



**Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1990/SR.12
5 March 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Special session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 23 February 1990, at 5 p.m.

President: Mr. POPESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

MID-TERM REVIEWS OF COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

THE ROLE OF UNDP IN COMBATING THE HUMAN IMMUNODEFICIENCY VIRUS INFECTION (HIV) AND AIDS (continued)

MID-TERM REVIEW OF RESOURCES (continued)

OTHER MATTERS (continued)

Annex to Governing Council decision 89/23 of 30 June 1989 on the annual report of the Administrator (continued)

/...

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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

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

CONTENTS (continued)

Preparations for the fifth programming cycle (continued)

Second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (continued)

UNDP management study (continued)

Agency support costs (continued)

Meeting of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.

MID-TERM REVIEWS OF COUNTRY AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMES (continued) (DP/1990/L.7)

1. The PRESIDENT, drawing attention to the document entitled "Report by the President on the work of the Committee of the Whole (DP/1990/L.7)", said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendations made in paragraph 8 of that report.

2. It was so decided.

THE ROLE OF UNDP IN COMBATING THE HUMAN IMMUNODEFICIENCY VIRUS INFECTION (HIV) AND AIDS (continued)

Draft decision DP/1990/L.5

3. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe), reporting in his capacity as Vice-President, on the outcome of informal consultations, said that agreement had been reached on the text of the draft decision. He recommended the Council to adopt it by consensus.

4. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, according to paragraph 7, the Administrator should report on the subject at the special session in 1991. In fact, the intention was to devote that session - if it was held - to country programmes. He wondered, therefore, whether it would not be wiser to have the Administrator report to the Council at the regular session in June 1991. If the Council accepted that suggestion, paragraph 7 would read: "Requests the Administrator to report to the Governing Council at the regular session in 1991 on the implementation of this decision."

5. Mr. LEMERLE (France) said that the word "endorses" in paragraph 2 of the draft decision was incorrectly translated as "se félicite" in French; the Secretariat should make the necessary correction.

6. Draft decision DP/1990/L.5, as orally amended, was adopted.

MID-TERM REVIEW OF RESOURCES (continued)

Draft decision DP/1990/L.8

7. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), reporting in his capacity as Vice-President on the outcome of informal consultations, said that consensus had been reached on the wording of the draft decisions submitted to the Council. There was one omission in the second line of paragraph 12: the phrase "by the economic and social committees of the United Nations in the context" should be added after the word "activities".

8. Mr. AL AFIL (Observer for Democratic Yemen) made two comments on paragraph 10 of the draft decision, which concerned his country. In document DP/1990/7, part two, section IV, entitled "Disaster relief to Democratic Yemen", paragraph 21

(Mr. Al Afil, Observer, Democratic Yemen)

suggested that Yemen had received assistance in excess of the established ceiling. In fact, the ceiling had been raised following the adoption of decision 89/37 (Mid-term resource situation: Assistance to Democratic Yemen) and now stood at \$1.1 million. The impression given was that the ceiling was \$400,000 but Democratic Yemen had received over \$616,000 more. He asked the Secretariat to make the necessary corrections in future reports. Moreover, in the light of resolution 89/37, paragraph 1, which read: "Requests the Administrator to consider the provision of additional assistance to Democratic Yemen from the Special Programme Resources beyond the normally authorized amount", his delegation would have liked a separate draft resolution confirming that request. As that did not seem possible, he suggested adding a new paragraph to draft decision DP/1990/L.8, to read: "Again requests the Administrator to consider the provision of additional assistance to Democratic Yemen from the Special Programme Resources beyond the normally authorized amount", on the understanding that the provision would not be mandatory, and action on it would be left to the discretion of the Administrator.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, the new paragraph proposed by the delegation of Democratic Yemen would be added after paragraph 10 of the draft decision.

