UNITED NATIONS

UNDP

United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1983/2
21 January 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL
Special meeting
14-18 February 1983
Agenda item 3(b)

SUPPORT

COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

RELEVANT TRENDS AND PROBLEMS IN THE COUNTRY PROGRAMMES PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL IN FEBRUARY 1983

Report of the Administrator

Summary

The present report is for the Council's information; it analyzes trends and problems in the 25 country programmes submitted for consideration and approval to the February 1983 special meeting of the Governing Council.

The report is divided into seven sections dealing, respectively, with timing of country programmes and related aspects, nature of preparatory work, financial aspects, equipment component in country programmes, pre-investment activities and investment support, major development objectives and sectoral allocations, and global priorities.

Given the rather limited number of country programmes presented to this session, any trends apparent in them may not be generally valid. Nevertheless, four distinct trends emerge from the analysis of the 25 country programmes. First, the concept of continuous country programming is now being applied by the large majority of the country programmes reviewed. Second, the projected sectoral distribution is very similar to that of the country programmes submitted in June 1982 and also of the second cycle Third, the higher level of Government cost sharing contributions noted in the last report (DP/1982/4 and Add.1) is maintained in the programmes currently presented for approval. Fourth, Governments tend to continue to synchronize the timeframe of their country programmes with the IPF cycle rather than with their respective national plans.

83-01649

1. This report, prepared in response to the Governing Council's request[1/] to be kept informed of relevant trends and problems in the country programmes presented for approval at any one session, examines 25 country programmes submitted for approval to the current special meeting of the Governing Council. Seventeen of these country programmes cover total available resources of less than $20 million and are thus short format country programme documents, submitted without an accompanying note by the Administrator, in accordance with Governing Council decision 81/15.

I. TIMING AND RELATED ASPECTS

2. Of the 25 country programmes, 12 represent programming undertaken in the Africa region, 6 emanate from the Asia and Pacific region, and 5 are being submitted by Arab States. Of the 2 remaining programmes, 1 is from the Latin America region and 1 from Europe. Taken together with the country programmes expected to be submitted to the Governing Council's thirtieth session, and those presented to the special meeting in May 1982, the large majority (i.e. over 120) of country programmes for the third programming cycle will have been considered by the Council by June 1983, i.e. within 12 months of the commencement of the third programming cycle. Contrary to the sample of country programmes analyzed in the previous report of this kind (DP/1982/4 and Add.1), the present sample is not large enough, nor is its distribution over the regions even enough, for the trends apparent in it to be fully representative of the programme as a whole.

3. Of the 25 programmes examined in this report, 2 are the first country programmes to be approved for the countries concerned; 4 are the second; and 1 is the fourth. The great majority, or 18, of the programmes presented, are the third country programmes of the countries concerned. In conformity with Governing Council decision 81/15, no country programme is submitted for retroactive approval of a period longer than six months. All programmes, therefore, commence in January 1983 or later and consequently do not fully coincide with the third programming cycle (see DP/1983/2/Add.1, annex I). The large majority of programmes (23) were elaborated within the framework of the national plan of the country concerned. Since most national plans cover more or less the same five-year period as the third programming cycle, the time-frame of most country programmes overlap to a large extent with the national plans. It is further to be noted that 16 of the country programmes were to have started in 1982 in order to coincide with the third programming cycle. However, due to the decision that retroactive approval should not exceed six months, the Administrator authorized the extension of the current country programmes of the countries concerned through 1982 (DP/1982/87). Taking into consideration this administrative measure, there appears to be a continued preference on the part of Governments to synchronize their country programmes with the indicative planning figure (IPF) cycle rather than with their respective national plans,[2/] notwithstanding the fact that most country programmes rely on a current or future national development plan.

4. Three of the country programmes submitted for the Council's consideration show a considerable hiatus between the preceding and present programmes. In the Sudan, there was a lapse of six years between the end of the previous (first) country programme and the start of the present one. The hiatus was due to a combination of factors, among which were the resources constraint of UNDP in 1975-1976 and budgetary problems of the Government of the Sudan, as a result of which the

/...

/...

