



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1998/SR.27
23 June 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1998

Operational activities segment

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 14 July 1998, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. OLHAYE
(Vice-President)

(Djibouti)

CONTENTS

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION: FOLLOW-UP TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
(continued)

Corrections to this record 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, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

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

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION: FOLLOW-UP TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
(continued)

Dialogue with the United Nations country team in Mozambique

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Haemmerli would act as Facilitator for the dialogue.

Mr. HAEMMERLI, Facilitator, introduced the speakers on the panel, who represented the various agencies from the United Nations system that were active in Mozambique as well as representatives of the Government of Mozambique.

Mr. DE CASTERLE (United Nations Development Programme, Resident Coordinator) referring to the document before the Council which summarized the presentations to be made by the panellists, said that despite extraordinary success since the Government had decided upon a programme of economic liberalization, Mozambique remained one of the 10 poorest countries in the world. Nevertheless, it could boast of a high level of participation by women in decision-making positions, accounting for 25 per cent of the members of Parliament.

As the country moved from a centralized to a liberal economy and from war to peace, it experienced an 8 per cent increase in economic output and could point to the highest level of debt relief in Africa, (with the exception of South Africa), Africa's most comprehensive framework for privatization, and anticipated foreign direct investment of \$5 billion over the next three years. Potential challenges for the United Nations system were the risk of increased disparity and regional imbalance, corruption and criminality, and the rapid increase in HIV/AIDS.

UNDP, in working towards achieving a culture of peace, democracy and development, would seek to respond to the priorities established by the Government and ensure that goals were met on time. To do so required a mobile and dynamic partnership between the Government and the United Nations based on the country strategy note (CSN) approved by the new Government in August of

1995. It had been followed by the common country assessment (CCA) and negotiations with the country programmes of the various United Nations agencies, resulting in the formation of a consultative group.

Mr. STIRLING (United Nations Children's Fund) pointed out that the main objectives of the Secretary-General's reform agenda at the country level included strengthening the role of the Resident Coordinator as country team leader, and endeavouring to develop and define, through a collaborative and inclusive process, the rules and mechanisms governing the interaction between the Government of Mozambique and the various United Nations system organizations. That collaboration must reflect local Mozambican priorities and global priorities for the various agency executive boards; it must involve all United Nations staff, civil society, donors and non-governmental organizations; it must be relevant to the needs outlined in the country strategy note and the common country assessment, be subject to policy review and take into account the plans of action of the various international conferences and the Special Initiative for Africa.

In order to develop a basic structure for coordinating the contributions of the various United Nations agencies, three strategic objectives were developed: first, to ensure access to and good quality of basic services; second, enabling environment for sustainable human development and peace; and third, to institute natural resource management. A common resource framework was also developed, with 45 per cent of resources allocated to the first objective, 30 per cent to the second and 25 per cent to the third. Forty per cent of funding was obtained from United Nations agencies and 60 per cent from donors.

The role of the United Nations Resident Coordinator as team leader, consensus-builder and facilitator was also examined. Under his leadership, the executive heads of the agencies would form a country management team (CMT) to set priorities, coordinate and manage. The UNDP strategic framework would set out specific objectives for cooperation for the next four to five years and the Resident Coordinator would prepare a work plan listing practical solutions to fulfil short-term priorities. Theme groups and operations committees would work on CMT-approved work plans while the Resident Coordinator secretariat provided liaison, facilitation and follow-up.

Evaluation of the impact of the United Nations system in Mozambique should be based on three main questions: were those strategic development objectives achieved, was the reform process working and was the Resident Coordinator management system working? The overriding purpose of the process was to increase complementarity and rationalization within the United Nations presence in Mozambique so as to effect real change for the benefit of Mozambicans. Implementation of the UNDP process had been effective: it committed heads of agencies and their staff to do more, to work differently and more effectively for the well-being and development of the people of Mozambique.

Mr. GEORGI (United Nations Population Fund) said that thematic working groups had been created with a view to developing a culture of collaboration and exchange among the United Nations agencies enabling them to respond efficiently to national priorities. Thus they established an internal mechanism for the United Nations system which was not in competition with government or donor coordination systems.

