

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

Rome, 10-26 November 1987

VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II

OF THE CONFERENCE

PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES DE LA COMMISSION II

DE LA CONFÉRENCE

ACTAS TAQUIGRAFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISION II

DE LA CONFERENCIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE DES MATIERES

INDICE.

FIRST MEETING
PREMIERE SEANCE
PRIMERA REUNION

(10 November 1987)

	<u>Page/Página</u>
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u>	2
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u>	
12. <u>Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	
12. <u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	2
12. <u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	

SECOND MEETING
DEUXIEME SEANCE
SEGUNDA SESION

(11 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	24
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
12. <u>Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	
12. <u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	24
12. <u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup.I)</u>	

THIRD MEETING
TROISIEME SEANCE
TERCERA SESION

(11 November 1987)

Page/Pàgina

II.	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II.	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	50
II.	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN</u> (continuación)	
12.	<u>Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process</u> (continued) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup. 1)	
12.	<u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme</u> (suite) (C.87/30), C 87/30-Sup. 1)	50
12.	<u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas</u> (continuación) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup. 1)	

FOURTH MEETING
QUATRIEME SEANCE
CUARTA SESION

(12 November 1987)

	<u>Second Report of the Resolutions Committee</u>	
	<u>Deuxième rapport du Comité des résolutions</u>	76
	<u>Segundo Informe del Comité de Resoluciones</u>	
II.	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II.	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	76
II.	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
12.	<u>Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process</u> (continued) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup.1)	
12.	<u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme</u> (suite) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup.1)	76
12.	<u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, Especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas</u> (continuación) (C 87/30, C 87/30-Sup,1)	

FIFTH MEETING
CINQUIEME SEANCE
QUINTA SESION

(12 November 1987)

Page/Página

II.	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II.	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	98
II.	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (Continuación)	
13.	<u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3 - Corr.1; C 87/3 Corr. 2 (English only); C 87/3 - Sup. 1; C 87/3 - Sup. 2; C 87/3 - Sup. 3; C 87/LIM/21)	
13.	<u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3 - Corr.1; C 87/3 Corr. 2 (anglais seulement); C 87/3 - Sup. 1; C 87/3-Sup. 2; C 87/3 - Sup. 3; C 87/LIM/21)	98
13.	<u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plaza media</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3 - Corr.1; C 87/3 Corr. 2 (en inglés solamente); C 87/3 - Sup. 1; C 87/3 - Sup. 2; C 87/3 - Sup. 3; C 87/LIM/21)	

SIXTH MEETING
SIXIEME SEANCE
SEXTA SESION

(13 November 1987)

II.	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II.	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	124
II.	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
13.	<u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (English only); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continued)	
13.	<u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (anglais seulement); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (suite)	124
13.	<u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (en inglés solamente); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continuación)	
	<u>Vice-Chairmen of Commission II</u>	
	<u>Vice-Présidents de Commission II</u>	131
	<u>Vicepresidentes de la Comisión II</u>	

SEVENTH MEETING
SEPTIEME SEANCE
SEPTIMA SESION

(13 November 1987)

	<u>Page/Página</u>
II <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	134
II <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
13. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2;(English only); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continued)	
13. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (anglais seulement); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (suite)	134
13. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (en ingles solamente); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continuación)	

EIGHTH MEETING
HUITIEME SEANCE
OCTAVA SESION

(16 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	164
<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
13. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (English only); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continued)	
13. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (anglais seulement); C 87/3- Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (suite)	164
13. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (en inglés solamente); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continuación)	

NINTH MEETING
NEUVIEME SEANCE
NOVENA SESION

(16 November 1987)

Page/Página

II	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	190
II	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN</u> (continuación)	
13.	<u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (English only); C 87/3-Sup.1; C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continued)	
13.	<u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (anglais seulement); C 87/3-Sup.1. C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (suite)	190
13.	<u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 87/3; C 87/3-Corr.1; C 87/3-Corr.2 (en inglés solamente); C 87/3-Sup.1 C 87/3-Sup.2; C 87/3-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/21) (continuación)	
14.	<u>Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes</u> (C87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F); C 87/8-Sup.1; C 87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	
14.	<u>Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (C 87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F); C 87/8-Sup.1; C 87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	206
14.	<u>Examen del Programa Ordinario, en particular, evaluación de los programas especiales de acción</u> (C 87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F); C 87/8-Sup.1; C 87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	
	<u>RIGHT OF REPLY</u>	
	<u>DROIT DE REPONSE</u>	215
	<u>DERECHO DE REPLICA</u>	

TENTH MEETING
DIXIEME SEANCE
DECIMA SESION

(17 November 1987)

II.	<u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II.	<u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	218
II.	<u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
14.	<u>Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes</u> (C 87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F); C 87/8-Sup.1; C 87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	
14.	<u>Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (C 87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F) ; C 87/8-Sup.1; C87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	218
14.	<u>Examen del Programa Ordinario, en particular, evaluación de los programas especiales de acción</u> (C 87/8; C 87/8-Corr.1(F); C 87/8-Sup.1; C 87/8-Sup.2; C 87/8-Sup.3; C 87/LIM/19)	

ELEVENTH MEETING
ONZIEME SEANCE
UNDECIMA SESION

(17 November 1987)

	<u>Page/Página</u>
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	242
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
14. <u>Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19) (continued)	
14. <u>Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19)(Suite)	242
14. <u>Examen del Programa ordinario, en particular evaluación de los programas especiales de acción</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19)(continuación)	
<u>Right of Reply</u>	
<u>Droit de Réponse</u>	266
<u>Derecho de Replica</u>	

TWELFTH MEETING
DOUZIEME SEANCE
DUODECIMA SESION

(18 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	270
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
14. <u>Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19)(continued)	
14. <u>Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19)(suite)	270
14. <u>Examen del Programa ordinario, en particular evaluación de los programas especiales de acción</u> (C 87/8, C 87/8-Corr.1(F), C 87/8-Sup.1, C 87/8-Sup.2, C 87/8-Sup.3, C 87/LIM/19)(continuación)	
15. <u>Impact of Financial Problems on Regular Programme Activities in 1986-87</u> (C 87/23)	
15. <u>Effets des problèmes financiers sur les activités du Programme ordinaire en 1986-87</u> (C 87/23)	290
15. <u>Repercusiones de los problemas financieros sobre las actividades del Programa ordinario en 1986-87</u> (C 87/23)	

THIRTEENTH MEETING
TREIZIEME SEANCE
DECIMOTERCERA SESION

(18 November 1987)

Page/Página

<u>ADOPTION OF REPORT</u>	
<u>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT</u>	302
<u>APROBACION DEL INFORME</u>	
<u>DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART I (C 87/II/REP/1)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE I (C 87/II/REP/1)</u>	302
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE I (C 87/II/REP/1)</u>	
13 <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and</u>	
<u>Medium-Term Objectives (paras.1-43)</u>	
13 <u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et</u>	
<u>objectifs à moyen terme (par. 1-43)</u>	302
13 <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y</u>	
<u>Objetivos a Plazo Medio (párrs. 1 - 43)</u>	
<u>Context (paras.1-4)</u>	
<u>Contexte (par. 1 - 4)</u>	304
<u>Contexto (párrs. 1 - 4)</u>	

FOURTEENTH MEETING
QUATORZIEME SEANCE
DECIMOCUARTA SESION

(19 November 1987)

<u>Fifth Report of the General Committee</u>	
<u>Cinquième Rapport du Bureau</u>	320
<u>Quinto Informe de Comité General</u>	
<u>ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)</u>	
<u>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)</u>	320
<u>APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)</u>	
<u>DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 1 (C 87/II/REP/1) (continued)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION I (C 87/II/REP/1) (suite)</u>	320
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 1 (C 87/II/REP/1) (continuación)</u>	
13. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and</u>	
<u>Medium-Term Objectives (paras 1-43) (continued)</u>	
13. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et</u>	
<u>objectifs à moyen terme (par. 1-43) (suite)</u>	320
13. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y</u>	
<u>Objetivos a Plazo Medio (párrs. 1-43) (continuación)</u>	

	<u>Page/Página</u>
<u>Context (paras 1-4) (continued)</u>	
<u>Contexte (par. 1-4) (suite)</u>	320
<u>Contexto (párrs. 1-4) (continuación)</u>	
<u>Approach (paras 5-7)</u>	
<u>Démarche (par. 5-7)</u>	320
<u>Enfoque (párrs. 5-7)</u>	
<u>Strategies, Priorities and Objectives (paras 8-17)</u>	
<u>Stratégies, priorités et objectifs (par. 8-17)</u>	320
<u>Estrategias, prioridades y objetivos (párrs. 8-17)</u>	
<u>Financial Framework (paras 18-24)</u>	
<u>Cadre financier (par. 18-24)</u>	320
<u>Marco financiero (párrs. 18-24)</u>	
<u>Level of the Budget (paras 25-28)</u>	
<u>Niveau du budget (par. 25-28)</u>	320
<u>Nivel del presupuesto (párrs. 25-28)</u>	
<u>Programme Activities (paras 29-43)</u>	
<u>Activités du Programme (par. 29-43)</u>	320
<u>Actividades del programa (párrs. 29-43)</u>	
(a) <u>Chapter 1: General Policy and Direction (para 30)</u>	
a) <u>Chapitre 1: Politique et direction générales (par. 30)</u>	320
a) <u>Capítulo 1; Política y dirección general (párr. 30)</u>	
(b) <u>Chapter 2: Technical and Economic Programmes (paras 31-40)</u>	
b) <u>Chapitre 2: Programmes techniques et économiques (par. 31-40)</u>	320
b) <u>Capítulo 2: Programas técnicos y económicos (párrs. 31-40)</u>	
(c) <u>Chapter 3: Development Support Programmes (paras 41-42)</u>	
c) <u>Chapitre 3: Programme de soutien du développement (par. 41-42)</u>	320
c) <u>Capítulo 3: Programas de apoyo al desarrollo (párrs. 41-42)</u>	
(d) <u>Chapter 4: Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) (para 43)</u>	
d) <u>Chapitre 4: Programme de coopération technique (PCT) (par. 43)</u>	320
d) <u>Capítulo 4; Programa de Cooperación Técnica (PCT) (párr. 43)</u>	
<p>FIFTEENTH MEETING QUINZIEME SEANCE DECIMOQUINTA SESION</p> <p>(19 November 1987)</p>	
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)</u>	348
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)</u>	

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 17. | <u>Implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development (C 87/24)</u> | |
| 17. | <u>Application de la stratégie et des Programmes d'action approuvés en 1984 par la Conférence mondiale de la FAO sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches (C 87/24)</u> | 348 |
| 17. | <u>Ejecución de la Estrategia y Programas de Acción Aprobados en 1984 por la Conferencia Mundial de la FAO sobre la Ordenación y Pesqueros (C 87/24)</u> | |

SIXTEENTH MEETING
SEIZIEME SEANCE
DECIMOSEXTA SESION

(20 November 1987)

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| II. | <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)</u> | |
| II. | <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)</u> | 382 |
| II. | <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)</u> | |
| 18. | <u>Follow-up to Tropical Forestry Action Plan and International Conference on Trees and Forests - SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)</u> | |
| 18. | <u>Suite donnée au Plan d'action forestier tropical et à la Conférence internationale sur l'arbre et la forêt - SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)</u> | 382 |
| 18. | <u>Aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos y de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Arbol y el Bosque – SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)</u> | |

SEVENTEENTH MEETING
DIX-SEPTIEME SEANCE
DECIMOSEPTIMA SESION

(23 November 1987)

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| II. | <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)</u> | |
| II. | <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)</u> | 436 |
| II. | <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)</u> | |
| 16. | <u>Review of Field Programmes (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)</u> | |
| 16. | <u>Examen des programmes de terrain (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)</u> | 436 |
| 16. | <u>Examen de los programas de campo (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)</u> | |

EIGHTEENTH MEETING
DIX-HUITIEME SÉANCE
DECIMOCTAVA SESION

(23 November 1987)

	<u>Page</u> <u>Página</u>
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	454
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
16. <u>Review of Field Programmes</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20) (continued)	
16. <u>Examen des programmes de terrain</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20) (suite)	454
16. <u>Examen de los programas de campo</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20) (continuación)	

NINETEENTH MEETING
DIX-NEUVIEME SEANCE
DECIMONOVENA SESION

(23 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	490
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
16. <u>Review of Field Programmes</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)(continued)	
16. <u>Examen des programmes de terrain</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)(suite)	490
16. <u>Examen de los programas de campo</u> (C 87/4; C 87/LIM/20)(continuación)	
19. <u>United Nations/FAO World Food Programme</u> (C 87/LIM/5)	
19. <u>Programme alimentaire mond iale Nat ions Unies/FAO</u> (C 87/LIM/5)	493
19. <u>Programa Mundial de Alimentos Naciones Unidas/FAO</u> (C 87/LIM/5)	
20. <u>Relations and Consultations with International Organizations</u>	
20. <u>Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales</u>	508
20. <u>Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales</u>	
20.1 <u>Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24)	
20.1 <u>Préparation de la session extraordinaire de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies consacrée à l'Afrique et actions consécutives</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24)	508
20.1 <u>Preparación y medidas complementarias del período extraordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas dedicado a Africa</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24)	

TWENTIETH MEETING
VINGTIEME SEANCE
VIGESIMA SESION
(24 November 1987)

	<u>Page/Página</u>
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	514
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	
20. <u>Relations and Consultations with International Organizations</u> (continued)	
20. <u>Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales</u> (suite)	514
20. <u>Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales</u> (continuación)	
20.1 <u>Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24) (continued)	
20.1 <u>Préparation de la session extraordinaire de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies consacrée à l'Afrique et actions consécutives</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24) (suite)	514
20.1 <u>Preparación y medidas complementarias del período extraordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas dedicado a Africa</u> (C 87/26; C 87/LIM/24) (continuación)	
20.2 <u>Other Recent Developments in the UN System of Interest to FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23)	
20.2 <u>Autres faits nouveaux survenus dans le système des Nations Unies et intéressant la FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23)	520
20.2 <u>Otras novedades recientes en el sistema de las Naciones Unidas de interés para la FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23)	

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING
VINGT ET UNIEME SEANCE
VIGESIMOPRIMERA SESION

(24 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION</u> (continued)	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION</u> (suite)	
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION</u> (continuación)	528
20. <u>Relations and Consultations with International Organizations</u> (continued)	
20. <u>Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales</u> (suite)	
20. <u>Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales</u> (continuación)	528
20.2 <u>Other Recent Developments in the UN System of Interest to FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23) (continued)	
20.2 <u>Autres faits nouveaux survenus dans le système des Nations Unies et intéressant la FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23) (suite)	523
20.2 <u>Otras novedades recientes en el sistema de las Naciones Unidas de interés para la FAO</u> (C 87/9; C 87/9-Sup.I; C 87/LIM/23) (continuación)	

20.3	<u>Relations with Intergovernmental and International Non-governmental Organizations</u> (C 87/17)	
20.3	<u>Relations avec les organisations intergouvernementales et les organisations internationales non gouvernementales</u> (C 87/17)	547
20.3	<u>Relaciones con organizaciones intergubernamentales y organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales</u> (C 87/17)	
15.	<u>Impact of Financial Problems on Regular Programme Activities in 1986-87</u> (C 87/23) (continued)	
15.	<u>Effets des problèmes financiers sur les activités du Programme ordinaire 1986-87</u> (C 87/23) (suite)	567
15.	<u>Repercusiones de los problemas financieros sobre las actividades del Programa Ordinario de 1986-87</u> (C 87/23) (continuación)	
<p>TWENTY-SECOND MEETING VINGT-DEUXIEME SEANCE VIGESIMOSEGUNDA SESION (25 November 1987)</p>		
	<u>ADOPTION OF REPORT</u> (continued)	
	<u>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT</u> (suite)	584
	<u>APROBACION DEL INFORME</u> (continuación)	
	<u>DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II PART 2</u> (C 87/II/REP/2)	
	<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - DEUXIEME PARTIE</u> (C 87/II/REP/2)	584
	<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PART 2</u> (C 87/II/REP/2)	
14.	<u>Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes</u> (paras. 1 - 30)	
14.	<u>Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris l'évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (par. 1 - 30)	591
14.	<u>Examen del Programa Ordinario, en particular evaluación de los Programas Especiales de Acción</u> (párrs. 1 - 30)	
A.	<u>Review of the Regular Programme 1986-87</u> (paras. 4 - 13)	
A.	<u>Examen du Programme ordinaire 1986-87</u> (par. 4 - 13)	591
A.	<u>Examen del Programa Ordinario 1986-87</u> (párrs. 4 - 13)	
B.	<u>External Evaluations of Three Special Action Programmes</u> (paras. 14 - 30)	
B.	<u>Evaluation externe de trois programmes d'action spéciaux</u> (par. 14 - 30)	591
B.	<u>Evaluaciones externas de tres Programas Especiales de Acción</u> (párrs. 14 - 30)	

	<u>Page/Página</u>
17. <u>Implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development</u> (paras. 31 - 48)	
17. <u>Mise en oeuvre de la Stratégie et des Programmes d'action approuvés en 1984 Par la Conférence mondiale de la FAO sur l'aménagement le développement des pêches</u> (par. 31 - 48)	591
17. <u>Ejecución de la Estrategia y los Programas de Acción aprobados en 1984 por la Conferencia Mundial de la FAO sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros</u> (párrs. 31 - 48)	
- <u>The Strategy</u> (paras. 32 - 40)	
- <u>La Strategie</u> (Par. 32 - 40)	591
- <u>La Estrategia</u> (párrs. 32 - 40)	
- <u>The Programmes of Action</u> (paras. 41 - 45)	
- <u>Les Programmes d'action</u> (par. 41 - 45)	591
- <u>Los Programas de Acción</u> (párrs. 41 - 45)	
- <u>Other follow-up actions to the 1984 World Fisheries Conference</u> (paras. 46 - 48)	
- <u>Autres activités de prolongement de la Conférence mondiale sur les peches de 1984</u> (par. 46 - 48)	591
- <u>Otras actividades complementarias de la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca del 1984</u> (párrs. 46 - 48)	
18. <u>Follow-up Tropical Forestry Action Plan and International Conference on Trees and Forests SILVA 1986</u> (paras. 49-57)	
18. <u>Suite donnée au Plan d'action forestier tropical et à la Conférence internationale sur l'arbre et la forêt - SILVA 1986</u> (par. 49 - 57)	592
18. <u>Aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos y de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Arbol y el Bosque, SILVA 1986</u> (párrs. 49 - 57)	
<u>DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 3 (C 87/II/REP/3)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE 3 (C 87/II/REP/3)</u>	606
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 3 (C 87/II/REP/3)</u>	
16. <u>Review of Field Programmes 1986-87</u> (paras. 1 - 17)	
16. <u>Examen des Programmes de terrain 1986-87</u> (par. 1-17)	607
16. <u>Examen de los Programas de Campo 1986 - 87</u> (párrs. 1 - 17)	
19. <u>United Nations/FAO World Food Programme</u> (paras. 18 - 28)	
19. <u>Programme alimentaire mondial (ONU/FAO)</u> (par. 18 - 28)	607
19. <u>Programa Mundial de Alimentos Naciones Unidas/FAO</u> (Párrs. 18 -28)	
- <u>World Food Programme:</u>	
- <u>Programme alimentaire mondial:</u>	607
- <u>Programa Mundial de Alimentos:</u>	
<u>Proposed Pledging Target for 1989-90</u> (Resolution .../87)	
<u>Objectif de contributions proposé pour 1989-90</u> (Résolution .../87)	607
<u>Objetivo propuesto de las promesas de contribución para 1989-90</u> (Resolución .../87)	

TWENTY-THIRD MEETING
VINGT-TROISIEME SÉANCE
VIGESIMOTERCERA SESION

(25 November 1987)

	<u>Page/Página</u>
<u>DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 3 (C 87/II/REP/3) (continued)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE 3 (C 87/II/REP/3) (suite)</u>	610
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 3 (C 87/II/REP/3) (continuación)</u>	
16. <u>Review of Field Programmes 1986-87 (paras. 1 -17)</u>	
16. <u>Examen des Programmes de terrain 1986-87 (par. 1 - 17)</u>	610
16. <u>Examen de los Programas de Campo 1986-87 (párrs. 1 - 17)</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)</u>	625
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)</u>	
12. <u>Consideration of review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup. 1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Res. 1; C 87/LIM/50)</u>	
12. <u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup. 1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Res. 1; C 87/LIM/50)</u>	625
12. <u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup. 1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Res. 1; C 87/LIM/50)</u>	

TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING
VINGT-QUATRIEME SEANCE
VIGESIMOCUARTA SESION

(26 November 1987)

II. <u>ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)</u>	674
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)</u>	
12. <u>Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Rev.1)</u>	
12. <u>Examen éventuel de certains aspects del buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Rev.1 ; C 87/LIM/50)</u>	674
12. <u>Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación) (C 87/30; C 87/30-Sup.1; C 87/LIM/27; C 87/LIM/28; C 87/LIM/29-Rev.1; (C 87/LIM/50)</u>	

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/1

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

FIRST MEETING
PREMIERE SEANCE
PRIMERA SESION
(10 November 1987)

The First Meeting was opened at 14.50 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La première séance est ouverte à 14 h 50
sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la primera sesión a las 14.50 horas
bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process
12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme
12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestacion por programas

CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the Commission II meeting. I am sorry that we are starting a bit late. It will be the last time that we start a bit late. My personal justification is that I have just come from a meeting attended by the Director-General. We should, of course, have anticipated such discussions so we are 20 minutes late today and we will try to make up for that by moving things along a little faster than we otherwise might have. We will start tomorrow morning promptly at 9.30.

Because of the fact that we run up additional costs if we exceed our time by a small amount -- even by only five minutes -- it is just as costly as if we had exceeded our time by three hours. We are going to make a judgement on whether or not to work overtime so that we can have an orderly transcription for the persons doing the translations, and so I would ask you to please bear those considerations in mind.

At this point we normally announce the vice-chairmen and introduce them, but as you may know, they have not yet been elected by the Conference. We will get to that item later.

This Commission has a very full schedule, Part II of the Agenda of the Conference, items 12 through 20. We have sixteen meetings that we foresee to cover these items plus three additional meetings to adopt our report. The timetable is contained in Document C 87/LIM/26. Document C 87/INF/12 which has just been issued providing additional lists for documents for this Conference will be considered and I am sure you will wish to obtain these documents promptly. We will be electing a draft committee to prepare a report and I will be contacting the regional groups in order to make a proposal to you about its composition. If there are no comments we will start to move on to the first item, item 12:

The Secretary has an announcement to make in this connection on a technical item. Will the Secretary please make that announcement at this point.

Ms. Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary of Commission II) I am afraid there is an error in the Spanish version of C 87/30-Sup.I. The reference to the page numbers in Appendix A is incorrect and should read "pages A-56 to A-74" in the Spanish version. The other language versions are correct.

CHAIRMAN: We have many items to discuss and a limited amount of time. We want to provide for balanced, fair and open discussion. As Chairman, I would propose that in the discussion on the reform items for which we have before us a great number of papers submitted by countries we will have views expressed by the prime sponsor of each paper and also, those expressed by persons who did not submit papers. I would suggest that a valid and appropriate form of discussion, here would 'be, rather than running all the countries who have submitted papers together and then having a reaction to them, to try to achieve some sort of balance. We would have the prime sponsor of a paper speak and then recognize a country that was not the prime sponsor of a paper, so that we can have an on-going back-and-forth dialogue, rather than having all one viewpoint at the beginning and all possible variations of that and differences of view at the end. We would then have throughout the discussions on the issue a back-and-forth conversation that will enable all views to be heard

throughout, and not just at the end of the meeting. In other words, during the course of the meeting at any point there will be a pretty balanced presentation of different thoughts. At this point I should like to give the floor to the Deputy Director-General to introduce the item before us.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Mr Chairman, it is not necessary for me to make an elaborate introduction of this item. I would merely recall that it started just about a year ago in the FAO Council at its Ninetieth Session. The events which led up to the submission of the 10 papers before the Conference are related in the first paragraphs of Document C 87/30 and I do not believe it is necessary for me to repeat them. I would like only to draw attention to the remarks which the Director-General made on this matter in his introductory statement to the FAO Conference yesterday. The actual text of his speech is available in the various languages. There is one paragraph in that text in which he summarizes very succinctly the actual issues which are now before the Commission.

The first is whether a review of some aspects of FAO is necessary. If that is felt necessary the Conference needs to agree on the appropriate subjects, the method to be followed, the timetable for discussions and the process of arriving at conclusions. This is a matter which is in the hands of member governments and whatever the final decision may be the Secretariat will collaborate fully and to the utmost of its capacity in carrying out that decision.

There is only one point that I would like to underline very strongly, and this too appears in the Director-General's speech. That is the need for the Director-General and the Secretariat to be very closely and intimately associated with any review process that the Conference may decide to set in train. I believe that is all I need to say at the start of the debate. There may be many questions from individual delegations on this point or that point, and we shall of course be very glad to answer them in due course.

CHAIRMAN: I thank the Deputy Director-General for his statement. At this time I would like to point out that we try to follow the spirit of the 24-hour principle used in the United Nations organizations. There have been some informal requests about resolutions to be advanced and we would like to have a procedure whereby those resolutions are advanced in an orderly fashion. Reference is made to them today, they are properly translated and then given to all representatives in their language. They can have adequate time to read and study any resolutions that might be advanced, with them of course going before the Resolutions Committee.

At this point are there any resolutions that would be announced not to be discussed or debated today, but to be translated as quickly as possible and made available to you? Is there any country here that has a resolution?

H. HØSTMARK (Norway): Since this is the first time that my delegation takes the floor permit me to take a minute of time to extend our heartiest congratulation upon your election to office, Mr Chairman. I am sure that the Commission under your able leadership will reach valuable conclusions on its deliberations. As you have indicated, I have a draft resolution. It has been handed to the Secretariat. I understand that for ease of the members of the Commission it will be preliminarily circulated today. However, since we have not had the benefit of the advice of the Resolutions Committee I formally request you to put off substantive discussion on it until such time as the Resolutions Committee has passed it. If you grant this request, Mr Chairman, I also ask you to grant me the floor again to give a substantive introduction of the resolution at that time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will see that the resolution is properly forwarded to the Resolutions Committee. We will confirm that and urge expeditious translation so that we can have the material before everyone for adequate consideration. At the appropriate point on the Agenda your country will be given the floor to discuss the resolution. Are there any others?

A. GAYOSO (United States of America): Like my Norwegian colleague, allow me to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, on your appointment. This promises to be a very interesting Commission. We have also introduced a resolution and I had the pleasure of delivering a copy of it to the Secretary of the Resolutions Committee this morning. I would like very much if later in the debate I am allowed to make a substantive intervention on the contents of that resolution, but at this time I just wanted to put on the record that we will have a resolution, that it has been delivered, and that it will be in the hands of the Commission as soon as the Resolutions Committee looks it over.

CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of those present, there will be no substantive discussion of any resolution at this point. We have been formally advised that the Norwegian resolution will be available for distribution, possibly later this evening, and I am sure they will be most cooperative in sharing with you the resolution when it is available. I am also advised that the USA resolution will not be available before the end of the day or tomorrow morning and that too will be available to everyone. For the United States the same principle applies, namely that as soon as it is properly in order your right to speak on that issue will be respected by the Chair.

Are there any other countries who have resolutions that ought to be advanced at this point? There is none. The delegate of Libya has caught the attention of the Chair. The Government of Libya is not a prime sponsor of any paper and it would be appropriate to have the delegate of Libya to speak second. At this point the Chair recognizes the delegate of Switzerland and he will be followed by the delegate of Libya.

I. MARINCEK (Suisse): Monsieur le Président, j'aimerais d'abord vous féliciter de votre élection à la présidence de cette Commission. J'aimerais ensuite remercier M. Walt'ôñ pour l'introduction du sujet et du document C 87/30.

Permettez-moi de rappeler d'emblée que la Suisse partage l'avis exprimé par de nombreux pays, à savoir qu'il est temps, après plus de 40 ans d'existence de la FAO, de procéder à un examen en profondeur de notre Organisation, notamment en ce qui concerne son rôle et sa stratégie à long terme.

Nous appuyons également la proposition selon laquelle la Conférence, dans la 24ème session, devrait envisager la constitution d'une commission consultative et temporaire d'experts de haut niveau, qui serait chargée de conduire un tel examen et d'en faire rapport au Conseil et à la prochaine Conférence. Ces experts éminents devraient être représentatifs des régions et choisis par celles-ci. Nous sommes par ailleurs tout à fait d'accord avec le Directeur général sur le fait que le Secrétariat doit apporter sa contribution à cet effort de réflexion. C'est pourquoi nous proposons que la FAO mette à la disposition de cette Commission des fonctionnaires qui auraient pour tâche de l'assister dans son travail comme cela a déjà été fait avec succès lors de l'évaluation du Programme d'assistance à la sécurité alimentaire (PASA).

Permettez-moi également de souligner le caractère consultatif et temporaire de la Commission proposée car il y a eu des malentendus à ce sujet dans le passé. C'est la commission qui devra faire des recommandations; mais ce seront les organes existants, notamment la prochaine Conférence, qui devront tirer les conclusions de l'examen et prendre les décisions.

Et je tiens à rappeler qu'il s'agit de rendre la FAO plus efficace et non pas de la remettre en question. Nous voulons, comme nous l'avons toujours souligné, une FAO plus forte, plus compétente et plus écoutée; une FAO qui n'éparpille pas ses efforts face à sa grande tâche qui est celle de libérer l'humanité de la faim.

Pourquoi des réformes sont-elles nécessaires? Parce qu'un habitant de notre planète sur dix souffre de faim ou de malnutrition; ils sont les pauvres des pays pauvres; ce sont ces individus qui sont la principale raison d'être de la FAO, même s'ils ne s'y trouvent représentés qu'indirectement. Nos déclarations, nos engagements, nos pactes ne doivent pas rester lettre morte pour eux.

Les problèmes sont pressants. On nous dit que plus de 80 pour cent des personnes les plus pauvres vivent dans les campagnes du tiers monde. Demain ces pauvres viendront rejoindre ceux des villes.

Si nous perdons la bataille du développement rural, les problèmes des villes deviendront insurmontables et nous perdrons la bataille du développement tout court.

La FAO n'est pas seule à s'intéresser aux problèmes du développement. Elle doit donc concentrer ses activités sur les domaines de ses avantages comparatifs; et elle doit coopérer au mieux possible avec les autres institutions du système des Nations Unies en vue d'une division du travail et d'une coordination efficace. Les doubles emplois ne coûtent pas seulement cher, ils affaiblissent aussi l'impact des actions.

Le Directeur général, dans son discours d'ouverture d'hier, nous a rappelé que la FAO et tout le système multilatéral traversent une crise existentielle très grave, une crise d'identité. Comment répondre à cette crise qui n'est pas seulement une crise financière mais qui est également nourrie par des doutes et par des déceptions face à la lenteur des progrès?

A notre avis, l'examen proposé est la seule réponse valable à cette crise. Certes, le Directeur général a mis beaucoup d'efforts à réduire les coûts des programmes. Il nous a rappelé les initiatives qu'il a prises depuis 10 ans pour "déb-ureaucratiser" l'organisation. Des coupures linéaires permettent certes de réduire les coûts. Cependant, nous ne nous intéressons pas en premier lieu aux inputs mais plutôt aux outputs, c'est-à-dire aux résultats du travail de notre Organisation. Si les résultats sont plus convaincants, si la contribution de la FAO au progrès peut être démontrée plus solidement, les ressources mises à la disposition de notre Organisation ne manqueront certainement pas.

Pour nous, le vent des réformes est nécessaire pour assister le Secrétariat dans sa tâche difficile de choisir les priorités, de mieux orienter son action, de servir de catalyseur. Le vent des réformes est également nécessaire pour mieux mettre en valeur le personnel de la FAO qui est le vrai capital de l'organisation, comme l'a si bien souligné le Directeur général. Quels devraient alors être les sujets de l'examen proposé? J'aimerais rappeler que mon pays a activement contribué à la discussion sur la nécessité de réformes lors de la dernière séance du Conseil. Nous avons formulé des propositions écrites qui figurent dans le document C 87/30 de cette Conférence. Elles portent en particulier sur les 3 points suivants:

Premièrement, la FAO devrait jouer plus utilement son rôle en ce qui concerne l'analyse et les conseils en matière de politique agricole; les spécialistes de la FAO qui sont chargés de cette tâche doivent jouir de l'indépendance nécessaire pour faire état des problèmes clés et des remèdes correspondants, même s'il est politiquement délicat de le faire.

Deuxièmement, le programme de terrain devrait être soumis à une orientation et à une supervision plus marquée des Etats Membres. A cet effet, serait créé un comité du programme de terrain. Parallèlement les comités des finances et du Programme seraient fusionnés en un seul, de sorte qu'il n'y aurait numériquement pas d'organe additionnel.

Troisièmement, les agriculteurs, qui sont au premier rang des utilisateurs des services de la FAO, devraient avoir plus directement voix au chapitre. Aussi proposons-nous d'examiner si un comité existant pourrait être transformé en un "Comité des organisations paysannes".

Dans le développement on a longtemps misé trop exclusivement sur le transfert des connaissances techniques. On a hésité à donner des conseils en matière de politique, craignant qu'ils pourraient être ressentis comme une ingérence dans la souveraineté nationale des pays. Mais il n'en reste pas moins que des politiques inadaptées sont, à elles seules, un indicateur de sous-développement, qu'elles freinent le développement dans de nombreux pays. L'étude de la FAO sur l'agriculture africaine présentée il y a une année a été claire sur ce point. Trop de projets, trop d'investissements sont restés sans effet durable et n'ont malheureusement pas permis d'obtenir d'autres résultats qu'un endettement croissant, car ils n'ont pas été suffisamment encadrés dans une conception de politique agricole. Les gouvernements concernés doivent mettre de l'ordre dans leur maison s'ils veulent éviter que les critiques à l'égard de l'aide au développement ne s'amplifient.

Ma délégation a donc noté avec satisfaction les propositions pour une nouvelle approche de la FAO dans le domaine de l'analyse et des conseils en matière de politique agricole, propositions qui ont été formulées dans le rapport d'évaluation du Programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire

(PASA), soumis à cette Conférence. Ces propositions vont tout à fait dans le sens de nos préoccupations et nous nous réjouissons de voir qu'elles ont été bien reçues par le Directeur général.

Quand nous parlons de la nécessité de réformes à la FAO, nous sommes bien conscients que les problèmes ont, pour une bonne part, leur origine dans la divergence des expectations des pays membres. Nous devons être moins égoïstes et veiller à ne pas demander à la FAO des activités et services qui la poussent à éparpiller ses efforts et à affaiblir l'impact de son action. Il faut savoir choisir des priorités. Ceci est un processus difficile qui demande des sacrifices de part et d'autre; mais si nous réussissons, la FAO en sortira grandie et les pays en développement seront les premiers à en profiter. Les réformes sont une affaire entre nous, pays membres; c'est à nous de faciliter le travail du Secrétariat et d'en faire le meilleur usage.

Permettez-moi de terminer en rappelant que nos idées de réformes sont données à titre informatif. La 24ème Conférence devra s'occuper en premier lieu de la question de savoir s'il faut ou non entamer un processus de réforme et créer un mécanisme approprié.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Before expressing my country's views on this important document before us I would like to make a general comment, with your permission, and it is this: I appreciate the views that have just been expressed on the procedure we are going to follow in discussing this document as you put it forward. However, there is one point with which I would disagree with you, as regards the nature of this document. This document was distributed to all member states, quite recently, but everybody has had a chance to see it so I think all Member Nations should be able to discuss this document because it is one of the most important documents that is before us, so it should not be just a matter of one for and one against and thus have a limited number of statements on the document. This is just on procedure.

Now, as regards my country's views on the substance I would say that my delegation has studied this document with great deliberation. We have considered its medium- and long-term implications and the views that I am putting forward now are the considered views emerging from the fact that we know we have a high degree of responsibility for the success of the work of the Organization, all of us, because the Organization exists to serve the Member Nations. We must therefore be frank and open from the very beginning and my delegation intends to refuse anything that might strike at the balanced position of the Organization or that might hamstring the exercise of the Organization's work.

Now there are some global subjects but they are important, essential subjects or points which are the following: the consideration of this problem as put forward by a number of countries who have submitted proposals implies that the Organization has not made progress, or hardly any progress since it was established, that seems to be the suggestion behind these various proposals but we know very well that FAO is a dynamic Organization which has been meeting a lot of challenges, it has been dealing with the needs, the changing needs of Member Nations and the changing economic situation of the world

Secondly, the deterioration of the economies of the developing countries, and also of developed countries, is after all the basic problem which we have now before us and the Organization has had to cope with that as adequately as it could within its programmes and within its budget. However, there is a problem that some Member Nations have not paid their due contributions to the Organization which is really the main cause of the financial crisis, the treasury crisis which the Organization is suffering from at the present time. I think we can say it is a crisis of our own making and now we have to solve it ourselves too.

Thirdly, we too believe certainly in the ideal of constructive reform and we are ready to make all the necessary efforts to strengthen our Organization to make it more vital, more effective, so that it can deal more effectively with the needs of Member States.

Quite frankly, we feel that we must say we refuse and reject reform if such reform fails to respect the sovereign rights of all Member States and if it tends to limit the assistance of FAO only to those countries which make a substantial contribution to its budget. This Organization exists to serve all countries and we feel it should go on serving all countries.

In the document that has been placed before us we feel that there is this bias which would negative the spirit which has inspired the Organization since the beginning. In other words, the equality of opportunity, the equality of decision-making and equality for all the Member Nations. Having said that, we would like to stress that we are ready to join in the process of taking all necessary decisions concerning constructive reform which will make it possible for the Organization to be more effective and to serve the developing countries of the world more usefully. In fact, our views do not differ at all from those of the developing countries which have sponsored one of the papers Included in this document now before us under number 10.

We support paragraph 12 of that section which deals with Strategies and Priorities. We also support paragraph 17 of the same document. We have said quite clearly that all reform should take place within the framework of the existing institutions and within the framework of the existing constitution. For this reason we support paragraph 25 in addition. As regards the work of the Organization over the last two decades I think we should appreciate the fact that a lot of changes have been introduced by the Director-General during his term of office in order to achieve much greater economy. Much greater economy has, in fact, been achieved in order to make the Organization more effective. New priorities have been set at various meetings and conferences and then implemented. So, I would say that we support the views put forward by colleagues from developing countries in the written paper which they have submitted.

I should like to add that reform will be effective and useful provided that it truly meets the needs of developing countries and is not limited simply to certain of those countries.

CHAIRMAN: I should like to make a point of clarification on a point raised by the delegate of Libya. He expressed the view he hoped that everybody would have an equal opportunity to speak. That is a valid point, and I assure him that everybody will under the procedures that were laid forth. What we said was that we would try to follow a balanced pattern in having a country which has submitted a paper to speak; and a country which has not submitted such a paper to speak; every country would, under such a procedure, have an equal opportunity to speak. This way you would have an ongoing dialogue. For example Switzerland, which requested the floor is a country which has submitted a paper, and therefore it was recognized. Libya is a country which has not and therefore we went to you second. Following that rotation as we have looked for a recognition the next on our list is a country that is a prime sponsor of a paper; namely paper No. 10. The prime sponsor of that paper is the Government of Mexico and at this point we recognize that country. There is a point of order from Costa Rica

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr. Presidente, el método de procedimiento que usted acaba de proponer no está previsto en la reglamentación; usted tiene derecho a proponerlo, sin embargo tiene que ser el conjunto de la Comisión mediante votación quien pueda aceptarlo o no aceptarlo. Mi delegación no está de acuerdo que haya decisiones unilaterales de la Presidencia.

CHAIRMAN: If I can point out to the delegate of Costa Rica that that was not stated as a procedure, but as a suggestion and there was a feeling from the desk here that there was general conformity. You are absolutely right in your point of order. It is for the body to decide. To facilitate an orderly proceeding, the Chair suggested that when dealing with a controversial issue we try to give a balanced presentation to the pros and cons or differences. We present an opportunity for everyone to speak, and we try to do so in an orderly fashion.

If we began with a procedure where we had all the countries who had presented papers speak first we would have nine countries which have said very similar things and then one country, the Government of Mexico as the prime sponsor, coming in tenth and speaking for another view which has been

concurred with by a number of other countries. This would be followed by those who have not. So, the Chair suggested, that it might be an orderly proceeding to follow a balanced approach. Where you have a country which has shown the interest to submit a paper speak and then countries which, for whatever reasons, have not submitted a paper speak and you balance that. I would suggest to the representative of Costa Rica that as a result of that, we would achieve a balanced approach. We had the Government of Switzerland present a view because it had a paper. The Government of Libya which did not have a paper spoke on behalf of views which were expressed in another paper. They endorsed another paper. Then we had next in line the prime sponsor of a paper, the Government of Mexico.

Now was the delegate's point of order simply to state the point of order to have clarification on a consensus? Do you agree with the procedure or not? Do you think it is a fair or orderly system, or are you suggesting it is not a fair or orderly system?

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Me parece que el debate debería ser libre, o sea que las delegaciones tuvieran la palabra en el orden que la pidan, como se hace de costumbre. Disculpe esta insistencia, pero yo creo que es más importante y más sencillo que usted y toda la Comisión tenga una idea clara de dónde se dirige el consenso, si el debate es completamente libre. Sin embargo, puede usted consultar mediante una votación levantando la mano sobre qué procedimiento prefieren.

CHAIRMAN: Let me respond to your Point of Order. The Chair assures you that at the time the Chair made that suggestion there was a general concurrence. There was a question raised by the representative of Libya, I in fact called for an interpretation. I deliberately made a point of clarification to assure him that under such an orderly proceeding everybody has a chance. I simply thought that it would be a good procedure. An informal discussion with representatives of varying viewpoints seemed to concur with the idea that it would be good to try to go back and forth. The interpretation is that one government submitted what you would call a reform proposal spoke first, and a country which had opposed that spoke second. Then a country which has an opposite viewpoint is speaking third. So if anyone were to suggest a bias at this point in the discussion, the bias would clearly be going towards those who do not advocate some of the reform papers. But over a period of a few hours, or a day, of discussion you will have an even viewpoint.

I should like to have a show of hands for a vote of confidence in that kind of an orderly procedure A Point of Order from the representative of Mexico.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Sr. Presidente, yo le había pedido una moción de orden, no la palabra, hace un buen rato. Usted no me la concedió y le dio la palabra a otra delegación. Yo había pedido la moción de orden, que coincide en buena parte con la de Costa Rica, que en verdad la interpreto como una moción.

CHAIRMAN: You were not denied the floor. The representative of Costa Rica raised a point of order and that takes precedence. He has not, in the judgement of the Chair, nor in his own judgement, finished with his Point of Order. Therefore under the Rules, even if you were requesting a Point of Order you would come after his Point of Order. You were raising your hand also - and please understand the ruling of the Chair - as you were the next in line to speak. If someone else, other than Costa Rica, had sought recognition at that time you would be given precedence because your Point of Order fouled their Point of Order. However, the Point of Order of Costa Rica was first and until Costa Rica's Point of Order is dealt with, your Point of Order must be next in line.

José Ramon LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Sr. Presidente, yo creo que la Secretaría seguramente puede dar fe de que mi punto de orden, yo había hecho la señal correspondiente, no sé si quiere usted que me levante, que grite o que pegue con mi bandera. Yo no sé si eso será necesario para que se reconozca el momento oportuno cuando pedí la moción de orden. Yo creo que lo hice con suficiente oportunidad, no se me dio la palabra y me esperé por respeto a usted y por respeto al distinguido delegado de Libia que había comenzado a hablar.

La moción de orden mía coincide en buena parte con la de Costa Rica, pero tengo otras mociones de orden que las voy a plantear una vez que se resuelva el procedimiento que usted acertadamente ha presentado a esta asamblea y es que presentara una moción de orden podrá hablar solamente otro delegado en contra y se procede a una votación; una vez terminado eso haré otra moción de orden, Presidente.

CHAIRMAN: While the representative of Libya was speaking, the Chair was informed that Costa Rica had its hand up on a point of order. Under the Rules, he then had the floor. If you simultaneously raised your sign for a Point of Order we thought that you were raising your hand to speak about the issue. We did not think that you were raising a Point of Order. The Point of Order was raised by Costa Rica. Under the Rules he received the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Chaval S. SASTRY (India): At this stage as a Point of Order and also with your permission I seek your indulgence to place before you a suggestion for your consideration. All of us who have read through the Agenda note C 87/30, realise that this is possibly the most important subject which is to come before the Twenty-fourth Conference. It has been preceded by discussions in the Council in June 1987 and also in November 1986. All this background data has been presented in some detail in this document.

My submission for your consideration would be that in the procedure that you have been good enough to outline each of the speakers on the paper presents only points of view which were contained in the paper - as the distinguished Delegate from Switzerland has done. In this document we find not only all nine papers from the Group of developed countries being presented, but also the tenth paper from a group of some nine to ten other countries has been presented.

Since all this data is available before all of us, while you recognise - you might choose to recognise - first from one group which has presented a paper and another from another group which has not presented a paper, would you like to consider that whoever speaks speaks not only on his paper but all the ten documents which have been tabled for discussion along with the summarising note. Because my submission is: basically the questions before us are: is the review necessary? If it is necessary what are the subjects on which the review is to be taken? Then what is the methodology? What is the timetable and what is the process by which we should get this done? Possibly this would be a compromise and I would specially beseech you not to put a point of order to vote. Let us arrive at the procedure by consensus, this is my special request to you.

CHAIRMAN: The chair appreciates your efforts to be helpful but we would point out one potential defect in your suggestion, and that is the chair does not think it a proper role for the Chairman to tell a sovereign country, when it is their turn to speak, what they may speak about. What the chair is trying to do is set up a procedure an order that would allow for an ongoing discussion that would be balanced, so that you would not just have all of one viewpoint. I must respectfully disagree with your suggestion that it is within the power of the chair to limit a delegate, a

representative of a sovereign country, as to what it chooses to say once it has the floor. I do not think it is our role to tell India, Libya, Switzerland, the United States, Mexico or any country that once it has the floor it may only talk of certain subjects. As far as we are concerned they are representatives of a sovereign country. We simply try to establish a fair, reasonable, orderly method so that everybody has an equal opportunity to speak. It is seen that the balance is a sensible balance. I would respectfully disagree with you. Speaking of time, you are roughly limited to 20 minutes. I would prefer not to take up so much time on procedural matters.

I would suggest that we would be best to back away from the idea of telling them what to say. Is there anybody who thinks it is unfair to have a rotation, so long as everybody has an equal chance to speak and no one is denied the opportunity to speak? I am simply trying to have an orderly basis so that there are no conflicting viewpoints.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Anwar Mohamed KHALED (Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman I do want to answer your question. I am trying to answer your question. There are problems with the translation. Mr Chairman what I would like to know is whether you would like us to adopt or approve this methodology or this procedure to be used during our discussion. I do not know whether I am to respond to this or whether I am to raise a point of order because I believe that this problem has become very, very complex. We just do not know what to do and at this stage perhaps the best thing, instead of spending so much time on this discussion, because I am afraid that time is gold, I think that we should decide right away what we want to do. If you have a proposal Mr Chairman could we have that proposal? We will discuss that proposal and then if it is necessary to vote we can proceed to a vote.

CHAIRMAN: We have a point of order. I think what we ought to do is proceed rapidly to resolve an issue. We should not spend all our time on procedure matters. The chair suggested that it might be an orderly procedure to simply rotate so that every country that wishes to speak can speak. The suggestion of the chair is that we provide for any country that wishes to speak the opportunity to speak. As best we can balance it so that you have a country which has a proposal speak, a country which does not have a proposal speak. We do not limit it only to countries which have written proposals. We do not have - as you are likely to have - a procedure whereby only those countries who have submitted proposals are speaking and the others are not. We just want to suggest everybody has an equal opportunity to speak - to say whatever the country wishes to say. We do it on a rotating basis. Cuba has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Queremos primeramente, Señor Presidente, expresar que nuestra intervención prácticamente no es una moción de orden. Estamos, tal vez, buscando un poco de orden para esta moción. Me parece que el problema no está en estos momentos en decidir.

CHAIRMAN: If you do not have a point of order you do not have the recognition of the Chair. Under the procedure, the Government of Mexico is next in line to speak and unless there is a point of order the next item on the agenda would be the request. Would the representative of Mexico confirm for the Chair whether you also wish to speak? We understood you wish to speak to the issue as

well as your point of order before. Is that correct? I'm sorry. If Mexico does not want the floor to speak we have a request from Bangladesh who is next in line to speak.

Does Cuba have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Lamento, Señor Presidente, que usted no tenga paciencia. Yo estaba diciendo que iba a poner un poco de orden para tratar de organizar la moción de orden. No estaba diciendo que no era una moción de orden.

Mi proposición es que llevamos 24 conferencias en la FAO, esta es la número 24 y, por lo general siempre en las mociones y en las discusiones se abre la discusión sobre un tema. Aquí hay un tema propuesto y este tema debemos discutirlo todos los que estamos sentados aquí y en el orden que lo pidan y en el orden que deseen intervenir. Es posible que muchos de los que han firmado hablen, y es posible que muchos de los que no han firmado hablen no quieran hablar. Creo que pretender organizar quien puede y quién no puede hablar no es correcto, no es práctica usual de 24 Conferencias. Por eso la proposición es que usted abra el debate sobre el tema, ya que usted, Señor Presidente, puede inducir al debate en la forma de buscar el consenso sobre lo que se está hablando, y esto puede crear problemas.

CHAIRMAN: The delegate of Cuba should know we are not trying to say who should speak but to do things in an orderly fashion. The reason you were asked whether it was a point of order or not a point of order was because under orderly rules the point of order would take precedence. If someone is on the list to speak someone else cannot simply decide that they go ahead unless there is a point of order. That is the reason for the interpretation of the Chair.

It was not out of disrespect to your Government but out of respect to the other governments which had first caught my attention. If you were about to speak, had the attention of the Chair, were on our list to speak next and someone else just decided to speak ahead of you, we would have to rule that they were not following proper procedure and it was your right to speak. That was simply the point we were making and that is why we asked if it was a point of order or not a point of order so that we could have an orderly proceeding. The general point you make is well taken and clearly what ought to be resolved at this point is do you or do you not wish to take the floor.

Frankly it does not matter to the Chair, recognizing a country saying a name but it could matter a balanced, orderly, interesting presentation of the issue which gives everybody an opportunity to speak. All that we were suggesting - and thought there was a consensus on - was that there be a balanced approach so that there be one viewpoint expressed for 20 minutes, a different viewpoint for 20 minutes, maybe a little bit different one for the next half hour, then another one, so that it went back and forth. You then avoid a situation in which you had only one general train of thought spoken about for an hour at a time and another for perhaps a couple of hours. The rules are simple and clear. Everyone can speak who wishes to speak and once they have the floor they can say whatever they want to say. We simply thought it would be more interesting to have an approach where you have one viewpoint for a while, another viewpoint for a while and a balance back and forth. If you do not wish to do that it does not offend the Chair. It may make for a less interesting discussion but that is your prerogative. Could I have a show of hands of those who would like to follow an approach of trying to have the country that has presented a paper speak for a while? Is that a point of order? A point of order takes precedence.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

J. AITKEN (United Kingdom): Mr Chairman, I am very mindful of the hour here and I am loath to propose this as a point of order but I think it may be helpful for the meeting if you could adjourn it for 10 minutes to enable people to consider the implications of this and then come back to you.

CHAIRMAN: That is the prerogative of the chair. But I think there is a consensus for that.

The meeting was suspended from 16.00 to 16.10 hours.
La séance est suspendue de 16 heures à 16 h 10
Se suspende la sesión de las 16.00 a las 16.10 horas.

CHAIRMAN: Our adjournment is over.

Mr Shah and I discussed this earlier in the proceedings and I suggested that what we ought to do was simply to have the countries which had submitted a paper speak, followed by countries which had not submitted papers and so try to ensure a balanced "back-and-forth". In view of the informal discussions between Mr Shah and I, we both thought that would be an orderly, even-handed and fair process that would cause no confusion. It would be welcomed as a way for everyone to have the chance to speak in a balanced manner. I made the suggestion earlier in the meeting and concluded that there was concurrence in it. Mr Shah is sitting near to me and can confirm that was our intention when we sat down and discussed the procedures. Is that correct? Very well.

That was the intent. Now it occurs to me that we have a meeting that was supposed to start at 2.30 and to end at 5.30. It did not start on time and it has spent most of its time on basically irrelevant procedural matters. It is going to end exactly at 5.30. It is going to be up to the judgement of the members as to whether you wish to spend most of your time on non-substantive matters or whether you wish to spend your time on important things. The meeting will start tomorrow at 9.30 promptly. It will end at 12.30. It will start at 2.30 in the afternoon and it will end at 5.30. If we fill all those hours with mindless discussion, so be it

If we use our time to try to serve interests that we are here to serve we will all be better for it and so will those persons whom we serve. The Chair, in dealing with the Secretariat, tries to come up with a balanced fair approach that will ensure an orderly process and would ensure that everybody has an equal opportunity to speak up to say whatever its country wishes to say and to do so in a fast-moving orderly pattern and to ensure that all points of view are heard. It is clear to the Chair that there is not a consensus view to proceed in a orderly pattern like that. The Chair would suggest that we proceed in a less desirable fashion and simply go with whoever raises his hand first and the order will be by recognition of the Secretary.

We will proceed to do it in a manner of first come first served. If it leads to a distorted situation where you have only one viewpoint heard for hours on end, then so be it. My conclusion is that is a correct interpretation. Do you want simply to forget trying to balance it and go by raising the hand? How many wish to follow what I would call the balanced approach and how many do not? The question is, who wishes to try to have a balance between those countries - incidentally, not a viewpoint, simply those countries who have not put a paper as prime sponsor and those who have and everybody speaks in that order. Who wishes to do that please raise your hand? Who does not? Who does not care? The don't cares' have it. Who wishes simply to proceed on whoever gets the secretary's attention first? Who does not? The chair rules that we will proceed and whoever gets the attention of the secretary speaks.

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH (Bangladesh): Mr Chairman, I congratulate you on being elected as Chairman of this Commission. Now that you have got over the question of deciding on a suggestion on procedure made from the Chair, I will take this opportunity to review the Agenda before us, particularly the document.

Those of us who attended the Ninety-first Session of the Council know what is behind this document. You will remember that the sentiments were high. Points of order were raised, and at one stage there was even a division of the House to decide on a point of order.

Now, it seems that we have started this session with too many points of order. That is apart. It is up to the House to raise as many points of order as they like. But as far as my Government is concerned I must explain my position, that the idea of reform and review which has been tossing around in various meetings and fora of the FAO for quite some time now is not an idea of which Bangladesh is an originator. That gives us some advantages and some disadvantages. The disadvantage is that we do not have a clear idea of what this is all about and we were not alone and that was the reason for which the Ninety-first Session of the Council merely decided that it should be included on the agenda of the next Conference, so that there could be formal discussion. Since there was no document for discussion, there was no basis for discussion at the Ninety-first Session of the Council. It was also decided that some papers on the subject would be prepared by the promoters of the concept, would be sent to the Director-General in time for circulation among the member countries, and the Director-General was also directed to present a summary. Insofar as the summary of the papers is concerned, I think the Secretariat has done its job faithfully in the sense that this is just a summary, nothing less and nothing more. That is my difficulty, because it does not make me wiser the papers present only the authors' point of view.

Coming to the papers that have been presented, we find that there are two sets of papers, one in favour of a study or review and the other may be against it, but not quite certain. Insofar as the nine papers which pleaded for a review are concerned, I find that there is considerable difference of opinion in the details. Someone said there is considerable unanimity of opinion in the sense that all the nine papers favoured some kind of a review. But one fundamental question is, why this reform. That I believe is the first question to be answered. Unless a detailed list of justifications for reform and review is presented to uninitiated members like me I am not wiser. When I say that I have a difficulty I am referring to this. Reviews on various aspects of FAO are being held by the FAO Secretariat itself, and during the course of this Conference we are going to study quite a number of such reviews. What is wrong with that? If we can list during the last 12, 15 or 20 years that FAO has been functioning what has happened, what has gone wrong with its functioning or its usefulness? To cause for a review is not clearly brought out by any of the papers, nor by the Secretariat, because the Secretariat was not asked to analyse the papers either way to show what had gone wrong, whether there were imperfections or omissions in them, nothing has been mentioned, and that was so because they were asked only to summarize the contents of the papers. So I do not blame them. But . again I repeat that an uninitiated member of FAO like Bangladesh, we are not wiser by omission of this vital aspect.

The nearest to the point that I am mentioning that the United States paper has gone is a reference to the method of working of the Finance Committee. That is the only thing you can get, and if this Commission accepts the viewpoint presented in the United States paper on the working of the Finance Committee, then that is probably a justification for reforming the budgeting procedure.

But what is wrong with other issues? It seems that issues like objectives, strategies and priorities of FAO issues, the Field Programme, are points of focus in most of the papers; but other issues are also there. Somebody mentioned financial crisis. Another paper speaks of lack of financial transparency. Some say evaluation of programme activities, obviously not satisfied with the evaluation done by the Secretariat. Then the reform of the accounting system, the reporting system, the decision-making process, working of the Regional Offices also mentioned as fit subjects for review. What has gone wrong with all these things FAO, I assume, has been following the established procedure of the United Nations and I believe that there is an elaborate system of training personnel with regard to the system of accounting. Why cannot the Conference direct the Director-General in these matters? Why should an "independent" group be necessary?

This is the point. If there is no justification given for this and if nobody knows what is the justification for reform then why waste time on it? Unless this question is satisfactorily answered, we cannot say whether it should be an independent review or an internal review, because everything

depends on that, the nature of the wrong that has occurred in the present system of working. We do not know whether an independent review would be justified or whether an internal review would be adequate.

Looking to the paper which has more or less opposed the concept of an independent review, it has been underlined in one point in the paper that if a review is necessary, then FAO under its existing system of working with committees, councils, and other bodies is adequately equipped to handle it. But when you say "if it is necessary" you do not deny forcefully enough the need for a review. Appreciating the papers before us in this fashion if this Commission agrees then we can come to one conclusion, that there has to be more detailed discussion on the basic question, namely, "is there a justification for a review and what has gone wrong?" Unless that is very clear, at least I am not in a position to answer whether it should be done by an independent agency or internally by FAO, and if it is an independent agency, what is the composition of this agency? Is it another international organization like, for example, the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, or else how do we translate our concept of independence because I think most of the countries of the world are members of FAO. If you select member governments they cannot be independent because they are part and parcel of this Organization, and so what do you do, what do you mean by independence? Do you mean that it should be outside the Secretariat? A consultant appointed by the Director-General is his man, and he is not independent. Then if it is a consultancy firm, then who appoints him? There are very complicated questions involved here but then I think the first question to be answered as I see it is a justification for the review and that justification should bring out clearly what has gone wrong with the present system. Only then the need for the review, the nature of the review, who should do it, how long it would take, what would be the composition of the committee, what would be the terms of reference, all those things could be settled, and I do not know how we should go about it.

That is why I was not very sure if my intervention was going to be a point of order, as you see I am dealing with points of procedure also. So at this stage I thought I should bring it to your attention and suggest only one thing on behalf of my country and that is, we should try to maintain friendly and cooperative atmosphere in the deliberations and should try to avoid the kind of heat and decision by vote _that we unhappily faced in the 91st Session of the Council. FAO 's tradition is also to arrive at a consensus, so my country would urge eloquently for developing a consensus on this issue, and as the delegate for India said, this is going to be one of the most important issues in this Conference. I would support the same view and like him, I would also ask for consensus.

Masaaki NOGUCHI (Japan): I just wish on behalf of my delegation and myself to associate ourselves in congratulating you in assuming the post of chairmanship.

My government submitted a paper on an item in accordance with the understanding reached in the Council, as you can see in the secretarial document C/87/30. I would like therefore to state briefly the position of the Japanese Government on this item by explaining what we meant by a paper and some additional ideas we have had after its submission. FAO was established more than forty years ago with the ultimate objective of contributing towards and expanding world economy and ensuring humanity's freedom from hunger, as stated in the preamble to its Constitution.

Japan has always been an ardent supporter of FAO since it joined the Organization in 1951 thoroughly appreciating its activities in the field of food and agriculture. FAO has certainly responded to the changing needs of the international community in carrying out the functions as spelled out in Article 1 of its Constitution in the past 40 years. My government believes FAO should and will play an increasingly important role in combatting hunger and malnutrition and other problems in the field of food and agriculture.

After 40 years of existence, however, it seems that the time has come to conduct a review of its activities. I consider it essential for the Organization to conduct such a review not only to cope with the present problems but also to be able to confront its future more efficiently and

effectively. Such a review is all the more necessary, especially now that FAO is facing financial difficulties. In this connection I would like to remind you that the General Assembly of the United Nations established a group of high level intergovernmental experts, a so-called G.18, to conduct a thorough review of these related and financial matters of the United Nations and that the group submitted a report containing 71 recommendations which was adopted in the 44th Session of the General Assembly. Following this example of G.18 and as many other countries suggest, the Japanese Government would like to propose to set up a high-level group of experts to conduct a review of FAO's activities. What this group should review, in our view, is two things; first, the group should examine what role FAO should play in the field of food and agriculture. FAO is, of course, expected to carry out the functions stipulated in Article 1 of its Constitution.

However, priorities could be different, in accordance with the changing situation of world food and agriculture.

My government considers that FAO should continue to be a central organ for information relating to nutrition, food and agriculture and for giving policy advice in the field of food and agriculture. At the same time as the fact that FAO Field Programme accounts now for approximately two-thirds of its total resources, FAO's technical assistance activities are assuming increasing importance. In view of its vital role, this field of activities should be reviewed for better functioning and management.

Secondly, the high-level group should examine the ways and means of improving the administrative and financial functioning of FAO. I know that FAO has already started to streamline the Organization in reducing the budget increase and the number of staff. However, under the present dire budget restraints, the responsibility should not be left solely to the Secretariat but should be faced by member countries jointly for more efficient and effective management. In this regard the report of the G.18, which I mentioned earlier, would be useful for possible developments.

As regards the composition of the group, I suggest a small number of experts, probably not exceeding 15 and the chosen have individual status. The group should submit a report to the Council and the Conference for deliberation and possible adoption.

I believe that FAO will continue to play a major role in solving world food and agricultural problems. Any organ is in need of a thorough review after a certain amount of experience. I earnestly hope that this session of the Conference will be able to establish the high-level group of experts with the support of all other member countries in order for FAO to play an even more constructive role in the field of food and agriculture.

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): En primer lugar, deseamos felicitar a usted por presidir nuestros trabajos, así como a los señores vicepresidentes que le acompañan en esa difícil tarea en esta Comisión cuyos temas y debates son tan delicados.

La delegación de México agradece a la Secretaría la síntesis que presentó en el documento C 87/30 que a nuestro juicio recoge los aspectos más significativos de las diversas propuestas y plantea-mientos.

Recordamos que como el título de este tema lo establece, en esta Conferencia estamos evaluando si es necesario o no emprender la revisión de ciertos aspectos de la FAO, con el objetivo de eventualmente reformarlo.

En los umbrales de un nuevo siglo y a más de 40 años del establecimiento de la FAO, es innegable reconocer el papel que la Organización ha tenido en favor del mejoramiento alimenticio y nutri-cional, y de la producción y distribución de alimentos en todo el orbe. Sin embargo, la brecha que se abre entre las actividades y metas de FAO, y el acelerado cambio de las estructuras de producción y de comercio agrícola internacional, tienden a limitar el efecto de las políticas concertadas en el plano multilateral. Ese cambio ha vuelto permanente un fenómeno antes coyuntural: la inestabilidad de los mercados de alimentos y la insuficiencia alimentaria.

Más aun, la acción de la FAO en la última década se ha realizado en medio de la peor crisis económica internacional desde postguerra y sus efectos sobre la producción y distribución de alimentos. En la esfera productiva se han acentuado las tendencias que favorecen la acción

de las empresas transnacionales y en la esfera comercial es notable el impacto de políticas proteccionistas de los países desarrollados y del control oligopólico de los mercados.

Por ello México reafirma el principio de que el fortalecimiento del papel de la FAO es la única alternativa que permitirá la plena vigencia de los principios y objetivos de su Carta Constitutiva.

Asimismo, señalamos que el funcionamiento de la Organización es susceptible de mejorarse, sobre todo a la luz de los cambios tecnológicos actualmente en proceso, pero que los esfuerzos tendientes a lograr este cometido exigen el respeto de los principios de la Constitución de la FAO y un real y genuino interés de los países por resolver los problemas de la Organización, y del mundo en desarrollo que padece hambre.

En los últimos años, hemos atestiguado que si ha habido un deterioro en la "productividad" o en la capacidad ejecutora de la FAO se debe fundamentalmente a un endurecimiento de la posición de ciertos países industrializados que ha conllevado a la falta de voluntad política para aportar más recursos financieros.

En efecto, nos preocupa y nos llama la atención que recientemente algunos de esos países estén erosionando el consenso tradicionalmente alcanzado. Es evidente que el trasfondo del problema no es técnico, sino básicamente político. Preguntamos a esos países que han puesto en duda la estructura, principios y programas de FAO, si todavía suscriben esas conclusiones y acuerdos de los órganos rectores de la FAO y de los eventos internacionales de máxima relevancia, que le ha dado marco a la estrategia y método de trabajo de la Organización, y que ellos anteriormente han aprobado.

Todo parece indicar, que la pretensión de esos países por revisar, entre otros, los objetivos y metas de la FAO, no responde tanto a la necesidad genuina de reestructurar y fortalecer la labor de esta Organización, como a la actitud que han adoptado dichos países en los últimos años de ataque a los organismos internacionales, dando lugar a la crisis del multilateralismo

Conforme a los comunicados de muchos de esos países, todo indica que el sesgo que pretenden otorgar a la Organización es convertirla en un instrumento para la aplicación de políticas que se formularían en otras instancias menos "complicadas". A partir de ese propósito, FAO sería simplemente un órgano técnico que avalaría la "bilateralización" de las relaciones entre países desarrollados y países en desarrollo en el terreno agrícola y alimentario.

Aquellos países han provocado la crisis de liquidez de la FAO para basar sus reclamos. Sin embargo, esa crisis no obedece a una mala administración o ineficiencias de la Organización, sino principalmente al hecho singular de que el mayor contribuyente ha decidido retrasar sus pagos por razones tanto económicas como políticas, así lo han declarado los voceros oficiales de ese Gobierno.

Existen ciertamente otras causas no políticas, como el retraso de los pagos de otros países, pero que representan una parte inferior del faltante total, o la caída del dólar estadounidense y el decremento de otros ingresos.

La restauración de la viabilidad financiera de la FAO a partir principalmente, del pago de las obligaciones del mayor contribuyente, y de todos, es el aspecto exclusivo más vital y la condición para que cualquier discusión en torno a la necesidad de reformas tenga sentido y sea útil.

Por ello, nos oponemos a todo intento de usar la crisis inducida de liquidez como pretexto y marco de reformas en FAO, derivadas en verdad de motivaciones políticas.

Si tales presiones financieras siguen ejerciéndose contra la Organización, sus programas, funciones y actividades quedarán de tal manera destruidas, que harían automáticamente improcedente e inútil las reformas buscadas.

En opinión de nuestro país podría ser deseable realizar cambios en la acción de FAO, pero que fortalezcan la orientación y el mandato establecido en su carta básica y fundamentalmente que responda mejor a las aspiraciones y necesidades del mundo en desarrollo, y en particular al logro de un Orden Económico Internacional más justo y equitativo para todos, tal como lo expresa la Resolución 3/75 adoptada unánimemente.

Ese esfuerzo de fortalecimiento de la acción de FAO debe emprenderse cuanto antes, en vista del grave deterioro de la seguridad alimentaria en todas las regiones del mundo en desarrollo. Ante todo esto ratificamos las prioridades señaladas en nuestro comunicado y recogidas en el documento C 87/30, páginas A 61 hasta A 64.

Por otra parte, según se desprende del documento de la Secretaría, algunos países pretenden, en aras de una mayor "transparencia financiera", abrir a debate principios de cooperación internacional acordados desde la post-guerra y reformulados en varias ocasiones desde entonces.