Government was unable to meet its cost-sharing commitments. Consequently, the preparation of a new country programme was initially postponed to 1979, but in August of that year it was decided to further defer the submission of the second country programme for the Sudan to the beginning of the third programming cycle. In the case of Nigeria, the lapse of three years between the second and third country programmes was due, in addition to internal problems, to the Government's wish to develop and consolidate its fourth national development plan (1981-1985) before the priorities chosen for UNDP assistance were determined. The delay in the submission of Tonga's programme by two years was due to the Government's decision to await the finalization of its national plan. All three Governments have been receiving assistance under the authority given to the Administrator by the Governing Council to approve UNDP assistance to projects pending the approval of a new country programme. Governing Council members will recall that these procedures were established by Council decision 81/15, without which requests for assistance would have had to be presented to the Council for its approval.

5. Twenty-eight country programmes ending in December 1981 were extended for one year by the Administrator in 1982. The respective new country programmes were to have been presented to the special meeting[3/] of the Council in February 1983. However, 10 of the Governments whose country programmes were thus extended subsequently informed the Administrator that they would be unable to submit their country programmes before June 1983,[4/] which would necessitate the retroactive approval of the first six months of these country programmes (i.e. the period January-June 1983). In the case of Suriname, the submission has been delayed until June 1984, and an extension document covering the period until the start of the new country programme will be presented to the Council in June 1983.

6. At its twenty-ninth session, the Governing Council approved 21 requests by the Administrator for authority to approve assistance to projects submitted by Governments which had never had a country programme or for which the date of submission of the next country programme could not be determined. The Governments of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nigeria, Sudan, Tonga and Vanuatu whose country programmes are to be considered during the present special meeting of the Council, were among these countries, leaving 16 countries for which the arrangement is to be continued.[5/]

II. NATURE OF PREPARATORY WORK

7. In 23 of the 25 country programmes submitted for the Council's consideration, the country programme documents state that these have been elaborated within the framework of a national plan or other economic programme. In 10 of the countries, national plans were either under preparation or existed in draft form at the time of elaboration of the country programme. In one case, Sierra Leone, the Government stated that the submission of the country programme was postponed so that it could be based on the national plan. Annex II of document DP/1983/2/Add.1 contains information provided in the country programme documents in respect of the activities undertaken for the preparation of the country programmes.

8. Selected studies of varying scope for the determination of technical co-operation needs in individual sectors were conducted in 22 of the country programmes reviewed. An over-all assessment of technical co-operation needs for all sectors was carried out in nine countries. In most cases, these were undertaken in conjunction with the preparation of the national plans rather than for the country programming exercise.

/...

9. In Yemen, the results of sectoral studies carried out in the context of the formulation of the national plan, with the assistance, inter alia, of the World Bank (through a UNDP-assisted project for development planning) and the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA), were used for the preparation of the country programme. On the other hand, sectoral reviews undertaken by several other agencies in preparation of the country programme were also regarded by the Government as contributing to the national planning exercise. In three other countries, the respective Governments and UNDP organized sectoral reviews and discussions between the Governments and representatives of the United Nations system.

10. In some of the least developed countries, over-all external requirements were assessed in preparation for round table meetings, in keeping with the provisions of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, with the participation of the recipient Government and major multilateral and bilateral donors. This was the case, for instance, in Cape Verde, where the preparation for the 1982 round table was concurrent with that for the country programme and where the objectives chosen for UNDP assistance were defined on the basis of sectoral studies and projects carried out by the Government with the support of consultants financed by bilateral and multilateral sources other than UNDP. In the remaining countries, Governments have drawn upon selected sectoral studies and needs identification missions carried out by United Nations agencies over the past few years.