10. It was so decided.

11. Draft decision DP/1990/L.8, as orally amended, was adopted.

OTHER MATTERS (continued)

Draft decision DP/1990/L.10

12. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), reporting in his capacity as Vice-President on the outcome of informal consultations, said that the text of the draft decision had been endorsed by the delegations taking part in the consultations. He suggested that the Council should adopt it by consensus.

13. Draft decision DP/1990/L.10 was adopted.

Annex to Governing Council decision 89/23 of 30 June 1989 on the annual report of the Administrator (continued)

Draft decision DP/1990/L.11

14. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), introducing the draft decision in his capacity as Vice-President, said that it had been decided during informal consultations to recommend that consideration of the annex to Governing Council decision 89/23 should be postponed to the thirty-seventh session, and to submit draft decision DP/1990/L.11 to that effect. He recommended the Council to adopt the draft decision by consensus.

15. Draft decision DP/1990/L.11 was adopted.

Preparations for the fifth programming cycle (continued)Draft decision DP/1990/L.9

16. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) said that some amendments had been made to the draft decision during the informal consultations. It had been proposed to replace, in paragraph 3, the phrase after the words "positions on" by the phrase "the level, use and distribution of resources in the fifth cycle". In paragraph 4, after the words "a synopsis of the" the words "views expressed and" should be inserted; and the phrase following "centrally managed resources," should be replaced by the phrases "taking into consideration all the views expressed regarding Special Programme Resources and the question of net contributor status, and to make recommendations for proposals thereon, and to report to the members of the Programme. ...". In paragraph 6, the date "23 April 1990" should be replaced by "30 April 1990". Paragraph 7 would be entirely reworded to read:

"Requests the Administrator to include in the material he is preparing for the thirty-seventh session of the Governing Council (1990) information on the availability and coverage of data on the factors which currently feature in the supplementary criteria, and on gross domestic product, life expectancy, literacy rates, output of manufacturing, availability of depletable and non-renewable resources, the latest data on economies in transition, external debt related to gross national product, the relationship between debt service payment and exports, net transfer of resources, and any other indices which will form part of the human development report."

17. Mr. DJOGLAF (Observer for Algeria) observed that it had been agreed that the text on preparations for the fifth programming cycle would be a procedural text only, and it was on that basis that his delegation and most others had participated in the consultations. However, the proposed amendments to draft decision DP/1990/L.9 bore on substantive questions, thus prejudging the outcome of the deliberations of the Council's thirty-seventh session. His delegation had already had occasion to express its point of view on the social indicators of development and on the report on human development. It noted that its concerns had not been taken into account. It therefore asked for an opportunity to review the proposed amendments rapidly with their sponsors. In order to save time, the Council could in the mean time move on to other questions on its agenda.

18. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands) said that he wished to reassure the representative of Algeria. The draft was a consensus text that had been drawn up with much effort and did not lend itself to last-minute modifications. Its sponsors did not consider that the criteria referred to necessarily had to be taken into account in the allocation of fifth-cycle resources. The draft satisfied a number of concerns and in no way prejudged the deliberations of the thirty-seventh session.

19. Mr. EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that the draft text did not take account of Mauritania's concerns. He therefore joined the representative of Algeria in asking for further consultations. The data being requested were important and without them it would be difficult to take informed decisions when the fifth cycle was

(Mr. El Ghaouth, Mauritania)

considered. The first statistic requested by Mauritania had to do with gross domestic product and not gross national product, the latter being a function of the GDP.

20. Mr. DJOGLAF (Observer for Algeria) said in response to the delegation of the Netherlands that for the moment it was not possible to speak of a consensus because some problems remained. He insisted on the need to devote a few more minutes to the consideration of the draft, with the aim of resolving those problems and reaching a true consensus.

21. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Observer for Mongolia) supported the Algerian proposal.

22. The PRESIDENT asked Mr. Babington to proceed immediately to hold consultations with the delegations that had expressed objections to the draft text.

