



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

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1990/SR.31
25 June 1990

Original: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL

Thirty-seventh session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 13 June 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. POPESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

Programme implementation

- (b) Implementation of decisions adopted by the Governing Council at its previous sessions
 - (xi) Refugees and displaced persons - present and future role of UNDP in the field of refugee aid and development (continued)
- (e) Special programmes (continued)
 - (iv) Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America

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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (agenda item 4)

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL AT ITS PREVIOUS SESSIONS

(xi) REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS - PRESENT AND FUTURE ROLE OF UNDP IN THE FIELD OF REFUGEE AID AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (DP/1990/66)

1. Mr. SIEBER (Switzerland) said that, in order to promote its activities in the field of refugee aid and development, UNDP must have access to additional resources. His delegation attached great importance to the training of field office staff. Co-ordination between UNDP and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) must be strengthened, especially in the field. His delegation supported the use of UNDP Special Programme Resources (SPRs), perhaps in the form of a new thematic programme. While not favouring introduction of a new supplementary criterion in calculating the IPF, it did support the creation of a special fund to enable supplementary resources to be mobilized.

2. His delegation attached particular importance to the participation of women in the projects planned. The establishment of a service responsible for co-ordination was acceptable, but it would have to be limited and must take account of partners' capacity. In his delegation's opinion, document DP/1990/66 did not place sufficient emphasis on the role of Governments. Measures should be taken to strengthen their capacity for management and co-ordination.

3. Mr. MIZUKOSHI (Japan) said that, despite the excellent recent record of the United Nations in resolving various international and regional conflicts, the need for extending assistance to refugees and displaced persons continued to exist. Compared with other types of assistance, special difficulties and constraints often arose when assisting refugees and displaced persons, perhaps on account of the unpredictability of their movements. In such circumstances, greater co-ordination was needed between the competent United Nations agencies. In particular, co-operation between UNDP and UNHCR should be improved, as suggested in the report of the working group recently adopted by the Extraordinary Executive Committee of UNHCR, which had established a joint UNDP/UNHCR task force. The report of the working group had also suggested that UNHCR should explore the possibility of rationalizing its work through enhanced use of United Nations Volunteers (UNV). Such moves were particularly to be encouraged in the light of the severe financial difficulties currently facing UNHCR. In that connection, he was pleased to report that the previous year his Government had made a contribution of \$US 1 million to the UNV Afghan programme, and had also contributed more than \$US 230,000 for the recruitment of 10 United Nations volunteers for the UNHCR assistance programme in Hong Kong.

4. The proposal to introduce "uprootedness" as a supplementary criterion for determining IPFs merited attention; however, his delegation was not convinced of the objectivity of the criterion, and hoped that it would be further refined by the secretariat before deciding on its position. As to the establishment of a new trust fund, it was doubtful whether such a fund would attract many additional resources in view of the large number of small satellite funds already in existence.

5. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands), referring to a procedural matter, said that delegations tried to come properly prepared to sessions of the Governing Council, but as the final versions of UNDP documents were often issued late, it was generally necessary for them to work on the basis of drafts, on the assumption that they reflected the contents of the final documents. The previous day it had been drawn to his attention that the final version of document DP/1990/66 contained substantive amendments to the final draft. The discrepancies extended even to the numbering of the paragraphs, so that confusion would now arise when representatives referred to specific sections of the report. He did not recall any reference having been made by the secretariat to those changes. If the secretariat amended documents without so much as informing the Council, it made the Council's work very difficult in view of the time needed to co-ordinate views within and between ministries and organizations. Consequently, his delegation had no position on the amendments to document DP/1990/66 and might have to consider changing its attitude to waivers of the 10-week procedure.

6. During the organizational meeting in February, his delegation had requested that agenda item 4 (b) (xi) should be amended to read "Refugees and displaced persons: present and future role of UNDP in refugee aid and development", an amendment that had been endorsed by the Council. Unfortunately, the words "in refugee aid and development" had somehow been omitted from the agenda as circulated the previous month. While the secretariat had reinstated them the previous week, it had by then been too late for the contents of document DP/1990/66 to be modified accordingly. Thus, his delegation's aim of provoking an analysis of the subject within UNDP had not been realized. That was regrettable, as a strong statement by UNDP on the matter could have influenced Netherlands policy concerning the respective roles of the international organizations in refugee aid and development, particularly in the light of the useful report by the Working Group of the Executive Committee of the UNHCR Programme. As it was, his delegation had concluded that UNHCR was the proper channel for all activities concerning refugees and would maintain that position in all appropriate forums, including the Governing Council.

7. Document DP/1990/66 - or at any rate its draft version - mentioned refugees and displaced persons in the same breath, as though the terms were synonymous. That was not quite the case: the term refugee implied crossing a national boundary, and UNHCR had a mandate to assist and protect refugees. However, internationally displaced persons were not covered by UNDP's mandate. Internally displaced persons had not crossed a border, and while in many cases they might have exactly the same motivations as refugees, they were not covered by UNHCR's mandate. The paradox was that, as the inability to cross a national boundary was often a symptom of political and economic weakness, a displaced person might be in greater need of protection than a refugee. The discussions in UNHCR would focus on the problem in due course. Meanwhile, he simply wished to call for caution in the use of the terminology.

8. His second comment concerned the "future strategies" set out in paragraphs 22 - 28 of the report in its final draft form, which focused clearly on a possible role for UNDP in emergency situations involving refugees. His delegation considered that UNHCR was the proper intergovernmental channel for that eventuality, and would not favour increasing UNDP's role, as that might lead to duplication of resources. It could thus not support the recommendations made in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the

final draft. Paragraphs 32 - 34 contained interesting ideas, which were not clearly expressed in the report itself. His delegation certainly had no objection to increased co-operation between UNDP and UNHCR, and welcomed the latter's positive attitude. But the need for joint missions to donor countries was not clearly documented. Trust funds for displaced persons might be a useful initiative, although the sensitivity of the subject must be borne in mind and co-operation between the parties concerned ensured before such funds were set up.

9. Paragraph 34 mentioned the role of NGOs. It was a well-known fact that NGOs played a very important role in refugee programmes. UNHCR should thus be called on to co-operate with host Governments, donor countries and the relevant organizations, including international and local NGOs, in the field of refugee aid and development. He hoped that UNDP would play a constructive role in that effort, under the aegis of UNHCR.

