

PROVISIONAL

E/1999/SR.22  
23 July 1999

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Substantive session of 1999

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Monday, 12 July 1999, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. MANGOELA (Lesotho)  
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
COOPERATION (continued)

(b) FOLLOW-UP TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

---

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

GE.99-63986 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
COOPERATION (continued)

- (b) FOLLOW-UP TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
(agenda item 3 (b))

Dialogue with country teams: Indonesia

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to begin a dialogue with the representatives of field offices of the United Nations system in Indonesia.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia), explaining the context in which country teams operated, said that Indonesia had the fourth largest population in the world, comprising some 350 different ethnic groups. The country was as rich in natural as in human resources, with 2 million square kilometres of land spread over 17,000 islands. The geographical characteristics presented both challenges and opportunities for development, not to mention logistic challenges for the country team.

The members of the United Nations country team had joined forces to help Indonesia respond to a whole series of interrelated crises in recent years, ranging from natural disaster to economic, social and political upheaval. In the wake of extensive forest fires and drought, United Nations Disaster Assistance and Coordination (UNDAC) had helped mitigate the fire damage, estimate food requirements and coordinate international assistance. In response to Indonesia's economic crisis, which was part of the larger Asian crisis, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in close collaboration with the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, had implemented reforms with a view to addressing the collapse of the national currency, the severe drop in output and rising inflation.

United Nations agencies had also been involved in assessing the social impact of the economic crisis, and in promoting a "social safety net" programme to mitigate the effects of the dramatic increase in poverty, extensive underemployment, a failing school system and widespread nutritional deficiencies. Indonesia's social crisis had, in turn, led to a political crisis involving a change of government and political unrest. The country team had responded, inter alia, by providing support for the transition to democratic governance, under the management of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as well as assistance in conducting elections.

Compared to the situation two years previously, economic indicators revealed that Indonesia was well on the road to recovery. Not only had the growth of gross domestic product (GDP) attained a rate of 3 per cent, compared to -13 per cent at the height of the crisis, but inflation was down from 70 per cent to 9 per cent and the currency was growing stronger.

Virtually all the specialized agencies of the United Nations system were represented in Indonesia. The United Nations country team had forged partnerships with the Government of Indonesia and civil society, including professional, academic and religious organizations and the private sector. United Nations bodies without offices in Indonesia were also part of the network, as were several international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Numerous countries and regional banks were represented in the Consultative Group for Indonesia (CGI), which was chaired by the World Bank.

Various country-led coordination mechanisms had been established to further recovery and reform. The Government of Indonesia had requested the World Bank to coordinate international assistance to social safety net programmes; the Government had also asked UNDP to provide technical assistance with the elections. As Resident Coordinator, he had also received a mandate from the Government to coordinate international assistance in dealing with the recent forest fires.

The country team had also established an innovative mechanism known as United Nations Support for Indonesian Recovery (UNSFIR) to monitor social indicators, conduct crisis impact and policy analyses and promote public debate on policy options. In addition, several United Nations humanitarian organizations had contributed to a joint task force to address issues of social unrest in drought-stricken areas. United Nations theme groups had also been established to deal with such issues as gender, safe motherhood and HIV/AIDS. A number of agencies had helped coordinate international assistance for recovery and reform and had provided leadership in their respective areas of expertise.

Mr. WOODHOUSE (United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)) said that the United Nations organs and Bretton Woods institutions had collaborated closely over the past two years in responding to the immediate impacts of the Indonesian crisis. In addressing short-term needs in the economic and social fields, they had been able to capitalize on a sense of joint purpose,

cooperating, inter alia to provide budgetary support for structural adjustment and policy reform and recovery programmes targeted at local communities. The specialized agencies had also, according to their respective fields of expertise, collaborated on crisis impact assessment and policy advice to the Government.

UNDP had coordinated international assistance for the elections, mobilizing a total of US\$ 80 million in order to educate 110 million voters, deploy several hundred thousand volunteers and train 3 million poll volunteers. In the area of reform, the country team had successfully promoted the implementation of international legal instruments, including human rights standards. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had launched a particularly successful programme to promote inter-cultural understanding and tolerance. The country team had also provided technical expertise for emergency preparedness, including direct emergency assistance for internally displaced persons. Donors and NGOs had also called upon the team to provide expert advisory services which were much appreciated for their neutrality.