11. A formal assessment of prior country programming experience was carried out by the resident representative in twelve countries. The assessment usually consisted of an examination and synthesis of the results of previous periodic reviews of the country programme, and of tripartite monitoring reviews and evaluations of individual projects. It formed the basis for the preparation of the "note" by the resident representative which is the contribution of UNDP to the early stage of the programming process (see paragraph 12 below). In the case of the Sudan, a joint review of the whole programme was conducted by the Ministry of Finance with the assistance of a UNDP consultant. A review mission visited the site of every IPF-funded project in the country and held discussions with national and international project personnel as well as with visiting review teams from executing agencies. The findings of this mission were discussed by the Government and UNDP and the recommendations of the joint review mission were endorsed by the Government and circulated to all agencies and other major multilateral and bilateral donors in the country. They were a major input in the formulation of the new country programme. In the case of Nigeria, senior staff from UNDP headquarters visited the country for a thorough review with the Government of the country programme and discussion of related issues in order to determine the future assistance needs of Nigeria and to establish a basis for the negotiation of the new country programme. Consequently, the resident representative's note was not prepared. In all other countries, the Governments agreed to forego a note and conduct instead extensive formal and informal discussions between the Government and the resident representative in order to assess previous country programming experience and to determine the contents of the new country programme.

12. A resident representative's note, formulated with the agreement of the Government to serve as a basis for the consultation on the new country programme, was prepared for nine of the 25 programmes examined (see DP/1983/2/Add.1, annex II). The note is an informal written communication to the Government containing

the carefully considered views and suggestions of the resident representative on the orientation of UNDP assistance in the new country programme, including possible areas of concentration, the nature of assistance to be provided and steps to be undertaken towards its implementation. It is intended to serve as a basis for discussion with the Government in preparing the new programme. The central issue in the note is the role of UNDP in the country's development effort. A useful focus for the note is therefore the analysis of how UNDP assistance has related to national development priorities and suggestions for the future application of UNDP assistance. The over-all decline in the number of such notes compared with previous years is least evident in the African region, where the large majority of resident representatives prepared such a note. In the Arab States region, only one resident representative transmitted a note to the Government (Algeria) and in the other regions no notes were prepared. In Sierra Leone, a series of consultations based upon the results of agency sectoral missions were held by an interagency advisory committee. This committee comprised United Nations international project staff with the appropriate background who had participated with the Government in the determination of priorities and helped to foster multidisciplinary action and the coherence of United Nations operational activities in the country. The results of the discussions were then used for the preparation of the resident representative's note to the Government.

13. Agency programming missions specifically for the country programming exercise were undertaken for 21 of the 25 country programmes examined. In Ethiopia, at the request of the Government, UNDP financed programme formulation missions from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), UNDP, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Industrial Labour Organisation (ILO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). An interagency mission composed of representatives from UNDP, the ILO, UNESCO and UNICEF covered the human resources sector. In Algeria, the Government considered special sectoral programming missions unnecessary in view of the many ad hoc agency missions which had visited the country. In most countries, Governments chose to invite selected agencies to assist in programming UNDP assistance in key sectors. Some Governments drew upon the expertise of intercountry advisers and experts as well as on findings of agency sectoral studies.

14. Efforts continued to co-ordinate UNDP-assisted activities with those financed from other sources (see DP/1983/2/Add.1, annex II, last column; and annex IV, column 3). Although no Government opted for joint programming of the resources available from the various United Nations organizations, a number of country programmes were designed to complement programmes financed by other multilateral and bilateral sources, or to combine UNDP assistance with assistance from other sources. For example, in Ethiopia the UNDP country programme was consciously designed to complement assistance financed by other multilateral and bilateral sources. An outstanding example is a UNDP-supported core project for the rehabilitation of the disabled, with FAO, the ILO, UNICEF and bilateral agencies financing ancillary projects. A project in energy is jointly financed with the European Economic Community (EEC). In the Gambia, the country programme was formulated taking into account the availability of other complementary sources of technical co-operation. For example, one UNDP-assisted project in rural water supply is also being supported by UNICEF, the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) and the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF). However, the

Government has pointed out the difficulty of achieving any measure of joint programming since the availability of resources from other United Nations organizations cannot be ascertained beyond a year or two. In the Sudan, special efforts have been made to ensure complementarity with programmes of other sources of external assistance. Projects in transport, trade, and development of the Jonglei region are related to activities financed by UNCDF, EEC and the Governments of Canada, Denmark and the Netherlands. In Saudi Arabia, although the bulk of Government cost-sharing resources is channelled through agency-administered trust funds, the projects are so closely linked to the UNDP-financed activities that they have been programmed along with the IPF resources.

III. FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

15. Summary information on the financial aspects of the 25 country programmes presented to the Governing Council at this meeting is contained in annex III to document DP/1983/2/Add.1. The illustrative IPF resources taken into account in the programmes amount to almost $677 million, representing approximately 17 per cent of the total UNDP illustrative country IPFs for the third cycle.[6/] The size of individual illustrative IPFs in this sample of country programmes ranges from $2 million (both for Sao Tome and Principe and for Vanuatu) to $112 million (Ethiopia).

16. The financial summaries of the country programmes reflect resources taken into account for programming as follows: (a) third cycle illustrative IPF resources; (b) less the "unprogrammed" balance;[7/] (c) less the authorized budget level for 1982; (d) adjustment for the carry-over of unused resources from the second cycle or for funds borrowed from the third cycle IPF; (e) other resources, such as Government cost sharing, the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries, etc. The total resources thus available for programming amount to $768 million.

17. In view of the decline in anticipated voluntary contributions, the Administrator recently decided to limit the resources taken into account for programming to 55 per cent of the illustrative IPFs for 1982-1986, in accordance with Governing Council decision 80/30. Nevertheless, and since the country programmes to be presented for approval at this meeting and in June 1983 are the result of lengthy negotiations and have in many cases been approved at the Cabinet level, these programmes will be presented to the Council with the resources taken into account for programming at 80 per cent of the illustrative IPFs, as decided by the Administrator in August 1980, following Governing Council decision 80/30. For these country programmes, the Administrator is presenting to the special meeting a note (DP/1983/59, pp. 4-8) which contains tables showing the resources taken into account both at the 80 and the 55 per cent levels. Unless the resource situation improves or alternative financing can be arranged through cost sharing, the necessary adjustments will need to be carried out through modifications in sectoral earmarkings and/or proposed new projects, thereby reducing or eliminating the flexibility granted through continuous programming. In country programmes with a high proportion of ongoing projects, especially those approved in 1981-1982, where commitments for ongoing projects are likely to have increased, such projects may also be affected (see DP/1983/59, para.9). As in the past, the Administrator will continue to ensure that expenditures will always be contained within the financial resources available at any given time so as to preserve the financial integrity of the Programme.

18. Following the recommendation by the Administrator, a provision for adequate programming (i.e. "overprogramming") has not been made in the programmes submitted. This recommendation was based on the consideration that the flexibility granted through continuous programming in combination with the control exercised over actual expenditures through the annualized authorized budget levels established for each country, would help to ensure full delivery of UNDP assistance within the projected over-all availability of resources.

19. A reserve for unforeseen needs has been included in 17 of the 25 country programmes. Of the eight programmes which do not have such a reserve, five include an earmarking for selected sectors or themes for which projects will be worked out at a later stage. Unforeseen needs in these programmes will have to be accommodated within these earmarkings or financed from resources freed by cancellations of projects or by reprogramming in conjunction with periodic reviews of the country programme. Three countries (Kuwait, the Republic of Korea and Uruguay) have identified projects for the full amount of available resources without setting aside a reserve for unforeseen needs. A change in priorities or new needs will therefore have to be accommodated either by a reprogramming of resources or by an increase in the cost sharing contribution.

20. Other resources supplement IPF resources in 11 of the 25 programmes examined. In six countries, these consist of recipient Government cost sharing; in two countries (Ethiopia and Upper Volta), of funds from the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries; in two others (Cape Verde and Sao Tomé and Principe), of a special allocation for island developing countries; and in one (Yemen), partly of Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries and partly of third-party cost sharing. Table 1 gives a breakdown of Government cost sharing by country and compares its volume to the total resources available for programming. Four of the six countries providing Government cost sharing are members of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and three of these are Arab States, which confirms the predominance of the Arab States region in this respect, as reported to the Council in June 1982 (see DP/1982/4, paragraphs 20-22). Of the total resources available for programming in the three Arab States, 78 per cent consists of Government cost sharing resources. This includes Kuwait, with 100 per cent cost sharing. In each of the other regions except Europe, only one country programme includes Government cost sharing resources. The percentages in these countries range from 27 per cent of the total available in Uruguay, to 19 per cent in Nigeria and to less than 1 per cent in the case of Papua New Guinea. In Yemen, the only country in the present sample where UNDP resources are supplemented by third-party cost sharing, these resources constitute 73 per cent of the total resources available (see DP/CP/YEM/NOTE/3, paragraph 7).