He recalled that UNDAF's main focus, based on CSN and the CCA, was sustainable human development. It was structured around the three United Nations strategic objectives, with 10 subsidiary thematic groups whose purpose was to ensure a coherent and coordinated response in the national priority areas, with one agency playing a lead coordinating role for each group. The 10 groups and their lead agencies were: education (UNESCO), health (WHO), water and sanitation (UNICEF), governance (UNDP), HIV/AIDS (WHO), gender (UNFPA), children/adolescents (UNFPA), environment (UNDP), disaster management (WFP) and food security (FAO). That structure was expected to avoid duplication and competition, promote value-added as a result of complementarity, facilitate contact within the United Nations system and between the United Nations and Governments/donors, provide a forum for the sharing of information and proposals and for follow-up to conferences and conventions, and make all agencies and staff responsible to each other. Each group was chaired by the head of a United Nations agency, membership was open to all agencies, especially those working in the thematic area, qualified staff were provided by the agencies, meetings were held at first weekly then monthly or quarterly, and the same representatives had to participate consistently in order to facilitate decision taking.

The groups shared common terms of reference, namely, to define common United Nations objectives and strategies for the theme area for the period

/...

1998-2001, formulate annual work plans and corresponding resources, identify areas and methods of collaboration, facilitate common monitoring of United Nations programmes, identify administrative and operational obstacles, follow-up to international conferences/conventions, prepare annual reports and prepare for UNDAF 2002.

Mr. TINY (World Health Organization), describing the key theme groups, said that the health theme group, made up of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, WFP and UNAIDS, was chaired by the WHO representative and met monthly. It had solicited participation from government health officials, developed a common strategy for 1998-2001 and a work plan for 1998, elaborated a common United Nations strategy for reducing maternal mortality, undertaken a needs assessment for reproductive health, organized joint monitoring field trips and worked with the Government and its partners for health sector reform.

The education theme group, made up of UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, the Bank, WFP and WHO, was chaired by the UNESCO representative and met monthly. It had participated in the Paris Conference on primary education, developed a common United Nations strategy, approach and work plan, acted as advocate for government budgetary allocations, mobilized resources and developed an education sector calendar.

The disaster management theme group, made up of FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, the Bank, WFP and WHO, was chaired by the representative of WFP and met bimonthly. It had for the first time assisted the Government in developing a national strategy compatible with that of the United Nations agencies, advocated prioritization of disaster management by the Government, held a two-day multisectoral government disaster management workshop and undertaken a vulnerability assessment and mapping project to identify the 20 most vulnerable districts.

The gender theme group, made up of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNESCO, UNIFEM, WHO, WFP and UNHCR, was chaired by the UNFPA representative with secretariat services provided by UNIFEM, and met monthly. It had developed a common United Nations strategy in collaboration with the Government for a national gender strategy and follow-up to Beijing, completed United Nations system gender mainstreaming staff training modules, promoted collaboration on an inter-agency gender pilot project proposal in Zambezia province, and developed mechanisms for

gender-specific evaluation of existing and future United Nations programmes and projects.

Mr. CHARLES (United Nations Educational and Scientific Cooperation) said that, despite the constraints and difficulties, the theme group had thus far made progress in a number of areas. It had agreed on a common set of core indicators, organized joint assessment field trips and inter-agency thematic retreats, prepared common position papers on such topics as water, food aid, maternal mortality and reproductive health and provided inputs for existing and new programmes, projects and processes. The theme group had also promoted the mainstreaming of gender equality and respect for children's rights in all United Nations activities and coordinated the Organization's response to situations, such as those caused by the HIV/AIDS and cholera epidemics.

The constraints faced by the theme group included insufficient staff and the time-intensive nature of the tasks that had to be performed. The challenge of decentralization was how to achieve a balance between leadership and staff participation and to develop new review and approval procedures. It was regrettable that under the current evaluation system no account was taken of successful inter-agency coordination in appraising the performance of staff.

Among the lessons learned by the theme group, was recognition of the value of incorporating inter-agency coordination into performance plans and staff appraisals. Arrangements had also been made to compensate for the time which agencies and their representatives devoted to the work of the theme groups. The group's effectiveness could be further enhanced if it were to meet on a more regular basis and if a small secretariat or focal point could be established to serve as a link between the members of the theme groups and between theme groups, operational committees and country management teams.