23. Mr. KIRDAR (Secretary of the Council), drawing attention to paragraph 6 of the draft decision and the amendment deferring informal consultations on issues pertaining to the fifth cycle to the week of 30 April, observed that since provision had not been made for them in the schedule of meetings, such consultations could be held only if the necessary services were available. He therefore proposed finding some other wording, replacing the word "Decides" for instance, by the phrase "Decides if possible" or "Requests". As for deferring the informal consultations to 30 April, he drew attention to the fact that the date of the special session of the General Assembly on development had not been set, but that it might begin on 30 April. Moreover, a meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to be attended by the secretariat heads of United Nations bodies, among them the UNDP Administrator, was scheduled for 2 May 1990. If the informal consultations in fact took place during the week of 30 April, the Administrator would probably not be able to take part in them.

24. Mr. LEMERLE (France) said that the date of 30 April was not convenient for the French delegation, not only because of the uncertainty of the date of the special session of the General Assembly but also because the members of his delegation had other engagements for that period. He asked that the possibility of deferring the consultations to the following week be considered.

25. Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Observer for Bahrain) pointed out that since the week of 23 April coincided with the end of the month of Ramadan and the celebration of the feast of Id al-Fitr, it would not be fair to hold those important informal consultations at that time because the delegations from Muslim countries would not be able to take part.

26. Mr. LANGENBACHER (Switzerland) said that if it was not possible to come to an agreement before the end of the meeting on the wording of draft decision DP/1990/L.9, perhaps, as the President had proposed, consideration should be given to deleting the passages that were not unanimous.

Second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Draft decision DP/1990/L.6

27. MR. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) said that very lengthy consultations had been held on the draft decision and that consensus had still not been reached on paragraph 2. At that point, however, he was in a position to propose certain non-substantive amendments: in the second preambular paragraph, the word "average" should be deleted; in paragraph 4, the brackets should be deleted together with the words "Requests that these countries receive", and the word "development" in the second line should be replaced by the word "programming", so that the beginning of paragraph 4 would now read: "Expresses the desire that these countries shall receive during the fifth programming cycle", and the remainder of the paragraph would be left as it stood; in paragraph 7, the words "originally allocated" in the third line should be deleted.
28. He then read out the amendments to paragraph 2 which were still under consultation with a view to consensus. It had been proposed to delete the brackets and to insert in the second line, after the phrase "a role to play", the phrase "in the development process of the developing countries and a special role". The clause "its commitment in those countries should be emphasized" was to be replaced by the clause "and this should be reflected in its commitment". Paragraph 2 would thus read: "Stresses that the United Nations Development Programme has a role to play in the development process of the developing countries and a special role in the least developed countries and that this should be reflected in its commitment during the fifth programming cycle;".
29. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America) said that a consensus had been reached on paragraph 5 and it had been decided that the word "increased" should be deleted from the third line. That word must be deleted.
30. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) said that he had overlooked the fact that that word should be deleted. He wished to confirm what the representative of the United States had just said.
31. Mr. GEPP (Brazil), supported by Mr. MORALES CARBALLO (Cuba), said that paragraph 2, whose deletion his delegation had proposed, was not the only paragraph that gave rise to problems. Paragraph 4 should also be deleted, since it did not reflect what had been decided at the Brasilia and Caracas meetings in the context of the Latin American economic system. Paragraphs 2 and 4 gave rise to difficulties not only for his delegation but for most delegations in the Latin American and Caribbean region.
32. Mr. GIANELLI (Uruguay), supported by Mr. DUHALT (Observer for Mexico), Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Observer for Mongolia) and Mr. TALAVERA (Peru), said that his delegation had the same difficulties as those mentioned by Brazil. The Governing Council must not prejudge decisions to be taken in June, when the fifth programming cycle was considered. Paragraphs 2 and 4 should therefore be deleted.