Para México sólo es válido entrar a debatir la reestructuración de la FAO si la meta que se persigue es consolidar y revitalizar el papel de este Organismo como foro internacional por excelencia para debatir las cuestiones agrícolas y alimentarias a nivel mundial, tendientes al establecimiento de un Nuevo Orden Económico Internacional.

En ese contexto México se opone a la propuesta del establecimiento de un grupo de alto nivel para estudiar la reestructuración de la FAO tal y como la proponen algunos países industrializados. Al respecto señalamos que, por mandato de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, el Consejo Económico y Social (ECOSOC) estableció una Comisión Especial encargada del estudio a fondo de la estructura del sector económico y social de las Naciones Unidas.

Dicha Comisión, que ha venido trabajando desde enero del presente año, prevé terminar sus labores a mediados del año próximo. Así, resultaría en todo caso inútil y duplicatorio establecer un grupo de alto nivel para el estudio de la reestructuración de la FAO, hasta en tanto no se conozcan las conclusiones y recomendaciones de dicha Comisión Especial.

Además, no siendo la razón de la crisis de liquidez por la que atraviesa FAO una cuestión técnica, sino como habíamos dicho, política, no se requiere de grupos de expertos de alto nivel, sino de conjugar la voluntad política de los Estados Miembros y de negociar un acuerdo que haga viable el futuro de la FAO que a todos satisfaga. Ratificamos en ese sentido que la Conferencia es el órgano rector supremo para debatir esas cuestiones, valiéndose de sus instancias constitucionales que son el Consejo y los demás órganos técnicos, particularmente los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

En lo que respecta a la forma en que ciertas delegaciones proponen que se interprete el consenso, deseamos que quede muy claro lo siguiente:

Coincidimos, como lo ha expresado el Secretario de Agricultura de México, con que el consenso es un camino deseable para llegar a conclusiones, establecer recomendaciones y decidir diversas cuestiones; pero, de no alcanzarse tal consenso, el sistema de votación por mayoría previsto por la Constitución de la Organización es la fórmula democrática apropiada, aceptada universal y formalmente para resolver controversias y promover el avance.

Por tanto, respecto a las ideas de aquellas delegaciones, estamos de acuerdo de nuevo en que el consenso es deseable, pero en tanto no conlleve, lo repito, no conlleve a un sistema de VETO abierto o disfrazado.

Por ello no coincidimos con las propuestas que sobre la formulación y aprobación de informes, resoluciones y otras decisiones tienen algunas delegaciones. El sistema prevaleciente nos parece satisfactorio, útil y expedito.

En cuanto al proceso de programación y presupuestación, FAO ha dado desde hace mucho tiempo, pasos muy importantes, que otros organismos apenas ahora consideran. No nos queda claro por qué ciertos países presionan más a FAO que a otros organismos con evidentes retrasos en este aspecto. El sistema actual, desde nuestro punto de vista, es satisfactorio, aunque admitimos que todo es perfectible y que puede y debe hacerse un esfuerzo de simplificación y de eficiencia mucho mayor.

Destacamos, particularmente, la conveniencia de elaborar matrices de presupuesto por programa que faciliten el seguimiento por parte de todos, en vez de complicarlo para beneficio de unos cuantos. Esto facilitaría la toma de decisiones y ajustes en los casos requeridos.

Finalmente México enfatiza la distinción que hay entre principios y objetivos de la FAO, conforme se señala más arriba, con aquellos relativos a las cuestiones presupuestarias y de manejo de la Secretaría de la FAO. Este último concepto es y puede ser debatido, y no así los principios y objetivos del Organismo.

Para terminar, la delegación mexicana señala que la FAO no puede ni debe entrar a revisar y menos aun a reestructurar ningún aspecto de los trabajos de la FAO hasta que aquel Grupo Especial de ECOSOC para la reestructuración del Sector Económico y Social de Naciones Unidas culmine su labor

el año próximo. En aras de racionalizar los trabajos no se deberá repetir en FAO un ejercicio que ya se está llevando a cabo en un plano más general.

Sr. Presidente, lo que hemos estado discutiendo ahora no es algo nuevo ni desconocido por ninguno; por tanto, el procedimiento que se ha aceptado de presentar, como se ha hecho, proyectos de resolución no representa, por lo menos de manera justa, los puntos de vista de los Estados Miembros aquí representados. No sabemos del contenido de tales propuestas ni de la forma en que recogen el debate aquí sostenido. Buscamos, Sr. Presidente, el diálogo y la conciliación de todos los puntos de vista aun cuando éstos sean divergentes en una atmósfera libre de presiones.

El hecho de que se hayan anunciado aquí proyectos de resolución que representan el punto de vista de un país, de otro país, o de una minoría y por tanto tenemos que interpretarlos, Sr. Presidente, como una presión. En esas circunstancias no podríamos entrar a una negociación. Exhortamos a través de usted, Sr. Presidente, a todos a no politizar este debate.

En esa tesitura con este punto de vista buscamos un diálogo abierto y constructivo para llegar al consenso. Instamos a los países que han anunciado proyectos de resolución a que consideren el no enviarlos al Comité de Resoluciones; en caso de que tal consenso y tal diálogo que se busca no se pudiera alcanzar y se presenten oficialmente esos distintos proyectos, mi Delegación deberá retraerse de discutirlos y no considerarlos como base de ninguna negociación en busca del consenso.

No pretendemos de parte de usted, Sr. Presidente, ningún dictámen sobre esos anuncios de proyectos de resolución, sino que exhorto a todos a buscar, repito, ese diálogo a la luz de los debates para llegar a un común acuerdo.

Pretendemos también llamar muy fuertemente la atención respecto a que no se lleven tales proyectos al Comité de Resolución. Esperamos que de aquí se recoja un consenso, un punto de vista general y que éste se pueda plasmar en un solo proyecto de resolución, sin presiones y con el ánimo más constructivo en beneficio de nuestra Organización y de todos.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Je voudrais d'abord au nom de ma délégation vous présenter nos félicitations pour votre élection et souhaiter que sous votre direction nos travaux se déroulent dans la sérénité que justifie le sérieux des questions qui sont soumises à notre examen.

Notre organisation aujourd'hui a plus de quarante ans. Au cours des dernières années elle a su s'adapter à des contextes changeants, s'ouvrir à des nouveaux champs d'activités, repenser ses actions en vue de mieux satisfaire les besoins de ses Etats membres.

Ce processus d'adaptation continue s'est amplement manifesté sous la conduite de l'actuel Directeur Général à qui nous devons des initiatives aussi marquantes et dignes d'intérêt que le PCT ou le système mondial d'information et d'alerte rapide.

Les efforts passés, et que la France a appuyés en leur temps, ne dispensent pas cependant d'une nouvelle réflexion. Un certain nombre de facteurs, en effet, rendent cette dernière plus pressante, notamment les perspectives en tout état de cause limitées de croissance des ressources de L' Organisation au cours des prochaines années et la nécessité de faire le tri entre les multiples activités qui, au cours des décennies, se sont ajoutées les unes aux autres en couches successives.

Si un certain nombre d'activités traditionnelles de la FAO, devenues moins utiles ou dont le relais a été pris par d'autres organisations doivent être revues, et, s'il le faut supprimées, à l'inverse, la FAO doit se concentrer, comme elle le fait d'ailleurs déjà, mais de manière encore plus systématique, sur des priorités définies par la Conférence. Notre pays estime, notamment, que la FAO devrait jouer un rôle plus grand de conseil des gouvernements dans l'élaboration de leurs politiques agricoles, sectorielles ou globales, ou encore assumer un rôle de contre-expertise auprès des pays qui doivent mettre en place, à la demande des institutions internationales de financement, des politiques d'ajustement.

Plusieurs délégations ont décrit quelles pourraient être les modalités pratiques d'un tel réexamen. Nous croyons que l'essentiel est d'associer à la fois les Etats membres et le Secrétariat dans une structure légère et efficace se concentrant entièrement à cette tâche.

Dans cet esprit, et dans le prolongement des positions qu'elle a prises précédemment, la France rappelle sa proposition de renforcer le Comité du Programme et suggère à cet effet que, sans créer un groupe indépendant de toute structure existante, il soit néanmoins fait appel à des experts extérieurs à l'organisation, choisis en fonction de leurs compétences personnelles, pour lui proposer des orientations à long terme.

Sans entrer dans les détails de procédure qu'elle pourrait développer ultérieurement, ma délégation suggère que si la Conférence décide de mettre en place ce groupe d'experts, elle devrait définir son mandat, sa composition et le mode de désignation de ses membres en tenant compte des observations suivantes :

Tout d'abord, pour assurer la cohérence nécessaire entre les travaux de ce groupe d'experts, et les activités du Secrétariat, il serait souhaitable d'y faire participer les Présidents des Comités du Programme et des Finances ainsi qu'un représentant du Directeur général.

Par ailleurs, compte tenu des activités de l'Organisation et de la nécessité de limiter strictement le nombre des experts, on peut envisager de retenir un expert pour chacun des grands domaines de compétence de la FAO.

La Conférence pourrait confier aux Comités du Programme et des Finances le soin de fixer le programme de travail du groupe d'experts, de suivre ses activités et d'émettre un avis sur son rapport final.

Enfin, en dernier lieu, le rapport final du groupe d'experts, accompagné de l'avis des Comités ainsi que de l'avis et des propositions du Directeur général, sera soumis au Conseil puis à la Conférence pour décision.

Tout en se montrant consciente des difficultés rencontrées pour concilier la diversité des besoins avec les priorités reconnues par tous les Etats membres, la délégation française fait observer qu'il s'agit là d'une question que les Comités du Programme et des Finances devraient examiner de façon approfondie avec le groupe d'experts envisagé. Ceux-ci, en raison de leur compétence technique, devraient être bien placés pour proposer des priorités aux Organes directeurs et au Secrétariat.

En faisant cette proposition notre délégation poursuit trois objectifs:

- d'une part contribuer à la redéfinition des orientations à long terme et des stratégies à laquelle une Organisation comme la nôtre se doit de procéder périodiquement;

- d'autre part contribuer à assurer un meilleur ajustement entre ressources et dépenses, notre Organisation ne pouvant plus se permettre dans la situation actuelle de disperser ses activités entre trop de cibles à la fois;

- enfin, trouver une solution de compromis entre celles des délégations qui préconisent une réforme en profondeur de l'Organisation, en introduisant des mécanismes que ne souhaitent pas bon nombre d'autres délégations.

Ce faisant, nous espérons rétablir un consensus sur les orientations et stratégies à long terme, consensus, sans lequel notre Organisation ne saurait durablement mener à bien sa tâche qui reste en dernière instance le mieux-être des populations d'agriculteurs à travers le monde. C'est cela l'essentiel auquel tout le reste doit rester subordonné.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Nous voudrions intervenir très brièvement sur un sujet particulièrement intéressant et particulièrement vaste.

Comme nous l'avons dit au cours de l'exposé introductif, la position du gouvernement belge est que dans toute organisation quelle qu'elle soit, il y a lieu de s'adapter en fonction des circonstances, des interrogations, des réalités telles qu'elles se présentent. On peut difficilement rêver et imaginer un organisme ou une organisation qui ne cherche pas constamment à se renouveler, à améliorer son travail, ses approches dans tous les domaines d'activités qui lui sont impartis.

Il est incontestable que la FAO a une tâche particulièrement importante et vaste, dans des secteurs et des horizons extrêmement variés, et ses cibles d'activités sont extrêmement différentes; en effet,

on touche à une série de domaines - que cela soit la pêche, la forêt, l'ensemble des problèmes agricoles, les échanges commerciaux, les aspects de commercialisation, qui sont extrêmement importants, les produits divers et variés - et quand on parle de réforme de la FAO il faut d'abord définir de manière très claire ce que l'on cherche et ce que l'on veut. La structure actuelle a fait ses preuves; il est incontestable qu'elle peut être améliorée, mais il faut examiner d'abord différents points.

Nous avons pour le moment un organigramme de la FAO à l'intérieur duquel le Directeur général, le Comité du Programme, ainsi que le Conseil peuvent régulièrement se pencher sur des améliorations possibles à présenter; ce sont des problèmes d'ordre purement technique. Il est possible que des conseillers en organisation, ou en management puissent, dans le cadre d'études spécifiques sur des problèmes précis et concrets, faire des suggestions intéressantes et qui seraient soumises à des instances compétentes, en l'occurrence les différents comités, ou le Conseil de la FAO qui sont parfaitement habilités à se pencher sur des problèmes d'amélioration du fonctionnement de la structure administrative de la FAO.

J'ai toutefois une certaine crainte que dans ce souci d'amélioration et de modification de l'organigramme de la FAO on ne masque un certain nombre de problèmes beaucoup plus urgents, notamment les problèmes financiers; en effet, vouloir améliorer les structures sans régler convenablement le problème des ressources et le problème financier de la FAO ne servirait strictement à rien. Et quand ce matin nous avons dit que nous n'étions pas très partisans d'un comité de haut niveau, c'est parce que nous sommes convaincus que si l'on discute d'un comité d'experts il faudra discuter du profil de ces experts, de leur représentativité, d'un équilibre entre les différentes régions qui composent la FAO, entre le groupe nord-américain, le groupe latino-américain, le groupe africain, le groupe européen, le groupe asiatique, et le groupe du sud-ouest pacifique, et l'on en arrivera à un comité d'experts qui risque de n'en être plus un et d'être tellement dosé et équilibré, qu'il serait par essence un comité politique, alors que la politique doit se faire au sein des instances compétentes de la FAO; et le Conseil est le mieux habilité pour déterminer les lignes politiques.

Mon pays n'est pas opposé à des réformes, qu'elles soient sur le plan de la structure administrative ou du rôle de la FAO - notamment du rôle de conseil à apporter aux gouvernements qui doivent pouvoir s'en inspirer tout en gardant leur souveraineté et leur liberté, et incontestablement la FAO a un rôle très important de conseil vis-à-vis d'un certain nombre de pays tant développés qu'en voie de développement, mais cette approche doit être extrêmement pratique et pragmatique. Elle ne peut se réaliser que dans le cadre des structures existantes. Et imaginer que des experts étrangers à la FAO pourraient apporter une solution d'ensemble au malaise que nous connaissons, et qui est pour l'essentiel d'ordre financier me paraît un leurre.

Ce que nous désirons tous, c'est améliorer le fonctionnement et voir dans quelle mesure les structures peuvent devenir demain plus efficaces et plus souples. Mais je crois que c'est dans le cadre des structures actuelles que les règles du jeu doivent être respectées.

Et s'il est nécessaire que le Conseil, le Comité financier, le Comité des programmes ou l'instance souveraine - en l'occurrence la Conférence - confie les mandats précis et limités concernant des points dont les termes de référence devraient pouvoir au préalable être définis, je crois que nous le souhaitons tous; et nous le souhaitons dans la mesure où ces contributions extérieures peuvent apporter des réponses à un certain nombre d'interrogations qu'il y a lieu de pouvoir préciser au préalable.

Je crois que c'est un point particulièrement important; et je crois que nous pourrions réellement jouer un rôle efficace et utile si nous travaillons dans cette perspective. Je vous en remercie.

CHAIRMAN: I would caution you that we have a limited amount of time, it will be a lengthy agenda. We have this afternoon spent a considerable portion of our limited time on procedural matters and having to observe the discipline of time to speak on procedural matters the chair moved to go into substantive discussion on a first come first served basis and said we would proceed as persons caught our attention.

Roberto PONCE (Ecuador): Yo comprendo que su intención es loable, es decir, aprovechar de la mejor forma posible, el escaso tiempo del que disponemos para tratar un tema tan importante como éste de las reformas en la Organización. Sin embargo, mi delegación no considera que sea procedente en este instante inducir a un debate cuando muchos de nosotros, muchos de los delegados consideramos que la importancia del tema amerita en este punto un estudio.

Bien puede abrirse en este momento un paréntesis para que todas las delegaciones puedan intercambiar ideas, puntos de vista, sin necesidad de que se presione intervenciones que muy bien podrían ocurrir en el transcurso de las siguientes sesiones que tendremos a partir de mañana.

Ustedes han notado claramente que no hay delegaciones que deseen hacer uso de la palabra y no veo la razón para que esto deba inducirse de parte de la presidencia.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not care if no one wishes to speak. The Chair cannot force people to speak. The Chair can simply observe that there is a limit to the time available in which to speak and that we will run up against a point later on when probably more persons will wish to speak than there is time available for them to speak. Therefore a prudent, orderly management of our business would seem to indicate that it would be a good idea to use the time we have for the period we are here. The Chair would observe that the issues before us are not unduly creative issues, but are the results of a long period of discussion. There is before each one of us a package of documents. Each of us knows why we are here and knows in advance what is to be discussed. Each of us knew in advance when we were due to start our discussions. However, you are absolutely correct. There is no one wishing to speak. I understand we now have a resurgence of interest in speaking. Cuba has the floor.

Pedro REYNALDOS DUEÑAS (Cuba): Nos damos cuenta que usted tiene problemas también en la vista, como usted mismo lo dice. Hemos levantado dos veces nuestra insignia y no se nos ha tomado en cuenta. Nosotros queremos apoyar a la distinguida Delegación del Ecuador y pensamos que por el interés de estos temas, es preferible terminar esta sesión y mañana hacer nuestra intervención, y por eso queremos que nos apunten en la lista de mañana.

Sra. Delia CHEVALIER VILLAMONTE (Panamá): Entendemos la preocupación suya por el desarrollo de los debates y el tiempo a nuestra disposición pero sí consideramos también nosotros muy importantes los temas que le toca a la Comisión II, en particular éste, y por ello apoyamos lo expresado por la Argentina y el Ecuador y deseamos que nos anote en la lista para el día de mañana.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): Mr Chairman, as this is the first time I have intervened since your election, may I congratulate you. I intervene very briefly to say that while I would be delighted to speak, I would prefer to speak tomorrow when I have seen the two draft resolutions which were announced or foreshadowed and which I have yet to receive from the Secretariat. Unlike some delegations, I am unwilling to make a judgement on those draft resolutions until I have seen them.

The meeting rose at 17.20 hours.

La séance est levée à 17.20.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.20 horas.

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/2

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

SECOND MEETING
DEUXIEME SEANCE
SEGUNDA SESION

(11 November 1987)

The Second Meeting was opened at 09.45 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La deuxième séance est ouverte à 9 h 45

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la segunda sesión a las 9.45 horas

bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN (continuación)

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued)
12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite)
12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: We will now open the floor to any countries which wish to speak.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I would like to make a general comment as regards a point of order. As regards the organization of work of this Commission, it has been the practice that the commission would elect Vice-Chairmen in order to organize our work, and this we expected when we started our session yesterday. However, this has not taken place. Therefore I would deem it appropriate before we start on the agenda to dispose of this item of the agenda, namely the election of the Vice-Chairmen. I have contacted in an informal manner some of my colleagues, and the majority believe that this is the prerogative of this Commission and not the prerogative of the General Committee.

CHAIRMAN: On your point of order, the Chair is advised by the Secretariat that the practice has been that it is in the General Committee where those decisions on the Vice-Chairmen will be made and that it will be reported to us. They are now meeting on this issue. That is the practice that has been established over the years according to the Secretariat and that practice is now in process. We fully expected to have it first thing this morning. As I indicated to you, we certainly want to have that just as quickly as possible. The reference on that is Rule XIII (2).

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Deseamos intervenir, como punto de orden, sobre la organización de los trabajos.

Esperamos que el Comité General nos transmita candidaturas que permitan darle a usted dos magníficos vicepresidentes; pero en cuanto al Comité de Redacción entiendo que esa sí es una función exclusiva de los miembros de esta Comisión. Por ello, quisiéramos preguntarle a la Secretaría si ha iniciado los contactos necesarios para que se constituya cuando se considere este tema en el Comité de Redacción y se le elija un buen Presidente.

CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken. That is a prerogative of the Commission and the answer to your question is yes, those steps are in motion.

Carlos DI MOTTOLABALESTRA (Costa Rica): Honro en presentar la posición común y unánime del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe.

Primero. Manifestamos que estamos abiertos al diálogo y a la negociación concertada, libre de todo tipo de presiones.

Segundo. Enarbolamos el consenso tradicional que reconoce a la FAO su liderazgo y labor efectiva en el sector de la agricultura y la alimentación, y la voluntad permanente de fortalecerla para que res-ponda mejor y prioritariamente a las aspiraciones y necesidades de los países en desarrollo.

Tercero. Nos preocupa que siendo esa la voluntad reiterada, algunos países pongan en duda en los últimos tiempos, diversos elementos de la Organización y busquen reformarlos, aprovechando, en buena parte, los efectos de la crisis de liquidez por la que atraviesa la FAO.

Cuarto. Coincidimos con la opinión generalizada en que la principal causa de esa crisis es el retraso e incertidumbre en los pagos del principal contribuyente, que obedece particularmente a razones políticas. Ello contrasta con las causas económicas que han obligado a países en desarrollo a retrasar sus contribuciones. Esta situación se agrava además, por la devaluación del dólar norteamericano.

Quinto. De continuar tales presiones financieras, los programas y la viabilidad misma de la FAO quedarían muy vulnerados,- y todo intento de reforma carecería de significado y utilidad.

Sexto. El caso de la FAO no es exclusivo. El Sistema de Naciones Unidas enfrenta la crisis del mul-tilateralismo que se deriva también de intereses políticos.

Séptimo. En este contexto, hay procesos de revisión general en el Sistema de Naciones Unidas que no deben anticiparse ni duplicarse en la FAO, visto el costo económico y político que ello implicaría.

Octavo. Refrendamos que los órganos rectores y técnicos de nuestra Organización son los foros apropiados y facultados para evaluar y dirimir estas cuestiones.

Noveno. En consecuencia, nos oponemos enfáticamente a la creación de cualquier tipo de grupo de expertos de alto nivel.

Décimo. Si lo que buscamos es la concertación de voluntades, habríamos preferido proponer conjuntamente un proyecto de resolución único que conjugase los diversos puntos de vista manifestados en el debate, en vez de proyectos de resolución unilaterales que harán más difícil la discusión y la negociación.

Undécimo. A este respecto, comunicamos, que en vista de esta situación someteremos un proyecto de resolución.

Pedro OYARCE YURASZECK (Chile): Permítame en primer término felicitarlo a usted, Señor Presidente, por su designación. Asimismo queremos aprovechar esta oportunidad para agradecer a la Secretaría por la preparación del documento C 87/30.

Mi Delegación desea formular brevemente algunas observaciones generales en relación a este tema. En efecto, la iniciativa que aparece detrás del tratamiento de este punto de la Agenda, como se percibió desde el inicio de su debate en el Consejo, nos llena, al igual que a otros países en desarrollo, de legítima preocupación. La presentación de las propuestas contenidas en el Documento antes mencionado comprometen el destino y la marcha futura de la FAO. Se pretende una reestructuración para perfeccionar la Organización. Sin embargo, no es evidente que la FAO necesite una reorientación que afecte su marco de acción fundamental, prioridades, programas de labores, métodos y procedimientos administrativos.

Lo que algunos sectores ven como debilidades del sistema general, no es sino un reflejo de la crisis económica internacional, de problemas presupuestarios acentuados por una contracción en el cumplimiento de las obligaciones que como contribuyentes tienen los Estados Miembros. Este hecho limita los servicios de asesoría, asistencia técnica y proyectos de campo, actividades intrínsecamente

vinculadas a la esencia y al mandato constitucional de la Organización. En suma, Señor Presidente, más que un conjunto de propuestas que envuelvan una reestructuración, la Organización requiere con urgencia que los Estados Miembros asuman plenamente el cumplimiento de sus compromisos financieros.

En el caso de nuestro país, no obstante dificultades y limitaciones, que son conocidas, se ha hecho un esfuerzo para pagar siempre nuestra contribución regular y el aporte a la Sede Regional. De allí que mi Delegación se opone decididamente a la idea de establecer un grupo de cualquier naturaleza, tendiente a promover un funcionamiento diverso de la Organización. Creemos que si, con todo, se busca examinar o evaluar ciertos aspectos puntuales de la marcha de la FAO, debe utilizarse la estructura y capacidad disponible en la Organización, en especial los Comités del Programa y Financiamiento, así como los órganos básicos establecidos en sus Textos Fundamentales. En el marco de estos organismos estamos dispuestos a buscar mecanismos que permitan realizar un análisis más de fondo de las prioridades y programas de la Organización. Por otra parte, cabe recordar que un grupo de alto nivel como el que se quiere establecer particularmente para esta Organización, ya existe dentro del ECOSOC por mandato de la Asamblea General con el objeto de estudiar la estructura del sector económico y social del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas en su integridad, lo que obviamente incluye esta Agencia especializada.

Parece, en consecuencia, altamente inconveniente que en un período especialmente crítico y sensible financiera y políticamente para el Sistema de Naciones Unidas, que la Agencia especializada más comprometida con las necesidades vitales del hombre, proponga un ejercicio que implica duplicidad y probablemente tenga un impacto financiero innecesario.

Mi Delegación estima inútil en esta instancia examinar en detalle el sinnúmero de propuestas circuladas ante esta Comisión y desea renovar aquí su adhesión a las conclusiones de la Comunicación presentada por un grupo de países en desarrollo, que figura en el Apéndice A del Documento C 87/30.

Igualmente mi Delegación suscribe plenamente la Declaración del Presidente del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe. No obstante lo anterior, Señor Presidente, creemos que es posible con voluntad política abordar las propuestas que tiendan a un perfeccionamiento y ajuste determinado en las funciones y programas de la FAO, en un ejercicio conducido a través de los órganos rectores y sujeto a las disposiciones de sus Textos Fundamentales. Este es un foro intergubernamental y es obvio, Señor Presidente, que no es procedente tomar decisiones y aprobar resoluciones que lesionen, entre otros principios, la igualdad jurídica de los Estados y la soberanía de cada uno de ellos.

Por último, mi Delegación desea formular un llamado a los mayores contribuyentes y a los Estados donantes, a fin de que reflexionen con pragmatismo sobre la viabilidad política de sus pretensiones. Al mismo tiempo, confiamos que los países en desarrollo defiendan con vigor los principios generales establecidos en los Textos Fundamentales de esta Organización, irrevocablemente comprometida con la causa del Tercer Mundo. La solidaridad, la cooperación internacional y el multilateralismo, son conceptos indivisibles e intransables.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair now recognizes the representative of Saudi Arabia who has a report from the Resolutions Committee.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Chairman, Resolutions Committee) (original language Arabic): I would like to extend this for your attention and i would also like to congratulate you on your election to chair this important Commission. I wish you to be most successful in your work.

In my capacity as Chairman of the Resolutions Committee I wish to inform you that the Committee itself held its first meeting this morning at 9.00 a.m. and during this meeting we had three draft resolutions on the agenda; one submitted by Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries and that is draft resolution C 87/LIM/27. The second draft resolution was submitted by the United States of America, it is contained in document C 87/LIM/28. The third draft resolution, an ordinary draft resolution, which has to do with the World Food Programme.

The Resolutions Committee, as you all know, has well-defined tasks and a well-defined working method. Draft resolutions are submitted to the Committee before they are presented in Commission or in Plenary. They are submitted to the Resolutions Committee for discussion, approval, and then for submission to the relevant Commission. The Resolutions Committee does not discuss the essence of the resolutions. It just deals with all the formalities so as to check whether they are well drafted according to the rules, so we really are not in a position to accept or reject any draft resolutions.

Unanimously the Committee noted that these three draft resolutions are acceptable, valid, formally and legally and we also note that these draft resolutions should be passed on to Commission II. This is all I have to say for the time being.

CHAIRMAN: As a point of clarification the Chair would like to remind the Commission that in the remarks of the delegate from Costa Rica he indicated that Latin America and the Caribbean countries will also be presenting a draft resolution. to be submitted to this Commission.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): Señor Presidente, al felicitarlo por su elección, la Delegación de Panamá augura que las responsabilidades y delicadas funciones por usted asumidas se llevarán dentro de una gestión ecuaníme y fructífera.

Nuestra intervención relacionada con el tema 12 de la Agenda, se ajusta a los lineamientos y orientaciones que nuestro Jefe de Delegación, el Ministro de Desarrollo Agropecuario, presenta en esta mañana al Plenario de esta Conferencia.

En los actuales momentos en que se observa una marcada tendencia en contra del multilateralismo y de los organismos que lo practican, nuestra Delegación reitera su plena identificación con los principios y objetivos fundamentales que regulan el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas en general y en particular los objetivos fundamentales de la Constitución de la FAO.

La Delegación de Panamá expresa asimismo, su convencimiento de que las orientaciones, estrategias, prioridades y estructuras de este Organismo, responden cabalmente a las aspiraciones y exigencia del conjunto de países aquí representados, constituyendo una garantía para el desarrollo y el bienestar común de la colectividad internacional.

Para nosotros es evidente e indiscutible la validez del mandato de la FAO y de sus órganos rectores, de su constitución y su reglamento, por lo cual apoyamos vigorosamente las actividades que ejecuta para el mejoramiento y fortalecimiento de sus programas en el marco de la solidaridad y en el reconocimiento de una realidad pluralista.

A la luz de este orden de ideas, nuestra Delegación, sin descartar la posibilidad de un diálogo constructivo que tenga como finalidad mejorar la eficacia de este Organismo y adecuarlo a las exigencias de un determinado momento, manifiesta su decidida oposición a cualquier intento de utilizar la actual crisis financiera de esta Organización como pretexto y marco para ejecutar reformas a la FAO. Máxime cuando consideramos que esta crisis financiera tiene profundas connotaciones políticas provocadas tanto por el principal contribuyente como por otros países desarrollados para avalar sus propuestas reformas. Creemos firmemente que cualquier reforma que se quiera introducir a la estructura de la FAO debe ser considerada sin precipitación y, mucho menos, con fines de debilitar el multilateralismo.

En este contexto, Panamá se opone firmemente a la creación de un grupo de expertos de alto nivel o de cualquier otra estructura similar. Estamos convencidos, en caso de que fuere necesario, que la FAO posee dentro de sus estructuras los órganos idóneos para analizar, revisar, modificar y decidir las políticas y orientaciones convenientes para el conjunto de sus miembros, y que estas estructuras responden, a juicio de nuestra Delegación, a las aspiraciones y necesidades de nuestros países en desarrollo, así como para propiciar el establecimiento de un Orden económico internacional más justo y equitativo.

La Delegación de Panamá, Señor Presidente, reitera su plena identificación y apoyo al Comunicado presentado por los Países en Desarrollo, y que se incluye en el Documento 87/30, así como declaraciones de nuestro Presidente del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe. Para nuestro país el diálogo y la conciliación son conceptos inherentes a la idiosincracia de nuestro pueblo, razón por la cual lo propiciamos, siempre que se practique en un marco de tranquilidad, respeto mutuo y voluntad de entendimiento. Consideramos las presiones y las amenazas, directas o veladas, como instrumentos inadmisibles en cualquier proceso de negociación.

Por tal motivo y a nuestro juicio, todo entendimiento o pronunciamiento debe ser el resultado de un documento debidamente negociado, resultado de la opinión de amplios sectores de países, razón por la que estimamos inútil la presentación de resoluciones a título individual.

En nuestra opinión el consenso es la forma ideal de cualquier proceso de negociación. Sin embargo, de no ser posible, existen otras fórmulas para llegar a acuerdos igualmente válidos. Siendo el voto una expresión democrática prevista en los textos fundamentales de esta Organización, resulta perfectamente viable en el caso de no llegar a resultados que satisfagan las partes.

Para terminar, a nuestra Delegación le resulta difícil comprender cómo es que países fundadores de esta Organización, que propugnaron e impulsaron su creación y que aprobaron sus principios y objetivos, hoy busquen pretextos para destruir la esencia misma de la FAO.

Igualmente nos llena de congoja que países que se han siempre identificado con las necesidades y los anhelos del mundo en desarrollo, en estos momentos de crisis económica internacional en los que se hace más que nunca indispensable su comprensión y apoyo, hoy integren corrientes adversas al principio del multilateralismo.

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Nos sorprende que usted haya dicho que nadie hubiera pedido la palabra, y usted mismo leyó una relación de oradores en la cual Cuba aparecía en tercer lugar; de todas maneras no haremos problemas con eso, Señor Presidente. Queremos primeramente expresar nuestro apoyo total a la declaración de la distinguida Delegación de Costa Rica, como Presidente del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe, que ayer en la tarde, en una reunión histórica, con la participación de toda la reunión, por no decir todas las regiones, ratificamos, acordó el documento que ha leído el Excelentísimo Embajador Carlos Di Mottola.

Para obviar tiempo, porque creo que nos va a hacer falta hoy tiempo para discutir en profundidad esta importante materia que se nos presenta, queremos decir lo siguiente: el documento 87/30, que es el que tenemos en la mano para analizar, comienza diciendo: posible. La palabra "posible" creo que en todos los idiomas de la FAO es clarita. Examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones. Ya esto está dando a entender, al que quiera entender, que la discusión en el Consejo fue una duda grande de que podríamos entrar a analizar lo que se llama proceso de reforma. Por lo tanto, creo que la primera pregunta que debemos hacernos aquí y decidir es: ¿La reforma es necesaria? ¿Podemos así, o no? Para no discutir por gusto. Aparte de eso queremos expresar que si estamos de acuerdo en que se pueden analizar los 40 años de la FAO. Esto es el mandato y facultades que tiene esta Conferencia para analizar todo el proceso de la FAO.

Podemos analizarlo, podemos analizar sus actividades, podemos inclusive revisarlo nosotros los miembros y representantes de los gobiernos que legítimamente sostenemos esta Organización.

A través de los órganos que legítimamente se han creado sobre bases multilaterales, que son los que tienen la atribución y la capacidad para realizar el objetivo de análisis. No creemos en independencias de organismo ninguno, fuera de los que están elegidos en este contexto.

La otra cuestión que creo que hay que dejar clara, es que en el mundo, hoy, producto de un sistema económico y financiero injusto contra el cual se está trabajando en las Naciones Unidas desde hace mucho tiempo para ver si podemos lograr un nuevo orden económico internacional más justo y equitativo, está demostrado que en el mundo hay suficiente producción para que coman, no sólo los habitantes hoy, sino el doble de los habitantes que pueden existir.

No hay ninguna cuestión demográfica que nos pueda subvertir el tiempo, en coger el tiempo de las cosas fundamentales. El problema en el mundo es la justicia en la distribución y la crisis financiera y económica que es producto de esa situación, y es mundial. La baja del dólar es un mecanismo para exportar la inflación o reexportar la inflación porque se esta reexportando la inflación para Europa y para Africa. Entonces esa situación rebota en FAO. No podemos reexportarle a FAO la crisis del sistema financiero, económico y social. Por lo tanto, no aceptamos ni podemos entrar a aceptar la discusión de reformas sobre bases de presión financieras de pago o no pago.

Los miembros deben de pagar todos de acuerdo con sus posibilidades y pagar, y entonces discutir y realizar. Buscar más eficiencia en FAO es posible. FAO es un órgano vivo, tan vivo que acaba de demostrar que con 94 votos, la gran mayoría de los miembros sancionan la política de FAO durante los últimos doce años, por lo cual creo que sería impropio entrar ahora, después de haber sancionado esa política con abrumadora mayoría, a querer reformar aspectos internos. Creo que es contradecirnos, o deseo de entretenernos, discutiendo para no resolver nada.

Quiero expresar, finalmente, que hay que trabajar o revitalizar la FAO en medio de la crisis mundial, no para destruirla ni fabricar otra FAO, y que tenemos que trabajar seriamente por la implementación de una resolución de FAO, la 3/75. Que nos compete a nosotros implementar el nuevo orden económico internacional, dentro de la agricultura y la alimentación en FAO, acuerdo soberano y unánime de esta Organización en el año 75.

Gerald Phirinyane KHOJANE (Lesotho): As this is the first time our delegation has taken the floor, we wish to congratulate you on your election of Chairman to the Commission. We are confident that you will lead our discussions to a successful conclusion.

The Lesotho delegation has read and carefully assessed different submissions on the need to renew certain aspects of FAO goals and operations, including the need for reform in the programme and budget process as reflected in Document C 87/30. We have listened attentively to the views expressed formally and informally by different delegations, before and during the Conference, and also to the remarks of the Secretariat during the introduction of this subject.

In our view the consolidated submissions in favour of the reform can be summarized as follows: 1) There is a concern about clarity of goals and priorities, financial and managerial control systems and distinction between FAO's Regular Programmes and its field activities; 2) There is a feeling that FAO's projects often tend to be ad hoc activities not clearly laid to government plans of investment policies; that coordination with UNDP, recipients, other UN agencies and non-government organizations is unsatisfactory, and that there is a lack of transparency with regard to the evaluation of FAO activities; 3) It is observed that the current FAO procedures for review and appraisal of the Programme of Work and Budget need to be modified to permit more in-depth consultations among members, and between members of the Secretariat, to allow for a better determination of budget level and priorities among programmes proposed by the Director-General; 4) It is suggested that during FAO meetings decisions are not taken but the written reports are drafted in such a way that members appear to have taken such decisions; 5) The calibre and ratios of representation on the Finance Committee are still being questioned while at the same time keeping Programme and Finance Committees separate is deemed as not the right approach to enhance effectiveness; 6) Finally, there is a feeling that the process of seeking consensus in the drafting committees does not always allow adequate reflection of minority views in the final reports of the Committees.

It is not an exaggeration to assert that the above mentioned consolidated points in favour of reform exercise are thought to have reached such proportions that their solution needs nothing short of creation of an independent high level group to analyse and advise on the appropriate course of action. While it would not be an unusual step to appoint a high level group to review the operations of FAO, we are of the view that at this point in time the proposal is ill-timed. In the first place taking the submissions individually one cannot deduce that there is unanimity on the problem areas which justify a need for review by an independent body outside the governing bodies of FAO for that matter. Secondly, even if there was unanimity on the problem areas, such problem areas would first need to be discussed by the appropriate governing bodies of FAO as provided for in the Basic Texts. There is no evidence from the submissions that this available avenue has been exploited. Thirdly, we feel that if complaints are not looking for hypothetical answers most of the expressed concerns have been answered in the documents before this very Conference.

Even if we were to give the promoters of reforms a benefit of doubt we would still have the following comments to offer with regard to the claim for need of reforms as outlined in their submissions: we commend Japan for acknowledging that FAO has set priorities on its programmes within the budget limitation and has endeavoured to implement them efficiently and effectively. Any suggestion that FAO is operating without clear objective and strategy is therefore out of step. Japan also made a positive observation that the recommendations of the Group of 18 of the United Nations include some useful suggestions and that FAO has already taken some measures, which, in fact, reflect the spirit of recommendations. Guided by this observation we believe a pragmatic move would be to allow some time to the FAO management to take full advantage of the recommendations of the Group of 18 before considering to set up an independent body to conduct a full review.

At the request of the Director-General, the issue of transparency was discussed by the Programme Committee early this year. It has been reported that the committee concluded that the nature and extent of information made available to it, by FAO Secretariat, was satisfactory in the exercise of its mandate. It was content that every request for supplementary information or clarification was met fully and promptly. The Delegation of Lesotho finds no justification, therefore, to challenge the conclusion of the Programme Committee.

The proposal to modify procedures for review and appraisal of the Programme of Work and Budget to permit in-depth consultations is simple and straight forward. In our view it can be considered and concluded by relevant governing bodies right away without recourse to a high level group. We therefore invite the delegates to submit a specific request to the Secretariat to work out the modalities of having this matter fully considered by the appropriate body.

The Government of Lesotho is satisfied that FAO has responded to its requests based on its plans and policies. We believe many other developing countries share this experience. If this is the case, a view that FAO projects tend to be ad hoc activities cannot but be too simplistic and not based on substantial facts.

The suggested improvements of coordination with recipients, UNDP, other UN agencies and non-government organizations cannot be the function of FAO alone but a joint responsibility. There is so far no evidence that FAO is not cooperating in the efforts to improve coordination channels. How then can a review in this case be confined to FAO alone?

It is already mentioned somewhere in document C 87/30 that the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations in its report of July 1986 has confirmed that the process of self-evaluation, established in 1979 in FAO, allows for efficient feedback into the system. Secondly, the proposed mechanism to ensure independent evaluation of FAO activities would in our view be a duplication of efforts since this is also satisfactorily done by external auditors.

According to our experience, there are always drafting committees which scrutinise reports prepared by the Secretariat and rapporteurs to make sure that such reports reflect what transpired in the meetings. Suggestions to have texts of meeting reports amended by individuals without debate makes the whole mockery of discussions in the drafting committees to reach agreed conclusions.

The suggestion to secure adequate representation of the major contributing countries in the proposed Programme and Budget Committee can only be interpreted as an attempt to impose veto powers on those who have more money or to directly introduce weighted voting in FAO. We are opposed to any form of manipulation to disturb the present healthy democratic character of FAO.

This leads us , to a similar conclusion with the group of developing countries reflected in their submission in document C 87/30 that "... The background to the problem of reforms is not technical but basically political ... What is required, therefore, is not high level expert groups, as suggested by various countries but united political will among Member Nations and the negotiation of an agreement that would make the future of FAO viable and satisfactory to all. .. The Conference is the supreme body for discussions of these questions making use of the Council and other technical bodies".

Ábdal Halem AL NOMAN (Iraq) (original language Arabic): I would like first of all, if I may, to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, on your election and thank you for giving me the floor at this stage in the debate. I congratulate you on being elected to the chair of this Commission in particular because it is one of the important commissions of the Conference as it has to deal with a problem which is of great importance to all our countries. Now this document has been studied very carefully by us and of course we respect all the opinions expressed therein quite naturally. But we would like to give also our own view - the view of my Government - on this matter which has to take into account the best interests of the Organization. My country does not feel that it is necessary to undertake an overall reform exercise of the Organization at the present time and we support all those delegations that have spoken against such wholesale reform, because the Organization has demonstrably been working effectively, implementing all the decisions that were taken at successive Conference sessions and we have always, all of us, participated at these Conference sessions and we heard the Director-General say the other day that the Organization has in fact in the last decade or so been improving a lot of its activities and stream-lining itself quite considerably, precisely in order to meet the needs of the changing world. There is something however which we would like to suggest and that is this: we certainly could undertake some changes if they are demonstrably necessary, and of course everything human can be improved, but what is important is that any changes should be introduced through the existing governing bodies of the Organization because these are by definition the governing bodies, they are in an excellent position to evaluate what is going on and what is being done and what needs to be done, and in this way we would not need to establish any additional bodies; we would not spend very much additional money, if any, because we would be using existing machinery. So we feel that the Organization, through its existing bodies and machinery, can undertake whatever study may be felt to be necessary and the result of this study would be submitted in due course to the Council and then to the Conference for consideration and decision. But as I say, of course, the bodies carrying out such an exercise must take into account all the views that have been expressed as regards the question of providing services to the countries that need them and not in proportion, for instance, to their contributions to the budget of the Organization. We must always work on a basis of equality.

Thomas YANGA (Cameroon): My delegation is very pleased to attend under your leadership the session of this important Commission and we take this opportunity to congratulate you for your election as its Chairman. I would like to restate here that the principle of reviewing the functioning and the method of work of any institution is constant in the policy of the Cameroon Government. Concerning the item of the agenda, on which we are having a very interesting and positive exchange of views, I would like first of all to thank the delegations of countries which referred to the closing statement of the Chairman of the 23rd Session of the FAO Conference which happened to be His Excellency Jean-Baptiste Yonke of Cameroon. It is not that we want to bring you back, on the contrary we are very concerned with the future of our Organization and we stand for the principle we believe strongly in. Before coming back to that statement I would like to remind the honourable delegates present here that this is not the first time and probably will not be the last one that the functioning and structures of this Organization are considered for review by CL Committee of experts. The basic frame of the present structure resulted from the proposal of a seven-member committee designated by each region which was established in 1968 to review certain aspects and activities of FAO, in which my country had the great honour to represent Africa. The position of my country has not changed for almost two years and as part of our contribution to the debate it is with pleasure and a great honour that I am going to remind the distinguished delegates of the precise and concise substance of the statement made by Mr Yonke of Cameroon as Chairman of the 23rd Session of the Conference, and that we make ours today.

To avoid any misinterpretation, I will quote him. He said: "A number of statements in the Plenary and in the Commissions have not only praised the activities and performance of our Organization in the past 40 years but have also requested us to look at the role of our Organization for the next 40 years." I here, Mr Chairman, want to draw the attention of the Commission to the last part of this sentence that underlines the review of the role of the Organization in the next 40 years. That means, in other words, that our delegation is looking forward from the present as FAO did very well in 1986 with its reference study on African agriculture: The Next 25 Years, and from which it brought up the future role of FAO in the field of rural development of Africa for the medium and long terms. Then our Minister went on with what we see as fundamental and permanent questions of any institution or organization, whatever its size, specificity and activity

and it was: What should FAO do and how should it be done not only in the regular but also in its field programme? Among many subjects he chose to talk specifically about the system of the governing and advisory bodies which should be reviewed and, for example, the procedure of adopting the Programme of Work and Budget and the Conference proceedings itself in which - and this can be confirmed through its present session - Ministers come at the beginning; they deliver their statements, hold a few meetings and then depart without personally participating in the deliberations of the Conference, thereby leaving many important decisions to be taken by their alternates who are really not in decision-making positions.

My country is in favour of genuine multilateralism clearance and we will fight strongly for the preservation of its basic principles. In this regard we hope that some important issues like the one we are debating now will find, easily and quickly, when most of the Ministers are still here, compromised and consensus solutions.

Finally, we fully agree with the Director-General that FAO is perfectible and we believe that changes are necessary. They are taking place all around us and those who do not change, in other words stand still, will regress and not progress. The only purpose of our processes should be -and we are glad to notice that this seems to be the line of our debate so far - the wish for FAO (our FAO to all of us), to progress, in spite of new and more complex challenges of the future, in order to serve better the ideas of its founders.

Thank you for giving me the floor and we might need to take it again to clarify some of our positions.

Anwar Mohamed KHALED (Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of) (original language Arabic): I would like to congratulate you on your election to Chair the proceedings of this Commission. As regards the document under consideration, I would like to express the viewpoint of my delegation, namely that we are not aware so far of the essence and the justification behind an in-depth study of some aspects of FAO's goals and operations and the formation of a high-level group to consider the goals, objectives and priorities as referred to in this document. We note that these papers highlight two particular incidents, namely the 40 years in the life of the Organization, together with the financial crisis of the Organization. Why is there a need after 40 years to reconsider, why not after 30 years or after 50 years? The length or the duration of the period for which the FAO has operated throughout the past 40 years was positive in the effort that the Secretariat, its leadership, the Conference, the Council, these mechanisms and this management have. given of understanding and displayed the ability to adapt itself and its methods of work and it has evolved in a changing world. And the leadership of this Organization has proven during the past period, especially during the past decade, it has displayed the ability to respond quickly and it has also displayed flexibility to respond to the requirements of the developing countries, in order to eradicate hunger and to increase productivity, and to surmount the various difficulties that stand in the way of developing countries. Why do we think of the financial crisis as a factor for reform? The means to solve this crisis is basically the payment of contributions. These obligations should be honoured by those countries still in arrears. Also we should increase the support to the Organization in order to enable it to assist developing countries in these difficult circumstances through which we are all passing. Therefore the delegation from the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen supports what has been said by previous delegations and particularly by the Chairman of the Near East Region and the Chairman of the Latin American Group. We believe there is no need whatsoever to embark upon a study of review of the objectives and priorities of this Organization, or even the formation of a high level group for this purpose.

We can see that there is a need to continue the dialogue and to air the various points aimed at strengthening the Organization and developing the cooperation within the Organization. However, this should take place within the framework of the Organization's existing institutions and through constructive dialogue, exchange of views and working towards understanding instead of the formation of external bodies alien to the Organization.

Sami SUNAA (Jordan) (original language Arabic): I should like at the outset to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Commission and express the hope that we shall be able, through serious discussions under your able leadership, to reach a unanimous resolution, of this critical issue.

We have considered these various proposals calling for a review of some aspects relating to the goals and operations of the Organization. We have noted that a majority of them stem from the financial difficulties suffered by the Organization at present and the potential problems. Therefore we believe that the current crisis faced by the Organization, which we hope will be temporary, does not at all justify the review of the objectives and goals of the Organization, because it would be a mere reaction. However, we definitely see that this crisis may require some changes as regards the priorities and programmes of work that take into consideration the requirements of countries facing special problems. We believe this task can be undertaken through the existing framework of the Organization and that the general Conference can highlight the required issues and entrust the Secretariat or the Director-General to implement them through the formation of a Committee, or any other procedure he may deem appropriate.

There is no harm in relying on external experts if they are not available to the Organization. However, we believe that the recruitment of external consultants to evaluate a highly specialized organization is not at all justified because we believe that the Organization, with its existing organs and its long expertise and regional offices, is well capable of ascertaining the facts and proposing ways and means of improving its operations and methods of work.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): As I announced yesterday, I wish for the membership of the Commission to have before it overnight, for study, the draft resolution that I announced. However, it was not technically possible to get it out last night. It is out this morning and therefore I would ask your indulgence in introducing it now.

Twenty-two years ago when our fathers founded FAO in Ottawa they had both vision and practical sense. Their practical sense was expressed in establishing the mandate for an organization that should be the focal point of this cooperation. Both are equally important and equally valid today. But - an important but - the world is not a static place and our founding fathers recognized this by providing our Organization with a Charter that allows it to change with the times, and the times have changed. The aspirations of the developing world have taken their rightful place at the centre of our attention. The role and the needs of women have been brought to the fore. That is to mention only two of the major manifestations of this process of change, and our Organization has also changed. Their emphasis today is on development and integration; and rightly so. I do not believe that any of the distinguished representatives in this room would have wanted it otherwise.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

CHAIRMAN: Could Norway hold for just a moment? India has just raised a Point of Order.

V.K. SIBAL (India): I should like to have your ruling on this. We have commenced this debate with a certain history. At the last meeting of the Conference we were well aware of the circumstances in respect of this particular item, on which no consensus was possible, which was referred to the Conference to take a view on whether we should have reform in FAO, to identify specific areas for them and to consider the methodologies which should be undertaken to carry on the process. I want to have your ruling, Mr Chairman. Should we start discussing resolutions at this stage? I thought that that would come after the debate had really progressed and the conclusions were to be distilled, and at that stage various resolutions would come. However, if we start debating resolutions perhaps the focus of the debate will shift to the wording of the resolutions rather than to the views of Member Countries of the conclusions and recommendations of the Council as put to the Conference. I should like to have your ruling.

CHAIRMAN: The resolution before you, the Chair would rule, cannot be voted on today because of the twenty-four hour ruling. However, nothing in the Rules prohibits or inhibits anyone who wishes to introduce a resolution from doing so, following the proper procedure. Then when it comes back from the Resolutions Committee it is perfectly able to be discussed. We have two resolutions today that meet the criteria. One would presume that tomorrow we will have an additional one introduced by Costa Rica on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group. It would be perfectly in order to proceed today with the discussion on this. It would be possible to vote on it tomorrow - not today. Tomorrow would be perfectly possible if the Latin American and Caribbean Group wishes to discuss their resolution and to say anything about it, to do that tomorrow. It would not be in order to vote on that resolution until the following day.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I am in full agreement with India on this point. As for your observation, I regret to say that the Near East Group would also like to submit a Draft Resolution. I hope this will be taken into consideration when we consider these resolutions either today or tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN: On that Point of Order, nothing can be discussed today. It could be introduced today and discussed as early as tomorrow and voted on as early as the following day.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): As I was saying, our Organization has changed. The emphasis today is on development and integration and rightly so. I do not believe that any of the distinguished representatives in this room would have wanted it otherwise: nor would the nations that they represent.

The changes and the consequences have been many and positive but as they have evolved they have been added and our Organization has become like a strong tree that has continually grown new small branches, producing fruit. And the wise gardener recognizes that in order for a tree to continue to bear valuable fruit it must be tended. Some branches should be trimmed and some shored up; its direction of growth judged and adjusted.

The Chairman of the Twenty-third Session of the Conference, the Honourable Minister Yonke of Cameroon recognized this. At the close of that Session he called on the membership to use the coming biennium to examine the role and priorities. Heeding this call and motivated by our interest in multilateral development co-operation and our interest in FAO, the Nordic countries have during the past two years been actively discussing the future structure and activities of our Organization.

I mentioned that FAO operates in an ever-changing environment. Issues at the top of the agenda yesterday maybe have to be replaced by new priorities today. Appropriate stability and continuity must at the same time be ensured. To achieve an appropriate balance it is essential that main priorities are clearly defined on the basis of the aspirations of the membership and the comparative advantages of FAO.

As an example of changing priorities I would mention the Report from the World Commission on Environment and Development, the Brundtland Commission. It has as a central message that environmental crisis can only be properly managed through a comprehensive programme for growth and sustainable development. Economic growth must enhance the resource base rather than degrade it. In this context FAO has an extremely important role to play and it should be regarded as a basic document when talking about the revision of basic priorities. Let me briefly mention six points which should be among those which are central in a continued discussion:

1. In addition to collection and dissemination of statistical and other basic information, FAO has a special role to play in the areas of policy development and advice, given the Organization's Mandate and comparative advantages. Accordingly FAO's analytical and norm-setting functions should be strengthened.

2.The technical assistance provided by FAO is small in quantitative terms. Thus, FAO's technical assistance should be linked to planning and policy development in the recipient country, and be characterized by high quality.

3.FAO is part of the UN family, and operates in a field where a number of multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental organizations are active. These organizations have specific mandates and comparative advantages, and ideally their work should complement and strengthen each other. Unfortunately, the situation is not ideal, as coordination and division of work has not been given sufficient attention. In the case of FAO we are especially concerned about the insufficient coordination with the UN resident coordinator at country level.

5.FAO cannot adapt its goals, objectives and strategies in a dynamic and flexible way without active participation from its member countries. For the member countries to be able to do this it is essential that the information and material we receive from the Organization is presented in a clear and transparent manner which clearly shows the link between priorities and allocation of funds. This we hope will improve in the future. Further, for FAO and the member countries to be able to assess the impact of activities independent evaluations are essential. The purpose of evaluations and reviews is to learn from experience to improve future performance.

6.FAO should aim at being the lead organization on agricultural issues in international debate including, in cooperation with UNDP, environmental issues related to agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and in cooperation with WHO, nutritional questions. In the late 1980s the global threat to environment and natural resources should be subject to special FAO attention. To FAO this means that the Organization will have to overcome the present fragmentation between forestry, agriculture, livestock and fisheries. Further, a greater reliance on local resources and improved farming systems calls for renewed initiative and participation. This is also the case in such areas as soil conservation, agroforestry and people's participation, including the role and need of women.

Our purpose has been to stimulate discussion among the members, to analyze issues and raise questions, not to provide the final answer. That can only be done in a more global frame where all the members participate and broad agreement achieved. The work of the Nordic countries has been conducted openly, our preliminary results transmitted to the FAO Secretariat, discussed during the process with a wide range of members and finally transmitted to the full membership through Conference document C 87/30 for the discussion that is taking place here today.

I mentioned that part of our motivation was our strong interest in multilateral cooperation in the UN system and in strengthening this system. The system can be strengthened in two ways, both by increasing the resources available to it and by using those resources more effectively. There is no contradiction between them. We believe that both of these should be pursued. When speaking of resources permit me, Mr Chairman a slight digression to point out that to the extent that our Organization's financial problems are caused by late or non-payments of contributions to the Regular Budget, this is in contravention of agreed principles for multilateral cooperation in the UN and in contravention of accepted obligations and as such unacceptable to my country. We do, however, also believe that FAO will have to deal with a situation of scarce resources in a wider context and in a longer frame of time.

In this wider context one of -the strongest arguments for achieving increased resources may be that the Organization shows that these resources will be used effectively and efficiently in accordance with clearly defined priorities and regulations. This is a continuing process, naturally, but at certain points it is necessary to make a special effort to consider the complex issues involved, an effort that is wider than the daily management activities allow. There are several possible ways of doing this and ongoing work in other parts of the UN system shows that the same need has been felt but dealt with in different manners.

In the Conference document which is before us and which I mentioned earlier the Nordic countries have presented their concerns and pointed to several issues that we strongly believe should be examined and discussed on a broad basis, including all member countries, including also the Secretariat.

We believe that this could most effectively, most appropriately, be done through this Conference establishing a special ad hoc interim body of eminent persons to consider the future activities and structure of the Organization.

As a practical way for the Conference to achieve this we have presented a draft resolution whose text is currently before you. This suggests details of the organization of such a group, including mandate and mode of work.

But let me strongly underline that in making our proposal we believe it must be a cooperative effort by all members and that we accordingly are open for discussion, changes and modifications that may be presented, discussed and agreed upon.

I would also, in view of some of the comments made earlier in this debate, underline that our proposal is not meant for any radical change of the basic frame of our Organization, it is not meant to shift influence from the members to any outside group, it is not meant to decrease the development activities of the FAO. It is, however, meant to, and only meant to, provide a way through which the best possible analysis, the best possible proposals for necessary future funding of our Organization can be placed before the full membership at our next meeting for decisions to be taken by the full membership in a spirit of agreement and cooperation.

With this, Mr Chairman, I recommend the draft resolution to you. I reserve my right to speak again if there should be need for further clarification and answers during the debate.

Sra. María Isabel CASELLAS (Venezuela): Queremos, Señor Presidente, referirnos a la Declaración expresada por el Presidente del GRULAC, Embajador Di Mottola, la cual apoyamos plenamente. Esta Declaración es el fruto de la posición común adoptada por todos los países de la Región. Después de un extenso debate, no consideramos necesario abundar en ella. La apoyamos en cada uno de sus puntos; sin embargo queremos llamar la atención en el punto 2, que se debe considerar como incluyente en lo expresado en la Resolución 3/75, aprobada por consenso y relativa al establecimiento de un nuevo Orden Económico Internacional, justo y equitativo.

Jorge A. Santos OLIVEIRA (Guinée-Bissau): Prenant la parole pour la première fois, j'en profite pour saluer votre élection à la présidence de cette Commission.

Au sujet du point 12 de l'ordre du jour sur la nécessité d'une réforme de procédure du budget du Programme, notre délégation estime qu'une investigation extérieure ne sera pas nécessaire pour modifier les priorités du Programme de travail et du budget de la FAO.

Pendant plusieurs années, ces programmes ont été approuvés par consensus. Au cas où il s'avérerait donc nécessaire de procéder à des changements dans une telle situation, les organes directeurs de l'Organisation ne manqueront pas d'en tenir compte.

Cependant, dans le cadre d'une amélioration constante du fonctionnement interne de notre Organisation, nous pensons que toutes les propositions positives venant des Etats Membres et allant dans ce sens doivent être mises en pratique par les organes directeurs de leur organisation.

Pour terminer, notre délégation réaffirme son accord total avec la position du groupe de travail des pays en développement.

Sra. María Eulalia JIMENEZ (El Salvador): Permítame en primer lugar, felicitarlo por su elección, felicitación que hago extensiva a los otros miembros de la mesa.

Hemos escuchado con atención Los debates sobre este tema, tanto en esta Comisión, como en el Consejo. Debates, que como bien dijo otro delegado, se refieren a un posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, incluida la cuestión de posibles reformas a la Organización.

No ahondaremos, en las cuestiones que con tanta propiedad han sido expresadas por otros delegados, queremos recalcar, sin embargo, que no vemos la necesidad de crear un grupo de Alto Nivel para estudiar estas posibles reformas. La FAO, se ha siempre adecuado a las diversas situaciones para responder adecuadamente a las necesidades de los países, reformando las cuestiones que ha sido necesario reformar.

Estas modificaciones han sido fruto, sin embargo, de las diferentes conferencias, comisiones y otros órganos de la FAO. No nos oponemos a analizar estas reformas, no nos oponemos al diálogo abierto, pero dentro de los órganos rectores de la FAO, creados sobre bases legítimamente multilaterales y buscando siempre el consenso. En este sentido deseamos ratificar en todas y cada una de sus partes, la declaración que ha hecho el delegado de Costa Rica, Embajador Di Mottola, en nombre del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe, y que refleja la posición común de nuestro grupo.

Para finalizar, apoyamos decididamente lo expresado por el Delegado de India respecto a la orientación que deben seguir nuestros debates.

Primero tenemos que decidir si son necesarias o no las reformas que algunos países plantean. Debemos expresar los criterios y elementos de juicio en favor o en contra de estas reformas y después decidiremos.

Rollee IGNACIO (Philippines): The Philippine delegation wishes to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, on your election and also your vice-chairman.

The Philippine delegation has studied carefully the paper submitted by member countries on the item under discussion. In our view the proposals can be classified under three general headings. Number one, another review or a review of specific aspects of FAO's work or structure, such as the FAO's Field Programme administration, FAO's future-orientation, priority setting, coordination with other agencies, regional activities, operational priorities, management, etc. Number two the concrete proposals for reforms, such as the establishment of financial envelopes related to activities of secondary importance which could be implemented if resources from arrears are forthcoming; reform in the programme budget process; reform in the manner of reporting in the inter-governmental meetings; change in the representation in the Programme and Finance Committees, and so forth; number three, the establishment of a high-level committee.

In connection with the proposals under these three headings the Philippine delegation would like to make the following comments: number one, like some other delegations who have taken the floor before us we submit that the need for the reform proposals have not been proven, the rationale and justification for the reform changes have not been substantiated. Number two, the Philippine delegation believes that FAO has to keep up with the times. It has to adapt itself to changing conditions, it has to be able to face the new challenges. FAO cannot be static. We believe, therefore, that the present set-up can be improved but we do not understand why an overall review, a review of the various aspects of the FAO, cannot be undertaken in the present set-up of FAO's governing bodies and its subsidiary committees. There is in FAO a continuous process of examining the programmes and priorities of the Organization in the regional conferences, in the technical committees, the Committee on Commodity Problems, the Committee on Fisheries, the Committee on Forestry, the Committee on Agriculture, the Council and its subsidiary bodies, and finally, the Conference. Likewise FAO has been responding to proposals to adapt the Organization set up to conform with the agreements reached in the various international fora, particularly the World Food Conference, the world conferences on agrarian reform and rural development, on fisheries management and development, on new and renewable resources of energy, on forestry, on certification, on United Nations decade for women, on least developed countries, the new international economic order and the critical economic situation in Africa. We have serious doubts about the usefulness of establishing yet another body in addition to the existing set-up in the form of a high-level group. We believe that the establishment of the financial viability of the Organization is a pre-condition to any serious discussion of the future orientation and programme of FAO. It would be an exercise in futility to discuss a programme of action which cannot be implemented because of substantial arrears in the receipts of assessed contributions.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr Chairman, may I also on behalf of my delegation add my congratulations to your selection as Chairman of this Committee.

Our delegation regards this item as crucial to the future of FAO, its very survival, its relevance and its effectiveness, both in the near future and in the long term. However, given the present situation we shall not be lengthy. Given the calendar of events, given the content and the tone of the debates in the Council which has led up to this point, my delegation feels that this matter must not and cannot be dealt with by a process of confrontation. We are told that we already have three draft resolutions on this matter. We know that there are at least two more to come and perhaps even more.

We must all be grateful to the Secretariat for C 87/30. It puts together the various proposals in a manner which facilitates comparative review. We are concerned, in fact we cannot accept any conclusion which speaks of immediate and significant review of administrative and financial structures of FAO in the absence of clear and convincing reasons for such changes in what are undoubtedly or, shall we say, crucial decision processes of the Organization. The continuous call for transparency by some delegations leaves us with a sense of uneasiness. I have followed the comments on this matter within Council since June and so far virtually no kind of response from the Secretariat seems to satisfy those delegations which have continually emphasized what they consider to be an inadequacy of transparency. The bottom line on the matter therefore is that some of the major contributors are not, and would not be satisfied or indicate satisfaction in the ongoing circumstances. The real problem is, of course, that these countries, a few countries which have not so far been able to convince the majority of Member States that there is a crisis of transparency. Our delegation is not opposed to change, any kind of change which is in the real interest of FAO and which will promote the goals, the objectives such as are desired by the majority of Member Nations and more so by the developing countries which were at the core, which were the point of focus when FAO was established more than four decades ago.

We have no difficulty with the call for a review. It is healthy to look backwards at the past, objectives, process and output and, of course, resources in order to plan for better performance in the future. The question is how and it is in this regard that we do feel that in the first instance we must exploit fully the in-house mechanisms and capabilities of the Organization. If the Organization must be so directed, let us do it. If we have some concerns about process let us examine these.

The submission by the Netherlands has some interesting comments. The comments by Australia on the Drafting Committee, are noted and the question arises are there other known or established procedures which can assure reflection of a higher degree of satisfaction. _

I must say that our delegation considers that the suggestion of Switzerland for some voice of the farmers within the Organization may well have some merit. Sometimes I have felt that as we quibble for hours over words in the Drafting Committee or even in Plenary that if we had a solid band of farmers looking over our shoulders we might behave somewhat differently.

In essence our delegation does not say no to evaluation or review but we say reforms only if they are necessary and that the suggestion of reform must not come up front when so far there are no clear grounds or any indication of direction in respect of reform for this Organization.

May I finally say that the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago is generally supportive of the position taken by the Ambassador Carlos di Mottola, the Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group.

Temel ISKIT (Turkey): Allow me to start by congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on taking this high responsibility as Chairman of our Commission. My delegation also thinks that our work here is very important, even crucial for the future of our Organization. Our views on the proposals of reform have been made known yesterday by the head of our delegation, by the Minister , but I still deem it perhaps useful that I reiterate our general approach in this Commission II.

The first point we make is that although the requests or the proposals for reform have coincided in time with the cash flow crisis of our Organization, the Turkish delegation does not see any direct link between this crisis and the necessity for reviewing FAO's work.

As to the reform proposals themselves we believe that this Conference is the supreme body of our institution, indeed provides the appropriate forum where all members should be able freely to discuss any idea tending to enhance the efficiency of our Organization. However, we think that the deliberations on this subject should be guided by certain principles. We should have a basis, and in the opinion of our delegation the following principles should be the guide in our work.

First, the obvious one, we should strictly adhere to the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter as regards the decision-making process, including, of course, the one country one vote principle. We should also have full respect for the provisions of the Basic Text of FAO. We should respect the prerogatives of the principal organs of FAO with respect to planning, programming and budgetary process. We should recognize the need for all Member States to participate in the Programme budget preparation in all its stages. We should respect the decisionmaking matters of our Organization, including of course, the priority given to reaching decisions by consensus. We should also recognize the fact that FAO evolved in the 42 years of its existence as response to and in line with the consensus reached at its governing bodies and that this general satisfactory process should continue to be adhered to.

This being said, of course, we as the Turkish delegation see the merit in considering certain aspects of the proposals which may, and in our eyes which can, contribute to the better functioning of this Organization but we repeat this, provided that they meet with the consensus of the Member States. Improvements can and should be brought. As we have stated at a previous Council session, the Turkish delegation wants evolution not revolution and we do not think that the difference between the degree of adaptation of FAO to changing conditions in the world justifies a revolution. Of course, on our part we stand ready to participate in the debate in the most constructive way possible but bearing always in mind that it is us, all the member countries which bear the main responsibility for the future of our Organization and we do not think we can delegate this responsibility to any one.

Now more specifically turning to the proposals contained in document C 87/30 the Secretariat did a very good job of summarizing them and especially classifying them. We have a different set of proposals. We have proposals concerning objectives, strategies and priorities. We have proposals concerning the Field Programme. We have proposals concerning programming and budgeting process and indeed this is a separate issue, as also indicates the title of the item. There are of course other issues which we may call miscellaneous issues. In the time imparted to us, it is not easy to handle these proposals and especially when they are different. We may run the risk of mixing pears with apples. However, we should, at the end of our deliberations, decide on a certain kind of process which may enable us to sift through these proposals to find the ones which really have the value of contributing to the efficiency of our Organization, providing they meet with our consensus. This is our real job here at this Commission. Of course, we have proposals and draft resolutions. At this stage, of course, my delegation does not have the opportunity to comment on them as we have received them only today, and only one of them has been introduced.