Ms. SHAVER (World Food Programme), reporting on the operational committees, said that the purpose of the operational coordination plan for the period 1998-2001 was to enhance the performance of the United Nations system through a more efficient and effective delivery of services and to establish a culture of coordination through broader staff participation, increased access to information and the identification of a common set of tools and processes. The selected operational areas were information, monitoring and evaluation (IME), Staff Development (SD) and Administration and Operations (AO). Management tools included an annual work plan based on approved objectives. The Committee

/...

coordinator reported directly to the country management team for purposes of decision making and information sharing.

The objective of the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Committee was to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to advocate for and report on human development, improve access to information and human development knowledge resources, support Mozambique's efforts to monitor human development and monitor and evaluate programmes supported by the United Nations in Mozambique. The main IME Committee outputs for 1998 included the preparation of a statistical profile, which was to be regularly updated, elaboration of a proposal for a common United Nations development information resource centre, preparation of a handbook of indicators and tools to monitor United Nations supported programmes, and proposals for indicators and methods to monitor United Nations reform.

The objectives of the Staff Development Committee were to identify and respond to the training needs of staff involved in the implementation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), to plan and implement common training events and to maintain a common United Nations training module and database of reports. The Committee's key activities for 1998 included an assessment of staff training needs, the proposed establishment of a training, information and self-learning resource centre and the proposed organization of two training events.

The objective of the Administration and Operations Committee was to improve the efficiency of the United Nations administration and human resources management in Mozambique through the ongoing review of remuneration, improved recruitment procedures, coordination of common services and improved financial reporting mechanisms. Thus far in 1998, the Committee had established a scale of common fees for locally recruited consultants and had finalized a common roster of consultants. It proposed to streamline information and technology systems, adopt common daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates for Government counterparts and establish a United Nations customs and tax monitoring unit. Common security plans and services were also being implemented.

The land provided by the Government for construction of new United Nations common premises had been returned in the expectation that a building might be identified on the private market. Currently, however, all United Nations agencies were located within a five-minute walk from each other and steps were already being taken to streamline critical common services.

Mr. DE CASTERLE (United Nations Development Programme), reporting on the achievements of UNDAF, said that a new spirit of collaboration and coordination among agencies had developed. Agencies recognized the need for information sharing and for ensuring complementarity between their activities which were aimed at helping Mozambicans to realize their human right to development. As a result, the United Nations system was able to more effectively respond to Government priorities through goal-oriented collaboration to reduce poverty and promote sustainable human development.

Among the challenges that remained were to retrofit those programmes that had already been approved, formulate a common resource framework and measure the follow-up to the global conferences. With regard to lessons learned, it was recognized that to be successful United Nations reform must be consistent, simple, operational, effectively managed and adequately funded.

Mr. MUNGUAMBE (Mozambique) said that the presence of its development partners, including United Nations agencies, bilateral partners and a large group of national and international non-governmental organizations, could be felt in daily life in Mozambique. Given the need to coordinate the activities of its many development partners, Mozambique had in 1995 approved the country strategy note which set out development objectives and priorities and determined the role to be played by United Nations agencies. His Government welcomed the successful completion of the UNDAF exercise for Mozambique, which reflected the common interest of all parties in the coordination and harmonization of programmes at the country level.

Mr. MASON (World Bank) said that the World Bank's overarching country assistance strategy in Mozambique was to support the Government's programme for poverty reduction through sustainable economic growth. The first priority of the country strategy was to promote that objective by developing the agricultural sector, which had significant export potential and provided income for 80 per cent of the population. A sector investment programme prepared in collaboration with United Nations agencies and other donors to coordinate donor resources was about to be implemented. The Bank was also providing support for other sectors with high growth potential, such as energy and transport, and for the creation of a business-friendly environment.

The second strategic priority was in the area of capacity-building and human development. Sector investment programmes in health and education

/...

provided for the coordination of all donor resources in support of the Government's sectoral programmes and placed special emphasis on women's health and reproductive issues, AIDS prevention, and higher school enrolment rates for girls, particularly in the poorest parts of the country.

The third strategic priority was to strengthen development partnerships with bilateral and multilateral institutions and civil society, since, given the enormous poverty and development challenges in Mozambique, no single institution or donor could make a significant impact on its own.

At the programmatic level, the Bank had appointed country directors who were responsible for developing and implementing the Bank's strategy in the country. A number of country directors were now resident in the borrower countries. In Mozambique, management of the Bank's portfolio had been moved to Maputo in order to ensure a more effective response to issues as they arose and to permit more active day-to-day coordination with United Nations agencies and other donors at the project level.

