

PROVISIONAL

E/2001/SR.18

8 May 2002

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Substantive session of 2001

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 6 July 2001 at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. NIEHAUS (Costa Rica)  
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

GE.01-63023 (E) 300402 080502

In the absence of Mr. Belinga-Eboutou (Cameroon), Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

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

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (agenda item 3) (continued) (E/2001/CRP.1)

Exchange of views with the heads of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Programme (WFP)

Mr. MALLOCH BROWN (Administrator, UNDP), speaking first as Chairman of the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), said that the Group currently had 18 members, following accession as full partners by the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The Group had strengthened its support mechanisms: it had a programme group and a management group, which reported back to it twice a year. In its work, the Group had made progress in determining its own responsibilities and those of the Bretton Woods institutions and in defining the arrangements for cooperation between them. To strengthen cooperation and increase synergies, the Group's Executive Committee had also held joint meetings, under the chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations, with the executive committees of other United Nations organs dealing with subjects of common interest.

With regard to the resident coordinator system, for which he was also responsible, UNDP had sought to make it more representative by introducing a new selection procedure. Some 16 per cent of serving resident coordinators were from agencies other than UNDP and 24 per cent of them were women; those figures should be further improved.

The Millennium Declaration provided the framework for UNDP's overall work. Over 70 country teams had already begun to align their activities with the goals set out in the Declaration and reports were being prepared by national authorities on the progress towards those goals. It was to be hoped that those efforts would help to achieve an increase in official development assistance (ODA), which was one of the aims of the International Conference on Financing for Development due to be held shortly.

Over the past two years, UNDP had carried out far-reaching reforms designed to refocus its action on advisory services and capacity-building in its core areas by adopting a results-based management approach. The process had been unanimously endorsed at the first ministerial-level meeting in September 2000, which had been attended by 40 ministers, as well as by the Executive Board.

UNDP should thus be in a position to take on a leadership role within the United Nations system in the fight against poverty. Many countries had already requested its assistance in preparing their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). While continuing with its work in previously defined areas (such as democratic governance, energy and the environment, crisis prevention and recovery, HIV/AIDS), UNDP had put special emphasis on mainstreaming gender issues in all its programming and advocacy work.

The downward trend in resources seemed to have been reversed. Thanks to higher contributions from 25 countries, 14 of which were members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC), regular budget resources were set to increase for the first time in eight years. In addition, the establishment of thematic trust funds corresponding to UNDP's main areas of action should make it possible to strike a better balance between regular budget resources and other resources.

Ms. BERTINI (Executive Director, WFP), making a positive assessment of the work of the United Nations Development Group, said member organizations had good working relationships, had improved or overhauled procedures that had led to duplication of work and they periodically held constructive joint meetings. The results were self-evident: in 2000, for the second successive year, WFP had registered a record level of contributions - US\$ 1.7 billion from the United States - and the trend looked set to continue.

As for the linkage between relief and development discussed in the document circulated at the meeting, it in fact existed only on paper. When extreme emergency situations had to be dealt with, the international community was there to help: 84 per cent of WFP requests for aid in 2000 had been met. However, once the crisis was over and the humanitarian disaster averted, aid dried up, either because donors had other priorities or because they had to respond to new emergencies or they had no long-term aid facility.

In other words, donors rallied to the aid of populations whose survival was threatened, as they had done recently in the Horn of Africa, but when it came to helping them move on to the next stage - a return to normal before gradually moving into the development phase - aid flows, especially ODA, were directed away from the disaster-stricken countries, which were often least developed countries (LDCs), and towards others.

It was the recurrent pattern that the organizations in the field came up against. No one could claim progress was being made in the discussion on the continuity between relief and development as long as the guiding logic was one of selective intervention and there was no structure in place to mobilize the resources needed to support the recovery effort. She concluded by urging members of the Council to engage in a realistic and frank discussion on the issue.

Ms. BELLAMY (Executive Director, UNICEF), speaking first on the follow-up to the major conferences, stressed that the Millennium Summit and the resulting Declaration provided a framework for integrating and linking the activities of the United Nations system in sometimes disparate areas.

Children were a cross-cutting issue in the Millennium Declaration. The review of progress made since the World Summit for Children in 1990, which would be carried out in September 2001 at the special session of the General Assembly on children that was part of the Summit follow-up, would, together with the country reports prepared for the occasion, provide baseline data for assessing the implementation of the commitments undertaken in the Declaration.