I have a question concerning our future deliberations on this matter. According to the timetable the item finishes today and we should like to ask when and where these resolutions will be discussed. Secondly, concerning the substance of these discussions I may say we have a suggestion which has already been made by some delegations that it would be much better to discuss these resolutions more generally than the proposals on the table, perhaps during informal contact. This is an idea which my delegation suggests, although I am in your hands and in the hands of the Commission. I finish my intervention with this suggestion which I hope will be helpful in our future work.

CHAIRMAN: Since there was a question put as part of your intervention I would just say that we will try to see how the discussion unfolds and at some time perhaps later this afternoon, we will try to make a judgement about the timetable. Also on that point, that is the very reason why the Chair has emphatically stated that we should start on time.

Mourad BENCHEIKH (Algérie): J'ai l'impression, Monsieur le Président, que nous sommes en train de tourner en rond. Nous sommes en train de tourner en rond parce qu'il y a manifestement une très grande complexité du débat. Il y a une petite minorité qui demande des réformes; il y a une grande majorité qui refuse ces réformes. L'Algérie a eu l'occasion de s'exprimer au sujet des réformes durant la session du Conseil. L'Algérie refuse ces réformes d'entrée de jeu.

Pourquoi? Parce que L'Algérie considère que, globalement, les objectifs fixés par les fondateurs de la FAO sont atteints et continuent d'être atteints. La délégation algérienne refuse également ces réformes parce qu'elles ont été présentées sur un fond de crise et que cette crise a été créée de façon artificielle. La délégation algérienne avait constaté que nous pouvions très bien surmonter cette crise si les contributeurs réglaient leurs arriérés.

Je regrette qu'une question aussi importante se soit placée dans un contexte de confrontation. Ce n'est dans l'intérêt ni des pays du tiers monde ni des pays industrialisés. A mon avis, si nous continuons à mener les débats comme nous les avons menés jusqu'à présent, c'est-à-dire une partie des délégués recevant les pressions de l'autre partie des délégués pour les faire entrer sur le terrain des réformes, alors, je crains que nous n'arriverons à rien du tout.

Je crois qu'avant de parler de réformes, il faut déterminer - et en cela, je rejoins tout à fait le représentant de l'Inde - si, oui ou non, ces réformes sont nécessaires.

Encore une fois, la délégation algérienne refuse d'entrer dans une discussion de résolutions. Cela n'aurait pas de sens parce que cela voudrait dire qu'une logique a prévalu sur une autre logique. Je crois donc que, pour gagner du temps - car je ne pense pas que, pendant la session actuelle, nous puissions résoudre ce problème - nous devrions nous concentrer sur les mécanismes à mettre en oeuvre pour déterminer de façon objective si, oui ou non, nous avons besoin de réformes. Je pense que, si nous nous concentrons sur la façon de dégager ce mécanisme, nous pourrions avancer et fixer un certain nombre d'échéances. Autrement, je crains fort que nous nous engagions dans une impasse d'où je ne vois pas très bien comment nous pourrions sortir, compte tenu du fait que les deux positions sont absolument tranchées et que je ne vois pas de composition permettant de trouver une solution satisfaisante.

Je répète: concentrons-nous sur le moyen de dégager des mécanismes destinés à déterminer de façon objective si, oui ou non, la FAO a besoin de réformes.

CHAIRMAN: Keeping in mind your suggestion we do have a number of other speakers who want to avail themselves of the opportunity which you have just had.

E.D. MUYANGA (Zambia): I will be very brief. May I start by congratulating you on your election as Chairman of this Commission.

My delegation has read document C 87/30 and have found it to contain issues which would affect greatly the future operations of FAO. My delegation does not feel strongly about the need for a review. This standpoint may be a result of insufficient information on the part of our delegation concerning the way FAO operates in its numerous functions.

In the areas where we have been operating with FAO we have found the Organization to be efficient and therefore would not like any new system which would weaken its efficiency, especially with regard to introducing more bureaucratic procedures which would make FAO unresponsive to immediate emergency demands of developing countries. With that background my delegation is hesitant to support the proposed measures for reform.

LI ZHENHUAN (China) (original language Chinese): Let me congratulate you on your election to the Chair of Commission II. As other delegations, the delegation of China would like to contribute to the success of the discussion in our Commission.

Allow me now to make a few comments concerning the principles regarding Item II of our agenda. The delegation of China believes that since its establishment, and therefore for over 42 years, FAO has never ceased to adjust its goals, its targets and its programmes in conformity with the evolution of the economic and political scene. I should like to recall the World Conference on Agricultural and Agrarian Reform, the conclusions and recommendations of which had an impact on the

Programme of Work of FAO. Since then, the field programmes of FAO are aimed more and more at country activities. This trend has contributed to promoting food production in developing countries and also to securing world food security. Therefore, we should positively appreciate the evolution in the work of our Organization.

I should like to stress my second point concerning reforms within FAO. In our opinion since 1975 we have been carrying out important reforms within FAO including for instance the establishment of a Technical Cooperation Programme aimed at providing developing countries with support and assistance and also establishing further activities in member countries. Bodies have become more streamlined, programmes have been restructured and economic principles have been adopted to restrict administrative expenses in carrying out the priority activities of FAO. In the field of food and agriculture policy principles have been adopted to foster agricultural production such as food security and international agricultural adjustment.

In 1979 FAO launched a new appeal to carry out agrarian reform and foster rural development. FAO also set up technical cooperation and policy advice operations in the field of forestry and fisheries. Now all this contributes to those efforts aimed at attaining the objectives set out in the Constitution of FAO and to promote agriculture in the various countries of the world. Many developed countries have submitted position papers about reforms in FAO. The delegation of China supports any reform which is aimed at implementing the objectives of FAO and improving the efficacy of the Organization. We endorse all proposals aimed at eliminating the obstacles to FAO's work. We likewise hope that FAO, in strengthening its technical assistance, will extend its mandate in the collection of data and consultation and technical analysis. We hope that the Secretariat will be able to draw up a balance sheet of all the activities carried out in the past, that it consults member countries and hears their opinions, and finds inspiration in the useful experience of other organizations of the UN system, so as to carry out reforms in a more effective manner.

I would like to stress in particular that in strengthening reform, all member countries -- and especially the major contributor -- should honour their financial responsibilities with the Organization. Otherwise the reforms we are currently discussing will never attain the expected results.

And to conclude I would like to speak a few words about the high-level expert group. Among the nine developed countries that have submitted proposals, eight countries have suggested the establishment of a high-level group composed of a minority of experts, the terms of reference of which will be really based on discussing the various proposals submitted. These proposals have raised a number of different issues including strategies, objectives, FAO administration, etc. The delegation of China is of the opinion that all important matters concerning the strategies, goals, objectives of the Organization -- which is to say all the important policy matters -- should be discussed within the statutory bodies of FAO, such as for instance the Council, the Programme Committee, the Finance Committee and the Conference. In the proposals of the eight countries special mention was made of the importance of selecting the members of this high-level group but any expert -- and after all these experts are a minority, and no matter how intelligent, how competent and skilled an expert can in no way replace Council because Council is made up of 49 Member States -- because the matters which will be discussed by the few experts will be extremely complex. With regard to other concrete matters concerning reform such as methods and procedure for reform, the delegation of China would like to hear the comments of all parties concerned.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): First of all I would like to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Commission. In accordance with the consensus reached within the FAO Council the Conference of FAO should primarily decide whether there are any grounds for the submitted proposals for reform or not. The Yugoslav delegation feels that requests for a comprehensive review and revision of FAO are neither grounded nor justified, as elaborated in greater detail in the paper of the group of developing countries. Indeed we do not see what to review and why. Have we ever established that something is wrong? We are not aware of any indication or evidence that the Organization is suffering from any major deficiency. The FAO is facing a serious and worsening liquidity crisis as are other organizations in the system of UN but it has nothing to do with the orientation and efficiency of FAO. In our view all talks about accountability, transparency and evaluation have never been substantiated with concrete evidence. Therefore we consider nothing is fundamentally wrong - without saying that everything is ideal. The Yugoslav delegation believes

that the aggravated international economic conditions call for the further improvement and strengthening of certain aspects of FAO's activities addressing the immediate needs of the developing countries in their efforts to resolve their outstanding problems in this sector. In our view a consensus is both necessary and feasible in adopting a conclusion to the effect that the general Conference invites the Director-General to carry out the necessary analysis in the light of the discussions conducted and proposed, in which arrears of FAO's activities, appropriate measures or possible reforms should be initiated so as to further promote FAO's efficiency. This analysis and suggestions should be considered by the FAO technical bodies and Council.

Abdel Moniem EL SHEIKH (Sudan) (original language Arabic): I would like to join the other speakers who preceded me in congratulating you on your election to the chair of this Commission and I hope you will be successful in your work. We all know that this Organization was established to serve principles and objectives in the field of agriculture to help countries that have problems in this sector and also to develop the agricultural sector in the countries concerned. These principles were and still are the principles of this Organization because the agricultural sectors are meeting with a great many difficulties. They are countries that are suffering under-development and famine. There is no doubt that the Organization of FAO is totally concerned in developing the agricultural sector throughout the world and hence we reject any reform in this Organization. Of course the world situation has changed since 1945 when the Organization was established. Nonetheless all these changes should in no way be conducive to questioning the way in which the Organization is dealing with world problems and should not lead us to change the modalities for FAO.

And furthermore, the area of activities of FAO and priorities have not changed. Priority is always given to developing countries to promote the agricultural sector, to support international cooperation either directly or indirectly by transferring agricultural development means to the agriculture ministries of the countries concerned so as to respond to the agricultural needs of the country itself.

I shall now move on to the Field Programmes. These programmes have developed and have gone beyond the financial means of the Organization but these programmes are necessary because the countries concerned need these programmes to resolve the problems they are faced with and therefore the development of field programmes is essential. But this is not a problem. The real problem lies in the way these programmes are managed and therefore to make the Organization more effective and lessen the burden of the Organization the countries concerned could be involved in the management of the programmes themselves so that these programmes become fully respondent to the needs of these countries. And therefore we believe that it is necessary to develop field programmes to take account of such matters as training, for instance so that the countries concerned may benefit from them fully. The programmes should become complementary to the programmes implemented by countries themselves and to programmes which are implemented thanks to bilateral agreements or other forms of agreement. All this can be done thanks to consultation among parties concerned.

I am coming now to the Programme and Budget. The two matters are closely connected because the importance and scope of the programme are dependent on the size of the budget which in turn is dependent on the payment of contributions on the part of all member countries. The Organization can only be successful if all countries pay their contributions on time. The Organization has always tried to adjust its structure to conform with international developments. The Organization has thus carried out certain budgetary cuts and has tried to tap its resources in the best way possible-

It would be necessary for member countries to help the Organization in its task as much as possible. We are not against reforms if they can improve the effectiveness of the Organization but we believe that these reforms can be achieved thanks to the main bodies of the Organization and constructive consultations and a dialogue among these different statutory bodies. Therefore, we do not think it is necessary to establish a special experts committee as proposed by some delegations. We believe that all this work could be carried out by the statutory bodies themselves-

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): A mon tour, permettez-moi d'associer ma voix à celle des honorables délégations qui m'ont précédé pour vous féliciter de l'effort et du succès des travaux que vous avez dirigés au sein de cette session très importante ainsi que de tous les travaux de cette Commission II de notre Conférence.

Qu'il me soit permis également d'adresser mes très heureuses félicitations au groupe des pays en voie de développement qui ont fait un travail louable, fouillé, conduisant à la présentation du mémoire présenté par ce même groupe et qui figure au document C 87/30- A57.

La délégation Cap-Verdienne soutient pleinement toutes les propositions y figurant. L'honorable ambassadeur d'Algérie, la délégation de la Zambie, celle de l'Inde, de la Chine, qui m'ont précédé ont déjà dit ce que je voudrais dire et je tiens à associer ma voix et à soutenir les positions qu'ils ont très bien exposées dans cette auguste assemblée.

Je tiens d'abord à dire qu'il y a une question de mécanismes à définir ainsi que l'a indiqué mon collègue de l'Algérie: est-ce que cette Conférence est d'avis que cet arbre, très grand, a besoin de réformes? Telle est la question de principe qu'il faut définir. Mon pays, depuis son accession à l'indépendance, a suivi avec beaucoup d'attention tous les travaux de la FAO. Nous connaissons parfaitement tous les organes qui existent dans cette maison; les pères fondateurs de notre Organisation ont fait une tâche louable et cruciale en faveur du monde et plus particulièrement des pays en développement; ils ont proposé certains objectifs dont on dit aujourd'hui qu'ils sont atteints, ce dont nous nous félicitons.

Les choses doivent se passer graduellement. Quand on dit qu'il faut tailler les arbres, en tant qu'agronome j'en suis tout à fait convaincu. En effet, j'ai fait mes études dans les pays du nord, et c'est là que j'ai appris à tailler les arbres; on ne taille pas les arbres quand ils sont grands; on doit commencer à les tailler dans les pépinières, faire une taille de formation, une taille de fructification, de floraison, etc... mais il est très dangereux (et je l'ai appris dans les écoles allemandes) de tailler les arbres quand ils sont en fructification ou en floraison; c'est quelque chose à ne pas faire. Voilà donc cette réflexion que je fais en tant qu'agronome diplomate.

J'ai dit tout à l'heure que cette Organisation qui nous est très chère avait graduellement fait des réformes, au juste moment et au moment venu. Combien de fois nous faudra-t-il répéter que le Programme de coopération technique (le PCT) est d'une très grande utilité, que ses projets sont parfaitement adaptés à nos besoins. C'est là une réforme. Il faut que cesse à son encontre une suspicion et une accusation que nous ne comprenons véritablement pas. A moins - et ce que je dis est très important - que l'on ne veuille retirer aux pays du tiers monde le droit le plus élémentaire, c'est à dire celui, d'identifier les projets de leur propre développement. Il nous semble très important que les mécanismes permettant de créer dans nos pays des bureaux de la FAO qui sont d'authentiques conseillers de nos gouvernements, qui permettent des contacts entre nos gouvernements et le Secrétariat, nous pensons que ce sont des réformes capitales.

L'honorable délégué de la Chine vient de dire - et je souhaite le soutenir - l'importance des études faites par la FAO sur l'aide en nature: n'est-ce pas là une réforme adaptée à la situation concrète des pays africains? Cela apporte des inputs permettant d'arriver à la sécurité alimentaire: n'est-ce pas une réforme?

Cela fait suite à la remarquable étude sur l'agriculture africaine présentée à Yamoussoukro en Cote d'Ivoire, lors de la Conférence ministérielle du Sommet des ministres africains. Ce fut une étude remarquable, de même que les épargnes administratives en faveur des travaux de terrain, surtout de la décentralisation dans les régions.

Il me semble d'après tout cela que la FAO a: fait, pas, mai de réformes et nous-refusons : toute - proposition comme l'a très bien dit mon ami de l'Algérie - qui tendrait à affaiblir notre Organisation.

Eduardo Tomas MIRANO (Angola): Nous voudrions en premier lieu nous joindre aux délégations qui nous ont précédés pour vous exprimer à vous, Monsieur le Président ainsi qu'aux personnes qui constituent votre bureau, notre grande satisfaction de vous voir à la direction des travaux de cette Commission dont l'ordre du jour revêt un caractère fondamental pour la survie de cette Organisation, étant donné la conjoncture du moment au sein de la FAO, et la situation de l'économie mondiale qui sévit chez certains de ses membres.

En ce qui concerne notre sujet d'aujourd'hui - le document C 87/30 - il est un fait que certains pays membres ont manifesté leurs préoccupations à l'examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO; nous pensons qu'il n'existe aucun lien entre la situation financière de l'Organisation et son rôle; c'est une hypothèse à écarter purement et simplement car son rôle, ses programmes et ses priorités ont fait l'objet d'un consensus et ont été approuvés par ses instances compétentes.

Les objectifs, les stratégies et les priorités actuelles répondent effectivement à la situation du moment des pays en développement, et nous ne voyons pas pourquoi il serait nécessaire de réexaminer à fond l'ensemble de la FAO, ce qui constituerait une distraction et une perte de temps, temps qui nous est précieux pour nous attaquer aux problèmes clés de l'Organisation qui sont ceux de sa liquidité et de sa solvabilité pour faire face à l'exécution de ses programmes conçus selon son rôle, ses priorités et ses activités à la lumière des circonstances nouvelles de l'évolution des besoins et des tendances de la coopération pour le développement.

Nous partageons les vues exprimées au paragraphe 10 de ce document où il est dit qu'à chaque rencontre internationale il a toujours été arrêté certaines stratégies pour améliorer la situation mondiale de l'alimentation et les activités de la FAO. Bref, c'est dans différents forum que sont analysés les objectifs à court, moyen et long terme de cette organisation, et c'est sur la base des priorités définies par la politique gouvernementale, et adaptées à la conjoncture de chaque pays membre, que sont déterminées les stratégies et priorités de la FAO qui lui permettent évidemment une évolution harmonieuse que nous devons reconnaître en toute honnêteté et en toute objectivité.

La nécessité d'accorder une priorité considérablement accrue au rôle consultatif de la FAO dans le domaine des politiques n'est pas un facteur indispensable si nous voulons vraiment atteindre l'objectif d'une réforme adéquate.

Quant au fonctionnement du Secrétariat de la FAO, celui-ci a toujours fait preuve d'efficacité dans la réalisation de ses tâches et personne ne l'a mis en doute. Sur ce, nous ne voyons pas la raison pour laquelle d'autres organisations se chargeraient de l'élaboration d'une partie des documents.

Nous souhaiterions cependant un réajustement structurel et fonctionnel qui s'avère nécessaire.

Avant de terminer, nous ne pouvons pas laisser passer cette opportunité sans faire allusion à l'intervention du délégué du Costa Rica ce matin à cette session, pour nous allier également au groupe de l'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes et pour appuyer également sans réserve le document des propositions du groupe des 77 qui a été élaboré et présenté à cet effet.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): FAO's mandate remains as valid today as it did forty-two years ago. As a founding member we have been strong supporters of its work. There is nevertheless a clear need for a thorough review of FAO's management and operations to ensure that its programmes, objectives and priorities are clearly delineated and responsive to changing needs and to ensure that there is effective co-ordination in programme delivery.

This issue was first raised by the Chairman of the Twenty-third Conference and concerns not only donor countries but developing countries also. Indeed it is worth recalling that we are discussing the issue today at Conference as a result of the discussions of the Ninety-first Council. Our discussion and my delegation's views cannot be seen in any confrontational context. My own Minister was very interested to hear the Ministers of many Commonwealth delegations support the process of review and reform of FAO during Commonwealth discussions on this issue to make FAO more efficient and more effective in respect of their agricultural development efforts.

We have no hidden agenda for this review. Our concern is simply to enhance FAO's effectiveness. We have submitted some views on the ways in which that could be achieved, which are contained in document C 87/30. We are encouraged to note much common ground and shared concerns emerging in that paper, including many of the views put forward by the Group of Developing Countries. The key issue for our Commission is how to bring those views together and establish clear and effective means to carry the process forward.

The review of our Organization's objectives, strategies and programmes is on the basis of flexible innovative management. The last major review of FAO was almost twenty years ago. We see the review as examining the directions and adaptation of the Organization. These are times of rapid change and the Organization must adjust to meet developing challenges against the objectives and strategies approved by Council and Conference. We see the need for independent advice, against which Conference and Council can determine the future direction of the Organization. My delegation emphasizes that the financial crisis is not the basis of our interest in reform.

I should like to make some remarks on FAO's Mandate. While the Mandate remains valid - a view shared by the developed countries which submitted papers, key areas need re-emphasizing. We see the single most significant area as policy analysis and policy advice to governments. Close cooperation and dialogue with government ministers would ensure that an economic environment conducive to agricultural development is established. We appreciate FAO's activities in this area and are aware of constraints, but in our view there is a need to move beyond FAO's originally conceived objectives of combatting undernutrition and of focusing on the technical dimensions of food and agriculture, to the more political arena of poverty, and the relationship between underdevelopment and agricultural policy. We are pleased to note support for this area of FAO's activities in the developing country paper.

The traditional role of collection, analysis and dissemination of information concerning food and agriculture should be recognized as one of the basic functions and as an integral part of the policy formulation and advising role. We note this view is consistent with the developing country paper.

Turning to the long-term goals of our Organization, the development of longer term goals and priorities is necessary to guide the formulation of FAO's immediate objectives and priorities in the biennial programme. This should be done in a way which would allow progress to be reported and measured on a regular basis against the original aims set for the programmes. Organs such as the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee must be given clear instructions to set priorities. We consider that a mechanism needs to be developed to distinguish the essential from the less essential in the corresponding budgetary allocations, while protecting staff morale. Governments are capable of doing this in their own programme budgeting process.

Turning to the life of our Organization, both the membership and the Secretariat, my delegation sees a need for: improved responsiveness of FAO to the views of the minority countries; satisfactory project evaluation and staff assessment programmes; realistic attention paid to the financial crisis by a sensible review of programme priorities to match financial resources (as a general comment the Australian Government supports zero real growth in the budgets of UN agencies and supports constant reassessment of priorities); greater openness in debate and discussion; improved cooperation and coordination between FAO and other international agencies, a view shared with the developing country paper; improvement in the operation of the Finance Committee and drafting groups.

Looking now at Australia's particular concerns, my government put forward some ideas and concerns which are in document C 87/30. We did not see much value in merely echoing others or cataloguing everything. We focused on one or two areas in order to encourage a wider ranging discussion. Our principal ideas as set out in that document have less to do with finances or the Organization itself but more with us, the members.

We see need for a more open budgetary process and an enhanced role for the Programme and Finance Committees. We are concerned, as we have noted in Council, that although the opportunities are there for significant dialogue between Member Nations, and the Secretariat on the Programme of Work and Budget, we are not using them to full advantage. After extensive consultations modification of the initial draft budget is in fact minimal. Are we having a time-consuming and expensive dialogue of the deaf, or at least the hard of hearing? Similarly we feel that the Finance Committee has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the necessary process of priority setting, injecting new ideas and perspectives. In this regard we place special value on representation from capitals, as indeed is envisaged in our Basic Texts. Enlargement of the Finance Committee, more fully to reflect donor views, perhaps focusing on a smaller range of key issues, could be advantageous and could remain within existing costs by pruning the sessions.

We have also expressed concern to see drafting committees, which are not mentioned in our Basic Texts but which are vital arteries of our work and discussions, should not seek consensus at the expense of clarity. We should aim in our reports to provide Member States with substantive evidence of the issues and views put. This would in the view of my delegation contribute positively to subsequent discussion of issues elsewhere in the Organization and perhaps help to correct the drift and occasional acrimony that has developed in recent years in this vital, practical aspect of our work. Reports of meetings are just that, not binding international treaties, yet we at times seem to treat them as such.

I would like to make a few remarks on what we would see as the way forward. There will be in the course of our debate many differing views, many shared views. In the time available for our debate it would be unrealistic to expect Conference to sensibly debate, consider and formulate detailed and far-reaching recommendations and decisions. We think that to further the process in a comprehensive and coherent way a high-level group of individual eminent experts, as proposed by the Nordic delegations in their draft resolution C 87/LIM/27 before us, makes good sense. Such a group would allow wide opportunity for all members to contribute in a measured and coherent way. It could report to Council next year through the Programme and Finance Committees.

We would envisage individuals chosen for their special eminence and competence in fields related to the Organization's activities, administration and management to bring a balance of insight and ideas. We see merit in each region providing a nominee, thereby achieving balance and consistency with the normal workings of our Organization. We have had good experiences with such small, high-level groups, both domestically, where such an approach has often proved a very effective way of dealing with complex issues, and internationally, in the Commonwealth context. They would of course need and call upon the full cooperation of the Secretariat, without whose support such a group could not function.

For our part we commend the draft resolution and keenly hope it will be supported by a positive consensus and the active involvement of the membership. We are confident that through such a process will emerge a more effective and authoritative FAO, energetic, vital and nourished by a recommitted membership.

Mention has been made of a review process involving technical experts corresponding to the major technical departments of FAO, reporting through and involving the Programme and Finance Committees. This is an interesting proposal and one on which we would like to reflect further, but our initial reaction is that on balance we do not consider such a process an appropriate or adequate response to the concerns expressed by many members. It is not the technical excellence of FAO which is under discussion, indeed I am sure we all agree that FAO's professional staff represent the Organization's most precious resource and greatest contribution to addressing its mandate. Rather the concerns lie in overall direction and priority settings, and management of change, including the budget process. We need guidance and wisdom rather than technical advice.

I would like to record that some of the issues of concern to my delegation, such as the Finance Committee and drafting groups, are up to us, the members, not a high-level group. We hope our Commission Report might reflect these concerns regardless of the process by which reform is carried forward.

In concluding, I would like to observe that the task and demands which could fall to FAO are unlimited. Objectives must be clearly defined, strategies agreed, and priorities, targets and methods of measurement of achievement identified to ensure that maximum progress is made with the limited resources available. This process must be coupled with the development of budgetary accounting and reporting processes which make the operations of the Organization clearly transparent and accountable.

Without these changes there is a risk that donor countries faced with many priorities of their own and confident of the transparency and accountability of their own organizations will drift to bilateral rather than multilateral actions. We are all faced with demands within high priority programmes and services which we cannot meet in our national budgets. Establishment of a clear, independent and high-level group will provide an important signal of the responsiveness and maturity of our Organization and its continued vitality and ability to manage change.

Finally, I would like to reserve my delegation's right to intervene later in the discussion of the draft resolution C 87/LIM/28 on the budget process.

HAN DEA SUNG (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Mr Chairman, my congratulations go to you on your election as Chairman of Commission II, which is a very important Commission of the 24th FAO Conference.

I would like to express my delegation's view on the item we are discussing now. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea joins other delegations in supporting the proposals made by the Group of 77. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea do not oppose the review of the FAO work, since it is a 40-year long history of work in the fields of food and agriculture. FAO's governing body, as set up on a multilateral basis, has the authority and capacity to carry out our task should it be concluded that some specific reforms are desirable, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea thinks that the present FAO set-up is quite capable of doing this work. Thus the Democratic People's Republic of Korea do not see any reason to establish a high-level committee, or a similar one, to review the objectives, strategies and priorities of the Organization's work.

Our delegation thinks that certain Member States, in spite of trying to create a climate of reform of the Organization by deliberately bringing about financial difficulties in the FAO by delaying their contributions, should have their contributions to the Organization made in time.

In conclusion, in the light of the consensus achieved on FAO's present orientation, priorities, programmes of work, methods, and administrative procedures and its evaluated efficiency, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reiterates the position that there are no elements and criteria for undertaking a process of reform in certain basic aspects of the Organization and fully supports the proposal made by the Group of 77.

The meeting rose at 12.30 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.30 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/3

Twenty-seventh Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

THIRD MEETING
TROISIEME SEANCE
TERCERA SESION

(11 November 1987)

The Third Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La troisième séance est ouverte à 15 heures

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la tercera sesión a las 15.00 horas

bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued)
12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite)
12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación)

Roberto PONCE (Ecuador): En homenaje a una puntualidad que parece difícil de alcanzar y, en razón del corto tiempo del que disponemos para los debates será breve.

En primer lugar, mi delegación desea expresar su apoyo a la declaración formulada por el honorable representante de Costa Rica, Presidente del GRULAC, que recoge claramente la postura mantenida por los países de América Latina y el Caribe frente al tema que estamos debatiendo.

En segundo lugar, quisiera hacer unas pocas y breves consideraciones respecto a este asunto.

Mi país piensa que durante más de 40 años la FAO ha cumplido una labor satisfactoria y consecuente con las necesidades de los países en desarrollo, y sobre todo ceñida a los objetivos y propósitos establecidos en su Carta Fundamental. De ahí que resulta sorprendente, por decirlo de alguna manera, el deseo de revisar tales objetivos y la forma, la metodología de alcanzarlos a través de reformas propuestas por un pequeño grupo de países.

Debo señalar que mi país por principio no se opone a cambios, pero es absolutamente indispensable conocer en forma clara y precisa qué se pretende cambiar y por qué motivos.

Consideramos que la FAO, como toda obra humana, es susceptible de perfeccionamiento, pero también pensamos que no bastan propuestas que, tras un enunciado general de una supuesta crisis y una necesidad de reorientar objetivos y establecer una escala de prioridades más ajustadas a ciertos deseos, se esconden motivaciones de orden político y no técnico. No deseo en este momento referirme a esa supuesta crisis, por que todos los aquí presentes saben en qué consisten y a qué se deben los problemas que atraviesa actualmente la Organización. Si deseáramos hablar de alguna crisis deberíamos referirnos al resquebrajamiento de los principios en que se basa el multilateralismo como forma de concertación y sobre todo como expresión de solidaridad y cooperación internacionales. De tal forma que no creo que sea necesario hablar de esa crisis, en la cual mi país no cree.

Finalmente, deseo reafirmar aquí el convencimiento del Ecuador de que la FAO tiene las instancias adecuadas, de que posee los órganos competentes para tratar sobre cualquier problema que afecte a la Organización y, por lo tanto, rechaza considerar siquiera la posibilidad de crear un grupo de expertos extraorganización para estudiar cualquier posible reforma; no vemos por qué alguna delegación en esta mañana atribuyó a personas de fuera de la Organización las cualidades de equilibrio, madurez y experiencia que muy bien se pueden encontrar dentro de los representantes gubernamentales que a través de largos años de experiencia en la Organización han llegado a adquirir los conocimientos y las cualidades necesarias para estudiar cualquier propuesta de reforma.

Joachim WINKEL (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): I wish to join all those who have congratulated you on your election to the Chair of this important Commission and I hope under your guidance we will be able to come to a successful conclusion.

My delegation would also like to thank the Secretariat for presenting document C 87/30. I would also like to thank the Director-General for the introduction he has provided for this paper. We had hoped that there would have been more written submissions to the Secretariat on this matter but perhaps there was not enough time and that is why there have been fewer submissions.

I should first of all like to comment on the summary in part I of the paper. First, we fully agree with what is stated in paragraph 8, that FAO is the lead agency in the UN System responsible for all issues related to food and agriculture.

Secondly, amongst the Member Nations there are different views as regards whether a long-term review of objectives and strategies really is necessary or not as is outlined in paragraphs 9 and 10 of document 87/30. We have a very open mind on this: the long-term review of objectives and strategies of an organization is a task which the members of such an organization have to currently carry out. As a general need which we find as a tacit item on the agendas of Conference and Council meetings, we feel there is no doubt that a long-term review of objectives and strategies is useful and necessary at any time. We feel that the bases of our Organization are thus not put into question. I would like to refer to the tree that was mentioned this morning here by the distinguished delegate of Cape Verde. He talked about how he learned pruning in Germany. He did learn properly but I must point out that there is also a post graduate course which does say that even old trees may be pruned to make them younger, as it were, and of course, compared to the ancient oaks we have in Germany FAO is only a very young tree so we are still in time to prune this young tree that is FAO. "Prune," I say, not "cut down." We love this tree that is FAO and we want it to flourish. So this long-term review of our aims and purposes we do not feel should in any way put into question the foundations of our Organization.

Thirdly, as regards the setting of priorities (paragraph 11) we in our own submission pointed out that we cannot consider FAO to be primarily a development agency because this would not comply with the long-term function and importance of the Organization. For us FAO is primarily the big United Nations specialized agency responsible for food and agriculture which represents a unique forum for discussions of world agricultural policy issues.

Fourthly, Part I as well as the submissions from Member States also deal with the field programmes of the Organization. In this connection we have expressed our doubts about TCP which still continue. We feel that technical assistance must be given above all from voluntary contributions from Member Nations, not from compulsory contributions. So we feel this programme should not any further increase.

Fifthly, we consider that FAO is first and foremost a technical organization and therefore our main interest is that its work is practice-oriented and in line with practical needs.

Several delegations mentioned today, and I am thinking particularly of the People's Republic of China, that the Organization in the past has in general done qualified work and meets the tasks set to it. Within the framework of the Programme of Work and Budget it is important to us to make the budget procedure and budget document still more transparent. And in our submission in addition we requested also greater clarity of the staff structure.

Sixth point: as regards the question of the establishment of a high-level group, we did not express our views on that in our submission. There is a reference to it in paragraph 26 of the document. The fact that we have not said anything does not mean that we are not in favour of setting up such a group. As our Federal Minister Kiechle, in his statement in Plenary yesterday, did go into this question, we would find it useful to convene such a high-level group particularly in the light of the recommendations of the Group of 18 to the General Assembly of the United Nations. One member country in fact attached an excerpt from these recommendations to their submission. We also feel that the recommendations of the Group of 18 to some extent are also transferable to FAO and we feel that the proposals contained in them are worth taking into account.

Allow me to thank the Secretariat too for the description of the developments in the Programme and Budget sectors within the United Nations system which have meanwhile taken place. We feel that our Organization, as part of the UN, should have a share in these developments.

Finally, we feel that all Member Nations of our Organization must work together closely in the continuous process of improvement and reform of FAO. If we pull together we can solve all the problems of our Organization.

Paragraph 44 of the document before us refers to this and I hope that we in our Organization may be able to achieve the consensus which the UN General Assembly itself has achieved as well as the Executive Board of WHO and the governing body of ILO have also achieved. I hope here too that that kind of spirit can prevail.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): La délégation congolaise se réjouit de vous voir présider les travaux de cette importante commission de la Conférence. Elle exprime le vœu de voir nos travaux couronnés de succès sous votre direction. Elle félicite le Secrétariat pour la qualité du document qui nous est soumis.

Je tiens également à rendre hommage au Directeur général adjoint pour sa brève et claire introduction d'hier.

Le Congo, vous le savez, est co-auteur du mémoire présenté dans le document qui nous est soumis, et comme ceux qui m'ont précédé depuis hier ont longuement exposé les motivations qui l'ont inspiré et les buts qu'il vise, je m'attacherai, ici, au cours de cet exposé, à donner notre point de vue sur le problème qui nous préoccupe cet après-midi.

Comme nous l'avons dit hier en plénière dans notre déclaration générale, la délégation de mon pays est quelque peu inquiète de voir la Conférence focaliser son attention sur un problème, certes important, mais dont l'urgence reste à démontrer.

En effet, comment ne pas s'étonner - et sur ce point je rejoins ce qu'a dit hier le délégué de la Belgique, mon collègue et ami l'Ambassadeur Saintraint - que nous puissions laisser au second plan les problèmes financiers qui accablent l'Organisation, et qui interpellent l'ensemble des Etats Membres et singulièrement le plus grand contributeur, pour détourner notre attention sur des questions qui, de toute évidence, auraient tout à gagner à être débattues dans un climat qui résulterait du règlement des arriérés.

L'Organisation traverse une période difficile de son existence. A un moment où plus que jamais elle devrait jouer pleinement son rôle d'aide aux Etats Membres en développement dans leur combat contre la faim et la malnutrition, la FAO, dont les structures ont montré une souplesse grâce à laquelle elle a su s'adapter aux conjonctures mouvantes qui caractérisent notre époque, la FAO est à notre avis une Organisation reposant sur une base solide.

Cependant nous ayons dit que nous étions ouverts au dialogue constructif; et nous sommes attentifs aux initiatives susceptibles de permettre à la FAO de renforcer ses activités de terrain et d'accroître son efficacité car nous croyons nous aussi que tout est perfectible.

Mais si tout le monde est d'accord sur cette nécessité d'améliorer ce qui peut l'être, les moyens pour y parvenir divergent sensiblement. Et à cet égard nous ne partageons pas l'avis de ceux qui pensent que le mécanisme approprié à conduire ce travail qui est un comité de haut niveau d'experts, soit à même d'y apporter une solution viable, d'autant plus que la question est avant tout politique.

Outre cela, nous pensons pour notre part que, sans être opposés à la nécessité d'apporter des améliorations sur le fonctionnement de l'Organisation, il importe d'attendre les résultats de la commission spéciale des Nations Unies dont la mission est précisément la restructuration du secteur économique et social du système.

Il est clair, aux yeux de ma délégation, que la création d'un comité de haut niveau semble superflue en ce moment, puisque les organes existants de l'Organisation ont souvent été à l'origine des ajustements et des améliorations de l'exécution des programmes, ainsi que des modifications d'orientations. Nous nous étonnons qu'au moment où certaines de ces orientations commencent à donner leurs fruits - comme l'indique l'évaluation faite tout dernièrement pour le PCT - on puisse déjà amorcer d'autres réformes. Nous croyons qu'il faut d'abord évaluer les résultats de toutes ces réformes passées avant d'entreprendre d'autres réformes en profondeur.

Bref, nous pensons qu'il convient de poursuivre le dialogue au sein des organes de la Conférence qui ont su s'adapter aux changements de priorités, de stratégies et de programmes.

En vérité, je crois sincèrement que le foisonnement de résolutions qui nous sont soumises ne semble pas pouvoir arranger la situation. Nous croyons sincèrement qu'il importe de créer au sein de cette commission un mécanisme approprié susceptible de débattre en profondeur de cette question. Je vous remercie.

Ruyat WIRATMADJA (Indonesia): Firstly I would also like to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, for your election to chair this very important Commission.

After carefully viewing the debate on this agenda so far, the Indonesian delegation believes that the review of certain aspects of the FAO operation need to be pursued, but leaving the mandate, the goal and objectives as they are in the charter. On the method of review itself at this stage our delegation does not see any need to appoint outside consultants or a high-level group of experts. We feel that this high-level group of experts will not be better than the Council, attended by well qualified representatives of its member countries.

The Conference just appointed the Director-General for another six-year term, the time span which is long enough for an organization to look at its internal matters. Therefore our delegation suggests that the Director-General be assigned to look at the need for internal review to consider the state of the present world food and agriculture, and other related matters that are always changing, so as to always make FAO an effective organization that can respond to the needs of its member countries.

Furthermore, the Director-General should also be assigned to report its findings on the need for this review in the coming Council meeting, and be sent to all member countries for their comments.

Ernest MULOKOZI (Tanzania): Thank you for giving us the floor. Allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the Chair of this Commission. I am confident that you will guide our discussions to useful conclusions. Let me say at the outset that the principle of review and reform is a part of our national character. However, such a review and reform must arise from felt needs and the aim to improve efficiency.

As regards the subject matter before us, my delegation has studied document C 87/30. In our view it envisages reforms on two broad but interlinked aspects of the FAO. These are, first, financial viability of the Organization and, secondly, its operational efficiency. On the former, the immediate need is for the Member States to discharge their responsibilities to the Organization. No amount of reforms or their intensity can make FAO do this if they have no resources. As regards the latter point, my delegation feels that not only has the need for the proposed reforms not been justified but the internal organs of the Organization, including its management, have not been sufficiently utilized.

It is for this reason that my delegation does not support the proposed study by an external group. Apart from the implied financial costs of such a study, a group of this nature, in order to do its work satisfactorily, must of necessity receive the cooperation of world member states, including those who receive its services. It is not evident that such cooperation will be forthcoming. Any reforms would only be meaningful if they enhanced the efficiency and effectiveness of FAO in carrying out its functions. Most important, however, is that such reforms must aim at meeting expressed needs of the developing countries.

There is no substitute for a process of dialogue between the Organization and those who enjoy the services it provides. Let me briefly refer before concluding to one aspect of the reforms contained in one of the papers submitted by the developed countries. I refer to the proposed formal link between FAO and the IMF. Should this proposal be implemented I foresee great danger ahead. It will mean moving from a position whereby this Organization responds effectively and quickly to the needs of the rural poor to a position whereby there will be need for institutionalized paper-

work, including country policy framework papers, as indicated in the text. I feel this is a dangerous path for this Organization.

Finally, for the reasons I have briefly outlined, my delegation would like to record its support for the position of the Group of 77 and the paper on Reforms, as submitted by the Group of Developing Countries, and particularly its conclusion.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): The United States is convinced that after 40 years there is a need for a significant review of FAO's administrative and financial structure, its goals and objectives, its monitoring approaches, its vast accomplishments and the effectiveness of its Field Programme in order to prepare the agency to meet the challenge of the late 1980s and the early 1990s. The United States proposal contained in document C 87/30 addresses the need for immediate change in some key decision procedures in FAO, as well as the need for a comprehensive longer-term look at FAO as a technical and development oriented institution.

Before going into the substance of our position, however, I should like to comment on some of the assertions that have been made during the debate with regard to the proposals for reform contained in document C 87/30. In our view, none of the proposals now reflected in draft resolutions C 87/LIM/27 and C 87/LIM/28 calls for a revision of the Basic Texts of FAO: neither do they undermine those texts. Furthermore, the need for a comprehensive review which is called for has nothing to do with the financial constraints currently faced by the Organization. Improvement in the management orientation and efficiency of FAO are worthwhile in their own right. We find it difficult to understand, to say the least, how such proposals for improvement can be seen or characterized as subversive. We also fail to understand how the exercise of our right as members of this democratic body to offer thoughts and ideas for debate and decision can be considered as pressure, to be resisted and/or rejected. Our proposals for changes in FAO's budget programme procedures must have a relationship with the scale of our payments. Under current United States legislation, the United States Government must show the Congress how the United Nations programme and budget procedures have changed towards a more open and participatory mode of operation before our Congress will appropriate the resources necessary for a full payment of our contributions. Thus we have presented a proposal that will facilitate member countries' increased participation in the Organization's budget and priority setting process. This proposal, I should add, does not go further than similar decisions in central United Nations as well as other specialized agencies in the United Nations such as the World Health Organization and the International Labour Office, to which all member countries attending this Conference agreed in those fora.

Some delegates have referred to the special Commission of ECOSOC which is now reviewing the structure of the economic sectors of the United Nations as a reason why any efforts to review FAO would be duplicative and useless. A special commission is looking at this Organization in terms of what its basic functions are and how these relate to each other, with the aim of consolidating functions across the system and, when possible, eliminating institutions and/or programmes which are obsolete or superfluous. The Special Commission is not - and I repeat not - looking at an agency's management or efficiency. In fact their work is based, *inter alia*, on the submissions made by the agencies themselves. One could hardly expect an agency to tell ECOSOC that they are inefficient or superfluous. The aim of our proposal is the improving of FAO's internal efficiency and programme effectiveness: nothing that ECOSOC is focusing on.

That said, I should like to summarize the basic elements of our proposals. We believe that current procedure followed in preparing and reviewing the Programme of Work and Budget do not allow sufficient time for member countries to conduct a substantive review of the budget proposal, the funding level and its implication for each Member. These procedures also do not permit an in-depth review of priorities proposed and/or implied. We believe that as member countries we have the responsibility to participate fully in providing the FAO Secretariat with clear guidelines regarding the budget levels and the Organization's priorities.

Our proposal, fully consistent with the Basic Text, would significantly improve the current shortcomings. The Resolution before you in document C 87/LIM/28 and our proposal in document C 87/30 fully supports the idea and restricts support for this Resolution from all member countries.

I should like to refer to the second part of the United States proposal in document C 87/30. The United States believes there is also a need to make a thorough review of FAO as a technical and developmentally-oriented institution in order to improve its effectiveness and efficiency in the years ahead. The review, to quote our proposal, should boldly look at FAO's roles, priorities and objectives in the context of current and projected world agricultural needs, as related to the work of the United Nations and other international co-operation programmes in this area. We believe that the best way to conduct this review is to entrust it to a high-level group of independent experts, eminent in the field of agricultural development. We believe that the Nordic proposal contained in C 81/LM/27 fully addresses our concerns and the aims of our proposal. The United States supports it.

The United States also concurs with the delegate of Australia regarding the need for wisdom, as against the need for technical advice contained in some other comments.

To end my remarks, sir, it is important to note that our proposal and that of the Nordic resolution calling for a review do not prejudge the results of the review. The only conclusion a priori is that after more than 40 years and much change in the world a reassessment is needed.

Clifton E. MAYNARD (Barbados): Mr Chairman, I too would like to congratulate you on your election and wish you good luck as you seek to guide the work of this very important body.

The head of my delegation in an intervention in the Plenary session yesterday made some comments about this item which will form the political chapeau of what I am about to say. My delegation as a member of the Latin American and Caribbean group obviously agrees with the position taken by that group. However, I believe that it is necessary to put into this debate some specific comments as I see them from the Barbados point of view about the proposals before the Committee at this time. I shall deal with them under some precise headings and make my comments as a result.

The proposal regarding programme budget procedures and decisions, there could obviously be no difficulty about wider participation in that process and therefore joint meetings which do take place between the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee are possible. However, I have some difficulties with the arrangement for this committee, or joint committee, to determine the future budget level, for I believe it would breach the principle that the decision involves all member nations in the Conference and therefore cannot be delegated to a restricted group. The proposal probably could be considered if it is stated that the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee were limited to making recommendations.

Again I should like to suggest that there is a mandate and the rules of procedure of the two committees do provide for joint session. Therefore it is at the discretion of the members of both committees and subject to the Council's guidance to the committees that they could consider the work as a joint body. A change in the representation in these committees on the basis of donor and recipient countries would in my view be totally contrary to the principles of representation in FAO bodies. To come to the priority to be attached to policy advice in FAO programmes, there should be and cannot be any doubt that policy advice is one of the core components of FAO's mandate and it has always enjoyed in my judgment a high priority. I think there needs to be some specific form as to the criticism about selecting these priorities. For arguments sake, obviously the work of selecting priorities is done at the global level by major global studies such as Agriculture: Toward 2 000, various global technical papers on conceptual studies, international trade and commodities studies, and with both major advisory work at regional level, even at the sub-regional level, either on the basis of meetings or on the basis of technical papers.

From my own standpoint I would like here to suggest that as far as coordination of programmes at the country level is concerned it is the resident representative of UNDP who is responsible for coordinating activities. Therefore it is from my own experience and judgment up to him to ensure that the coordination is there. My experience tells me that the resident representative of FAO is always available to those coordination meetings. However, there are some serious problems when you talk about this reform that one has to look at, because it is strange that FAO and some other agencies are excluded from UNDP round tables and consultative groups, these are vital bodies in terms of providing

inputs and policy guidance, therefore to exclude FAO because of its constitutional responsibility in the field of agriculture seems to me to be something that needs to be corrected.

One of the important aspects that one must remember at this time is that FAO's advisory assistance and its programmes have increasingly been oriented towards training and strengthening institutional potential, and this is an area that must be developed, it cannot be retarded in any way.

In the context of the long-term strategies, objectives and priorities, I would like to say first that as I understand it the baseline of FAO's long-term strategies, objectives and priorities has emerged from a number of important international events - World Food Conference, WCARRD, the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development, and the process of refinement within the baseline orientation continues and is the basis of studies such as Agriculture: Toward 2 000 and the two studies that are being undertaken now or are proposed to be undertaken in the next biennium in the context of finding out the process of agricultural development in Latin America and the Caribbean. Indeed one must recall that the Regional Conference in Latin America and the Caribbean made specific recommendations to the Director-General as to how Latin America and the Caribbean agriculture should be developed and should proceed in the medium term, and that Conference was held only in August last year.

Secondly, there is the process of the inter-governmental technical bodies, and it is on the basis of all these that the medium-term and the longer-term objectives which find a way into the Programme of Work and Budget develop.

Indeed I must mention that until recently there has always been full consensus of FAO membership on the long-term orientation and strategy of the Organization, and the call for an ad hoc review of long-term strategies, objectives and priorities without even attempting to provide some tangible-reasons as to why it is necessary does not seem even to justify the review.

With regard to the field programmes, generally it must be said that the field programmes do not belong to FAO, and do not consist of FAO projects. The policy framework for field programmes is given by the recipient governments' requests and the funding institutions are because of the fact that the government provides funds. Therefore a consistency with policies established by FAO is ensured only through the technical acceptance by FAO to assist governments in implementing their projects, such acceptance only occurring when projects reflect the policies laid down by the FAO governing bodies. Indeed the impact of FAO policies on food programmes is especially evident in the special action programmes and Member States represented here must know that these priorities are established by the Conference and the Council and they thus enable the donor countries and the donor community to be able through FAO to respond in favour of specific areas of activities and of course to ensure the closest possible linkage between regular and field programme activities. The present structure of rules and functions of the field programmes were established after review by the Conference in 1976 and in 1977. Therefore if another review is necessary certainly the governing bodies, the Council and the Conference, can ask for such a review now, another reason why I cannot accept the need at this time for a high-level body to look at these questions.

In my judgement an ad hoc high-level group can only be viewed as a contingency mechanism, a sort of last resort in the face of a major crisis in programme orientation and our management, and I would like to exclude from that crisis the present one of cash flow. This is in my judgment the basis on which such a request could possibly be justified. The fundamental question to be raised therefore is whether countries do indeed have any serious indication or evidence of a major orientation or management crisis which could justify a suspension of the existing review and evaluation mechanisms by a high-level group.

All that is known which is accessible to Member States, such as the reports of the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, internal and external evaluation reports and the systematic reviews and evaluation by the Programme and Finance Committees and other inter-governmental technical bodies, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Fisheries, the Committee on Forestry, leave no doubt in my mind that FAO is well oriented and comparatively speaking a highly efficient UN organization. Indeed until recently this Organization was held up as the model that other UN agencies should use to develop programmes and for management.

Of course, as my Minister said in the Plenary session, it is necessary to renew the mechanism which allows Member States to reach decisions by consensus. I think that it would be good if we could use this opportunity to redevelop that mechanism of cooperation that indeed in my view is inherent in the whole development of international organizations.

I should like to add that I make these comments as a result of my experience as a member of the Programme Committee over two biennia and participation in the United Nations General Assembly as the member of the Fifth Committee for five sessions.

Goran WIDE (Sweden): The delegate of Norway has previously in detail explained the motives which have inspired our countries to put forward the proposal you have now in front of you. I would therefore restrict myself to a few supplementary remarks on behalf of the Swedish delegation.

First of all I wish to point out that we recognize that the Organization has an important role to play on one hand in contributing to the development of the agricultural, fishery and forestry sectors in member countries and on the other hand on carrying out the global functions as indicated in its Constitution.

As is well known Sweden and the other Nordic countries have since many years been advocating the need for certain reforms. The proposal we have put forward now is consequently not directly linked to the financial problems which the Organization is facing presently. I especially wish to stress that our intention is not to promote through this proposed review the principle of zero growth. As certainly is well known Sweden does not accept zero real growth as a principle. The programmes should be judged on their own merits.

The proposal which you now have in front of you is an expression of our conviction that a review is needed in order to strengthen the Organization to meet the challenges in a continuously changing environment and enable it to fulfil in an optimal and most effective way its objectives and functions as spelt out in the Constitution, to permit the receiving countries to profit in an optimal way of the programmes of technical assistance. We strongly believe in the multilateral cooperation system and it is an expression of our wish to enhance this cooperation that the existing proposal should be seen.

I wish to point out that the review according to our opinion should be undertaken within the framework of the Basic Text. We believe that the constitution of FAO is still valid as a general frame of reference for the activities of the Organization. As the Norwegian delegate declared in his introductory statement we believe that an adequate mechanism for the undertaking of this review could be an ad hoc high level body.

Finally I wish to underline that the Nordic proposal should be seen as a framework for an open discussion on this matter between the Member Nations.

Kou CHANSINA (Laos): Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, permettez-moi de vous féliciter pour votre élection à la présidence de cette importante Commission.

En ce qui concerne la proposition de réforme de la procédure du budget-programme faite par certains Etats Membres, ma délégation veut faire les remarques suivantes.

Comme vous le savez, depuis sa création, il y a maintenant quarante-deux ans, en dépit de la situation économique mondiale et des échanges parfois instables et difficiles qui ne favorisent guère la production alimentaire et agricole, la FAO a néanmoins fait des progrès remarquables dans différents domaines, en particulier dans ceux de l'agriculture, des forêts, des pêches, du développement rural et de la nutrition, au cours de son existence, et surtout à partir des années 80.

Aussi, les problèmes de la faim, de la pénurie alimentaire et de la pauvreté rurale touchant des centaines de millions d'hommes ont-ils fait l'objet d'un examen attentif en vue de les résoudre graduellement, au cours de ces dernières années. Non, ce n'est pas par pure autosatisfaction que

je constate cette réalité. C'est plutôt pour dire que les mesures et les orientations qui ont été adoptées par la FAO pendant ces dernières années sont, il faut le dire, correctes et que les résultats obtenus doivent nous encourager à nous unir autour de la FAO afin de poursuivre notre lutte contre la faim, la pénurie alimentaire et la pauvreté, ces maladies chroniques qui sont en train de défigurer le monde du vingtième siècle, comme le répète inlassablement notre Directeur général.

La délégation laotienne est heureuse de constater que la FAO n'est pas une organisation intergouvernementale figée mais une organisation qui se perfectionne sans cesse dans ses politiques, ses priorités et ses modalités d'intervention. L'exemple du programme de coopération technique qui s'avère être utile pour un pays comme le nôtre, celui de la mise en place progressive d'un réseau de représentants dans les pays membres etc., en sont les preuves.

C'est dans ce contexte que ma délégation entend examiner la mise en oeuvre de diverses réformes proposées par un certain nombre de pays membres, et portant sur divers aspects des buts et activités de la FAO, y compris l'élaboration du budget.

Nous félicitons les pays membres qui ont ainsi présenté une large gamme de propositions destinées à améliorer le fonctionnement de notre Organisation. Ces propositions constituent une preuve éloquente de leur foi dans le rôle essentiel de la FAO. La République démocratique populaire du Laos partage cette conviction.

A ce tout premier stade de nos discussions, il est compréhensible que ces propositions, toutes bien intentionnées, soient nombreuses et même dans certains cas contradictoires. Beaucoup sont excellentes. Certaines méritent un examen approfondi.

Ma délégation considère que, participant à cette Conférence, nous pouvons jouer un rôle très utile si nous parvenons à délimiter le domaine où s'appliqueront les modifications. Nous devons préciser les domaines qu'il convient d'étudier pour y apporter des améliorations. Ceci constitue une tâche que nous ne pouvons déléguer à aucun groupe de travail quel que soit son niveau ou la valeur de ses membres. Je considère que les représentants qui constituent cette Conférence sont les mieux informés des besoins de leurs pays et de la façon dont l'Organisation peut au mieux y répondre à l'avenir. De plus, nous devons, dans toute la mesure possible, utiliser nos propres structures et nos propres moyens.

Ma délégation n'est pas disposée à accepter quelque proposition que cela soit qui viserait à réduire les prérogatives de la Conférence en ce qui concerne la définition de la politique de notre Organisation.

Reza ASKARIYEH (Iran, Islamic Republic of): We wish you and the Commission a successful conclusion. Also I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to the Secretariat for the preparation of the valuable document C 87/30.

Today, after a lengthy debate, we are finally here to review certain aspects of FAO's goals and operations, especially the need for reform in the programme and budget process to re-adjust and meet the challenges of the next decade.

With respect to the Member States who do not wish to use FAO as a means to oppress the underprivileged countries for their own further eco-political gains, we urge the developing countries to express more attention and effort to bring about changes necessary to mobilize FAO for its future tasks.

In view of considerable food security deterioration in most developing countries, and worsening international economic and financial crises due to inflation and devaluation of the U.S. dollar, if the role of FAO is to be of any significance to a certain extent to remedy these crises we must have an FAO with efficient programming and budgeting processes.

During the course of this Twenty-fourth Session of FAO Conference we are looking forward to the approval of a series of measures relating to the structural planning, programming and budgeting processes. Therefore, we would like to express our views as follows: concerning document C 87/30 we would like to declare that the position of our Government in the line of experts for reviewing the objectives of FAO does not seem to be necessary. We would like to pose the replacement of "reform" by "improvement" since any principle reform requires change in the Constitution of FAO which in itself does not seem easily plausible.

As mentioned above, any improvement for the benefit of the developing countries requires more decentralization, and in this regard, we would like to propose the following suggestions:

We would like to support the conception of the establishment of regional offices of FAO and FAO representation in the countries. In this regard we strongly request from FAO and His Excellency the Director-General an increase in the number of the aforesaid offices. It is to be mentioned that the establishment of four offices proposed by Dr Saouma does not seem to be sufficient.

Along with the presence of these offices each country would be in a position to collaborate with FAO representatives in line with the country's objectives and requirements. In this respect the role which FAO can play in the implementation of these objectives could, therefore, be defined and planned.

FAO should allocate a global yearly budget to each country in order to plan their programmes and budgets.

Programmes linked to government plans that are in accordance with the general guidelines set forth by FAO, UNDP, TCP, and the like, will also be prepared and planned by each state at FAO's MSCA (Member State's Central Agency) with greater reliance on local resources, improved farming systems and socio-economy.

FAO will feed greater specialized statistics and analyses to each country's "FAO's MSCA" emphasizing their own situation, location, resources, etcetera, as well as providing them with policies and guidelines.

A draft summary of the Programme of Work and Budget produced by each country, with the collaboration of FAO representation, should be sent to the regional FAO office for further consideration along with other countries of the region. Then, the summary should be passed to Headquarters for final technical revision. Afterwards the Secretariat takes the necessary actions and should finally send the draft Programme of Work and Budget to FAO Council and then to FAO Conference for final adoption.

Amador VELASQUEZ GARCIA-MONTERROSO (Perú): En primer lugar, Señor Presidente, reciba usted nuestra felicitación por su designación como Presidente de esta Comisión. Voy a ser muy concreto y puntual.

Sobre el tema en cuestión mi país siempre ha sido, y es, partidario de las reformas que persiguen el mejoramiento de las instituciones a las que pertenecemos; pero, a su vez, consideramos que el perfeccionamiento, en el entendido de que todo es perfectible, debe hacerse dentro del marco legal y orgánico y la Constitución misma a la que nuestra Organización se debe.

Por ello, y en vista de que varios oradores han fundamentado las valederas razones de esta posición, reitero la adhesión del Perú a la Declaración de mi Grupo Regional, vale decir del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): La délégation guinéenne vous félicite de votre élection au niveau de la présidence de notre Commission. Ma délégation considère ce point de réforme éventuelle avec un intérêt tout particulier parce que touchant le fondement et les objectifs de notre Organisation.

La Guinée pense que depuis la création de la FAO cette Organisation a connu de nombreuses améliorations qui ont abouti à la qualification que nous lui connaissons aujourd'hui, et dont les pays membres en développement se félicitent. Le principe d'égalité entre les membres, et celui de participation de l'Organisation au développement par le biais de l'assistance technique et de la présence effective des représentations dans les pays, sont des facteurs éminemment positifs.

Nous estimons que le problème réel qui se pose est celui volontairement créé par des pays membres qui retardent de s'acquitter de leurs obligations vis-à-vis de notre Organisation; de ce fait, celle-ci connaît des difficultés quant à la réalisation de l'ensemble des programmes d'action qui lui sont confiés par les pays membres.

Nous ne pensons pas que le moyen de la pression financière soit approprié pour faire prévaloir une soi-disant nécessité de réforme au sein de la FAO; en effet ses méthodes actuelles de travail se caractérisent par une extrême souplesse lui permettant de s'adapter aux différents événements économiques, politiques et sociaux dont les Pays membres sont le siège. Nous ne pensons pas que la question de réforme en profondeur soit une préoccupation prioritaire et urgente; certes nous ne la rejetons pas mais nous estimons que la poursuite de la discussion doit être opérée au niveau des différentes instances de notre Organisation jusqu'à maturité du problème posé, et surtout jusqu'à ce que la situation des liquidités soit équilibrée au sein de notre Organisation.

Hermann REDL (Austria)(original language German): First of all we should like to congratulate you on your election and I should like to express my best wishes for success. I should also like to thank the Secretariat for preparing document C 87/30.

Austria endorses the principles contained in the basic text of the Organization. If we are discussing thoughts today it is because the objective we have in mind is to contribute to attaining these objectives by best using the means and resources available. This is essential.

In all our debates and considerations we must take into account all UN decisions and the decisions of the various bodies within the UN family. I should like to recall the decisions of the World Food Conference held in 1974, the WACARRD and the Fisheries Conference as well as the World Conference on Forestry. We also accept the consensus principle. We attach great importance to it. It should be retained. We also believe that some measures are necessary to strengthen the activities of FAO and to avoid any overlapping of activities to guarantee the best and optimum use of the available resources. I am thinking especially about FAO collaboration with the relevant bodies of the Economic Commission in Geneva.

New problems are arising and new problems are there to be coped with. All these problems must be taken into account when discussing FAO activities. We believe that the necessary bodies to do this exist and whenever necessary these bodies should be strengthened or important criticisms should always be constructive and conducive to positive results. We reject any form of destructive criticism.

Now I should like to come to the draft resolution. We have not received them all and this is why I would like to be given a chance to talk about them later.

Douglas LINDORES (Ganada): Let me join the others who have congratulated you as Chairman of this Commission.

Two years ago at the Twenty-third Conference of the FAO Canada outlined in its submission, in Plenary and in this Commission, both its support for the FAO and its concerns about the evolution of this Organization over its recent history. I do not intend to review our concerns in great detail at this time - many of them were well expressed by our Australian colleague this morning. We can certainly associate ourselves with his submission. In addition, we have had numerous occasions over the past two years to explain them to many who were kind enough to listen. Let me simply underline the basic objectives which we have been pursuing as were outlined this morning in our statement to Plenary.

We believe that we should all benefit within the FAO from a greater clarity in the substance and process of priority setting that we believe this Organization should become a more dynamic forum for the exchange of views with a tolerance for differing opinions on the problems that face world agriculture. We believe that our agency should be most appropriately organized to achieve the priority objectives that we have established. We believe that our council and committees should play a more effective role in governing the activities of our Secretariat and in allocating our limited resources. We believe that the FAO's daily management functions should be achieved with the benefit of the modern managerial concepts and tools that are now available to us. We believe that our programming process should more properly reflect the increasing need to lower costs while enhancing impact.

Finally, we believe that FAO should assume its full responsibility as a cooperative and integral partner within the broader UN system.

Those seven objectives - rather simply stated, I admit - entail scores of detailed questions on which we will not try your patience by addressing today.

In the complex process of managing multilateral institutions we believe that it is from the management that the leadership must be forthcoming if the process of adapting to changing priorities is to be achieved with the minimum possible level of controversy. High on this list of changing priorities is a much clearer view of the links between resources used and results achieved. From the statements made at this Conference and elsewhere it is apparent to us that the current management of the FAO is essentially satisfied that it has responded by and large properly to the evolving needs of the FAO's Member States. The debate in this Commission on this item and events earlier in this Conference indicate that the majority of Member States agree with that assessment. It has been pointed out to us that it is a lack of political will to provide resources to the FAO that is the institution's primary problem and not any shortcomings on its own part. This is, in our view, a rather simplistic position with which we do not agree. Although my country has never failed to meet its assessed payment obligations to the FAO on time, recently, we have not used the FAO in any major way as a delivery channel for our voluntary development assistance funds. These funds will continue to be channelled through those organizations in which we have greater confidence as to the development impact achieved.

I would like generally to conclude by underlining our strong support for the resolution tabled by the Nordic countries this morning. We can also associate ourselves with the statement of our Norwegian colleague in which he outlined the reasoning behind the Nordic countries' resolution. It would be difficult to over-estimate the importance of this issue for us.

We are also grateful for the innovative proposal placed before this Commission by the distinguished representative of France. This is a thoughtful proposal which seeks to bridge the gap that obviously exists between some of the governments in this room. We appreciate that effort, and are prepared to give that proposal careful consideration. Our initial reaction is, nevertheless, that the French proposal would not lead to the required injection of intellectual leadership that the question of meaningful reform in the FAO now demands. Canada will not abandon its goal of a FAO universally respected for its competence and efficiency in addressing world problems of hunger and malnutrition. We will continue to work towards that goal. The most fundamental elements of our policy towards the FAO will, of course, be heavily influenced by the extent to which we are able to continue to share common objectives with the majority of FAO's membership.

Carlos DELPIAZZO (Uruguay): Señor Presidente, la Delegación de la República Oriental del Uruguay desea reafirmar la posición manifestada esta mañana en nombre del Grupo Latinoamericano y el Caribe por su Presidente.

Pensamos que ésta es una de las mejores formas de manifestar nuestro apoyo y nuestra confianza en la Organización y en sus posibilidades de ajuste y dinamismo en su modo de actuar. Lamentablemente, no tenemos el honor de compartir algunas propuestas de reformas realizadas en este ámbito.

En primer lugar, con relación a las propuestas de modificación relativas al procedimiento presupuestario, pensamos que las mismas no se ajustan al marco regulador actualmente vigente en nuestra Organización, particularmente no se ajustan a la Constitución de la FAO, no se ajustan a su reglamento general de organización y tampoco a su reglamento de finanzas. No puede decirse que el nivel presupuestario y el orden de prioridades no sean conocidos con antelación, por cuanto, en cumplimiento de las normas actualmente vigentes, todos los Estados tienen conocimiento de tales documentos con suficiente antelación al momento de iniciarse cada período de sesiones de la Conferencia.

La delegación de la República Oriental del Uruguay, tras un examen primario de estas propuestas entiende que cualquier ajuste en el tema presupuestal debe realizarse, en todo caso, en el marco del reglamento y de la Constitución vigentes. No podemos propiciar ni acompañar mecanismos indirectos de modificación de las reglas constitutivas de nuestra Organización. Si queremos mejorar la Organización, como creo que todos los Estados que la integramos aspiramos a que ocurra, debemos empezar por cumplir las normas de la Organización, y no establecer por vías indirectas, procedimientos que por su complejidad y su extensión, más que agilizar, pueden burocratizar y, por ende, debilitar nuestra Organización.

En segundo lugar, Señor Presidente, tampoco tenemos el honor de compartir la propuesta de integración de un grupo de alto nivel. No creemos conveniente la creación de un grupo de estas características, porque confiamos en la propia Organización, en cuanto a su capacidad para examinarse y para revisarse a sí misma.

La Organización, Señor Presidente, la FAO, somos nosotros, los Estados que la integramos, y nuestra voluntad debe manifestarse a través de nuestros representantes en el marco de las normas actualmente vigentes para la FAO.

Finalmente, a fin de no agobiar a la Comisión, en consideraciones de tipo jurídico, que estaríamos en condiciones de añadir, en caso de que la Comisión lo juzgue necesario o conveniente, queremos ratificar el apoyo de nuestro país y nuestra confianza en la FAO, y proponemos exhortar a los órganos ejecutivos y a los servicios de la FAO para que dinamicen su gestión.

Son muy importantes los fines que nos proponemos alcanzar a través de la Organización para que distraigamos nuestro tiempo discutiendo aspectos formales, que como tales son necesariamente secundarios.

J. Augusto DE MÊDICIS (Brazil): During the 91st Session of the Council, held last June, the Brazilian delegation agreed that any proposal aiming at the improvement of FAO and the enhancement of its work should be dealt with by the Conference, which should as well decide on its opportunity, scope and methodology of work. We are, therefore, open to dialogue and ready to discuss sound and truly multilateral proposals that take into due account the interests of the Organization and of all its member countries. From the start, however, we reject any attempt to disregard the "one-country-one-vote" basic principle.

Unfortunately, Mr Chairman, this seems to be the main concern of most of the proposals presented and summarized in document C 87/30. The shortfall in payments by the largest contributor, which is the main cause of the present financial difficulties, is often invoked as a reason for the alleged need of reforms. Some other countries go so far as to defend "more realistic" approaches to ensure greater influence of major developed contributors in the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget and in the overall decision-making process. Even in this sensitive area there are, however, conflicting proposals. Thus, for instance, while some advocate longer and deeper discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget, another country wishes that, after the approval by the Finance Committee, the Programme of Work and Budget be no further questioned by the Council or by the Conference. However, the renewed confidence in the Finance Committee would only take place, according to that proposal, after an increased participation of developed Member States in that Committee.

The enhancement of FAO's work, and not its tighter control by a few main contributors, must be the aim of any discussion. Above all, Mr Chairman, the present financial difficulties should not be used as an excuse for additional pressures on the Organization and for new challenges to multilateralism. The anticipated shortfall is not a "symptom of disaffection on the part of numerous FAO Member States" as suggested in one of the proposals. Member States unanimously recognize the importance of FAO and the great majority fully support its activities. Delays in payments, with one exception, result from economic difficulties.

On the other hand, it seems highly contradictory to us that amongst the present financial difficulties, some of the main contributors confront us with a series of proposals that will lead to larger and mostly unnecessary new expenses. We are referring specifically to the creation of highlevels groups to examine the budget process, management and objectives of the Organization; the engagement of external consultants and experts; and the proliferation of new bodies, such as the "Committee of Farmer Organizations" and the "Field Programme Committee".

