His delegation would welcome information on both the country and the regional IPFs involved.

11. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that such information would be made available as soon as possible.

12. Mr. FESENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that in January 1979, speaking in the Governing Council, his delegation had expressed sympathy with the economic needs of the Chinese people. It did not, however, consider it appropriate at the present time to discuss the possibility of establishing an IPF for China, given the fact that China's policies were aimed at undermining the situation in neighbouring countries and helping anti-government movements and that China was militarizing its economy. Assistance from UNDP should be used to help only those countries and peoples whose policy was to develop their economy in the interest of improving the people's welfare. That was not true of China, and his delegation could not endorse the proposal to give that country financial assistance.

13. Mr. CHEN Xingnong (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, observed that the comments by the Soviet representative represented an unwarranted attack on the Chinese Government. The Soviet Union was attempting to sabotage the work of the Governing Council, and everyone was aware that it was the Soviet Union that was invading neighbouring countries and undermining peace.

14. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it that the Governing Council decided to endorse the Administrator's recommendation contained in document DP/424 and to adopt it as a decision of the Council. He also took it that, taking due account of the objections expressed by the Soviet delegation, the Council decided to endorse the Administrator's proposal that \$15 million should be borrowed from the third cycle to give advance assistance to China.

15. It was so decided.

MATTERS ARISING FROM ACTION TAKEN BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION:

- (a) ASSISTANCE TO NICARAGUA (DP/427)
- (b) ASSISTANCE TO EQUATORIAL GUINEA (DP/436)
- (c) ASSISTANCE TO ZIMBABWE (DP/440)

16. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said that in response to a request from the Government of Equatorial Guinea for emergency humanitarian assistance, the Secretary-General had sent an interagency mission to that country. The mission had concluded that in addition to humanitarian assistance, the country needed immediate development assistance. In resolution 34/123 the General Assembly had requested Member States and organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to adopt special measures in behalf of Equatorial Guinea for the rest of the development decade, pending the examination of its situation by the Committee for Development Planning. The Administrator recommended certain actions in paragraph 6 of document DP/436, subject to the Council's agreement to extend to Equatorial Guinea the same benefits as those accorded to the least developed countries for the remainder of the cycle.

17. In the light of General Assembly resolution 34/8, which inter alia requested UNDP to assist the Government of Nicaragua in its reconstruction efforts, the Administrator had already allocated an amount from the Special Measures Fund for least developed countries as a response to the action taken by the General Assembly to authorize the treatment of Nicaragua "as if" it were a least developed country until the situation had normalized, and he had undertaken the programming of United Nations Capital Development Fund assistance. In addition, in paragraph 10 of DP/427, the Administrator recommended certain actions and requested guidance from the Council on other possible steps that might be taken.

18. In anticipation of the independence soon to be achieved by Zimbabwe and a request by its Government to UNDP for an IPF for the remainder of the current cycle, the Governing Council might decide on the size of that IPF. If the Council agreed to the recommendations of the Administrator in paragraph 5 of document DP/440, the IPF would be conveyed to the legally constituted Government of Zimbabwe.

19. Mr. PRAGER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that UNESCO had been responding to Nicaragua's reconstruction needs in accordance with the priorities established by the Nicaraguan Government in the ECLA report. It now wished to seek the Governing Council's support for the appeal to international solidarity, made by the Director-General of UNESCO in January 1980, for assistance to Nicaragua's national literacy campaign. The literacy campaign involved literacy teaching for 850,000 people, and its success depended not only on the determination of the Nicaraguan Government and people but also on adequate financial, material and moral support from the international community. The campaign deserved UNDP's support and encouragement.

20. Mr. TINOCO (Observer for Nicaragua) said that the assistance given by UNDP to Nicaragua pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/8 had been one of the mainstays of Nicaragua's reorganization and reconstruction in recent months. Both UNDP and the Nicaraguan Government were aware, however, that the country's rehabilitation could not take place overnight: unemployment would soon reach 40 per cent because of the disruption of agricultural and industrial production, and per capita income had dropped 30 per cent from its level of \$800 per annum two years earlier. UNDP had responded promptly to the Nicaraguan Government's technical co-operation needs, and more than \$3 million had been committed for projects since July 1979. That meant, however, that nothing remained of the IPF assigned to Nicaragua for 1977-1981. His delegation therefore welcomed the announcement by the Deputy Administrator that aid would be forthcoming from the Capital Development Fund.