Table 1

Cost sharing resources

	Total resources available for programming (see DP/1983/2/Add.1, column 7 of annex III)	Of which Government cost sharing	Of which third-party cost sharing	Cost sharing as percentage of total
	(Thousands of dollars)			
Algeria	36 008	23 213	-	64
Kuwait	7 926	7 926	-	100
Nigeria	47 393	9 163	-	19
Papua New Guinea	8 167	24	-	<1
Saudi Arabia	43 468	36 729 a/	-	84
Uruguay	8 575	2 292	-	27
Yemen	67 165	-	49 200	73
TOTAL	218 702	79 347	49 200	

a/ Excluding $197,070,000 in funds-in-trust resources which, although linked to UNDP-assisted projects, will be provided by the Government to the agencies concerned (see DP/CP/SAU/3, Annex).

21. Although the Latin American and European regions are underrepresented in the present sample of country programmes, there seems to be a correlation between the level of per capita gross national product (GNP) and the relative importance of Government cost sharing resources. Of the total resources available for programming in all country programmes presently submitted, Government cost sharing constitutes 10 per cent, which is the same as that reported last year. By region, the following figures emerge: Latin America, 27 per cent; Arab States, 18 per cent; Africa, 3 per cent; and Asia and the Pacific, less than 1 per cent.

22. Previous reports (DP/522; DP/1982/4 and Add.1) to the Governing Council found an increase in the proportion of resources allocated to new activities (both projects and earmarkings). While the proportion of total resources allocated to ongoing activities in the present sample of country programmes is slightly higher than last year's figure, only five countries (Ethiopia, Kuwait, Sierra Leone, Tonga and Uruguay) have allocated more than 50 per cent of their total resources to ongoing projects. Since the programmes have

already moved into the first year of the third programming cycle, a higher percentage of resources committed to newly approved projects is to be expected, and an average of between 30 and 40 per cent would seem reasonable (see para. 17).

23. One strong trend in the allocation of resources to projects is the use which Governments make of the possibility of programming by objectives. Eighteen of the 25 Governments presenting their programmes for approval have earmarked resources for the later identification of projects in chosen sectors. Interestingly enough, there seems to be a preference to adopt the principle of continuous country programming in the African region, where all countries have made some provision for future project identification as needs arise. The Asia and the Pacific and the Arab States regions follow in indicating preference for this principle. No valid conclusions can be drawn from the small sample from the Latin American and European regions. The average of resources programmed by objectives varies from 25 per cent in the Asia and Pacific region, 17 per cent in the African region, 13 per cent in the Arab States, 10 per cent in Europe (Greece) and to none in Latin America (Uruguay). In the majority of these countries, project-specific programming covers only the first two to three years of the programme, allowing for the necessary flexibility in programming during the last year or two.

IV. EQUIPMENT COMPONENT IN COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

24. Following consideration of the report on the use of programme resources for equipment (DP/1982/3) during the special meeting of the Governing Council in May 1982, at its twenty-ninth session, the Council, *inter alia*, requested the Administrator to "continue to include a summary analysis of the various components in country programmes" in the present report (decision 82/4,B, operative paragraph 3). Since decisions on project inputs are normally taken at the time of project formulation, it is difficult to forecast accurately the equipment component proportions of country programmes at the time of their approval. Nevertheless, if the expenditures on the equipment component during the second cycle are taken as an indication of the expected third cycle equipment component proportion of any given country, it is anticipated that none of the country programmes submitted to the present session of the Council will have an unduly high proportion of funds spent on equipment. As may be seen from Table 2, the proportion of resources spent on the equipment component during the second cycle (1977-1981) ranged from 2 per cent in Saudi Arabia to 42 per cent in the Republic of Korea.

/...