My delegation believes that the objectives, strategies and priorities of the Organization reflect Member States' interests and have progressively adapted to needs and circumstances. We are, however, ready to discuss, in the competent fora of the Organization, some sound suggestions presented in the papers under review. As stated in the Japanese paper, "the FAO Secretariat has already taken some measures which, in fact, reflect the spirit of the recommendations" of the Group of 18, of the United Nations. We would add that some of the measures being proposed by the papers are under implementation or consideration by Member States. In this case are some of those related to the Working Capital Fund and to delayed payments. This is a better way of discussing issues of common interest and of proceeding to changes and improvements in the Organization.

We agree, as stated in the document presented by the developing countries, that "what is required is not high-level expert groups, but united political will among Member Nations". More than a thorough

review of the Organization, we need deeper discussions and decisions on the main factors leading to the widening of the economic gap between developed and developing countries. Political will must be shown in relation to solutions to the foreign debt problem, to the dismantlement of protectionist policies and to building a fairer international economic order. In FAO, we need greater support to the TCP and to ECD/TCDC activities and a genuine commitment from the developed member countries, to the Codex Alimentarius standards and to truly multilateral projects in the field.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I have the idea that this discussion is taking place without any really serious thought being given to the issues that were brought to the attention of Member States as long ago as the last Conference, as was mentioned by the distinguished delegate for Cameroon. I also had the impression that those who say that there is no need for a review have not been listening to the general debate in Plenary. I myself have heard several forceful interventions in favour of change, and they are certainly not confined to the representatives of the developed countries. Nor do I think we are considering in a serious way the implications of the new international atmosphere and the new mood of self searching within the United Nations family as a whole and within other international development institutions. It is certainly not necessary to await the outcome of the decisions within the United Nations itself. Decisions to make a review of structure, objectives and other issues which are related can and should be taken by each institution at the earliest practicable moment. Such a decision in fact has only recently been reached by consensus at UNCTAD VII within UNCTAD.

The reasons for Britain's consistent support for review and reform within FAO were set out very clearly by my Minister to Plenary earlier today and therefore I will not repeat his remarks. However, they are an integral part, and indeed the basis of my country's position. For us this is also, and has always been, divorced from the budgetary crisis or from any other issue. Every competent institution should have the capacity for its governing bodies to conduct and oversee critical self-examination. The idea that everything in the garden is lovely in itself betokens a very dangerous complacency. When consultancies are taken into account the total number of staff employed by FAO in the field and Headquarters amounts to nearly 7 500 but of this figure only just under 2 000 are employed full time in the field programme.

I will illustrate this theme further by reference to the debate so far on priorities, and especially priorities in relation to FAO's individual country actions. It is useless to pretend, as I have heard some delegates pretend, that national resource and investment priorities can be set by reference to a set of international guidelines agreed by this or that technical conference. Guidelines of that kind are useful in helping us all to consider where to put our strategic priorities and how to do it over a period of years. They are no help at all in considering when to do it and what resources should be devoted to this or that activity, when we are trying to refocus our constrained national resources for the immediate future.

It is clear also that misunderstandings persist in this Commission. It is even suggested, as now, I think, by the distinguished delegate from Brazil, that there are threats to the supreme role of the Conference and to the one country one vote principle. Anyone who has actually read the Nordic Draft Resolution could not possibly make such a nonsensical statement. The chief problem to us, and the chief requirement, is for a more effective deployment of FAO's efforts tailored to the precise changing and short-to-medium-term needs of each country.

With due deference to the distinguished delegate of Barbados, it is just not true that this is only a matter for the UNDP Resident Representatives alone. Indeed the Trust Fund and the TCP must be more effectively geared to the urgent priorities of each country. Urgent priorities are not the same as emergency needs. Proper pre-planning of the bulk of the TCP is an essential element in a more effective FAO field strategy.

Some have mentioned the importance of the Basic Texts and their observations. We agree the basic elements in those Texts must be sacrosanct. There must be no changes in the essential structure of the governing bodies. Nevertheless, it is not inconceivable or wrong to look at some of the more detailed rules that are bound up in that single volume. If I might for a moment compare this to the Christian Bible, there are parts of the Texts that are rather like the Ten Commandments and there are other parts that are like the lists of genealogies. Not every comma is sacrosanct, and the suggestion that some procedures might be looked at with a view to their improvement should not be treated as a heresy worthy of burning at the stake.

The Nordic Proposal that has been put to us today by the distinguished delegate of Norway offers clear, comprehensive and well-linked suggestions for our consideration. My Minister has already made it plain in Plenary that we think that it is excellent and that we should back it one hundred percent. It does no violence to the Basic Texts. It offers a proper role to each Member State to make its own reflections on the future. It proposes a fixed but reasonable timetable. It proposes - and this is also essential - close links in all the work with the management of FAO. It does not pre-empt or prejudice the answers to the questions that we should be asking ourselves. It does set those questions out clearly and puts forward a sensible method of reviewing them.

The questions have to include the issue of management organization, as both African and developed country Ministers said in Plenary today. You cannot settle what you ought best to be doing without also examining how best to do it. My delegation reserves the right to revert to detailed discussion of the Draft Resolutions at a later stage. Meanwhile let me only say, as was said to my delegation elsewhere in this building yesterday - and I quote - that: "reform within FAO is now unavoidable".

Antonio MAGALHÃES COELHO (Portugal): Monsieur le Président, ma délégation vous félicite de votre élection à la présidence de cette Commission.

La délégation portugaise a bien présent à l'esprit le rôle important que joue la FAO dans l'aide apportée aux pays en voie de développement. C'est dans ce sens que nous pensons qu'il est nécessaire de maximiser les ressources de son budget de telle sorte que la plus grande part de l'argent disponible soit acheminée vers des projets sur le terrain et que ceux-ci fassent l'objet d'un schéma rigide de priorités prenant en compte les aspects d'ordre social et de reproductivité des investissements .

Sans vouloir mettre en cause les efforts et les hauts mérites du Comité du programme et du Comité financier, nous pensons que la FAO aurait des avantages si leurs travaux pouvaient être canalisés par des experts extérieurs à l'Organisation et qui ne seraient pas influencés par le travail quotidien de la FAO. Mais, d'un autre côté, nous pensons qu'il ne faut pas mettre de côté la compétence et le dévouement du personnel de la FAO qui, statutairement, réalise déjà ce travail.

En tenant compte de ces points, la délégation portugaise donne son adhésion à la constitution d'un comité mixte d'experts de l'extérieur et de la FAO pour réaliser l'évaluation mentionnée.

Ugo SESSI (Italie): Monsieur le Président, je répondrai très volontiers à votre appel à la concision. Je voudrais vous féliciter de votre élection et je vous prie de transmettre mes félicitations au Vice-président quand nous aurons le bénéfice de l'avoir avec nous dans cette salle.

Nous sommes à un moment très important de notre travail. Nous examinons un point de l'ordre du jour vital pour la FAO. Je tiens à remercier le Secrétariat d'avoir préparé ce document C 87/30 et surtout le résumé des vues et suggestions présentées par les Etats Membres. Nous l'avons trouvé très utile pour l'examen de la question.

A la lecture de ce document et à la suite du débat qui a eu lieu aujourd'hui, je dois dire que deux mots émergent surtout de la discussion, à savoir la nécessité d'une transparence plus poussée pour la FAO et d'une restructuration. Ce sont des mots cruciaux, des mots à la mode, si je puis dire. Tous les jours, dans les journaux, vous pouvez lire ces deux mots dans une autre langue - transparence et restructuration - se référant à un grand pays qui, hélas, n'est pas membre de la FAO. Il y a donc la nécessité d'une plus grande transparence et d'une réforme de la FAO. Nous pensons que tout est perfectible. On peut toujours améliorer la situation.

C'est la troisième fois que je suis les travaux de la Conférence générale. Je suis actuellement les travaux de la Commission III et, même si je ne suis pas un des plus anciens à la FAO, je dois dire que j'ai trouvé le fonctionnement de cette Organisation considérablement amélioré au fil des années. On pourrait citer, comme exemple, l'institution du PCT et la décentralisation, le taux décroissant des dépenses consacrées au personnel au bénéfice des dépenses sur le terrain et, enfin, l'informatisation, toujours plus poussée à la FAO.

A notre sens, l'Organisation a démontré qu'elle est un organisme vital capable de changer au fil des années et de répondre au défi des demandes toujours accrues qui lui parviennent du monde en développement. Pour nous, donc, comme l'ont dit plusieurs orateurs, une réforme, une restructuration partielle pourrait être mise en place. En commençant une oeuvre de restructuration, il faudrait, selon nous, élaborer un programme de travail très clair et identifier, en premier lieu, les objectifs finals à atteindre, en second lieu, les moyens pour le faire et, en troisième lieu, le processus à utiliser. Ces trois facteurs ont été mentionnés dans l'intervention que le Ministre de l'agriculture de mon pays a prononcée, hier matin. Je vais donc élaborer très brièvement sur ce concept.

En ce qui concerne les objectifs finals, il ne faut pas remettre en cause et en discussion, bien sûr, les Textes fondamentaux. Je crois qu'il existe là un consensus général chez toutes les délégations, à savoir que le rôle de la FAO dans le domaine de l'aide au développement agricole mondial doit rester tel qu'il est énoncé dans les Textes Fondamentaux.

En ce qui concerne les moyens, il nous semblerait inopportun et injuste d'exclure le Secrétariat, le personnel de la FAO de ce travail. Il y a dans cette Organisation un remarquable patrimoine d'expérience, de travail, de connaissances, qu'il serait malheureux d'évincer d'emblée.

Quelle que soit la restructuration que l'on va étudier, le Secrétariat devrait y être associé le plus étroitement possible. En outre, il ne faut pas oublier les organismes intergouvernementaux qui existent à l'intérieur de la FAO et qui, selon nous, auraient à jouer un rôle fondamental dans ce processus; nous pensons en particulier au Comité financier et souhaiterions un élargissement de la composition du mandat de ce comité; nous voulons dire par là qu'il faudrait lui donner des moyens plus concrets et plus prégnants d'intervention dans le processus budgétaire et dans le travail de l'Organisation.

Enfin, concernant le processus, il faudrait choisir une approche pragmatique, qui se situe dans la ligne du fonctionnement régulier, normal, de l'Organisation. Nous n'aimerions pas avoir des conférences extraordinaires, ou autre chose de ce genre, mises en place pour approuver des rapports des comités d'experts ou d'autres organes intérieurs.

Il faudrait prévoir un processus qui passe par les organes internes, le Comité de programme, le Comité financier, le Conseil et la Conférence.

Je limiterai ici mon premier commentaire en me réservant le droit d'intervenir dans la suite du débat.

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Permítame, Sr. Presidente, en primer lugar hacerle llegar la felicitación de mi delegación a usted y a los vicepresidentes de la Comisión por su elección.

En relación al tema que nos ocupa la delegación argentina quisiera expresar sólo algunas ideas básicas.

En primer lugar, quisiéramos manifestar que hemos intentado aprehender en todo su significado la información y propuestas contenidas en el documento C 87/30 presentadas por varios países industrializados. No obstante, debo confesar que este ejercicio, que significó un notable esfuerzo de análisis, no ha tenido como resultado, en nuestro caso, la formación de un juicio completo y definitivo acerca de las cuestiones planteadas.

Uno de los principales impedimentos para esto fue la cantidad de contradicciones que entre estos mismos papeles fue posible detectar.

Con relación a la necesidad de proceder a realizar reformas sustanciales en la FAO, la delegación Argentina estima que el concepto "reforma" es demasiado amplio y demasiado radical, motivo por el cual se opuso en ocasión de la introducción del tema 11 en la agenda de esta Conferencia a su inclusión en el título del tema.

Al respecto, debemos hacer constar nuestra coincidencia con lo expresado por la delegación de Bangladesh en el sentido que no nos convencen los argumentos adelantados hasta el presente para proceder a una reforma de tan vastos alcances, como algunas delegaciones pretenden.

Permítame en consecuencia referirme a estas cuestiones en términos de "necesidad de examinar" y no de "necesidad de reformar".

Con relación al alcance del examen pasaré revista brevemente a las cinco más grandes áreas que los países industrializados proponen que se examinen. En primer lugar, están los objetivos y función de la Organización. La mayor parte de las propuestas sobre estas cuestiones escapan al denominador

común de las reformas solicitadas hacia el presente en otros organismos internacionales. Si bien el documento de la Secretaría aclara que todas las comunicaciones reconocen la validez indiscutible del mandato, de la Constitución y de los documentos básicos de la FAO, el documento de Suiza pone en duda la existencia misma de dicho mandato sugiriendo que éste debería ser definido sobre la base de la resolución de la institución de una economía de la abundancia aprobada por la Conferencia de Hot Springs en 1943.

Mi delegación estima que los objetivos y función de la Organización que técnicamente no son otra cosa que el mandato de la organización están perfectamente definidos en el preámbulo y en el Artículo I de su Constitución.

Nos parece sumamente aventurada la aseveración de Suiza y queremos dejar expresa constancia que no nos parece pertinente su revisión. La FAO ha cumplido y cumple un rol destacado; en los esfuerzos para erradicar el hambre y la desnutrición, su valor y vigencia está más allá de toda duda; sus objetivos, tanto para el corto como para el mediano plazo son válidos y a nuestro juicio se ajustan a las necesidades de los países en desarrollo.

Entrando ahora en el segundo gran área en la cual se están pidiendo reformas, que son las estrategias de largo plazo y las prioridades de la FAO; estimamos que la elección de los medios para lograr los objetivos y el establecimiento de las prioridades son patrimonio exclusivo de los Estados Miembros que deben actuar a este respecto con el asesoramiento y la información que le ofrecen la Secretaría y los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

Coincidimos en que existe la necesidad, atento a la crisis de liquidez que sufre la Organización en este momento, de proceder a una formulación clara y precisa de las prioridades, tarea en la que los países miembros deben poner el máximo de buena voluntad y espíritu de colaboración.

En lo que respecta a las que han sido incluidas en el documento C 87/3 para el próximo bienio, estimamos que en definitiva ellas son de las que los propios Estados Miembros hemos fijado en los diversos foros. La Secretaría de FAO sólo ha reflejado en el citado documento la voluntad mayoritaria de sus miembros.

El tercer área de preocupación es la reforma del proceso de adopción de decisiones. Señor. Presidente, si bien mi Delegación puede entender las razones invocadas por algunos países para esta propuesta, estimamos que la necesidad de esta modificación debe ser acordada en razón de la voluntad de los que adoptan las decisiones. En consecuencia, creemos que deben ser ellos mismos, dialogando en éste y en otros foros intergubernamentales los que decidan el modo y la oportunidad de proceder a su examen y eventualmente sobre la base de un documento de la Secretaría que describa los métodos utilizados por otras organizaciones.

Con relación a la reforma del proceso de programación y presupuestación, hemos notado que todas las propuestas de los países industrializados acentúan este punto, que fuera el originariamente planteado por la Delegación de los Estados Unidos de América en ocasión del 91º Período de Sesiones del Consejo.

Las sugerencias que aducen la necesidad de mejorar la transparencia financiera, tienden a asegurar una mayor participación de los países miembros en el proceso inicial de preparación del proyecto de Programa y Presupuesto, a la vez que concentrar las decisiones últimas sobre prioridades y asignación de fondos en un único organismo intermedio que aglutinaría las funciones de los actuales Comités del Programa y de Finanzas. Países Bajos propone que este cuente, con "adecuada" representación de los países donantes y que sus recomendaciones sean prácticamente vinculantes para los órganos deliberativos.

A este respecto, Señor Presidente, quisiéramos dejar constancia desde ya, que no consideramos adecuada ninguna modificación en los procedimientos que tienda a otorgar a algunos miembros, o grupos de miembros, un voto ponderado, una voz más potente, o un poder de veto sobre éste o cualquier otro área en que se adopten decisiones en esta Organización.

Al respecto, apoyamos lo dicho hace unos momentos por el distinguido Delegado de la República Oriental del Uruguay.

El Programa de Campo de la FAO. Respecto de esto, la Delegación argentina estima que algunas de las propuestas pueden ser interesantes y merecerían un estudio más detenido por parte de la Secretaría y los órganos intergubernamentales. Apoyamos los pedidos de una mayor coherencia y coordinación con otras agencias o programas y con los esfuerzos de los propios países beneficiarios.

Comprenderá usted, Señor Presidente, que la magnitud de las sugerencias nos imposibilita de comentarlas todas. No obstante, permítame en primer término aclarar que el no mencionarlas no implica de ninguna manera que las consideremos aceptables o inaceptables.

En segundo lugar, quisiera dejar aquí sentada la posición de mi Delegación respecto de la posibilidad de examinar el funcionamiento administrativo y financiero de FAO, para intentar reforzar su eficiencia y la eficacia e impacto de sus programas. Estimamos que toda Organización es perfectible, y que los países miembros utilizando mecanismos adecuados, por medio de sus órganos intergubernamentales y con el apoyo técnico de la Secretaría, pueden y deben atender a estas cuestiones. Contará, para ello con la experiencia de otros organismos, otros órganos u otros grupos. Podrán analizar las recomendaciones del Grupo de los 18 de Naciones Unidas, las conclusiones a que arribe oportunamente el ECOSOC en su examen del sector económico y social del Sistema de Naciones Unidas, y las opiniones de órganos técnicos como la Dependencia Común de Inspección.

No es necesario, a juicio de mi Delegación, proceder a la creación del propuesto grupo de alto nivel. Coincidimos al respecto con lo manifestado durante el día de ayer por el distinguido Embajador de Bélgica.

Señor Presidente, no necesitamos un diálogo político de alto nivel. Podríamos, en cambio, ganar algo si en su lugar utilizamos nosotros mismos los recursos humanos, los insumos técnicos, el sentido común y la voluntad política para emprender los exámenes que creamos pertinentes.

Permítame por último, Señor Presidente, referirme al modo y oportunidad de adoptar decisiones respecto de este tema. La Delegación argentina quisiera que todas las Delegaciones aquí presentes dispongamos de todo el tiempo necesario para agotar las consultas, pues apresurarnos no sería, a no dudarlo, beneficioso para el resultado de hoy, ni para la FAO que queremos en el mañana.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sobre este tema, Señor Presidente, la posición de Colombia fue expresada adecuadamente esta mañana por el distinguido Embajador de Costa Rica, Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. Los brotes de espíritu reformista no son nuevos en esta Organización. La FAO no se ha mantenido estática en sus 42 años de existencia.

Para referirnos tan sólo a los últimos 20 años, convendrá recordar que la Conferencia de 1967, mediante un Grupo de Trabajo, aportó ciertas ideas que en 1968 contribuyeron a mejorar los trabajos de nuestra Organización. Ocho años más tarde en 1976, empezó una nueva era en la vida de la FAO. El Director General elegido por la Conferencia de 1975 propuso una serie de reformas que recibieron amplio apoyo y han tenido notorias consecuencias benéficas.

Particularmente los colegas de Laos e Italia se refirieron a dos aspectos principales: el Programa de Cooperación Técnica y la Política de Descentralización, mediante designación de representantes de la FAO en los países como funcionarios propios de nuestra Organización. Hoy, en 1987 doce años después, la FAO no se ha mantenido dormida. Por el contrario ha estado atenta vigilante cómo todos los hechos que han tenido cumplimiento en la comunidad internacional debieran reflejarse sobre las políticas y los programas de la Organización. Esa actitud dinámica y permanentemente innovadora del Director General de la FAO ha venido recibiendo el pleno apoyo de los órganos rectores, particularmente Comité del Programa y de Finanzas, Comités Técnicos, Consejo, Conferencias Regionales y Conferencia, organismos en los cuales han participado representantes de todos los Estados Miembros. Estos hechos conforman la posición neta y convencida de la Delegación de Colombia en el sentido de que todo deseo de reforma no podrá interpretarse como censura ni crítica a lo que se ha hecho hasta ahora. Por el contrario pensamos que toda reforma deberá estar dirigida a fortalecer las buenas realizaciones logradas.

Dentro de esa concepción, la Delegación de Colombia considera que nuestro país está abierto al diálogo para introducir algunas reformas moderadas, prudentes, sensatas y objetivas, basando cualquier cambio en la condición inmodificable de que todo ello deberá significar mejores y más eficaces servicios

para los países en desarrollo ¿Cómo podríamos oponernos a reformas que encaucen, por ejemplo, mejor el uso de las nuevas tecnologías? ¿A reformas que condujeran a que se evite en el futuro el incumplimiento del compromiso que adquieren todos los contribuyentes para que así la FAO no siga sometida al asedio constante de reajustes de programas con tan lamentable beneficio para los países en desarrollo? ¿Cómo podríamos oponernos a reformas que puedan fortalecer el carácter multilateral de nuestra Organización? ¿y a traer así nuevos recursos a parte de los del Programa Ordinario, Fondos Fiduciarios o contribuciones voluntarias que permitan a la FAO ofrecer nuevos y aun mejores servicios a los Estados del Tercer Mundo?

Hemos seguido con atención el debate sobre este tema y encontramos apenas natural la controversia que se ha desatado. Es un tema importante, cuya conclusión tendrá repercusiones en el futuro de la Organización. Dentro de este debate hemos, seguido con atención el espíritu constructivo y el ánimo sensato que han guiado a los países nórdicos, uno de cuyos líderes, nuestro colega y amigo de Noruega, Harald Høstmark hizo una declaración sincera y convencida, aunque algunos de los aspectos de las propuestas nórdicas, hechas con espíritu pragmático, no recibieron apoyo suficiente como parece. La Delegación de Colombia desea transmitir a los colegas de los países nórdicos el mensaje de comprensión y reconocimiento del Gobierno de Colombia, pidiéndoles que no se desalienten y no se sientan frustrados y seguros estamos de que cualquiera que sea el resultado de este debate los países nórdicos seguirán a la vanguardia en la defensa de los principios y las aspiraciones del Tercer Mundo. Igual confianza quisiéramos tener en todos los demás representantes de los países industrializados en esta nueva era de la FAO, para la cual el Director General ha demandado la unidad de todos los gobiernos. Han proliferado numerosos proyectos de resolución y seguramente seguirán aún muchos otros.

La Delegación de Colombia apoya lo que dijo hace poco nuestro colega y amigo vecino de la derecha, el Embajador Tchicaya, del Congo, sobre la necesidad y conveniencia de que a través de un mecanismo, como lo dijo ayer nuestro colega y amigo López Portillo, de México, se logre adoptar por consenso un solo texto, una sola resolución, que matice las distintas opiniones que aquí se han expresado.

La Delegación de Colombia confía en que usted, Señor Presidente, y los más caracterizados voceros de las diversas tendencias, encontrarán el mecanismo, ése fue el término usado por el colega del Congo, el más adecuado y eficaz para que en un ámbito más reducido, más limitado, más tranquilo y más sereno que el pleno de esta comisión, tal vez en un grupo de contacto, un grupo de trabajo o como quiera llamársele, le puedan preparar un texto que sea plenamente aceptable para todos.

La Delegación de Colombia piensa que en esta oportunidad, como tal vez en ninguna otra anterior, se requiere la unidad y el apoyo pleno de todos los gobiernos para que la FAO siga siendo un instrumento válido al servicio de los países en desarrollo.

Jung Joo KIM (Republic of Korea): To begin with the delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to express our congratulations on your election as Chairman of Commission II which is very important for the issues for the FAO.

In order to save time the delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to point out what we can agree with amongst the suggestions submitted by the Member Countries.

First, the establishment of the committee for field programme is necessary_in order to minimize inefficiency of the FAO projects and also the committee for farmers' organization should be established in order to cooperate and help to solve the problems of agriculture more effectively in parallel with FAO's reports.

Secondly, a reasonable level of independence and flexibility should be allowed to project host countries in the process of the implementation of the projects of FAO.

Lastly, considering the role of the FAO, the ECDC/TCDC activities should not be merely maintained but even be expanded in the future.

Antonio BROTONS DIEZ .(España): Señor Presidente, felicitamos a Usted por su elección como Presidente de esta Comisión.

La delegación española ha analizado detenidamente las propuestas de los distintos países que se incluyen en el documento C 87/30 respecto a la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas de la FAO.

Creemos que se debe recordar aquí que a lo largo de los últimos años la FAO ha ido reestructurando sus actividades, acomodándolas a las necesidades nacidas de la realidad agraria mundial, tanto desde el punto de vista de la producción y de las relaciones comerciales, como de la consideración de los recursos renovables y conservación del medio ambiente.

Algunos países han expresado claramente que la crisis financiera de la Organización, en nada tiene que ver con la conveniencia de una reforma en profundidad de sus estructuras.

Creemos sinceramente, que aunque este extremo es cierto en gran medida, lo cierto es que debido a estos problemas financieros, y en particular a la crisis del valor del dólar con respecto a otras monedas, es aconsejable establecer con mayor énfasis los programas prioritarios, que permitan reajustes automáticos en las actividades a desarrollar por la Organización. Cabe recordar, como experiencia, los recortes que han sido necesarios para el presupuesto de FAO 86-87, realizados por el Director General, que han conllevado disminuciones posteriores a la aprobación del presupuesto de ese bienio.

Sin duda, estas modificaciones presupuestarias deben basarse en un sistema de prioridades claramente definidas y muy en especial de los objetivos a plazo medio.

Es nuestro deseo, y de acuerdo con el principio de máxima transparencia, que la FAO siga en una línea de perfeccionamiento de su presupuesto, en el que cada día es más necesario el establecimiento de las prioridades en sus actividades y proyectos, a la par que su presentación deba permitir un sistema de evaluación permanente de sus metas conseguidas y de sus objetivos previstos.

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, jointly with other delegates, on your election as Chairman of this Commission.

It is the belief of my delegation that improvement in some aspects of the budget would strengthen the FAO's budget in conformity with the spirit of the Programme budgeting process. Thus projects supported should be in harmony and integrated well with the planning, programming and budgeting framework of recipient countries while keeping a high regard for the achievement of the project targets and objectives of the projects. Projects approved should be based on a sound system which is conducive to establishing a parcel of projects according to the needs and priorities. In addition, a sound monitoring and evaluation system needs to be adopted to be able actually to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects, with special emphasis on the achievement of the project's goal.

Without such improvement it is doubtful how we are actually able to utilize our limited budget and how the developing countries can be assisted to be self-reliant in terms of food and development with the budget constraint and the negative growth of budget, after taking into consideration the inflation and the decreasing value of the U.S. dollar. My delegation therefore believes that there is an urgent need for a budget system improvement.

V.K. SIBAL (India): At the outset we should like to congratulate you on your election and we look forward to your chairing this meeting today and in the days that follow.

We are very heartened by some of the statements that have been made but before we comment on them we should like to make the point that we seem to be having a very preliminary discussion. It is very customary for us in our meetings to have very detailed papers giving close and deep analysis of the matters under discussion before us, and we take our decision in the light of our reactions which are also aided in a substantial way by the material presented before us. In this case we are seriously handicapped because what we have is a compendium of suggestions and not the analysis which is necessary to take a balanced view on the suggestions made. Having said that, we should like to express our appreciation for the assurance given to us that what is intended is that there should be no amendments of the basic text - we take that point.

As we go into detail, I am sure that we will be able to concert together and avoid any pitfalls in the shape of amendments of the basic text which may present themselves while we are pursuing in detail some of the suggestions that have been made to us. We should also like to express our appreciation for a very appropriate point made earlier in the course of this debate namely, that what have been presented for consideration are suggestions for action and not pressure. We take note of that point.

When we go into the history of the present debate let us refer for a moment to the Ninetieth Session of Council when a few delegations raised the issue of reform of the FAO, its objectives, its priorities and its role. The record shows that most members did not share this view, but what is significant is that even those who suggested this suggested that the issue should be pursued through the Programme Committee and Council and that the reviews should be done in these fora. Of course, within the space of one year, the situation seems to have changed radically when the arena for working out the advisability of accepting or not accepting, what has been proposed is sought to be taken deliberately of this very arena in which it was initially sought to be presented.

I also beg your indulgence to revert to the Ninety-first Session of Council when these issues were raised in a big way and where it was not possible for us to arrive at a conclusion which could be subscribed to generally by the Council. We took note of a situation brought to our notice by the largest contributor and it was stated that this matter should be pursued and that would help the FAO in the difficulties it is undergoing. We had taken note of that and in a spirit of compromise and positive cooperation it was thought that even though there was no consensus on this issue let us not apply the brakes, let us present the issue to the Conference. This will give us time for reflection and a chance of having the issue debated in this Commission and in the Plenary at the Conference, so that the larger representations available in these fora may help to guide us in the further course which we are to pursue.

When we read these papers we get the feeling that we have a series of suggestions without adequate justification, a series of remedies without adequate diagnosis, a series of generalizations unsupported by adequate and concrete data and a case without adequate evidence.

One paper asks for a thorough reappraisal of FAO as a technical and development institution. We understand that the protagonists of this idea are convinced of this. However, the facts and the evidence which have led to this conviction we feel need to be shared with this Commission and with this Conference before the bodies can commit themselves to what looks like a wholesale review. Such a review would be protracted and expensive if it is to be effective, and if we are to keep in view the dictates of prudence and economy -- which are very, very important and about which we hear such a lot -- we deserve to know the case on which the reform on specific aspects of FAO's function is based. A few areas of the largest common concern on the basis of agreement would need to be identified so that further consideration could be given to what ought to be done in these areas. The suggestion that there must be a review simply because 40 years have passed is, we are afraid, rather over-simple and will not bear a close scrutiny. If an institution is broadly efficient, resilient, flexible and useful but 40 years old, what it might be needing is greater financial and operational strength and not overall reform implying that the institution is not good enough.

FAO's goals, priorities and objectives have not been plucked out of thin air. These are based on an international consensus to which all of us were a party at one time or another; they flow from the decisions of the Governing Bodies of the FAO and the decisions of international conferences in the area of food and agriculture and related areas.

A number of proposals have been made in this document which do not imply an overhaul of the Organization but shifts in emphasis on which there can always be more than one view. FAO is an organization with a membership which can and will differ in its approaches and views on the matters coming before it. Considering the shades of perspectives represented here, some may believe that the policy advisory role of the FAO should have greater priority. Policy advice is a part of FAO's mandate and operations. If there are different perceptions about its weight vis-a-vis the decentralization programme what is needed is not a case of reform but a detailed discussion within the Organization to achieve consensus on the weight to be assigned to various programmes.

Environment and depletion of natural resources are the concern of FAO today and if that needs to be more or less it is a matter again not for reform but for discussion. Sometimes there are similar suggestions; namely let us define FAO's priorities more precisely or identify objectives more clearly. Now, if we are to pursue these ideas then we need some information on what are the imprecisions troubling us and what is the lack of clarity which is causing us a problem? If we want more work on forestry and biotechnology as has been suggested, by all means we can take a view after a debate. But, we are not clear how this makes out a case for reform. Forestry is a very concern of FAO. There is a whole division doing nothing else. Bio technology has been stated to be an area in which there is an explosive potential for growth and the FAO is working on that. In the perception of some of us there has been an appropriate shift in the balance between the global and the decentralized concerns of the FAO and the shift should become even more pronounced and emphasis on TCP and training needs to be sharpened even further. However, this too is only a point of view. It must interact and compete with other viewpoints and be modified or shared more widely through debate rather than raise any issues of reform.

We have suggestions which are very acceptable, for example more active dialogues in the UN fora -- yes, by all means we should have more active dialogues. Improvement in appraisal, evaluation and feedback which have been suggested are integral to FAO operations. By all means let us look at specific proposals. The centralization of the field programme responsibilities has been suggested. Is it always better? There is a big debate always on the relative meeting of decentralization and centralization.

Let us study what is wrong with the current setup. Let us bring up these points more openly and then have a view. There is a suggestion concerning a Field Programme Committee -- There would be an excellent case for this if the Field Programme was being neglected, was not being reviewed and not being looked at. But the Field Programme is not being neglected, it is an important programme. It is being reviewed. The Programme Committee reviews it. The Council reviews it and the Conference reviews it, so we are not very clear as to how the Field Programme Committee -- I am not necessarily saying that the Committee should not be there -- constitutes a case for reform because when you talk about reform you are talking about rejection of certain institutions and mechanisms which either become decrepit, irrelevant or useless and you want to replace them with something much better.

The planning and budget process is a very important area which we are considering. We see the good intentions behind the proposals. We are having some trouble about the proposed decision by consensus. We have the assurance that amendments of the Basic Texts, are not envisaged. Within the UN also there is a reference about establishing a broad area of agreement in the budgetary process. I think we have to keep all these points in view before we commit ourselves because there is a constitutional obligation on the Director-General of the FAO to present a budget at a level which he considers appropriate. We feel that there are not enough reasons to change the situation because if you do that, the constitutional obligation is affected. If the budgetary process is to be changed the decision making process within the budgetary process should not be changed. The role of Director-General should not be attenuated. In the UN also the Secretary General's role has been preserved and the principle of one vote one country has been protected.

There is a suggestion that the Finance Committees should have representatives from the capitals who should be experts in finance and administration. Again, the intention is all right: there is no problem there, but the assumption is that the people who are available here should be excluded because they may not be experts in finance and administration and we do not know if that is a valid assumption. If the countries are to choose who should represent them, need we circumscribe their discretion to choose those experts in finance or administration whom they think can best project their viewpoint. How will it be ensured, as has been suggested, that the experts, the representatives who will be appointed, will be working in their individual capacities when they are appointed by governments?

A very interesting suggestion has been made that the Finance Committee should be reconstituted on the pattern of the CFA to strike a balance between donors and participants. We must confess that we are totally confused and puzzled at this suggestion. We do not see the FAO as an institution of donors and recipients. Everyone here is a donor and everyone here is a recipient. It is an institution which is working for global welfare within the mandate which has been assigned to it. If this kind of suggestion is pursued it could well represent a retreat from multilateralism.

Another suggestion is that there should be retrospective review of the budget of the last five biennia. Again this seems to be a very unusual suggestion. We have heard of reviewing, the budget of the last biennium, that we can understand, but to go back as far as five biennia seems more an exercise in historical archives than anything else. We are not aware of any other institution which has this kind of review and if there is we will be very grateful to be informed about it.

But some of the suggestions which have been made are very interesting and these need to be looked at, for example the suggestions for providing incentives for timely payments of contribution and those for a larger Working Capital Fund. Some create difficulties, like a greater member country control over the transfer of funds, or member country shared financial management. Such suggestions may not be conducive to better management. The Council is really a policy-making body which reflects various national standpoints. It is not a managing body and if this role gets confused we may have a lot of difficulties in operations. There is also a suggestion that proposals should be decided by consensus or by a two-thirds majority. This is changing the decision-making process in the FAO and making it less democratic. What has happened in the WHO, the ILO and the UN needs to be closely kept in view and whatever we decide should be based upon what has been done there and not ignoring it. We are for collective decisions, we are for reconciliation; we are for acting in concert, and we would seriously suggest, with all humility, that it will be better if we can get together and work out, in smaller groups perhaps, as to how we should proceed further in this matter. A suggestion has been made that FAO's work should be complementary to the UN organization. A high-level group would look at the issue. The group will study the work of the other UN organization also, because they may be doing work which the FAO should be doing. So we will have to be very clear and specific about the kind of terms of reference of any review.

We should have a small contact group which can look into the issue before us. We have heard from a distinguished delegation that everything in the garden may not be lovely. This may be true but the garden may also not be all weeds and briars and slithering entities.

We are saying let us look at the garden together with the gardener and try to improve it with our skills and resources in which we have not lost faith, and that the state of the garden is not such that we need outside help of eminent gardeners.

CHAIRMAN: We are now past our time but we have four more countries on the list to speak: Nicaragua, Denmark, Netherlands and New Zealand. We are going to have to carry them over until tomorrow. We would like to spend a limited amount of time tomorrow on item 12 so that we can get to item 13 as promptly as possible. Item 13 is a serious problem for us because we have a specific deadline that we must meet or we will cause inconvenience to the entire Organization. We may well suggest early tomorrow after we go through a little bit, that we suspend for a while, go on to the budget issues which are deadlined and assure that we will come back to item 12, and in the interim we will try to have the sort of informal discussions occurring that the representative of Turkey referred to earlier. This concludes our business for the day but before adjourning the meeting I should give the floor to the delegates of Brazil and Barbados who have asked to exercise the right of reply.

RIGHT OF REPLY

DROIT DE REPONSE

DERECHO DE REPLICA

J. Augusto DE MÉDICIS (Brazil): Very briefly, Mr Chairman, since my delegation has been singled out by the distinguished representative of the U.K. for its "unsensible remarks", may I indicate that we were not referring to the Nordic countries' draft when it mentioned the attempts to disregard the one-country-one-vote principle. We should say however that if an attempt is reflected in another resolution which proposes that the Conference agrees to the approval by consensus of the budget, thus implying the possibility of a veto by one country or group of countries, what my delegation has in mind and would like to emphasize now is the general trend permeating some of the papers

contained in document C 87/30 that favour a privileged role in the decision-making process for major contribution such as "securing adequate representation for the major contributor countries" or "taking into realistic account the views and concerns of donors", in the review of the membership of the Financial Committee for instance. Can I also refer to a statement recently quoted in the international press by a high-ranking officer of a major contributor, in the sense that the whole purpose of this exercise of reforms in the UN system is to give a greater voice in the decisionmaking process to the major contributors. May I finish by saying my own fears are not seen to be so unfounded as a number of other delegations from developing countries refer to the same attempts.

Clifton E. MAYNARD (Barbados): I will detain you and the Commission for half a minute. The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom suggested that I had spoken about the Technical Cooperation Programme. Indeed I never mentioned the Technical Cooperation Programme in any part of my intervention. I have specific reasons for not doing so. I have specific reasons for not going into detail about UNDP. I shall do so at the correct time. I always accept technical assistance from anyone and indeed we do in Barbados, but on this occasion I would like to reject the technical assistance offered by the addition - or the suggested addition - to my intervention which the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom made.

CHAIRMAN: Let me clarify. Tomorrow we have four countries on the list: Nicaragua, Denmark, Netherlands and New Zealand. We will commence activities tomorrow with the continuation of this discussion. We will try to limit it as best possible because we must proceed to item 13 as quickly as possible too because on item 13 we face a very serious deadline and on that issue we must be finished by Friday and we must have our drafting committee to work by Monday night. We must have a report on Tuesday - we must report back or else we will inconvenience others.

Probably tomorrow after these countries have spoken we will talk about suspending further discussion on that item 12, getting on to the business of item 13, and having met our deadline on that serious issue we can then re-open, and will re-open, further discussion on item 12. So everyone will have an adequate opportunity. You will have your opportunity on item 12 tomorrow and I would recommend to you highly, as I have before, that we start promptly.

The meeting rose at 17.40 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 40.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.40 horas.

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/4

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

**FOURTH MEETING
QUATRIEME SEANCE
CUARTA SESION**

(12 November 1987)

The Fourth Meeting was opened at 09.45 hours.

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La quatrième séance est ouverte à 9 h 45

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la cuarta sesión a las 9.45 horas

bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

Second Report of the Resolutions Committee
Deuxième rapport du Comité des résolutions
Segundo Informe del Comité de Resoluciones

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Chairaan, Resolutions Committee) (original language Arabic): The Resolutions Committee held its second meeting this morning at 9 o'clock. We had a discussion in regard of a number of important resolutions which we had before us and we had seven resolutions before us this morning for Commission III. We reviewed these resolutions in turn and we have referred them to Commission III. We also have before us this morning a resolution dealing with the item which you have before you at the present time, which resolution was introduced by the Latin American and Caribbean Group and a further group of developing countries. We had a discussion of that item and some of my fellow delegates touched upon the fact that there is not sufficient coordination in regard of some of the paragraphs, or in other words, some of these paragraphs are not ordered in the best manner. I will just refer you to Section A and Section D-5. But that being so, our Committee will mention this as a footnote to this resolution which will come back to this Committee on this particular aspect. That sums up the discussions we had this morning, and may I just wish you success in your work.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued)

12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite)

12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed with the opening of the day's session, the Secretary has some announcements

Ms. Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): With regard to C 87/LIM/29 which came out this morning, it contains the Resolution announced yesterday proposed by the Group of Latin American and Caribbean and Near East countries and other developing countries. It is going to the Resolutions Committee this morning but in the stress of translation I am afraid the various language versions do not entirely correspond and I would like to announce a few corrections to the English and the French versions of C 87/LIM/29.

With regard to the English version the title should read Draft Conference Resolution Co-sponsored by the Groups of Latin American and the Caribbean and Near East Countries and other Developing Countries. With regard to the second preambular paragraph in the English version the words "continuous" and "intensive" should be deleted. The paragraph should therefore read "Noting also the efforts made to adapt FAO programmes to the changing needs of Member Nations...".

In the first operative paragraph in the same page "Decides: A) ii)" at the very bottom of the page the paragraph should read "The role of FAO in advising on the formulation of food and agriculture policies at global, regional and national levels and its function as catalyst and purveyor of assistance", insert the words 'purveyor of assistance'.

With regard to the French version the two corrections are on page 2 of the French version of C 87/LIM/29. The first is at the top in small paragraph (ii). In the third line the text should read "sa fonction catalytique et d'assistance".

In the middle of the page there is a paragraph which should be deleted which was inserted by mistake in the printing, after paragraph (C), the small indented paragraph which begins "Les conclusions et recommandations"; that entire paragraph should be deleted. You will see that it is repeated at the very end of the Resolution.

CHAIRMAN: As we indicated late yesterday afternoon we have to move as quickly as possible to Item 13 on the agenda but we have four countries which had requested to speak and were not able to have the opportunity yesterday. We indicated that we would like to proceed this morning with those four countries and then suspend discussion on Item 12 and then after we meet our deadline on Item 13, return to Item 12 and take it up for further consideration.

John GLISTRUP (Denmark): Since this is the first time my delegation has taken the floor, I wish to congratulate you on your nomination as Chairman of this Commission.

For almost four years Denmark, together with the other Nordic countries, in a number of FAO meetings have expressed our view that it was time to conduct an open review of FAO's future role and priorities. I need not add how happy we are now finally to have on our agenda an item specifically dealing with this matter which is giving us an opportunity to discuss openly and formally with other Members our view on this issue. All through these four years we have shared our views with the Secretariat and a number of other Members and since we have now formally submitted a document of the Conference together with the other Nordic countries I need not explain in detail our viewpoints and can merely point to this document in front of us, the Draft Resolution and the statements by my Minister in Plenary on Tuesday and by Norway and Sweden in this Commission earlier in our debate.

We have listened to the debate and have been concerned but not as the Colombian delegate said, frustrated. We have been concerned because at times delegates have focused more on reforms rather than as we would have preferred on open review. It is correct as the delegates of Argentina and India (together with many others) have stated that the documents in front of us contain a number of varied viewpoints. This is why we think that the Conference cannot tackle the issue in detail at this point and that we should request a high-level group to digest the matter first.

Also many delegates are linking the present cash flow problems with a review. In our opinion these two are distinct and different problems and I should like to remind the delegates that when we first brought up our wish for a review we did not have a cash flow problem. Perhaps I could add that we may perhaps not have had such a strong cash flow problem had we started debating openly on the review somewhat earlier.

In our view the issues for the Conference to decide on are in fact two problems: one is the need for a review and the other is the mechanism for such a review. In connection with the first problem we have noted with satisfaction that most Member States support the basic idea of such a review, to mention a few:- Cameroon, Australia, Turkey, China and Trinidad and Tobago. A few Member States have stated that they are against. To those who have requested justification for a review I can give a 'very clear reply. My delegation is concerned about the general decreasing support for multilateral cooperation and open review and debate concerning efforts to improve the system, in our opinion, could restore confidence in multilateral cooperation.

The second point concerning the mechanisms appears to be more controversial. We have suggested one method in our draft Resolution. As Norway and Sweden said earlier we are prepared to discuss the type of mechanism which should be applied. Some delegates have stated that we should use the established systems in FAO through the Programme Committee. In this connection I should like to refer to the

viewpoints already expressed by the Danish delegation at the 19th Session of the Council this summer where we had to note with concern that in spite of the clear signals given already during our last Conference, the Programme Committee had not even briefly dealt with the problems during the entire present biennium. As a responsible representative of Member Governments it is our role to give clear signals to FAO's management concerning the role we wish our Organization to play now and certainly also in the future. Unfortunately, this debate has not done this. Not because there are great and unsolvable differences of opinion concerning our review, but mainly because there is a different attitude to the mechanisms to be used.

The Danish delegation prefers a high-level body as stipulated in our draft Nordic Resolution. However, I shall reiterate that we are prepared to discuss this proposal in order to obtain a consensus.

May I conclude by referring to the concluding remarks made yesterday by the UK delegate referring to remarks about the need for review heard outside this room. The Danish delegation wishes to state here in this room that an open review, in our opinion, is now getting very urgent.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): My delegation feels honoured to address this Commission on this very important item under your guidance and we should like to congratulate you on your election. As our Minister Braks stated in Plenary yesterday several sweeping changes are taking place in the worldwide economy and financial situation and especially in agriculture during the last couple of years.

World market prices for agricultural products declined, surplus productions in some regions of the world are to be cut and several developing countries started to become exporters and needed better access to import markets. In short, very important and far-reaching developments are influencing agriculture both in the developed and developing world.

Trade problems and surplus production have serious effects on the agricultural sector in their countries. Since agriculture in so many developing countries functions as the engine for overall economic development, it is completely clear that decision-making processes on these matters determine the economic and social future of so many people in the Third World countries. In the international agricultural decision-making processes FAO should participate fully on the basis of its knowledge and experience. The reasons for a review, re-orientation and restructuring of FAO lay mainly in development outside of FAO but which can, and will, force FAO to adjust its goals, its rate of operations and priority setting. As other delegations have said, FAO should not feel ashamed to decide to undertake a major review. During the first 40 years FAO passed through several other adjustments. I will put it more strongly. If we together cannot reach consensus on the goals of reform towards getting FAO involved in this international process of economic (and therefore also agricultural) re-orientation and adjustments, within a decade FAO will find itself completely on the sideline of important developments.

This needs action within and outside FAO, action on a high-level to ensure that such bodies as the World Bank, IMF, GATT as well as the total UN system will become committed to the role that FAO should play.

Of course, the starting point will remain FAO's basic mandate and mission as laid down in its Constitution, namely, to contribute to the effort of countries and people to eliminate hunger, malnutrition and poverty and also to the efforts of the UN and other international organizations and bodies.

From this starting point, and our delegation is grateful for the opening the Director-General gave in Plenary, FAO should be reinforced to participate on the basis of its knowledge and experience in the intergovernmental decision-making processes. FAO should be the main policy consultant towards governments and international multilateral financial institutions in the field of agriculture and rural development, as it is its mandate. In this respect, I mention especially the structural adjustment programmes of the World Bank and IMF. The formulation and implementation of these structural adjustment programmes in the field of agriculture and rural development should be based mainly on analysis and policy advice of FAO.

FAO can offer on a structural base these contributions to World Bank and IMF in a continuing flow of information and advice related to the needs of both developing countries and financial institutions. In this way, FAO can contribute in the most effective way as a broker in consultative groups of the World Bank, assisting and advising both governments and the World Bank. In this way, FAO should avoid possible negative consequences of the structural adjustments and also assist to safeguard the needed action.

While I am saying this I will also try to explain what, in our opinion, this means for the Organization. First of all, we (our Organization) need a highly qualified group. It is not important what we call it - a high-level group or independent task force - the importance of this group will be its terms of reference and I wish to stress this point - an intensive cooperation/collaboration with the FAO Secretariat. Therefore with this spirit we should find the right mechanism to formulate and recommend how a structural review and structural re-orientation has to be implemented.

The Director-General finds himself in the strongest position to recognize the importance of our recommendation. It will reinforce the position of FAO by showing the political will in the reconsideration of FAO's goals and methods of operation. If not, then the Netherlands fear serious escalation which will lead to a disintegration of FAO in the multilateral mechanism. I should like to be more explicit by giving an example of what, in our opinion, should be arranged inside the FAO Organization. The attention that FAO staff at this moment is able to pay to more policy advice seems to us relatively small. So much work and backstopping the field programme activities lays a major burden on the Organization which is financed from the regular budget. Therefore, we think it is very useful, and in our opinion necessary, to examine how the situation can be improved without damaging field programme activities at all and also to offer more room, that is to say, staff and financial resources within the programme for this highly needed reinforced role of FAO as a policy consultant. This means not only some internal reorganization of FAO on a managerial level, but for sure a strengthening of FAO in the international decision-making process. Therefore, we endorse the content of the Resolution proposed by the Nordics. We think that we should reach consensus on the goals of our intention for reform and reorientation of FAO. We are looking at it in a pragmatic way because it is most important that we should reach consensus amongst ourselves. As you will know consensus for us is a way of major importance for decision-making in this Organization as we explained in our contribution in document C 87/30. We invite especially those who are interested and who want to discuss the proposals in an open and constructive manner in the papers 1 - 9 as they are submitted in the above mentioned document.

S. RAJASEKAR (New Zealand): May I, at the outset join the other delegates in congratulating you on your election to the Chairmanship of this Commission. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to say a few words on this important subject of reform. We believe that this subject must be approached in a positive and constructive frame of mind. New Zealand is a firm believer and supporter of the charter and basic objectives of FAO.

New Zealand's support for reform is based on its acceptance of the significant benefits of reappraisal and external evaluation. This conviction is derived not the least from New Zealand's own experience in recent years. In his address to the Conference our Minister of Agriculture highlighted the fundamental reforms that we have initiated over the last three years. In addition to implementing a major economic reform the New Zealand Government has also initiated comprehensive reviews of many of its statutory organizations and state trading enterprises. Some of the arguments that have been advanced against a review of FAO have a familiar ring for us in New Zealand. Calls for critical examination of various institutions and accepted criteria of efficiency, transparency and accountability have not been without opposition but I would say that even the most ardent critics of our Government's policies have come to recognize the benefits that these reviews have achieved.

We believe that FAO, as an organization would only stand to gain from a review of its functions and operations. We recognize the fact FAO may well have had a programme of on-going assessment of its operations but we believe that such ad hoc exercises are not substitutes for a carefully designed and independent review of its operations against a clearly defined set of criteria. Over the years FAO has no doubt adapted to changing needs and demands but we believe that a number of questions may well be asked on such diverse issues as staffing levels (including the relative distribution of field and support staff), transparency and accountability in the decision making process, the role of FAO vis-à-vis other development agencies, its role and efficacy in the sphere of policy advice. This last is an area of particular interest and concern to New Zealand. We believe that FAO is eminently qualified to play a leading role in the formulation and promotion of rational agricultural policies - a subject that was the theme of the World Bank's 1986 World Development Report.

We are living in a period of enormous change - times of phenomenal technological progress, economic pressures and challenges. As one of the leading development agencies in the agricultural arena the FAO has clearly a major role to play in shaping the future. The review process should help it to meet these challenges.

New Zealand endorses the call for reform and sees merit in the establishment of a high level group comprising independent and suitably qualified people to review its operations and recommend ways of promoting improvements. New Zealand does not see this issue in North/South terms and attempts to portray it in that light would, we believe, only serve to detract from the real issues of operational efficiency and transparency. Our sole interest is to see the emergence of an even stronger FAO that is able to lead world agriculture into the twenty-first century.

CHAIRMAN: At this point we are going to have to make a judgement about how to proceed. We yesterday, late in the day, mentioned we had four countries who did not have the opportunity to speak at the time that the discussion was supposed to close under our schedule. Those countries were Nicaragua, Denmark, Netherlands and New Zealand. Denmark, Netherlands and New Zealand have had the opportunity this morning. At this point, however, we also have a number of requests to prolong this issue and not get on to the issue that we were supposed to start at 9.30 this morning - item 13. We have requests from Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Egypt, Samoa, Switzerland, Norway and France. The Chair would observe that three of those countries - Switzerland, Norway and France - have already spoken, and that if we proceed to go into a second round of speeches - if the opportunity is given to any country to speak for a second time, and certainly in all fairness the Chair would have to give that opportunity to every other country that has already spoken - and we would also observe that we had indicated that there is a serious deadline that faces us on item 13. We must complete our work on item 13 tomorrow if we are going to proceed orderly our discussion on item 13 tomorrow so that we can have the Drafting Committee meet its deadline of Monday, so that we can have our report on Tuesday, so that we do not run a risk of inconveniencing others here at this important conference. The Chair would respectfully request that Switzerland, Norway and France waive their request on the grounds that they have already spoken and we would ask that Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Samoa be first in line for when we do come back to this. We would as soon as we complete item 13 return to a discussion of this issue. We would also in the interim - the Chair would - as we already have commenced discussions with some delegations and some groups of delegations, the G 77 and OECD countries - attempt to reach some kind of an agreement on a contact group that can be working behind the scenes and in concert with these activities. At this point we do not have a consensus view on a contact group - that is going to take some time - and that is something that if it develops a little more smoothly in the next hours, or in the next day, we can certainly suspend item 13 for a brief discussion of the contact group if we can resolve it. But it would seem to the Chair from its observations - observing discussions and participating in some - that today, this moment, is not the right time and if we get into a discussion of that we are going to simply subtract valuable time from item 13. We would not however deny the opportunity to Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Egypt or Samoa to speak at that time. But if each one of them would be willing it would facilitate the work of this body if we simply proceeded now and then assure them that they will be the very first in line when we do return to this discussion. I have an indication from Saudi Arabia that this is acceptable to them. We have the same from Tunisia, from Egypt and from Samoa and I would presume that since these countries have not had the chance, we would certainly have the same indication from those countries which have already spoken. We do. Costa Rica is requesting the floor. The Chair cannot grant you recognition to speak at this point, unless it is a point of order, on precisely the grounds that we just stated. Each one of these countries, some of which have not spoken, have decided to wait their turn. Costa Rica has already spoken. We would certainly ask that you do the same unless it is a point of order. Would you state, is it a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Moción de orden. Como moción de orden voy a decir que no estoy de acuerdo en que el debate sea interrumpido en este momento; hay un problema de procedimiento, de orden extremadamente importante. Se han celebrado muchas reuniones entre las delegaciones presentes en esta Conferencia y hay la voluntad de crear el grupo de contacto. Yo estoy convencido que usted, Sr Presidente, debería declarar que el grupo de contacto se constituye. Debería declarar el número de personas que lo han de integrar y escoger una presidencia para el grupo de contacto con el acuerdo de la Conferencia.

A estas alturas los presidentes de los grupos regionales, no se han reunido para celebrar las consultas a fin de indicar los miembros del grupo de contacto, que son escogidos por ellos, no se puede dejar todo en el aire porque los días pasan y durante el weekend puede haber consultas muy provechosas para constituir el grupo de contacto. El grupo que tengo el honor de presidir está completamente...

CHAIRMAN: Please state your point of order. You are out of order. You have the floor for the purpose of stating a point of order. You are not stating a point of order, you are introducing a discussion of a new item. Colombia has a point of order. State your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr Presidente, con profundo pesar tengo que decir que la delegación de Colombia reclama y exige una actitud más democrática y libre en usted como presidente. Usted es Embajador de un gran país, pero en esta Comisión estamos presentes igualmente embajadores de países humildes y pequeños pero que merecemos respeto y dignidad.

CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, please. We must follow an orderly proceeding. You are recognized for the purpose of stating a point of order, not for stating an opinion. They are different. And under the rules you are recognized for a point of order. On the order of business I will recognize you for a point of order - I just so indicated - but I recognized you for the purpose of stating a point of order and you did not state a point of order. Now the order of business and schedule for which we are here to work is a schedule that has a discussion on item 12 that was to go until yesterday at 5.30. We then reached past that point and we tried to come to an agreement to move orderly on to item 13. The Chair does not mind if we go on with this issue for a long, long time - we simply caution that if we do so and do not allow sufficient time for item 13 we will then reach the point where our failure to follow an orderly schedule will cause serious inconvenience, not just to ourselves but to others here. And it is for that purpose that the Chair is attempting to have meetings start as near on time as possible to try to follow the agenda which we must operate on. Colombia you have a point of order now, state your point of order.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr Presidente, nos extraña que usted siga haciendo uso de la presión sobre el límite de tiempo cuando ha sido usted mismo quien ha hecho perder demasiado tiempo a esta Comisión. Mi punto de orden consiste en lo siguiente: en pedir a usted por favor que no sólo ahora con el Embajador de Costa Rica, sino en adelante, respete a cada miembro de la Comisión. La Delegación de Colombia le pide, Señor Presidente, que conceda la palabra a Costa Rica.

CHAIRMAN: I believe that the Chair could assist you in what you want to achieve and the Chair would like to do so. The Chair of course can cause a member not to speak because if one country goes ahead of other countries we must have respect for every country and if a country that has already spoken speaks to an issue and other countries have waived that right that is an inconvenience to those countries. The Chair has to try to be cognizant of the right of all countries and to try to achieve an equal opportunity for every country to speak. That is why the Chair suggested that countries that have already spoken should please not speak, out of respect for those countries that have not yet had the chance. The Chair has tried to accommodate Nicaragua so that its remarks could be put into the record.

I have the floor; I have not finished making my suggestion to you. I would suggest that if you want to have a Motion that we continue discussing this item now, that is perfectly in order.

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Mi moción es por lo siguiente. Usted, Señor Presidente, había dictaminado que se interrumpieran los trabajos. Apeló Costa Rica con una moción de orden indicando que no debían interrumpirse y que no debía usted, Señor Presidente, quitarle el derecho a las Delegaciones de intervenir. Por tanto, Señor Presidente, y conforme a los Textos Básicos, está obligada esta Asamblea a decidir respeto de su dictamen sobre la oposición de Colombia.

CHAIRMAN: I will tell the gentleman from Colombia that is not a point of order. We must follow orderly rules. If you are going to be recognized for a point of order you must state it or you are wasting time. The Chair would suggest that it would be perfectly in order for any delegate to suggest an alternative. If someone puts forward a Motion that we should continue to discuss this, that is in order.

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): No sabemos, Señor Presidente si estamos votando o está considerando usted nuestras opiniones. Si está usted considerando nuestras opiniones, deseamos que continúe el debate.

CHAIRMAN: That is a valid point of order. Would those countries who wish to continue the discussion of item 12 rather than proceed to item 13 so indicate? Mexico has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

José Ramon LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Para una moción aclaratoria Señor Presidente. Solamente deseo preguntar si al no terminar el Tema 12 el Comité de Redacción va a ser capaz de empezar a analizar este aspecto y si en consecuencia vamos a retrasar también los trabajos del Comité de Redacción. Yo como Miembro del Comité de Redacción estoy preocupado al respecto. Le pido a usted, Señor Presidente, que nos aclare si podemos proceder en el Comité de Redacción a tratar ese tema, aunque no se ha terminado.

CHAIRMAN: That is exactly how the Chair interpreted your statement and the Chair stated that was a valid Point of Order. The Chair interpreted your remarks as a request that a Motion that the body should vote on whether or not to continue should be made. That is a Motion before the floor. The Motion is that a decision be made on whether you wish to continue discussion of item 12 rather than move on to item 13 at this point. That is the Motion. it would change the schedule laid down before us by the Secretariat and not to discuss now the issue we are scheduled to discuss today, item 13. Would you please indicate if the Chair is stating this accurately and fairly in your interpretation? The Chair understands that you were asking that the body should continue to discuss item 12 and not at this point proceed to item 13. Is that valid?

The Motion of Mexico is that we should continue to discuss item 12. Is that accurate?

The Secretariat advises me that under normal procedure the answer to your question is no, they would not be able to commence.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH (Bangladesh): The latest development in this Commission does not appear to be very congenial to the conclusion of our business, so at this point I think that Costa Rica made a Point of order which remains to be decided. The submission was that a contact group should be established, and because Costa Rica was trying to elaborate on that point with additional observations, you cut the delegate short and the main point has been missed. I think there were several delegations who wanted to speak in the morning, and in order to cut short the session they

have voluntarily withdrawn their requests to speak. That indicates that all the delegates are interested in concluding the discussion on this issues. May I suggest if we proceed with the point made by Costa Rica about establishing a contact group perhaps our work would be shortened and we could come to a conclusion.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair appreciates what has been said by the delegate from Bangladesh. The delegate from Mexico has a motion on the floor and the Chair suggests that perhaps a quick and easy resolution on this would be to have some indication of consensus. If you wish, we can have a full vote. The delegate from Costa Rica has suggested the establishment of a contact group. The Chair's impression is that those activities are already under way. If there is a consensus that a contact group ought to be established, I would ask for a second on that. Then I would wish to give Mexico the opportunity to have a second for its motion.

Bernard LEDUN (France): J'appuie tout à fait l'initiative prise par le représentant du Costa Rica. Un grand nombre des délégations ici présentes souhaitent effectivement la constitution d'un Groupe de contact, préférablement sur une base géographique, ce qui permettrait de rapprocher les thèses en présence et de faire avancer d'une manière positive notre affaire.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair interprets France's remarks seconding the motion made by Costa Rica that a contact group should be established. Would France please confirm that?

Bernard LEDUN (France): Oui, Monsieur le Président.

CHAIRMAN: So at the moment we have before us a motion on the floor by Costa Rica that a contact group be established and France is a second. Are there any objections to establishing a contact group?

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): We have listened to the debate so far with interest and we are considerably taken with the very cogent arguments put forward by the distinguished delegate of Mexico that there is such a degree of interest in this debate that it should continue. We would feel it would be in the best interests of any further developments if in Plenary Session we could hear the views of more Member States before any contact group is established. We would therefore prefer the proposal from Mexico that this debate should continue before we turn to considering the establishment of any contact group.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to get from the United Kingdom a yes or no on this question. The Chair interprets your remarks as seconding Mexico's motion. That is correct. We now have two motions which have been proposed and seconded. There is a motion by Costa Rica that a contact group be established. That has been seconded. We have a motion put forward by Mexico that we should continue-discussion of this issue; and we have that seconded by the United Kingdom.

The Chair would suggest that for orderly progress any motion is subject to discussion. Let us take them in the order in which they were raised. In fairness, Costa Rica's motion was made first. It is that a contact group be established. Is that a fair statement of your motion, Costa Rica?

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): La idea era que el Grupo de Contacto no puede ser establecido oficiosamente en los corredores. El Grupo de Contacto tiene que ser establecido por esta misma Comisión. Ahora tenemos ya depositados y publicados como documentos de la Conferencia tres proyectos de resolución y el Grupo que tengo el honor de presidir está completamente abierto a un diálogo para ver si es posible un entendimiento entre los presentadores y los que apoyan este Proyecto.

Creo que el dialogo es lo mejor para el entendimiento. El tiempo apura, Señor Presidente, ya que la Conferencia tiene un termino. Creo que constituyendo oficialmente el Grupo de Contacto hoy, será fácil llegar a un cierto entendimiento antes del comienzo de la próxima semana. Usted, Señor Presidente, podría consultar en este momento sobre la integración numérica del Grupo de Contacto. Sobre la Presidencia, creo debería haber un Presidente, yo propondría a la Delegación de Turquía, que podría dirigir muy bien el Grupo de contacto y creo que cada Región podría nombrar dos Representantes. Sin embargo, todo esto está sujeto a variación una vez establecida la Presidencia, y establecida la integración numérica, se debería dejar a las regiones entregarle durante el día de hoy el nombre de los respectivos Representantes. Así ganaríamos muchísimo tiempo.

Reenviar al lunes todo, significa precipitar la labor de la Comisión a los últimos días de la Conferencia. Enviar a votación estos Proyectos de Resolución, no es agradable para nadie, especialmente para nosotros. Mi Región está con la máxima voluntad conciliatoria y de diálogo.

José Ramón LÚPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Una moción de orden, Señor Presidente, creo que no se me ha interpretado. Yo hice dos mociones: Una en relación a que debía resolverse el problema de la moción de orden de Costa Rica primero. Dos, una moción aclaratoria en el sentido de que si no iniciábamos los trabajos estos podían discutirse en el Comité de Redacción. No apoyé en ningún momento que no se constituyera el Grupo de Contacto, sino hasta que termináramos nuestros trabajos. Yo no hice esa propuesta, Señor Presidente, y espero que se me haya entendido adecuadamente y en vista de que Costa Rica ha aclarado su posición nosotros nos unimos a ella.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): If I understood the Ambassador of Costa Rica correctly, what he was concerned about was that the setting up of a contact group should not be put off until item 13 is discussed. What I was going to suggest is that, in view of the necessity for a few more informal contacts before the contact group is set up the Chair declare that as soon as they were completed and the talks with the regional spokesmen were completed the Chair would interrupt item 13 to formally establish a contact group, which would take a very short time, and then come back to item 13 again, but I am sorry if this has been overtaken by events.

CHAIRMAN: Norway is correct. That is what the Chair stated, that we would interrupt item 13 and then would proceed.

Sra. María Eulalia JIMENEZ (El Salvador): Permítame, en primer lugar, decirle que es necesario que se respete el orden en que los países han pedido la palabra. Queremos apoyar la moción hecha por Costa Rica. Creemos que es necesario crear el Grupo de Contacto, y crearlo en esta Sesión de la mañana, y puede ser establecido como lo ha propuesto Costa Rica, o sea, dos miembros por cada región.

La decisión sobre la creación del Grupo de Contacto, creemos debe tomarse esta mañana. Sobre su composición, estimamos que el mismo puede estar compuesto por dos miembros de cada región. Las diferentes regiones, durante la hora del almuerzo podrían consultarse y establecer quiénes serán los miembros de su región que participarán en ese Grupo de Contacto.

Cuando iniciemos nuestro trabajo a las dos y media, esta tarde, las diferentes regiones habrán ya comunicado a la presidencia cuáles son los miembros que participarán, y así podremos encomendarle al Grupo de Contacto que inicie sus trabajos.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Vamos a hacer una moción concreta con el deseo de ayudarlo, no obstante el comportamiento que no entendemos, Sr. Presidente. Creo que la actitud de Costa Rica es perfectamente constructiva. Los colegas que habían pensado intervenir sobre este Tema 12, han renunciado al derecho al uso de la palabra. Creemos que la Comisión debe ahora declarar que se constituya un Grupo de Contacto, que se comisione a los presidentes del Grupo de los 77 y de la OCDE, para determinar la composición de ese grupo y su presidente, y pasamos al Tema 13.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): The delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia expresses deep regret at the fact that we have got ourselves into the present situation after so much discussion and counter discussion. This has been the result of some draft resolutions and proposals which perhaps have made the atmosphere somewhat too tense in this assembly. Therefore we would like to make an appeal to all our colleagues who are members of this Commission, including yourself, Mr Chairman, we would like to make an appeal to everybody, an appeal for patience, for calm, because we have all come here, I believe, to seek solutions to very great problems indeed, which problems the Organization has to deal with, problems which are matters of great concern to the Member Nations of this Organization. Therefore we must try to find the right solution and we must not attempt to complicate a situation which is already excessively complicated.

As was observed by my friend Mr Høstmark of Norway, I also am beginning to understand what is going on in this room after a certain period of calm which has settled upon it. I think there is no doubt that what Mexico moved is realistic indeed, because if we break off discussion on this item we are not going to get ourselves in a very useful position.

I think, you have before you a list of countries which have asked for the floor and I think you should ask those countries whether finally they do want to address the assembly or whether they wish to waive their right to the floor, at least for this morning's session I think this is the best way of proceeding at this stage in development.

Then let me say that I support fully any proposal which is constructive and I think that what the Ambassador of Costa Rica moved was extremely useful - that is, that the contact group be set up.

May I very sincerely ask you, to proceed as suggested, because what we have to do first is to solve our problems and we certainly should avoid adding further complications to an already complicated situation.

V. K. SIBAL (India): We should like briefly to endorse the suggestion made by Costa Rica. We think it is positive, it is constructive, and it will help us in our sincere search for finding solutions, which should be the paramount consideration. We feel that Mexico's suggestion to carry on the debate is a sound one' if the Commission so wishes and you may perhaps like to elicit views on that.

CHAIRMAN: That is precisely what the Chair would like to do. We have two motions. We have a motion from Costa Rica and we have a motion from Mexico. In fairness, a motion has to be specific. So that there is no possibility of misunderstanding, we would ask at this point that Costa Rica state its motion. We would ask that France at that point indicate whether that is in fact the motion it wishes to second. We would like to have a show of hands, or whatever, to get an idea of the view on that motion. The next proper step would be to have Mexico state its motion. The Chair's impression is that Mexico's clarification remarks later made indicated that it really was not making a motion so much as supporting, but that is for Mexico to say. At that point the United Kingdom, which had seconded what it thought was a motion by Mexico, would be next in line. At this point we would ask that Costa Rica state its motion - not discuss it but state it. Would Costa Rica please state its motion?