There had been many examples of successful inter-agency collaboration. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP) and UNDP had conducted joint crop assessment and food aid analyses; the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO had implemented education assistance programmes; and WHO, UNICEF, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the World Bank had jointly coordinated forums to assess the health impact of the crises. A number of agencies had collaborated on food assistance schemes and community recovery activities, and ILO had joined forces with the Bretton Woods institutions to promote the ratification of the ILO conventions.

Those short-term responses also had an impact in the long term. The election process had led to greater democratization; "Back-to-school" programmes had enhanced school governance and local accountability; and health and nutrition had been revitalized. Economic recovery would also have a positive impact in the long term, as would the improved access to basic social services promoted by the country team. Cooperation between multiple actors in civil society for the purpose of short-term community recovery programmes had set the stage for longer-term collaboration and assistance.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that cooperation on short-term responses to the economic, social and political crises facing Indonesia had led to a common sense of purpose among the United Nations agencies in the field. In collaboration with its partners, the country team had established a joint agenda for the next few years which focused on advancing good governance, institutional reform and the implementation of the international human rights instruments. Further priorities included providing support for sustainable and equitable economic recovery, promoting social justice and poverty eradication and general capacity-building.

The country team recognized that economic growth must focus on sustainable use of environmental resources and that short-term "safety-net" responses must be translated into a more sustained promotion of social justice and equity, including a reduction of gender, ethnic and regional inequalities. Civil society must be involved in both the implementation and monitoring of social programmes, with a view to ensuring that best use was made of available funds. Again with the long term in view, the United Nations humanitarian task force would continue to promote emergency mitigation and early-warning strategies.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia), commenting on the factors constraining coordination efforts, said that differing organizational cultures occasionally posed a problem. Organizations with a humanitarian focus tended to favour rapid response and to be impatient with the longer-term, capacity-building outlook of organizations which focused on development. Both concerns were legitimate, of course; it was merely a question of learning to work together. Given that the agencies conducted programmes throughout Indonesia, the lack of geographical synergy caused difficulties in some instances. Bureaucratic formalities were also an impeding factor, particularly with regard to the mobilization and the transfer of resources between agencies. There was also an evident need for additional funding for inter-agency cooperation. Moreover, in 1998, the country team had been forced to spend much of its valuable time dealing with security concerns.

Most members of the team had served together for some three years, and the stresses of the last 12 months had forged a spirit of unity and collegiality on which they were capitalizing. The team had held three

retreats to seek consensus on the nature of the crisis and on suitable recovery strategies. The common mandate had been absorbed and had resulted in a commitment that had led to the formulation of new approaches. Following the recent elections, the new strategies and policies that the Government would be establishing afforded a further opportunity for support. The time was ripe for a common country assessment (CCA), and the team was firmly committed to a Common Development Framework (CDF), possibly in conjunction with a United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and other joint action was to be envisaged shortly.

The sum of the whole had been greater than the agencies' individual parts. He hoped that the team, too, would benefit from Indonesia's spirit of gotong royong (mutual help), a major force behind its recovery.

Mrs. GUERREIRO (Observer for Portugal), expressing surprise that the funds and programmes were unaware of the special status of East Timor, asked them to rectify the reference to the territory as a province of Indonesia in the document distributed.

Ms. PAIVOKKE (Observer for Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the team had frankly mentioned not only its achievements but also the difficulties it had faced during the past year. However, quite apart from the crisis period, on which the team had understandably focused, she was also interested in the running of normal operations in more general terms.

She understood from the team's explanation of the special coordination mechanism for responding to the crisis that the various areas of coordination had been undertaken by the different groups and agencies at the Indonesian Government's specific request. She would like to know, however, how the team would describe the Resident Coordinator's role in the overall coordination of the crisis situation and whether the United Nations mechanism had resulted in timely and effective country programme implementation.

She was happy to learn that the crisis had produced positive cooperation and that resources had been channelled towards common goals. Since obstacles to joint programming clearly persisted, she wished to hear the team's views, from the field perspective, on its current and potential situation. Its assessment of the gains and savings to be achieved through common services and premises would also be interesting.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia) said that, because the resident coordinator system called for specific responses in times of crisis, it was understandable that the Indonesian Government, in setting up its coordination mechanisms, had focused on the three major parties, the IMF, the World Bank and UNDP. The World Bank had been asked to coordinate all the safety-net programmes and had worked closely with the other agencies, funds and programmes in their design. However, at the top of the system was the Resident Coordinator, under whose umbrella a mechanism had been created in which the various specialized agencies led action in their individual spheres of competence. Matters such as humanitarian and security operations had also come under the Resident Coordinator.