10. UNDP's country programmes reflected the development priorities of the recipient country. It was thus difficult to fathom why "displacement" (para. 30 (a)), however defined, should be used in the future as a criterion for allocating resources, since those resources would not necessarily be used for programmes benefiting the refugees or displaced persons in that country.

11. Miss DOHERTY (United Kingdom) said that her delegation welcomed proposals for greater and closer collaboration between UNHCR and UNDP as a means of securing long-term solutions to the problems of refugees and displaced persons. UNDP had an important role to play in ensuring the success of that process by undertaking rehabilitation and development projects. It was important that all appropriate organs of the United Nations system should be properly co-ordinated in addressing the needs of both refugees and peoples in refugee-hosting countries. Her delegation also believed that closer co-operation between the two organizations would facilitate identification of activities relevant to each, and provide a mechanism for dealing appropriately with activities that spanned the mandates of both organizations. It was pleased to note the recognition accorded by UNDP to the role NGOs had to play in refugee assistance programmes. The United Kingdom supported NGO activities and agreed that greater efforts should be made to integrate NGOs' valuable contributions with those of UNDP and UNHCR, as they were often well placed to deliver aid quickly and effectively to areas of greatest need. Her delegation commended the use of UNV in UNDP refugee rehabilitation programmes, and supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 30 (f) of the Administrator's report that UNDP should also promote maximum participation of both NGOs and UNV. That proposal was in accordance with the United Kingdom's wish for the appropriate use of volunteers in relevant United Nations programmes, as described in the UNV programme advisory note.

12. Her delegation was not convinced by the recommendation, in paragraph 30 (e) of the report, that there was a need for new trust funds. It would prefer to see the existing United Nations funding mechanisms applied more effectively. However, it did support paragraph 30 (b) (i) concerning access to SPRs.

13. Mr. SALEEM (Pakistan) said that in principle his delegation supported the proposal for collaboration between UNDP and UNHCR where there was a parallel approach, and also the views expressed in paragraphs 32 and 34 of the final draft of document DP/1990/66. However, it considered that the transfer of

some UNHCR activities to other organizations was not feasible, since that would involve changing the mandates of UNHCR and the agencies concerned. Involvement of too many agencies would result in chaos, rather than reducing the burden. The central role of UNHCR was essential to the security and welfare of refugees. If UNHCR was relieved of some of its responsibilities, the refugees might find themselves at the mercy of the agencies' lengthy bureaucratic procedures. He wished to reiterate the position set forth in his country's statement made at the meeting of the UNHCR Working Group in Geneva on 19 April 1990.

14. Mr. HUGHES (Observer for New Zealand), referring to the useful supporting role played by UNV in assisting persons displaced or uprooted in the wake of natural or man-made disasters, said that UNV had also been active in the Cook Islands in the South Pacific, helping the Government rebuild the harbour infrastructure and electric power system destroyed by cyclones Sally and Tusi in early 1987. His delegation supported such assistance, and wished to endorse the recommendations made in the Administrator's report concerning the promotion of UNV participation in rehabilitation and development efforts for refugee and disaster-stricken populations. It also supported the recommendation whereby UNDP would have access to SPRs for prompt assessment of emergencies relating to refugees and displaced persons. Given its cost effectiveness, the UNV programme should also be associated with such emergency activities as often as possible.

15. Ms LONGINOTTI (Italy) said that the alarming increase in the number of refugees, returnees and displaced persons called for greater solidarity towards those groups on the part of the international community. It was very important to find lasting solutions, based on the principle of self-determination. The prerequisite for such a solution was integration of such persons in the socio-economic environment of the areas where they had chosen to settle. Development programmes should take into account the needs of refugees, displaced persons and host countries, so as to avoid discrimination, foster interchange and help relieve social tension. In line with that approach, her Government was supporting the Development Programme for Displaced Persons, Refugees and Repatriated Persons (PRODERE), implemented by UNDP in co-operation with UNHCR, WHO and ILO. Her delegation fully endorsed the recommendation contained in document DP/1990/66 aimed at strengthening co-operation between UNDP and UNHCR at headquarters and in the field. In that connection, a strong effort should be made to define operational mechanisms in order to reach an agreed division of responsibilities as well as adequate financing arrangements. In the broader context of integration of refugee-related activities into national development, she wished to stress the importance assigned by the report to UNDP's co-ordinating role in helping to bridge the gap between relief assistance and development. Her delegation supported the recommendation aimed at strengthening the co-ordinating capacity of resident representatives.

16. Mr. IVERSEN (Federal Republic of Germany) welcomed the Administrator's initiative in presenting a report on UNDP's role with regard to refugees and displaced persons, but said that the report raised a number of questions. In talking about the increasing number of refugees, returnees and displaced persons, it would have been helpful to provide comparable data on the past and current situations. Furthermore, it was not clear whether the funds available for training UNDP fieldstaff in refugee-related emergency management were taken from the specially designated SPRs or from the traditional SPRs for

disaster relief. His delegation asked for clarification on that point. It regarded such training of UNDP field staff as necessary only in countries affected by emergencies, and especially where there was no UNHCR representation. His delegation would be glad to learn in which affected countries there was no such representation.

17. The specific problems described in the introductory part of the report were hardly reflected in the task force's suggestions regarding future strategies and its recommendations to the Governing Council. His delegation felt that the specific problems of women refugees, health, water supply, detrimental effects on the environment, and the conflict that aid provided free of charge provoked in host communities merited the specific attention of the Council and should thus be reflected in specific recommendations. The issue should also be included in NATCAPs, and in round-table and consultative-group meetings as proposed in paragraph 27 of the report.

18. In the past, the problem of refugees and displaced persons had been handled through a variety of different mechanisms. The impression given was that considerable streamlining was required. His delegation thus welcomed the establishment of the inter-agency task force and the increasing efforts to ensure co-ordination between UNDP and UNHCR. Their respective mandates needed to be clearly spelled out and, if necessary, revised, and responsibilities must be clearly distributed between UNDP, UNHCR, United Nations Border Relief Operations (UNBRO) and the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO). The report made no mention of that need. As a first step in that direction, it would be most helpful to draw a distinction between emergency measures and longer-term development efforts. With regard to emergency measures, his delegation had some doubts about the importance of the role of UNDP resident representatives, and favoured stronger involvement of UNHCR and UNDRO. On the other hand, resident representatives' access to SPRs was a point in favour of a primary role for UNDP. In that case, however, SPRs should not be limited to natural disasters, but should be expanded to include man-made emergency situations.