21. Vital development projects were still pending, however, and projects with a total value of over \$7 million must be financed to ensure Nicaragua's sustained development. The next few years would be crucial if the economy was to recover and the living conditions of the population to improve. As a result, while his delegation was deeply grateful for the allocation of over \$1 million in additional resources recommended by the Administrator, it wished to emphasize that Nicaragua's needs far exceeded that amount. His Government was therefore requesting that additional resources should be assigned from the Programme Reserve, as recommended by the General Assembly, so that Nicaragua's needs could be met. His delegation trusted that, in the spirit of General Assembly resolution 34/8, the Council would accede to his Government's modest request, so that UNDP could continue to give vital assistance to Nicaragua's development efforts.

22. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Latin American countries, reaffirmed their support for Nicaragua's economic reconstruction effort, which formed part of its efforts to restore full democracy. The Latin American Group endorsed Nicaragua's request for the allocation of assistance from the Programme Reserve, for Nicaragua's IPF needed to be totally revised in the light of the country's economic and social reconstruction needs.

23. Ecuador had sent a planeload of school materials to Nicaragua as part of its contribution to the national literacy campaign.

24. The Latin American Group also supported the recommendation for assistance to Equatorial Guinea, as stated in document DP/436 and the proposal in document DP/440 that an IPF should be established for Zimbabwe as a way of demonstrating the international community's support for that country's economic and social development after the independent government of Zimbabwe had been elected and assumed office.

25. Mr. ALVAREZ SOBERANIS (Mexico) recalled that Mexico had witnessed at close range the struggle of the Nicaraguan people and the devastating effects of that struggle on Nicaragua's economy and general situation. Accordingly, it fully endorsed the request just made by the Nicaraguan Government, and supported by the representative of Ecuador, that UNDP should grant Nicaragua the necessary aid for its reconstruction. His delegation also supported the recommendations with regard to assistance to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

26. Mrs. MENA (Cuba) observed that the proposal contained in document DP/427 on assistance to Nicaragua represented only a modest contribution, especially as Nicaragua's IPF for the second cycle had been largely spent before the overthrow of Somoza, and hence not in the interests of the Nicaraguan people. Her delegation therefore urged that \$4 million should be assigned from the Programme Reserve to finance Nicaragua's development programmes under the current cycle. It also appealed to the Governing Council to endorse the proposal that Nicaragua should be regarded as a least developed country for the purposes of establishing its IPF for the third cycle.

27. Similarly, Cuba welcomed the assistance given to Nicaragua by other Latin American countries. Its own aid, particularly in the provision of teachers for the literacy campaign and doctors and support staff, was well known.

28. Her delegation also supported the proposals for assistance to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

29. Mr. SIOSTRONEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation fully supported the recommendation for assistance to Nicaragua and, in general, UNDP activities aimed at promoting the economic and technical development of developing countries. It also supported the proposals for UNDP assistance to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

30. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) recalled that his country had been providing generous bilateral aid to Nicaragua since August 1979. In the same spirit, his delegation supported the Administrator's proposals for international aid to Nicaragua, as stated in document DP/427.

31. Spain also had links with Equatorial Guinea and was helping that country in its development process. Consequently it fully supported the Administrator's proposals for assistance to that country, as it did the Administrator's proposals for assistance to Zimbabwe.

32. Mr. AGO (Italy) expressed support for the proposals contained in document DP/427. His country had sent a mission of inquiry to Nicaragua, as a result of which it was sending emergency assistance in the form of financial aid, rice, medicine, contributions to the Red Cross fund and financing for a UNDP geothermal project. It also planned to send medical units to Nicaragua. The European Economic Community, for its part, had provided almost \$10 million in emergency aid, in the form of food and financing.

33. Mr. PIMENTEL (Brazil) said that his delegation shared the views of the Latin American Group of States with respect to the Administrator's recommendations concerning assistance to Equatorial Guinea, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe. In the case of Nicaragua, his Government had already worked out a small but effective programme for bilateral technical co-operation in the context of technical co-operation among developing countries, which, as a two-way process, would benefit not only the people of Nicaragua but also the people of Brazil.

34. Mr. ZHURAVLYOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported existing and additional measures to assist Nicaragua pursuant to General Assembly resolution 34/8.

35. His country was extending bilateral assistance to the people of Nicaragua in the wake of its hard-won victory over the fascist Somoza régime, which had left the country in a state of economic disaster. Emergency assistance had been provided by the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent, national personnel were being trained, and economic co-operation developed. One of Nicaragua's most serious difficulties was the lack of financial resources. His delegation therefore supported the granting of assistance by UNDP, including an increase in Nicaragua's current IPF. It likewise supported the Administrator's recommendations in respect of Equatorial Guinea (DP/436).