Replying to the observer for Finland, he said that the system was working well and had resulted in timely and effective programme implementation. Admittedly, it had been a learning period and all the actors - United Nations system, bilateral and others - had initially needed time to adjust to its complexity. However, to judge by the successful coordination of the election assistance provided by more than 15 countries, all members of the Consultative Group on Indonesia (CGI), the coordination mechanism had improved.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that joint programmes and small-scale activities had existed even before the crisis. During the crisis it had been natural to seek joint implementation of projects and programmes. As already stated, there was no simple modality for commingling resources. When UNDP, WFP and others had wished to transfer some of their resources to UNICEF for an infant-feeding project, they had been prevented by the organizational procedures and had been constrained to set up a parallel project with the same name and content for channelling the funds. Such constraints were, in fact, easily circumvented.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia) assured the observer for Portugal that her point concerning the status of East Timor had been noted.

The Indonesian Government had long since donated the common premises in Jakarta to the United Nations. Although the growth of the organizations concerned meant that some had had to be housed in adjacent buildings, modern communication techniques facilitated contact. Others were housed in nearby rented accommodation, which was not designated as part of the common premises.

Mr. TUMKAYA (United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)) said that coordination and programming, in addition to normal projects, posed different challenges in times of crisis, but the team had found responses. Replying to the observer for Finland, he recalled that country programmes were implemented through the appropriate sectoral ministries, with which expertise and information were shared. UNFPA activities had been successfully coordinated with UNICEF, WHO and many bilateral donors, NGOs and government departments. Coordination did not mean that all United Nations agencies undertook identical tasks with the same ministry; rather, they provided input for each other's projects, thereby avoiding duplication and achieving greater synergy.

Mr. WOODHOUSE (United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)), referring to the comment by the observer for Portugal concerning East Timor, said that one hallmark of UNICEF was that its bosses were the poor women and children of the world, and its credo the Convention on the Rights of the Child. He had visited East Timor and obtained permission from all the parties concerned in the sensitive situation there to start immediate immunization, six days a week, of all children under five. He hoped in that way to lay the basis of a truce for children, which would also serve the interests of peace.

Dr. KIM-FARLEY (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that one benefit of common premises had been the ability to obtain high-speed Internet connection that provided rapid audio and video equipment, which a single agency could not have afforded. However, WHO and other agencies found it difficult to use the real-estate fund for upgrades, since the property, although donated to the United Nations, was still government-owned.

Mr. BAHAMONDES (Canada) said that, while he found the explanation of the role of the resident coordinator system in times of crisis satisfactory, he would like to know what level of cooperation had been attained with bilateral donors. The role of the IMF and the World Bank in economic matters and in establishing safety nets during the crisis was well known, but it would be interesting to learn what the relationship between them

and the Asian Development Bank was in terms of programming for the future, and how all three organizations fitted into the system's larger crisis coordination role. The current situation might be conducive to the establishment of an UNDAF and a CDF, but it was unclear what role the Government played in coordination and programming. He asked what the next step was likely to be, and how sustainable the crisis initiatives would be in future projects. Regarding the long-term/short-term vision of humanitarian assistance, his delegation particularly wished to know how the need for sustainability and the need for immediate crisis response could be meshed. In the absence of any specialized official, he wondered whether the delegation of Indonesia was in a position to say what it thought about the United Nations' performance during the crisis.

Mr. KUMAMARU (Japan) commended the highly coordinated United Nations support to Indonesia during its crisis. Two levels of coordination and collaboration were involved: one among the United Nations family, and the other with all the other players. Although the former was the prime United Nations concern, it should play a role in the latter also. He would like to know whether coordination still focused primarily on information exchange or whether it had progressed to project formulation and implementation, as a result of the recent reform. Could the Resident Coordinator explain exactly how he envisaged the role of the various components in formulating an UNDAF in close coordination with the CDF? More importantly, how would the ownership of the Indonesian Government be secured in that process? What was the Resident Coordinator's relationship with other providers of assistance and, in particular, his role in the CGI which was scheduled to meet shortly? He would like to see coordination expanded from the United Nations to embrace all the players, including the CGI process. Although coordination was primarily the Government's responsibility, he wondered how it could be facilitated by the United Nations.