33. Mr. LANGENBACHER (Switzerland) said that he had taken part in the ongoing negotiations. The text submitted by Mr. Hamadziripi faithfully reflected the ongoing discussions and represented a narrowing of the differences between delegations.

34. Mr. AMAZIANE (Observer for Morocco) said that some delegations were being very inconsistent. In the general debate all delegations had expressed solidarity with the least developed countries (LDCs) and called for special treatment for them. However, when it came to translating that solidarity into action, some delegations were calling for the deletion of paragraphs 2 and 4, an approach that was entirely unacceptable. Where paragraph 5 was concerned, in the second line of the French text the word "appropriés" should be placed after the word "ressources", and not after the word "programmes", so that the phrase in question read: "par des programmes et des ressources appropriés".

35. Mr. KABIR (Observer for Bangladesh) said that it was surprising that after lengthy discussions paragraphs 2 and 4 should be considered unacceptable by some delegations. Those two paragraphs were the manifestation of the support for the LDCs that had emerged in the course of the discussions in question. His delegation was willing to take part in informal consultations on the subject.

36. Mr. LUCAS (Guyana) said that his delegation was willing to continue informal consultations on the paragraph in dispute.

37. Mr. EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that he was surprised that a delegation of a developing country should arrogate to itself the right to make a regrettable statement on behalf of a group of developing countries, and to try to set up as an obstacle to their interests the interests of another group of developing countries. The members of the Group of 77 had repeatedly stressed the need for active solidarity among developing countries. Draft decision DP/1990/L.6 was not being submitted by the developing countries but, by the least developed countries, and it was regrettable that developing countries should formally oppose it. That approach represented a threat to solidarity among developing countries at a time when the Group of 77 was preparing a joint strategy for the special session of the General Assembly to take place in April. The draft decision could be adopted as submitted by Mr. Hamadziripi.

38. Miss NCHAPI (Observer for Lesotho) said that she was shocked and concerned at the trend that seemed to be developing in respect of the least developed countries, which were also the most vulnerable countries. She found it particularly hard to understand some delegation's remarks in view of the fact that various United Nations decisions and resolutions, especially Governing Council decision 89/20 and General Assembly resolution 44/211, recommended that increased resources should be made available to the least developed countries. Her delegation called on the members of the Council to support draft resolution DP/1990/L.6 as originally drafted.

39. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Observer for Liberia) said that he wholeheartedly supported the statement made by the Observer for Lesotho and wished to propose a solution

(Mr. Fernandez, Observer, Liberia)

where paragraph 2 was concerned. The current text of paragraph 2 should end with the words "Least Developed Countries", and a new paragraph 2 bis reproducing the text of General Assembly resolution 44/211, paragraph 4, should be drafted: "Reaffirms the need for priority allocation of scarce grant resources to programmes and projects in low-income countries, particularly the least developed countries". Moreover, in the second line of paragraph 4 of draft decision DP/1990/L.6 the words "a larger share" should be replaced by the words "a proportional share".

40. Mr. KING (Observer for Trinidad and Tobago) said that paragraphs 2 and 4 did indeed prejudice decisions to be adopted on the fifth programming cycle. However, it should be possible to find wording that would maintain solidarity with the least developed countries without prejudging those decisions. His delegation was willing to take part in informal negotiations with a view to finding an appropriate formula.

41. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that, as pointed out by the Observers for Lesotho and Liberia, there was a General Assembly resolution on the subject, whose wording should be used in the draft decision before the Council.

42. Mr. ALMABROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that he was taken aback by the statements made by some developing countries. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, itself a developing country, believed that all developing countries should display solidarity with the least developed countries. As a member of the Group of 77, it appealed to all delegations, particularly those that had voiced objections to paragraphs 2 and 4, to take action to ensure that the decision could be adopted by consensus.