36. Mr. CARIAS (Observer for Honduras) said that the Government and people of his country had provided assistance to Nicaragua and continued to support the economic efforts of that country to the best of their ability. Their belief in the need for international assistance to Nicaragua, with particular emphasis on assistance from the United Nations family had been made clear in a statement by the Honduran Minister for Foreign Affairs at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly (A/34/PV.14).

37. Mr. HUTTON (Canada) expressed his delegation's support for the Administrator's recommendations with regard to special assistance for Equatorial Guinea and Nicaragua and to the establishment of an IPF for Zimbabwe.

38. In respect of assistance to Nicaragua, as his delegation had stated at the special session of the Economic Commission for Latin America, the granting of "as if" status to least developed countries provided UNDP with an objective mechanism through which additional resources could be allocated in emergency situations. However, there was no such mechanism for allocating funds from the Programme Reserve, a matter on which the Administrator was to prepare a paper for the twenty-seventh session. In the light of the fact that the Governing Council would review the status of the Programme Reserve at that session, he proposed that the Council should approve at the present Special Meeting the recommendation contained in document DP/427 and give full and sympathetic consideration at the twenty-seventh session to the additional request from the Government of Nicaragua.

39. Mr. PREUSS (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Government of Nicaragua undoubtedly needed UNDP assistance if it was to remedy speedily the economic damage the country had suffered. His Government had been among the first to respond to requests for bilateral co-operation. About \$30 million had already been committed, and additional resources would be made available under the forthcoming budget, to finance urgently needed reconstruction programmes. With regard to international assistance, his delegation fully endorsed the recommendations of the Administrator contained in document DP/427 and would favour early and sympathetic consideration of the possible use of the Programme Reserve. It also endorsed the recommendations for assistance to Equatorial Guinea (DP/436) and for the establishment of an IPF for Zimbabwe (DP/440).



40. Mr. ZDRAVKOVIĆ (Observer for Yugoslavia) expressed the whole-hearted support of his delegation for the Administrator's recommendations with regard to Equatorial Guinea, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe.

41. Mr. GILLE (United Nations Fund for Population Activities) explained that soon after the new Government had come to power in Nicaragua, the Fund had approved over \$400,000 for maternal and child health care, together with resources for population projects. At the request of the Nicaraguan Government, a mission had been sent to identify needs for future population assistance, both from the Fund and from other interested organizations and Governments. As a result of that mission, the Nicaraguan Government had submitted to the Fund a number of project proposals, including support for the 1982 population census, training in demography, the extension of the maternal and child health care project, the establishment of projects on the integration of women into development and on the improvement of civil registration and vital statistics, and a study of the demographic impact of agrarian reform. Proposals for an assistance programme to Nicaragua, totalling \$4 million for 1980-1983, would be submitted to the Governing Council at its next session.

42. Mr. KANE (Senegal) expressed his delegation's support for the recommendations for assistance to Equatorial Guinea and Nicaragua, two countries where freedom and human rights had recently triumphed. The African countries had always demonstrated their full support for Zimbabwe, and as independence approached, they welcomed the initiative taken by the Administrator with respect to the establishment of an IPF for that country. In supporting the Administrator's recommendations, his delegation also hoped that the Governing Council would be able to consider other ways of enabling the three countries concerned to receive assistance from UNDP and from the United Nations system in general.

43. Mr. BRECHER (United States of America) observed that his Government was among those that had strongly supported international efforts to assist Nicaragua, not only by endorsing the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic Commission for Latin America but also by providing \$27 million thus far in bilateral aid for emergency relief, housing and rural development. Additional funds were being requested from the United States Congress to assist with reconstruction. In supporting the Administrator's recommendations (DP/427), his delegation would also view with positive understanding the request from the Government of Nicaragua for additional funds, while bearing in mind that at its twenty-seventh session the Governing Council was to discuss the criteria for the Programme Reserve.

44. He requested information from the Administrator as to whether it might be possible to make draw-downs from both the Programme Reserve and the "future participants" funds pending the discussion of the Programme Reserve at the twenty-seventh session, while bearing in mind that UNDP would need to have sufficient funds available to meet any urgent needs that might arise before the end of 1981. It would also be helpful to have an indication of the status of the projects to be financed in Nicaragua, in order to determine what proportion of the funds requested would not, in fact, be required until after June 1980.