Mr. TOMASI (France), noting the coordination difficulties posed by the existence of different financing and other procedures, wondered whether the coordination of the work of 19 organizations was, in fact, a practical undertaking. He would like to know more about the Resident Coordinator's relationship with the Bretton Woods institutions and how coordination was achieved with them. Indonesia was a somewhat special case, confronted as it

had been by an enormous economic and financial crisis in a region itself in the throes of crisis, which was why the IMF and the World Bank had been strongly urged to intervene. Lastly, he was puzzled by the very limited, specialized choice of gender equity, maternal health and AIDS for the country's thematic groups, whereas other countries had such groups for topics like education and health policy.

Mr. BAIRD (World Bank) said that, as the newest member of the country team, he wished to state how valuable he had found the preparations for the meeting. It was most impressive how the United Nations system had been able to achieve such unity; once a common purpose was defined, all the members of the team worked together to attain it. Moreover, as an official of the World Bank, he had been pleased to receive support from the United Nations for the Bank's programmes.

In reply to the question about the CGI, he said that it met once a year. The most recent meeting, in July 1998, had focused largely on the social impact of the crisis and the important national programmes for dealing therewith. It would be recalled that UNDP was responsible for overseeing the civil society monitoring of the Government's major programmes in that regard. The CGI included the major bilateral partners and they, too, had shown a willingness to restructure their programmes in order to support the crisis measures and other initiatives.

Much of the coordination effort had, in fact, been government-led. For example, all three of the financial agencies concerned, the IMF, the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank, were always represented in meetings with the Government. References had been made to tensions between agencies but in his own experience, there was much more tension within agencies than between them. The debate was an active one and answers were worked out at both the intra-agency and inter-agency levels.

The Bank had been a relative latecomer to the crisis. The IMF had already stressed the need for fiscal stimulus. The challenge for the Bank and the donor agencies had been to ensure that that stimulus was used effectively by means of good governance. The process had gone well, and it was to the credit of the IMF that it had learned from experience and had thus not imposed

too tight a fiscal policy, opting instead for a high degree of stimulus. The programme in Indonesia was yielding interesting results: inflation was down, growth was positive and interest rates were declining, clearly showing that the Government and the economy were on the right track.

One good example of cooperation within the United Nations system was the assessment of the extent of the crisis which had been formed out of many opinions formulated over a period of time. It had been shown that the rate at which people fell into poverty was highly differentiated, but that overall it had doubled. The establishment of UNSFIR to monitor the impact of the crisis, conduct policy analysis and promote public debate on policy options was a very important contribution to the United Nations system. The smooth election process had been essential to economic recovery and the immediate UNDP response and successful action was greatly appreciated by all parts of the system, not least the Bretton Woods institutions.

Mr. WOODHOUSE (United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)) said that the thematic groups were intensely multisectoral and a large number of agencies had a role to play in them. They were characterized by pragmatic cooperation. In the health sector, for example, WHO had been supported by UNFPA. In education, UNESCO had played a pivotal role, with the support of UNICEF.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia), replying to the representative of Japan, said that, while he could not as yet outline the whole progression from exchange of information to project formulation, he believed that, once a new programme had been agreed upon with the new Government, there would be major opportunities for joint work under either an UNDAF or a CDF. Until that moment came, the agencies would continue to explore options.

Mr. HILL (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) said that it might be useful to compare the country team process in Indonesia with that in the Philippines. In both cases, what mattered most was that a process of dialogue had been established and relationships formed between people. The difference between them, however, was interesting: in the case of the Philippines, the thematic groups had

gradually brought the agencies together under an UNDAF/CDF. In the case of Indonesia, the stress had been on working together immediately on a concerted basis. Thematic groups were a long-term mechanism. In Indonesia, the need to respond to the issues had been immediate.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that, in terms of financial resources, the United Nations system was only a small player. The major donors - with Japan in the lead - and the World Bank had put in billions of dollars whereas the United Nations had put in millions. Nevertheless, on several occasions, pooling those resources under the United Nations system had produced some added value. For example, in the case of the Community Recovery Programme, a trust fund had been established by UNDP. So far, some US\$ 60 million had been pooled in the fund. Similarly, the elections programme had provided an opportunity to come together under a single leadership and serve the Government by acting as a funnel for the resources contributed by many donors. If the Government had had to deal with every donor separately, it would have had no time left to do anything else.