43. Mr. SALES (Mozambique) suggested that informal consultations should be held.

44. The PRESIDENT said that it ought to be possible to reach a consensus on the basis of the proposal made by the Observer for Liberia. At the current stage there were three solutions: paragraphs 2 and 4 could be retained, amended or deleted.

45. Mr. EL GAOUTH (Mauritania) said that he supported the appeal for solidarity made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and called upon delegations to adopt a text without holding further consultations.

46. Mr. RONDON (Venezuela), referring to the problems raised by paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft decision where a number of Latin American delegations were concerned, said that, while he by no means wished to break with the traditional solidarity of the Group of 77 with the least developed countries, he none the less considered it impossible to adopt a text prejudging the outcome of UNDP's thirty-seventh session. Brief informal consultations should enable delegations to reach the consensus that he too was most anxious to achieve.

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that delegations should adopt the text proposed by the Vice-President.

48. Mr. GEPP (Brazil) said that his position remained unchanged. Informal consultations should be held on the subject, and in the mean time the Council should move on to consideration of another item.

49. The PRESIDENT invited Mr. Hamadziripi (Zimbabwe) to preside over further informal consultations and in the mean time to proceed with his report on agenda item 9 (b) entitled "UNDP management study".

UNDP management study (continued)

Draft declaration

50. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) read out a text which had been the subject of lengthy consultations, and proposed that it should be included in the report of the special session of the Governing Council:

"At the request of a member of the Governing Council, an item was included in the agenda of the special session to allow the Administrator to bring to the attention of the members of the Programme an internal management study prepared by outside consultants. The Governing Council heard a statement by the Administrator on the study as well as the views expressed by members of the Programme thereon. The Administrator reaffirms that any recommendation of the study falling outside his management prerogatives would be implemented only after consultation with the Governing Council."

51. The draft declaration was adopted.

52. The PRESIDENT invited Mr. Babington (Australia) to announce the results of the informal consultations which had been held on draft decision DP/1990/L.9.

Draft decision DP/1990/L.9

53. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) said that agreement had been reached on the two points which had been left in abeyance. In paragraph 6, the words "during the week commencing 23 April 1990" should be replaced by the words "during the first half of May 1990". Paragraph 7 should read as follows:

"Requests the Administrator to include in the material he is preparing for the thirty-seventh session of the Governing Council (1990), information on the availability and coverage of data on the factors which currently feature in the supplementary criteria, as well as other factors such as on gross domestic product, gross national product, output of manufacturing, availability of depletable and non-renewable resources, the latest data on economies in transition, external debt related to gross national product, relationship between debt-service payment and exports, net transfer of resources and any other appropriate indicators."

54. Draft decision DP/1990/L.9, as orally revised, was adopted.

55. Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain), supported by Mr. AL-SAMEEN (Oman), said that his delegation did not oppose the adoption of the draft decision but that the position of Bahrain remained unchanged because of the problems which the text posed for island countries.

Agency support costs (continued)

Draft decision DP/1990/L.12

56. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) said that the draft decision, which he was recommending for adoption by the Governing Council, had been the subject of lengthy consultations with interested delegations.

57. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that, for purposes of clarification, several delegations wished to make a number of amendments to the text. In the second line of paragraph 4, it had been proposed that the words "from members countries of the Council" should be replaced by the words "from member countries of the Programme, on the basis of proportional geographic distribution of the membership of the Council,"; the rest of the paragraph would remain unchanged. It had also been proposed to add a paragraph 4 bis, which would read as follows:

"Emphasizes the desirability of participation by these 10 advisers, referred to in paragraph 4 above, who should be knowledgeable about the operations of the United Nations development system, to ensure that the work of the informal consultations results in a clearer view of the implications of various options recommended by the Group of Experts."

58. Mr. EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that he could not support the proposed amendment. The position of his delegation on the draft decision was well known. He hoped that the informal consultations would continue.

59. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that he understood the position of the representative of Mauritania. He hoped that it would be possible to find an acceptable formulation.