45. Miss SUAREZ (Observer for Venezuela) expressed support for the Nicaraguan Government's request for additional funds for the current cycle. Her country was

(Miss Suarez, Observer, Venezuela)

giving both economic and financial support to Nicaragua, including a broad programme of technical co-operation. The recommendations of the Administrator with respect to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe also had her delegation's support.

46. Mr. NGUYEN NGOC DUNG (Observer for Viet Nam) said that his delegation had welcomed the decision of the General Assembly to grant least-developed-country treatment to Nicaragua until the situation in that country returned to normal. It therefore supported the recommendation to increase Nicaragua's current IPF and was confident that the Council would also accept the Nicaraguan Government's request for emergency assistance at the current Special Meeting, as a first step towards a large-scale programme to meet the needs of the courageous Nicaraguan people.

47. His delegation also supported the recommendations for assistance to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

48. Mr. VONGSALY (Observer for the Lao People's Democratic Republic) expressed his delegation's support for countries facing the difficult problem of reconstruction and for the recommendations of the Administrator contained in documents DP/427, DP/436 and DP/440.

49. Mrs. ZAKI (Egypt) said that the establishment of an IPF for Zimbabwe would undoubtedly give great encouragement to that country, as a first step in development assistance. Her delegation therefore supported the Administrator's recommendations with regard to Zimbabwe, and also with regard to assistance for Equatorial Guinea and Nicaragua, pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 34/123 and 34/8 respectively.

50. Mr. BASSIN (Finland) said that his delegation fully supported the Administrator's recommendations with regard to Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe. Finland had already voiced its sympathy and support for the new Government in Nicaragua and indicated its willingness to support that Government's development endeavours; however, in view of the situation with regard to the Programme Reserve, his delegation would support the Canadian proposal concerning the request for additional assistance.

51. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that his Government recognized the magnitude and urgency of Nicaragua's needs and had noted the request for additional assistance submitted to the Council at the present Special Meeting by the Government of that country. However, in the light of the comments made by the Administrator in paragraph 8 of document DP/427, he believed that a decision on the use of the Programme Reserve should be postponed until the Council had had time to discuss the criteria at its twenty-seventh session. In all other respects, his delegation supported the Administrator's recommendations as contained in documents DP/427, DP/436 and DP/440.

52. Mr. HATEGA (Uganda) commended the Administrator for his prompt response to the General Assembly resolutions regarding assistance to Nicaragua, Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe. He said that his delegation was keenly aware of the damage suffered by the economies of Equatorial Guinea and Nicaragua as a result of

(Mr. Hatega, Uganda)

exploitation by the former dictators in those countries. It therefore fully supported the Administrator's recommendations and hoped that the Governing Council would endorse them. The assistance being proposed for Zimbabwe would undoubtedly go far towards placing that country's post-independence economy on a sound footing.

53. Mr. WASILEWSKI (Poland) associated his delegation with the support expressed by previous speakers for the Administrator's recommendations with regard to assistance for Equatorial Guinea, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe.

54. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Observer for Benin) said that implementation of General Assembly resolution 34/8 was a matter of urgency if Nicaragua was to overcome the backwardness which had resulted from a dictatorship supported by international imperialism. It was only natural that UNDP should provide assistance to the Nicaraguan people.

55. For obvious reasons, his delegation also supported the proposed assistance to help the people of Zimbabwe place that country's economy on a sound footing and achieve full social, economic and political development. Similarly, his delegation endorsed the Administrator's recommendations on assistance to Equatorial Guinea.

55a. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) said that his country had been one of the first to respond to the request for assistance from the Nicaraguan Government and had provided bilateral assistance in the form of medical services, education, and the rehabilitation of industrial enterprises. In that spirit, his delegation fully supported the recommendations of the Administrator contained in document DP/427 and likewise supported his recommendations with regard to assistance for Equatorial Guinea (DP/436) and the establishment of an IPF for Zimbabwe (DP/440).

56. Mr. CHEN Xingnong (China) said that China had always supported the struggle of third world countries to achieve development. His delegation therefore supported the recommendations of the Administrator with regard to Nicaragua, Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

57. Mr. BA-ISSA (Democratic Yemen) said that his delegation supported the proposals concerning Nicaragua, Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe.

58. Mr. TINOCO (Observer for Nicaragua) said that, in view of the misgivings expressed by some delegations, in particular Canada, he felt it necessary to renew his country's urgent appeal for additional funds from the Programme Reserve to deal with the disastrous situation following the years of rule by the Somoza régime. UNDP, in co-operation with Nicaraguan technicians, had worked out and programmed a series of high-priority projects whose cost would reach nearly \$5.8 million and therefore would not be fully covered by the initial special request of \$4 million. He recalled that the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Second Committee and the General Assembly had all indicated that additional and special resources should be granted to Nicaragua if needed. He therefore urged the Council to give favourable consideration to his country's request for additional funds.

59. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) suggested that the Council could, in a spirit of goodwill, approve in principle all or part of Nicaragua's request at the present Special Meeting; then, at its twenty-seventh session in June, it could evaluate progress and decide on further allocations.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendations of the Administrator with regard to assistance to Nicaragua, as stated in paragraph 10 of document DP/427.

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. BROWN (Deputy Administrator) said, with regard to the status of funds for future participants, that there was a balance of \$2,542,000, a figure which took into account the increased IPFs for Nicaragua, Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe discussed at the present meeting. The Programme Reserve showed an unallocated balance of \$8,038,000 as at December 1979. Furthermore, for 1979 the estimated commitments approved by the Council on the basis of standing rules amounted to \$5,280,000.

63. He drew attention to paragraph 8 of document DP/427, which referred to the paper requested by the Council for submission by the Administrator to the Council at its twenty-seventh session concerning criteria for the use of the Programme Reserve. The present position with regard to those criteria was, as decided by the Council at its twentieth session, that the Programme Reserve was to be used for financing emergency assistance in cases of natural disasters and assistance for rehabilitation and reconstruction of the areas concerned. The Council could now decide to amend the criteria and allow for the consideration of Nicaragua's special request for assistance from the Programme Reserve for rehabilitation activities following a man-made disaster.

64. He confirmed the statement made by the observer for Nicaragua with regard to the availability of projects. The Regional Bureau for Latin America had projects in hand whose cost exceeded the \$4 million initially requested. However, it was impossible to estimate the amount which would be spent between now and June 1980, when the Council might consider the matter further.

65. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Council should defer to the following meeting its decision on Nicaragua's additional request and the possible need to amend the criteria to be used in allocating assistance from the Programme Reserve.

66. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendations of the Administrator with regard to assistance to Equatorial Guinea, as set forth in paragraph 6 of document DP/436.

67. It was so decided.

68. Mr. ESONO BIBANG NGUI (Observer for Equatorial Guinea) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the decision taken by the Council with regard to assistance to his country.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendations of the Administrator with regard to an IPF for Zimbabwe for 1980-1981, as set forth in paragraph 5 of document DP/440.

70. It was so decided.

(d) INTERIM FUND ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (DP/433)

71. Mr. MORSE (Administrator) said that for 1980-1981 the General Assembly had assigned to UNDP the responsibility for administering the new Interim Fund on Science and Technology for Development, which was to be separate from the Programme but would be able to benefit from the Programme's existing services and channels, in particular the extensive network of UNDP Field Offices. The General Assembly had also agreed that the target for voluntary contributions to the Interim Fund for 1980-1981 should be no less than \$250 million. A pledging conference would be convened by the Secretary-General at United Nations Headquarters on 27 March 1980. He urged Governments to contribute generously to the Interim Fund, so as to strengthen and promote international co-operation in the field of science and technology.

72. UNDP had made considerable progress in preparing for the operations of the Interim Fund. In particular, a draft paper setting up the procedures for its operations had been prepared and would be discussed with the specialized agencies, regional commissions and other concerned organizations of the United Nations system at an interagency consultative meeting to be held in early March 1980. Furthermore, intensive preparations were in progress for the identification of projects which might be considered for support by the Interim Fund. UNDP could assure Governments that the Interim Fund would be prepared to make an early start in operations and make an effective contribution during the two-year interim period if financial resources were made available to it.

73. The newly established Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development had already met for a one-week session at the end of January 1980 and had dealt mainly with organizational matters. A resolution adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee, entitled "Guidelines for the Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development", called on the Administrator in consultation with the Director-General to make available for consideration by the Intergovernmental Committee at its next meeting details of the criteria and methodologies for the identification and assessment of projects eligible for financing from the Interim Fund.

74. He would make a full report to the Council at its twenty-seventh session on the Interim Fund's operations and management. He also expected to be able to present for the Council's consideration a number of projects submitted to the Interim Fund.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the Administrator's recommendation, set forth in paragraph 12 of document DP/433, with regard to the inclusion of an item on the Interim Fund in the agenda of the Council's twenty-seventh session.

76. It was so decided.

DP/SR.673

English

Page 14

77. The CHAIRMAN said he would adjourn the formal meeting, so as to enable Council members to hold informal consultations.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.