Dr. KIM-FARLEY (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that another spectacular example of bilateral donors working with the United Nations system was the eradication of poliomyelitis from Indonesia. Through a major effort of social mobilization, some 22 million children had been brought in for vaccination twice a year over a three-year period. Bilateral donors, government bodies, United Nations agencies and NGOs had all come together, under government leadership but with United Nations back-up, to engage in that great success story.

Mr. KASRI (Indonesia), replying to the question from the representative of Canada, said that the challenges facing his country had created a need for swift action on the part of the international community, which had responded with generous and much appreciated support. The World Bank had played a critical role in mobilizing the resources for a social safety net programme, thereby mitigating the impact of the crisis. Other development organizations and specialized agencies had provided crucial emergency assistance, political advice and technical assistance, which had bolstered the Government's efforts for recovery and reform.

UNDP had played an important role by coordinating international technical assistance so as to facilitate the carrying out of the recent electoral process. Through that landmark programme, which had become UNDP's largest third-party cost-sharing programme ever, it had demonstrated its ability to mobilize the support of the international community in full harmony with government priorities. It had also managed to balance the interests of all the development actors, civil society, the Election Commission, the private sector and the donors, to the full satisfaction of all concerned.

The Indonesian Government supported and would continue to support cooperation with UNDP and the country team, in the effort not only to optimize the effectiveness of their programmes in response to the needs of the country and its people, but also to face the development challenges that lay ahead.

Mr. WINNICK (United States of America) said that the opportunity for the Council to interact with selected country teams was very useful. He would, however, like some information on two additional points. First of all, regarding the support given by the United Nations system to the electoral process in Indonesia, he noted that there had been some cost-sharing with the Government. He would like to have the team's assessment of the ability of the system to maintain its independence in those circumstances. In other words, how had the team been able to work with the Government and at the same time keep it at arm's length? Secondly, he would like to know where UNDP had found the staff it had needed and whether there had been any problems in that regard. There had been some references to the need for additional funding to meet the cost of enhanced coordination. He would be interested in hearing more about the return from coordination, in the form of direct savings or enhanced output. The UNESCO member of the team had made an interesting comparison between the situations in the Philippines and Indonesia. The question seemed to be how the desired crisis mentality could be replicated without an actual crisis.

Ms. LAUN (Germany) said she would like to know what mechanism existed for cooperation with those United Nations agencies that did not have offices in Indonesia. Furthermore, she wondered whether the demand for increased cooperation at the field level was being met at the Headquarters level or whether there was a need for improvement there. Regarding the common

premises, the Resident Coordinator had said that, even without common premises, good cooperation had been achieved via E-mail. She presumed, therefore, that databases were fully compatible between the various agencies.

Mr. HUANG Xueqi (China) said that Indonesia was a major representative of the developing world. United Nations experience there could thus serve as a model. United Nations agencies had done much good work for social and economic development in Indonesia, in the fields of education, health care and poverty reduction. He would like to know what further progress had been made in those fields and whether the work of assistance was being coordinated with the Indonesian Government in such a way as to enable the agencies to maintain their neutrality and the non-political nature of their work.

Mr. GOFFIN (Belgium) asked how far the United Nations system intended to follow through with decentralization. He understood that common premises were being established in Jakarta. There were geographical constraints on the possibility of full decentralization, but it was possible to envisage the establishment of common premises in some provincial capitals. While it was difficult enough to coordinate 19 agencies, it was still more difficult to work in a coordinated way in a country as geographically vast and complicated as Indonesia.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator for Indonesia) said that there had been several questions about how the country team had maintained its independence while assisting the electoral process. In the first place, the team had been invited to participate by the Indonesian Government and, in cooperation with the Government, it had formulated a technical assistance programme. It had not been the intention of the Government to internationalize the elections but, merely to obtain some technical support. After the Government and UNDP had signed the Memorandum of Understanding, the programme had been turned over to the team. Because of the difficult circumstances, the team had been asked to maintain contact between the various actors involved in the process. The Election Commission was run by the various political parties. With the support of the Government but not under its direction, UNDP had been able to maintain relations with the Election Commission, NGOs and the private sector. The process had not been without difficulty; particularly since the involvement of civil society was

still at a very early stage. UNDP had nevertheless been able to maintain strict neutrality and, to make sure that the general public understood that, a UNDP Advisory Council had been set up, a completely non-partisan body chaired by a prominent Indonesian. Part of the success of the operation was due to the fact that the legal framework set up by the Government was flexible enough to allow the United Nations to work directly with the population.