19. Longer-term development efforts related to the refugee problem clearly fell within the mandate of UNDP. However, his delegation felt the lack of specific suggestions regarding future involvement of the remainder of the United Nations development system. With regard to the problems of women refugees, for example, it would have appreciated a suggestion about the involvement of UNFPA, UNIFEM and UNDP's own Division for Women in Development, and proposed inclusion of a specific recommendation on that subject. The question of the sources for financing rehabilitation and longer-term development assistance would also have to be clarified.

20. With regard to the recommendations presented in the report, his delegation was not very enthusiastic about the proposals for additional supplementary criteria, including the criterion of displacement. The suggestions that UNHCR and UNDP should provide co-ordinating emergency units and appoint a UNDP focal point at headquarters must be dealt with in the context of overall streamlining efforts. His delegation welcomed the proposal to involve NGOs adequately in refugee assistance programmes, but was not in favour of creating new trust funds. It wished to know whether UNDP had already received significant commitments to the proposed fund from private or other donors. Lastly, it wished to place major emphasis on the recommendation to increase co-operation between UNDP and UNHCR, but did not favour the

launching of joint resource mobilization missions at the present juncture. Both organizations should come up with a clear-cut concept before seeking additional resources.

21. Mr. SOUTTER (Canada) said that his delegation was aware of the impact of the refugee problem on national development and thus supported the principle of an expanded role for UNDP. That position was in keeping with the principles of maintaining appropriate limits on the mandate of UNHCR and resisting the creation of new United Nations organs without first studying alternatives. His delegation encouraged the use, or even creation, of mechanisms to broaden UNDP's responsibilities, in view of its developmental mandate, its function of co-ordinating United Nations operations in the field, and its outstanding network of field offices.

22. Turning to the recommendations made by the Administrator in document DP/1990/66, he said that his delegation heartily supported recommendations (d) and (f), which proposed close co-operation with UNHCR and the NGOs, particularly as they entailed no modifications to existing procedures. Recommendations (c) and (h), concerning the establishment of a focal point and, when necessary co-ordinating units, were acceptable in principle, provided any proposal with potential budgetary implications was examined by the Budget and Finance Committee. The proposals to establish trust funds and to use SPRs and IPFs were intrinsically worth considering. However, they must be dealt with within the context of discussions on the fifth cycle and UNDP's funding strategy. Although his Government was in principle opposed to proliferation of trust funds, it felt that an exception could be contemplated in the present case. The issue of the growth of those funds relative to the core programme was still at stake, but it need not be a major impediment. As to SPRs, they could be used without major modifications under the heading "aid co-ordination" for initial needs assessment, and under the heading "programme research" for training. His delegation was not in principle opposed to earmarking an allocation for refugees, subject to a sufficient allocation being earmarked for the centrally managed programmes, a question that had still to be debated.

23. On the suggestion that a specific supplementary criterion for calculating country IPFs should be adopted, his delegation considered that the maintenance of the principle of supplementary criteria was itself a topic in the discussions on the fifth cycle. Moreover, there would be no guarantee that recipient countries would use the supplementary portion for the purposes for which it was intended. Recipient countries directly affected by refugee problems could be encouraged to use their own IPFs as the massive presence of refugees, returnees and displaced persons in a country was in itself an element of its socio-economic status.

24. To sum up, his delegation was very much in favour of an expanded role for UNDP.

25. Mr. MacDONALD (Australia) said that the issue of refugee aid and development had as its central theme the recognition that the immediate needs of refugees should not be considered in isolation from their development needs. Failure to take that aspect into account in considering development projects not only limited the scope for sustainable recovery but perpetuated a long-term recurrent funding burden for donors.

26. Australia considered that UNHCR should not seek to become a development agency but should leave implementation of refugee aid and development projects to agencies with an explicit development mandate. Accordingly, his delegation had supported the conclusions and decisions which had been adopted by the Executive Committee of the UNHCR Programme at its fortieth session on refugee aid and development and which had recognized the significant role that development assistance could play in ensuring the effectiveness of durable solutions. In the same vein, his delegation had supported the decisions on the sharing of responsibilities for operational activities relating to refugees and, in particular the need for close co-operation between UNHCR, UNDP and other relevant international organizations. His delegation believed that UNDP was anxious to increase such co-operation in order to ensure that relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction were matched by development plans for refugees and displaced persons. In that connection he paid tribute to the work of resident co-ordinators.

27. His delegation endorsed the recommendation contained in paragraph 30 (a) of document DP/1990/66 to the effect that the Council should consider the possible inclusion of the problem of displacement as a new criterion for calculating IPF levels. Consideration might also be given to providing access to SPRs for the same purpose. His delegation was not, however, enthusiastic about the proposal to establish a trust fund.

28. Mr. TCHAPTCHET (International Labour Organisation) said that the problem of refugees, returnees and displaced persons was of continuing concern to ILO in terms of both normative protection and international technical assistance. ILO, in close co-operation with UNHCR, had always striven to ensure that refugees and displaced persons were treated in their countries of asylum in accordance with the international standards recognized in the ILO conventions on employment, working conditions, equal treatment, forced labour and entitlement to social security.

29. In connection with technical assistance, ILO had accumulated considerable experience in the search for and implementation of durable solutions to the thorny problem of material aid for the ever-increasing number of refugees and displaced persons. Funds from various sources, including ILO, UNDP, UNHCR and multi-bilateral donors, had helped to finance technical co-operation programmes for refugees in such areas as job creation, self-employment, vocational training, the promotion of small- and medium-sized undertakings and income generation.

30. ILO experience in Africa, Central America and Asia had made it even more aware of the trends described in the report of the Administrator (DP/1990/66), such as: the vulnerability and precarious nature of the situation of refugees, particularly women and children, in their countries of asylum; the increasingly high cost to developing countries of asylum of refugee support and environmental protection; the need for the full integration of refugee aid programmes and the stipulation of self-sufficiency as the main objective of refugee aid; and the close interdependence between the solution of economic and social development problems and the protection of human rights in countries of origin, on the one hand, and durable solutions to the underlying causes of the original exodus of citizens from many developing countries on the other.