It was through the common country assessment (CCA) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) mechanism that UNDG members could best help Governments to fulfil their commitments. The process had been launched four years ago and there was now sufficient information available to assess its effectiveness. Some 81 countries had completed CCAs and 34 had completed UNDAFs. That dual mechanism had undoubtedly made it possible to better define national development priorities, establish a more coherent approach by the United Nations system and define the roles of the various stakeholders.

However, without wishing to prejudge the outcome of the triennial review, she believed a number of improvements were desirable. Governments and country teams should be helped to make the mechanism an effective tool for reaching the goals of the Millennium Declaration,

which would mean involving Governments more closely in the whole process; the quality of documents must be improved and procedures rationalized and simplified to ensure that the development assistance framework did not involve excessive paperwork for anyone. That would require a review of the guidance to country teams on drawing up the frameworks, more support from the system, including in the area of capacity-building, and a strengthened managerial role for the resident coordinator during the implementation and monitoring of the CCAs and UNDAFs, combined with recognition of the key role played by Governments. It was also a question of improving the linkage with PRSPs and the other instruments established by the Bretton Woods institutions. All those points were discussed periodically within UNDG. Evidence of the interest aroused by the UNDAF mechanism lay in the fact that the European Union had indicated it might wish to use the instrument in its own work.

Lastly, two other important issues - the Secretary-General's Girls' Education Initiative and the problem of resources, including the worrying imbalance between regular budget resources and other resources - were covered in the document circulated at the meeting.

Ms. OBAID (Executive Director, UNFPA) stressed that greater coordination, one of the *raison d'être* of UNDG, was intended, among other things, to reduce the workload related to programming for both the recipient countries and the country teams. Progress had been made but much more could be done to streamline and simplify procedures and thus make the system more effective. With that in mind, the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board had requested UNFPA to propose to the other UNDG members that a working group should be set up to develop a common programme approval process, on the understanding that Governments would retain ownership and control of the actual programme development. On the basis of the group's work, the UNFPA Executive Board had agreed at its annual session that the CCA/UNDAF mechanism would only be used as a common planning framework on a pilot basis and that the relevant documents would be made available for information during the presentation of the draft country outlines. UNDG was currently studying the programme and policy implications of that decision. Similar discussions were to be held in the governing bodies of UNICEF and WFP. As Chair of the Working Group, UNFPA was keenly aware of the need to continue to emphasize the role of Governments in the CCA/UNDAF process and to involve civil society and the various UNDG agencies from the outset in consultations on those mechanisms.

In conclusion, she would emphasize that UNDG could not be expected to do its work properly if there continued to be a shortage of resources. It was clearly a question of political will, and so there was hope that the International Conference on Financing for Development would produce the resources needed to ensure the viability of the operational activities of the United Nations.

Mr. VAN DER PLUIJM (Observer for Belgium), referring to the risk of duplication of work highlighted in the Secretary-General's report in connection with the proliferation of coordination mechanisms, said he would like to know more about the United Nations system's involvement in the preparation of PRSPs and about what it could contribute to them. He asked if the speakers had any suggestions for filling the gaps in the institutional memory.

Ms. KING (United States of America) said she wondered whether it was necessary to continue organizing major conferences on specific issues such as women's or population issues when the follow-up to the implementation of the Millennium Declaration meant the various issues could be dealt with in a more comprehensive and coordinated fashion. Her delegation would also like to know what could be done using available resources to ensure the linkage between emergency operations and development activities.

Mr. CHA Young-cheol (Republic of Korea) said he welcomed the willingness shown by UNDG to adopt a comprehensive approach that involved all partners, but wondered what precisely it was going to do to monitor progress in implementing the Millennium Declaration in the field and at Headquarters, as mentioned in paragraph 22 of document E/2001/CRP.1. Such documents were actually very useful and should be issued in future as official documents of the Council. He would also like to know how the Group intended to reduce the "transaction costs" involved in drafting and monitoring the implementation of a CCA/UNDAF. In any case, it was encouraging that UNDP regular budget resources had slightly increased for the first time in eight years and that those of UNFPA had gone up for the second year running.