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): La propuesta de Costa Rica es de que el Comité declare constituido un Grupo de Contacto desde ahora. El Comité tiene que decidir su integración numérica. Me permito proponerle de consultar al Comité sobre lo que voy proponiendo, ya sea que la integración numérica sea de 2 representantes por región y de un presidente. Propongo, que para la presidencia sea escogido el jefe de la delegación de Turquía. Una vez declarada esta constitución, se pediría a los jefes de los grupos regionales de consultar con sus grupos sobre los dos representantes por cada región, comunicándolo a Ud. durante la hora del almuerzo, de manera que Ud. pueda comunicar la integración nominativa del Grupo de Contacto durante la sesión de la tarde.

CHAIRMAN: That is a specific motion. We had an indication earlier that France seconded that motion. Would France please indicate at this point if it does second that specific motion?

Bernard LEDUN (France): Oui merci, Monsieur le Président. Je crois qu'effectivement nous aurions pu aller beaucoup plus vite dans le débat si, à la fin du dernier orateur inscrit, la France ou le Costa Rica avaient pu faire valoir leur point de vue qui n'était pas d'en revenir sur les discussions du point précédemment examiné mais de proposer précisément la constitution de ce groupe de contact.

Je redis ici que nous soutenons absolument la proposition présentée par le Costa Rica, et nous l'appuyons entièrement.

CHAIRMAN: There is a motion from Costa Rica; that motion has been properly seconded; that motion is now before the Body. At this point discussion on that specific motion is in order and will now be discussed. Anyone wishing to speak on that motion?

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): I was planning to state that I got somewhat confused but it is clear that this is not a confused proposal. It was the understanding of my delegation that the idea of the Contact Group was the initiative of the Chair and that the chair had, on its own initiative, approached the heads of the OECD and the heads of the G 77 Groups to put in motion the negotiations necessary for this process, so that there has never been any question in my view that the Chair has been moving in this direction. So whether the Commission declares that they agree with the Chair's motion, it would be nice but I do not think it is necessary. Certainly to my knowledge there has never been a procedure such as when the Chair is moving to create what has been called a Contact Group, but elsewhere it has been called the friends of the Chairman, for the Commission to discuss in public, without these negotiations taking place as they usually do outside of the Plenary, who the Chairman would be and what the composition would be, so it seems to me that is highly irregular and I am not even sure whether the motion that the Costa Rican delegation has presented included both the central idea of supporting the initiative for the Contact Group and/or his own proposals for a specific composition.

CHAIRMAN: For the record the Chair would state that the representative of Costa Rica was very precise, at the Chair's request just a few moments ago he made a precise Resolution before the Body. So that there is no misunderstanding of it, that precise motion was that there be a Contact Group established, that the membership of the Contact Group be two members from each FAO region; that there also be a Chairman and that the Chairman be specifically the representative of Turkey. That was the motion put before the Body. On your information request, yes, the Chair did contact the Group of 77 leader yesterday; yes, the Chair did contact the OECD' leader; the Chair did ask them both to try to work out a Contact Group and to come to an agreement on its formation because the understanding was that that was the way that things are normally done, that the two Bodies try to get together on an on-going basis, at lunches and at other events and private discussions, try to come to a consensus on what is the composition. That is not satisfactory obviously to the gentleman who made the motion and he made a specific motion on how the composition ought to be and he made a specific motion on who ought to be the Chairman. Further discussion?

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Señor Presidente, habiendo de tener el panorama completo de lo que estamos por hacer, la delegación argentina solicita que se le explique claramente también cuál va a ser el mandato del eventual Grupo de Contacto que vamos a crear, específicamente, qué tiene que hacer el Grupo de Contacto.

CHAIRMAN: Full clarification of that will have to come from the discussion and to facilitate that we will certainly have to give the floor back to the persons who made the motion. Congo has indicated it has a Point of Order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je voulais intervenir depuis longtemps sur la question, et il semble malheureusement qu'il y ait quelque confusion au niveau du Secrétariat. Je pense qu'il convient de donner la parole dans l'ordre; et nous pensons donc qu'il faut respecter cet ordre sinon nous risquons d'aboutir à une confusion dans ce débat.

Pour notre part, nous nous sommes exprimés hier sur cette question et nous étions de ceux qui avaient fait la proposition de constituer ce groupe de contact parce que nous pensions que le débat en plénière tel qu'il était engagé ne pouvait aboutir à des solutions viables. C'est pour cette raison que nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition faite par le Costa Rica, que nous appuyons; mais nous aimerions que le problème de la composition de ce groupe de contact soit revu à la lumière des dimensions de chaque région. Je crois qu'on ne peut pas de but en blanc fixer à deux par région. Il y a des régions qui n'ont que deux pays. Et s'il y a des régions qui n'ont que deux pays contrairement à d'autres qui en ont 50, nous pensons qu'on ne peut pas arrêter à un chiffre unique pour toutes les régions. Je crois que cela doit être pris en compte lorsque nous aurons à fixer le nombre des membres de ce groupe de contact.

C'est tout ce que j'avais à dire pour l'instant sur cette question. Nous pensons que vous tiendrez compte de ces remarques pour que nous puissions avancer.

CHAIRMAN: Yes they have and for your Point of Order on what is the Point of Order I will tell you on the Chair's list before us to speak are Gambia, Norway, Algeria, Costa Rica and Mexico but India had indicated that it had a Point of Order and the Point of Order takes precedence.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

V.K. SIBAL (India): Briefly, when you were summarizing the Costa Rican proposal you said that the Chairman should be the representative of Turkey. We thought that the Costa Rica delegate said the Head of the Delegation of Turkey. We are a little confused, so could you clarify.

CHAIRMAN: You are accurate in your statement that the statement made by him at that point was that it was to be the Head of Delegation of Turkey.

Harald HOSTMARK (Norway): Just a question for clarification, does the motion as stated by Costa Rica imply that what we are now doing is setting up a Committee under the Commission under Rule XIV instead of the other type of structure of the Chairman's Contact Group. Would it in that case be guided by those Rules and what would be the ramifications of that? I think my question is somewhat on the line of what was raised by Argentina earlier.

CHAIRMAN: You do indeed raise a question similar to the question raised by the representative of Argentina but it is a question that the Chair cannot speak on the intent of someone who makes a motion. The Chair would yield to the representative of Costa Rica to respond and clarify the questions put to you through the Chair by Norway and previously by Argentina. Could you please do that?

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): A la pregunta de Argentina contesto inmediatamente. Nos encontramos frente a tres proyectos de resolución. Lo que tenemos que tratar de obtener es que haya un único proyecto de resolución o tratar de expresar el consenso que hay en la sala; para esto se necesitan conversaciones. Se podría negociar para ver si hay un retiro momentáneo de todos y se pasa únicamente al informe del Comité o si se puede llegar a un proyecto de resolución. Esto sería el mandato: un proyecto de resolución único negociado entre las partes.

Respecto a la solicitud hecha por mi amigo Tchicáya, del Congo, estoy abierto en lo que respecta a la región que tengo el honor de representar, a las propuestas que él pueda formular. Yo creo que podríamos escucharlas, aceptarlas o eventualmente modificarlas, pero no creo que deberíamos perder días sobre este punto. Estoy de acuerdo en que hay regiones que pueden tener un representante más que otras porque hay razones basadas en la costumbre.

Respecto al hecho de que éste sea un grupo del presidente o de qué sé yo, el concepto es que en Naciones Unidas se usa siempre que cuando haya un grupo de negociación, un grupo de contacto, las regiones interesadas designen sus representantes y no sean escogidos por la presidencia, porque la escogencia por la presidencia puede llevar a designar personas equivocadas, las regiones pueden establecer personas que representen verdaderamente las tendencias, que representen verdaderamente el pensamiento prevalente en el grupo regional y, por tanto, este método que me permití sugerir tiene más posibilidad de éxito que una escogencia hecha únicamente por su persona.

CHAIRMAN: We have been on a Point of Order. On a point of information the Chair never suggested appointing anybody. The Chair suggested prodding the Group of 77 and the OECD group to come together. The Chair never suggested that the Chair appoint anybody, simply that the Chair tried to facilitate the group getting together, and that was done yesterday.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I propose that we close this discussion which has now become sterile. The delegation of Costa Rica has moved a very formal proposal. It is not necessary to repeat it any further. Therefore, I move that the Commission should simply support the Costa Rican proposal and move on to item 13 on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, we have other persons wishing to speak and you have made what is a closure motion to close the debate. The consequence of that motion would be to deny some countries which have requested to speak, namely, Algeria, Mexico, Colombia and the United Kingdom the opportunity to speak further.

We have a motion before the floor and we have a second of that motion and we have a discussion on that motion. We have had some points of order and we now have a motion, which now takes precedence, to close further discussion. Your motion is that at this point we should cease discussion on this motion. That is perfectly in order to make. It requires a second and it requires an affirmative vote. I trust that the members are aware that the passage of that motion means that Algeria, Mexico, Colombia and the United Kingdom would not be discussing. Do you wish to press your motion?

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): The answer is yes because the countries which have asked for the floor will merely repeat the same proposal. They will simply speak to the motion from Costa Rica. Therefore I think that since the Costa Rican motion has been adopted by many of us explicitly, there is no need to go on with any further discussion.

CHAIRMAN: Well you have just informed the Chair that Algeria, Mexico, Colombia and the United Kingdom second your motion. In fairness the Chair would insist upon confirmation by Algeria, Mexico, Colombia and the United Kingdom that they confirm. Colombia do you second that?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Apoyamos plenamente esa moción a la luz de la siguiente conclusión que es clara: la Comisión decide crear un grupo de contacto presidido por el representante de Turquía. La Comisión pide a los presidentes del Grupo de los 77 y de la OCDE que determinen la composición geográfica equilibrada de ese grupo de contacto. Suspendemos el debate sobre el tema 12 y pasamos al punto 13.

CHAIRMAN: Algeria do you second that? On a point of clarification the motion stated is not as you stated it. It was not have a geographic balance but specifically to have two countries from each region. It did not say "geographic balance", it defined geographic balance as "two countries from each region". Algeria, the Chair asks you do you second the motion?

Mile Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Nous avons demandé à prendre la parole parce que nous avons suivi le débat avec intérêt et nous pensons que, s'il y a une telle résistance de la part de nombreux délégués, c'est justement parce que la discussion sur ce point de l'ordre du jour n'a pas été jusqu'au bout.

Nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition du Costa Rica, mais nous souhaitons vivement connaître le mandat du Groupe de contact, comme l'ont demandé l'Argentine et la Norvège.

Nous sommes plus ou moins rassurés par les explications de l'Ambassadeur du Costa Rica, mais nous souhaiterions connaître également votre position sur la composition de ce Groupe de contact. Nous souhaitons vivement aussi que le critère de l'équilibre régional soit assuré.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): I make it clear we are opposed to the motion to close the debate. We also oppose the terms of any motion we have at present on the floor to establish a Contact Group. We are opposed to the motion to establish a Contact Group, although it is linked to the motion to close the debate, because we are opposed to the proposals for the composition of the Group and also the method of proposing the Chairman from the floor...

The reason we are opposed in this way is because we feel that this is directly against the rules of procedure that we normally have for establishing either friends of the Chair, and most specifically against Rule no. XIV of the General Rules.

Finally, Mr Chairman, through you I should like to ask for clarification from the distinguished delegate of Costa Rica. I may have picked up the translation wrongly but when he was describing his proposals for selecting participants on the basis of regional groups and two members for regional groups I heard him say that this was "to prevent the inclusion of the wrong persons". I was very interested in this, and through you, Mr Chairman, I would be very grateful if he could provide us with a definition of what are "the wrong persons" to enable us to consider these proposals more fully.

CHAIRMAN: Costa Rica, to try and make this as clear as possible, the Chair cannot answer questions on what you stated, but a question was put by the United Kingdom, namely, who determines which two countries from the region?

I think it is obvious that there was an interpretation mix up if it said "the wrong persons", but I think he wishes for clarification of who would select. Could you please respond to his enquiry? Point of Order by the United Kingdom.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): May I intervene to assist you here? My point was that on translation I heard the distinguished delegate of Costa Rica say in his description of his proposals "to prevent the selection of the wrong persons". I merely wanted, through you, to seek a definition of what is a "wrong person" in terms of the view of the delegate of Costa Rica.

CHAIRMAN: The question put to the Chair to put to you was that what he heard when you spoke was that there would be two persons selected from each region but they would be "wrong persons". He asks "what is the definition of the wrong persons?" Costa Rica, please, reply.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr. Presidente, estamos en un momento muy serio de la Conferencia y no estamos jugando con las palabras. No recuerdo la frase que dije ni sé cómo ha sido traducida. Mi intención era decir que cuando la designación es hecha por los grupos regionales se va a encontrar en el grupo de trabajo un conjunto de personas que representan diferentes tendencias que han sido expresadas en los documentos que tenemos a la vista y entre los cuales se tendría que buscar una conciliación. Yo creo que podría ser una cosa que no produce los efectos que queríamos alcanzar, incluir sólo representantes de una tendencia o de dos, pero no de las tres tendencias por conducto de las cuales han sido formuladas las tres propuestas de resolución. Esto era el fondo de lo que quería decir. Si durante la intervención he usado algún término que puede haber sido mal interpretado me disculpo, pero mi idea es que los grupos regionales son los más aptos para designar sus representantes porque les toca a ellos llegar a una tentativa de composición y de formulación de un consenso.

CHAIRMAN: At this point we have a couple of other countries which have sought to speak on the motion, but we also have two points of order - one by the Congo and one by Mexico. We will take those in order. But the Chair would caution, a point of order must be a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Ce que nous voulions, ce n'était pas refaire un discours sur le sujet dont nous discutons en ce moment mais apporter la lumière sur la proposition faite par le Costa Rica, qui a pourtant été amendée par nous - et notre amendement a été appuyé. Nous n'aimerions pas que toutes les régions soient représentées sur une base égalitaire; nous avons souscrit pour notre part à la proposition faite par la Colombie qui a invité les deux Présidents du Groupe des 77 et de l'OCDE à s'entendre sur la représentation au sein de ce Groupe; en effet, nous pensons qu'une représentation égalitaire au sein de ce Groupe ne reflète pas les opinions émises dans cette Commission.

Voilà ce que nous avons à dire sur ce sujet: il faut amender légèrement la proposition faite par notre ami du Costa Rica et reprendre la proposition concrète et bien élaborée, comme à l'habitude, par mon collègue et ami, l'Ambassadeur Bula Hoyos.

CHAIRMAN: That was not of course a point of order but you were not ruled out on those grounds because, coincidentally, you were next in line. We have four other countries requesting the Chair's attention. We would ask that in the future if you have a point of order as opposed to a request to speak please slip a note up to the Secretary. Sometimes it is not clear. We have had two instances where the chair had the impression that the distinguished representative of India was asking to speak. In fact he had a point of order and we apologise for that. It was a misunderstanding.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

José Ramon LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (Mexico): Mi moción de orden consiste en protestar por la forma en que se tratan las mociones de orden, porque de acuerdo con los textos básicos cuando hay una moción de orden usted debe dictaminar al respecto, después de lo cual la Asamblea decide, y no continuar con una sucesión de mociones de orden que no nos permiten aclarar el debate.

Yo tenía una lista de países que iban a intervenir normalmente y he visto, sin embargo, que algunos de los que iban a hablar después de mí han hablado antes sin aclarar que se trataba de una moción de orden. Y además, el tratamiento que se le ha dado a esas supuestas mociones de orden no ha sido el adecuado; es decir, dirimirlas inmediatamente, por tanto, Sr. Presidente consiste en que se traten las mociones de orden conforme a los textos básicos y que se me dé la palabra luego para hacer las propuestas correspondientes en relación al tema que estamos discutiendo.

CHAIRMAN: The Point of Order is well taken and the Chair specifically made the request that when there is a Point of Order please slip a note to the desk so that we will be absolutely certain whether it is a Point of Order request or a request to speak. They are different. You are correct and it would facilitate the proceedings if we did know that.

The meeting was suspended from 11.40 to 12.20 hours

La séance est suspendue de 11 h 40 à 12 h 20

Se suspende la sesión de las 11.40 a las 12.20 horas

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr. Presidente, si por razones técnicas, que mi delegación no entiende, usted sugiere que yo retire la moción de orden de manera que se permita formular una propuesta de Francia respecto a la solución de los problemas que he venido presentando en mi intervención, estoy de acuerdo en retirarla para facilitar la conclusión de esta reunión y, por lo tanto, le ruego dé la palabra a la delegación de Francia.

Bernard LEDUN (FRANCE): Après avoir entendu les nombreuses déclarations des délégations ici présentes, il faut bien convenir que nous n'avons guère avancé sur la voie du consensus. Les thèses en présence sont en effet fort éloignées les unes des autres et on ne voit pas bien, dans ces conditions, comment nous pourrions parvenir à nous séparer avec une position commune.

La délégation française suggère donc, après en avoir discuté avec d'autres délégations, la mise sur pied d'un groupe de contact constitué sur une base géographique dont les membres seraient désignés par les différents chefs des groupes régionaux. Ce groupe de contact se réunirait dès que possible, sur une base informelle, afin de procéder éventuellement à la préparation d'un projet de résolution qui permettrait de rapprocher autant que faire se peut les points de vue en présence.

Nous pensons que nous devons faire tout notre possible pour aboutir à un résultat positif. Seul un groupe de contact restreint, établi sur une base géographique, mais également représentatif des thèses des uns et des autres, serait en mesure d'aboutir à un compromis de cette nature. Nous suggérons que la composition de ce groupe se fasse au plus tot, en consultation avec les différents groupes régionaux, et soit annoncée par vous-même dès que possible.

CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding the Chair would ask if there are any objections to the motion of France? There is an objection. Italy state your objection.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): I have tried to take the floor for the last hour and ten minutes. So far Italy has not been allowed to express its view on the subject which is being discussed. We have lost one hour and fifteen minutes for a recess that was supposed to be only five minutes. You never gave me the floor although I asked for it five times.

CHAIRMAN: India has signalled the Chair that it relinquishes its slot on the roll; it preceded you; you were next in order.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): May I say why I have to oppose the French motion. The reason is that I never thought that the Chairman would ask the Committee to form the Contact Group. This is alien to my knowledge of the proceedings. Sharing the view of many delegates I think that is our duty to try our very best to reach a consensus if it is reachable. We should help you but you have the baton. You should in my view form the Contact Group, not ask us to vote. I am so glad that the Costa Rican delegate withdrew his proposal because I wanted to ask him kindly to withdraw and to leave it to the Chairman to select the advisors that would be most susceptible of reaching a compromise. Although I am very doubtful of the result this is the duty and the right of the Chairman. Please consider my delegation at your disposal for any of this attempt, but let us not waste more time. We have wasted an hour and twenty minutes, whereas you yourself have proposed that we shift to the next item on the Agenda. I was ready to support your proposal because the item has a deadline whereas this one has no deadline.

CHAIRMAN: I want to assure you that I very much appreciate that. I was well aware that earlier you requested to speak in support of what you just said and that that certainly made things easier for the Chairman. As you well stated the Chair did indicate yesterday that efforts were under way concerning the Contact group, and indicated that earlier this morning before 10 o'clock. They are under way.

The Chair does not feel that it is the role of the Chair to pick the specific members. The order of procedure has been to approach the representative groups. Yesterday I met with the head of the Group of 77 and I met with the head of the OECD group. To them privately I expressed my personal views that there ought to be effort under way that was roughly what France has just suggested, and there ought to be a geographic balance but not at the expense of having a representation that is by viewpoint and you should try to have people who have particularly strong views one way and particular views another way. There should be some countries like France which I specifically mentioned yesterday being involved, and you have a blending that way. I cautioned that we try to avoid having friends of the Chairman or contact group that is too big. So there is no possible misunderstanding, do we have a consensus in support of the proposal of France? The Chair's impression was that there was but one objection raised, a mild one. Can you please indicate by a show of hands those countries who feel that they are in general agreement with the proposal of the Government of France? Well, the Chair does not see remotely as many signs held up as it had the impression there was support. Can the Chair now see those that are objecting?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): It is a question of clarification. If I understood the French proposal correctly - that is what I want to clarify - the French proposal was trying to convey to you the sense and the hope that it should be announced that a contact group would be established and that its composition would be announced as soon as possible when consultations that are presently ongoing with regional groups were concluded. Am I right in that understanding?

CHAIRMAN: Does France state in the affirmative that Norway has a correct interpretation of the French views?

Bernard LEDUN (France): Oui, monsieur le Président, le distingué délégué de la Norvège a en effet bien interprété la proposition que j'ai faite. Il s'agit d'annoncer au plus tôt, ou dès que possible, la composition du Groupe de contact, une fois que les consultations entre les différents groupes régionaux auront abouti.

CHAIRMAN: That was the Chair's interpretation as well. Accordingly, the Chair also interprets that there is a majority support for the French proposal and accordingly the Chair will ask the group of 77 representative and the OECD representative to continue with the efforts that they began yesterday and as expeditiously as possible to try to come to agreement following consultation with the representatives of each region. They should try to put together a body that follows the outline of the French proposal and to report to me as quickly as possible on its composition so that I can then present it to the full body.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): I think you were rather too optimistic in saying that my objection to joining the consensus was mild. I do not agree at all.

CHAIRMAN: At this point I would apologise to you then because I did something that I said the Chair should not do and that is interpret for you.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): My objections do not concern the intentions of the French delegation. I fully share them. My opposition was not to the foresight or slim perspective that the French delegation sees. I do agree with him. I agree with many things except the point it should not be the Chairman to select a very restricted group of countries after hearing what the positions are, and not balancing geographically. It is not a balancing of geography here. I am straightforwardly opposed to geographical distribution, otherwise we make a small committee which reproduces this Commission and we never get through.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair believes that it can clarify your concern by asking France to state if its intent was as the Chair understood it and that was not simply to have geographic balance, but to have a consideration of both the different viewpoints and the geographic balance. Is that correct France?

Bernard LEDUN (France): Tout à fait Monsieur le Président; nous avons dit au moment de notre intervention qu'il serait souhaitable que la constitution de ce Groupe de contact se fasse sur une base géographique, car je vois difficilement comment il pourrait en être autrement; il faudra bien que les régions du globe soient représentées au sein de ce Groupe de contact; mais j'ai également dit qu'il faudrait pondérer cette représentation géographique par une représentation des différentes thèses exprimées au cours de nos débats pendant cette session.

Donc, les deux aspects rentreront en ligne de compte: d'une part, un aspect représentation géographique, et d'autre part, un aspect représentation des différentes thèses et tendances retenues pendant nos débats.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that there has been a consensus on the French proposal and that efforts will proceed to get under way.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): As you were just about to close the debate we should like some clarification of the French proposals. They are not the proposals we understood that we would be dealing with. We were also surprised to hear reference to "weighting" involved. We understood nothing about this and what we are being asked to agree to was something that was on a regional basis, and the composition would be decided by regional groups. It might be helpful if we had some clarification about it.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Il est bien certain, en ce qui me concerne, que je ne peux pas faire à leur place le travail des groupes de consultation régionaux. Par conséquent, quand je dis "pondération", je dis que c'est un terme qui équivaut à "prise en compte". Il y aura forcément une représentation géographique au sein de ce Groupe de contact parce que l'on ne peut pas imaginer un instant que, par exemple, une région en soit totalement absente. Il faudra donc qu'il y ait un équilibre.

Cela étant, cet équilibre pourra et devra prendre en considération les différentes thèses soutenues au cours de ce débat. Elles ne sont pas très nombreuses et l'on peut en résumer deux ou trois catégories au maximum.

Il ne devrait pas y avoir de doute ou davantage d'ambiguïté sur ma proposition; il appartiendra aux différents chefs de groupe régionaux d'en discuter plus profondément ultérieurement.

CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I take the French intervention as being solely the expression of opinion of one delegation about how the geographical areas might themselves draw up the composition of any contact group representatives that might be put forward. However, it cannot be for any other group than each geographical region to make its own decisions. It is therefore my understanding that that particular aspect of the French intervention does not form part of the proposal which we are all being asked to endorse.

Sra.María Eulalia JIMENEZ (El Salvador): Queríamos, Señor Presidente, apoyar la moción de Francia, ya que tiene como finalidad lo que durante esta mañana hemos estado discutiendo. No compartimos lamentablemente la opinión de Italia. El Grupo de Contacto debe ser formado por las diferentes Regiones.

Queremos dejar constancia, sin embargo, de una cuestión. No entendemos, Señor Presidente las razones técnicas por las cuales el Delegado de Costa Rica ha debido retirar su propuesta para que se acepte otra de Francia que es igual a la que venimos discutiendo toda la mañana.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I have to interrupt you but the Chair has been advised of a point of Order from Algeria. Algeria would you state your point of Order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Mourad BENCHEIKH (Algerie): J'avoue, Monsieur le Président, que je suis très étonné de la façon dont toute l'affaire et tous les débats sont menés.

Je pose une motion d'ordre sur votre façon d'aborder la création d'un Groupe de contact, et qui est tout à fait ésotérique; je crois ici représenter l'opinion de beaucoup d'entre nous.

En fait, il vous appartenait de dénoncer dans cette salle cette proposition au lieu de la soumettre -encore une fois - de façon ésotérique, en contactant les uns et les autres en dehors de cette enceinte.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. These are personal comments and I will reply. You were told yesterday that the Group of 77 and the OECD Group were approached and that they were asked to start this in motion. You were informed this morning that there was a sense that some persons are not quite as enthusiastic about the Contact Group at this point as others are and it needs the participation of everyone. The timing was a little bit off and you can see by the feelings expressed that there are some very serious divisive issues before here and that it was best under the circumstances to let the contact Group evolve. If you observed up here you would see that there are representatives of France, of Mexico and others in the Secretariat all trying to come to an amenable resolution and together in those discussions we thought that the procedure that we were about to follow to resolve this right after the recess was an orderly procedure that could lead to a consensus and get us on to the other business.

Sra.-María Eulalia JIMENEZ (El Salvador): Había ya manifestado, Señor Presidente, la opinion de mi país sobre este asunto; sin embargo, quiero plantear una cuestión. Dos veces en esta mañana se me ha interrumpido por una moción de orden. Yo creo que con una moción de orden se puede interrumpir al Delegado que habla si la moción de orden es sobre lo que el Delegado está planteando, no se interrumpe por una moción de orden a cualquier Delegado que está haciendo uso de la palabra en ese momento. Repito lo que planteé anteriormente.

Apoyamos la moción de Francia ya que tiene como finalidad lo que durante toda esta mañana hemos esta do discutiendo. Lamentamos no poder compartir la opinión de Italia, ya que el Grupo de Contacto, según nuestra opinión, debe estar formado por los países que las Regiones decidan y tratar de que en ese Grupo de Contacto, como lo dijo el Delegado de Francia, se encuentren reunidas todas las tendencias que existen sobre ese asunto

Mi Delegación quiere dejar constancia de que no entendemos, Señor Presidente, las razones técnicas por las cuales el Delegado de Costa Rica ha debido retirar una propuesta para que aceptemos en esta sala otra propuesta exactamente igual como la que ha hecho el Delegado de Francia.

CHAIRMAN: El Salvador, you are absolutely right on a Point of Order and the Chair ruled earlier that Points of Order that are not genuine Points of Order but are simply an effort to interrupt another delegation will be ruled out of order. That was stated before and I appreciate your support for that - you are absolutely correct.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La Delegación de Colombia apoya, Señor Presidente, los principios expuestos por nuestros colegas de El Salvador y de Argelia. Una vez más de manera muy cordial, respetuosa y hasta humilde, quisiera pedir a usted que en todo lo que falta en los trabajos de nuestra Comisión, por favor, se abstenga en adelante de interrumpir a cualquier orador.

Pensamos, Señor Presidente, que sobre la propuesta del Grupo de Contacto hay acuerdo unánime, los argumentos que se han expuesto complementan la propuesta de Francia, y esos argumentos deberán tenerse en cuenta por los Representantes de los Grupos Regionales para conciliar la manera más adecuada como se constituya el Grupo y se pueda presentar una propuesta generalmente aceptable.

Para concluir, Señor Presidente, pedimos que se aplique el Reglamento sobre nuestra moción formal de suspender el debate sobre el Tema 12, para esta tarde iniciar el debate sobre el Tema 13. Es una propuesta que se aplique el Reglamento.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone second the motion just put before the Body? I would also point out that you do not need a formal motion for that; it can be done without it but it would be better with it. The motion was that we just simply suspend and when we come back this afternoon we go on to item 13. Is that a correct statement of your motion?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Señor Presidente, nuestra propuesta, después de haber perdido tanto tiempo en apoyar y adoptar la propuesta de Francia, es que se suspenda el debate sobre el Tema 12. Usted ha aplicado una interpretación perfectamente opuesta al Reglamento. No se necesita que nadie apoye esa propuesta. Usted debe preguntar quién se opone a mi propuesta. Eso dice el Reglamento.

CHAIRMAN: The motion is to suspend discussion. There is a vote on it immediately under the rules. Under the rules of FAO "when a motion is made by a member such motion shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to a vote". Under the rules I will put that to a vote immediately. Those countries which wish to suspend discussion indicate so by showing your hand or your sign.

Vote by show of hands.

Vote à main levée.

Votación a mano alzada.

It was so decided.

Il en est ainsi décidé.

Así se acuerda.

The meeting rose at 12.50 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 50

Se levantó la sesión a las 12.50 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/5

Twenty-fourth Session

COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session

COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones

COMISION II

FIFTH MEETING
CINQUIEME SEANCE
QUINTA REUNION

(12 November 1987)

The Fifth Meeting was opened at 14.45 hours.

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La cinquième seance est ouverte à 14 h 45.

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la quinta sesión a las 14.45 horas

bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Commission II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES PS L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives

13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme

13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plaza medio

CHAIRMAN: The business before us is now the Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives. The Chair will turn the floor over to Mr Shah who will give the Secretariat's introduction of the item.

V. J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): I am pleased to submit for the consideration of the Conference the Director-General's proposals for the Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89.

The challenges of world hunger remain more compelling than ever. The number of the world's undernourished is still on the increase, despite the remarkable progress of agriculture in many developing regions during recent years. Within the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and nutrition, our Organization is dealing with issues which are of vital importance to the lives of hundreds of millions of people. We are under constant pressure to do more.

The proposals for the Programme of Work for 1988-89 are framed firstly in the context of the long-term outlook for food and agriculture. The long-term outlook for food and agriculture was considered by the Committee on Agriculture in March 1987 and its judgement was endorsed by the Council, in June. The Council agreed with the assessment of long-term trends which indicated a further imbalance in the world food system, with surpluses in some regions accompanied by chronic shortages in others. It also foresaw a growing threat to the environment arising from pollution and the degradation of natural resources.

The Committee on Agriculture and the Council endorsed eight principal goals for world agriculture. While their relative importance varies both nationally and regionally, they have sufficient universality to provide the basic framework for FAO's medium-term objectives.

The medium-term objectives, according to the Conference's own previous decision, are submitted for your consideration as an integral part of the programme and budget proposals. They have been endorsed by the Council.

As the Council stressed, the selection of priorities is based on the prior guidance of and recommendations from FAO Regional Conferences, the full range of technical advisory bodies, and the results of the in-depth reviews undertaken by the Programme Committee. They also, of course, reflect the recommendations of the Council itself and of the Conference.

The process of selection has led to a concentration on programmes and activities for which there is the greatest demand. It has also involved a search for new horizons through innovative programmes and modalities, with a greater reliance on the appropriate application of new technologies.

Continuity is respected in carrying forward programmes which are still justified, and where we have a proven record of effective delivery. Innovation is called into play, to channel resources to new areas by reducing or discarding programmes and activities which have outlived their justification or cannot compete with more pressing demands.

As a result, the programme priorities that are advocated include:

- a concentration of effort on increasing agricultural production in those countries which face chronic food shortages and deficits, through a focus on soil and water management, measures for the provision of more and better inputs, and the effective utilization of biotechnology;

- implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and the Programmes of Action of the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development;
- environmental protection and prudent management of renewable resources; policy studies for agricultural development and improved food security;
- and the more effective management and utilization of all our scientific, technical, social and economic data bases.

The relevance of FAO's field activities to requirements of recipient countries, and efficiency in field operations, are heavily dependent on the solidity, breadth and quality of the Regular Programme. As emphasized by the Council, the importance of the organic and dynamic links between FAO's technical assistance activities at field level and its Regular Programme are reflected in the proposals before you.

The overall approach is to devote as much of our resources as possible to the technical and economic substance of the Organization's work. We have therefore continued to apply the policy of judiciously cutting administrative expenditures wherever possible, in order to make room for increases in the technical and economic programmes.

The Programme and Finance Committees have commended this approach. In particular, they have welcomed the continued application of policies of increasing efficiency, making further economies in administration, reducing expenditures on established posts, increasing computerization and streamlining activities.

On the impact on Programme Budget, the proposals before you, Mr Chairman, involve a minimal programme increase - a quarter of one percent over the re-costed 1986-87 budget base. I can offer no stronger evidence of the efforts made by the Director-General to take into account the burden on all Member Nations, but at the same time to reconcile this with the need to meet the demands made on us.

Despite a programme increase of just over US\$ 1 million, technical and economic programmes would receive a net programme increase of US\$ 4.7 million, or 2.3 percent over their present level. This is only possible by reducing the provision for General Policy and Direction by over US\$ 2 million, or 6.5 percent; Development Support Programmes by US\$ 1 million, or 1.4 percent; and Support Services by US\$ 0.5 million, or 1 percent.

25 established posts are proposed for elimination. The proportion of expenditure on established posts, which was 77 percent in the biennium 1974-75, is thus further reduced in the next biennium .. to 51.7 percent.

The proposals in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget which was presented to the Programme Committee and the Council were somewhat higher. The Director-General had then proposed a real programme increase of one half of one percent, amounting to US\$ 2.2 million.

Members of the Council expressed differing reactions to the real programme increase proposed.

A few members reiterated their advocacy of zero programme or real growth throughout the United Nations System, together with the maximum absorption of non-discretionary cost increases. They urged the Director-General to aim at this objective in the Programme of Work and Budget. The majority of the Council, however, supported the proposals submitted in the Summary. A large portion of this majority would have wished the real programme increase to be higher, in view of the extent of the requirements for, and in view of the dependence on FAO assistance. They drew attention to the fact that the approved Programme of Work and Budget for 1986-87 was not being implemented in full due to force majeure, and that the modest net increase proposed could not even remedy the programme adjustments made in this biennium.

The reduction of the real programme increase to half the level proposed in the Summary is the Director-General's response, it represents his efforts to have Member Nations once again to unite in a consensus.

As regards cost increases, the estimate of cost increases in the Summary amounted to US\$ 18 million. As noted by the Finance Committee and the Council, this provision for cost increases was calculated on the basis of the methodology approved by the Finance Committee and was very moderate. It should provide realistic protection for approved programmes against factors beyond the Organization's control.

We have, once again, reviewed the proposed cost increases. There is no new development which would warrant reduction of the total estimate of US\$ 18 million. On the contrary, as recognized by the Finance Committee, a number of recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission, at its current Session, if accepted by the UN General Assembly, would bring about additional cost increases during the next biennium, 1988-89 well beyond the proposed provision. However, the Director-General had promised the Council to lower this provision in recognition of the widespread economic difficulties facing many of our Member Nations, and the difficulties they would face in meeting a higher level of assessed contributions. He has accordingly reduced the provision for cost increases in the proposals before you by US\$ 5 million.

It should be clear that this reduction does not mean that we expect cost increases to be lower than those estimated in the Summary. It means simply, very simply, that we do not include provision for the full amount; cost increases beyond the level of US\$ 13 million now provided for will have to be absorbed during the implementation of the next Programme of Work and Budget in the next biennium.

The proposals, at the budgetary rate approved for this biennium, would have involved an increase in the budget from US\$ 437 million to US\$ 451 million. However, the depreciation of the US dollar and the current dollar/lire exchange rate have the effect of raising the effective budget level to a requirement of somewhat over US\$ 481.7 million at the rate of 1 350 lire to the US dollar, which was the rate when we sent this document for processing. At a rate of 1 250 lire to the US dollar, the effective budget level would be US\$ 490.7 million. It will be recognized I am sure by the Commission that this is totally beyond the control of the Organization. Any suggestion that the consequences of this currency factor be absorbed, would be tantamount to a negative budget and a drastically reduced Programme of Work.

Through every state of consideration of these proposals, both the representatives of Member Nations and the Director-General have been obliged to bear in mind the financial difficulties which affect us in this biennium.

Your Commission will consider the impact of these financial problems on Regular Programme activities under a separate agenda item. Commission III of the Conference will consider the financial implications and the measures still required. We therefore submit that this is neither the time nor place, to go further into the subject.

I have to mention it, however, as some members of the Council considered that expectations of a likely continuation of such difficulties into 1988-89 made it desirable to prepare a Programme of Work and Budget at a lower budget level, or alternatively including a contingency plan which would permit the Programme of Work to be implemented in the light of contributions actually received. These members accordingly suggested that the Director-General consider submitting the full Programme of Work and Budget proposals on these lines.

The vast majority of the Council, however, did not agree with this approach. In the view of this majority, this was tantamount to disregarding the constitutional requirements of all Member Nations to honour their obligations in full, and to put the implementation of the full Programme of Work, as approved by the Conference on an ill-assured legal basis. Consequently, no hypothesis or projection of financial difficulties could be accepted by them as a principle.

Financial difficulties will have to be faced, as always in any biennium. The Director-General relies on and looks to the Conference to give him the necessary authority and flexibility to deal with such problems. And Member Nations have the proper forum for discussion in Commission III, precisely for that purpose. However, we submit that consideration and approval of the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 cannot be sullied, or compromised by such factors. The acceptance of noncompliance with obligations accepted by Member Nations in the Conference would be unconstitutional, would in fact act as a further encouragement to non-compliance and would be immensely damaging to the integrity of this Organization.

May I conclude with the sentiments expressed in the Director-General's Introduction to the document before you.

It can confidently be said that the proposals for the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 represent a platform for the unity of this Organization, a unity to be reconfirmed by the act of acceptance.

The proposals have obtained an impressive response of agreement at all the stages of the various intergovernmental bodies, including the Council, where they have been considered. Member Nations have made it clear that essentially they agree on the long-term trends, the medium-term objectives and the plan of action for the next biennium.

For his part, the Director-General has done everything possible to respond to all shades of opinion and expressions of view, not least by the further changes which he has introduced since the Summary.

The Director-General remains ever confident that Member Nations wish their Organization to remain vital, effective and responsive to the demands made on it. He hopes that Member Nations will see their way to a consensus approval of the proposals which he hereby submits.

He has done everything possible to help bring this about. The differences which separate you - it seems to him - are not on the substance of the proposals but on pre-determined approaches and theories such as on budget levels. He hopes you will not allow such differences to prevent you from establishing a common ground.

Now is the time for you to unite and the Director-General hopes that in recognition of this need, you will all be able to reach a consensus.

After this introduction of the Programme of Work and Budget on behalf of the Director-General may I now offer a few comments to facilitate consideration of the document before you. There is no change in the basic structure of the document.

The section on the Programme Framework gives an analysis of the programme budget proposals. It discusses the selection of strategies and priorities, the proportion of expenditure on posts as a part of the total budget, changes in established posts, details of cost increases and other financial aspects of the proposals. It brings us to a part of the document which amounts to no more than two pages but which is rather crucial to the discussion. I refer to the English text of the document. On page 29, there is a section dealing with the currency factor to indicate what the budget level would be at different rates of exchange. On page 30, there is a table showing a comparison of the present budget with the proposed budget, and on page 31 there is an explanation showing what would be the effect of the various budget levels on contributions of Member Nations.

The draft resolution provided in the document gives the text as it will be considered by the Conference when it adopts the Programme of Work and Budget in Plenary next week. The figures in the draft resolution are given at the rate of Lire 1 760 to the dollar, the present rate for the present biennium as approved by the last Conference. The text of this draft resolution will of course be updated to permit the Conference to decide on the rate of exchange which it will adopt, together with the Programme of Work and Budget.

It is in the Programme Budget itself that a very considerable expansion of details on proposed activities is now given. We are now providing indication of budgetary outlays and changes at programme element level as well as mention of activities and outputs under each element. The narratives are more specific than ever before. This applies more particularly to Chapter 2 "Technical and Economic Programmes".

The three annexes in the document are more for information, and yet they are an integral part of the document.

Annex I presents the proposed programme in respective regional contexts. It does not deal only with the activities of the regional offices, because the technical and economic programmes of FAO are an integral whole, whether the activities are carried out at Headquarters or in regional offices or at country level. Annex II deals with the budget by organizational unit, and gives information by objects of expenditure, both for the present biennium and for the next, together with organizational charts. Annex III deals with salary schedules and staffing tables.

There are three supplements to the Programme of Work and Budget. There is nothing new in Sups. 1 and 2. They provide the customary lists of main publications and meetings which will form part of our programme of activity in the next biennium.

I should draw attention to a few correction to Supplement 2. I should indicate that these are only corrections of detail and the total number of meetings and the total cost is as given in the Supplement 2 before you.

Under sub-programme 2.1.4.2, AGE sessions 701, 702, 703, 704, 705 and 706 involve two sessions each, not one.

Three sessions covered in the provision were omitted from the list through an oversight.

- (1) 2.1.4.2: AGE 901 - FAO/IAEA Seminar for Developing Countries in Africa on Food Irradiation;
- (2) 2.1.8.3: ESC 724-12 - Intergovernmental Group on Tea, Sub-group of Exporters;
- (3) 2.2.3.2: CIFA Sub-Committee for the Development and Management of Fisheries of Lake Tanganyika.

Under sub-programme 2.1.6.3, the 17 Codex sessions organized and paid for by the host government were not listed as the information was provided too late.

However, these sessions are covered in the document, as regards the total number and the cost.

This time there is a brief Sup. 3, only two pages in fact, which mentions minor organizational changes affecting three Headquarters divisions, ESC, AGP and AGA. In view of the detailed consideration by our Establishments Committee of the staffing implications regarding these changes which took place during the summer, it was not possible to include this information in the document before it was sent for processing and it, therefore, appears in a Supplement. Finally, there is a Corrigendum 1 which gives the results of the upgradings proposed for the next biennium.

I realise that I have been rather lengthy in this introduction but the subject is of such an importance that the Director-General felt that it merited this introduction. I hope that the Commission will find it helpful. I remain at your disposal now throughout your debate to provide any clarifications that the Commission may wish.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr Shah. By no means was your introduction too lengthy. It was appropriate to the seriousness of the issue before us and we appreciate the introduction you made on behalf of the Secretariat.

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH (Bangladesh): When the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 was discussed at the 91st Session of the Council in June we were present as a Member of the Council. At that time we had endorsed the Programme of Work and Budget recommended by the Programme Committee and Finance Committee. We endorsed it as we thought that it represented the aspirations of the developing countries. However, there were some critical observations on the proposed Programme of Budget in the Council meeting. Therefore, the Council adopted the Programme of Budget 1988-89 subject to recommendation of as many of the critical observations as possible. That is how the Council endorsed the Programme of Budget for consideration by the Conference. That was our understanding. We note that the Programme of Budget 1988-89 now before us is slightly different to that considered by the Council. As explained by the Director-General in his forward to the document the differences have occurred because he tried to respond to the wishes of some of the delegates at the Council session. Therefore, we welcome these changes because we believe they increase the acceptability of the Programme of Budget. We hope it would now get a wider support than was evident in the Council session.

As far as the Bangladesh delegation is concerned, we indicate our full and unconditional support for the Programme of Budget now before us. I wish now to offer our views on the theory of zero growth in the Programme of Budget. The concept does not fit in with the reality of the world we live in. Everything in the world is increasing. The world's population is increasing and national incomes are rising. Comforts of human society at certain levels are also increasing. Defence expenditures are also increasing and so also are poverty and misery. The problems of hunger and depravation in the world are increasing and multiplying. According to the astrologers even the universe is expanding. In this context how can one accept the concept of zero growth in the Programme of Budget of FAO. Therefore, we reject this concept.

However, I wish to make a few points for the consideration of the Commission. In the first place, the presentation before us does not take into account the outstanding unpaid contributions that might become available during the biennium and, as such, there is no indication of any planned utilization of such amounts. At least I did not find it in the document. A clarification on this point is perhaps necessary.

Secondly, we know that the position of the dollar against lire has created a serious budgetary problem. Although the Conference is expected to take a decision on the exchange rate to be applied during the 1988-89 biennium, it is not clear what should be the actual rate. A highly fluctuating exchange rate can upset the budget of the Programme of Work and this has been amply evidenced during the 1986-87 biennium,

At the 91st Council meeting the need for greater stability of the exchange rate to be applied in FAO's accounting and budgeting system was felt. There was a suggestion to change the accounting system to SDR. As far as I recollect this decision came from Switzerland and was endorsed by Bangladesh. However, there is yet no indication that this suggestion had received any serious consideration. Since the exchange rate to be applied during the 1988-89 biennium is not yet clear the budget proposed itself is uncertain. The budget level between US\$ 451 million and 496 million is only indicative. As a result the share of contribution of each Member in accordance with approved scales of contribution is also indicative. The sooner this uncertainty is removed the better for all concerned.

Gerald Phirinyahe KHOJANE (Lesotho): The Lesotho Delegation endorses the programme priorities advocated in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89. In particular, increasing agricultural production through a focus on soil and water management, provision of more and better inputs, and effective-utilization of biotechnology have a special appeal to this delegation. This is why we totally agree that FAO's study on "African Agriculture - the next 25 years" endorsed by the last Regional Conference for Africa, the Programme of Action for Africa, the Study and Plan of Action requested by Latin American and the Caribbean States set a clear course for the organization to follow in the next biennium and beyond. A feasibility study on the provision of expanded aid-in-kind for agricultural inputs is a good start in this direction and we are looking forward to other complementary initiatives.

FAO has already identified a need for increased investment in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors of the developing world. While developing countries are aware of the need to allocate more of their domestic resources to this sector, many, like my own, are dependent on a continuing flow of external funds if growth and development are to be sustained. FAO's investment support services have in the past been tremendous help in assisting member countries to identify and formulate viable investment projects and in mobilizing resources for investment in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. This role is expected to assume even greater importance during the 1988/89 biennium. It will be important, therefore, to ensure that funds and professional staff are adequate for this purpose.

In this period of budgetary constraints, affecting flow of financial resources to the developing countries, food aid assistance is increasingly gaining its rightful place as a development resource. As developing countries are more and more acknowledging food aid assistance as a development resource, there is bound to be an increased demand on FAO experts to assist in the formulation of viable projects for food aid assistance. We therefore urge the Secretariat to expect more requests for technical inputs into WFP food aid assistance projects than probably provided for in the Programme 1988/89.

Reliance on consultants to comply with the increased but unorganized demands on FAO may not be the best method of responding to the call of those in urgent need. We have therefore always questioned the prudence of reducing the number of professional and general service posts with a risk of increasing reliance on consultants. This is why we feel relieved that the programme provision for consultants shows a decrease while provision for contractual services will increase. For this reason, we endorse a proposal to create new professional posts to implement priority programmes for which it is not advisable to rely on short-term expertise. However, we wish to emphasize that elimination of some posts to compensate for the creation of new ones should be done with caution.

FAO Global Information and Early Warning System for food and agriculture (GIEWS) has proved to be an invaluable service when the attention of the international community was drawn to the acute food crisis in Africa in time for relief action. It is appropriate, therefore, that during the biennium 1988/89 priority continues to be accorded to improving remote sensing assistance for the advanced warning of agricultural drought, desert locusts and/or floods. It is especially significant that FAO is even prepared to take a step further to promote and support national warning systems particularly in Africa South of the Sahara and on the Indian sub-continent.

It is encouraging to notice that the Secretariat has accommodated comments of the Governing Bodies and recommendations of auditors in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89. In particular, we wish to commend the following provisions:

(a) extending monitoring to the sub-programme level and including an ex post facto review of sub-programme expenditures; (b) monitoring of actual manpower to sub-programmes against planned input; and (c) comparing estimated costs with actual expenditure in areas as far as practicable.

Finally, addressing ourselves to the level of the Programme of Work and Budget viewed in the light of the programme priorities for the biennium 1988/89, we find the appropriation figure of US\$496 260 000 rather modest in relation to the legitimate demands on FAO. But in the spirit of the need to contain budget growth due to widespread economic difficulties facing many countries to meet higher levels of assessed contributions, we are ready to go along with it. Indeed, we find the efforts of the Director-General to suppress the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89 to the almost aspired zero growth highly commendable. It must have taken a lot of sacrifice and willpower to attain the programme increase of merely 0.25 percent. We therefore do not hesitate to happily join the consensus for the approval of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89.

J. LYNCH (Canada): As this is the first time I am intervening here I would like to congratulate you on your selection. I would also like to join in thanking Mr Shah for his very good presentation. I think the calm and very lucid way in which he deals with such large increases can only recall the radio announcers of World War II who became known for their ability to announce disasters one after the other as the "voices of doom". I would note that with respect to one comment made by Mr Shah, which I may have misunderstood because of his calm style of delivery. I think he had referred to the agenda items which come up later relating to the Working Capital Fund and the Special Reserve Account as being items that perhaps should not be introduced here in the discussion of the budget. I believe he used the term that the budget discussion should not be "sullied" by the discussion of these other items. I would note and I am sure he can take me to task on this later on, that in the Director-General's introduction on the first page there are two references, one to a Special Reserve Account and one to a Working Capital Fund. I think they are fairly significant. We might perhaps just take a note of them and perhaps read them out, but on the first page of document C 87/3 in the right-hand column it says: "The dollar depreciation is leading us to the full utilization of the Special Reserve Account precisely for its intended purpose. After its exhaustion the effects of dollar depreciation will be covered from savings" and in the next paragraph, "The use of the Working Capital Fund to offset part of the shortfall at the end of the biennium and the need to borrow to cover obligations are issues depending on our action or inaction in ordering Member States' constitutional obligations." I believe that the fact that the Secretariat has taken the effort to highlight these particular items on the very first page of the introductory document does bode well for us, bearing at least in mind these particular items which come up later on our agenda and will be discussed in Commission III.

But to turn to the major task before us, that task is to review the FAO's budget for the '1988/-89 biennium. In this context as members of this Commission we should bear in mind that FAO, like other specialist agencies in the United Nations system, faces great financial difficulties. Late payment of assessed contributions, decline in the dollar and the decline in income as a result of falling interest rates are the main causes of the current financial crisis. Canada, historically, has never failed to pay its contribution to the FAO on time. However, given our understanding of the constraints operating on other countries, including the largest contributor as well as many developing countries, we recognize that it is extremely unlikely that there will be full payment of assessed contributions early in either year of the coming biennium. We therefore consider that the FAO must be realistic, and would join with other countries in the Council, such as the Federal Republic of Germany, to urge that the FAO initiate contingency measures which anticipate the fact that programmes as submitted in the proposed 1988/89 budget could become largely meaningless when the respective contributions in both amount and time are unpredictable as they are likely to be. By "contingency measures" Canada means that the FAO should try to have a core stand-by budget to ensure the financing of indispensable FAO activities.

In his introduction, Mr Shah made reference to certain constitutional and legal arguments stating that to draw up contingency measures would be unconstitutional and encourages States further in noncompliance with their legal obligations. This may be true, but I do not think the timing should dissuade us from dealing with that subject now. There will come a time during the next biennium when reality will force the Secretariat to do that which they are urging us not to do now and I believe that it would be important for us to provide some input or advice to the Secretariat in adopting those contingency measures.

In addition to concerns about the availability of financial resources, Canada is concerned at the level of the proposed 1988/89 budget. While we appreciate the efforts which have been made by the Secretariat to keep the proposed budget modest in the light of the financial burden it will place on Member States, we believe that a variety of economic factors make this an inappropriate time to propose a budget containing real growth. While the proposed budget contains only 0.25 percent programme increase this should not cause any of us to lose sight of the fact that because of currency fluctuations we are speaking of very large increases - perhaps from \$437 million to \$490 million. I would note that several other UN specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organisation and the International Civil Aviation Organization, have already adopted budgets for the coming biennium 1988/89 which contain negative real growth. We believe that given the difficult economic circumstances facing most FAO members it would be desirable at this time to hold the line on growth and absorb cost increases to the maximum extent possible. Our concern about the need for financial constraint is prompted by two factors. First, we are concerned by the dramatic effect which the fluctuation in currency exchange rates will have on the assessed contributions of most Member States calculated in national currencies. To use Canada's case only as an example: we anticipate that, expressed in Canadian dollars, our assessed contribution for 1988 will increase by 20 percent over our 1987 contribution. We are aware of other countries whose increase in payment in terms of local currencies will be very much more than that. In several cases there will be increases of over 50 percent in assessed contributions in national currency terms.

Second, we are concerned by the fact that the proposed replenishment of the FAO Working Capital Fund and Special Reserve Account will result in additional financial demands on Member States which will be felt by national governments simultaneously with the impact of the increase in the annual contributions as a result of the Regular Programme of Work and Budget. My Government believes that the proposed replenishment of the Working Capital Fund and the Special Reserve Fund is justified and have supported the need for specialized agencies to have realistic working capital funds if they are to be effective. Nevertheless we as representatives of Member States must recognize that the magnitude of the replenishment of the Working Capital Fund and Special Reserve Account is determined in part by the replenishment of the budget for the 1988/89 biennium and that the magnitude of the increase being proposed is such that it may put additional limitations on the ability of many Member States to make their financial contributions to the FAO as promptly and as fully as they would like. We would also like to use this opportunity to emphasize that the FAO Secretariat should use the Working Capital Fund and Special Reserve Account in a disciplined manner, not as a means to ensure indirectly higher levels of growth in the programmes than the membership has and will approve directly.

In addition to these fundamental comments on the proposed 1988/89 budget and related financial matters, I would like to offer two additional comments on other points related to the proposed budget with which we have difficulty. First, while we acknowledge improvements in the presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget we believe that there is room for more improvement, particularly providing a clear impression of how the priority-setting mentioned in the introduction to the budget document has been carried out. I will not bore you now with certain comments we might have about how greater transparency could be encouraged, but I would perhaps reserve the right to return at a later stage.

Second, we feel that the establishment of new country offices should be postponed to a future biennium, given the financial difficulties which our Organization currently faces and which have prompted the Director-General to propose significant reductions elsewhere in the budget.

In conclusion my Government cannot support the proposed budget.

Hermann REDL (Austria) (original language German): First of all, I should like to thank Dr Shah for his precise and clear introduction. The Austrian delegation has considered with special interest the presentation that we have in the document submitted. We particularly welcome that the priorities established over the last biennium, that is to say the promotion of food production, the increase in food security, the consolidation of information systems, intensification of training, promotion of economic and technical cooperation between countries in development are being continued.

As regards the regional aspects, it is to be observed that as we said it is particularly to be welcomed that also in the future Programme of Work and Budget the African region will be enjoying particular priority. The extension of the programme of activities by FAO and special consideration given in the priorities of the Director-General are fully endorsed by us. This is particularly true for the work that is proposed in the framework of Chapter 2. We are pleased to note that it has been possible to reduce staff costs from 77.2 percent in the last biennium to 51.7 percent. This also means even compared with the 1986/87 biennium, a considerable reduction of staff costs.

As regards the extension of programme activities in Chapter 2, we would note that as regards the further pursuance of programme activities there is a great deal of useful work. The use of improved seeds as a basis for better production is something which goes without challenge and we shall be applying all our efforts to these programmes and in particular the training aspects, both national and regional, will be given high importance. As regards activities in the field of forestry we must observe that many woods and forests are at risk in Europe because of pollutants from cars and lorries. There is considerable degradation of the climate and we can see effects throughout the world. We hope therefore that in the future activities of FAO, particularly as regards the dying forests, particular importance will be attached.

As regards the field of food, consideration should be given to the fact that this is something requiring no emphasis here. We support the activities of FAO as regards Codex Alimentarius, both regionally and world-wide. However, due to the tight budget position it seems to us necessary that great economy should be observed in the search for greater efficiency in the use of the available resources.

As regards the details given in Chapter 4, Technical Cooperation Programme, our view is that TCP puts FAO in a position to provide rapid help to countries. This also means that project planning must constantly be adjusted to new situations in order to ensure optimum use of the available resources. Once again, I must emphasize that the TCP activities in the African region enjoy our full support.

May I be allowed, as a representative of a European country, to make a brief comment on the work of FAO in Europe. As already mentioned, my country supports the work done in the field of the Codex Alimentarius and also of the Forestry Commission in FAO. Close cooperation in the Committees for Agriculture and Forestry with the ECE authorities seems to us to be very desirable and should be given yet greater emphasis.

The transfer of know-how and knowledge in Europe seems to us to be a matter that should be given every support on behalf of the developing countries. We feel that Europe could also give financial backing to this. I should like to assure you that Austria, within the limit of its capabilities, will be pressing these proposals in the appropriate bodies. From all these points of view and in view of the current world situation, the budget as put forward by the Director-General seems to us to be fully acceptable. In the Plenary the Austrian Delegation emphasized that the Programme of Work and Budget, as put forward by the Director-General, enjoyed our full support. I wish to emphasize this again here. We also hope that the draft programme by the Director-General, in consideration of amendments and adjustments, will receive the full support of the Twenty-fourth Conference.

Hidayat Ganda ATMADJA (Indonesia): My delegation would like to express its appreciation of the excellent work done by the FAO Secretariat in preparing documents relating to the Programme of Work and Budget of the Organization for 1988/89. We would also like to congratulate Mr Shah on his comprehensive presentation.

My delegation realizes that it is very difficult to develop a Programme of Work and Budget in the light of financial difficulties faced by the Organization because of the uncertain economic situation that we now face. Also it would be hard to formulate programmes of work and budget to meet the needs of various member countries. Bearing that in mind, my delegation supports the strategy, priority and approach contained in the Programme of Work and Budget put forward by the Director-General.

We have seen that the proposal is in conformity with the requirements of most developing countries in supporting their development efforts. The programme in fact stresses support for the efforts in respect of increasing food production in many food-deficit countries. We are happy to note that the Programme puts its priorities on improving soil productivity and water management, supporting tropical forestry action plans, fisheries management and development and environmental protection as well as promoting bio-technology.

I believe that priority is also given, among other things, to the effort to stimulate long-term investment-technical and economic programmes as well as field programme activities including technical cooperation programmes and technical cooperation among developing countries. Within this aspect, my delegation appreciates the work of FAO in developing the Organization to move in an efficient and effective way by reducing administrative costs and dealing with economic and social as well as economic programmes. My delegation is of the view that this Programme could only be done if all member countries made their contribution on time. Therefore we would suggest that the support of all member countries in this respect is required. We appeal to those whose contributions are still not fulfilled to do what is necessary to help the Organization to carry out its programme. In conclusion, my delegation fully endorses the proposals under the Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1988/89.

Ms Janet Lesley TOMI (Australia): The Australian delegation has a number of reservations concerning the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium. First, the proposed budget, we have just heard through Mr Shah's introduction, is now fixed at US\$ 490 million at the current exchange rate. In fact the total budget would be considerably greater if the Secretariat's proposals to top up the Working Capital fund and replenish the Special Reserve Account through the imposition of additional excess levels are not set aside. Secondly, we are concerned that the Secretariat has failed to base its budget proposals on a realistic assessment of likely contributions, and to limit expenditure to achieve real zero growth together with the maximum absorption of costs of currency fluctuations and inflation. The delegation of Australia is unable to support budgetary proposals, the net effect of which is to put countries like ourselves in the position of making additional contributions to accounts depleted by the unwillingness of others to pay.

According to the report of the Ninety-second Session of the Council session, only 90 of the 158 Member Nations had paid their current assessments in full as at 31st October 1987. At the same time for the preceding year the situation was even worse, when only 65 Member Nations had paid in full with no payment received for that year from 61 Member States.. It would appear that Australia remains one of the diminishing number of Member Nations which has hitherto consistently paid its contribution promptly and in full. We would urge all Member Nations to make every effort to meet their financial obligations to the Organization to ensure equity in the distribution of the financial burden.

Thirdly, Australia wishes to express its disappointment and concern that the Secretariat has failed to tackle growth in the budget in a responsible fiscal manner. It is our firm view that the only viable long-term solution is a rigorous review of programme priorities in order to contain costs so as to achieve a realistic budget.

In this respect we would like to place on the record our strong support for the Draft Resolution presented by the Delegation of the United States advocating changes in FAO's budget and programme procedures. We believe that the whole budget process is too complicated and too rigid and that any changes are too difficult to achieve. The report of the External Auditor on the accounts of the Regular Programme for the financial period 1984-85 ended 31st December 1985 notes that while there is a comprehensive system of budgetary planning in place, programme budgeting is not concerned with monitoring by object of expenditure and that there is no out-turn statement comparing estimated costs with actual expenditure in object of expenditure costs. In other words, the following biennial budget is prepared before the end of the current period and determined by Conference almost 6 months before the out-turn of the preceding budget is known. This is only one small example of why we believe improvements are called for in the budgetary accounting and reporting processes which will make the operations of the Organization clearly transparent and readily understandable to Member Nations and fully accountable.

The Delegation of Australia is certain that Australia is not alone in its concern that, faced with serious domestic budgetary constraints, the resources we can provide to the United Nations and its specialized agencies are not without limit. Nor can the secretariats of the international organizations ignore the image they present to their members, which in turn have a responsibility to their own people to justify the resources allocated to international organizations. This becomes politically more difficult to justify when the perception exists that an organization has not adjusted to the harsh economic and financial realities which confront most Member Nations in the 1980s. Accordingly as long as the cost to us of multilateralism continue to rise steeply in nominal terms, the Australian Government will have to make hard choices in the allocation of its international assistance and will remain unable to support budgetary proposals that fail to take account of our concerns.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): We have listened with interest to the excellent presentation by Mr Shah with regard to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89. On behalf of my delegation I should like to thank him and congratulate him. Further study of this document confirms that the proposals put forward have been the subject of a serious approach and that the requirements of developing countries have been understood, and this in view of the important financial difficulties that we all face today. Considering the document, we appreciate that the various bodies of the Organization are indeed competent and have demonstrated their efficiency more than once and have been able to adjust to the developing circumstances. This leads me to look at the future with some optimism and we would like to say that the ideas put forward in the document have been translated into fact, which confirms what has been said at earlier meetings.

I should now like to refer to the document itself. I do not want to go through all the details of the technical aspects, all the more since I have spoken of these at earlier meetings of the Programme Committee, Council sessions and elsewhere. There are three things I would like to touch upon. First of all, essential considerations in the presentation of the document and, secondly, the way in which these considerations impinge upon the programme. Then I should like to make some further general observations.

On the first part, let me say quite frankly that those who have followed the activities of the Organization for some time will be aware of the major thrusts and the major objectives in the Organization's activities.

There are two main features of this strategy. First, there is the real approach, that is to say the consideration of the real needs of developing countries and the realities of the international economic situation. The Organization has been able to take this on board. This is an enlightened form of realism. It does not mean simply yielding to circumstances.

Secondly, we need to unify the Organization's ranks and we must attempt to achieve the maximum of consensus. The Organization has always hoped that its proposals would be a call for unity rather than division. It is important to understand these aspects in order to understand the major thrust of the programmes submitted. Large resources will be necessary for the technical programmes that serve agricultural development in developing countries despite zero growth, the lack of growth in the budget, which is a matter of satisfaction, but this is another aspect to which we wish to refer, that is to say, better recruitment in order to cut down operating costs.

Table 3, page 29, shows us what the expenditure has been, and I think that this table shows that we are on the right lines. Accordingly my delegation can agree with the general considerations and the philosophies that underlie the programme and we would give support to these proposals that aim at decentralization and the support for the programme as desired by the developing countries.

There is reference to problems of liquidity, which is a matter of current concern. These are the matters which have to be limited, we have to know how the budget is to be drawn up, and today we can only take this as a basis for the coming period.

Further, we would not wish the discussion on the programme and budget to become a political discussion rather than a technical discussion, which would drift off into physical considerations without logical foundation.

A number of points were raised and we have listened to questions put by delegations on the priorities. These are not the Secretariat's priorities, we must remember: these are priorities that have been laid down by the countries and these have been discussed at every level, including the Council and governing bodies.

This document sets forth very clearly the ideas that have been advocated at these meetings. The Programme Committee has discussed these and has prepared a report that indicates the effort that has been put in by the Secretariat in producing the document. My delegation gives its support to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): We would like to thank Mr Shah and congratulate him on the very clear presentation he has made on the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

My delegation had the opportunity to express its views at the last Council Session and my Minister also briefly exposed our approach to the proposals concerning the Programme of Work and Budget at the Plenary. If I may just briefly touch upon these views, Turkey fully endorses the strategies, priorities and programmes proposed by the Director-General in his Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

Our support is mainly based on the fact that we really think that in some ways it is our own budget, because these proposals reflect an odd result of a long process to which all Member Nations, including mine, have largely contributed.

We also welcome the effort to ensure a better and clearer presentation of priorities, programmes and budget estimates. We appreciate in particular the overall approach which aims to devote maximum resources to technical and economic programmes, to refine programme priorities, to increase efficiency and to cut costs.

To sum up, we consider that given the present budgetary and financial constraints and uncertainties the proposals before us seem to be balanced enough to deserve a consensus including the budget level, which foresees an increase of 0.25 percent over the recosted base.

We also had the opportunity at the last Council Session to express our views concerning some ideas referring to a contingency or core budget. I again reiterate our views very briefly on this subject. Turkey thinks that the Director-General under the Basic Texts could not act otherwise. He could not act on the hypothesis that some Member Nations will pay at some given time and so much. He has to go only by the Basic Texts and on the basis that the only revenue of the Organization is the commitments of the Member Nations based on the assessed contributions. So we consider that we cannot start discussing a core budget or a contingency budget at this stage, first because it would be against our Basic Texts and Constitution, and secondly it would not be practical because it would imply reopening the whole process of budget programme preparation.

Please allow me now to touch upon a point which is dear to Turkey concerning the priorities of the Programme and Budget. Of course we had ample opportunity to express our views on the various sets of programme priorities, and priorities in the means of action, but my Minister picked up a point in particular at the Plenary and this is the importance we attach to economic and technical cooperation among developing countries.

As our activities show, as our contribution to the TCDC and ECDC activities shows, we do not consider the ECDC and TCDC as empty concepts, we contribute to them. In this context we have programmes of TCDC and ECDC in cooperation with FAO which are in course. On the basis of the success of these programmes I have at this stage a suggestion, or even a proposal, to make. This concerns the establishment of an FAO regional centre for training in agricultural and rural development and my Government offers to host this permanent centre in Ankara providing all the facilities and trainers.

We hope that this proposal will meet with approval, of course going through the normal process of such proposals, and we hope that this will respond, if established, to the requirements of the countries of the region, based of course on the requests of these countries.

Again I hope that we will have the opportunity to come back to this proposal in our further work. I just wanted to take this opportunity to make this suggestion officially.

I would like to conclude by reiterating our hope that the Budget and Programme proposals for 1988-89, which are before us, will be approved by consensus at the Plenary.

LI DACHUN (China) (original language Chinese): First I wish to thank Mr Shah for his introduction of the Programme of Work and Budget. I wish to make some general observations on the Programme of Work and Budget, one concerning the budget level. The 91st Session of the Council held last June conducted deep-going discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget, but much to our regret the meeting was not able to reach a consensus on this matter. Now we have noted that in the budget presented for discussion at this meeting programme increase has been reduced from 0.48 percent to 0.25 percent and cost increase reduced from US\$ 18 million to US\$ 13 million. This represents the result of the effort made by the Director-General to coordinate the views of all parties concerned according to the recommendations of the discussion at last June's Council meeting.

It will be conducive to reach a consensus on this matter during the discussions of the Conference. We feel that in comparison with the previous 'budgets, the increased level of this budget is relatively lower, therefore it can be accepted. It is our sincere hope that the parties concerned will accept this budget level.

At the same time we have also noted that in the next biennium budget there will be a 2.3 per cent increase for technical and economic programmes. This increase is achieved through cutting the administrative expenditures. We support the measures taken by FAO to ensure the substantial increase for the programme.