31. ILO endorsed the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 44/137 on the division of responsibilities for refugee aid and development, and in that connection would encourage the greater use of NGOs and UNV in assistance programmes.
32. Mr. BACAR (Mozambique) said that the growing numbers of refugees and displaced persons resulting from domestic and regional conflicts and natural disasters were undermining the efforts of the developing countries to reinvigorate their economies. For more than a decade Mozambique had been afflicted not only by an externally supported war of aggression aimed at destroying its social and economic infrastructure, but also by a series of natural disasters. In response to that situation, his Government had launched an emergency programme and, in collaboration with UNDP, had established a co-ordinating mechanism designed to strengthen national institutions responsible for programme co-ordination and implementation.
33. His delegation fully endorsed the proposal of the Administrator to establish a fund to be managed by the Resident Co-ordinator in order to provide an immediate response to needs arising from both natural and man-made disasters. The establishment of a specific trust fund to mobilize additional resources for the long-term needs of displaced people would enable UNDP to play a more active role in that field.
34. On the basis of experience, his delegation believed that the role of UNDP should not be limited to the assignment of a field officer to be trained in the management of refugee and displaced person assistance programmes. It would be preferable to strengthen national institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, through technical assistance and training. Responsibility for planning, co-ordination, management and execution of all national programmes for displaced persons should lie with the Government, which must establish the strategies, priorities and criteria for aid distribution in order to avoid duplication of effort. Those tasks would be implemented in close co-operation with the UNDP Resident Representative and representatives of the donor community.
35. His Government was doing its utmost to restore peace and tranquillity in the country and was currently pursuing peace talks with the rebel RENAMO group, through Zimbabwe and Kenya as mediators. If those efforts were successful, it was anticipated that there would be an influx of hundreds of thousands of Mozambican refugees and displaced persons. His delegation therefore appealed to UNDP, donor countries and the international community at large to consider the preparation of a contingency plan to assist the people of Mozambique to cope with that problem.
36. Mr. VILLAGRAN (Guatemala) said that the countries of Central America had committed themselves to provide assistance for refugees, displaced persons and returnees under the Development Programme for Displaced Persons, Refugees and Repatriated Persons (PRODERE), which, with the financial support of Italy, was the centrepiece of the plan of action approved by the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA). The progress made in implementing the plan of action would be evaluated at the end of the current month.
37. The participation of UNDP in those programmes was of paramount importance in view of its 40 years of experience in designing, implementing and evaluating development plans and projects which had facilitated the temporary

integration of refugees in their countries of asylum or their resettlement in their countries of origin with dignity and security. The work of UNDP on the issue complemented that of UNHCR and was an example of effective collaboration between agencies in the United Nations system.

38. Mr. FERNANDEZ-PITA (Spain) said that, in general, his delegation endorsed the report of the Administrator (DP/1990/66) and, in particular, its emphasis on the need for close collaboration between UNDP and UNHCR on the design and implementation of integrated programmes of assistance for refugees and displaced persons. There was also a need to improve co-ordination of the activities of NGOs which, through their experience, could help to enhance the effectiveness of programmes, and to increase the participation of UNV in refugee aid and development.

39. His delegation endorsed the Administrator's recommendation that the Governing Council should consider the possible inclusion of the problem of displacement as a new criterion for calculating IPF levels. Such action would be a token of the importance attached to the refugee problem by the Council. His delegation was confident that UNDP, with the Council's support, would play an even more active role in the forthcoming meeting of the CIREFCA international follow-up committee.

40. Mr. MacARTHUR (United States of America) said that his delegation welcomed the initiative and work of UNDP in highlighting the links between the problem of population displacements and development. The growing number of refugees, displaced persons and returnees affected the ability of countries to achieve their development objectives and, in addition, had a tremendous human cost. His delegation felt that there should be a United Nations system-wide response to the problem. UNDP was already playing an important role in addressing its development aspects, but did not have the only role; UNHCR, UNICEF, the World Food Programme and UNDRO all had specific roles in relation to the problem. In his view, the respective roles of those agencies needed to be more carefully defined.

41. The UNDP Resident Representative, in his role as United Nations Resident Co-ordinator, should be responsible for assisting in identifying needs and devising policies which would enable Governments to take the impact of population displacements into account in their development planning. He also had a role in co-ordinating the agreed programmes of involved United Nations agencies. The Governing Council should emphasize that the Resident Co-ordinator was expected to carry out those functions when the situation so required.

42. In the view of his delegation, the recommendations contained in the report of the Administrator (DP/1990/66) were based on UNDP's role as a development organization providing funding for technical assistance and on the function of the Resident Co-ordinator and field office in co-ordinating United Nations system assistance. Against that background, UNDP was uniquely placed to help countries integrate into their medium and long-term development planning the issues raised by population displacements. Resources were clearly required to address the problem of such displacements and should be available, for example, from the funds set aside for disaster relief in the fourth cycle, or a similar category in the fifth cycle. His delegation could also support a recommendation for allocating financial resources to resident co-ordinators to carry out the co-ordinating and development planning function, including the training of UNDP field office staff.

43. His delegation strongly supported the roles of NGOs and UNV in refugee assistance. UNDP should, in general, not be implementing relief activities for displaced persons or refugees; it had a co-ordinating and needs-assessment function. In many important respects, UNV and NGOs could be the hands and feet of the system in undertaking more operational tasks. His delegation could not support inclusion of the problem of displacement, sometimes called "uprootedness", as a new criterion for calculating IPF levels. The matter was complex and his delegation would merely note that such a criterion would be nearly impossible to calculate over a full funding cycle.

44. The report of the Administrator had pointed out that there were 14 million displaced persons and the number was growing; yet there was at present no focal point in the system for dealing with the question of displaced persons as opposed to refugees. In that connection, his delegation would suggest that UNDP should follow up the report of the Administrator by working with its other partners in the United Nations system to develop a system-wide approach to the problem of displaced persons and report to the Council on the results at its thirty-eighth session in 1991. His delegation would introduce a draft resolution to that effect.

45. Mr. GORDON-SOMERS (Regional Bureau for Africa), replying to comments made by delegations, said that UNDP appreciated the support expressed for the contents and recommendations of the report of the Administrator. The issue was relatively new for UNDP and what was currently needed, as had been pointed out by the representative of France, would be guidelines for the future. The comments of delegations had been very helpful and indicated the direction in which agreement could be achieved in drafting a decision.