Mr. MALLOCH BROWN (Administrator, UNDP), in reply to the question about institutional memory, said that for UNDP, with its subregional teams of experts, the most important thing was the memory itself, in other words, the identification and dissemination of best practice. Without, of course, giving up project management, UNDP was becoming more of

an information manager. With regard to the linkage between emergency operations and development activities, it should not be forgotten that the latter affected 4.6 billion people whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), for example, dealt with 40 million people. Once the emergency relief phase was over, the amount spent for each inhabitant fell considerably. Temporary arrangements needed to be made for the difficult period of post-disaster recovery to make sure that some form of bridging finance was available. However, it was a sensitive question: the UNDP Executive Board had itself asked questions about whether it should allocate more resources to countries emerging from conflict and had concluded that its limited resources should be entirely devoted to development, which was already underfunded.

As for the follow-up to the Millennium Declaration, UNDG would help Governments to prepare their annual reports on the progress made in implementing the goals of the Declaration; the Department of Economic and Social Affairs would then prepare a summary for inclusion in the Secretary-General's annual report on the subject. Country reports should also be a way to draw the attention of Governments, the public, NGOs and others from the donor countries to the progress made and the problems encountered in each recipient country.

Ms. BERTINI (Executive Director, WFP) said she wished to put forward a few ideas on the linkage that needed to be made between emergency relief and development assistance. When donor countries were announcing pledges to an emergency operation in a particular country, for instance, they could make a longer-term financial commitment to help recovery in the country in question in following years. It might also be useful to review the financial priorities of the various funds and programmes. WFP, for example, had to assign at least 50 per cent of its resources to LDCs and 90 per cent to low-income food-deficit countries. More attention could be paid to non-food aid (basic health care, water, seeds, tools), which was very useful in terms of prevention, and to the reasons why donors sometimes preferred to go through NGOs or other channels rather than through United Nations agencies in that area. Lastly, the international community should take its moral commitment not to let people die of hunger a step further and undertake not to let people go short of water or die of disease for lack of vaccines.

Ms. BELLAMY (Executive Director, UNICEF) said that, although coordination with the Bretton Woods institutions was considerably better, it could be improved still further, including in the area of PRSPs: the United Nations system should think carefully about what it might propose. The special sessions should be postponed but not cancelled completely, as they were important in mobilizing and reaffirming commitments. Thought should be given to ways of making better use of them while looking for ways to carry out some sort of continuous monitoring before the 15-year term expired, as it was very important to have a precise timetable for reaching objectives.

Ms. OBAID (Executive Director, UNFPA) said that, with regard to institutional memory, UNFPA had set up an information exchange service in its new Strategic Planning Division and was in the process of installing an information-sharing system linking outside offices and headquarters. It already had an evaluation network among project support teams and a database of lessons from the implementation of certain projects. The advantage of major international conferences on specific subjects was that they led to consensus and commitments, but organizing them diverted the human and financial resources of the organization concerned away from programme delivery. It was therefore not sure they were the best follow-up method.

Mr. DESAI (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) reminded members of the Council that they had to take a decision on the issue of the follow-up to conferences and that, with regard to the achievement of the goals of the Millennium Declaration at the national level, they would be meeting the United Nations country team for the United Republic of Tanzania in the course of next week.

Mr. HASSELBALCH (Denmark) said that, following the series of major conferences held in recent years, he too thought it was time to meet the goals that had been set. The assessment of the CCA/UNDAF process had shown that the use of those mechanisms had improved teamwork and led to a better understanding of the priorities at country level. However, as an end product, the development assistance framework was too imprecise, lacking in objectives and follow-up, and so was not suitable for use as a planning tool. He would like to know how that was to be remedied and also what plans there were for streamlining the administrative and financial procedures that often seemed to hinder joint programming initiatives. Local control of the framework by government and civil society seemed to be inadequate. UNDAF should be the main programming tool used by the United Nations system at the country level, so that it spawned the country programmes, rather than the other way round.



Mr. SHARMA (Nepal), referring to the duplication of work that persisted despite attempts at streamlining, asked whether the idea of designating one agency as the lead agency in each area of activity had ever been considered. Noting that local control of projects carried out with United Nations assistance was more theoretical than real, he said his delegation would like to know how it was intended to rectify that situation and also what was being done to further decentralize the project approval procedure.

Again, did the agencies, either individually or collectively, intend to launch a massive campaign to raise funds and halt the general downward trend in core resources? With regard to Mr. Malloch Brown's statement that UNDP was going to concentrate increasingly on information-sharing, he was afraid that it might lead to duplication of effort and that development activities would suffer.