Mr. MISHRA (United Nations Support Facility for Indonesian Recovery UNSFIR) said, in reply to the question by the representative of China, that the severity of the crisis could not be conveyed by mere statistics: the social effects had been profound. When, after some 25 years of constant, high economic growth, average people suddenly saw their incomes plummet - as in the former Soviet Union, to take another example - the effect could be devastating. At a time when prices had risen and old certainties had shifted, however, it had been difficult to measure the impact.

One of the achievements of the collaboration between the Government and the Bretton Woods institutions had been to establish reliably the fact that 50 million Indonesians had fallen below the poverty line. The challenge was to use that information to design sustainable programmes to help the poor and create a just social policy. Coping with such widespread impoverishment would take many years; and it was not a purely technical problem. There would have to be public debate on the way forward so as to achieve fairness and justice.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that, having started with three professional staff members, three junior professional officers and two United Nations volunteers, her office had assembled a staff of 50 international experts within a month, thanks to the generosity of international donors. The Inter-Agency Procurement Services Office had sent an expert, some UNDP staff members had joined together with some - very experienced - recently retired staff members. The Japan International Cooperation Agency, the United States Agency for International Aid (UNSAID) and Australian Aid, among others, had also helped, whether with funding, seconding experts or technical assistance.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia) said, with regard to decentralization, that Indonesia had experienced some far-reaching regional autonomy loss, which raised a number of important

issues. The international community would provide technical assistance and, in the meantime, the Government was establishing decentralization mechanisms.

Mr. WOODHOUSE (United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)) said that Indonesia's new law on autonomy and decentralization was fully consistent with the work of UNICEF over the past four or five years. UNICEF already worked directly with 74 districts. He hoped that the World Bank would be able to build on the models that had been established. It was difficult to develop capacity in a vacuum: the best way was through a specific programme like the Back-to-School Campaign or the immunization campaign. More United Nations Houses were also being established: for example, WFP and UNICEF were currently sharing premises.

As for the question of education and health, progress had been made, but it often consisted in preventing further deterioration rather than in securing actual improvements. For example, it had been estimated that the Back-to-School Campaign had resulted in an additional two million, rather than six million, school drop-outs. Similarly, the health and nutrition system had been revitalized through the vitamin A campaign, the iron fortification of all wheat flour and the campaign to combat iodine deficiency.

Mr. BAIRD (World Bank) said, with respect to the new legislation, that decentralizing a sector like health could maximize the positive aspects and minimize any negative ones. As for the question of coordination, and the possibility of headquarters lagging behind the field, or vice versa, in the last analysis it came down to personalities. No matter how good the structure, coordination would break down if individuals were not prepared to work together. On the other hand, the field and headquarters could often influence each other's action for the general good. In that context, the move by the WHO Director General to join the UNDG would undoubtedly have a positive effect at both the headquarters and field levels.

Mr. HILL (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) said there was certainly no wish to build up United Nations procedures on the back of Indonesia's misfortune. The effect of a crisis, however, was to bring people together in order to achieve real results. The programmes developed by the United Nations gave people

responsibility through team building, retreats and, in particular, joint field missions. It was also important that performance standards should be set and that funding should be targeted towards results.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that some agencies had no representation in the field but provided technical expertise, usually in conjunction with an agency that was already on the spot. For example, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) was working with UNDP on urban development schemes; or, to take another case, at the time of the forest fires the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) had worked closely with UNDP, even though it had no local representation. UNDP had paid the staff members and provided some services, but the small additional burden involved was entirely acceptable.

Mr. TUMKAYA (United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)) said that coordination had progressed beyond mere information sharing: joint activities were undertaken, although the stage of pooling all resources had not yet been reached. That might, perhaps, occur in the future, under the UNDAF process, but he was not sure that it would prove cost effective. As things stood, returns on coordination were far more valuable than the small costs incurred.