46. It was clear to UNDP and UNHCR that a legitimate distinction must be made between displacement, particularly internal, and refugees. He was aware that the numbers were comparable and growing but would try to establish a comparison with numbers for previous years. A distinction must also be made between emergency humanitarian relief and rehabilitation and development although such a distinction could sometimes become blurred. It was clear that delegates supported the idea of greater co-ordination and UNDP had tried to meet that point. In reply to the questions raised by the representatives of Turkey and Mozambique, he said that resident co-ordinators would not usurp the role of Governments in co-ordination.

47. On the question of resource mobilization, he agreed with the representatives of the Nordic countries and the Federal Republic of Germany that that could complicate UNDP management and should therefore be discouraged. He would look forward to further discussion on the point. Resource mobilization for CIREFCA had, however, been successful. He had noted the comments of those delegations which had opposed the possibility of including supplementary criteria for IPFs. He would examine the possibility suggested by the representatives of France and Japan to see whether it would be possible to find material which would help in reaching a decision. Reaction to trust funds had been mixed. He welcomed the seeming support for the use of SPRs by resident co-ordinators in their assessment work. The work of UNV and NGOs had also been appreciated by delegations.

48. In conclusion, he considered that enough information was now available to UNDP to advance the discussion in the drafting group.

49. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands) said that no reply had been given to the questions which his delegation had raised in the plenary Council.

50. Mr. GOMPERTZ (France) asked whether it was necessary to adopt a new budgetary section for the use of special reserves and whether existing reserves could be used.

51. Mr. GORDON-SOMERS (Regional Bureau for Africa) said that discussions on special reserves were taking place within the fifth-cycle group, but it would be for the Council to take a decision on the matter.

52. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished the drafting group to begin to prepare a draft decision on the question.

53. It was so decided.

(e) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES (continued)

(iv) SPECIAL PLAN OF ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION FOR CENTRAL AMERICA
(DP/1990/85)

54. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean), introducing the report (DP/1990/85) of the Administrator on the Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America (PEC), said that his statement would update and complement the contents of that report. Progress in implementation of the PEC had been achieved thanks to the consolidation of the Esquipulas II Agreement, which had created the Plan. The political will to achieve peace and democracy remained strong, as had emerged clearly at successive meetings of the Central American Presidents, notwithstanding the difficulties which were bound to arise in negotiations involving five independent nations. The commitments entered into by the Presidents under the Esquipulas II Agreement had been ratified and amplified in the Presidential declarations of Alajuela, Costa del Sol, Tela, San Isidro, and Montelimar.

55. During the previous year, democratic elections had been held in four countries while warlike activities had diminished and peaceful developments had multiplied. While the decisive role had been played by the Central American Governments, the United Nations had given substantial support for the entire peace process. Mention must also be made of the structural adjustment efforts undertaken by the countries of the region to eliminate basic macro-economic imbalances and establish the foundations of sustained and equitable growth.

56. In order to support activities designed to increase the technical, economic and financial co-operation of the international community with the Central American countries, the Council had, in June 1988, allocated \$US 20 million from SPRs to promote, co-ordinate, implement and follow up the objectives of the PEC in accordance with priorities set by the Central American Governments. The Special Plan had begun to take shape in September 1988, with the adoption of modalities for its implementation; subsequently specific projects had been drafted for the purpose of obtaining the practical support of co-operating countries. On the one hand, the PEC was to be a common reference point and was to establish priorities for international co-operation for development. On the other, it was to establish

institutional arrangements and modalities for the preparation of the necessary technical documentation for the submission of proposals to the co-operating community. In November 1988, the first meeting of the Support Committee had taken place and, beginning in January 1989, the Central American Governments, together with SICEA, the principal regional integration agencies and UNDP, had worked together in a series of meetings in different capitals of the subregion.

57. The nine meetings held during the previous 15 months had made it possible to approve 34 technical co-operation projects against the \$20 million appropriated by the Council. The total cost of those projects would amount to \$17.9 million, of which \$11.2 million would be charged to UNDP resources while \$6.7 million would represent financing from other sources. The balance available was therefore \$8.8 million. There was an additional request for \$7.8 million against the list of technical co-operation projects of a priority nature.

58. In response to General Assembly resolution 43/210, the first meeting between Central American Governments and co-operating Governments and institutions had been convened in Geneva in July 1989. At that meeting a start had been made on the second phase of the Special Plan, which involved the establishment of schedules and procedures for project submissions at sectoral meetings for the mobilization of resources for the subregion. During the first meeting with co-operating Governments and institutions on the electrical sector, which had taken place in San Salvador in April 1990, projects totalling \$US 230 million had been submitted and firm commitments had been obtained in the amount of \$47 million. Bearing in mind the interest expressed by a number of the co-operating entities, follow-up activities would be started in the near future, jointly with the electrical companies of the Central American region, with a view to reaching further commitments.

59. In pursuance of the agreements reached at the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA), the First International Meeting of the CIREFCA Follow-up Committee would be held shortly in New York. The co-operating Governments and Institutions had already received the documentation for that meeting, which included 59 project profiles, the majority of which were multisectoral. The project portfolios required \$US 161 million in financing, in respect of which there had to date been expenditures, commitments and expressions of interest totalling \$US 74 million. In addition, within the CIREFCA framework, reference should be made to the substantial financing approved by the Government of Italy for the Programme of Assistance to Displaced Persons, Refugees and Returnees (PRODERE), as well as other CIREFCA-related initiatives, amounting to \$127.9 million.

60. As indicated in document DP/1990/85, the Central American Governments had agreed to the holding of the following thematic or sectoral meetings with co-operating Governments and institutions: Central American Monetary Stabilization Fund (CAMSF); agricultural sector; health, road network, small and medium sized undertakings; telecommunications; and tourism. At its latest meeting, the Committee on Policies and Projects had also approved the preparation of projects to preserve the environment of the region and to overcome extreme poverty, with emphasis on the most vulnerable groups such as women and children.

61. He was pleased to inform the Council that the purposes of the PEC were being systematically met and that the actions carried out and projects prepared had served to mobilize resources amounting to more than \$700 million in financial contributions. He expressed gratitude to the Central American Governments for their continuing support, which had been demonstrated throughout the past two years. Similarly, the continuing collaboration of the agencies, the World Bank, IMF, IDB and the European Economic Community, and the generous co-operation of the international community had made possible the success achieved to date.