Table 1

Equipment component as a per cent of total project expenditures by country 1977-1981 a/

	Total expenditures (Thousands of dollars)	Equipment	Equipment share %
AFRICA			
Cape Verde	4 241	714	17
Ethiopia	43 617	11 363	26
Gambia	8 287	1 272	15
Mali	24 579	6 342	26
Mauritania	9 967	976	10
Niger	21 055	3 878	18
Nigeria	60 297	4 136	7
Sao Tome and Principe	1 721	400	23
Senegal	12 908	1 881	15
Sierra Leone	13 991	2 253	16
Togo	11 880	3 819	32
Upper Volta	23 535	4 251	18
ARAB STATES			
Algeria	23 172	3 258	14
Kuwait	6 111	164	3
Saudi Arabia	22 096	445	2
Sudan	45 129	12 206	27
Yemen	38 425	2 953	8
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC			
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	5 911	1 454	25
Mongolia	8 873	2 797	32
Papua New Guinea	9 876	703	7
Republic of Korea	14 781	6 198	42
Tonga	2 052	127	6
Vanuatu	1 833	180	10
EUROPE			
Greece	7 462	688	9
LATIN AMERICA			
Uruguay	10 606	1 503	14

a/ 1981 data do not include expenditures by WHO.

/...

V. PRE-INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES AND INVESTMENT SUPPORT

25. The review of country programmes has confirmed once again that there is an emphasis placed upon pre-investment-type activities by Governments. Of the 25 country programmes being submitted to the Council, 17 comprise projects of a pre-investment nature or projects with a clearly identifiable pre-investment component. Based on country programmes which allocated resources at the project level, about 10 per cent of the IPFs for the third cycle have been devoted to pre-investment activities. It should be noted in this connection that many projects which were not identified as pre-investment projects in earlier country programmes have later proved to have an investment potential and have been successfully re-oriented to include pre-investment activities. Therefore, the magnitude of the pre-investment component in the programmes under review may be assumed to be considerably higher than the 10 per cent estimate given above.

26. Another trend which has emerged in recent years is that UNDP resources are increasingly being used to provide technical assistance to support Government projects for which investment commitments have already been made. This form of assistance has been described in several programmes reviewed as being catalytic in securing additional financing as well as supporting various Government agencies in the planning and preparation of projects.

VI. MAJOR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND COUNTRY PROGRAMMES EMPHASES

27. Objectives selected for UNDP assistance and their relationship to national development strategies and to regional, bilateral and multilateral programmes are shown in DP/1983/2/Add.1, annex IV.

28. Among the 25 programmes presented, there are a number of common themes reflecting both common development constraints among countries as well as common perception of the role which the United Nations system can play. Improving food security and food self-sufficiency is a major objective of 10 of 12 African programmes as these countries are facing increasing difficulty in keeping food production up with population increase. The programmes of seven Sahelian countries emphasize two other themes especially critical to the subregion, namely, water development and conservation of the Sahelian environment, including desertification control. Of the 25 programmes, four are submitted by members of OPEC: Algeria, Kuwait, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia. These programmes emphasize human resource development, including formal education, skills development and training in the context of strengthening national institutions as well as diversifying the economy, particularly through developing industry and agriculture. Another group of countries, which have skilled personnel and human resources, identifies technology development as the area where UNDP can play a most useful role, particularly by permitting exposure to international progress made in industrial processes. These countries are the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Greece, Mongolia and the Republic of Korea.

/...

29. Various approaches have been adopted to achieve efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Increasing the use of short-term consultants and national experts is emphasized by Algeria and Uruguay. It is considered that concentration of resources in large-scale activities will lead to greater impact in the programmes of Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, and Saudi Arabia. Some programmes with extremely limited resources concentrate on one or two key projects, e.g. Sao Tome and Principe, while others spread resources over a number of very small projects, e.g. Greece, Tonga and Vanuatu. Still others emphasize the need to tailor projects to the scope of the Government budget, given that externally financed projects require Government contributions which have to be limited, e.g. the Gambia.