60. Mr. OGAWA (Japan) said that he believed that the text proposed by Mr. Babington was a balanced compromise formula, and appealed to the representative of Mauritania to accept the proposed amendment.

61. Mr. SALAZAR-SANCISI (Observer for Ecuador) supported the representative of Japan. In his opinion, the amendment which had been read out by Mr. Reyes would ensure that consultations would be conducted by competent persons.

62. Mr. EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that his position remained unchanged. At the current stage in the debate, he could see three possibilities: the controversial paragraphs could be deleted, the question could be postponed until the Council's June session, or informal consultations could be continued. In his opinion, the earlier consultations had not been sufficiently transparent.

63. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that the text had been accepted by all delegations except one. In such cases, it was always possible for the delegation which had reservations to refrain from joining the consensus.

64. The PRESIDENT, supported by Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) and Mr. REYES (Philippines), appealed to the representative of Mauritania to take account of the opinions of delegations which were in favour of the text.

65. Mr. EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that the Governing Council should abide by the rules in force and that he maintained his position; he requested that the informal consultations should be continued.

66. The PRESIDENT proposed that the meeting should be suspended briefly so that consultations on the draft decision could be held. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Governing Council agreed to his proposal.

67. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 7.40 p.m. and resumed at 8.05 p.m.

68. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) announced that, as a result of the consultations which had just been held, a new amendment had been proposed which took the concerns of Mauritania into consideration. A new paragraph, 8 bis, would be added; it would read as follows:

"Authorizes the Administrator to facilitate the participation of officials from least developed countries, members of the Governing Council, who are responsible for technical co-operation activities, to attend the open-ended consultations. The costs of this participation will be covered from the support-cost line."

69. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision DP/1990/L.12, as orally revised by the representative of Australia.

70. It was so decided.

71. Draft decision DP/1990/L.12, as orally revised, was adopted.

72. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) said that he had agreed to join the consensus because the draft decision contained important elements. However, the text did not reflect the wish of his delegation, which was to see the governing bodies of the partners of UNDP participate fully in decision-making through an exchange of views with the Bureau before June 1990. That was all the more regrettable since most of the governing bodies would not be able to consider the question before the Governing Council took decisions on future arrangements. He hoped that the members of the Council would do everything within their power, both collectively and individually, to give the heads of secretariat of the executing agencies the opportunity - in spite of the calendar which had just been adopted - to consider

(Mr. Pettitt, United Kingdom)

the implementation of future arrangements, in order to facilitate the achievement of the consensus requested in paragraph 9 of draft decision DP/1990/L.12.

73. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) endorsed the statement which the representative of the United Kingdom had just made. In her opinion, it was very important to establish good working relations with the partners of UNDP. The informal consultations had shown that developing countries were not satisfied with the status quo. Her delegation, too, was not satisfied with the current arrangements. UNDP and its partners should endeavour to develop viable arrangements which would not exist only on paper, which was often the case, but which would become a reality.

74. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) reported on consultations which had been held with several delegations regarding draft decision L.6. The following new wording had been proposed for paragraph 2 of the draft decision:

"Emphasizes that the United Nations Development Programme has an important role to play in the least developed countries and that its commitment in these countries should continue to be adequately reflected in its activities;"

Paragraph 4 had been modified as follows:

"Stresses the need for priority allocation of its scarce grant resources to programmes and projects in the least developed countries on the basis of their special needs and requirements;"

75. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision L.6 as orally revised by the representative of Zimbabwe.

76. It was so decided.

77. Draft decision DP/1990/L.6, as orally revised, was adopted.

Meeting of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole

78. The PRESIDENT said that the Council must also decide on the meeting of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole. The decisions which had just been adopted implied that the Working Group would have to hold several meetings, probably in May, in order to prepare for the fifth cycle and to examine the question of the support costs of executing agencies as well as questions arising from decision 89/20. First, however, it was necessary to decide whether the Working Group should meet. The delegations had seemed to indicate that it should.