62. He drew attention to document DP/1990/43/Add.2 which contained a request submitted by Central American representatives for support for the PEC to be continued during the fifth programming cycle, of the same level of funding as during the fourth cycle. In conclusion, he wished to stress the commitment of the entire United Nations system to the peace process in Central America. It was difficult to find an area where the United Nations had made a greater contribution.

63. Mr. MERINO (El Salvador) stressed the importance of the Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America (PEC), adopted by the General Assembly through resolution 42/231. The implementation of the Plan under the auspices of the United Nations and with UNDP co-ordination had been one of the most important responses made to the Central American countries by the international community and, to a great extent, constituted sustained support for the efforts made by the Presidents of the region in the Esquipulas II Agreements, in adopting a procedure to establish a lasting peace in Central America. Those Agreements had, for all Central Americans, crystallized the idea of the close relationship existing between peace and development.

64. The regional effort to achieve peace and development was the principle underlying the implementation of the Plan, which set out an order of priorities and served as a framework for international action to mobilize additional financial and technical resources for the implementation of programmes and projects of vital importance for the region. The first specific step towards the achievement of that objective was being taken within the Governing Council which, in June 1988, had approved \$20 million from Special Programme Resources for the promotion, co-ordination, implementation and follow-up of the Plan through pre-investment studies and other indispensable tasks, in accordance with priorities determined by the Central American Governments. At the regional level, co-ordination of PEC-related activities was carried out by the forum of Central American Vice-Presidents as an expression of the highest political interest in the effective development of the Plan.

65. With regard to external co-ordination, a primary role had been played by the assistance provided by the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, in particular through the activities of the Committee on Policies and Projects and the meetings with co-operating countries, the first of which had been held in Geneva in July 1989. That meeting had signalled the initiation of the second important stage in the Central American objective of consolidating peace and promoting development. The first phase of the Plan had begun with the definition of the intraregional and extra-regional co-ordination mechanism in September 1988 and the priorities accorded by Governments to the execution of technical co-operation projects, financed through resources allocated by the Council in June 1988. That had enabled

the Latin American countries to direct their efforts towards sectors requiring urgent attention, such as refugees, returnees and displaced persons, agricultural projects, telecommunications and health.

66. The resources provided by the Council for the Plan had enabled the first stage to include various project portfolios and preparations to be made for the first meeting of Central American Governments with co-operating Governments and institutions. The meeting had highlighted the central themes of interest to those Governments and institutions, namely, advancing the process of peace and demobilization, continuing economic reforms at the regional level, setting stricter priorities for intra-sectoral and transectoral programmes and projects, and stimulating the mobilization of technical and financial resources at thematic or sectoral meetings with co-operating Governments and institutions.
67. The activities which had resulted from the last topic had constituted the second stage of PEC implementation, which was taking place at the present time. The Central American Governments had worked assiduously, with the support of regional institutions, UNDP and other international bodies, on preparations for the following sectoral meetings with co-operating Governments and institutions: electrical sector, held in San Salvador in April 1990; refugees, to be held in New York in June 1990; agricultural sector, to be held in Managua in October 1990; the Central American Monetary Stabilization Fund (CAMSF); road network; telecommunications; small and medium-sized undertakings; and tourism.
68. The \$20 million allocated to the Plan had been used to finance the preparation of technical documentation, including profiles for investment project and projects geared to strengthening national and regional institutions. As at 30 April 1990, with those resources 34 technical co-operation projects had been or were in the process of being approved, amounting to a total \$17.9 million, of which \$11.2 million represented UNDP funds and \$6.7 million constituted co-financing from other sources, leaving an available balance of \$8.8 million. In the past six weeks significant progress had been made in the preparation of an additional portfolio of 27 high-priority technical co-operation projects totalling \$7.8 million. With regard to resource mobilization, satisfactory results had been achieved, constituting significant parameters for an initial evaluation of the progress made in the implementation of the Plan. To date, a total of \$415.3 million and 120 million ECUs had been mobilized, and negotiations were under way for a further \$111.6 million and 30 million ECUs. The first allocation made by the Council to the Plan had had a positive multiplier effect in the implementation of programmes and projects having high priority from the standpoint of the requirements of the Central American region.
69. The Plan could be regarded from two standpoints: on the one hand, it constituted a general frame of reference and promoted the establishment of priorities for international co-operation with Central America; on the other, the PEC implementation mechanisms had been strengthened as important forums for co-ordination and decision-making, and for the approval of projects by consensus, with the aim of preparing technical documentation and devising follow-up strategies for sectoral meetings with co-operating Governments and institutions.

70. The Central American countries were committed to consolidation of the peace and democratization process in the region, which was clear from the electoral processes in four of those countries which had ratified the principle of government through universal suffrage and the pluralist participation of political parties. They were making efforts to confront and overcome the serious problems impeding economic and social development. In that connection, the Central American Presidents were preparing to hold a summit meeting shortly in order to discuss those problems and to take decisions concerning the challenge represented by the revitalization of their economies and the need to become partners in the world economic context. However, that also required considerable resources and sustained support on the part of the international community as a whole.

71. Much remained to be done, and after having laid the foundations for a sustainable climate of peace, security and democracy in the region, it was essential to resolve the serious difficulties which confronted Central American women who, as a result of the prolonged armed conflicts, had been obliged to leave their places of origin and to take refuge in other countries or regions.

72. He was aware of the important role played by the Council in the enormous efforts being made for the pacification and development of Central America through the allocation of extraordinary resources. Those resources were almost exhausted and needed to be renewed in a broad spirit of solidarity and urgency. He therefore called on the members of the Council to consider favourably the request submitted by the Central American Governments for Special Programme Resources and funds from the fifth programming cycle for the period 1992-1994 in the amount of \$20 million, in order to enable them to continue implementing the Plan.

73. Those resources would be aimed at the following major goals: (a) inclusion of women in development, special attention to the needs of children, health, education and housing, technological development of the agricultural and industrial sectors; and strengthening of regional institutions; (b) consolidation of the economic process in the region through the strengthening of institutional capacity, training of human resources and co-ordination of external aid; and (c) holding of meetings with co-operating Governments and institutions on important subjects such as the development of frontier-zone projects and programmes designed to preserve natural resources and the environment.