With regard to UNDAF, the Bank had emphasized the complementarities between the objectives and programmes of the Bank and those of the United Nations and the benefits of close collaboration and coordination between the two organizations. The most recent country assistance strategy and UNDAF would both feed into the forthcoming donor strategy review with a view to improving coordination, building on synergies and minimizing overlap among Mozambique's development partners.

Mr. TOMASI (France) said that it appeared that the different agencies and specialized funds contributed to financing the secretariat of the Resident Coordinator in Mozambique and asked if a similar system could be used to fund other staffing expenses. In Mozambique, UNDAF appeared to have gone beyond a Framework as there were actual projects involving the different United Nations funds and programmes. He wished to know more about the type of projects implemented under UNDAF and about the linkages between UNDAF and the programme activities of each specific fund and programme. There was a close link between the work of the thematic groups and the UNDAF process. However, before UNDAF, thematic working groups existed and were open to the whole donor agency community; they allowed the United Nations system to play the role of catalyst and encouraged a greater rationalization of international cooperation. He

wished to know what links existed between the UNDAF thematic groups and the rest of the donor community.

Mr. KÄÄRIÄINEN (Finland) said that the UNDAF process was important and should not be evaluated too strictly for the time being. He was surprised that greater emphasis had not been placed on capacity-building in Mozambique. The cost of technical assistance was very high in that country and it would be useful to have additional figures on operations: numbers of projects, programmes and staff. At present UNDAF was an internal United Nations process; however, the donor community in Mozambique was very large and coordination among donors was most important. If many of the large bilateral agencies which were active in Mozambique were willing to adopt sectoral-wide approaches in programming, could the United Nations agencies join in or was that a decision that had to be taken at Headquarters? He asked if plans existed to increase cooperation with the European Union which was by far the most important donor agency in Mozambique, providing over half the country's external funding needs. Lastly, he suggested that the statistical information contained in the document provided good baseline figures rather than indicators.

Mr. ABDALLA (Observer for the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the presentation had been excellent although it must have represented a substantial expense.

UNDAF had been accepted as a framework with the proviso that it was subject to the views of the Member States and they had since expressed concern about UNDAF and its ownership. It was now apparent that, in Mozambique, UNDAF had developed from a coordination framework for the United Nations agencies' programmes into a complete system requiring a special secretariat. He asked how the additional financial and human resources required were justified and what financial burden the Framework would add to each agency. Moreover, he requested information on the qualitative and quantitative added-value that UNDAF contributed to a country. He believed that the creation of a secretariat signified additional resources from the agencies; such resources could be better used to train local Government staff to enhance national execution which would have added value and save funds used to enlist international expertise.

The United Nations programme in Mozambique had an HIV component but no mention had been made of malaria eradication; however, the death rate from malaria was much higher than that from HIV.

/...

He was concerned that staff from the various United Nations agencies were being used as a task force for the different UNDAF thematic areas; he would be interested to learn how that affected the specific responsibilities of each staff member and whether it could affect reporting levels and staff appraisal processes.

The Resident Coordinator should not preside over donor community meetings as, by doing so, he identified himself as part of the donor community and thereby relinquished his role as a catalyst.

Finally, he was also concerned about the time spent in coordinating the Framework by agency heads and the resident coordinator.

Mr. TOULMIN (United Kingdom) asked to what extent agencies outside the United Nations system were involved in the UNDAF process in Mozambique. He needed clarification of the extent of the involvement of government officials in the different thematic groups and in the UNDAF process as a whole. Lastly, he would welcome information on how the conclusions of the global conferences were being translated into country-level objectives and how those objectives were then being translated into UNDAF.

Mr. WEDENIG (Observer for Austria) asked how procedures and collaborative programming at the country level could be simplified. He also wished to have further information about the impact of the thematic approach on the external representation of the United Nations system and how the United Nations system ensured that development parameters were integrated into humanitarian issues. He requested information on the common United Nations strategy developed by the disaster management group in Mozambique. Lastly, he asked whether the different agencies had gender focal points, what was the seniority level of such focal points and whether gender was being mainstreamed into the planning and evaluation process.

Mr. KVALHEIM (Observer for Norway) said that it appeared that UNDAF was being used as a tool to implement the United Nations Special Initiative for Africa at the country level. He would like to know how that was being done and the country team's perception regarding the added-value of the Special Initiative.