2. As for priorities of the programme we agree with the five programme priorities that are advocated by the Director-General, namely to help those countries which are faced with chronic food deficit to develop agriculture and grain production. Due to various reasons Africa does not only need emergency assistance but also needs medium long-term assistance, especially in the fields of economy, technology and inter-lateral development. Therefore we support FAO to place programme priorities in Africa. At the same time due consideration should be given to the needs of other regions.

3. With regard to new programme priorities we support FAO to take biotechnology as a new priority in the next biennium. Biotechnology has great potential in promoting the high degree of development of agricultural production. FAO can play a unique role in technology transfer, manpower training and information provision. However, we also appreciate the useful work done by FAO which includes collaboration with IAEA to help Member States to deal with agricultural problems arising from the accidental release of radial nuclei. Therefore we support FAO to increase the appropriation in the next biennium for this item and to continue its work in this field.

4. Concerning the Field Programme: this is an inseparable part of the Programme of Work and Budget under discussion and its financial resources are mainly from extra-budgetary resources. We are happy to note that extra-budgetary resources in 1988 and 1989 have some increase from the lowest level in 1983 with some increase for the fund of FAO's UNDP programme, a fairly large increase for Trust Fund and some development of FAO's Investments. However, we have to point out that the increased range for an some extra budgetary sources is not big enough. It is well known to all that an insufficiency of extra-budgetary funds is closely related to the results of the Field Programme. For developing countries the Field Programme is an important way to help developing countries to improve production and therefore we hope that the international community will make active efforts in this regard and will make their due contributions to the developing countries.

5. The technology transfer and manpower training are extremely important to developing countries. FAO can play its useful part in these two areas. It is our hope that FAO should continue to give priority to the work in these two areas in its future work.

Before the conclusion of my speech I wish once again to express our thanks and appreciation to the Director-General and the staff on the Secretariat for the arduous task that they have accomplished in preparing this Programme of Work and Budget and our support to the strategy goal priority and the budgetary level of the Programme of Work and Budget.

Matti HANNULA (Finland): I would like to congratulate you on your election to the Chair. The Finnish Delegation considers that the timetable and procedure followed presently do not offer member nations enough of possibilities to really influence the level of budget as well as the process of

decision-making including setting priorities for the work of the organization. We strongly feel that there is a need for an involvement by Regional Conferences, Special Committees like the Committees on Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries as well as for a re-scheduling of the work of the Programme and Finance Committees. Changes like these will facilitate the influence of member countries on the decision-making process, when approving the Programme of Work and Budget of our organization. As an example we would like to mention the practice used at present in the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee is not supposed to discuss budget questions, but is nevertheless requested to give its views on the programme of work. Because these two issues are closely inter-related, it would be appropriate in the future to request the Committee to discuss priorities and their budgetary implications within the framework of a realistic budget target. The Committees should also be requested to discuss and work out clear priorities of the programme of work within their respective areas of competence. It is evident that a pre-requisite for such a process is a better transparency of all documentation provided by the Secretariat, and some sort of evaluation of performed activities.

The level of the budget, which must be considered to be almost a zero budget meets with the approval by our delegation. In connection with the budget the financial problems of the organization are discussed. The Finnish delegation would like to stress, as was stated by our Minister, Mr Pohjala, at the Plenary session, that any international organization will run into big difficulties, if its members do not fulfil their obligations concerning the timely payment of membership fees. We strongly encourage all members of FAO to take full responsibility for the financial situation of their organization. When it comes to the practical management of the organization, we are in favour of savings in administrative costs by avoiding a too heavy bureaucracy, which must be fought against in any large organization. For the future we consider that the setting of priorities must be the most important issue for the organization, because it will not be possible to work efficiently on the entire front as has been attempted so far. It is also important to establish efficient links between different divisions, e.g. agriculture and forestry as these fields are closely inter-related being parts of the same farm unit. In extension and other development work there should be an integrated approach to solving the problems of the farm. We also want to emphasize FAO's role as an organization providing advice for member governments in agricultural policy matters. In general, it must be stressed that efficient management and leadership play an important role for the achievement of favourable final results.

Due to the prevailing financial difficulties of FAO our delegation is not in favour of increasing at this time the number of country representations. Even if the proposal in principle is well justified, we are not able to support this idea, before the financial situation has improved.

The Finnish delegation would like to present some principles on priorities in the programme of work for 1988-89 that should be seriously considered when planning the work of the organization.

When we are discussing the setting of priorities in a regional context, we strongly support the continuing emphasis on Africa as can be seen in table A on page 257 of the document C 87/3. The agriculture and food situation in Africa is still so serious that Africa must be considered as a first priority region. This does, Mr Chairman, not mean that other regions should be forgotten. There is an evident need of an active involvement by FAO in all the developing regions of the world.

Turning now to particular programmes we would like to state that Finland has traditionally been in favour of a strong involvement by FAO in the forestry sector. Having said that we regret to inform you that we have not been able to see clear signs that forestry has been given higher priority among FAO programmes than the case has been during previous years. The efforts of the Finnish delegation in this respect at previous FAO meetings have not been fruitful. Within the forestry sector we want to pay special attention to Community forestry. Forests as producers of firewood and shelter have such a big importance for developing countries. These facts cannot be neglected in the future. Promotion of forestry is also very important from the point of view of protection of the environment. Erosion and desertification can be stopped and prevented by forestation.

Protection of the environment in a broader sense is in the view of our delegation a priority area. We strongly support the idea of working for sustained development. If we do not in FAO as well as in other UN and international organizations pay attention to environmental hazards in economic development, we will all suffer in the future. Therefore we support the proposals of the Bruntland Commission and propose that environmental aspects should be given due consideration in all relevant FAO programmes and projects.

Salim SARRAF (Liban) (langue originale arabe): C'est la première fois que ma délégation intervient ici dans cette commission. Je vous félicite donc pour votre élection. Nous remercions aussi M. Shah qui a très bien présenté ce document C 87/3.

Nous avons, je crois, dans nos discussions antérieures, perdu beaucoup de temps. Dès lors, pour ne pas en perdre davantage et pour éviter les discussions inutiles, nous serons extrêmement brefs dans notre déclaration. Nous sommes favorables aux propositions figurant dans le document C 87/3 et nous approuvons cela d'autant plus volontiers que le Directeur général a apporté à ce texte des amendements pour donner suite aux vœux exprimés par les pays membres lors des réunions antérieures du Conseil.

Nous sommes, sans réserve, favorables à ce programme de travail et budget pour l'exercice financier 88-89. Puisse un consensus se dégager sur ce point.

Rudolf GENSKE (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): I should like to begin by thanking Mr Shah for the excellent introduction he has given to us to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 (document C 87/3). The Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium have been intensively discussed over the last few months in different technical bodies. The Finance and Programme Committees, and the Council have been dealing with them. We are pleased to see that a great number of proposals and suggestions that were made in these bodies have been incorporated into the new Programme and Budget document.

Let me make first of all a few general comments concerning the Programme of Work. During the 91st FAO Council Session we had already pointed out that while the priorities were established rightly in the Programme of Work, we considered that a further priority might be appropriately added, environmental protection and prudent management of renewable resources. I am happy to observe that the Secretariat has taken up this idea. In our view a greater awareness of the need for taking greater care of environment and resources are now becoming a basic component of concepts and discussion approaches. This is true even when it has not always found the required degree of acceptance.

We consider it important that the programme of our Organization should meet practical needs and be practice-oriented. Federal Minister Kiechle has pointed out this repeatedly. This also includes that we try to achieve through the increased cultivation of food crops also greater incomes for the producers. As regards the marketing of agricultural products we must proceed from the view that agriculture as the basic pillar of development will still for many years continue to have the leading role in the economies of the developing countries. The programme of our Organization must therefore try to bring about beyond pure production efforts also a more balanced access to markets and to the establishment of purchasing power for broader sections of the population.

Let me now turn to some of the budgetary aspects. We acknowledge that the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 has been extraordinarily difficult. This is true for the whole of the United Nations system. Indispensable economies in the regular budget for 1986-87 are connected to this. Our Organization was not alone in this respect. The United Nations itself economized US\$ 163 million; WHO, as the UN organization with the largest budget volume, US\$ 35 million and ILO which has a smaller budget volume than FAO was able to spare US\$ 17.3 million. We think that our Organization with its economies of US\$ 25 million comes out quite well in the comparison. We welcome the fact that the Director-General has postponed the establishment of four new FAO country representations in the Major Programme 3.4 until the current financial crisis has been solved. We think that these new country representations should be abandoned at all in the next biennium, even if through phased timing the establishment of these representations would involve additional expenditures of no more than US\$ 550 000.

With the revised final proposal for the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89, with a real growth rate of only 0.25 per cent, FAO has virtually achieved the level of zero growth requested for long by us in the budgets of the United Nations system. We welcome this because the growth rate for our own national budget for 1988 will also be by 0.6 percent below the planned economic growth

We particularly welcome the fact there has been a further reduction in administrative costs and in the share of staff expenditures which now amount to only 51.7 percent. We are also aware of the difficulties resulting from the unpredictability of currency development.

The representative of my country in the Finance Committee had positively appreciated the low real budget increase. As already in May of this year he had called for an emergency provision to be made, that is to say that activities whose financing is insecure because of arrears in contributions to be expected should be included in a standby programme. In this way the Director-General would be in a position to be able to implement the major part of the programme on a financially secure basis from the beginning of the budget period. Activities in the standby programme would only be implemented as and when arrears are made up or when resources become free as a result of delays of other programmes or when other miscellaneous resources become available.

We can only approve the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 which we consider basically reasonable provided that such emergency planning is provided for. Relevant decisions of principle already exist in UNIDO, WHO, ILO and WMO. In the present form - without this provision for emergency - we are therefore not able to give our agreement to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

During the 91st Council meeting, my delegation already made the point that organizations in the UN system cannot spend more money than available to them. Therefore, we see the delays and failures to pay the compulsory contributions as the major cause for our current financial crisis, and therefore call upon all Member States who have not yet paid their contributions to fulfill their obligations as promptly as possible. We hope that we will still be able to come to an agreement and to approve the Programme of Work and Budget by consensus.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, I would like in the first place to express my sincere gratitude to Mr Shah for the excellent presentation of this document, and would also like to commend the efforts of the secretariat in the preparation of the document so that it truly reflects the different viewpoints and recommendations sounded by the various organs of FAO. After careful study of the document presented to the Ninety-first Session of the Executive Council and, on the basis of the realistic technical and economic objectives of the program aimed at the increase of agricultural production, the effective application of technology, the reinforcement of data collection bases, the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources, my country has certain observations concerning the following programs.

With regards the Major Program 3-1 for the planning of field programs, we would like to express our satisfaction with the fact that this program encourages technical cooperation between developing countries and aims at greater reliance on national cadres in the management and operation of different projects.

Mr Chairman, after review of the medium-term objectives and work plan of the Major Project 3-2 concerning investment, the delegation of my country fully endorses the program because it highlights the different investment projects and promotes the participation on the private sector in various investment activities.

The delegation of my country also fully supports the Major Program 3-4 concerning country representatives in view of the effective contribution of representatives in giving consultation and advice and in extending technical assistance when most-needed. My country itself has had a successful experience with this program; however, we feel we need to draw a new policy and secure its approval by the Executive Council. This policy is envisaged to prescribe the standard requirements for the establishment of country offices and to determine the relationship between country offices and regional offices with the possibility of charging country offices to serve more than one country if the volume of their projects so requires.

The support given to my country by the technical assistance program had a positive impact on its agricultural development programs. We happily endorse the establishment of the new cadre for technical cooperation between developing countries, and welcome the prospected benefits to be made possible by such cadres. The new trend adopted for the allocation of resources to the different components of this program as referred to under para. 26 of this document is another source of our satisfaction, and we hope that the list of projects implemented will be submitted to the Council.

After review of the sub-program 5.1.2 concerning the library, we note with satisfaction that allocations to the library and to the support of agricultural library systems have not been affected.

With regards sub-program 5.1.3, we feel that further guidance and orientation are needed. Hence a plan is required to determine the number of publications. In this context, reports on meetings and conferences should be summarized and strictly limited to the results and recommendations of meetings. The practice of including summaries of all documents presented should be discontinued.

Mr Chairman, the delegation of my country commends the new system adopted to allocate the greatest amount of financial resources to technical and economic programs and at the same time to cut down on administrative costs. We feel that under the circumstances of the financial crisis, the 1988 budget as proposed by the Director-General, is satisfactory.

Mr Chairman, my country is indeed one of the greatest supporters of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries. It has hosted the Technical Cooperation Meeting in 1986 and we are presently preparing for another round of meetings in the field of technical cooperation to examine the role of documentation centres in developing countries. Documents for these meetings are being prepared by the competent bodies in my country in its capacity as hosting the meetings. Training is provided by several centres and institutes in agriculture and agricultural activities related to trainees from developing countries and from international organizations alike. Such institutes are bound by strong ties and agreements with international organizations particularly, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Bank. The Egyptian International Agricultural Centre and the Rural Development Centre are prepared to receive trainees from within the region and from other regions as well. The Centres are well equipped and possess adequate facilities in addition to technical and administrative cadres able to handle any training tasks entrusted to them.

Abdal Halem AL NOMAN (Iraq) (original language Arabic): I would like once again to express my thanks to you for providing us with this opportunity to speak on this important subject as it deals with the budget organization and the services provided to developing countries to increase their agricultural output and to provide the necessary resources and food for their inhabitants. After having reviewed the various documents on the budget and after having heard the introduction of the Secretariat, and considering the difficult circumstances during which they were established, I would like to point out that the Medium-Term Objectives aimed at increasing production and productivity as well as the improvement of the terms of trade and rural development, in addition to the importance accorded to fisheries and forestry, all these projects and proposals are in fact vital and important to the overall proposals of the budget. These objectives as set out in the budget were very carefully discussed by the various member countries with a view to developing their agriculture. In fact we think that these proposals indicate a very clear awareness of the needs of the developing countries. The increase in the budget of the Organization to achieve these goals through the improvement of services is commendable. This will help the Organization to stress the priorities requested by the member countries, it will also help member countries to adopt those new technologies that will increase efficiency and effectiveness.

The budget provides for support to local institutions and organizations which will also help them to improve their own country's development. Achievement of these basic goals reflects the increased budgetary cost. However, the indication in the budget document of a cut-back in costs indicates that the Organization, as I said, is to give priority to the technical sides of its programmes. For this reason we fully support the contents of the Programme of Work and Budget as well as those measures taken by the Director-General and we believe that any further increases in the budget can be avoided if the member countries work to fulfill their financial obligations to the Organization in time, and if local personnel and expertise were resorted to in the implementation of field programmes, as this will help to reduce overall costs especially those related to travel and living allowances of imported expertise.

We wish once again to express our thanks and gratitude for the excellent quality of these documents.

Pedro Agostirihô KANGA (Angola): Tout d'abord, nous tenons à remercier M. Shah de son introduction très brillante du Programme de travail et budget pour 1988-89. L'analyse exhaustive faite sur ce Programme de travail et budget présentés par le Directeur général nous a amenés à conclure que le travail réalisé était de longue haleine si l'on veut concilier sous les différents aspects qu'ils revêtent les problèmes auxquels la FAO se heurte en ce moment.

Le cas de la FAO est similaire à celui de toutes les organisations du système des Nations Unies victimes de la crise économique mondiale due plus particulièrement à la fluctuation monétaire, d'un côté, aux termes de l'échange, au système monétaire international dans les institutions spécialisées, au prix des matières premières et à la dette extérieure galopante pour la majorité des pays en développement membres de la FAO. Les organisations internationales en général se heurtent à des problèmes budgétaires et financiers cruciaux et la FAO, tel qu'évoqué ci-dessus, se trouve également entraînée dans le marasme économique du moment.

Les efforts déployés par le Directeur général de l'Organisation en faisant sans doute les acrobaties nécessaires pour arriver à présenter ce Programme de travail et budget pour 1988-89 nous convient à lui manifester sincèrement nos vives félicitations. Nous apprécions le dévouement du Directeur général et du Secrétaire et les efforts qu'ils ont fournis en vue de satisfaire les opinions et les points de vue exprimés par les uns et les autres lors de l'examen du Sommaire par les organes techniques consultatifs.

Vous conviendrez avec nous que le problème de la faim continue à sévir dans le monde et plus particulièrement en Afrique et en Asie. Malgré la gravité de la situation économique internationale, il est temps de prendre les décisions qui s'imposent. Et certaines questions qui se posent méritent une étude approfondie pour trouver des solutions adéquates à tous les problèmes de retard ou de non respect dans nos engagements car il est évident que rendre le cadre financier de la FAO opérationnel ne dépendrait que du flux financier constitué essentiellement de l'acquittement de leurs obligations par tous ses Etats Membres dans le règlement régulier de leurs contributions. Il est important de retenir cette observation que la FAO ne connaît pas de crise financière mais plutôt une carence de liquidités car elle est l'une des organisations du système des Nations Unies qui peut être fière de présenter, comme par le passé, une gestion saine.

Nous ne voudrions vraiment pas entrer dans le détail du document dont nous sommes saisis car nous l'avons fait dans d'autres organes consultatifs de l'Organisation. S'agissant de stratégies prioritaires, nous appuyons les suggestions du Directeur général relatives à l'affectation de ressources à de nouvelles priorités telles que définies au chapitre des stratégies et priorités.

Parlant une fois encore du Programme de coopération technique, nous exprimons notre regret de voir que les ressources affectées au PCT sont en stagnation malgré notre souhait de les voir augmenter, ne fût-ce que de 1 pour cent, car le succès déjà enregistré depuis la création de ce Programme a suffisamment démontré son dynamisme.

Une augmentation de 1,1 million de dollars, soit 0,25 pour cent par rapport au programme biennal antérieur actualisé, est vraiment dérisoire. Nous considérons ce budget comme un budget historique car il s'agit du plus petit présenté jusqu'ici. En huit ans, le budget de la FAO a été réduit de 4 pour cent et il a un taux de croissance zéro.

Nous éprouvons réellement beaucoup de difficultés à appuyer ce niveau. Il ne répond en aucun cas, pour nous, aux besoins actuels, à un moment où de nombreux pays s'enlisent dans une situation économique mondiale qui se traduit par la persistance de la pénurie alimentaire.

Malgré les difficultés que nous venons d'exprimer, animé d'un esprit conciliant, mon pays appuie le niveau du Programme de travail et budget pour 1988-89 tel qu'il est présenté.

Pour terminer, nous exprimons le souhait que tous les Etats Membres qui ne l'ont pas encore fait honorent leurs engagements en temps opportun et au niveau prévu.

Usama AL-BILBEISI (Jordan) (original language Arabic): Allow me first of all to express my thanks to all those who have prepared this detailed document on the budget and for the detailed figures and statistics that reflect the activities and the ambitions of this Organization. Here I wish to point out the following. First of all, it goes without saying that a cutback in administrative costs is something worthy of expressions of gratitude, but this should not affect the performance of the Organization.

A second point we wish to refer to is the great importance we attach to TCPs as these are an effective means of responding to urgent needs and of effective implementation.

After having reviewed the various items of the budget in the document we note the very limited increase in the funds allocated to the transfer of technology. This is a source of certain concern, as research and transfer of technology and extension activities are very important, especially where improved efficient technology and its transfer are vital for an increase in production and an increase in farmers' income.

A last comment: we wish to stress here the need to give special importance to the training element in all field programmes and in all opportunities available, especially for developing countries, as this is a vital means of introducing improvement of development and production in member countries.

I would like to reaffirm my country's willingness to provide this Organization with all the necessary support. This is based on our appreciation of FAO's role in development and our firm conviction of the need for genuine international cooperation which would be an essential foundation for a world free from hunger, poverty and underdevelopment.

SAMBA MOOMI-TE-AVELELA (Zaïre): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de vous féliciter pour votre élection; je profite de l'occasion pour présenter à Monsieur SHAH nos vives félicitations pour sa brillante présentation du document C 87/3 relatif au programme de travail et budget 1988/1989 de la FAO.

Concernant le programme, comme l'a dit le chef de la délégation zaïroise ce matin, ainsi que les délégations qui ont pris la parole avant nous, nous considérons qu'il est conforme aux besoins illimités que les pays en développement sont en droit d'attendre en matière d'assistance de la part de la FAO. Toutes les actions ici proposées sont un minimum que la FAO devra faire au cours du prochain biennium.

En ce qui concerne le budget 1988/1989, ma délégation pense qu'il doit être adopté par consensus. Il faudra également que les Etats Membres fassent des efforts pour s'acquitter de leur contribution dans les délais impartis, afin que notre Organisation puisse honorer ses engagements.

Pedro OYARCE YURASZECK (Chile): Mi Delegación desea en orimer término agradecer a la Secretaría por la presentación e introducción de este Documento.

La orientación global dada en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el ejercicio 1988-89 refleja equilibradamente, de una parte, componentes derivados del retraso en el pago de contribuciones, la depreciación del dólar, la reducción de ingresos por conceoto de intereses; y, por la otra, la necesidad de los países en desarrollo, acentuada, entre otros elementos, oor variables vinculadas a la deuda externa.

Las modificaciones propuestas para el próximo bienio denotan un meioramiento en la asignación de recursos para Droeramas técnicos v una disminución de aquellos destinados al servicio de oolíticas y dirección. La orientación oue se plantea en este Documento es producto de un esfuerzo valioso y serio por ajustar a la FAO, al igual que a otras agencias del Sistema de Naciones Unidas, a una situación internacional crítica y a unpproblema específico de liquidez:

Mi Delegación concuerda con las cinco prioridades pronuestas y comprende el nivel de asignación sugerida. Mi país recientemente ha expresado en el transcurso de la presente Asamblea General su comprensión y solidaridad con la acción de la Organización en beneficio del continente africano.

En el ámbito estrictamente regional coincidimos con la orientación dada en el Plan de Acción oara el bienio 1988-89, en cuanto a recursos naturales y a otras materias vinculadas a los sistemas de exnlotaciones agrícolas.

En el programa de cultivos se estiman importantes los esfuerzos de la FAO tendientes a intensificar la transparencia de tecnología mediante medios modernos de comunicación destinados a pequeños productores y extensionistas, a desarrollar cultivos hortícolas- y a profundizar el conocimiento y tecnología de pérdida postcosecha.

En cuanto a la información, análisis y políticas en materia de alimentación v agricultura, mi Delegación reconoce el esfuerzo de la FAO. en la preparación del Estudio solicitado en la última Conferencia Regional para América Latina y el Caribe sobre las posibilidades y perspectivas de alimentación, agricultura y el desarrollo rural en la Región;

Al mismo tiempo, es interesante destacar las actividades desarrolladas en esta esfera en cuanto al análisis de precios y mercados de los productos básicos, la colaboración con organismos regionales de integración y cooperación, así como la capacitación y planificación del desarrollo agrícola y rural

Por otra parte mi Delegación se complace en observar la inclusión del componente ambiental, reco-giendo las recomendaciones del Informe de la Comisión del Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo.

En relación con el Programa de Campo, nos parece adecuada la orientación propuesta y el fortalecimiento necesario que en esta materia requiere la acción de la Organización. Confiamos que a pesar de las dificultades que plantea este documento a ciertas Delegaciones, pueda ser aprobado por consenso.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav Delegation is in agreement with, in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-39, the identified Medium-Term Objectives and the selection of programme priorities. We believe they are realistic and acceptable. They are highly inter-related, thus indicating the need for simultaneous and more closely coordinated action at all levels if we are to get nearer to the attainment of the final goal of the elimination of hunger and malnutrition, and to attaining world food security. This obviously implies effort by all countries and international organizations and the community as a whole to give more generous support to the efforts of the developing countries in the formulation and implementation of food and agricultural development plans.

Our delegation regret the circumstances which have compelled the Director-General to disguise the negative growth and a symbolic real term increase in the budget as much as we appreciate that he has done so. On the budget level our principal position remains unaltered, based on the merits of programmes rather than on any preconceived budgetary theory.

We consider it necessary to exert all possible efforts towards preserving and further promoting the basic orientation of FAO in maintaining the balance between activities of a global nature and those geared towards specific regional, sub-regional or national issues and problems. We welcome the fact that in the allocation of resources to these two types of activities in the coming biennium priority has been accorded to activities in support of the developing countries for both regional and national plans-

Our delegation also welcomes further persistent shifts in resources from administration and general support towards substantive programmes. In this regard we strongly support the further strengthening of the role of the Technical Cooperation Programme with the corresponding increase of funds in the Regular Programme. As a member of the United Nations family, FAO is facing a serious and worsening liquidity crisis. In this connection we would like to underline the conclusion of the FAO Council that the real causes of the current financial crisis are not to be found in the orientation, management or efficiency of FAO. It is unacceptable that financial problems of this nature should be taken as a pretext and justification for limiting the Programme of Work and Budget of the FAO in the forthcoming biennium.

The question is, what kind of survival strategy to adopt. We are aware of the advocacy for a core, a stand-by or satellite budget. However, a small technical trick will not of course solve the real problem. Furthermore, we are positive that such an approach is as dangerous as it is unsound. The only rational option seems to be to apply managerial measures to safeguard to the maximum the major priorities of the Organization. It has to be done under the precise guidance and with the full involvement of the Governing Bodies.

Finally, the Yugoslav Delegation is prepared to endorse the Programme of Work and Budget, although my country is facing economic and balance-of-payments difficulties.

Ugo SESSI (Italie): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de remercier Monsieur Shah pour sa présentation du document C 87/3 qui contient les propositions du Directeur général pour le programme de travail et budget pour l'exercice 1988-1989.

L'examen du programme de travail et budget a lieu cette année à un moment crucial pour la vie de cette Organisation. En effet, les difficultés financières que la FAO a rencontrées au cours de l'exercice qui se termine le mois prochain n'ont pas, si j'ai bonne mémoire, de pareil précédent, dans son histoire qui compte désormais plus de quarante ans. Je ne me bornerai pas à rappeler les causes et l'étendue des difficultés car nous les connaissons tous. Elles ont fait l'objet d'un examen sérieux de la part du Conseil, du Comité du budget et du Comité du Programme. Elles sont aussi rappelées dans l'introduction du Directeur général au document que nous examinons. En plus, les aspects financiers de ce problème font l'objet de plusieurs points à l'ordre du jour de la Conférence. Cela montre, s'il en était besoin, les profondes conséquences sur la gestion actuelle et future de la FAO des difficultés d'ordre financier dont je parle et qui marquent d'une manière particulière le moment que l'Organisation vit actuellement.

Que nous le voulions ou non, ces problèmes seront dans nos arrière-pensées au cours de la discussion du budget car ils ont et auront une incidence directe sur les programmes de la FAO, sur le niveau budgétaire que la Conférence approuvera et, bien sûr, sur les contributions de nos gouvernements. C'est ici que je voudrais partager au nom de ma délégation, l'opinion exprimée par le Directeur général dans son introduction.

Nous sommes confrontés à un grave problème mais non pas à une crise fondamentale de l'Organisation et surtout pas à une crise de confiance dans la FAO et dans ses objectifs principaux.

Nous espérons qu'à l'issue du débat qui va se dérouler au sein de cette Commission et dans les autres instances de la Conférence, ressortira clairement un appui renouvelé vis-à-vis du rôle et des tâches fondamentales de cette Organisation.

Je vais m'occuper maintenant du document C 87/3, et je le ferai en deux étapes:

En premier lieu, en ce qui concerne les stratégies et priorités qui sont indiquées, nous pouvons en général approuver les propositions du Directeur général, en particulier les propositions tendant:

- à générer un effort accru dans le secteur de la production agricole des pays en déficit vivrier chronique;
- à privilégier les mesures visant à protéger le sol, les eaux et l'environnement en général;
- à favoriser une utilisation optimale des biotechniques.

Nous partageons aussi l'idée d'une amélioration de la gestion et de l'utilisation de toutes les bases de données disponibles à l'Organisation. La FAO constitue en effet un observatoire privilégié de tous les aspects du développement rural et agricole; et nous pensons qu'elle pourrait jouer un rôle accru dans ce secteur, surtout à la suite des dépenses considérables qui ont récemment été effectuées au siège dans le secteur informatique.

Ensuite, en ce qui concerne les programmes de terrain, nous avons pris note de la situation de dépenses effectuées à l'aide de sommes extrabudgétaires qui montrent un niveau constant, en termes globaux, de sommes dépensées pour les projets financés par le PNUD, et une substantielle bonne performance des programmes réalisés à l'aide des donateurs bilatéraux, en coopération avec le gouvernement.

Pour le PNUD, j'espère que le nouveau cycle de programmation, qui a débuté en 1987, et les perspectives favorables des contributions de la part des principaux donateurs permettront un accroissement des moyens mis à la disposition de la FAO qui pourront compenser la chute enregistrée surtout dans les années 83 et 84.

Sur les programmes de collaboration avec les gouvernements et les fonds fiduciaires, il est un peu plus difficile de faire des prévisions car on parle ici d'activités réalisées sur des bases bilatérales entre la FAO et les gouvernements concernés. Dans ce cas, chaque pays décide donc de façon autonome de l'étendue de sa coopération avec la FAO.

En ce qui concerne mon pays, je ne puis que confirmer l'engagement de l'Italie à poursuivre le programme et les expériences réalisées bilatéralement avec la FAO, comme l'a déjà déclaré le chef de ma délégation dans son intervention en plénière.

Les programmes dont je viens entre autres de parler se situent dans les lignes directrices qui régissent la nouvelle loi sur la coopération avec les pays en voie de développement, qui a été adoptée par le Parlement en février 87.

Enfin, sur les activités d'investissement, je voudrais déclarer toute notre satisfaction et tout notre intérêt pour le rôle que joue la FAO en stimulant les courants d'investissements au bénéfice des activités agricoles et rurales dans les pays en voie de développement. Nous espérons que les moyens accrus mis à la disposition de l'IDA, en conjonction avec les ressources du FIDA, bien qu'inférieurs à ce qu'on pourrait attendre, pourront faciliter un effort et une participation majeure de la FAO dans ce secteur.

Il faut quand même rappeler que le FIDA pourra compter aussi sur les moyens qui lui seront confiés avec le fonds spécial pour l'Afrique.

En plus, il faut aussi rappeler les expériences très intéressantes réalisées par le PNUD dans les activités des pré-investissements.

Nous croyons que la FAO aurait beaucoup à gagner d'une collaboration plus étroite avec le FIDA, et d'un échange d'expériences avec le PNUD dans ce secteur.

Après ce commentaire d'ordre général, je voudrais exprimer notre position sur les aspects plus significatifs du projet de budget, d'un point de vue plus technique et plus financier, c'est-à-dire sur la partie comprise entre les pages 18 à 32 du document.

Nous avons noté avec intérêt les efforts d'économie et de rigueur déployés par le Directeur général pour faire face aux incertitudes financières. Nous jugeons adéquates les réductions de crédits apportées aux consultants et aux réunions officielles. Nous avons noté avec satisfaction la diminution nette de 25 postes dans les effectifs permanents, qui résulte de la création de 13 nouveaux postes et de la suppression de 38 postes existants, bien qu'à la suite de la présentation du nouveau document supplémentaire, il faille compter seulement sur 20 diminutions nettes - si j'ai bien compris.

Nous avons quand même remarqué que sur les 11 nouveaux postes prévus pour la catégorie "professionnels", 10 postes sont au niveau P-4 P-5. A ce sujet, je voudrais renouveler les réserves déjà manifestées à plusieurs reprises par ma délégation. En effet, sur un total prévu de 920 fonctionnaires du cadre organique pour les prochains bienniums, 615 sont au niveau P-4 P-5, c'est-à-dire plus des 2/3.

Selon nous, et dans la situation d'incertitude financière actuelle, le recrutement devrait être effectué au niveau le plus bas possible, pour donner ainsi aux nouveaux fonctionnaires de meilleures possibilités de carrière à l'intérieur de l'Organisation.

Parallèlement, les taux de vacance des postes devraient rester au niveau fixé par le Comité financier.

En ce qui concerne les augmentations de dépenses proposées, si nous n'avons pas d'objection à un relèvement de crédit pour les services informatiques, que nous considérons comme des dépenses d'investissement très rentables, nous aurions préféré éviter l'augmentation de 10% prévue pour les voyages officiels.

Je vous rappelle que le comité des 18 a proposé à l'ONU une réduction de 20% des crédits alloués à ces dépenses dans le budget des Nations Unies. On a procédé à des coupes considérables dans ces dépenses aussi dans les autres Agences spécialisées, comme rappelé par le Représentant de la Rép. Féd. d'Allemagne.

Nous accueillons avec satisfaction la croissance presque nulle du budget en terme réel.

En ce qui concerne la croissance globale, elle dépendra bien sûr du taux de change du dollar que la Conférence choisira. Pour l'instant, il faut noter que la seule hypothèse présentée dans les documents montre qu'avec un taux de change à 1 350 livres pour un dollar qui est, pour l'instant, supérieur au cours actuel, on aurait une croissance globale du budget de l'ordre de 10% comme l'a rappelé M. Shah aujourd'hui.

Rien ne nous est dit sur d'autres hypothèses, mais il n'est pas difficile de calculer la croissance globale du budget si on choisissait le taux de change de 1 250 livres pour un dollar. Dans ce cas, comme on peut le voir dans les tableaux de la page 30 du document (auquel M. Shah faisait également référence), avec un niveau de budget aux alentours de 490 millions de dollars, on aboutirait à une augmentation d'environ 12%.

Il ne faut quand même pas non plus oublier que les crédits proposés ne couvrent pas, pour plusieurs types de dépenses, toutes les augmentations dues à l'inflation et à l'augmentation des coûts, et qu'une partie de ces augmentations devra être absorbée, à l'intérieur du plafond approuvé, par des économies réalisées dans la gestion du budget.

Enfin, il faut aborder la question plus délicate qui est celle des recettes, étroitement liée à la discussion sur d'autres points à l'ordre du jour, notamment en ce qui concerne la crise financière et les moyens d'y faire face.

Notre préoccupation est d'éviter une situation de vide de pouvoir à laquelle on a fait référence pendant le débat du dernier Conseil. Ma délégation a posé des questions et a obtenu de la part du Secrétariat l'assurance qu'un mécanisme approprié pourrait être envisagé et mis à la disposition du Conseil dans l'hypothèse où la FAO se trouverait à nouveau dans la situation difficile qui s'est produite dans le courant de cette période budgétaire.

On doit donc prévoir la possibilité pour le Conseil de donner des directives au Directeur général dans le cas où il serait nécessaire de procéder à des ajustements de programmes, à une modification, à une réduction ou à un renvoi de certaines initiatives prévues dans le budget, si nous nous trouvions confrontés à un déficit des recettes provoqué par le retard ou le manque de paiement des contributions - ou d'une contribution particulièrement importante.

Lors du débat de la troisième commission, ma délégation se réserve le droit de présenter un projet de résolution à ce sujet et nous reprendrons donc ce débat ultérieurement dans une autre instance.

En conclusion, je peux déclarer, compte tenu des observations que je viens de faire et sous réserve que la question des pouvoirs d'intervention du Conseil soit résolue dans l'hypothèse que je viens de mentionner il y a quelques instants, que ma délégation est prête à approuver le projet de programme et budget tel qu'il nous est présenté dans ce document.

Ms Malgorzata PIOTROWSKA (Poland): The Polish delegation fully supports adjustments introduced in the Program of Work and Budget for the next biennium, according to the changing agricultural and financial situation.

The philosophy explained in the Introduction to the document is in our opinion a correct one and it gives a basis for an even better focussing on important FAO activities in the future, and at the same time preserving a universal character of the Organization and understanding that deep changes could not be implemented in a short time.

Our delegation meets with special satisfaction enlarging FAO's activities in Europe. These activities are important not only for the European region but also for future intensified cooperation of Europe with developing countries.

The Polish delegation is concerned about the disruption in the FAO programme caused by the cash shortages due to late contributions or absence of contributions from Member States. The effect in 1987 has been that priorities established by the Council and Conference have not been adhered to. We are concerned if this trend continues that the priorities and programmes of emphasis approved by this Conference for the coming biennium will become almost meaningless.

Natural Resources: We are particularly pleased with the emphasis placed on the conservation and reclamation of soils, especially as this is to be based on the mobilization of small farmers and peasants. My delegation also wants to stress the importance of rational land use planning and the development of more efficient farming systems. In the exploitation of natural resources the guiding principle must be concern for environmental protection and the proper management of renewable resources.

Crops: My delegation gives full support to the emphasis given to the preservation of crop genetic resources and is pleased to see the enhanced cooperation with IBPGR. We consider it important to secure the widest agreement on the International Undertaking for Plant Genetic Resources as soon as possible.

My delegation fully supports the major emphasis given to roots and tuber crops which constitute some of the most important basic foods, not only in tropical and sub-tropical countries but also in temperate climate countries like Poland which, as you know, is one of the largest producers of tuber crops in the world.

In this connection we would like to emphasize that it is equally important to enhance and stabilize production of these crops as it is to prevent a third, our potato crop through premature sprouting. We are thus looking into the possibility of using modern methods, including irradiation, to reduce these losses. In that connection we welcome the International Conference on Food Irradiation that FAO is co-sponsoring in Geneva next year with WHO, IAEA and GATT.

Livestock: We are particularly pleased to note in this programme the new emphasis given to the use of modern biotechnology both in an effort to improve livestock reproduction and productivity as well as for diagnosis and control of livestock diseases. It is to be hoped that the use of these new biotechnologies will lead to early results in the two major campaigns for diseases such as rinderpest and trypanosomiasis in Africa. However, these new technologies are of equal interest to other regions and countries, including Poland. We are thinking of food and mouth disease and also of biotechnology for vaccine production as well as for improved nutrition.

The work being started on animal genetic resources is welcomed and we support the organizational changes being made to strengthen activities in this area.

Research and Technology Development: My delegation considers research and technology development to be one of the major tasks of FAO within its whole area of responsibility for agriculture; including soils, crops and livestock as well as fisheries and forestry. We agree with the emphasis given within this programme on improving research management capabilities. We are particularly supportive of the role that FAO is undertaking in supporting advanced research technologies, biotechnology and, where appropriate, genetic engineering as well as the increased use of modern nuclear technology for plant improvement, animal production and health, insect control and preservation of food.

We welcome the inclusion of AGRIS in this programme, an activity to which we give our full support.

Rural Development: We have noted with satisfaction that within this wide-ranging programme the priorities for increased emphasis have been placed on extension and training, formulation of national policies and programmes, and the various programme elements strengthening the role of women in both food production and rural development. In this context my government has welcomed the attention that FAO has drawn to the role of the small farmer and fisherman in food production and also the plight of the peasants and ways of improving their lot.

Nutrition: My government continues to regard the Codex Alimentarius Commission co-sponsored by FAO and WHO to be one of the most important intergovernmental committees and welcomes the attention being given to food quality. With the rapid increase in the volume of international food trade it is of the utmost importance to have internationally accepted standards of food wholesomeness and quality.

The consequences of nuclear accidents were a painful reminder of this necessity. It is a pity that now, one and a half years after, there are still difficulties in international food trade due to the inability of national governments and international agencies to reach an agreement.

We would like to congratulate FAO on the establishment of radioactive levels in food to facilitate international food trade. These have greatly helped to alleviate the problem and we fully support the plans to initiate activities in the next biennium within this programme and the joint programme with other UN agencies concerned to train food controllers in assessing the radioactive contamination and to advise governments on actions to be taken with regard to food and agriculture in the case of such accidents.

In conclusion I would like to state that my delegation supports the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, stressing the need for consequently introduced changes in the future, especially enlarging the FAO's role in advising and guiding Member States in shaping their macro-economic and social policies in food and agriculture.

The meeting arose at 17.30 hrs

La séance est levée à 17 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.30 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/6

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

SIXTH MEETING SIXIEME SEANCE SEXTA SESION

(13 November 1987)

The Sixth Meeting was opened at 9.45 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La sixième séance est ouverte à 9 h.45
sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la sexta sesión a las 9.45 horas
bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)

13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme (suite).

13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: As you are aware from the Order of the Day there will be an adjournment promptly at 10.30 and we will re-convene at 2.30.

Jung Joo KIM (Korea, Republic of): It is my honour to be chosen as the first speaker of this morning's session. The delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to express its appreciation for Mr Shah's excellent explanation on the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89. We would also like to express our compliments for the painstaking efforts of the Secretariat in preparing this budget proposal within the limit conditions.

In particular, the Secretariat endeavoured to make a balance between limited resources and priorities to be given. For example, US\$ 2 million decreased in the chapter of General Policy and Direction through the cutting of administrative expenditure, while US\$ 4.7 million increased in the chapter of the Technical and Economic Programme.

As we are well aware, FAO is now confronted with serious financial difficulties. Such a problem does not only apply to FAO but to most of the international organizations. Consequently, the impact of such difficulties brought an absence of qualified personnel who played a leading role in carrying out their function. According to the report, 170 posts in FAO have been left unfilled and there are two more professional posts which are proposed for elimination.

Allow me to quote an old proverb of Korea which says: "Plant a tree if you want it to prepare for ten-year future, and educate your children if you want to prepare for a hundred-year future." This simple proverb reminds us of the importance of the development of human resources. No matter how we might be depressed by the financial burden, we should not neglect the development of human resources. At the same time horizontal coordination among professional personnel should be organized.

Once again we appreciate the effort of the Secretariat in preparing this budget proposal.

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Queremos, Señor Presidente, referirnos a este Documento C 87/3 que está en discusión. Ante todo mi Delegación desea felicitar como siempre al Señor Shah por la excelente y precisa presentación que nos ha brindado del tema en debate. Al mismo tiempo saludamos a la Secretaría por la calidad y claridad del Documento C 87/3.

Nos encontramos nuevamente examinando en este 24° Período de Sesiones de la Conferencia un Programa de Labores y Presupuesto que, desde el 22° Período de Sesiones, viene estigmatizado por el denominado crecimiento cero, aunque en la práctica y en términos reales el crecimiento se comporta en forma negativa, teniendo presente las implicaciones de las corrientes inflacionarias, la devaluación del dólar norteamericano y la insuficiencia de liquidez de la Organización a consecuencia de la retención del pago de las contribuciones de algunos Estados Miembros, en particular por el principal contribuyente.

Una vez más debemos reconocer el papel líder de la FAO, la capacidad de gestión de nuestra Organización, dentro de esta situación tan difícil que le ha tocado vivir; a su Secretaría y a la clara ejecutoria de su Director General en la búsqueda de soluciones a los agudos problemas de la agricultura y la alimentación a pesar, repito, de la situación aguda que atraviesa financieramente. La FAO ha sabido enfrentar con dinamismo y decisión situaciones críticas y está realmente realizando y ha realizado muchos esfuerzos en fav'or de los países subdesarrollados, especialmente en la crisis de hambruna que azotó al continente africano. En medio de estas limitaciones financieras la FAO fue líder en el ejercicio del apoyo a Africa.

Continuando con esta estrategia, no obstante las dificultades ya referidas, con optimismo, pero también con realismo, la Secretaría nos presenta un Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1988-89 en respuesta a las demandas de los Estados Miembros, manifestadas y consignadas en las definiciones de las estrategias a largo plazo emanadas del 9º Período de Sesiones del Comité de Agricultura y que fueran aprobadas por el Consejo el pasado mes de junio. Al mismo tiempo, se han tomado en cuenta algunos criterios innovadores para la aplicación de nuevas tecnologías a fin de contribuir al logro del principal objetivo: el aumento de la producción y de la productividad en el sector de la agricultura y la alimentación.

Al apoyar el contenido del Documento C 87/3 mi Delegación respalda plenamente las prioridades que se otorgan en las diversas actividades propuestas para el próximo bienio en el entendido de que ellas responden a las demandas de los países subdesarrollados, que son en definitiva los más necesitados. Ello es también un reflejo de que han sido tomadas con mucha precisión las recomendaciones hechas por las diferentes reuniones convocadas por la Organización, como son las Consultas de Expertos, consultas intergubernamentales, Comités Técnicos, las Conferencias Regionales, el Consejo y la Conferencia. O sea, que la FAO ha funcionado debidamente con toda su estructura actual.

En este sentido, continuarán en curso actividades tan importantes como aquéllas encaminadas al aumento de la producción de alimentos, mediante un mejor manejo de los recursos de tierras y agua, a la aplicación de medidas para obtener más y mejores insumos y a la utilización progresiva de la biotecnología, la puesta en pleno funcionamiento del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos y la continuidad de los Programas de Acción de la Conferencia Mundial sobre Reforma Agraria y Desarrollo Rural y de la Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesquero. Todo esto ha sido fruto del trabajo de la FAO y de sus representantes gubernamentales.

Mención particular merece, Señor Presidente, el Programa de Cooperación Técnica, cuya eficacia ha sido plenamente demostrada por el impacto beneficioso que ha tenido en los países receptores, tanto desde el punto de vista de su capacidad de movilizar recursos humanos y materiales que existen al interior de los países, a veces no explotados, como por la capacidad de atraer contribuciones suplementarias de otros donantes, con fines de desarrollo o por situaciones de emergencia. Además, debemos subrayar que por sus razones de ser este Programa permite a la FAO responder con rapidez a necesidades urgentes de los países, aunque de manera moderada y a un bajo costo. Es lamentable que a pesar de las bondades de este Programa no pueda tener un incremento mayor de sus fondos.

En otro ámbito de la acción de la FAO, merece se destaque el notable impulso que está dando a la incorporación de la mujer a las tareas más importantes del desarrollo económico y social. Un tema de mucha actualidad también, al cual la FAO le está concediendo una gran importancia, es el referido a la Cooperación Técnica y Económica entre Países en Desarrollo. Sin embargo, aun los esfuerzos que se realizan para avanzar en estas actividades, resultan insuficientes si se tiene en cuenta que este es un campo aún sin explotar y cuyos beneficios son incalculables.

Como parte de la Cooperación Técnica de los Países en Desarrollo y la Cooperación Económica de Países en Desarrollo, la transferencia de tecnologías constituye un elemento de primer orden, es una de las necesidades que tienen nuestros países para tener capacidad de elevar su producción.

La perspectiva de incrementar el desarrollo de la biotecnología y la ingeniería genética en los países en vías de desarrollo, como un criterio innovador, merece también nuestro reconocimiento.

La propuesta hecha por el Director General en favor de continuar avanzando en la política de descentralización, con la apertura de cuatro nuevas oficinas de representantes de la FAO en igual número de países, cuenta también con todo nuestro respaldo.

Para concluir, mi Delegación desea expresar firmemente que como cuestión de principios se opone al crecimiento cero; a la luz de los tiempos que corren en que por el contrario el hambre y la malnutrición, la miseria y la pobreza expresan un signo de crecimiento positivo con un ritmo sin precedentes en la historia.

Tal como fuera manifestado en Plenario por nuestro Ministro de Agricultura, Cuba apoya plenamente el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, propuesto para el bienio 1988-89 en aras de la unidad de la Organización y para contribuir a su aprobación por consenso, en la convicción de que la FAO mantendrá su vitalidad, su eficacia y capacidad de respuesta a las necesidades y reclamos de aquellos que padecen hambre en el mundo.

Carl THOMSEN (Denmark): We would also like to thank Mr Shah for his introduction to this item of our agenda. It has indeed assisted us in better understanding what is a very difficult situation in which to prepare proposals for the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89.

We would also like to express our appreciation for the Director-General's introduction in the document C 87/3 which has helped us to understand the background against which the detailed proposals have been worked out.

As far as the budget level is concerned, my country is prepared to support the level as now proposed. As indicated by my Minister in the Plenary the other day, what matters to us is the content of the Programme, and naturally the results which can be expected from it. My remarks will, therefore, mainly be related to these aspects.

But before coming to this, we would like to reiterate our appreciation of the efforts which have been made to reduce the part of the budget which is allocated to administrative expenditures. We would also like to acknowledge the efforts which have been made to accommodate the more recent deterioration of the financial situation. Nevertheless, as Mr Shah stated, the financial difficulties which lie ahead will have to be faced also.

With regard to the Programme of Work, the Danish Delegation has for many years repeatedly emphasized the importance of the setting of priorities for the effective utilization of the resources at the disposal of the Organization. As the Director-General has indicated in his statement to the Conference, the FAO cannot be expected to do everything - to solve all problems connected with food and agriculture in the world.

The capacity of the Organization will in all circumstances be limited, and it is therefore necessary to adopt a selective approach. The needs and demands of the member countries are so numerous and so varied in character that it is impossible to satisfy them all. In view of this, considerations of quality of work or professional excellence becomes more important than quantity. Innovations in general can only be feasible at the expense of some existing programme activities.

The question of selectivity and the setting of priorities becomes even more important and necessary at the present juncture, when it seems highly probable that the financial resources which will be available, will not be sufficient to enable the Organization to implement the proposed Programme of Work in its entirety.

In such an event, there is a special need for the rate of implementation which will be possible to be guided by a set of priorities, if we wish to avoid a proportional reduction across the board, which of course would impair the quality of the work to be performed. A better strategy would be to prepare for selective cuts in programme activities in order to protect the professional capacity of the Organization in a more limited number of programme areas.

In this connection we would emphasize the statement by the Director-General that the main asset of the FAO is its professional staff. I feel sure we all agree to that, and it is of course not only true for the Regular Programme activities as such - but also with regard to the necessary backstopping of the Field Programme by the substantive Divisions of the Organization. This professional back-stopping in our view is also of crucial importance to the successful implementation of the Technical Co-operation Programme, the TCP.

Consequently the capacity of the substantive divisions should be the determining factor or criterion as far as the size and content of the Field Programme and the TCP are concerned. In other words the FAO should not offer to undertake more activities under their programmes than the professional staff of these divisions are able to cope with. There has to be a balance here if we are to maintain the comparative advantage of the FAO.

In the same vein, we strongly support the view that the Regular Programme and the Field Programme should complement each other. The quality of the advice that FAO can provide to Member Governments depends in fact on this inter-relationship: one cannot succeed without the other. The issue of priority setting for purposes of maintaining the professional excellence of the Organization will therefore have a bearing on the activities under both these programmes. It could be added that the quality of the work performed by the FAO country representatives will likewise depend on the capacity of backstopping from the professional staff of the substantive divisions. Thus it follows, in our view, that there also has to be a balance in this respect.

An important function of the FAO is to provide services to governments of the member countries within its field of professional competence. This of course also applies to other agencies within the United Nations family. As the problems are often inter-related and of a multi-disciplinary character, a fruitful and close collaboration with other agencies will be of crucial importance. A case in point is the joint division with the International Atomic Energy Agency. We should like to see more of that.

Again, the FAO cannot be expected to cover all aspects of food and agriculture in the world and therefore it will be desirable and even necessary to establish a certain division of work with other agencies dealing with food and agriculture, as in the case of IBPGR in connection with the activities related to plant genetic resources. This is just an example of a model we hope to see repeated.

The setting of clear-cut priorities for the work of the Organization is, in our view, of central importance. At the same time we must admit that it is a very complex and arduous task. It is the responsibility of the management of the Organization, but governments have to provide essential inputs and of course eventually approve the proposals put forward by the management. Because of the complexity of the task, it is our view that valuable inputs might also be obtained from knowledgeable personalities external to the Organization. These could be obtained in several ways. One possibility would be to follow the procedure which has been suggested by the Nordic countries under the previous item of our agenda but, as stated earlier, we are prepared to discuss other possibilities of obtaining the same thing.

Before concluding, I should like to emphasise that we are making our remarks and suggestions out of a sincere concern about the future role of the Organization as a member of the United Nations family. Our purpose in doing so is to assist the FAO in improving its ability to serve the basic goals for which it was created.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, allow me first of all to congratulate you on your election and to wish you success in taking the Chair of this Commission. I wish to thank Mr Shah for his excellent summing up and exposé of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

After having reviewed document C 87/3, on the proposed Programme of Work and Budget, we wish to point out briefly that the Programme of Work and the priorities therein contain many alternatives and options that the Organization plans to undertake over the next two years. The priorities established are due to what the Organization has felt to be the requirements of member countries and beneficiaries. We wish to seize this opportunity to refer to the need to support the abilities of individual countries in undertaking their own development through knowledge, experience, advice and help in the use of appropriate technology. It is also important, where future programmes are concerned, that special attention must be accorded to TCDC.

Training for local staff and personnel in the fields of rural development and the establishment of sound agricultural policies must be given special importance. This is due to the fact that this may help to overcome poverty and under-nourishment in rural communities and with landless farmers. Any proposed programme for implementation, if it is to be undertaken with the necessary efficiency and professionalism, must have the required resources. In view of the services to be provided by this Organization, we find that the level of budget is very appropriate, especially taking into account that no real growth has been introduced in the budget. Therefore the implementation of the proposed budget requires member countries to fulfil their financial obligations within the period established. This should enable the Organization to implement the programmes in turn in the appropriate time span. All this should be undertaken in the spirit of international cooperation and multi-nationalism in which this Organization was established. Finally, we support the level of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

Jean-Luc GRAEVE (France): La délégation française voudrait tout d'abord féliciter le Directeur général, l'ensemble du Secrétariat, les comités, en particulier ceux du programme et des finances qui, chacun dans son propre domaine de compétence, ont accompli un remarquable travail de préparation au cours des derniers mois.

Très attachée à la croissance zéro des budgets des organisations internationales, la France note le caractère très raisonnable des propositions du Secrétariat qui, en outre, ne répercutent que partiellement l'augmentation des coûts.

Ma première observation concerne les ressources de l'Organisation pour le prochain biennium. Comment la Conférence peut-elle s'engager sérieusement sur un programme de travail et de budget si, comme le laissent penser certaines délégations, pèsent des incertitudes sur ses ressources? C'est toute la cohérence de la programmation, tout le travail de réflexion et de concertation au niveau des conférences régionales et des comités qui seraient remis en cause.

La Conférence doit se prononcer clairement sur la nature des dispositions à prendre dans cette hypothèse.

Ma délégation fera le cas échéant des propositions précises à la Commission III lors de l'examen du point relatif aux mesures destinées à faire face aux incertitudes budgétaires.

J'observe ensuite le véritable effondrement, de l'ordre de 30 millions de dollars, des recettes accessoires dans le prochain budget. Cet effondrement est dû pour l'essentiel aux retards dans le versement des contributions.

Il nous est proposé de compenser intégralement cette chute des recettes accessoires par l'augmentation des contributions. Ma délégation fera, dans le cadre de la Commission III, une proposition visant à substituer au système actuel, qui pénalise les Etats bons payeurs, un dispositif encourageant les Etats Membres à s'acquitter pleinement et rapidement de leur contribution.

Je propose enfin qu'une étude approfondie sur l'impact exact des fluctuations monétaires, tenant compte de la grande diversité des pays dans lesquels est exécuté le budget, soit soumise par le Secrétariat au Comité financier.

En ce qui concerne maintenant le contenu du Programme et sa présentation, je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter le Secrétariat pour les améliorations apportées cette année au document soumis à la Conférence. Il est plus précis qu'auparavant sur les critères de choix, les caractéristiques des actions envisagées, les rôles respectifs des différents services au sein de l'Organisation.

Par ailleurs, l'OAA fait appel de plus en plus aux techniques modernes. Je pense en particulier aux dispositifs de suivi informatique des projets au niveau du Siège, à la télédétection, aux énergies nouvelles.

Nous avons aussi constaté avec grand intérêt que l'OAA adopte une approche plus intégrée du développement rural et agricole. Cette orientation, nous souhaiterions la voir se généraliser; elle est déjà particulièrement claire dans les programmes d'agroforesterie et d'élevage.

Sur un plan plus général, il conviendrait de rechercher plus que par le passé à utiliser toutes les possibilités offertes de renouveler certains programmes en concentrant les moyens sur un nombre nécessairement réduit de priorités. Mais il existe aussi des actions qui pourraient être remises en cause de manière plus systématique parce qu'elles sont devenues moins utiles, ou parce que d'autres organismes nationaux ou internationaux sont susceptibles de prendre le relais.

Dans son introduction au document sur le Programme de travail et budget, ainsi que dans son intervention, le Directeur général a exprimé le souhait d'un consensus sur ses propositions en dépit des préoccupations parfois divergentes des Etats Membres. Le projet qui nous est présenté nous apparaît suffisamment raisonnable pour recueillir ce consensus. C'est pourquoi la France appuie et votera le projet de budget soumis à l'adoption de la Conférence.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ D. (Honduras): Sr. Presidente, he observado que es costumbre extenderle una felicitación en el momento en que se toma la palabra por primera vez; yo también quiero hacerlo, sin embargo como una felicitación no tiene sentido si no es sincera, la mía quiero respaldarla elogiando la forma en que usted ha tratado de realizar las sesiones de esta Comisión dentro del horario establecido y la forma en que explicó desde el primer día con toda claridad los motivos para ajustarse a ese horario.

Seré muy breve porque no es mucho lo que se puede agregar a lo que se ha dicho. Creo que todos tenemos una visión clara de los diferentes puntos de vista; ahora bien, en lo que se refiere al tema 13 lo que falta concretar es si el programa de labores para el bienio 1988/89 podrá ser atendido con el presupuesto presentado a nuestra consideración y si en la elaboración del presupuesto no hubo que depender demasiado en esperanzas que es muy importante ser optimista, pero en organizaciones como ésta a la hora de actuar, al enfrentarse con la realidad, las esperanzas no sirven de mucho.

Para terminar, quiero hacer dos solicitudes: al Director General que nos indique cuáles son las incertidumbres que existen en las cifras presentadas para ver en qué forma podremos ayudar a eliminarlas. A todos los miembros de esta Comisión que al tomar la palabra no se aparten del tema que se esté discutiendo y que no pierdan de vista nuestro objetivo principal: liberar del hambre a la humanidad.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): Mr Chairman, the Ghana delegation would like to join others in congratulating you on your election as Chairman of Commission II. We wish you good luck and success in your undertakings. We also thank Mr Shah for his excellent presentation of the budget statement.

The Ghana delegation has studied the Programme of Work and Budget of the Director-General and has noted that a great deal of thinking has gone into the setting of priorities for the 1988-89 biennium. My delegation is also happy that the programme has given priority to the African region, as indicated on the summary at page 257 of the document.

We have noted with satisfaction that there has not been any appreciable increase over the previous budget. However, my delegation is somewhat disturbed, as it seems that the expected cash flow is based on speculations during the 1988-89 biennium in view of the present situation as described in the Director-General's statement on this issue. It is our hope that proper precautionary measures will be taken to contain any cash flow crisis which may show up during the period of this budget, so that the developing Member Nations are not too much hit.

The Ghana delegation is appealing to the Director-General to consider the use of local experts as consultants. This would be one way of making savings on FAO's expenditure. This we consider is vital in view of the present economic situation.

Member Nations are aware that FAO plays an important role in advising its member countries on food and agricultural matters. However, when governments are holding round-table conferences or consultative discussions with prospective donor organizations FAO is often not represented. It is the view of the Ghana delegation that it is necessary that the FAO should be represented at such important discussions. The presence and the advice of the FAO may go a long way to cut down budgetary allocations on the part of the recipient countries and save considerable time. The Ghana delegation therefore gives full support to the Director-General's Programme of Work and Budget.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi de féliciter et de remercier M. Shah pour la clarté et l'excellente présentation du Programme de travail et budget auxquels mon pays apporte son plein soutien. Je ne peux, à cet égard, que regretter la faiblesse du budget qui est proposé pour le prochain exercice, celui de 1988-89. Mon Gouvernement considère que ce budget est insuffisant pour permettre à la FAO de répondre aux énormes besoins en matière de développement agricole.

Compte tenu de la gravité et de l'importance des enjeux qui sont la raison d'être de notre Organisation, c'est-à-dire la lutte contre la faim, la malnutrition et le sous-développement, compte tenu enfin et surtout de l'efficacité avec laquelle la FAO remplit sa mission, ma délégation rejette fermement ce qui ne pourrait qu'affaiblir son action, c'est-à-dire le principe de croissance zéro de son budget.

Avec votre permission, et après une analyse détaillée des documents soumis à notre Commission, je me permets de me référer brièvement à certains points d'un intérêt capital pour notre pays.

La délégation cap-verdienne appuie les propositions qui figurent au paragraphe 7-(page 174) du Grand Programme 2.2 - Pêches, et en particulier la priorité accordée à la promotion de la coopération technique et économique entre les pays en développement ainsi qu'aux besoins des pays en développement enclavés et des petits Etats insulaires tels que le nôtre.

Ma délégation accorde une importance toute particulière au suivi donné à la Conférence mondiale des pêches. Cette Conférence fut l'une des importantes initiatives prises par la FAO au cours des douze dernières années, surtout pour un pays comme le Cap-Vert. Au niveau national, en tenant compte des recommandations de cette Conférence et en étroite coopération avec la FAO, nous avons pris nos responsabilités et accompli notre part dans l'application de la stratégie adoptée par la Conférence des pêches.

L'importante étude sur l'aide en nature élaborée par la FAO témoigne du dynamisme du Secrétariat qui cherche sans relâche de nouvelles solutions pour relancer la coopération et l'adapter aux besoins de chaque région. Nous soutenons les propositions qui figurent au paragraphe 16 de la page 68; elles ,nt suite à la remarquable étude sur l'agriculture africaine qui fut présentée à Yamoussoukro lors e la Conférence régionale de la FAO pour l'Afrique. Nous partageons pleinement l'idée selon laquelle l'accès aux intrants et aux moyens de production est un facteur décisif pour le développement agricole et alimentaire de notre région. Nous soutenons les propositions qui figurent au Chapitre 2, par. 16.

L'amélioration de l'approvisionnement en produits industriels nécessaires à l'agriculture, leur distribution, l'étalement des facilités de paiement pour l'achat de ces produits et le soutien technique nécessaire à l'entretien et la bonne utilisation du matériel sont primordiaux. et nous soutenons toutes les propositions à cet effet.

Les programmes qui figurent au Chapitre 3 sont donc d'un très grand intérêt et reçoivent le plein appui de mon pays. Nous appuyons également le Grand Programme 3.4 concernant les représentants de la FAO dans nos pays. D'après notre propre expérience, ils remplissent des fonctions très importantes. Celles-ci sont décrites au paragraphe 2 du Grand Programme 3.4.

En ce qui concerne les propositions figurant au Chapitre 4 - Programme de coopération technique, nous saisissons cette occasion pour réaffirmer l'importance de ce programme qui, pour notre pays, est d'une très grande utilité, ces projets étant parfaitement adaptés à nos besoins. Nous tenons à rappeler que le PCT tire son origine des économies effectuées sur les dépenses administratives du Siège. En effet, le PCT joue un rôle catalyseur de premier ordre et permet à nos pays de préparer des projets viables qu'ils soumettent aux sources bilatérales et multilatérales de financement.

Ma délégation soutient les programmes par région de l'Annexe I, et en particulier les paragraphes 1 à 63 concernant le continent africain. Nous appuyons les efforts positifs de l'Organisation en ce qui concerne la priorité donnée à la coopération économique et technique entre pays en développement et les efforts déployés par la FAO dans la formation des cadres à tous les niveaux.

Je tiens ici à appuyer la déclaration faite hier par le représentant de la Turquie. Nous le félicitons pour les efforts faits par son Gouvernement pour coopérer avec la FAO en contribuant aux efforts de l'Organisation en vue de promouvoir la coopération économique et technique entre pays en développement.

Nous avons analysé brièvement toutes les priorités fixées dans le Programme 2.1.8 intitulé "Politique alimentaire et agricole": les objectifs à moyen terme et le renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire.

Le Programme d'assistance technique pour la sécurité alimentaire (PASA) et la proposition visant son renforcement contiennent des éléments qui méritent notre soutien. La mise en place du Système d'alerte rapide et des plans de prévoyance pour la pénurie alimentaire constituent des programmes d'une grande importance pour nos pays.

Nous appuyons également le sous-programme 2.1.1.1. et les propositions qui y figurent concernant la planification de l'utilisation des terres ainsi que la protection et la conservation des sols et des eaux, la conservation du patrimoine naturel et de l'environnement, et toute les autres recommandations qui figurent aux paragraphes 20 à 30.

Vice-Chairmen of Commission II
Vice-Présidents de la Commission II
Vicepresidentes de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to announce that we have just been informed that Plenary has approved the Vice-Chairmen and at this point I should like to take a moment to announce them. The two Vice-Chairmen are: Mr Bashir El Mabrouk Said of Libya, who is of course well known to all of us here in Rome as the Permanent Representative to FAO of his country; and also Mr Hirisnel Sucre of Panama, Minister of the Department of Agricultural Development. At this point of course it would be totally appropriate for these gentlemen to assume their roles.

Negotiations on the composition of the Drafting Committee are continuing to go on. No agreement has been reached so far between the OECD and the Group of 77. As soon as there is an agreement we will report to you.

The meeting rose at 10.40 hours
La séance est levée à 10 h 40
Se levanta la sesión a las 10.40 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/7

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

SEVENTH MEETING SEPTIEME SEANCE SEPTIMA SESION

(13 November 1987)

The Seventh Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La septième séance est ouverte à 15 heures

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, président de la commission II

Se abre la séptima session a las 15.00 horas.

bajo la presidencia de fred j. Eckert, presidencia de la comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)

13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme (suite)

13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: I want to announce that we have got agreement on a Drafting Committee for Commission II and I will read the names of those countries who will be on the Drafting Committee. I will read them in alphabetical order and I will indicate the Chairman at the appropriate point: The countries on the Drafting Committee shall be: Australia, Canada, Congo the Chairman, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Turkey. We shall now proceed with our order of business as we left it for our adjournment this morning.

Namukolo MUKUTU (Zambia): My delegation has studied document C 87/3, the Director-General's Programme of Work and budget for 1988-89.

We have noted that it was indeed an extraordinarily monumental task to prepare a budget of such small magnitude compared to the many demanding requests for higher increases from the poorer members of the Organization.

The problems of the constrained budget are now clearer - these being mainly the late payment of assessed contributions by major contributors who would like to see some measures of reform to improve effectiveness of FAO. We see nothing wrong with any demand that seeks to improve efficiency, after all that is what business is all about. My delegation, therefore, hopes that some agreeable formula will soon be found that will make it possible for Member Nations, in arrears, to effect payment, not only of arrears, but also of their assessed contributions on time. I am confident that it is neither the wish nor the intention of Member Nations to see multilateral anarchy.

As we examine the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, we should not, for one moment, forget that we are here and have been sent by the hungry millions to speak for them, to articulate their problems and indeed to identify their priorities for sustained and ever-increasing food production.

FAO has been in existence for over 40 years now and yet the problems of hunger, malnutrition, poverty disease and ignorance are not abated, if not on the increase. For Africa, conditions have certainly worsened suggesting that probably the prognosis and prescriptions for development may not be the correct ones.

What is clearly visible in most of Africa today is that forests are fast being cleared for agriculture, for human settlement and for fuelwood. Simultaneously, food deficits are worsening and rainfall is increasingly becoming erratic.

In Zambia it is estimated that some 120 000 hectares are cleared every year for agriculture and fuel-wood. We are now seeing more and more bare land, watersheds are being destroyed, streams no more running and rivers are silting and flooding with whatever little rain falls. We are witnessing a very serious degradation of the environment, all in the name of the struggle to increase agriculture and food production.

My delegation is firmly convinced that a genuine first step to increasing sustained food production in Africa, particularly in Zambia, is to create soil and water management policies that are closely interwoven with environmental considerations. I cannot see development in any other way.

My delegation believes that the time is more than ripe for FAO to move away from commodity-oriented programmes - except by way- of supporting commodity research. The era of dealing with general extension development programmes to develop particular crops such as maize, rice, cattle, etc., should be a thing of the past. We should instead emphasize programmes which deal with integrated development —

programmes which address all farmers' problems at once and would include relevant crops, livestock, fisheries, wildlife, forests, soil, water and indeed infrastructure. The total environment would be considered and enhanced. This would lead to more reliable, sustained food and agricultural production.

Without flogging the horse, I have witnessed the damaging effect on the environment of a single livestock programme, which increases livestock numbers, encouraging over-stocking and leading to soil erosion and in the final analysis, decreasing crop yields in the area. I have seen the damaging effects of goats alone in an already dry area. I have seen the damaging effects of single crop cultures with the damaging effects of too many chemical fertilizers and dangerous pesticides. There is need for change in approach.