74. Mr. GEPP (Brazil) said that the Latin American and Caribbean Group reiterated its support for the Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America (PEC). It was of the utmost importance that UNDP should continue supporting the efforts made by the Central American countries to consolidate peace and democracy and stimulate their economic and social development through the implementation of the Plan, whose goals had been endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 42/231. It was essential that the Plan should continue to receive the necessary financial support in order to achieve its goals, as a demonstration of the international community's support for the peace process which had been initiated in the Central American region with the signing of the Esquipulas II Agreements in August 1987.

75. The United Nations was playing an active part in consolidating peace in Central America. The Security Council had supported the peace process by establishing peace-keeping operations which enjoyed the support of both permanent and non-permanent members of the Council. In order to restore and consolidate peace and security, it was necessary to support regional efforts to overcome the major economic and social problems. The Central American Presidents had called on the international community to continue providing financial support for the Plan. The presence and participation of UNDP and the United Nations were essential in stimulating and strengthening the process of consolidating peace and security in that region and strengthening democracy, which would help its Governments to promote economic and social well-being and respect for human rights.

76. The Central American Governments had submitted a request that the Special Plan should be included as a priority item in the fifth programming cycle and that financial resources should be earmarked for it for a further three years, in an amount equal to the allocation for the fourth cycle. The Latin American and Caribbean region hoped that the request submitted by the Central American countries, which his delegation fully supported, would meet with the approval of the members of the Governing Council.

77. Mr. MIZUKOSHI (Japan) said that since the adoption of the Special Plan (PEC) by the General Assembly in May 1988, his country had supported that undertaking, which was aimed at bringing political stability and economic development to the region through technical and financial co-operation. His country's support was not limited to endorsement of legislative action in the United Nations, but also extended to actual development assistance through both bilateral and multilateral channels, as indicated in the report by the Administrator (DP/1990/85).

78. Since the inception of the Plan, his delegation had stressed the importance of co-ordinating various activities by international organizations and by bilateral donors. UNDP was playing a leading role in those efforts. His delegation supported the proposed extension of the Plan as well as funding from UNDP resources in recognition of the continued need for international assistance in the efforts of the Central American Governments to promote democracy and economic development.

79. Mr. CHAUDOUET (France) said that his country actively supported the Special Plan (PEC). Its support was all the more energetic in view of the fact that the region, which had been seriously affected by economic and political difficulties in the past, had recently embarked on a phase of historic recovery and co-operation. It was absolutely essential that the international community should help to consolidate that remarkable effort.

80. France had undertaken to participate in the various thematic meetings concerned with implementation of the Plan. It was doing so resolutely, in accordance with its means, which were not considerable in that region. In the previous year, it had contributed more than \$1 million to the Plan, directing its support in particular to refugees and displaced persons. His Government's efforts, although modest, had helped to unite the activities of UNDP and UNHCR in that region, and it was prepared to continue them.

81. He expressed surprise that it was not planned, for the fifth programming cycle, to continue that programme, at least for some time. He fully understood that it would be necessary in a few years for the PEC to become an integral

part of a regional programme, financed by regional IPFs, and possibly increased through mobilization of the country IPFs concerned. However, that change of tack could not be brought about as quickly as had been proposed. The countries of Central America had an imperative need for additional resources and were not in a position to convert the PEC overnight from a special programme to an ordinary programme, at a time when it had not even entered its operational phase.

82. The request by the Central American Governments for the PEC to be continued for three years seemed reasonable and legitimate and his delegation therefore supported it. France therefore undertook to continue the special financial contribution it had been making to that region. It would endeavour to participate in the forthcoming meetings at which efforts would be made to translate the PEC into various programmes or projects and would do its utmost to ensure that those efforts were completely successful. It was convinced that the countries of Central America would then continue their programme, making the best possible use of the resources they would receive through their customary country or regional IPFs.

83. Mr. IVERSEN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government continued to support the Special Plan (PEC) in accordance with its own policy guidelines for Central America. It welcomed the endeavours of UNDP to formulate, co-ordinate and implement the programme and congratulated all the parties concerned on the progress already achieved. Prospects for economic and social progress in Central America were currently more favourable than ever before. With the efforts to establish democracies in that region, the peace process had made considerable progress. In that context, the difficult task of reconstructing economies and contributing to the internal process of reconciliation must be given support.

84. In the past few years, his Government had considerably increased its financial and technical co-operation with Central America. As it had stated on several occasions, it was prepared to participate in the Special Plan provided the Governments of the region submitted specific proposals within the framework of its bilateral programme for financial and technical co-operation with those individual States. In that connection, it would welcome specific requests.

85. As to the request submitted to his Government by the representatives of the five Central American States concerning the continued funding of the PEC beyond 1991, his delegation had great sympathy for it and considered that it should be included in the agenda for the negotiations on the fifth cycle. As many requests in that complex matter had to be reconciled, his delegation stressed that the Central American request would entail increasing the Special Programme Resources even beyond the level proposed by the Administrator and reconsidering the question of the retention of the floor principle.

86. Ms. AARNIO (Observer for Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, stressed the high expectations they placed in the Special Plan (PEC). Once the Central American leaders had embarked on the peace process, the Nordic countries had jointly decided to increase their bilateral and multilateral co-operation in the region. They supported the UNDP initiative to allocate SPR funds for enhancing the special programme, and it was of the utmost importance to follow up the results and adjust UNDP support accordingly.

87. PEC's most important achievement had been to enhance co-operation between Central American countries. Unfortunately, the results, in terms of projects implemented, had not met expectations. Compared with the original PEC document, the number of projects currently being implemented and funds contributed were modest. One reason for that was that the administration seemed to be too centralized. To be concrete, action-oriented and effective, most co-ordination should take place in the field. It was important to strengthen the UNDP field offices, but the transfer of the PEC office from New York to Central America was even more vital. Further institutionalization of PEC activities in UNDP's regular structure should be avoided. Implementation of the Plan might benefit from increased local participation, in particular on the part of regional institutions. UNDP should assist such involvement with capacity and competence-building activities. The proposed allocation of additional funds from the original SPR allocation deserved consideration, but UNDP's background information and plans as stated in the document were too general to allow the Council to take an informed decision.