With regard to the impact of the crisis on health, he said that UNFPA had brought to the Government's attention the new international dimension on health, as stipulated by the International Conference on Population and Development. It had tried to help the Government redirect its programmes and change hearts and minds. As for the concern about the proliferation of agencies, he noted that not all the agencies were involved in any given project area: three or four might be fully engaged, others only peripherally. Only WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP were involved with the health programme, for example. Coordination therefore presented no great difficulties.

Ms. ECKEY (Norway) recalled that gender was one of the Council's cross-cutting issues. She wondered what was being done in the way of economic programmes for women and the advancement of their human rights.

Mr. VERBEEK (Observer for the Netherlands) said he noted that the coordination structure still deviated from the blueprint worked out at United Nations Headquarters. The international community's work in Indonesia was having an extremely positive impact. That meant that the existing mechanisms were working well. The obvious question arose as to whether an

UNDAF was really needed in a country the size of Indonesia that was already decentralizing. More generally, the question arose whether the blueprint should be imposed or whether the reality in a given country should be accepted.

Mr. SUH Dae-won (Republic of Korea) said he wondered whether coordination, admirable though it might be in itself, might not place an unnecessary burden on a small organization like UNFPA, which had a narrow mandate. Secondly, he noted that, while the resident coordinator system was being strengthened, there was no defined scope to a resident coordinator's activities. He feared that important projects might be undertaken without the knowledge of Headquarters and asked how much consultation took place on the implementation of projects in Indonesia.

Ms. GUERREIRO (Observer for Portugal) said that, while she appreciated the work of UNICEF on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, references to East Timor as a province of Indonesia were incorrect.

Ms. ALBRECHTSEN (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said, with regard to the gender issue, that the Inter-Agency Committee on Gender was working on a number of fronts. In the first place, it was engaged in advocacy: all the agencies had held workshops on the situation of women in the economic sphere and on violence against women, in the Indonesian context. Secondly, it was ensuring that, from the outset, gender was not overlooked within the CCA. Moreover, all the specialized agencies had been actively engaged in mainstreaming, which was high on the agenda for them all.

Mr. BAIRD (World Bank) said that there were three aspects of the gender issue of significance in the Indonesian context. First, a study carried out in Aceh had found that a large number of households were headed by women. That was most relevant for the design and implementation of programmes, with consequent implications for the Bank and the donor community generally. Secondly, the impact of industrial unemployment on women workers had been found to be serious, in that they enjoyed less protection if they worked in the home. The issue was being examined in collaboration with the trade union movement and other professional associations. Thirdly, with

regard to the social safety net programme, women did not have as much access to public works programmes as men did. There was a tendency, indeed, to concentrate on heavy infrastructural work. The Government had recently introduced a programme specifically designed for women and it was hoped that that would provide immediate relief.

Decentralization would constitute a major challenge. The Government had two years to put together the capacity and competence to implement the programme approved by Parliament. The Bank was counting on specific examples of micro projects, initially in the fields of education and health but later in other areas also. Decentralization would not, however, have much effect on United Nations coordination in Indonesia, particularly with respect to the location of offices, because programme management was already highly decentralized and would become increasingly so, as projects became more province- or region-based.

As for the future of the UNDAF, the biggest challenge was not the application of the Indonesian experience to other countries but the transition from emergency activities to the recovery and development phase. That was how appropriate mechanisms would be developed.

Mr. RAJAN (United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia) said that the United Nations was committed to a common framework but would examine whether the UNDAF and the CDF would give added value. He added that the United Nations had been asked to support parliamentary activities in Indonesia, particularly at the local level: it was an exciting prospect. As for the concern expressed by the representative of the Republic of Korea, there was no chance of Headquarters being unaware of what was happening in the field. There were considerable accountability requirements and they were borne in mind daily. Lastly, he emphasized that coordination occurred not only within the United Nations system but also with the Government. His team had particularly close contacts with the Ministries of Planning and Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KASRI (Indonesia), after expressing his gratitude for the work that had been done by all the agencies, said that the crisis was far from over. Indonesia was, however, undeniably on the path to recovery and the role

of the United Nations might be of crucial importance in putting the country back on its feet. The inter-agency collaboration showed the responsiveness of the United Nations to the country's needs and would constitute a positive precedent for other countries in the years to come.

The PRESIDENT said that the commitment of the members of the country team was a fine example of collegiality. The international community could rest easy in the knowledge that, if disaster struck a country, the United Nations was ready. Fears of lack of coordination in the field had been shown to be wrong.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.