As I read the budget, the foregoing thoughts were my guiding principles. To what extent does the Programme of Work and Budget fit into my own guidelines? It would appear that probably in general terms, yes, but in specific terms, no.

My delegation would prefer to see more resources allocated to the Technical and Economic Programmes dealing with rural development - that is integrated rural development. Also more resources should be allocated to soil and water resources and to the forestry sub-sector. The allocation of 4.1 percent of the budget allocation to the forestry sub-sector is too small to recognize the importance of this sector to sustained food production and to global environmental effects. If we do not manage our forests properly, we will soon have deserts all over the world in our countries.

As my delegation was examining the Summary of the 1988-89 Estimates by Region and Programme as given at Table A, page 257, we felt that the programme allocations for Asia and Pacific presents the likely desirable balance between and among the programmes. We believe that in the African Region, while the correct total emphasis is placed on natural resources, too much weight may be given to livestock. Quite seriously, crops and livestock must be seen against the background of rural development, in general, except of course as we have already indicated in the cases of crop and livestock research and diseases.

All in all, my delegation supports the Budget and we recommend that it be adopted by consensus. We would, of course, have preferred a higher budget.

We have tried hard to put forward to this august gathering, the wishes of a hungry man or woman out in the village in Zambia. A villager who is perplexed by his well-wishers who quite often fail to reflect on paper and on the ground what he would like done. This may be because his well-wishers have differences of opinion, some want reform and cost effectiveness, some are resisting. We wonder for whose benefit. Let us come up with a compromise. Ours is to serve the villager to the best of our ability.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): C'est avec beaucoup d'intérêt que nous avons suivi hier l'excellente introduction de M. Shah sur le Programme de travail et Budget 1988-89 soumis à notre examen. Je dois dire qu'en tant que membre du Comité du programme, j'ai eu tout loisir d'approfondir l'examen du présent document et de m'exprimer en détail sur ses propositions pour faire les observations et les commentaires appropriés. Aussi m'efforcerai-je d'être bref dans cette intervention.

Lorsqu'en juin dernier fut présenté au Conseil le Sommaire du Programme de travail et Budget, nous eûmes l'occasion de dire combien le Congo souscrivait à la volonté affichée de notre Organisation de relever les défis de notre temps que constituent la faim et la malnutrition dans le monde en développement. C'est ce qui explique l'appui qu'apporte ma délégation aux objectifs à moyen terme de l'Organisation sur lesquels, me semble-t-il tous les Etats Membres s'accordent, puisqu'ils visent l'accroissement de la production et de la productivité agricoles et l'amélioration des conditions socio-économiques dans les zones rurales. A moins qu'il n'y ait des pays qui persistent à croire qu'il suffit de continuer à déverser des stocks alimentaires pour résoudre cette question?

Les stratégies et priorités retenues dans ce Programme de travail sont celles fixées par les différentes instances de notre Organisation. Aussi serait-il déplacé de vouloir demander au Secrétariat de définir à la place des Etats Membres d'autres priorités et de s'en servir pour

établir un budget dont ces priorités constitueraient le noyau dur. Ce budget à deux vitesses n'aurait aucun caractère incitatif auprès des Etats, tels que le plus grand contributeur et les autres ayant des arriérés, pour qu'ils s'acquittent de leurs obligations statutaires et, au pire, pourrait amener d'autres Etats jusqu'ici réguliers à suivre ces exemples fâcheux. Toutes les pressions doivent être exercées sur ces pays pour qu'ils paient leurs arriérés et versent leurs contributions à temps. A cet égard, mon Gouvernement pourrait souscrire à toutes mesures visant à encourager les bons contributeurs. Bref, il n'appartenait pas au Secrétariat de s'engager dans cet exercice périlleux pour établir un budget de l'Organisation qui tienne compte des difficultés de paiement de chaque Etat.

Nous devons rendre hommage aux efforts méritoires du Directeur Général qui nous présente ainsi un Programme de travail et Budget qui tient compte des observations, des suggestions et des propositions raisonnables qui ont été présentées en juin dernier, singulièrement par les pays développés, dans le but évident de rechercher un consensus et ce, malgré le large appui qu'avaient obtenu ces propositions. En effet, comment ne pas reconnaître que l'élaboration du Programme de travail et Budget 1988-89 s'est faite dans des conditions sans précédent où l'exécution du budget en cours a souffert de graves distorsions qui ont conduit l'Organisation à opérer des ajustements de programme pour faire face à la crise de liquidités consécutive à l'accumulation d'arriérés par le plus grand contributeur? Cette situation a sans doute été prise en compte lorsque le Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget nous a été proposé, en juin, avec une augmentation infime de 0,48 pour cent par rapport au dernier exercice et plus faible encore à présent puisqu'elle a été ramenée à 0,25 pour cent - autant dire une croissance zéro - au prix d'une réduction des ressources affectées aux augmentations des coûts prévues.

Mais dans ce tableau sombre, il reste que les programmes techniques et économiques de l'Organisation ont bénéficié d'une légère augmentation de 2,3 pour cent au prix d'une réduction draconienne des ressources consacrées aux services administratifs et de soutien. Et ici, il importe de s'arrêter pour manifester notre inquiétude devant la poursuite de la politique de réduction des effectifs et, donc, des compétences, qui nous paraissent être la richesse incontestée de notre Organisation, car cela pourrait signifier une baisse de vitalité dans les activités multiformes de soutien de la FAO. Certes, des économies sont souhaitables, mais elles ne doivent en aucune façon se faire au détriment de l'efficacité de l'Organisation. On peut donc applaudir à la performance réalisée par le Directeur Général qui, en douze ans, a fait baisser les dépenses administratives de 77 pour cent à 51,7 pour cent, et ce, en particulier, parce que cette baisse s'est réalisée en faveur des programmes techniques et économiques de l'Organisation. Nous regrettons que le Programme de coopération technique, qui a fait ses preuves au cours de ses dix années d'existence et dont tous les gouvernements des pays en développement bénéficiaires ont souhaité avec force un accroissement, n'ait pu bénéficier davantage de ressources en raison de l'hostilité de certains pays développés, qui nous disent vouloir une FAO pratique et efficace, mais ne veulent pas renforcer ce qui a le plus d'efficacité dans ses moyens d'intervention.

Permettez-moi de dire un mot sur l'ouverture de quatre bureaux supplémentaires au cours du prochain exercice. En effet, au moment où on parle de réforme de la FAO, il nous revient que la décentralisation de l'Organisation est saluée par les pays en développement comme une innovation qui, couplée avec la création du PCT, a un impact réel sur le terrain, car elle a rapproché la FAO de ses Etats Membres en développement et a permis à ceux-ci de mieux tirer parti des services de l'Organisation. Le Directeur général, qui mène une gestion prudente, se propose même d'échelonner leur mise en place pour économiser 400 000 dollars. Nous pensons qu'il faut donner leur chance aux pays où est projetée l'installation de ces bureaux afin qu'ils bénéficient davantage des services de l'Organisation.

Enfin, nous nous félicitons de ce que l'on envisage de mettre l'accent sur la protection de l'environnement et une utilisation prudente des ressources renouvelables. Il s'agit d'actions qui sont une garantie pour l'avenir de l'humanité.

Je dirai, pour terminer, que nous espérons que ce Programme de travail et Budget continuera, dans sa mise en oeuvre, à mettre l'accent sur l'Afrique, étant donné la situation agricole et alimentaire de cette région et l'ampleur de ses besoins d'assistance dans la plupart des Etats qui la composent.

C'est donc en, tenant compte de tout ce que nous venons de déclarer que nous nous prononçons en faveur de l'adoption de ce Programme de travail et budget, malgré son niveau qui ne reflète en rien les besoins et dans l'espoir qu'il ne fera pas l'objet d'ajustements en cours d'exécution. Un appel solennel doit être lancé en direction de tous les Etats pour qu'ils s'acquittent de leurs contributions dans les délais impartis. Tous ceux qui sont attachés au multilatéralisme devraient s'efforcer d'y apporter un soutien franc pour marquer leur appui inconditionnel aux pa-ys en développement en général, et singulièrement à ceux d'Afrique dont beaucoup se réclament d'être le soutien.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): As this is the first time the Ethiopian delegation is requesting the floor in this Commission, we would like to use the opportunity to congratulate you on your election to guide the deliberations of this Commission's work. Our delegation would also indicate its due regards to Dr Shah and to the FAO Secretariat for the detailed document on the Programme of Work and Budget and also for the excellent introduction of the agenda item under discussion.

Our delegation has gone through the document carefully and has also had the chance of listening to the valuable contributions made by all those who have spoken before us. Most of the technical questions about which our delegation had queries have been raised and therefore we have no intention of raising them again, having the intention of avoiding repetition and assisting you as well as saving valuable time for the Commission. However, we would like to raise some points which we consider deserve attention. The present net increase in programme costs which is indicated as 0.25 percent, is a small increase that will not justify disruptions in agricultural development and food production, the effects of which could be catastrophic and tragic. This is even more significant when we think of the prevailing feeling of the international community in realizing the need to assist development and food production so as to improve the pace at which it is achieved. In connection with the Programme of Work and Budget, I should like to quote from the statement of our Minister of Agriculture of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia:

"Express our concurrence with the proposed FAO's Programme of Work and Budget and support the Director-General in his efforts to stimulate indispensable changes in world agriculture."

At this stage one could raise a number of questions regarding the adequacy of the budget request, particularly when compared with the needs of the specific areas of rural development covered in the Programme of Work presented.

Our delegation feels that views directing towards "Everything else but FAO's Programme of Work and Budget has a characteristic of change and increase" is very difficult to accommodate. The increase in cost of everything required for the operation of the Organization, as was pointed out by the representative of Bangladesh yesterday, has been a characteristic that we all witness and I do not see the need to go into details of that.

As the costs of operation in general terms increase and there is no increase in the overall budgetary resources, whatever needs to be accounted for the increase, which incidentally is outside the control of the Organization, will have to come from resources that could be made available to the Organization, thus diminishing the volume of financial and budgetary provisions directed towards development directly. Delays in the approval process will cause disruptions in the implementation of programmes which are targetted thus affecting activities aimed at increasing food production and consequently the countries which are striving hard to attain self-sufficiency and to increase food production.

Even so, we strongly feel that the present budgetary request is too low when compared with the global need. We would like to voice our consensus in view of the present atmosphere of zero growth in which the item is being discussed and considered. A particular difference, however, should be made with regard to the difficulties faced by the Organization in recruiting qualified staff due to the inability of financial provisions attractive enough in prevailing international circumstances. Even with the approval of the present cost of the Programme of Work and Budget, the Organization will still be faced with other problems for which it will require our support.

Finally, I should like to raise a point relating to the recording of the speakers. I flagged to indicate my intent to speak as soon as I came into the room. At that time most of the delegations had yet to take their seats. I also noticed that the list of countries that you read out was going right and left of my seat, without seeing the Ethiopian delegation's intention to speak. We felt that such a small oversight could be a source of misunderstanding.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to inform you that she has tried to take the names in exactly the order in which she sees them, and that some countries yesterday after the completion of our work came up and asked to be put on the list. She commenced the list at that point, and we got to you just as soon as you were on her list.

Haris ZANNETIS (Cyprus): Let me first express my thanks to Dr Shah for his clear introduction to the item under discussion.

When discussing the Summary Programme of Work and Budget in the 91st Session of the Council my delegation was between those who supported the proposed Programme of Work and the level of the budget. The full Programme of Work and Budget submitted for our consideration still enjoys my delegation's support.

We note with concern the falling financial resources available to our Organization and we want to pay tribute to the Director-General and his staff for always finding ways to make economies. We note that this is the third consecutive biennium during which administrative expenditure is reduced dramatically.

My delegation welcomes the assurance of the Director-General in his introduction that the crisis the organization is facing is not a fundamental one. The fact that issues of principle are not questioned is a source of comfort. The withholding of payment to the Organization on the other hand creates problems which as time goes by might become serious for its operations.. While the available capital to FAO is passing through a difficult period, the available finance for agricultural development overall seems to have improved recently. The assurance of the World Bank to accord priority to agriculture and the record level agreed for the second replenishment of the International Development Association (IDA) are two encouraging indications. This, however, will mean that FAO should remain in position and ability to assist developing countries in generating well prepared and viable projects. In this regard we believe that the Conference should once again call on the Member Nations who for several reasons have not as yet fulfilled their financial obligations to the Organization, to do so as early as possible.

With the proposed Programme of Work and Budget the Director-General maintained the basic priorities of FAO. The proposed Programme of Work has been scrutinized by the Programme Committee and we are informed that it has enjoyed its full support. We are pleased to note that our priorities and concerns expressed in several technical committees and the two Regional Conferences to which we participate are fully met. I will not attempt to analyse the Programme of Work yet again but I will confine myself to a few programmes which are of major concern.

First, the emphasis on the management of national resources and the consequences of the deterioration of the environment. Problems such as soil degradation, desertification, deforestation and overfishing are now faced by many countries. The Organization should be in a position to advise affected countries on establishing or strengthening their own mechanisms for incorporating environmental components in development projects and for evaluating the actual or potential impact of these projects on the environment. We would therefore like to support the emphasis given on programmes aiming at this end. In this regard we welcome the close cooperation between FAO and the World Food Programme in many fields but especially in projects related to agricultural and rural development incorporating environmental components as outlined in paragraph 3.13.

Secondly, the agricultural problems arising from the accidental release of radionuclides. We will all recall the difficulties caused to many countries, developed and developing, in 1986 following the accidental explosion of the atomic reactor in Chernobyl. It was obvious then that the international community was not prepared for such an incident and much research is required. We support the increased allocation of resources for related activities. Cooperation between FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in this field is essential and it should be continued.

Thirdly, cooperation is also important between FAO and the World Health Organization (WHO) through the joint Codex Alimentarius Commission for the definition of food standards.

Fourth, the increased allocation proposed for the Global Information and Early Warning System meet our approval. This particular programme is important for the identification of possible hazard areas as we have observed in recent years. Its activities should be expanded to cover animal diseases.

Fifth, the allocation of resources to the TCP is considered to be acceptable under the circumstances. This Programme has proved to be -vital both for the Organization and the developing countries. Its continuation is essential in all types of projects falling under its mandate but especially those promoting TCDC and ECDC.

Sixth, the proposed opening of four new FAO Country Representations: the presence of FAO representatives in the field has proved to be useful for the implementation of the Organization's programme. Being in the country they also serve as a source of first-hand information both for the Organization and the governments of the countries where they are based. Their presence becomes more essential with project execution when they have a critical coordination role to play. The suggested phased timing of the establishment of the new representations results in a significant reduction in the increase of the budget for this biennium as it has been stressed.

Finally we welcome the continued emphasis on training and the maximum use of technology for reduction of costs.

With these observations, my delegation would like to support the proposed Programme of Work and the level of the Budget.

Sra. Delia CHEVALIER VILLAMONTE (Panamá): Permítame en primer lugar felicitar al Señor Shah por la presentación clara del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto. Al expresarnos sobre el tema en examen preferimos destacar muy brevemente los aspectos sustantivos que reflejan la posición de Panamá y que ya fue expresada por el Jefe de nuestra Delegación en el Pleno de esta Conferencia.

Considera nuestra Delegación que la denominada teoría de crecimiento cero, así como el de crecimiento en el nivel presupuestario de esta Organización, obedece fundamentalmente a motivaciones políticas. Opinamos que los problemas actuales de la agricultura y la alimentación, así como las necesidades crecientes de los países en vía de desarrollo, unidos al desperdicio de recursos producto de la carrera armamentista, invalidan dicha teoría y los de crecimientos presupuestarios que nos imponen. Es por ello que coincidimos con la preocupación manifestada por el Director General en el sentido de que las limitaciones presupuestarias, producto de la presión a que está sometida en los momentos actuales la FAO, parecieran perseguir el predominio de una anarquía multilateral.

Consideramos asimismo que el aumento de 0,25 por ciento propuesto para el presupuesto del bienio 1988-89, es meramente simbólico. Por tal motivo, a la Delegación de Panamá le preocupa que tal simbolismo pueda desembocar en la práctica en un crecimiento negativo con consecuencias nefastas para el futuro de nuestra Organización y con inevitables repercusiones en el desarrollo económico y de la seguridad alimentaria de los países en vías de desarrollo.

A pesar de lo expuesto, y en aras de la unidad y el logro del consenso necesario, apoyamos el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto presentado, aunque estimamos que éste no alcanza a cubrir el conjunto de las necesidades de los Estados Miembros en vías de desarrollo, particularmente.

En lo que se refiere a la creación de cuatro nuevas oficinas de representación de la FAO, Panamá apoya firmemente dicha idea y manifiesta su interés desde ya, en que una de ellas funcione en nuestro país.

Nuestra Delegación Señor Presidente, no puede dejar pasar la oportunidad sin reiterar su pleno apoyo al Programa de Cooperación Técnica (PCT) por el efecto catalizador que el mismo tiene para los planes de desarrollo de nuestros países. Deseamos, sin embargo, manifestar nuestra preocupación por el nivel insatisfactorio que al mismo se le ha acordado dentro del Proyecto de Presupuesto en discusión y unimos nuestra voz a la de los países que han señalado su deseo de que se le conceda una mayor relevancia en el futuro.

De la misma manera, resaltamos nuestro interés en programas tales como el de la Cooperación Técnica y Económica entre Países en Desarrollo, recursos pesqueros, el análisis de las políticas, las raíces y los plátanos, lo mismo que el Programa de Acción de la Conferencia Mundial sobre Reforma Agraria y Desarrollo Rural y, en particular, el Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos, por su incidencia en el medio ambiente, en el desarrollo de los recursos forestales, dado que ello garantiza el futuro de la humanidad.

Para terminar, Señor Presidente, teniendo en cuenta las importantes modificaciones presentadas al presupuesto a fin de alcanzar el acuerdo más amplio posible, estamos seguros que todos realizaremos los esfuerzos necesarios para lograr su aprobación por consenso.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): In the just-completed 92nd Council the United States stated that it could not support the proposed FAO budget for 1988-89. We recognize that it is late in the budget process, but the United States delegation wishes to appeal even now for changes in the budget that could allow us to join consensus. At this critical time in the FAO we fully understand the importance of unity on the programme of work, but without significant alteration of the budget we shall oppose its approval by this Conference. Obviously, given the attention that both the Secretariat and many members have directed to the United States on the matter of contributions, I feel I must try to make perfectly clear the United States position on the budget. Why does the United States oppose this budget? Our position is based primarily on the lack of realism it shows in regard to expected income during the biennium. It is a certainty that there will be significant income shortfalls for FAO being carried into 1988 which render the proposed Programme of Work and Budget unrealistic and impossible to implement. That is the primary reason. Secondary reasons include United States disagreements with certain aspects of the budget proposal which will be mentioned briefly later in our statement.

The United States disagrees with the view that the budget can only be formulated on the assumption of a full United States payment of its assessed contributions. The United States has referred to the budget as unrealistic because of the effects that current financial conditions in the United States will have on the level and timing of the United States contributions during the next biennium. In preparing this budget proposal the Secretariat has been well aware of this situation. Since some member countries here have probably not closely followed the United States budget process, the United States delegation would like, with your indulgence, Mr Chairman, to offer a brief explanation of the current status of its likely contributions to the FAO in 1988.

The United States assessed contributions to international organizations are treated as a sub-account in the United States budget. Included are contributions to some 46 international organizations. For our fiscal year 1988, out of which our 1987 calendar year contributions are paid, the United States administration requested the Congress to approve the \$ 571 million required to pay our 1987 assessments in full. The Congress has yet to decide the amount to be approved but it will almost certainly be between US\$ 355 million and US\$ 373 million, or about 40 percent below the President's request. The Executive Branch will then distribute that amount among the 46 organizations. While it is impossible to estimate from these figures a final contribution level to any particular agency, it will certainly be far below our assessment. According to the proposed Programme of Work and Budget the United States assessment for 1988 would rise to roughly US\$ 63 million, a 26 percent increase over the 1987 assessment, which we cannot pay anyway under current conditions. It is for this reason that we must consider the proposed budget unrealistic, with no chance for full implementation because for reasons which we are all well aware of, our government has reached the conclusion, the hard conclusion I should add, that it is imperative to reduce our budget deficit. Reaching this conclusion has been helped by the many demarches we have received from many member countries.

As an example of the effect such reductions are having throughout the United States Government, I could point out that in fiscal year 1988 United States Department of State faces a budget shortfall of US\$ 84 million which could require the elimination of up to 1 200 employees. Under proposed additional cuts we could also be facing as much as a 20 percent total reduction in force. We are certain that many of the member countries assembled here can understand the budgetary problems of which we speak.

Council document CL/92/LIM/1 makes it clear that many members have similar problems by showing that 70 members - almost half - are in arrears on payments of their contributions. As we said before, 36 countries are in arrears to a greater extent as a percentage of their assessments than the United States is in arrears. We do not pretend that these arrears are equivalent to ours but we do believe that the Budget should take into account the very serious financial constraints faced by almost 50 percent of the members which affect the capacity of their governments to pay.

We would like also to distinguish between temporary cash flow problems and the significantly longer-term budgetary problems facing the FAO. We have already indicated that our best estimate of United States contributions to the FAO in the coming year, 1988, will be drastically less than our assessment. In addition, in order to reduce the budget deficit over the coming 5 years, the United States Congress has already passed legislation restricting government spending across the board, and making it quite clear that United States contributions to United Nations organizations, including

the FAO, will not increase in the near future. Those are the hard facts regarding likely United States contributions throughout the period covered by this budget.

For over 40 years I would like to remind the membership, the United States has been FAO's largest contributor, at one time contributing as much as one-third of the regular budget. The United States has not repudiated its liabilities to the Organization; our payments however, will be quite constrained over the next few years. The United States strongly supports FAO and it is precisely for this reason that we have advocated the clear identification of priorities within the Regular Programme, areas which are mutually agreed upon as deserving protection from what appears to be inevitable programme reductions if the proposed budget is adopted.

Indeed, the United States Delegation believes that there already is a broad range of agreement about what constitutes FAO's major priorities. We note that in a Draft Resolution paper before this Commission presented by a number of developing countries under Item 12 several areas are pointed to as deserving high priority with which the United States is in complete agreement; activities such as strengthening FAO's information and data-gathering activities, its commodity analysis activities, improvement of the early warning system, increased emphasis on providing policy advice to member countries, and strengthening Codex Alimentarius. In addition to these areas identified by developing countries themselves, the United States also believes a priority area should be the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, as well as increased attention to the environment as a factor in agricultural development.

These and other programme areas should be protected from across the board cuts resulting regrettably from the contributions short-falls which face the Organization from almost half of the membership. The United States has tried in Council and in the Programme Committee to engage other members in a dialogue about priority setting. We believe the response has been disappointing. Such a dialogue is necessary not only on what should be given high priority but also on what constitutes low priorities. In the United States' view these low-priority areas include expenditures for the Plant Genetic Commission, follow-up activities to the World Food Security Compact, as well as in streamlining of a large number of commodity meetings. Especially in view of the reduction my own Government is facing in its employees, we understandably do not consider the proposed increase in the number of FAO representatives appropriate at this time. We are struck by the very sizeable reduction planned for the North American Liaison Office and want to see proportionate cuts, nearly one-third, in other Regional Offices.

My delegation would like to take advantage of this opportunity to reiterate our positions expressed in the Ninety-second Session of the Council concerning the three budgetary resolutions contained in Council Document 92/4. I know they will be discussed in Commission III but in our view they have direct bearing on the assessments that will be imposed on all countries present here.

Regarding the resolution concerning increases in the level of the Working Capital Fund the United States has supported an increase in the Fund to US\$ 20 million as of January 1 1988 but cannot support the proposed additional increase to US\$ 26 million in January 1990. Therefore we cannot support the resolution.

Concerning the resolution for Amendment of Procedures for Application of Cash Surplus, the United States understands that the financial situation in the FAO is under extraordinary circumstances. However, we do not believe that these circumstances dictate changes in financial regulations of the Organization governing cash surplus and therefore the United States cannot support this resolution.

With respect to the resolution on Replenishment of the Special Reserve Account for 1988-89 the United States cannot support the resolution unless the replenishment of up to US\$ 12 million is made through savings in the FAO budget, rather than through additional assessment for the 1988-89 biennium.

Finally, regarding the resolution for Measures to deal with Problems of Delayed Payment of Assessed Contributions, and following the Secretariat's explanation in the Ninety-second Council, about the details of the formula which would be applied under this advanced payment incentive plan, mainly that the plan would be explicitly limited to being income sensitive only to the timing of the payment of assessed contributions, the United States is now able to express support for this resolution on the basis of that formula.

The United States would again like to highlight the relationship which we identified in the discussion under Item 12 between the United States position on the FAO budget, and the resolution which the United States has introduced earlier proposing reform in the FAO Programme and Budget procedures. We believe approval of this resolution would facilitate our request for full funding for international organizations, including FAO.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Permettez-nous tout d'abord de remercier M. Shah pour la clarté de son exposé introductif au document C 87/3 et à ses trois suppléments.

Concernant le programme de travail proposé pour le prochain biennium, notre délégation constate que dans l'ensemble les actions proposées reflètent les préoccupations de la grande majorité des Etats Membres, dans la mesure où les recommandations des conférences régionales et des différents organes et comités de la FAO ont été prises en compte. C'est ainsi que nous approuvons les stratégies à long terme clairement indiquées aux pages 66 à 69 du document C 87/3. Il en est de même pour les objectifs à moyen terme définis dans les différents programmes et plans d'action proposés dans les sous-programmes.

Notre délégation, comme bon nombre d'autres délégations de pays du tiers monde, guidée par le souci du développement de l'agriculture, approuve tout particulièrement: les chapitres 2, 3 et 4 du budget-programme.

Notre pays appuie la mise en oeuvre de mesures pour un développement rural intégré, les actions de renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire, l'extension de la CTPD et de la CEPD envisagée dans les programmes régionaux, la création de bureaux de représentation de la FAO dans les pays.

Nous appuyons également la protection des végétaux notamment par l'intensification de la lutte contre l'avancée du désert et la détérioration des labours, ainsi que contre les ravageurs migrants et en particulier les criquets et sauteriaux.

A ce propos, permettez-moi d'ouvrir une parenthèse pour attirer l'attention de mes collègues sur la grave menace qui pèse sur la production agricole de nombreux pays d'Afrique et du Proche-Orient du fait de la persistance de ce fléau. L'intervention d'urgence de la FAO, en coopération avec les pays membres de l'OCLALAV et de la commission de lutte contre le criquet pèlerin en Afrique du nord-ouest, a permis d'éviter le pire. Il nous paraît toutefois indiqué d'envisager une action préventive d'envergure.

Notre pays, qui subit les assauts dévastateurs de ce genre de ravageurs, appuie les actions proposées au sous-programme "protection de cultures", et souhaiterait pour sa part qu'il soit renforcé.

Il y a un autre problème qui préoccupe notre délégation, qui est celui de l'avancée du désert dont l'étendue tend à réduire chaque année davantage des centaines d'hectares de terres agricoles en Afrique du Nord et dans toute la région soudano-sahélienne. Nous souhaitons vivement que l'on accorde une plus grande attention à ce problème par l'inscription par exemple de la question de la désertification à la prochaine session du COAG.

La délégation algérienne considère que la priorité accordée à l'Afrique est conforme aux graves difficultés auxquelles ce continent est confronté. Il est évident que, de tous les continents, c'est celui où la sécurité alimentaire pâtit de tous les maux à la fois. Il y a ceux qui sont subis par tous les pays en développement, notamment la détérioration des termes de l'échange, le fléchissement des prix des matières premières, le fardeau de la dette extérieure, le protectionnisme grandissant et d'autres problèmes dus au refus d'une aide réelle au développement par une obstruction systématique à toute action susceptible d'engager le processus du développement du tiers monde.

L'Afrique donc, outre ces problèmes d'ordre structurel, connaît de graves menaces à la sécurité alimentaire. Parmi tant d'autres, nous citerons les différentes maladies qui assègent les troupeaux et les cultures ainsi que les ravages causés par les insectes nuisibles, et les différentes sortes de criquets et sauteriaux.

Nous ne manquerons pas de souligner qu'en Afrique australe la sécurité physique tout court, du fait des agressions multipliées de l'Afrique du Sud contre ses voisins mais aussi contre ses populations noires, constitue une menace à la sécurité alimentaire. Cet ensemble de désastres justifie pleinement la priorité accordée à l'Afrique.

A propos de calamités du fait de l'homme, notre délégation considère que la situation qui prévaut en Afrique australe se retrouve également dans la région du Proche-Orient en raison de la politique d'agression israélienne. A cet égard, la délégation algérienne souhaite que le 4ème paragraphe de la page 331 de la version française du document C 87/3 fasse référence explicitement au problème évoqué ci-dessus en tant que facteur de déstabilisation au Proche-Orient.

S'agissant du chapitre 4, notre délégation déplore la stagnation des ressources qui lui sont affectées. En effet, le niveau du budget proposé, soit 63 148 000 dollars, marque une baisse compte tenu du fait que les augmentations de coûts prévues sont en deçà des estimations réelles. Pourtant, le programme de coopération technique a démontré le bien fondé de sa création. En l'espace de 10 ans, 3 400 projets ont été approuvés et les demandes continuent d'affluer.

Cet engouement pour le PCT n'est pas le fruit du hasard, il exprime la satisfaction de pays en développement.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair must inform the representative from Algeria that under the rules of this Organization the Chair is instructed to intervene and call a speaker to order when the speaker violates the proper decorum of debate. It says: "The speaker must confine him/herself to the question under discussion and avoid personalities." The Chair considers the speaker's remarks are improper, i.e. remarks of a personal character, or which attack the good name of an individual government. The Chair will intervene and call the speaker to order. The Chair advises that you have made reference to two countries, one which is not a member, and one which is a member but is not present in the room. Please keep your remarks to the issue under discussion. The Chair will advise the Government of Israel of its right to reply.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Ce n'est pas de la faute de la délégation algérienne si le représentant du pays que vous venez d'évoquer n'est pas là.

Monsieur le Président, nous userons nous aussi du droit de réponse.

CHAIRMAN: It is the fault of your delegation if you violate the decorum in debate. That is your fault. Abstain from it. Cuba, express your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Moción de orden. Sr. Presidente, quiero expresarle que la distinguida Delegación de Argelia está, sencillamente, interpretando el sentir de esta Comisión, y se ha referido a lo que un país anteriormente había referido a ella. Usted tenía que haberse dirigido también al país que anteriormente expresó la misma situación,

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): J'ai un point d'ordre. Monsieur le Président, je pense pour ma part que vous avez eu tort en tant que Président d'interrompre la déléguée de l'Algérie qui intervenait sur des points essentiels. Je crois que nous l'avons déjà fait ici; des délégués ont répondu à des attaques qui ont été faites ici, et vous n'aviez pas interrompu, vous aviez laissé parler tout en accordant à ces délégations le soin de pouvoir répondre.

Alors je ne comprends pas que vous ayez arrêté la déléguée de l'Algérie qui était en train d'intervenir sur un point qu'elle estime essentiel. Je crois que vous devez être juste; et nous demandons quia justice se fasse au niveau de la Présidence.

CHAIRMAN: I will point out to you that promptly after the other incidents the government affected advised the Chair promptly of its request for a right to reply and they were promptly, assured by the Chair that they would receive the right to reply at the end of the meeting, as is provided for in the Rules. The government to which you referred was not in the room and the Chair has a responsibility in such cases to intervene. The Chair will advise that government. But, please stick to the proper decorum. We will now proceed on the subject.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Monsieur le Président, c'est la première fois que cela arrive dans cette enceinte. L'égalité de tous à la parole était respectée dans cette enceinte par tout le monde sans exception y compris par la délégation américaine - je dois le souligner.

C'est notre droit le plus absolu de constater et de faire les remarques que nous pensons être justes sur le 4ème paragraphe de la page 331. Et nous demandons que soit ajouté le facteur essentiel de déstabilisation au Proche-Orient. En effet, il n'y a pas que les facteurs socio-économiques, il y a également la guerre, et c'est un point important. Les territoires arabes occupés, ce n'est pas une imagerie.

Dato' Abu Bakar MAHMUD (Malaysia): This is the first time I have made an intervention and I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, on your election to this very responsible post. I am happy to have been informed by you this morning that we now have two Vice-Chairmen to assist you in your difficult task. I should like also to congratulate Mr Shah for his brilliant introduction of the item under discussion.

Permit me to make some general comments on the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the 1988-89 biennium which is before us today. The need for an in-depth review of FAO's role, programme priorities, and operations of procedures was raised at the 90th and the 91st Session of the Council and has been the subject of discussions in another item, namely item 12. My delegation is happy to note that some positive action has been taken regarding this matter through the reduction in administrative expenditure in order to provide for increases in technical and economic programmes. We also endorse the Director-General's earnest efforts and overall approach in increasing efficiency, reducing expenditure on established posts, increasing computerization and streamlining activities within the Organization. I sincerely hope such efforts will be continuously undertaken to achieve maximum efficiency without affecting implementation of numerous field programmes and activities in other countries.

My delegation is happy to note that the Director-General's Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 has been prepared taking into consideration FAO's medium-term objectives. We are also glad to note that top priority has been accorded to programmes which will go a long way towards increasing agricultural production in Member Nations which face chronic food deficits, while not forgetting the needs of other developing countries.

My delegation fully endorsed medium-term objectives to be worked out for the various technical and economic programmes to be implemented in the next biennium. I am certain that if the plan of action as outlined for numerous programmes is carried out earnestly much progress will be achieved towards increasing the productivity of the agricultural sector, more so in developing countries. I am also glad to know that the Programme of Work" for 1988-89 has excluded activities which are no longer justifiable, or cannot compete with new programmes that warrant higher priorities. We also concur with the need to carry forward programmes begun in previous years which are important and are still justified.

My delegation views these planning initiatives as in conformity with the call for reforms by a number of Member countries. My delegation fully appreciates that the proposals for the Programme of Work and Budget for the 1988-89 biennium had to be governed by current budgetary constraints and shows only a very modest increase in new activities. Although the real programme increase proposed for 1988-89 for an additional 1.1 million, we hope that a total budget of US\$ 486 million for the biennium will be approved by consensus in order to fully implement the proposed programmes during the period. Needless to say, the 1.1 million increase represents 0.25 percent and is merely symbolic and could easily be regarded as zero growth.

As my delegation has observed in the last Council session I should like to reiterate our concern for the exodus of expert personnel from the Organization and its difficulty in attracting experienced experts to come in. We hope that this problem will not become a protracted one, otherwise the Organization will, suffer an irretrievable loss of expertise and a consequent reduction of its capacity and ability to respond to the needs of Member Nations.

The implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan is also a programme which merits high priority, and so are other programmes relating to environment protection, management and replenishment of mineral resources, policy studies on agricultural development and improved food security as well as effective management and utilization of data. We believe that the programmes are of special importance in considering the present need and problems faced by the agricultural sector in developing countries. The level of budget allocated, to TCP should be maintained since this programme has been designed by concept and objectives to provide a quick response mechanism to meet specific needs of member Countries, particularly the developing ones.

Many technical and economic programmes contained in the proposed Programme of Work and Budget are relevant to my country and from which we have benefitted and will continue to benefit in the future in terms of technical assistance as well as financial assistance.

Worthy of mention are the seed improvement and development programmes, programmes, that focus on the development of small and medium-scale processing units for perishable commodities, agricultural mechanization and the prevention of food losses, plant protection, land use planning, particularly the Geographic Information System (GIS) and those programmes focussing on crop intensification and crop diversification. My delegation would like to lend support to these programmes.

Before I conclude, let me once again congratulate the Secretariat, and particularly Mr Shah, for having prepared the Programme of Work and Budget for the 1988-89 Siennium.

Finally, my delegation finds little difficulty in accentine.and.endorsine.the.Proexamrae of Work_and Budget under consideration and I hope other Member States will also have little difficulty in approving it by consensus.

Masahiko YASUMURO (Japan): First of all, I would like to thank Dr Shah for his lucid and elaborate introduction on this very important agenda item.

On behalf of my delegation, I should like to present the view of my Government on this proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium. I would like to start by expressing some views concerning the Programme of Work, before coming to the budget level.

Delegations of Japan have already put forward specific comments on programme priority in the Councils, the Committees of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and other fora, and I would like to avoid restating them here.

My delegation knows- that there are tremendous requirements for this Organization in solving food problems and promoting agricultural development, and also recognizes that the financial environment for the next biennium of FAO will be severe under the economic and financial situations of the member countries.

In this connection, my delegation fully recognizes the efforts made by the Director-General to cut the resources allocation for Chapters 1, 3 and 5 and to increase the resources allocation for Chapter 2, Technicaland Economic Programmes, which is, in fact, at the core of FAO's activities. My delegation can support, in principle, this direction taken by the Director-General.

However, my delegation believes that there, will be some limitation in reducing the established posts, and in cutting the allocation for Chapters 1, 3 and 5. Those are "General Policy and Direction", "Development Support Programmes" and "Support Services". Imbalance between the allocation for those elements and the allocation for "Technical and Economic Programmes" will cause some obstacle or delay in implementing FAO programme and projects. In this point of view, my delegation feels that during the next biennium it is important and necessary for the Secretariat and the members to study how we can get more output from a given input.

I would now like to touch on Chapter 4, the Technical Cooperation Programme. Although my delegation recognizes the role of TCP in responding speedily to requests for urgent or unexpected small-scale assistance, as has been pointed out by Japanese delegations on a number of occasions, the following questions arise with regard to Chapter 4:

1. TCP is an unprogrammed reserve, while other provisions are under a programme budgeting system. This means that the member governments have no specific ways of checking and controlling TCP expenses.
2. My delegation believes that coordinating development activities among the UN agencies at the field level could mainly be achieved through effective allocation of UNDP funds. Therefore, in principle, my delegation is not in favour of the situation whereby each specialized agency has its own resources for development projects under the regular budget.

From this point of view, my delegation considers that it is necessary to improve the procedure of project approval, and also that it is useful for members to share results and experience of TCP, through annual reports of TCP to be submitted to the Council.

I would now like to move on to the budget level. My delegation thinks that the total amount of the members' contributions should be kept at such a level to avoid any possibility of causing an increase in arrears which might put the financial situation of the Organization in the next biennium in difficulty.

In this connection, it is important that the Programme of Work and Budget should be at a level which could be accepted by all members.

On page 31 of document C 87/3, it shows that the Member Nations' contributions will be US\$ 469 million at the rate of Lit. 1350 to US\$ 1. This amount is 19% up on that of the current biennium, 396 million. If we introduce the proposed financial measures on Working Capital Fund and Special Reserve Account, the total Member Nations' obligation in 1988 would be 28% up on that of 1987. My delegation thinks that the increase of the total Member Nations' contribution should be as modest as possible.

In our experience, the level of the total Member Nations' obligation for 1986-87, this biennium, was only 0.5% up from the previous biennium. And also the level of the total Member Nations' obligation for 1984-85 was as modest as 9.7% up from the previous biennium. Then the level of the total Member Nations' obligation for 1982-83 was more than 30% up from the previous biennium, and the Programme of Work and Budget for 1982-83 was not approved by consensus.

My delegation considers that it is important that the level of the Programme of Work and Budget is to be such a level that would be acceptable to all members, especially for the next biennium.

Ton HEIDSMA (Netherlands): First of all, my delegation would like to address some of the issues that were raised by Mr Shah in his introduction and also by the intervention of the United States recently. We basically agree with Mr Shah that the budget level as such should not be established, taking already into account, pre-empting as it were, non- or late payment by Member States of their assessed contributions. This in our view would sanction to a certain extent the fact that some - quite a number actually - of countries do not fulfil their constitutional obligations. Having said that we must not close our eyes to reality. It is extremely unlikely that the funds budgeted will indeed become available at the time they are supposed to be available. This calls for a highly prudent and conservative cash management so as to avoid a situation where FAO can no longer fulfil its essential financial obligations. In the view of my delegation the realistic way to do this is to take all possible measures that would slow down the actual cash outflow, for instance through delayed recruitment and other measures, and also by separating urgent from less urgent activities. This relates to something else Mr Shah said on the Working Capital Programme and Special Reserve Account which, according to him, ought to be treated separately from the Budget as such. Again, basically, he is right of course, but that does not mean that both issues are not related. They are and the position of my delegation on the Budget will have to be seen in conjunction with our views on these two issues.

We are happy that the Director-General has been able to cut down cost and programme increases as compared to the summary Programme of Work and Budget. On the other hand FAO is not at all especial in this. Almost every UN organizations had to cut down its programmes as had many national governments. In fact some other UN organizations and the United Nations itself were more severely affected by the financial crisis in the UN than FAO.

We also commend the Director-General for having again reduced the administrative costs as compared to actual programme delivery. Apparently this has been an involuntary reduction so to speak caused by the freeze on salaries that has continued for a number of years now. Many UN organizations find it difficult to maintain and recruit well qualified staff. This, of course, is something that is decided upon in New York and we fully agree with this principle. It is essential to maintain the United Nations common system for salaries and other emoluments but the Netherlands delegation in New York is certainly aware of the difficult situation in which many UN organizations find themselves at present in this respect.

With regard to the Programme contents we should like to mention a few items where we think there is room for improvement. First we believe that expansion of the network of country offices should not be pursued at this stage. We should like to remind the Secretariat that a discussion is at present going on on the modalities of field representation by the United Nations system. We strongly believe that substantial streamlining is possible and that the time has come for FAO to engage in a constructive dialogue with Mr Ripert in New York on coordination and integration of the FAO country offices with a possible system-wide UN presentation in the field.

Secondly, we support very strongly true decentralization to the field but we do not believe that the regional offices as constituted at present are a good example for this. Either it ought to be decided to give the regional offices more authority with regard to operational activities and consequently reduce activities at Headquarters or we should decide to pursue decentralization at the country level with the necessary consequences for the regional offices. We support what was said by the delegate from Finland that the different substantial Committees of FAO such as CÔAG, COFO, COFI, should look into the budgetary consequences of their proposals and decisions.

We should welcome an even greater emphasis on the forestry sector and in particular on the (Tropical forestry action Plan. If necessary priorities within the Forestry Programme must be set, for instance, by reducing wood industry activities. Forestry is also an important factor for sustainable development as emphasized in the Bruntland Report. The preservation of our environment and the need for sustainable development should be an important condition for FAO's operational activities.

My delegation also attaches great importance to the role of women in development and we will come back to that issue next week under the relevant agenda item.

The Netherlands is a strong supporter of the zero growth principle for the assessed budgets of UN organizations. We acknowledge of course that this is a rather crude instrument but we believe that it has proved to be the only realistic one to contend with the ever-increasing expenses in the United Nations system as they have occurred over the past decades. In fact many governments themselves are forced to use similar methods in their own budgeting process. Zero growth on the other hand is not the only criterion against which programmes and budgets are judged. The programme content, the sincerity and seriousness of efforts to contain unnecessary growth, priority setting in drafting the Budget and actual needs of those that benefit from FAO's work are also important factors. All these elements taken together will determine my Government's position with regard to the present Budget level, including various observations of the Member States in this Commission.

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): The Thai delegation would like to make a few comments on the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 as follows. First, while we are very happy to note that the Director-General has made earnest efforts to generate a platform for consensus among Member Nations by reducing the net programme increase to a mere 0.25 percent instead of 0.48 percent as he previously proposed to the 91st session of the Council in June this year, we regret very much to say that the Technical Cooperation Programme has not received increased support. My delegation would like to refer to the Thai Minister's statement in the Plenary that the TCP mechanisms enable FAO to respond promptly to Member Governments' urgent requests and to fill the gaps in technical assistance which have not been filled by other donors. Furthermore, my delegation considers that the TCP can play an important role in strengthening the Field Programme of the Organization. We should therefore wish to see that the budget increase remains at 0.48 percent, as was submitted to the 91st session of the Council last June.

We would like to see the FAO allocate at least 17 percent of its total regular programme to the Technical Cooperation Programme, but perhaps we have no choice this time. We should therefore like to see the budget increase remain at 0.25 percent, as submitted by the Director-General.

Secondly, I should like to draw your attention to the fact, that in the proposed budget no mention is made of appropriate labour-based priority in agricultural production and product processing. The labour issue should be considered since unemployment has been prevalent widely in developing countries and especially in the agricultural sector. This is one of the main causes of poverty. We would like therefore to suggest that the integrated approach to agricultural development should pay particular attention to the problem of unemployment in the rural areas.

In conclusion, I should like to say that we are now discussing the complex problem of budgetary limitation. This problem would be resolved if our members made efforts to meet their obligations. My delegation wishes to appeal to the members of the Organization to try to pay their dues promptly.

Bedda KATANI(Tanzania): To begin with, the Tanzanian delegation would like to start its intervention by first thanking Dr- Shah for his elaborate, lucid and balanced introduction of the agenda under discussion. My delegation wishes to support one delegate who said, "This is our budget: it is we members who appointed different committees and the Council. They have done a magnificent job. It is our view that basic issues which are being raised at this Conference should have been ironed out at those levels". I think what is expected of us at this level is clarification on issues which are not clear to the members. Sincerely, by asking the basics here, we are creating an impossible situation for the Secretariat, who have done a commendable job.

The principal objective of FAO is to increase food production. The major problem facing developing countries has been a food deficit caused by several factors. The main factors have been discussed in different international fora. The priorities outlined in document C 87/3 have underscored the measures to be undertaken to address these factors, and should receive the support they deserve.

I wish to comment on the Technical Cooperation Programme. My delegation would have wished to have an increased allocation in this area. On a number of occasions it has been used in emergency cases when the recipient countries could not handle the situation by themselves. It is unfortunate that the resources allocated have been stagnant. However, from the explanation given on the prevailing financial situation, we have no strong objection to accepting the level at which the TCP has been allocated its resources.

The Tanzanian delegation is fully in agreement with the Director-General's proposed budget cuts, particularly in the administrative area. But caution must be taken on the proposed cuts regarding professional posts. Here I must say that care should be taken to ensure that we do not freeze or cut posts and then proceed to employ consultants who are generally very expensive.

The main problem facing the proposed budget is non-payment of the assessed contributions by Member States. It would be a positive gesture if Member Nations see to it that they meet their obligations and enable the FAO to meet its programmes by payment of contributions wishing FAO to implement the budget which has been put to us for consideration.

In conclusion, my delegation is fully convinced that the Director-General has very carefully balanced the views expressed by Member Countries at the various stages of budget preparation and has at the same time maintained the basic strategies which can help to retain the objectives of FAO within the prevailing financial conditions. In view of this, the Tanzanian delegation endorses the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

James Samson KAIRO (Kenya): The Kenya delegation congratulates you on your election as the Chairman of this Commission. Allow me to make observations on the FAO Programme of Work and Budget for the period 1988-89. I note with appreciation FAO's attempt to increase the budget in line with the requirements of member countries. Through the use of the TCP, FAO is able to supplement programmes funded by other donors and recipient governments. Increase in the budget would be expected to increase project activities by FAO, which suggests a further growth of FAO programmes in Member Countries. This is a welcome move because in spite of the tremendous efforts made by FAO, individual developing countries and the international donor community, the battle against hunger, poverty and malnutrition is far from being won.

FAO's mandate is to address itself to matters relating, among others, to hunger, poverty, malnutrition and disadvantaged groups, particularly women and children. The UNDP funds should remain the responsibility of the governments of recipient countries and should be focused on responding to requests and meeting urgent and critical needs of each developing country such as the vulnerable sections of their societies living below the poverty line. However, this does not preclude the FAO's dependence on much needed UNDP programmes.

The Kenya delegation would have wished to see a more significant budget growth over the previous year to enable FAO to expand her support in research, development of suitable and cheap technology for dry lands, water harvesting and conservation practices, small-scale irrigation, development of drought-resistant crop varieties, integrated farming systems, incorporating both livestock and cultivation in dry lands, production of traditional food crops, improvement of agronomic practices, conservation of soil, watershed management and afforestation, and to take a leading role in seeking solutions to storage problems.

The Organization, through its Technical Cooperation Programme, should address itself to the rising needs of the least developed countries and it should increasingly entrust the governments and institutions of the recipient countries with the responsibility for executing the projects. When projects are agent-executed, use of national project coordinators and the participation of national professionals should be preferred. Involvement of local personnel has the advantage of greater cost-effectiveness, easier collaboration with national institutions, easier communication with target groups, the understanding of social attitudes and the environment and the eventual utilization of gained experience by local personnel in future projects.

The Kenya delegation supports the adoption of the budget presented by the Director-General, but in expressing that support permit me to state that in future the budget should be flexible so as to make FAO capable of addressing itself to issues and needs as they arise. In this regard, I appeal to member countries to be more prompt in the payment of their contributions.

Finally, let me suggest that training programmes should be increased in developing countries to build technical, managerial and professional capability. Many developing countries have established institutions which require either strengthening or revamping. FAO, through the TCP and the Trust Fund, should increasingly address itself to this area. While the budget for livestock has addressed itself to a wide range of activities, we note that small stock, such as camels - the traditional stock - is not adequately funded. The small stock which have a high turnover will make a significant contribution to nutrition, particularly as regards the supply of animal proteins. The camels have the dual purpose of providing transportation and the supply of milk and meat.

Humberto CARRION M, (Nicaragua): Señor Presidente, cuando traté de intervenir esta mañana como un punto de información fue para ayudarlo a usted, ya que soy Miembro del Comité General, en la sesión de hoy antes de comenzar la Plenaria recomendó los nombres de los países y las personas que ocuparían las vicepresidencias de las tres Comisiones de la Conferencia. También esta mañana un Delegado expresó que las felicitaciones al Presidente deben ser sinceras. Nuestra Delegación está plenamente de acuerdo con esto y por ser la primera vez que Nicaragua interviene en los temas de esta Comisión, deseo manifestar que la sinceridad indica que no debemos felicitarlo a usted por la forma y la prepotencia con que está conduciendo nuestros debates. Deseamos dejar constancia de esta protesta. Tal vez sería mejor para esta Comisión que en este tema usted ceda la Presidencia a los vicepresidentes.

Sobre el Tema 13, Señor Presidente, nuestra Delegación desea reiterar lo que expresamos durante el 92º período de sesiones del Consejo de la FAO, que se reunió del 3 al 6 de noviembre y en el que se examinó de manera preliminar el Programa de Labores y Presupuestos para el bienio 1988-89. El Director General ha hecho un gran esfuerzo para elaborar un Programa de trabajo y un nivel de presupuesto que pueda ser aprobado por consenso. La Secretaría, los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas y el Consejo, han intervenido directamente en la preparación del Documento C 87/3 y han recomendado su adopción y aprobación por la Conferencia.

Parte del párrafo pertinente del Informe del 92º período de sesiones del Consejo dice y cito: "La mayoría de los miembros reiteraron su apoyo a las propuestas; ya que estaban plenamente satisfechos de que se hubiera adoptado un criterio prudente y de moderación formulando un programa realista y teniendo en cuenta las preocupaciones expresadas con respecto al efecto que tendrían en las cuotas asignadas de contribución". Fin de la cita.

El trabajo de nuestra Organización para preparar el Programa y el nivel de presupuesto para el próximo bienio ha sido hecho dentro de un contexto de crisis financiera artificial de la FAO. Decimos artificial porque esta supuesta crisis ha sido creada por la falta de pago del total de las obligaciones del país mayor contribuyente de la Organización. No es una crisis porque, como se menciona en la introducción del Documento C 87/3, no entraña decisiones de principio adversas ni irrevocables sobre las contribuciones. La reducción de los ingresos por concepto de intereses está compensada por los ajustes en los programas y la depreciación del dólar se ha cubierto con la plena utilización de la cuenta especial de reserva. Si los Estados Unidos están realmente interesados en disminuir su déficit, deberían reducir los gastos en armamentos.

Por otra parte, el aumento neto propuesto de solamente el 0,25 por ciento del nivel del presupuesto, es insuficiente para que la Organización pueda hacer frente adecuadamente a su vital tarea de contribuir a la eliminación del hambre y la desnutrición en el mundo y, por lo tanto, contribuir al desarrollo integral de los países más pobres. Sin embargo, aunque nos oponemos al crecimiento cero, reconocemos los esfuerzos del Director General para presentarnos un nivel de presupuesto que pueda ser aprobado por consenso. Nuestro Gobierno apoya el Programa de Labores y el nivel de presupuesto contenidos en el Documento C 87/3, así como las prioridades establecidas y los objetivos a plazo medio.

Deseamos destacar el dinamismo que el Director General ha desplegado en el presente bienio para realizar ajustes en el programa de trabajo de hasta 25 millones de dólares, tratando de no afectar los programas técnicos y económicos de la Organización.

Vemos entonces con satisfacción que para el bienio 1988-89 se propone que el 46,8 por ciento del presupuesto se dedique a los programas técnicos y económicos y el 14 por ciento al Programa de Cooperación Técnica, que mi país apoya firmemente. En este sentido nos gustaría que en el futuro el PCT contara con un aumento real en su asignación presupuestaria, y nos preocupa que mayores ahorros y reducciones en los gastos administrativos y de apoyo a los programas técnicos puedan tener consecuencias negativas en esta actividad de la FAO.

Consideramos que la FAO ha sido y es una Organización eficaz y eficiente en su importante tarea de contribuir con los esfuerzos de los países en vías de desarrollo para eliminar el hambre, la desnutrición y la pobreza. Nicaragua tiene además motivos adicionales para apoyar la estrategia y los objetivos a plazo medio de la Organización.

Estamos convencidos de que la contribución que realiza esta Organización en los sectores agropecuario, forestal y pesquero a los países centroamericanos, es una contribución para alcanzar la

paz en nuestra subregión. No puede haber paz sin justicia social y sin desarrollo económico y centroamérica necesita la asistencia que la FAO nos puede brindar.

Finalizamos nuestra intervención apoyando especialmente las prioridades propuestas para los trabajos de la FAO para el próximo bienio 1988-89: la concentración de los esfuerzos en la producción agrícola en los países que tienen un déficit crónico de alimentos, concediendo la máxima atención a la ordenación de suelos y aguas. Las medidas para obtener más y mejores insumos y la utilización efectiva de la biotecnología. La aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos y los Programas de Acción de la Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesquero entre otras.

Mi país se ha beneficiado de la política de descentralización de la FAO a nivel regional y por países; por lo tanto, deseamos también apoyar específicamente la creación de cuatro nuevas representaciones de la FAO en Países Miembros de la Organización.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): The Philippine delegation wishes to express its support for the proposed Programme of Work and Budget. The Philippine delegation has already expressed its conformity with the programmes and priorities as well as the Medium-Term Objectives when these were taken up by the various technical committees reporting to the Council, and by the Council itself.

I wish to indicate my country's support for the Programme of Work and Budget and the budget level in spite of the fact that they imply a substantial increase in the contribution of our country at a time when my country is experiencing serious economic difficulties. While the Philippines support the Programme of Work and Budget and budget level, I would like to express concern that the scale of contributions adopted by FAO from the United Nations General Assembly in New York has raised the scale of the Philippines contribution precisely when my country is undergoing economic setbacks. On this count alone the Philippines contribution has increased by about nine percent in dollar terms.

Also in this connection I should like to refer to the so-called currency factor. A substantial increase of the budget is due to this currency factor - that is, to the exchange rate of the dollar vis-à-vis the lira. Yet many countries because of this currency factor will be paying in terms of their national currency very much less than they paid in the last biennium.

I should like to refer to document C 87/3 page 30 at the top of the page, the second column. The 1988-89 budget level would be \$ 451 million, if the exchange rate of the lira would be 1760 to one dollar. That budget level would include 2.94 percent cost increase and a 0.25 percent programme increase. But if the lira exchange rate remains at the level it is today at about 1 250 lira to one dollar the budget level would be something like \$ 490 860 000, as can be seen in page 29 of the Document I just mentioned. So because of the difference of the exchange rate of the dollar vis-à-vis the lira from January 1985 to the present, the budget level will increase from \$ 451 million to \$ 491 million. In other words, a substantial increase of the budget is due to this currency exchange rate but because of the same currency exchange rates there are some countries who would actually be paying less than they paid in the last biennium in terms of their own national currency, for example the deutsche mark, the yen and most European currencies. The contributions of these countries in their own currency would be less by somewhere between eight percent and eighteen percent.

I am wondering therefore whether a scale of contributions could be elaborated which would take into account among other things the currency factor or the exchange rates of member countries vis-à-vis the United States dollar, in which assessments are made.

The Philippine delegation therefore would like to suggest that the Finance Committee should study a more just scale of assessment which would take into account among other things this so-called currency factor.

The present situation has already caused great damage to the Programme of Work and Budget in the present biennium. A considerable number of posts have been frozen. Many meetings and publications have been cancelled. This has resulted in less advisory services to governments and less technical back-stopping to field projects. It is therefore the view of the Philippine delegation that the Conference should call on member countries to honour their obligations as stipulated in the constitution so that this Organization can comply with its mandate to help Member Nations fight against hunger and malnutrition according to the programme of work approved by member countries.

Mme Fatma LARBI (Tunisie) (langue originale arabe): C'est un plaisir pour moi, au nom de la délégation de mon pays, de vous présenter mes félicitations les plus sincères à l'occasion de votre élection à la Présidence de notre Commission. Je voudrais également féliciter les deux vice-présidents. Et je voudrais exprimer notre gratitude à M. Shah pour l'exposé clair et précis de ce point de l'ordre du jour.

Je voudrais également féliciter le Secrétariat de l'excellence du document C 87/3.

Puisque nous ne sommes pas membres du Conseil ni des comités du programme et des finances, nous voudrions exprimer notre appui aux propositions du Directeur général bien que l'augmentation totale requise est tout à fait symbolique et modeste (0,25 pour cent) si nous prenons en compte les nécessités croissantes des pays en développement.

Nous voudrions à cet égard exprimer notre inquiétude quant aux réductions continues dans les moyens de travail de l'Organisation et les modifications que le Directeur général a dû introduire au budget, qui arrive au niveau de 25 millions de dollars. Ceci a des effets négatifs sur les activités de l'Organisation. Nous ne sommes pas satisfaits non plus du montant des allocations données au programmes de coopération technique étant donné la croissance des besoins.

La délégation de mon pays comprend que le Directeur général ait dû réduire un certain nombre de postes pour pouvoir faire face à un nombre croissant de nécessités. Nous estimons cependant que le programme technique, l'assistance et la formation sont les moyens nécessaires pour satisfaire les nécessités et les besoins des Etats Membres.

Nous voudrions à cet égard féliciter le Directeur général et son personnel de la direction tout à fait sage des travaux de l'Organisation.

Finalement la délégation de mon pays voudrait exprimer son appui au programme de travail et budget pour 88-89; et nous sommes d'accord pour donner la priorité au continent africain.

Nous en appelons donc à tous les Etats Membres pour adopter à l'unanimité le Programme de travail et budget et nous sommes certains que tous les Etats Membres feront de leur mieux pour appuyer l'Organisation qui est la leur et qui est l'expression de la volonté de toute l'humanité pour consolider le développement agricole et rural.

João Augusto DE MÉDICIS (Brazil) : " Let me first of all inform this Commission that my Government has delivered yesterday, to FAO, resources covering the whole of our 1986 statutory contribution and part of the 1987 contribution. During the current year, Brazil paid more than five million one hundred thousand dollars to the Organization. This is the best we can do at present in face of budget constraints imposed by an economic readjustment policy being implemented. But it depicts the clear support my delegation renders to the Programme of Work of FAO and also of the will of my country to positively contribute to its full achievement. We must, therefore, reiterate our position, as stated in previous sessions of the FAO Council, rejecting any proposal of alternative budget or contingency plans, solutions which we consider to be inadequate to deal with the forecast difficulties of FAO.

While being perfectly aware of the financial constraints faced by the Organization, my delegation is willing to contribute in a positive way to the Programme of Work by stressing the importance of some of the programmes proposed and underlining some priorities which are considered to be of utmost importance for our country and region:

1. Sub-Programme 2.1.1.4, we welcome the increase in resources allocated to it, within the general framework of stringency, as for Brazil this is a field of particular interest, irrigating being tabled among the national priorities, especially in the arid and semi-arid regions in the Northeastern portion of the country.

2. Programme 2.1.3, my delegation considers, that Sub-Programmes 2.1.3.1 - Grassland, Forage and Feed Resources, as well as 2.1.3.2 - Animal Health should deserve greater attention.

3. Programme 2.1.4 - Research and Technology Development, priority should be given to Sub-Programme 2.1.4.5 - Environment and Energy, since it is of great interest for Latin America and the Caribbean.

4. Programme 2.1.5 - Rural Development, we want to underline the importance which should always be attributed to Sub-Programme 2.1.5.1.1 - Agricultural Education, Extension and Training, since this is the tool which will allow new technologies to effectively reach the field.

5. Programme 2.1.6, is certainly one of the most important as feeding mankind is the ultimate and greater goal to be achieved by agriculture. We are well aware that there is a quantitative surplus of food currently available in the world, mainly in the North, whereas we are faced with malnutrition in large areas of the South.

Two other observations, regarding the Programme of Work as a whole:

- My delegation recognizes the needs of the African Region and supports the emphasis placed by the Organization, through the allocation of a large share of resources to that continent. We must, however, insist that the Latin America and Caribbean Region are also in need of expertise and resources, especially in the field of food and agriculture.

- Our second general point, is the importance my country attaches to TCP and, particularly to activities developed in the field of TCDC, as we considered it then to be an outstanding tool for developing countries which are struggling to overcome economic and technological gaps.

We are therefore pleased to convey the general support of the Brazilian delegation to the Programme of Work. To conclude our intervention may I state our position regarding the Budget, to which unfortunately we are not in a position to extend the same degree of support granted to the Programme of Work.

First of all, I would like to reiterate our full support for the cause of multilateralism and underline the importance of rendering resources available for application through international organizations, rather than the present trend to an increasing bilateralization of aid. A second important issue in the view of our delegation is the understanding that the budget of the Organization might and should be much higher than the actual figures that are submitted to us in document C 87/3. Brazil, however, struggles to face the bulk of its external obligations and, not willing to fail with its constitutional obligations to international organizations in general, cannot afford supporting any proposal for increase in budgeting, as our delegations to the meetings of other international organizations have already rendered clear. In this respect, we believe it would be fairer if the necessary increase could be spread among those nations which were benefited by the massive fluctuations in world exchange rates during the last almost three years. We wish to support, therefore, the proposal presented this morning by the delegate of France, that a study be made on the impact of the exchange rates fluctuation on member countries' contributions.

In summing up, our position is of general support for the Programme of Work and reservations in relation to the augmentation in our contribution to the Regular Programme of the Organization.

V. K. SIBAL (India): We would like to express our appreciation for the very detailed and informative budget documents and their very clear and capable presentation by Mr Shah.

We have heard this debate with interest and we find that though there are differences over the level which the budget must have there is unanimity on support for the FAO and the value which is assigned to the FAO's work. We feel this awareness of FAO's values and the support for its work are positive elements in this debate on which we must build to achieve a consensus on the item which we are considering.

One very major point which is being made is that the budget is unrealistic because it does not take into account expected shortfalls. Now, on the other side the argument has been put in a different way, that the budget is indeed a very realistic one because it is a budget which has been pared to the bone, keeping in view the current difficulties of the FAO, keeping in view what has been happening and therefore every attempt has been made not to have much growth in this budget. By its nature, a budget is a very integrated and organic programme of action. It is not possible to.

increase it or decrease it except within limited ranges and these ranges have something to do with the level of development which any institution has reached, so therefore when we talk of reductions in FAO's budgets, any unlimited reduction is not possible. Only limited reductions which will not leave any permanent scars or inflict any damage on the institutions, can be prudently considered by Member Countries who are committed to FAO's goals and FAO's role. This is the technical aspect of the difficulties of trying to base the budget on expected shortfalls which are difficult to determine with a degree of accuracy and certainty. Once you do this the basis can shift as the economic situation shifts and give rise to so many complex questions, such as how to ascertain it, how to build on it, and how to safeguard against these expected shortfalls not becoming larger, especially when there is no repudiation of the constitutional obligation to pay when the latter gives a more realistic basis for the budget. In fact we have heard with very great interest and respect the intervention made by the largest contributor in which though financial difficulties have been highlighted it has also been stated that they are looking for a situation in which full funding can be facilitated. There is no repudiation of the constitutional obligation envisaged. I think all this backdrop has to be kept in mind all the time. The proposals are faithfully based on the summary and take fully into account the debate in the Council on the Summary Programme on Work and Budget. What we have before us is in fact a cautious budget, a balanced budget, keeping in view the constitutional obligations of Member Countries in respect of their contributions and it is a realistic budget.

It is not perhaps the budget which many would have wanted. In many ways it is a somewhat timid budget, seeking to preserve the effectiveness of vital programmes within the limited resources likely to be available. It is evident that an adequate budget, a growth-oriented budget, a budget more realistically geared to the expectations of most countries from the FAO was impossible keeping in view the major problems arising out of late payment of contributions, depreciation of the dollar, and low interest income. There was just no escape from the exercise balancing of expectations from FAO and the programme delivery capacity based on expected level of resources and this exercise we think the Director-General has performed with skill, a degree of fine tuning, a serious concern for economy and an earnest desire to preserve indeed increase, though marginally, the technical and economic programme through diversion of savings, and through administrative economies. For this we would like to congratulate the Director-General.

The efforts made by the FAO to effect savings of US\$ 25 million in the present biennium by freezing as many as 170 hosts, cancelling over 50 meetings and 100 publications is an earnest of the hard, realistic approach the FAO is following in facing their current financial constraints and will continue to follow if such difficulties were to persist in the current biennium. While noting this we cannot help feeling a measure of anxiety over the damage which such cuts if prolonged or magnified can cause to FAO's capacity for programme delivery with obvious ill-effects on the quality and range of services available to the Member Countries.

It has been stated that FAO should have had a smaller core budget, based on the likely shortfall in resources and a supplementary budget if increased resources available. We are not clear how the level of such a budget can be determined. We have an expected level of resources based on the contributions which Member Countries are obliged to pay. Can there be a more logical and more assured basis for a budget? If we have to take into account these shortfalls how will we ascertain them and this exercise is bound to be subjected, investigatory and the figures arrived at may change from time to time within the biennium. In this context we must underline that the constitutional commitment to pay in accordance with assessed scales must be observed. What the FAO has therefore done in basing the budgetary on assessed contributions is reasonable, realistic, logical.

We hope that those who have not paid will find ways to remit their contributions quickly and contributors will continue to support FAO to avoid a situation of multilateral anarchy of which we have been warned. We agree that FAO cannot do everything in the area of food and agriculture and has to be selective. We feel FAO has been selective in identifying the priorities relating to the increase in agricultural production in food deficient countries through a selective focus on activities relating to soil and water management. Measures for the provision of more and better inputs, effective utilization of biotechnology, the implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, programmes of action of the World Fisheries Conference, environmental concerns, policy advice and data bases which are necessary for FAO advice.

The Programme Committee, of which we have the honour to have been a member, has gone through this budget in detail and we have no hesitation in supporting the proposals. The Director-General has tried to meet the concerns of those who wanted a modest budget, as expressed in earlier debates, by proposing a small increase of only US\$ 1.1 million, which represents a small percentage over the recosted budget base, and by reducing the provision of cost increases by \$ 5 million. If this is taken into account what we have is almost a zero growth budget for which some of us have a preference.

The proposals that we have before us have been cleared by Council and the Programme Committee and debates in the fora in which these have been discussed show that the Member Nations agree to the longer term trends, the medium-term objectives and the programme priorities for the next biennium. In this context the budget does constitute a platform for the unity of this Organization, a.. unity which we should not hesitate to confirm through its acceptance by consensus.

Clifton E. MAYNARD (Barbados): Earlier in our committees I expressed my pleasure at seeing you in the Chair, I should now like to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen on their election. I too am very grateful to Mr Shah for his comprehensive and lucid introduction to the Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1988-89. The breakdown provided a programme at element level and the new presentation in programme narratives of medium-term objectives and the focus of FAO's action in relation to them, particularly in Chapter 2 makes it easier to consider the various proposals in the document C 87/3.

My delegation approves the choice of priorities and strategies (which motivated the formulation of these proposals for the biennium) because of the emphasis placed on assistance to disadvantaged groups including women and youths in rural areas, poor developing countries as well as the preservation of natural resources. This emphasis can be seen in all relevant programmes and sub-programmes. On the major programme 2.1 - Agriculture this emphasis is placed on increasing agricultural production in food deficit countries through soil and water management, provision of increased inputs and the wider application of biotechnology.