88. UNDP should more clearly acknowledge the PEC's role as a co-ordinating tool and support mechanism for all regional development activities in Central America. The modality of sectoral and thematic meetings was valid and had proven to be at least partially effective. The Nordic countries would welcome increased efforts by UNDP to report on the enhancement of its support for the PEC, and requested a more detailed plan of utilization of potentially increased funds for the special programme and its administration.

89. Mr. SOUTTER (Canada) observed that his delegation supported subregional programmes of reconstruction and development, which were important in promoting progress towards peace and democracy in Central America. It was particularly appreciative of the catalytic role that UNDP was playing in the Special Plan (PEC).

90. His Government had taken note of the proposal made by the Central American countries for a further allocation of \$US 20 million from the SPRs for the fifth programming cycle. While it considered that specific regional initiatives should not normally be financed from SPRs, it recognized the significance of continued UNDP participation in the Plan. It was important not to prejudge the outcome of the fifth-cycle discussions. His delegation was alive to the needs of the Plan and would take them into account as negotiations proceeded.

91. Mr. FERNANDEZ-PITA (Spain) said that notable efforts had been made over the past two years to achieve peace in Central America. But as in many other parts of the world, peace implied development; seen in that light, the PEC's ultimate purpose was to implement a plan of action for development that would in turn help bring about lasting peace. The co-operation activities envisaged under the PEC were open to all donors, and not just the United Nations system. At the San José meeting, chaired by Spain, it had been decided to revitalize trade in the region. Spain had been attempting to co-ordinate its activities in Central America with PEC objectives and priorities and had been increasing its bilateral co-operation. But the participation of other donors could not replace the direct involvement of UNDP, which must continue its long-term activities. Terminating support for the PEC at the end of the fourth cycle would not only endanger the progress made, but would prevent the Plan from achieving maximum effectiveness.

92. Spain supported the request by the countries of Central America to extend the Plan over the fifth programming cycle, with an allocation of at least the same amount as that granted for the fourth cycle. It was of particular importance to send the right message to the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA). The best way to make firm commitments for achieving full development would be to hold specific sectoral meetings on the various sections of the Plan.

93. Although all aspects of the Plan were of great importance for the development of the region, enhancing regional integration was particularly vital. In the longer term, reviving trade in Central America must include an industrial rehabilitation and recycling programme and measures to strengthen regional integration institutions. Co-operation was also urgently necessary with regard to refugees and displaced persons, the promotion of human resources and the creation of a network of small businesses to act as the keys to development.

94. Mr. FONDI (Italy) said that the PEC was the appropriate framework for extending practical and financial co-operation to Central America. Mindful of the worsening economic situation in the region, his delegation reaffirmed its commitment to support the efforts being made by the Central American countries in the context of the Esquipulas Peace Plan. The international community must increase its support for the peace process in order to generate economic and social development in the region, which in turn would foster greater political stability. His delegation reiterated its support for the request made by the countries of Central America for an allocation of \$US 20 million in the fifth cycle for the continuation of the Special Plan.

95. Mr. MacARTHUR (United States of America) said that the Special Plan (PEC) had been instrumental in helping achieve peace, democratization and development in Central America. In 1988, just as the Plan had been adopted at the special session of the General Assembly, additional resources had unexpectedly become available to UNDP. His Government had joined in approving the original allocation of \$US 20 million for the PEC from Special Programme Resources (SPRs). But the approval of the SPR allocation for the PEC in 1988 had been possible because of an unexpected increase in programmable resources due to currency fluctuation and because most of the fifth-cycle resources already allocated in decision 85/16 had already been programmed. That was not the case currently. Resource levels were known, but not all fifth-cycle plans had been made, so there was room to allow for planning in country and regional IPFs. His delegation would not wish to see the precedent of a line item of \$US 20 million for the PEC extended into the fifth cycle. That activity should be included in the regular regional, interregional and country IPFs that would be decided upon in the course of negotiations on the fifth cycle. UNDP activities under the Special Plan should have priority claims on UNDP country IPFs and regular resources. UNDP had a co-ordinating role under the Plan, one that charged it with strengthening regional institutions; that function should be pursued.

96. Regardless of the decision taken by the Council on continuing the PEC, the Central American unit established in UNDP to administer the Plan should be retained and financed from UNDP's administrative budget. It was the understanding of his delegation that the administrative cost of the unit was currently financed from the 1988 allocation for the PEC. His delegation

proposed that the questions of regularizing the funding of the Central American unit and increasing the allocation for administrative support to the PEC should be referred to the Budget and Finance Committee for consideration.

97. Mr. AQUARONE (Netherlands) agreed with the observer for Finland that the PEC projects and programmes had been slow to bear fruit. Many of those activities were of a long-term nature, and it was therefore to be hoped that they would eventually produce the desired results. His delegation was focusing its attention on the proposed sectoral meetings, in particular on agriculture, health, small businesses and CIREFCA. UNDP's role in the Special Plan had been most valuable, and it was therefore surprising that it was not yet clear in what form UNDP would continue to be involved. It was to be hoped that more light could be cast on that question at the current session.

98. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe), speaking on behalf of the African countries, said that the political and economic reforms being carried out by the countries of Central America required concerted international support if they were to reach fruition. Additional resources needed to be mobilized for projects and programmes within the context of the Special Plan. The countries of Africa supported UNDP assistance to the Plan, and the Council should agree on the appropriate means and levels for continued UNDP financial support to the Central American region in the fifth cycle.

99. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean), responding to comments made during the debate, said that the PEC had played an important co-ordinating role as a frame of reference for the activities of both the United Nations and other international organizations. He agreed with the representatives of Finland and the Netherlands that the progress made under the Special Plan could have been greater, but the Plan could only move forward at the same speed as the peace process itself. The Plan had been extraordinarily useful in maintaining a constant dialogue between Governments at many levels.

100. Efforts to decentralize the Plan had been very successful. Studies on projects had been conducted and decisions taken on site by the relevant ministries. A UNDP representative was following up the Plan throughout the region, and only a small nucleus of 13 persons remained in New York. PEC decentralization was probably greater than in other areas. The Central American regional institutions were deeply involved in the co-ordination and decision-making process and were themselves mandated to initiate ideas. The Central American Governments also co-ordinated activities in each country and throughout the region.

101. As an instrument that had been introduced only one and a half years previously the PEC had already proven its worth. He was certain that a way would be found to enable the Plan to be continued.

102. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished the drafting group to begin to prepare a draft decision on the question.

103. It was so decided.