Mr. ROHNER (Observer for Switzerland) said that, according to the independent evaluation carried out, the new UNDAF mechanism had so far produced mixed results. He would like to know what the agency heads taking part in the debate thought should be the next steps to ensure better coordination of the aid programmes implemented by United Nations agencies. The UNDP and UNFPA Executive Boards had recently decided to work together on approval of country programmes, and UNICEF and WFP should do likewise. He would be interested to know what the heads of the latter two agencies thought about that idea.

The Millennium Declaration made it clear to the entire United Nations system what was to be done in terms of harmonizing and simplifying procedures. The results so far were modest, but the first steps taken were encouraging. At the national level, the recent experience of the United Republic of Tanzania could be a useful source of inspiration, but it was not a model to be followed slavishly, as each country had to define its own approach.

With regard to the financial basis of United Nations funds and programmes, he suggested that the executive heads should stop talking about "voluntary contributions" and simply refer to "general contributions", as it was of course in the so-called "voluntary" resources that budget chiefs were tempted to introduce the first cuts.

His Government had long argued that donors should put an end to the uncertainty that plagued United Nations funds and programmes as a result of the system of annual contributions, by adopting a multi-year system. He appealed again to donors to try to persuade their Governments to authorize them to at least provide the United Nations with notional figures for a period of several years.

Mr. VERBEEK (Netherlands) said that the regular meetings between the Chairman of UNDG and the heads of United Nations funds and programmes augured well for improved inter-agency cooperation and the integration of assistance, which should as a matter of principle be strongly encouraged, but he would like some details about the general approach taken in those meetings. He would also like to see greater cooperation at the intergovernmental level, along the lines of the recent joint meeting between the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council.

The progress made in the resident coordinator system, the UNDAF mechanism and joint programming was encouraging but, as shown by the questions asked by the representatives of Denmark and Switzerland, there was a need for further integration at the national level, as UNDG was not doing enough in that area. UNDG should also have a stronger presence at Headquarters.

It would also be a good idea generally to strengthen cooperation between the secretariats of the United Nations system and those of the Bretton Woods institutions.

He asked the Executive Director of UNICEF if it would not be possible and useful to strengthen the UNDAF mechanism by appealing to external partners, the donors, rather than merely call for the involvement of recipient countries, who were supposed to be increasingly exercising ownership.

That comment was also valid from the financial point of view, since the new programming tools had so far been no more successful than previous efforts in mobilizing donors, who should no doubt be approached in a slightly less aggressive way.

Mr. MALLOCH BROWN (Administrator, UNDP) said that the question of the security of United Nations officials in the field had been raised again in a brutal fashion, with the killing on 5 July of a field security officer, Jean-Pierre Lhommée, in the Central African Republic, where he had been in charge of a UNDP team. For his own part, he wished to offer his condolences to the victim's family and added that Governments were failing the system in matters concerning the security of United Nations personnel.

In reply to questions raised, he said that the full participation of Governments in the work of United Nations agencies was vital. If UNDAF was to become a real planning tool, national control must be an essential element of it. The development assistance framework should be the key to simplifying procedures, but that presupposed that countries actually had control over the programmes.

On the question of national implementation, he agreed with the representative of Nepal: project implementation was still not sufficiently under the control of the recipient country, partly because of the complexity of the programming tools themselves. That was why, moreover, if that unintended obstacle was to be overcome, the development assistance framework must be extremely simple. Another obstacle to national implementation had to do with the complexity of administrative procedures in the recipient country. The case of the United Republic of Tanzania was an eloquent example, as the Council would soon learn. The system's agencies did not wish to exercise de facto ownership of the implementation, but only wanted to move faster than the infrastructure of the recipient country would allow.

He wished to allay the fears expressed by the representative of Nepal upon learning that UNDP would henceforth be devoting part of its work to the dissemination of knowledge. It was not trying to do the work usually carried out by other agencies but simply wanted to draw on the abundant experience already available to give advice and build capacity.

The PRESIDENT offered his condolences to the family of Jean-Pierre Lhommée and expressed his solidarity with the family and friends of all those who had died in the service of the United Nations.

Ms. OBAID (Executive Director, UNFPA) said that she too conveyed her condolences to the family of the United Nations security officer recently killed while on mission. It was essential to do more to ensure the safety of staff in the field.

With the preparation of CCAs and UNDAFs, UNFPA had already begun to move towards simplification and national ownership and it would continue in that direction. Because of its limited number of staff, UNFPA only sent one or two officials at most into the field in recipient countries and recruited local staff or drew on the services of national NGOs. Management of its projects was therefore largely in the hands of the recipient country. UNFPA also decentralized decision-making to a large extent, especially in financial matters: within the budget allocated to them, decision makers organized the implementation of projects as they saw fit.