Ms. QUANRUD (United States of America) said that five United Nations agencies were listed on the signature page of the Mozambique UNDAF report and asked how many other United Nations specialized agencies or smaller agencies had

/...

been incorporated into the UNDAF process. She requested information about the interaction between humanitarian and development activities and about the connection between humanitarian activities and UNDAF.

Ms. SUZUKI (Japan) requested more information on joint-programming to follow-up on the UNDAF process. The UNDAF programme included activities that the bilateral donor community already supported and she would appreciate information on any linkages or dialogue with other donors regarding UNDAF programme areas.

She wished to know how the common resource framework that had been mentioned would be elaborated and its relationship to the specific resources for each fund and programme. Furthermore, she would appreciate information on the linkages between regional activities and UNDAF, and she expressed the hope that the impact indicators identified in the UNDAF document would be used in the programming process.

Ms. COCHIUS (Observer for the Netherlands) asked whether Mozambique had exchanged experiences with other countries included in the pilot phase. Mr. de Casterle had mentioned that there had been an increase in private investment in Mozambique and she asked whether this had occurred in any one sector in particular.

Mr. ABDELLATIF (Egypt) requested further information on the time and resources dedicated to the UNDAF process. The Secretary-General's report (E/1998/48) mentioned that the UNDAF provisional guidelines foresaw 10 stages and he wished to know if that procedure had been followed in the case of the Mozambique UNDAF. It would be useful to know more about the role of the Resident Coordinator in the management of UNDAF, how progress would be measured and how national partners would be involved in the review process. Moreover, it was unclear who would carry out the independent review in the year 2000. Lastly, he wished to know whether UNDAF would be affected if the anticipated project resources were not available and whether UNDAF would affect the allocation of resources to the funds and programmes.

Mr. BETI (Observer for Switzerland) asked if there was a direct or indirect link between the fact that both Guatemala and Mozambique had just emerged from very serious crises and the existence of what seemed to be such perfect collaboration between the different agencies.

Mr. HAEMMERLI, Facilitator, said that the evaluators had chosen the countries for their pilot evaluations with no outside influence and not for any special features those countries might have.

Mr. PÉREZ-SEGNINI (Observer for Venezuela) asked whether the criterion used in monitoring and evaluating the work of the Mozambique country team would be the performance of the team or the results they achieved. He noted that the indicators were too general, and seemed to have been influenced by factors that had nothing to do with the work of the United Nations system.

He wondered how matters that fell within the purview of more than one of the 10 theme groups would be split up: too many cooks might spoil the broth, as well as diluting the authority of the Resident Coordinator. Noting that 60 per cent of funding came from outside sources, he inquired how the responsibility for finding new sources of funding was shared.

Mr. BAMIALY (Observer for the Democratic Republic of the Congo) asked how much reliance the United Nations system placed on local experts in its country teams, given that up to half of some project budgets were allocated to salary costs for non-local experts.

Ms. GUERREIRA (Observer for Portugal) asked what lessons had been drawn from project failures in Mozambique, and how far the various United Nations entities were involved in coordinating development activities, particularly poverty eradication in the most remote areas.

Mr. DE CASTERLE (United Nations Development Programme), said that of approximately 500 United Nations country team staff in Mozambique, about 100 were not Mozambican nationals. The team therefore relied a great deal on local expertise at all levels, and intended to do so to a greater degree.

The country team used the United Nations System-wide Special Initiative for Africa as an important source of guidance and was comfortable with its priorities. Its goals, such as those for education and health, gave the team substantive and qualitative indicators which it did not need to invent and towards which it could strive. Also, the Government supported the Initiative and that enhanced its feeling of ownership, while the World Bank and IMF were also involved in the Initiative and therefore participated indirectly in the Mozambican UNDAF without being signatories to it.

The Government had privatized some 850 semi-public companies in the largest and most comprehensive privatization programme in Africa. The programme had

/...

attracted a great deal of interest, and as a result foreign direct investment was flowing into many sectors.

He believed that the country team did not perceive Mozambique as a post-conflict country per se: the team had started work after the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) had left. ONUMOZ had been very successful, leaving as its legacy a good relationship between the Government and the United Nations system entities in Mozambique and between the entities themselves.

Ms. SHAVER (World Food Programme) said that the relief-development continuum was dealt with in an UNDAF context through the disaster management theme group, which dealt also with disaster preparedness and response. Another function of the group was coordinating disaster appeals with the Resident Coordinator if and when necessary: the lead organization changed depending on the nature of the emergency. Reports and information were shared with all United Nations agencies and with donor countries and non-governmental organizations, and had in the past achieved timely and appropriate responses as well as pulling in funds.