79. It was so decided.

80. The PRESIDENT invited the Governing Council to suggest topics which the Working Group should address.
81. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America) recalled that at the previous session the United States delegation had, with the support of other delegations, suggested several topics which the Working Group might consider. It had been recommended that the Working Group examine the question of special programme resources (SPR), together with that of multinational and interregional IPFs, within the framework of preparations for the review of the fifth programming cycle in June. The second topic submitted for consideration had been the procedure for conducting mid-term reviews of country programmes. The third topic had been the role of the specialized agencies in providing programme support or sectoral support. A fourth proposed topic for discussion had been the role of UNDP in providing disaster relief and aid to refugees and displaced persons.
82. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) said that in his delegation's opinion the Working Group should concentrate on two questions, namely, the question of special programme resources (SPR) and that of the procedure for conducting mid-term reviews of country programmes.
83. Mr. VARADACHARY (India) expressed surprise at the speed with which the decision to convene a Working Group had been made. His delegation did not see how such a meeting could be useful, since the schedule for the period between the current special session and the Governing Council's session in June was already extremely full. Furthermore, experience had shown that mid-term review of programmes by persons having no knowledge of how those programmes were executed was an exercise in futility.
84. Mr. SALAZAR-SANCIZI (Observer for Ecuador) proposed that the Working Group should examine a question to which developing countries attached very great importance, namely, the possibility of increasing the IPFs of those countries by considering them as seed money. His delegation hoped that the practical experience of countries where such an approach had been adopted would be examined.
85. Mr. PETTITT (United Kingdom) expressed support for the suggestion made by the representative of Ecuador. If the Working Group was to confine itself to two questions, then his delegation would be willing to abandon the question of special programme resources and retain only the question of the procedure to be followed in mid-term reviews of projects and programmes and the question proposed by the representative of Ecuador.
86. Ms. DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America), responding to the Indian delegation's objections, said it had not been proposed that the Working Group should consider the programmes themselves but merely the procedure to be followed for reviewing them mid-term. Moreover, the United States delegation was quite willing to show flexibility by retaining both the question proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom and that proposed by the observer for Ecuador.

87. Mr. DJOGHLAF (Observer for Algeria) expressed great disappointment at the manner in which the special session's proceedings had unfolded. Although Algeria's mid-term programme review had been an item on the session's agenda, only one delegation had referred to the programme. The Algerian delegation had hoped to be able to hear the views of member States on the status of Algeria's programme, in the expectation that those views would be very useful for his country. Such a review had not occurred. As a result of that bitter experience, the Algerian delegation wondered whether there was any point in repeating the exercise within the framework of a meeting of the Working Group.

88. Mr. MORALES CARBALLO (Cuba) said that his delegation had decided to support the decision to convene a meeting of the Working Group, although it did not favour the idea. His delegation believed that the Working Group should examine two questions, namely, the role of the specialized agencies in providing programme support and the procedure for conducting mid-term reviews of country programmes.

89. The PRESIDENT, noting that views seemed to differ on the question of which topics the Working Group should address, suggested that the Governing Council should interrupt its work for a short period in order to conduct informal consultations. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council supported his suggestion.

90. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 8.45 p.m. and resumed at 9.25 p.m.

91. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), reporting on the informal consultations which had just taken place under his guidance, said that it had been proposed that the Working Group meet for one day, before consultations on the support costs of organizations, to examine "the role of the specialized and technical agencies in providing programme support to UNDP-funded activities: technical analysis and advice".

92. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to request that the Committee of the Whole should entrust to the Working Group the task of considering the question which the Australian representative had just specified. He suggested that the Council, in conformity with established procedure, should transform itself immediately into the Committee of the Whole.

93. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 9.25 p.m. and resumed at 9.30 p.m.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

94. After an exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 9.35 p.m.