The donor base needed to be significantly expanded. Of the \$110 million that UNFPA hoped to receive, \$70 million had already been paid in. It would certainly be useful if donors adopted a multi-year funding system.

The dissemination of knowledge acquired through experience should not jeopardize research and development or duplicate it. It should in fact be extremely beneficial.

Ms. BELLAMY (Executive Director, UNICEF) said that it was necessary to simplify procedures because programming on a country-by-country basis was far too time-consuming; the CCA/UNDAF mechanisms and the mid-term review were undoubtedly useful in that respect. Progress was also being made with decentralization, including at the financial level, where the delegation of authority to the local level had become much more common over the past year. The assessments which the Council was currently considering had in fact been carried out on pilot projects that were still in the early stages and agencies had already been working for some time to correct the shortcomings identified.

The dissemination of knowledge would mainly take the form of sharing best practice and the Council would find from the examples of the United Republic of Tanzania and China that the approach was very rewarding.

As to the harmonization of programmes and procedures, UNDP and UNFPA had taken a joint decision that was likely to set a precedent. UNICEF and WFP would decide at the beginning of 2002 whether to follow that precedent. However, it should not be forgotten that the Executive Boards of UNDP and UNFPA had been careful to preserve, during the harmonization process, the features that made each agency distinctive and enabled them to take their own particular approach to programming and capacity-building. Lastly, she too was convinced that a way must be found to expand the donor base.

Ms. BERTINI (Executive Director, WFP) said that the idea of several agencies preparing joint strategies seemed to appeal to many members of the Council. In drawing up country strategies, WFP, for its part, relied increasingly on a complex information system that allowed it to decide in which regions of the countries concerned the food situation was at highest risk. The system also made it possible to determine whether food aid would be useful in the circumstances or whether other kinds of aid should be considered. WFP was therefore sure it would be directing its resources to the places in greatest need. Since the country team was increasingly aware of the needs at the regional or subregional level, WFP could look forward to intervening with more concrete results.

The Executive Boards of UNICEF and WFP were clearly being encouraged to harmonize their programmes and procedures. The two organizations had already for some time been seeking to harmonize at least their schedules, which should then allow them to work on the compatibility of their programmes. The question of harmonization also affected funding that could be approved locally. Currently, when the WFP Executive Board endorsed a country programme, the director responsible for implementation could make some changes to the budget but the general structure and the main items were sacrosanct. Even in emergencies, she herself had to go through the WFP hierarchy. Delegation of authority had little meaning when autonomy was so limited.

With reference to coordination between United Nations agencies and the Bretton Woods institutions, it would be a mistake to imagine that such coordination existed in the field. For instance, at the height of the drought that had recently hit the Horn of Africa, the World Bank had quite simply refused to cooperate with WFP to improve the road network and thus enable food aid to be transported. Moreover, the World Bank had not deigned to inform other United Nations agencies about the implementation of a major project in Ethiopia in what was not even one of the regions hardest hit by the drought. Lastly, she wished to emphasize that decentralization was a core concern of WFP, which was why top officials were often sent out into the field to help national offices to implement programmes.

Mr. ANDERSSON (Observer for Sweden) said he welcomed the opportunity for delegations to have a frank and useful discussion with officials from the United Nations system, not only on successful operational activities but also on subjects of concern. Significant progress had been made in the past three years and activities at the national level were better targeted, thanks in particular to the CCAs and UNDAF. Those two programming tools had unquestionably helped to strengthen the resident coordinator system and to achieve better results with regard to cross-sectoral issues like AIDS prevention. With regard to good governance, he would like to know how the cooperation between UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA actually worked in the field, particularly within the framework of national programme implementation. He would also like to know what conclusions had been drawn from the operational activities carried out at the national level and what kind of strategic vision the United Nations had for the next three to five years.

Ms. SIMONOVA (Czech Republic) said that United Nations operational activities faced some major problems, the most important being the lack of resources and the duplication of work. Despite genuine efforts at coordination, there was still overlapping between activities and, in particular, a waste of resources and energy. Several programming tools had been produced but they did not yet complement each other. In that respect, it was important to introduce a solid partnership between the Bretton Woods institutions and United Nations agencies. It was also important for the latter to make sure their development goals were taken into account in the PRSPs prepared at the request of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The latter, for its part, never failed to invite its partners to provide social input for its activities. Accordingly, she asked what UNDG intended to do about those matters and what the chances were of establishing a real partnership with the Bretton Woods institutions at the national level.

Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) said his Government had already had occasion at meetings of the UNDP Executive Board to stress the need to keep member States regularly informed about the nature of the problems and proposals considered by UNDG in efforts to simplify its procedures. Such transparency would prevent member States from being suddenly confronted with solutions that had implications of which they were unaware. A similar transparency should also govern the implementation of the Millennium Declaration at the national level and the monitoring of projects carried out in pursuit of its goals. Such monitoring would have little effect if it was limited to the national level and action at the international level was neglected. It was surprising that PRSPs had been compared with the Millennium Declaration. PRSPs had been prepared by the IMF specifically for small, heavily indebted countries and, unlike the Declaration, were not universal in scope.

Mr. ABREHA (Ethiopia) thanked Ms. Bertini for her tireless efforts to help the victims of the drought in the Horn of Africa and said he shared her disappointment that there were no programmes to make the transition from emergency relief to development aid. On the question of the CCAs and UNDAFs, he stressed that those programming tools, useful as they were, should be based on programmes and strategies defined by the countries concerned, not by others. The recipient countries must be one of the driving forces in the operational activities of the United Nations agencies. The decision to harmonize and coordinate the programming process followed by UNDP, WFP, UNICEF and UNFPA was the first stage in a long-term process. However, for the reasons given by Ms. Bertini, it would no doubt be premature to apply that programming process to other United Nations development agencies.

Mr. GIORDANO (Italy) stressed the importance of security and asked what the heads of the United Nations agencies intended to do about it. With regard to training, each organization carried out its own programmes in isolation, whence the risk of duplication of work. While trying to improve cooperation between them, organizations should also be considering common training programmes, particularly in areas of common interest. In that respect, he recommended approaching the United Nations Staff College in Turin, Italy. With regard to the thematic funds UNDP intended to set up, he thought they would be an excellent interface between core resources and resources earmarked for particular purposes. Moreover, such funds had more chance of attracting donor countries while allowing UNDP to combine its work with that of other agencies. He would like to know what the heads of the United Nations agencies thought about that idea and about the prospects for coordination in that area.

Ms. ROUCHET (UNESCO) said that, although UNESCO had only recently become a member of UNDG, she could vouch for the major coordination efforts made by the Group. However, she did not think coordination was the sole preserve of United Nations agencies. Member States were just as concerned: their representatives should take into account its vital importance when taking positions in the governing bodies of United Nations agencies.

Ms. BELLAMY (Executive Director, UNICEF) observed that member States were represented by different ministerial delegations in the work of the governing bodies of the Bretton Woods institutions and United Nations agencies, and she encouraged Governments to establish a dialogue between all ministries so as to harmonize their positions in those bodies. As to security, the issue was important enough to merit inclusion in the regular budget of the United Nations. UNICEF had done a good deal in the area of training in cooperation with other organizations and recognition by member States of the importance of that issue would be invaluable. As for the United Nations Staff College, she wished to stress that the high cost of living in Turin was a drawback. Lastly, she agreed with the observer for Sweden on the need to define a strategic vision for the United Nations but she believed the question should be dealt with at a special session of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. MALLOCH BROWN (Administrator, UNDP) said that his organization was a strong supporter of partnerships. UNDP had changed from being a multi-purpose agency into a more specialized organization that did not hesitate to delegate certain activities to organizations it considered more competent in a particular area. Thus, UNDP entrusted programmes with a large forestry element to FAO, while it preferred to leave educational projects to UNESCO.

With regard to good governance, UNDP aimed to fill the gaps in the areas heavily dependent on its action by, for example, encouraging the establishment of the rule of law, which was a precondition for the success of development programmes. Efforts had certainly been made with regard to cooperation between the Bretton Woods institutions and United Nations agencies, though admittedly with only limited success so far. He agreed with the representative of the Czech Republic about the need to integrate, at the operational level, the PRSPs of the IMF and the programmes of United Nations development agencies, particularly as they shared the same goal - the eradication of poverty. Security was an important issue that should be included in the regular budget of the United Nations, but if member States insisted that development agencies should finance it, it would have to be under a specific budget heading and protected against erratic fluctuations in resources.

The PRESIDENT, in closing the debate, thanked the heads of the United Nations development agencies, whose contributions had undoubtedly enriched the work of the Council.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.