With input from the disaster management theme group, the Government was working on legislation shifting its role in disasters more towards management and development and away from pure response. The group had found funding for consultants to help in the legislative task and define a disaster management plan for Mozambique that included preparedness for the ever-present threat of drought.

While it was true that the indicators used were rather general, the process was new: the indicators would be updated regularly to the full satisfaction of the whole team which was to apply them. Indicators were, however, an essential management tool for the appraisal process, reporting and feedback, and better communications were needed to keep them in line with those being used at the headquarters of the various United Nations agencies.

Mr. GEORGI (United Nations Population Fund) said that the Fund dealt also with the special needs of children and adolescents in the areas of health, with special reference to HIV, drug abuse and prevention; the programmes covered by the theme group were targeted to exploited, abused and marginalized children and adolescents, who represented a special problem in Mozambique because of the recent war.

The theme group on gender took a cross-cutting approach to gender issues, and examined other groups' programmes from a gender perspective. Currently, the theme group was planning a jointly financed and executed gender initiative for one province.

The primary requirement was for all United Nations system staff to have gender training, with a view to gender mainstreaming in all United Nations system activities; secondarily, there was need for capacity-building in Government and in non-governmental organizations in order to achieve that objective.

Mr. CHARLES (United Nations Economic and Social Council) said that no process as complex as UNDAF could be pursued without difficulty. Although participation by the specialized agencies had not initially been required, the challenge at the country level had drawn them in. There were seeds of conflict; they had led to negotiations, and difficulties had been and would be ironed out by seeking the greatest possible degree of consensus and feedback - not only from Mozambique - through the various agency headquarters.

Mr. STIRLING (United Nations Children's Fund) said that "framework" and "joint programming" were not synonymous: in Mozambique, a framework, not a joint programme, had been established that gave the various United Nations system entities a clear mission with strategic objectives outlined in UNDAF. The framework identified priorities where joint action was required, but the various United Nations entities conducted their own programmes.

The priorities identified by the United Nations entities did not always coincide with those of the Government; the framework allowed the various entities to contribute to development by assisting the Government in mounting a more effective and adequate response to problems such as malaria, HIV and maternal mortality.

The framework also enabled the United Nations system to deal with the problems of replication, duplication and overlap by a process of rationalization through the theme groups. The improvement made the Government's task easier in that it no longer faced such an array of multiple demands.

The Resident Coordinator system and secretariat would cost some \$350 million over four years and would have a small, inexpensive and accountable secretariat, with one professional officer to ensure that the necessary

coordination capacity was available. For the first year, the officer would be non-local, but thereafter it was possible that a Mozambican would be hired.

The theme groups were mainly for internal coordination and did not substitute for the donor or sector coordination mechanisms managed by the Government. For its relations with bilateral donors and bodies outside the United Nations system, the country team therefore needed to strengthen the national capacity to coordinate external cooperation, and would participate in the donor coordination mechanisms that were established.

The amount of time required for the UNDAF exercise had been enormous and was not sustainable, but the worst part of the learning curve was over. However, the participants would get out of UNDAF only as much as they put into it, and would withdraw if they were not satisfied with the results.

Mr. TINY (World Health Organization) said that all the United Nations entities involved in the health sector were working in a new spirit and in new ways. The Minister of Health was satisfied because instead of multiple demands, everyone went to see him in a group, with an agreed simple strategy to discuss.

At a recent regional meeting in Harare of WHO representatives, an analysis of the involvement in UNDAFs of 10 WHO country offices had revealed that the UNDAF process was clearly useful for WHO. WHO as a whole was now officially committed to it.

Mr. MUNGUAMBE (Mozambique) said that even before the Resident Coordinator had been posted to Mozambique, there had been cooperation between the Government and the United Nations system. However, the Government recognized the benefits of UNDAF even though the costs had been high: the Government did not have many people to deal with the demands of the United Nations system and bilateral donors. He confirmed that the Government was pleased when multiple demands could be combined into a single planned instrument.

The PRESIDENT reviewed the progress of the Council to date on the items under discussion, and stressed the particular importance of the draft resolutions the Council would prepare in connection with the triennial comprehensive policy review by the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.