30. Annex IV of document DP/1983/2/Add.1 shows the allocation of resources programmed by sector. Taking the total resources programmed for 25 countries ($768 million), the largest sector is transport and communications, which receives 27 per cent of resources, followed by agriculture, which has 24 per cent. The other major sectors are planning and administration, industry, and natural resources, each accounting for about 10 per cent of the total. However, the high percentage of total resources programmed for transport and communications in the present sample of country programmes does not signify that the majority of these country programmes attach greater importance to this sector than country programmes in general; rather, this high percentage arises from the allocation by Saudi Arabia of 70 per cent of its very large ($240 million) programme to this sector. The average (unweighted) allocation to this sector in the 25 programmes is 11 per cent. On this basis, the largest sector would be agriculture, for which the average allocation is 31 per cent. This pattern is consistent with the sectoral distribution of UNDP resources in recent years for the Programme as a whole.

VII. GLOBAL PRIORITIES

31. The extent to which the 25 country programmes promote development priorities endorsed by inter-governmental bodies, particularly by the Governing Council, was also examined (see DP/1983/2/Add.1, annex VI). These objectives include: meeting the needs of the poorest segments of society; promoting women's role in development; conserving the environment; technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC); the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (IDWSSD), and the International Year for Disabled Persons (IYDP). Compared with previous years, there is increased attention to global priorities since, with the exception of IYDP, all other objectives examined were discussed in at least half the country programmes as Government objectives. However, inclusion of specific activities which promote these objectives is much more varied. A majority of the programmes (20 out of 25) allocate resources to promote the objective of national food security. About half of the 25 programmes include activities consistent with the objectives of IDWSSD and improving living conditions of the poorest sectors of society. About one third of the programmes (9 out of 25) include projects to conserve the environment, while five include projects promoting women's role in development and TCDC. Particularly noteworthy is the attention given by the African country programmes in this sample to specific African regional mandates which have received global support through the General Assembly, e.g. the Lagos Plan of Action, the United Nations Decade for Transport and Communications in Africa, the Industrial Development Decade for Africa and the African Regional Food Plan.

/...

32. As noted in previous years, it is clear that Governments do not use the country programme primarily as a vehicle for promoting global priorities. National development strategy is clearly the framework for UNDP country programming. If global objectives are addressed, it is because they coincide with national objectives. The prevalent use of country programme resources to promote food security reflects the importance of this objective as a national development priority. This is consistent with the principle that UNDP technical co-operation at the country level is intended primarily to address national development needs. While the appropriate role of the United Nations system in promoting implementation of global priorities is to encourage and support national action towards their achievement, it does not necessarily follow that Governments are obliged to use UNDP funds for this purpose. The use of funding other than that provided by UNDP for national action to implement global priorities is often the reason why such priorities are not reflected in country programmes. Nevertheless, UNDP will continue to ensure, in co-operation with the agencies, that Governments are kept informed of global concerns and priorities for development and of the special contributions which the United Nations sytem can make towards their achievement.

VIII. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

33. The number of country programmes reviewed in this report is too limited and the distribution over the regions is too uneven for the trends apparent in them to be considered as valid for the programme as a whole. With this reservation, the following conclusions may be drawn:

(a) The application of the concept of programming by objectives, reflected in 18 of the 25 programmes, shows a substantial increase over the figure reported in the previous report (DP/1982/4 and Add.1). This may signify that the principle of continuous country programming is beginning to take hold;

(b) The relatively high proportion of Government cost sharing in the total of resources available for programming as noted in the last report, is corroborated in the country programmes reviewed;

(c) The projected sectoral distribution of UNDP technical co-operation is similar to that of the programmes submitted in June 1982 and is more or less consistent with the sectoral distribution for second cycle country programmes;

(d) The preference of Governments to synchronize the time-frame of their country programmes with the IPF cycle rather than with their respective national plans, is reconfirmed.

/...

NOTES

1/ Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixty-first Session, Supplement No. 2 (E/5779), para. 283.

2/ See document DP/1982/4, para 5.

3/ See DP/1982/87.

4/ Bolivia, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Republic of Cameroon.

5/ Belize, Brunei, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Hong Kong, Iran, Kiribati, Lebanon, Nauru, Nicaragua, Qatar, Swaziland, Tokelau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Tuvalu and Uganda.

6/ Total UNDP illustrative country IPFs for 1982-1986 amount to $3,924,200,000 (see Governing Council decision 80/30).

7/ This figure represents 20 per cent of the illustrative IPF which has not been taken into account for programming.

- - - - -