Environmental pollution and better management of renewable resources, policy studies for agricultural development and improved food security as well as the increased utilization of the Organization's scientific, technical, social and economic data bases.

I particularly wish to support the incorporation of nutritional considerations in food and agricultural planning at the national and international level under Programme 2.1.6 - Nutrition. The establishment of the Joint FAO/WHO Consultative Group of Food and Nutrition Policies will promote greater complementarity between FAO and WHO nutrition activities. We support also the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, because Codex standards facilitate international trade. I also support the proposals to upgrade the central unit of the Global Information and Early Warning System for its service within the Commodity and Trade Division, and the merger of the Food Assistance Unit with the Food Security and Food Aid Policy Group, to form the Food Security Group, because the merger has no cost implications coverage of livestock and animal health conditions by the system response to the Council's request at its 91st Session.

The proposed fisheries programme for 1988/89 included net increases and was fully supported by the 17th Session of the Committee on Fisheries and I agree with the importance being given to strengthen international capability in the development and management of fisheries resources through training and a transfer of technology. Developing countries, particularly coastal states, require urgent help in order to fully exercise the rights they have over exclusive economic zones under their control. Special attention to be given to the promotion of TCDC and ECDC activities and the needs of the landlock and small island states are fully supported. I approve also of the net increase on the major programme of forestry since the increase, among other things, is for the coordination and implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Programme. The inclusion of the activities formerly on the programme 2.3.4 - Forestry and Rural Development into the other three programmes is a significant, practical and conceptual improvement. We also support the work of the Field Programme Development Division in the development of field programmes and the mobilization of extra budgetary resources. I know that the Council at its 92nd Session, when it considered the review of the Regular Programme of 1986/87, including the independent external evaluations of three special action programmes, welcomed the increase in focus of the field programmes on "building up self-reliance in recipient countries to deal with development matters".

I agree that its cause and further efforts in this direction include the increased use of qualified national personnel and projects, and use of national directors and coordinators and support for direct government execution of projects where appropriate. Again, the emphasis on building TCDC approaches into FAO projects should continue, as well as the utilization of pertinent technical capacities existing in developing countries. The concentration of the field programmes and development needs of the rural poor should continue in the spirit of the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development of 1979.

I also support the expansion of activities in support of women and the cooperation with local nongovernmental organizations.

The work of the Investment Centre which generated US\$ 3000 million in total agricultural investment in 1986 alone, and has continued to be of a high standard, is supported and I hope that the reorganization of the World Bank described in one newspaper on 29th May as bearing "little relationship to rational reorganization. It comes more under the heading of self-mutilation with 10 percent of the 6000 staff members to be fired in a process that strongly resembles a lottery." I hope this will not affect the FAO/World Bank Cooperative Programme over the longer term. Because of the importance we attach to having a FAO representative in Barbados, although he serves in a similar capacity in six other caricom states, I support the proposed increase by four over the biennium. The net increase in costs over the biennium will be significantly reduced by the decision to phase the timing of the establishment of these new offices.

With regard to the Technical Cooperation Programme I can do no better than support the view expressed by Council earlier this month when, with reference to the catalytic role of TCP, it noted the higher proportion of TCP projects which resulted in subsequent larger technical assistance and investment activities. In our view it would be a retrograde step if the concept and operation of this innovative programme is changes in any way.

The Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries of Barbados in his statement in Plenary on 10th November said that the Director-General "had rightly presented a Programme of Work and Budget based on the guidelines set by the Organization's governing bodies and the condition of the world food and agriculture situation. He was right to fix the level of the budget on the basis of the contributions Member States are legally obliged to pay in full and on time, rather than a projection of the level of contributions the Organization is likely to receive because some countries indicated an inability to meet their assessed contributions."

I believe that in considering the Programme of Work and Budget we must also recall the situation of force majeure arising from the combination of factors beyond the control of FAO. Council has approved the Director-General's response which will see programme adjustments amounting approximately to US \$25 million. This situation has necessitated the cancellation of about a hundred meetings, left 170 posts unfilled, 100 publications not produced and related reductions in expenditure and consultant's travel and other objects of expenditure. It seems that these programme adjustments have covered the decline in income interest income whereas the depreciation of the dollar means that the special reserve account established to deal with this problem will be fully utilized. Once exhausted, the effects of the dollar depreciation must be covered from savings. Whether, despite these measures an uncovered budget, deficit remains at the end of this biennium and at what level can be answered only by those Member Nations who still have outstanding contributions due to FAO. Another consideration which I think should be taken in the context of our consideration of this important item is a comment which Prof. Mayer made in the recent McDougall Lecture. He said, and I quote, "The installation of more productive, sustainable agriculture and of an economy that permits an adequate diet for every person, has been likened to the Marshall Plan. (The Marshall Plan, if you remember, revived the European agriculture and economy after World War II.) In reality, the project is far more complex and costly and will take far longer. It asks for contributions from each member of the world community, for every member has a particular capacity in one area or another."

The net programme increase for 1988/9 is reduced to about US\$ 1.1 million, which is mere 0.25 per cent of our costed 1986/7 budget base. The provision for cost increases has been deliberately reduced from US \$18 million to US \$13 million. According to the traditional methods of calculation, the proposals involve only a very moderate net programme increase. If absorption of a large share of the cost increases is taken into account, the level of resources effectively at the Organization's disposal will be lower in real terms than that approved for this biennium.

I would like to insert into this intervention of mine paragraphs 2.63 and 2.64 of document CL 92/4. This is the Report of the Fifty-third Session of the Programme Committee. I will not detain members of this Commission by reading them, but I would wish to have them included in extenso because they state that Committee's view on the situation which this Organization faces. After reading paragraphs 2.63 and 2.64 it would be difficult for any group, be it high-level, low-level, narrow or broad minded, from within or outside the Organization, or even from outside the universe to disagree with the views expressed in those two paragraphs.

We wholeheartedly support the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/9. We will not need to speak again on this item.

Ahmed S. HARIRI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): We have listened with great attention to everything that has been said by our colleagues putting forward their views on the Programme of Work and Budget. For the next biennium generally there has been a consensus aired by developing countries in particular on the priorities and strategies for our scrutiny. I think this shows that the documents effectively reflect all the recommendations made by Regional Conferences and the Conferences held here in regard in particular to our future direction. The Organization has made a lot of effort and I think we should pay tribute to that as part of an effort to put together a programme which is in harmony with the aspirations of all Member States.

Now clearly most Member States are in agreement on the low level of budget proposed. A lot of delegations said that they would very much like a much bigger real increase in the programmes and Saudi Arabia can here state that with respect to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988/89. We can say this because we believe in the mission of the Organization. We believe in what it is doing for Member States and we take off our hat to it for all its efforts to improve all countries' standard of living and standard of food. We must help our Organization do what it can do to continue this work. This is a duty, since it reflects the aspirations of all developing countries, nay all countries in the world, since humanity has a single fate. There is no bright future without dignity, freedom and peace, with the present disparities that exist between the various regions, when we see countries who simply have not got food and others that have a surplus.

The consensus, the general agreement voice by everyone on the Programme of Work and Budget confirms the solidarity which will ensure peace and security for all of us, which will enable us to transcend our individual egoisms.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): La délégation malgache félicite le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents relatifs au point 13 de l'ordre du jour, et pour la présentation très claire qui en a été faite

Le Comité du Programme, le Comité financier et le Conseil ont reconnu et apprécié les efforts inlassables fournis par le Secrétariat en vue d'améliorer le fond, la forme et la présentation de ces documents, afin qu'ils répondent aux exigences des Etats Membres. Bien entendu, d'autres améliorations peuvent être envisagées et entreprises; mais il faudra préserver les acquis. Et l'on dit que lorsque l'on cherche le mieux, le mieux est quelquefois l'ennemi du bien.

Madagascar étant Membre du Conseil et- du Comité financier, notre déclaration sera assez brève. Nous appuyons sans réserve les rapports de ces organes.

Dans son intervention en séance plénière, relative à ce point de notre ordre du jour, le chef de la délégation malgache a regretté que le Programme de travail et Budget ne représente même pas le minimum requis pour venir en aide aux millions de personnes à bas revenus, mal nourries et déshéritées des pays en voie de développement.

La croissance du Programme de travail et Budget 1988/89 par rapport à celle de 1986/87 est négative si l'on considère que les augmentations de prix sont loin de refléter la réalité: 18 millions de dollars réduits à 13 millions, on est en dessous de la croissance zéro prônée et réclamée par certains délégués; alors, pourquoi n'atteint-on pas le consensus? Quelles autres raisons valables pourrait-on encore évoquer pour tergiverser et finalement essayer de bloquer le minimum vital correspondant aux priorités connues, voulues solennellement et mondialement déclarées, par ceux-là mêmes qui vivent la faim, la malnutrition et la misère?

De telles priorités sont d'ailleurs celles retenues par les conférences régionales, par la Conférence mondiale sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches. Elles tiennent compte du Programme spécial pour l'Afrique, approuvé par l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies; elles, tiennent compte du Programme d'action forestière tropicale que tous appuient unanimement.

A-t-on le droit dans ces conditions de faire fi de toutes ces résolutions, résolutions sérieuses prises par des assemblées très sérieuses que nous connaissons tous?

Notre chef de délégation précise: "notre foi en l'Organisation, notre volonté commune de la soutenir, notre ferme engagement à remplir les obligations librement consenties envers elle constituent la seule assurance de son efficacité dans l'action".

Cet engagement que nous avons pris ne nous autorise pas à adopter un budget incertain, un budget dont le seul critère dominant pour la prise de décisions serait la crise de trésorerie qualifiée à juste titre d'artificielle par plusieurs délégations.

A-t-on oublié ou fait-on semblant de ne pas se souvenir des effets néfastes des mesures d'ajustement de programme opérées pendant le biennium en cours?

La délégation malgache souhaite vivement que des dispositions concrètes et appropriées soient prises pour y remédier, et que de telles situations désastreuses ne se reproduisent plus.

Malgré son insatisfaction du niveau du Programme de travail et Budget, malgré les diminutions opérées sur certains programmes prioritaires - nous ne voulons pas les citer car nous les trouvons de manière très claire dans le document et dans plusieurs tableaux - et tout en regrettant que le Programme de coopération technique soit bloqué au niveau de 1986/87 alors que les besoins des pays sont loin d'être satisfaits, la délégation malgache appuie quand même le Programme de travail et budget tel qu'il est soumis à cette assemblée et elle invite chaleureusement tous les Etats Membres à oeuvrer de concert pour parvenir à une entente harmonieuse, celle qui reflète une coopération internationale renforcée, ne visant que la victoire commune contre le sous-développement, les fléaux bien connus de la faim et de la misère. La volonté de tous de parvenir à cette victoire devra se manifester par le consensus dans l'adoption de ce programme.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): Ma délégation a déjà eu l'occasion de vous féliciter. Permettez-moi de féliciter M. Shah pour sa présentation claire du document C 87/3 soumis à l'examen et à l'approbation de notre Commission.

S'agissant de ce document, dès le départ notre attention est frappée par les retards de versement des contributions, en particulier du plus grand contributeur, ce qui crée une atmosphère d'inquiétude quant à l'exécution complète du Programme, cependant bien équilibré, que le Secrétariat nous a présenté. En effet, les différents secteurs sur lesquels les programmes sont axés, sont ceux que les pays en développement considèrent comme leurs priorités. Ainsi, il est rassurant que le maximum de ressources soient consacrées aux activités techniques et économiques.

Tout en soulignant notre inquiétude concernant la diminution du personnel compétent menaçant ainsi l'efficacité du travail attendu, nous comprenons toutefois le souci du Directeur général d'améliorer la gestion de notre Organisation.

D'autre part, compte tenu du rôle que joue le PCT en raison de sa flexibilité et de la rapidité de son intervention pour résoudre les problèmes ponctuels, ma délégation aurait souhaité un niveau plus élevé de moyens destinés à ce poste.

Toutefois, ma délégation se rallie à la majorité des intervenants pour appuyer le Programme et le Budget qui nous sont présentés, et en appelle aux autres pays membres pour que ces propositions qui tiennent rigoureusement compte des diverses tendances obtiennent le consensus dont elles sont le reflet.

En abordant la question des Représentations, la Guinée se réjouit de l'existence d'un Représentant de la FAO sur son sol. Cette présence rapprochée de la FAO des utilisateurs de ses services est une expression concrète très efficace de l'assistance technique permanente au niveau des milieux de décisions des pays membres. Nous appuyons fermement la création de nouvelles représentations. Cela va dans le sens du renforcement du rôle de conseiller de la FAO.

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La Delegación de Argentina desea fijar de la manera más sucinta y clara posible su posición respecto a uno de los principales temas de nuestra Agenda, la adopción del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1988-89 y los objetivos a plazo medio que hoy estamos discutiendo.

En primer término mi Delegación agradece la clara exposición del Dr. Shah referida al documento C 87/3.

Estimamos que la FAO ha cumplido y cumple un rol destacado en los esfuerzos para erradicar el hambre y la desnutrición. Su valor y vigencia están más allá de toda duda, sus objetivos tanto para el corto como el mediano plazo, son válidos y a nuestro juicio se ajustan a las necesidades de los países en desarrollo. Sin embargo, las limitaciones financieras de la organización y de muchos Países Miembros agobiados por la deuda externa y un contexto internacional negativo, nos obliga a redoblar esfuerzos en la identificación de prioridades y en la administración de los recursos disponibles.

Mi Delegación coincide con las prioridades de los programas que aparecen en el Documento C 87/3, que, en definitiva, son las que los propios Estados Miembros hemos fijado en los diversos foros intergubernamentales. La Secretaría de la FAO sólo ha reflejado en este Documento de esta manera la voluntad mayoritaria de sus miembros.

Compartimos la política del Director General de continuar disminuyendo los gastos fijos en servicios administrativos. La reducción del porcentaje de recursos totales que se gastarán en puestos de plantilla es positiva. Por otra parte, el cambio neto entre los puestos nuevos y los suprimidos no es sustancial ni debería afectar la capacidad de la FAO para actuar eficazmente. Al respecto creemos que una mayor utilización de instituciones y técnicas nacionales en la ejecución de los proyectos, no sólo redundará en beneficio financiero de la Organización, sino también de los propios países en desarrollo donde se llevan a cabo las actividades.

Vemos con satisfacción la propuesta creación de cuatro nuevas oficinas en países, lo que seguramente coadyuvará a incrementar los logros en este aspecto.

En lo que hace al capítulo de Servicios de Personal, no tenemos objeciones que formular. Si nos surgen algunas dudas respecto de los llamados Servicios por Contrata. Si bien los aumentos originalmente previstos para el próximo presupuesto en este rubro han sido posteriormente corregidos en casi un millón de dólares, queda la duda de todas maneras sobre la justificación de un incremento real de 1 300 000 dólares.

En el Programa 1.2.1: "Oficina del Director General", vemos que no se producen variaciones respecto del presupuesto vigente y, obviamente, tampoco tenemos objeciones. Solamente para información rogaría mos a la Secretaría un comentario acerca del origen y destino de los fondos extrapresupuestarios_, de un monto de 510 000 dólares previstos para dicho Programa.

En el Programa 1.4.1: "Asuntos entre Organismos", compartimos sus fundamentos y objetivos. La Organización debe cooperar con numerosos Organismos Internacionales,• estar al corriente de lo que sucede en otras Instituciones y participar en aquellos foros en los que por la materia en discusión pueda hacer una contribución efectiva. Así es como lo.hemos solicitado al Director General que la FAO participe como Observador en las negociaciones del GATT sobre productos agrícolas. Sin embargo, no se menciona específicamente al GATT dentro de los Organismos del párrafo 7 de la página 62 en la version española del documento que estamos analizando, y además vemos que se reducirá el plantel de la Oficina en Ginebra, precisamente cuando comienzan estas negociaciones.

Compartimos el enfoque del Programa Principal 2.1, "Agricultura", con sus ocho objetivos básicos. La presentación de los Subprogramas es adecuada.

En el subprograma 2.1.1.5 "Conservación y bonificación", vemos que se han asignado 160.000 dólares a actividades de conservación de suelos y ordenación de cuencas hidrográficas para permitir el desarrollo de una estrategia de conservación de suelos para África. Apoyamos las labores del subprograma y dicho incremento, ya que consideramos que el tema tiene máxima importancia en el tercer mundo. Sin embargo, mi país desearía ver una mayor participación de la FAO en América Latina en general, ya que el porcentaje de recursos que recibe es siempre proporcionalmente bajo. En este caso, en un tema que afecta a varios países latinoamericanos, y entre ellos a la Argentina, se observa que a toda la región se destina el 6,42% del total de los recursos del subprograma. La situación es aún más notable en el subprograma 2.1.2.6. "Industrias alimentarias y agrícolas", donde el porcentaje regional disminuye al 3,59%.

Apoyamos el programa 2.1.6 "Nutrición", tanto en su orientación como en sus objetivos a mediano plazo. Se han integrado las distintas disciplinas que hacen a un mejoramiento de los niveles de consumo y nutrición, así como a la calidad de los alimentos. Estimamos que, sin descuidar la finalidad primordial del programa, que es el mejoramiento del estado nutricional de la población, y particularmente de los grupos vulnerables, la FAO junto a la OMS realiza una importante labor de protección al consumidor a través del programa conjunto FAO/OMS sobre Normas Alimentarias y Comisión del Codex Alimentarius que merecen nuestro apoyo.

El Programa principal 2.2 "Pesca", también requiere y merece atención especial. El Departamento está llevando a cabo los objetivos fijados por la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca y coincidimos con lo observado al respecto por el Comité del Programa, en el sentido de dar apoyo prioritario a los Países en Desarrollo con litoral marítimo, para aumentar su producción dentro de una adecuada ordenación de sus recursos.

Nos referiremos más ampliamente a este tema en posteriores deliberaciones de esta Comisión.

El Programa de Cooperación Técnica, tal como ha sido señalado en reiteradas oportunidades, tiene gran significación para los Países en Desarrollo. Los criterios vigentes para su utilización son, a nuestro juicio, adecuados y responden fundamentalmente a las necesidades de los Países en Desarrollo, tal como lo sugiere el número de solicitudes presentadas. En lo que hace a su monto, y a pesar de que mi Delegación estuvo entre las que oportunamente apoyaron el incremento del monto máximo por proyecto de 250 a 400 000 dólares, entendemos que la Secretaría ha actuado con prudencia al tratar de mantener el efecto catalizador del PCT mediante un mayor número de operaciones en pequeña escala. Sólo excepcionalmente, los montos de los PCT deberían superar los 250 000 dólares.

A pesar de nuestro decidido apoyo al PCT, creemos acertada la propuesta del Director General de mantener los niveles de recursos actuales a fin de limitar el crecimiento presupuestario.

El Programa 5.1 "Información y Documentación", sin que queramos disminuir su importancia, estimamos que tiene menor prioridad y hubiéramos preferido que se hiciera un esfuerzo para mantener su nivel actual de recursos. Somos conscientes de que el incremento resulta del aumento de costos, ya que no se introducen cambios importantes. De todas maneras, quizás sea éste un Programa donde todavía se pueda hacer un esfuerzo adicional para contener el nivel total del presupuesto.

Respecto al resto de los Programas Principales no tenemos observaciones de fondo, y apoyamos las consignaciones propuestas.

Resumiendo, la Delegación argentina estima:

- 1) Que las estrategias, objetivos y prioridades para 1988/89, son correctos y tienen nuestro respaldo. Obviamente, la realidad financiera de la Organización, nos obligará a actuar con una dosis de pragmatismo.
- 2) Vemos con satisfacción que se han aumentado porcentualmente los fondos destinados a programas y disminuido los gastos en servicios administrativos.
- 3) El incremento del 0,25% en las consignaciones presupuestarias para 1988/89, respecto del bienio anterior, al tipo de cambio de 1 760 liras por dólar, no debería ser objetable ya que implica un aumento mínimo, casi simbólico.

4) Mi Delegación, sin embargo, reservó su posición sobre este tema en la última Sesión del Consejo y se vé obligada a mantener por el momento dicha reserva debido a que el monto presupuestario sujeto a cuota puede llevar a un incremento muy superior, atento a la caída del dólar frente a la lira italiana.

Ello implica que los países en desarrollo más castigados por la fluctuación del cambio y de tasas de interés seamos también los más perjudicados al momento del pago en dólares de nuestras cuotas. La Argentina enfrenta una grave crisis económica, como consecuencia del pesado servicio de su deuda externa y de la disminución de los precios internacionales de sus exportaciones. Su moneda se ha depreciado sustancialmente respecto al dólar y, en consecuencia, no estamos en condiciones de asumir nuevos compromisos financieros con los organismos internacionales, particularmente cuando éstos responden a fluctuaciones en la paridad de cambio del dólar frente a otras monedas fuertes, fluctuaciones en las que no tenemos ninguna responsabilidad ni beneficio de ningún tipo. Quisiéramos en este foro reiterar una sugerencia adelantada en la reciente sesión del Consejo de la FAO. Estimamos que la solución quizás pudiera estar en que esa diferencia la compensen aquellos países cuyas monedas se han revalorizado frente al dólar. Otra alternativa podría ser que la Conferencia, teniendo en cuenta que los tipos de cambio pueden fluctuar en altos porcentajes en los próximos meses, decida fijar una paridad de cambio a los efectos de la determinación del monto sujeto a cuota, que se acerque a la utilizada para el presupuesto vigente.

Por último, deseamos manifestar que coincido con el enfoque del Documento C 87/3 en lo que se refiere a la región de América Latina y el Caribe. El diagnóstico de la situación, lamentablemente, es acertado, lamentablemente porque el panorama descrito y las alternativas a corto y mediano plazo no son optimistas. La región se ha estancado en su crecimiento y en algunos aspectos inclusive ha involucionado. Se requiere urgente atención por parte de la FAO. El estudio y plan de acción que se está realizando para la Región puede destacar los principales problemas y sugerir medios de acción para superarlos, pero es evidente que se requerirán mayores recursos y que en la FAO debemos destinar una proporción porcentual mayor que la que históricamente ha recibido la Región.

The meeting rose at 18.00 hours

La séance est levée à 18 heures

Se levanta la sesión a las 18.00 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/8

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24 período de sesiones
COMISION II

EIGHTH MEETING HUITIEME SEANCE OCTAVA SESION

(16 November 1987)

The Eighth Meeting was opened at 9.45 hours.

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La huitième séance est ouverte à 9 h 45,

sous la présidence de ; Fred J. Eckert, Prèsident de la Comission II

Se abre la octava sesión a las 9.45 horas.

ba jo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)

13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme (suite)

13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plazo medio (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary informs the Chair we now have a forum. We have a list of speakers and we would call to your attention that there is a fair possibility that we could complete this item this morning if we move along as rapidly as we can - not that we wish to rush or restrain anyone's remarks but if everyone could bear in mind that if we do finish this morning then we will be able to have the Drafting Committee go to work this evening which will facilitate our efforts and we would ask everyone to cooperate on that.

Anwar Mohamed KHALED (Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of) (original language Arabic): We would like to express our appreciation to Mr Shah for his clear introduction of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89. Others have preceded me in expressing their views on what has been put before us and so there is no need for me to go into the details of all the ideas that have been expressed by these preceding speakers.

I should like to limit myself to a few points. We feel that the budget proposals are a reflection of all the observations, opinions and guidance provided by the governing bodies of the Organization. They are in accordance with the objectives of the Programme on the international level. We feel also that the Programme in fact has responded to the needs and ambitions of developing countries to increase their agricultural production. On the other hand it took into account the necessity for compressing expenditure and the need for rationalization. However, we see that some countries are in arrears with their contributions and this no doubt affects the Organization and its effectiveness in implementing its programme and fulfilling its objectives.

Democratic Yemen has in fact expressed its views in several fora of this Organization, such as the Council and the Committee on Agriculture, regarding the Organization's need to develop and improve its activities in arid and semi-arid areas, especially in the field of irrigation, due to adverse climatic conditions and to the worsening economic situation in developing countries. We therefore feel there is a need to expand the budget items concerning this issue.

We should also like to express our support, along with other developing countries, for the allocations to the Technical Cooperation Programme. We hope that the financial situation of the Organization will improve in order to increase the allocations to the TCP. The Democratic Yemen gives great importance to the TCP because of its positive effects on the development of agriculture.

After studying the components of this Programme we should like to express our support for the budget level as well as for the Long and Medium-Term Objectives and the Programme priorities. We hope that our discussions in this Commission will lead us to agreement on the budget level.

As regards the improvement of our resources in the field of agricultural production and development, we should like to express our support for the cooperation and coordination within the Organization and in its relationship with the WFP. The Organization in fact is carrying out effectively its mission to fulfill its objectives for agricultural development.

Ms Nomathemba DLAMINI (Swaziland): Allow me on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Commission. I should like also to join other delegations in thanking Mr Shah for his brilliant and comprehensive presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89. My delegation wishes to express its support for the Programme of Work and Budget. We note that the original Programme gives priority to the African region. We support this because Africa is the worst effected region as regards food production.

My delegation welcomes the Programme's priorities as outlined in document C 87/3 as these are in line with the needs of most developing countries. In particular these priorities are in line with the current agricultural development strategy of Swaziland.

The Swaziland delegation supports the Director-General's emphasis on food security, crop protection, soil and water management, the consolidation of information systems and integrated rural development. We fully support FAO's work in Codex Alimentarius, the improvement of animal feeding systems and the monitoring and provision of assistance in the control of major epidemic diseases.

The Swaziland delegation is looking forward to the deliberations on the feasibility of aid-in-kind as it relates to acaricides, which would benefit our tick and tick-borne disease control programme.

The Swaziland delegation notes with appreciation the importance given to early warning systems and the consolidation of information systems. Swaziland, with the support of FAO, has launched the EWS project which will undoubtedly facilitate the monitoring of harvests and prices. This is very important considering the persistent drought that has adversely affected agriculture in the southern African region.

Our delegation wishes to state that a reduction in the TCP would be regrettable, since from this programme Swaziland has been able to meet the numerous emergencies that the country could not have afforded through local resources alone.

Finally, the Swaziland delegation hopes to see the adoption of the 1988-89 Programme of Work and Budget by consensus.

Mme Isabelle GANSORE (Burkina Faso): Monsieur le Président, je voudrais vous exprimer le point de vue de la délégation burkinabè sur le Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 qui nous est soumis par le Directeur général. Mais avant tout, je tiens à féliciter le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents.

De façon générale nous approuvons les objectifs et les priorités définies dans le Programme. Toutefois, ce programme n'a de valeur que si un budget le soutient.

Aussi, ma délégation ne peut que déplorer les difficultés rencontrées par le Secrétariat pour l'exécution du biennium actuel, difficultés dues essentiellement au retard de paiement des contributions, notamment de celles du plus grand contributeur.

Cela s'est traduit par une diminution des activités de l'Organisation dont les pays en développement sont les principales victimes. Cette situation en effet contraste avec les besoins sans cesse croissants de nos pays, notamment en Afrique, et les diverses sollicitations adressées à la FAO.

L'avenir ne semble pas meilleur au regard des propositions prévues pour le prochain biennium. Si nous acceptons dans un esprit de consensus le niveau d'augmentation de programme (1,1 million de dollars), nous rejetons catégoriquement le principe de la croissance zéro.

Il ne fait pas de doute que de réduction en réduction, d'ajustement en ajustement, nous risquons d'entamer l'efficacité de l'Organisation.

C'est ainsi que nous regrettons que certains programmes comme le PCT ne connaissent pas d'augmentation notable, compte tenu de leur importance pour nos pays.

Faut-il rappeler l'importance qu'accorde mon Gouvernement aux activités de l'Organisation. C'est dans ce sens que, malgré les difficultés économiques qu'il connaît, il a décidé de renoncer à sa quote part de l'excédent de trésorerie de 3 476 dollars, compte tenu des difficultés que connaît l'Organisation. Du reste, le Burkina Faso s'est toujours efforcé de payer sa contribution dans les délais requis. Cette décision est le témoignage de l'intérêt que nous portons à l'Organisation.

Nous lançons un appel à tous les pays afin qu'ils assurent leurs responsabilités de membres de l'Organisation. Cet appel s'adresse particulièrement au plus grand contributeur qui devrait prendre les dispositions pour s'acquitter de ses contributions qui font partie des engagements qu'il a pris envers l'Organisation.

Enfin, lors du débat sur ce point, certaines délégations ont mis en doute le rôle et l'efficacité des représentations de la FAO dans les pays membres. Le Burkina Faso qui a le privilège d'avoir une de ces représentations est bien placé pour souligner le rôle que les représentations jouent.

Interlocuteurs directs des gouvernements, les Représentants exécutent et apportent un appui efficace au suivi des différents programmes et projets exécutés avec l'assistance de la FAO. Structures décentralisées, les représentations facilitent les relations entre les gouvernements et le Siège de la FAO et constituent un centre d'information.

Nous ne pouvons que marquer notre satisfaction pour les tâches accomplies par la représentation FAO au Burkina Faso et souhaiter que d'autres pays puissent bénéficier des mêmes services.

Nous comprenons que dans une situation difficile, il faille opérer des choix parmi les priorités du Programme. Mais nous ne pouvons pas ignorer ou nier le rôle irremplaçable que jouent les représentations FAO dans les pays.

Sra Mercedes FERMIN-GOMEZ (Venezuela): La Delegación venezolana considera que la Secretaría del Comité del Programa ha realizado una encomiable labor en la preparación del Programa de Labores en el cual podemos apreciar un notable esfuerzo para conciliar las necesidades sentidas por los Estados Miembros y sus expectativas, habiendo logrado la preservación de lo esencial de los programas técnicos y económicos y al mismo tiempo realizar las transferencias de recursos desde las unidades de apoyo y administración, a fin de satisfacer las necesidades imprescindibles para la eficacia de su labor.

Comprendemos las razones que aconsejaron tales medidas, si bien mantenemos la esperanza de que en el futuro pueda la Organización hallar el camino adecuado para atender aquellas urgencias que en el mundo subdesarrollado se hacen cada vez más apremiantes, como son la seguridad alimentaria y más que ésta, la seguridad nutricional.

Este Programa constituye una iniciativa de la FAO, que responde al criterio sustentado por ésta en relación con su propósito de cumplir debidamente con el primordial objetivo para el cual fue ella creada.

Por esto, ratificamos nuestro apoyo a las prioridades del Programa, especialmente el énfasis en el cumplimiento del Pacto de Seguridad Alimentaria, que a nivel mundial implica la asistencia a los grupos menos favorecidos en las áreas rurales, la conservación y defensa de los recursos naturales del medio ambiente la promoción y defensa de los cultivos autóctonos, en especial de las raíces y tubérculos.

Nos complace apoyar las estrategias y medios de acción dirigidos concretamente a la capacitación y muy especialmente los programas que se dedican a la incorporación de la mujer en las tareas del desarrollo, por cuanto ello significa un reconocimiento a la importancia de la doble colaboración que la mujer del medio rural presta en las labores de beneficio común, ya en su condición de trabajadora, bien en su carácter de madre y ama de casa.

Queremos enfatizar nuestro apoyo al propósito de continuar los esfuerzos para lograr el acuerdo general en el compromiso internacional de recursos fitogenéticos, y aprovechamos esta oportunidad para anunciar la decisión del Gobierno de Venezuela de adherirse a dicho compromiso. Por consiguiente, estamos de acuerdo con las transferencias propuestas en los párrafos 7 y 8 del Documento C 87/3 Sup. 3. Por idéntica razón, damos nuestro respaldo al Programa 2.1.3, y los cambios propuestos para establecer el Grupo de Recursos Genéticos y el Grupo de Recursos de Piensos, dentro del Servicio de Producción Animal.

Asimismo, unimos nuestra voz para respaldar la proposición de la Delegación mexicana, con apoyo de un numeroso grupo de delegaciones, con el fin de solicitar la creación de un Comité Pecuario.

Apoyamos decididamente el Programa de Desarrollo Rural. Consideramos este Programa como el marco fundamental, en el cual se inscriben los subprogramas de capacitación, extensión y mercadeo, los cuales a su vez, son complemento indispensable para el correcto ejercicio de los programas concernientes a la agricultura en general y a la alimentación.

En concordancia con este Programa de Desarrollo Rural, debemos reconocer y apoyar los programas relacionados con la información, la investigación, y el desarrollo de la Biotecnología. En este sentido, debemos urgir a la FAO una atención preferente a la colaboración Norte-Sur, a través de los programas que propicien las transferencias de tecnologías apropiadas y selectivamente aplicadas, para colaborar en el desarrollo tecnológico de los países en desarrollo, en especial en la capacitación de profesionales a nivel técnico.

Damos nuestro pleno respaldo al Programa Conjunto con la Organización Mundial de la Salud y el del Codex Alimentarius y las acciones que realiza el Grupo Consultivo sobre políticas de alimentación y nutrición. Por la importancia que tiene para los países latinoamericanos, queremos expresar nuestro apoyo al estudio de la participación de las empresas transnacionales en la producción, comercialización y consumo de productos agrícolas y alimentarios. Debemos hacer hincapié en este estudio porque ello nos permitirá, especialmente ahora cuando se está llevando a cabo el estudio de la FAO sobre América Latina, conocer cuál es la verdadera participación de dichas empresas en la vida económica de nuestros países. No queremos pasar por alto una manifestación de justo reconocimiento a la labor que la FAO ha llevado a término en la realización del Programa 2.3 del Departamento de Montes, el cual, dicho sea de paso, aspiramos a que en el futuro pueda denominarse correctamente Departamento de Bosques. El Plan de Acción en los Trópicos Húmedos merece todo nuestro apoyo, así como el cambio propuesto por dicho departamento.

Debemos lamentar, que no podamos decir lo mismo con respecto a los programas de campo de la División de Desarrollo, que no han merecido ni un ligero aumento en la asignación presupuestaria.

Consideramos, precisamente, en un momento en el que la FAO adelanta el estudio de América Latina que la programación de las actividades de campo son indispensables si es que queremos conocer la realidad en toda su verdadera dimensión. Nada puede sustituir el trabajo de campo en una investigación de tal índole y ello es mayormente necesario en una región que, como la de América Latina y el Caribe no ha merecido precisamente la atención que demandan sus urgentes necesidades y sus graves problemas en cuanto a desnutrición y desempleo, dos concomitantes elementos del hambre disfrazada que aqueja a sus masas trabajadoras del medio rural y de las poblaciones marginales de los centros urbanos.

En papel que la FAO está llamada a desempeñar, como asesora de los gobiernos o la formulación de sus políticas agrícolas y de desarrollo rural, es indispensable para ello el reconocimiento "in situ" de esas realidades particulares, y es justamente éste el objetivo primordial de los programas de campo. Es por ello por lo que vemos con preocupación que en el Programa de Labores no se haya dado mayor énfasis a dicho programa reforzando la dirección de programación de las actividades de campo, que actualmente necesitan una mayor atención para comprensión del desbalance que ha venido señalando al respecto.

Debemos, en justicia, unirnos a las delegaciones que han expresado aquí sus congratulaciones a la FAO por la eficacia, el acierto y la competencia con que se conduce su programa de Cooperación Técnica, cuyo reconocimiento es unánime en los países beneficiarios.

Finalmente, no podemos terminar sin antes expresar nuestro reconocimiento y apoyo a los esfuerzos realizados por el Director General Edouard Saouma y su equipo de colaboradores en la preparación de este Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988/89 que trata de ser equilibrado en medio de las dificultades financieras que aquejan a la Organización, como reflejo de las que atraviesan la gran mayoría de los Países en Desarrollo.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): The reason I asked for this point of clarification is that I want to inform the Commission that Italy has tabled a draft resolution which bears the number C 87/LIM/32, which concerns Item 25.4 in Commission III, and is available in the pigeon holes this morning. Since many of the speakers in this Commission have raised legitimate and realistic concerns about the means available to the end that we want to reach on the Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium, and recalling what happened in this biennium, that we had to face liquidity problems, and the delegate of Italy tried to make a practical contribution to the solution, I want to draw this to the attention of the members.

May I leave to you, Mr Chairman, the decision whether it would be useful or not useful for this Commission, although not directly competent, in view of the bearing of the subject of the draft resolution in our proceedings, to make recommendations to the Conference in conjunction with the decision that Commission III will take.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr. Presidente, a los Representantes de Colombia nos complace intervenir ahora, cuando según parece, Usted, Sr. Presidente y todos nosotros también, aprovechamos el pasado fin de semana para meditar sobre la conveniencia de que en esta Comisión sigamos trabajando con espíritu democrático, en ambiente de armonía y cordialidad, dentro del cual cada delegado pueda expresar libremente sus opiniones sin interrupciones, que no son convenientes.

La Delegación de Colombia apoya plenamente la declaración que acaba de hacer nuestra distinguida colega y amiga, la Embajadora de Venezuela, particularmente en cuanto a la mejor atención a nuestra región de América Latina y el Caribe y la permanente preocupación de la Embajadora Fermin-Gomez de Venezuela por el reconocimiento a los derechos de las mujeres.

Consideramos que, en general, las prioridades han sido definidas adecuadamente, pero lamentablemente, habrá que ser realistas y objetivos. Si el bienio en curso va a terminar con un déficit en el pago de las cuotas del primer contribuyente de más de 67 millones de dólares ¿Cómo podríamos alegremente adoptar el nivel propuesto, basar las actividades de la FAO 88/89 en un nivel dentro del cual corres-ponaerá a ese mismo importante país cerca de 125 millones de dólares?

El sistema de prorrateo del pago de las contribuciones va a continuar. Con abonos de 5 a 10 millones de dólares cada 3 ó 6 meses, el primer contribuyente terminará de pagar más allá del año 2000. Los representantes de ese respetable Estado Miembro nos han dicho reiteradamente que aún no saben cuándo podrán cumplir sus compromisos pendientes del bienio 86/87, ni tampoco cómo procederán en 88/89.

Nuestro colega y amigo Antonio Çayoso, distinguido representante de Estados Unidos en esta Comisión, habló prácticamente de una reducción del 40 por ciento en sus contribuciones a todos los organismos internacionales incluida la FAO. Parece que ésa será la decisión inaceptable del Congreso.

Todo ello nos inquieta y alarma y deberá incluirse en nuestro informe. Además en Plenaria el honorable Secretario de Agricultura de los Estados Unidos ni siquiera se refirió a ningún plazo para el pago de las cuotas atrasadas como si nada estuviera pasando, como si ese país no estuviera incumpliendo un compromiso legal con la FAO y moral con toda la comunidad internacional. Dijo, en cambio, y cito, que "los países en desarrollo necesitan ajustarse a un flujo más limitado de recursos externos en el futuro".

La delegación de Colombia piensa que los países en desarrollo no necesitan consejos como esos; a los países en desarrollo no se les puede exigir más sacrificios ni resignaciones, sobre todo por parte de aquellos estados que son factores esenciales en la recesión económica, de la cual han sido víctimas impotentes los estados del Tercer Mundo, hoy exportadores netos de capital a los estados industrializados.

Rechazamos toda exhortación paternalista dirigida a negar el derecho a la asistencia a los países en desarrollo.

Nuestros estados vienen haciendo esfuerzos notables por asignar a la agricultura la más alta prioridad y el máximo de los recursos en sus planes nacionales de desarrollo.

Desafortunadamente, esos esfuerzos aún no han sido suficientes. Necesitamos, demandamos, exigimos, asistencia técnica y financiera crecientes y no más limitada, como ahora se nos pretende aconsejar.

La actual situación confirma que la opulenta sociedad de consumo de los estados industrializados no podrá disfrutar en paz, mientras subsista el presente orden económico internacional injusto.

Como lo dijo nuestra colega Faouzia Boumaiza, de Argelia, mientras en Sudafrica siga vigente la funesta política segregacionista del Apartheid no podrán existir las condiciones de paz dentro de las cuales se haga justicia al Tercer Mundo. Parece evidente que en el bienio entrante asistiremos al mismo proceso continuo de reajuste en los programas, con tan lamentables efectos negativos para los países en desarrollo.

El Director General ha venido actuando acertadamente sobre los reajustes que se ha visto obligado a aplicar. El lunes pasado el Director General dijo: "nuestra Organización está sana y me duelen como una gran herida los 25 millones de dólares que hemos debido reducir en 1987".

Esos reajustes han sido plenamente aprobados a posteriori por los Comités del Programa, de Finanzas y el Consejo, lo cual confirma el acierto del Director General. Afortunadamente, otros países industrializados y también en desarrollo, con grandes esfuerzos, de manera muy responsable han venido pagando oportunamente sus contribuciones, si como esperamos, esa aptitud positiva continuara la situación podía ser crítica y desafortunada para los países necesitados.

En 1988 el Consejo normalmente sólo se reunirá a fines de año; en esas condiciones la administración tendría que hacer esos reajustes sometida a la autoridad limitada de los comités del Programa y de Finanzas. Valdría la pena que Francia concretara su propuesta sobre las funciones coyunturalmente ampliadas de los comités del Programa y de Finanzas. Pensamos que será necesario que esta Conferencia establezca una serie de prioridades alternativas para que los gobiernos señalen pautas a la Secretaría y ésta no tenga que proceder independiente aunque adecuadamente, como ha sido el caso de 1987.

La delegación de Colombia reconoce los esfuerzos del Director General por manejar una situación tan incierta y difícil como ésta. Se podría pensar en adelantar, por ejemplo, hacia la mitad de 1988 la reunión del Consejo, organismo que se ha establecido para ejercer las funciones de la Conferencia en el intervalo entre los dos años durante los cuales la Conferencia se reúne, o convocar una sesión especial del Consejo, como ya se hizo en 1974 para ocuparse en esa ocasión de los problemas de fertilizantes y de personal.

Por otra parte, tampoco sería aceptable que de antemano conviniéramos en que el primer contribuyente no va a pagar oportunamente sus contribuciones y así nos hiciéramos cómplices de esa actitud indebida. Al contrario, la delegación de Colombia considera que esta Conferencia debe apoyar las preocupaciones y los llamados del Consejo en el sentido de que todos los Estados Miembros, particularmente el primer contribuyente, tienen que cumplir oportunamente, sin retardos, los compromisos que adquieren con la Organización.

Durante la discusión de este tema estamos asistiendo a una singular paradoja: la FAO ha confirmado que es la Agencia líder del sistema en los campos de la agricultura y la alimentación. Nuestra Organización ha demostrado la eficacia de sus trabajos y la unánime aceptación que tiene en los países beneficiarios.

La consideración del primer tema de la Sala Verde, Comisión I, concluyó que es progresivamente grave y preocupante la situación de la agricultura y de la alimentación en el mundo. A los más altos niveles, los jefes de estado y de gobierno de los países industrializados siguen haciendo declaraciones en favor de la cooperación internacional y de la mejor atención a los problemas del Tercer Mundo. Entonces ¿cómo podríamos entender y aceptar que un importante y respetable país industrializado vaya a reducir sus contribuciones y otros se nieguen a apoyar este modesto nivel propuesto?

En contraste con esta paradoja existe una afortunada coincidencia: el gobierno de Colombia piensa que los Estados Unidos son uno de los países más importantes y respetables del mundo, con larga trayectoria en la cooperación internacional, y pensamos también que la FAO es una organización de excepcional transcendencia, porque la agricultura y la alimentación han ido adquiriendo progresivamente mayor significación en las economías de los países en desarrollo. Por ello el Gobierno de Colombia, al reiterar sus sinceros sentimientos de admiración y simpatía a los Estados Unidos, expresa la esperanza cierta de que ese país y todos los demás estados industrializados seguirán apoyando a la FAO, que representa tantas esperanzas para el Tercer Mundo.

En la última reunión del Consejo el representante del primer contribuyente dijo que el nivel propuesto era irreal. Esta expresión y su proveniencia confirman que será necesario jerarquizar las prioridades con base en las declaraciones que se han hecho en la plenaria y las opiniones expresadas -aquí.

Es lamentable, nos duele, que en pleno siglo XX toda una comunidad internacional constituida por 158 estados soberanos deba depender de la voluntad del Congreso de un Estado Miembro.

Como lo dijo la delegación de Colombia en la plenaria, será necesario esperar con cierto optimismo el futuro al tomar nota del cambio afortunado de posición de uso de las dos potencias mundiales, la Unión de Repúblicas Socialistas Soviéticas, que recientemente adoptó una actitud positiva y constructiva con relación al sistema de Naciones Unidas, hecho que ojalá pudiera significar el ingreso a la FAO de esa gran nación, lo cual consolidaría el carácter de universalidad de nuestra Organización. Cuando la Unión de Repúblicas Socialistas Soviéticas decida hacer uso de su derecho como miembro fundador de la FAO, el Gobierno colombiano estaría muy complacido y a lo mejor podrían cambiar muchas cosas.

Estaremos atentos a conocer y a analizar las propuestas que la delegación de Francia ha anunciado que presentará a la Comisión III. Mientras tanto, la delegación de Colombia opina que de los dos conceptos utilizados en este documento, uno el de continuidad, debe desaparecer y prevalecer el otro: innovación, para reducir o eliminar programas y actividades de baja prioridad, podar las ramas secas,

como se decía en el pasado, para tratar de atender demandas más urgentes y justificadas, nuevas prioridades que señalen los gobiernos. Los grandes esfuerzos de la FAO deben dirigirse al aumento de la producción agrícola. Apoyamos la aplicación del plan forestal en los trópicos y los programas de acción dimanantes de la Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros.

La delegación de Colombia apoya la acción de la FAO en favor del incremento de las CEPD y CTPD, así como una mayor asistencia y cooperación de nuestra Organización con las organizaciones regionales y subregionales. Las redes de cooperación técnica hay que fortalecerlas.

Ante la escasez de recursos corresponde a la FAO asistir a los países en desarrollo para que maximicen los medios con los cuales puedan sumar, racionalizar y utilizar mejor los limitados recursos de que disponen.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair would like to caution that the rules that guide our conduct and the instructions under which I am supposed to proceed make it clear that in the debate the speaker must confine himself to the question under discussion. We would advise that for the purpose of keeping our discussion going smoothly and for the purpose of doing the business which we are charged with doing, bear in mind that this is not a political forum, it is a technical body and we need to confine the remarks to those areas that we are here to work on. Henceforth, any references to the foreign policy of a country will have to be interrupted and we will have to put the speaker back on track. We are not a political forum, we are a technical body. I was not referring to any reference to the United States of America, I was referring to the one on the Union of South Africa. It is particularly difficult for the Chair to have to deal with this when a country is a non-Member country. For example, if the United States of America were to proceed and lecture about the foreign policy of the Soviet Union the Chair would, under the rules, have to intervene and stop that discussion because it is not relevant.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sí, Sr. Presidente. Voy a responder a sus observaciones con mucha calma y serenidad porque estoy enfermo. A raíz de la acalorada discusión que tuve con usted la semana pasada debí ir donde mi médico quien me dijo que yo sufría de reacción a la ofensa al espíritu democrático.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry Colombia, this is not a forum for the discussion of personal medical problems. The Chair is certainly grieved to hear that you are not well, had suspected as much, but that is not a point of order. In all seriousness, we have work to do and we must try to do it. The point that the Chair was making was simply that we should follow the rules, keep in order and proceed as orderly as possible. I must rule on a point of order. However, when what is claimed to be a point of order is simply an attempt to speak out of turn that is unfair to other countries and must be ruled out of order.

Yosef HASSEN (Israel): We request the right of reply.

CHAIRMAN: You had requested that earlier and the Chair indicated that that right of reply would be given to you. Under normal proceedings, which we would like to follow, the right to reply is given at the end of the day in which an incident occurred. It is sometimes impractical if a person who has to reply has not heard it. We would like to provide an early opportunity, however, for the

orderly conduct of business it may be better to deal with any rights of reply at the end of today's session, if that is acceptable to you and the other country which has requested the right of reply. In that way we can continue with the order of business and not become distracted by side issues. The Chair would now like to recognize Algeria for a point of clarification, for the purpose of completing its intervention on item 13.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Nous reprenons notre intervention au point où nous l'avons laissée vendredi soir.

En ce qui concerne le budget propose, notre délégation considère que la répartition des ressources sur les différents chapitres, programmes et sous-programmes pour le prochain biennium est, dans l'ensemble, rigoureuse et répond au critère des priorités.

C'est ainsi que nous apprécions tout particulièrement que la plus grande partie des ressources ait été affectée aux Programmes techniques et économiques, seul chapitre qui bénéficie ainsi d'une augmentation malgré la nécessité d'un budget en stagnation dicté par le refus de certains pays développés de renforcer le caractère multilatéral de l'aide au développement et par une conjoncture économique de plus en plus défavorable aux pays en développement.

Quant au Programme de coopération technique, et compte tenu de la sous-estimation des augmentations des coûts, notre délégation déplore la baisse des crédits alloués à ce chapitre. En effet, nous pensons que l'enveloppe prévue est bien en deçà des besoins réels tels que le révèlent les paragraphes 7 à 10 de la page 245 du document C 87/3. Ce succès du PCT exprime la satisfaction des pays utilisateurs pour l'efficacité des projets réalisés dans ce cadre. Mon pays se joint à cette appréciation positive et suggère que ce chapitre puisse bénéficier à l'avenir de ressources plus importantes.

Enfin, le niveau du budget proposé pour le prochain exercice est assez réaliste et notre délégation l'approuve malgré la charge d'une augmentation sensible de notre contribution du fait du barème des contributions et du taux de change probable qui sera appliqué.

Notre délégation regrette que certaines délégations, notamment de pays développés, aient exprimé leur refus ou exigé des changements comme condition préalable à toute approbation. Nous lançons un appel à ces pays pour qu'ils acceptent le consensus en contrepartie des efforts notoires du Directeur Général et des pays en développement pour que la vingt-quatrième session aboutisse à des résultats satisfaisants pour tous.

Mokhtak NAANANI (Maroc): Monsieur le Président, puisque je prends la parole pour la première fois, permettez-moi de me joindre à tous ceux qui, avant moi, vous ont félicité pour votre élection à la présidence de cette Commission.

Après avoir examiné attentivement le contenu de Programme de travail et Budget pour le biennium 1988-89 et écouté l'exposé lucide de M. Shah, ma délégation considère que ce programme est parfaitement équilibré et qu'il s'inscrit dans les orientations visant en priorité l'accroissement de la production agricole dans les pays en déficit vivrier, la protection de l'environnement et la gestion des ressources naturelles.

Le programme que nous examinons constitue, à notre avis, une résultante optimale compte tenu de toutes les nombreuses contraintes que rencontre notre Organisation.

Nous n'avons pas d'observation particulière à faire si ce n'est que le Programme de coopération technique devrait être davantage renforcé en raison de son haut niveau d'efficacité. La réalisation de ce programme est tributaire de la mobilisation des ressources qui lui sont allouées, et c'est la raison pour laquelle ma délégation insiste sur la nécessité des contributions des pays membres en temps voulu.

Je terminerai en réitérant l'appui total de ma délégation au Programme de travail et Budget pour 1988/89.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): J'aimerais d'abord remercier Monsieur SHAH de son introduction claire à ce très important point de l'ordre du jour.

Permettez-moi de commencer par quelques remarques concernant le Programme de travail proposé pour traiter ensuite du Budget.

Un premier point: La structuration et la présentation du Programme de travail ne font pas ressortir clairement comment les priorités sont établies et hiérarchisées. On semble essayer de couvrir tout le front agricole et alimentaire. C'est trop par rapport aux ressources limitées de la FAO tant humaines que financières. C'est trop aussi pour donner un message clair aux pays et aux populations concernés. Si nous voulons être réalistes, nous devons accepter le fait qu'il n'est pas possible de disperser les ressources et de faire du sur mesure pour tout le monde d'une part, et d'autre part, de demander un rapport coût/efficacité favorable. C'est à nous, pays membres, de choisir les priorités si nous voulons contribuer à renforcer l'impact des activités de la FAO.

Il s'agit donc à notre avis de mettre en valeur de manière optimale la riche expérience de notre Organisation pour développer et poursuivre une stratégie claire. C'est dans cette perspective que mon pays estime qu'un examen du rôle et de la stratégie à long terme de notre Organisation irait dans le sens du renforcement de la FAO, ce que nous avons déjà dit en plénière ainsi que dans notre dernière intervention au sein de cette Commission.

Dans sa tâche principale qui est la lutte contre la faim, la FAO agit trop en tant qu'agence d'assistance technique. Certes, cette assistance technique est indispensable, mais pour arriver aux résultats escomptés elle doit être conçue et mise en oeuvre au niveau des pays dans le cadre d'une stratégie plus globale de politique agricole et de développement rural, avec une priorité pour la sécurité alimentaire notamment.

Le rôle joué par la FAO dans ce domaine nous paraît aujourd'hui insuffisant, et d'autres agences telles que la Banque Mondiale par exemple tendent à se substituer à notre Organisation à cet égard.

Nos propositions de réformes visent donc à un renforcement durable de la FAO en matière d'analyse et d'assistance à la formulation et à la mise en oeuvre de politiques agricoles bien entendu dans le respect de la souveraineté nationale.

Permettez-moi maintenant de faire quelques remarques concernant les détails du Programme.

Il faudrait réduire les activités qui ne trouvent pas suffisamment de preneurs, par exemple dans le domaine des publications. Notre époque est submergée d'informations, et la capacité d'absorption est limitée. Il serait souhaitable, dans ce contexte, d'étudier l'audience rencontrée par les diverses publications de la FAO en vue d'avoir des critères rationnels.

Il serait cependant dommage de supprimer une publication telle que Idées et Action de la Campagne mondiale contre la faim, qui, selon notre expérience, rencontre beaucoup d'intérêt sur le terrain.

Il serait également intéressant de connaître la relation entre l'engagement des ressources financières et personnelles de la FAO pour la préparation et le déroulement des réunions et des conférences d'une part, et le solde des ressources disponibles pour la mise en oeuvre des programmes décidés par ces organes d'autre part.

Le processus actuel de programmation et de budgétisation, de même que la structure organisationnelle du Secrétariat sont peu transparents, et méritent d'être examinés en vue d'une réforme. Il est assez significatif que ni le Comité du Programme ni le Comité financier n'ont su apporter des modifications notables aux propositions de Programme du Secrétariat. Ceci ne correspond pas à l'intention de la Constitution de la FAO qui assigne à ces deux organes un rôle actif dans le processus de décision.

J'aimerais maintenant passer à la question du budget proposé. Permettez-moi de rappeler d'emblée que le niveau proposé du budget ne pose pas de problème particulier à mon pays. Nous apprécions les efforts déployés par le Secrétariat depuis la 91^{ème} Session du Conseil de ramener le budget à un niveau proche de la croissance réelle zéro par rapport au budget voté à la dernière Conférence. Il convient de noter cependant que le budget proposé représente une croissance réelle, par rapport au Programme de Travail 1986/87 effectivement exécuté.

Mon pays voit avec souci que les difficultés financières de notre Organisation risquent encore de s'aggraver. Dans ce contexte, nous lançons un appel à tous les pays concernés, petits et grands, pour qu'ils paient leurs arriérés. Nous constatons également avec regret que plusieurs pays, tant du Nord que du Sud, en raison de problèmes budgétaires domestiques, craignent de ne pas pouvoir assurer le paiement de leurs contributions au niveau du budget proposé.

Cependant, à notre avis, il est important de laisser au Secrétariat - l'exécutif de notre Organisation - la responsabilité de:

premièrement, nous proposer un budget qu'il considère comme réaliste dans la situation actuelle des choses,

deuxièmement d'assurer, une fois le budget approuvé, une gestion saine des ressources, c'est-à-dire, de veiller à ce que les dépenses soient en balance avec les recettes effectives.

Dans ce contexte, nous tenons à rappeler que le Fonds de roulement est prévu pour équilibrer la situation des liquidités à court terme et non pas pour échapper aux conséquences d'une aggravation sans perspective d'amélioration.

On nous annonce maintenant dans le rapport du Comité financier que le fonds de roulement sera viré en totalité au Fonds général à la fin de cette année pour combler le déficit de ce dernier; et on nous demande d'augmenter ce fonds en dehors du budget à un niveau de 20 millions de dollars, d'abord, et 26 millions de dollars plus tard. Une question à ce sujet: comprenons-nous correctement que la reconstitution des 13,3 millions de dollars de ce fonds au niveau actuel se fera sur les recettes des arriérés de contribution de l'exercice en cours?

Au taux actuel du dollar, le budget proposé plus l'augmentation du fonds de roulement, plus la reconstitution du Fonds de réserve spécial par une contribution extraordinaire de quelques 12 millions de dollars risquent en s'additionnant d'atteindre plus de 510 millions de dollars. En tenant compte de la diminution des recettes accessoires, les Etats Membres seraient donc appelés à contribuer au total à quelques 500 millions de dollars, soit une augmentation de 104 millions de dollars ou plus de 26 pour cent par rapport aux 396 millions de dollars de l'exercice en cours.

Vu les problèmes financiers de nombreux pays membres, il est difficile de voir dans le budget proposé la preuve du réalisme nécessaire. Que faire, alors, si les contributions des Etats Membres continuent à faire défaut? On nous dit que la FAO devra peut-être faire des emprunts. Mais sur quelles garanties? La FAO n'est pas propriétaire des immeubles qu'elle occupe. Us ne peuvent servir de garantie. Les pays membres devraient-ils donner cette garantie? S'il s'agit des pays qui ont des arriérés de contribution, qu'ils donnent cette garantie! Mais je doute qu'elle soit acceptée par les banques. Mon pays n'est certainement pas prêt à garantir des emprunts servant à compenser les contributions déficitaires d'autres pays. Comment, alors, assurer que, dans le futur, les recettes et les dépenses soient équilibrées? Nous ne blâmons pas le Secrétariat pour la situation financière difficile dans laquelle il se trouve aujourd'hui. Mais c'est le Secrétariat qui, en tant qu'exécutif, doit assurer la responsabilité d'une gestion saine. C'est donc lui qui doit formuler des propositions qu'il estime réalistes dans la situation actuelle. Cette responsabilité ne peut pas être assumée par les organes directeurs. C'est pour cette raison que mon pays doute de l'opportunité d'un "core-budgeting", tel que proposé par certains pays membres. Il faut ajouter qu'un "core-budgeting" pourrait encore réduire la discipline des contributions.

Deux dernières remarques concernant le budget. J'aimerais rappeler la suggestion de ma délégation, reprise par le délégué du Bangladesh, demandant à ce que le budget de l'Organisation soit mis à l'abri des fluctuations monétaires, et ce en choisissant comme base budgétaire un panier de monnaies, comme par exemple les droits de tirages spéciaux.

Enfin, concernant les coûts de soutien pour les programmes de terrain: selon le rapport de la 61ème session du Comité financier les dépenses totales d'appui pour l'ensemble des projets exécutés sous fonds fiduciaires, ont augmenté en 1986, de plus de 5 millions de dollars, pour atteindre 25,7 millions de dollars, soit 16,9 pour cent des dépenses d'exécution contre 13,8 pour cent en 1985. Le chiffre correspondant pour les projets PNUD s'élève à 22 pour cent. Cependant, seuls 13 pour cent sont à la charge du bailleur de fonds, le reste étant financé par le budget ordinaire.

D'une part cette subvention des activités financées sous fonds fiduciaires ou PNUD par le budget ordinaire ne nous semble pas justifiée; les coûts d'exécution devraient être intégralement à la charge des bailleurs de fonds respectifs. D'autre part, comme pays bailleur de fonds fiduciaire., important, nous ne pouvons pas accepter de prendre en charge une augmentation d'une telle ampleur sans justification détaillée. Nous pensons qu'il devrait être possible de rationaliser encore l'exécution de ces projets en vue de limiter leur coût d'exécution.

Anastase MUREKEZI (Rwanda): Je voudrais exprimer l'appui de la délégation rwandaise au Programme et au Budget proposés par le Directeur général de la FAO pour le biennium 1988-89. Ceci constitue un minimum acceptable pour que notre Organisation puisse continuer à remplir le rôle qui lui est dévolu et que tous les pays membres lui reconnaissent.

Les stratégies, les objectifs et les priorités contenus dans le document C 87/3 rencontrent mon approbation. Je regrette seulement que l'accroissement réel du budget ne soit que de 0,25 pour cent par rapport à la base révisée du biennium 1986-87 et que le programme de coopération technique soit maintenu à son niveau minimum pour le biennium 1988-89, à savoir le même niveau que le biennium qui est en train de s'écouler.

Concernant les représentations de la FAO dans la plupart des pays membres, je pense qu'un des moyens les plus sûrs d'assurer et de renforcer la décentralisation des activités de l'Organisation est de permettre aux gouvernements de se concerter- avec les représentants de la FAO sur place sur les orientations à donner aux programmes et aux projets de développement agricole, et sur les mesures d'ajustement éventuel à prendre d'un commun accord.

Mon pays apprécie hautement les services qui lui sont rendus par le bureau du représentant de la FAO à Kipali; et il est évident que le PNUD seul ne pourrait faire efficacement ce travail.

Pour ce qu'il en est des réformes, je voudrais me référer à la déclaration du Directeur général de la FAO à la Conférence quand il affirme que "comme toute entreprise humaine, la FAO est perfectible et qu'en réalité, elle se perfectionne sans cesse".

Les ajustements éventuels aux stratégies, aux objectifs et aux priorités de la FAO ne devraient en aucun cas remettre en cause les principes fondamentaux du rôle que doit jouer notre Organisation conformément à l'esprit de son Acte Constitutif.

La FAO est appelée à coordonner les efforts déployés au niveau international pour lutter contre la faim et la malnutrition dans le monde. Elle doit constituer une banque de données sur l'agriculture et l'alimentation; faire des analyses et proposer aux Etats des politiques de développement agricole à mettre en oeuvre.

Elle doit en plus exécuter des programmes de terrain dans le cadre de sa mission.

Toutes ces activités demandent des financements provenant surtout des versements de cotisations des pays, selon une formule de calcul des contributions tout à fait transparente.

Je n'ose envisager un seul instant que des versements des contributions puissent être subordonnés dans l'avenir à l'adoption et à la mise en oeuvre des réformes qui risqueraient de saper inutilement les bases de notre Organisation multilatérale.

J'en appelle donc à la sagesse de toutes les délégations ici présentes pour qu'un consensus soit dégagé de nos débats afin de proposer à la Conférence l'adoption du Programme de travail et du Budget pour le biennium 1988-89, tels qu'évoqués par le Directeur général de la FAO.

Tommie SJÖBERG (Sweden): In the late stage of the deliberations of this item I will be brief. Sweden welcomes the efforts made by the Director-General to further reduce the initially proposed real budget increase to a level of 0.25 percent. This increase is almost a zero real growth, but will

in our opinion still make it possible to implement the programmes. My Danish colleague gave an eloquent and distinctive description of what has to be done to make it possible for FAO to fulfil the mandates given by Member Countries. The Swedish delegation fully share his views.

As to the Programme of Work, as presented in the document before us and the excellent introduction by Mr Shah, Sweden - as was stated by our Minister - by and large supports the declared objectives of the work of FAO in the coming biennium. However, there are some areas of action I would like to comment upon.

Efficient and rational agricultural productivity will continue to be an important area. However, in this context other questions are becoming important for us to focus upon. The undesirable side effects of current production methods on flora and fauna, on ground water lakes and the ocean, put pressure on us to increase our monitoring of environmental effects. Avoiding environmental damage, both as a result of agricultural methods and from waste industrial production collection will be an important research question. In this context food quality is an area of increasing interest. Therefore Sweden welcomes the proposals as to research and development. However, in our opinion, more resources should be directed to biotechnology and environmental research.

Wise management of existing forestry resources would sustain food production, prevent floods and soil erosion, combat desertification, maintain water balance, environmental quality and so on. Afforestation would involve local populations and secure benefits for them. Good planning of the utilization of forests would furthermore contribute to the welfare of the national economy. As our Minister has stated, it seems that forestry has not been given its proper place within FAO's total Regular Budget resources for 1988-89. Only 4.2 percent has been allocated to Forestry. For the next biennium we request increased resources for Forestry. We are convinced that by a careful review of ongoing activities, resources could be allocated from other areas and sectors.

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to quite another matter. We note that among available personnel resources at FAO women are dramatically underrepresented. As far as we have been informed, there is presently not one single woman among FAO's country representatives, no women at ADG and D2 levels and only 5 out of 95 at D1 level. In our opinion FAO should take this into consideration and try to correct this imbalance when taking someone into its employ.

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO (México): Sr. Presidente, me gustaría compartir una reflexión que ha sido ya planteada por otros delegados, pero que debe recordarse una y otra vez en la conciencia de todos: pueblos y gobiernos.

Esta Organización fue creada para servir a la humanidad. Para servirla en el aspecto mas vital, mas íntimo a la dignidad humana que es el derecho a una alimentación suficiente y nutritiva.

No estamos aquí reunidos para negociar meras cuestiones financieras y económicas o sopesar indicadores de costo-beneficio. Menos aún para transar con fórmulas que dañen a la Organización, o que permitan encontrar pretextos para castigarla.

Aquí estamos debatiendo la manera de fortalecer el multilateralismo, de fortalecer a la FAO para que cumpla mejor su cometido conforme a sus principios y objetivos constitutivos, y de acuerdo a las necesidades y aspiraciones principalmente de los Países en Desarrollo. Así lo indica su propia Constitución.

Por eso, reclamamos que al discutir sobre estos asuntos programáticos y presupuestarios, pensemos primero en esos objetivos y en que nuestra actitud impactará, directa o indirectamente, la vida y perspectivas de progreso o de hambre de millones de personas. La Delegación de México tendrá siempre como límite de toda negociación el respeto a esos principios y objetivos de la Organización y la voluntad permanente de fortalecerla.

La Delegación mejicana' felicita a la Secretaría y al Comité del Programa, por el excelente trabajo que ha venido realizando en la preparación de la documentación que hoy analizamos, y al Dr. Shah por su brillante presentación del tema.

Sr. Presidente, reconocemos el gran esfuerzo de equilibrio y sensatez realizado por el Director General en la preparación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988/89, y el nivel presupuestario propuesto. Lamentamos, sin embargo, que a pesar de lo reducido de su aumento, el nivel presupuestario implicará, por efecto de la crisis monetaria actual, un esfuerzo extraordinario en muchos Países en Desarrollo, cuyas dificultades financieras les obligan a restringir estrictamente el uso de sus divisas y recursos.

Consideramos inequitativo que países como México, abrumados por el proteccionismo, por un comercio inestable y por el servicio de una deuda externa que nos sofoca, debamos cargar con el peso de los ajustes monetarios del dólar, moneda en relación con la cual la nuestra se devalúa día con día.

En este sentido, deseamos que queden bien claras las diferencias en las razones de los adeudos de diversos países y la naturaleza y condiciones de los compromisos futuros, no sólo para con la FAO, sino con todo el sistema de Naciones Unidas.

Subrayamos que las condiciones económicas entre los Estados Miembros son distintas y que los indicadores usados para distribuir cargas, son a nuestro juicio, obsoletos e inadecuados. Las condiciones económicas del mundo han cambiado radicalmente. De esa manera hay países que como el mío, deberíamos pagar mucho más al tipo de cambio de 1.350, mientras que otros, por lo general, países industrializados, pagarán menos. . Un análisis al respecto, lo realizó el distinguido Delegado de Filipinas.

Coincidimos con muchos otros países en que el Comité de Finanzas debe estudiar un mecanismo u otras alternativas para distribuir las cargas y así poder llevar a la práctica el Programa de Labores que consideramos vital para nuestra agricultura y alimentación.

Esperamos que a la actitud constructiva de nuestro país hospedante, Italia, secundado por otros países industrializados en su apoyo al Programa y Presupuesto, se unan otros Estados Miembros, cuya situación económica y monetaria les permite, si hay voluntad política, dar pasos adelante para respaldar un nivel de presupuesto más robusto en el futuro.

La Delegación mexicana solicita que los resultados del debate de este punto que ahora analizamos en la Comisión II, estén disponibles oportunamente para que la Comisión III aborde los asuntos administrativos y financieros del Programa, con el fin de que el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el próximo bienio se defina sobre la base objetiva de las contribuciones de los Países Miembros, incluyendo los aportes compensatorios como el que nos ha mencionado nuestro querido amigo el Embajador Pascarelli.

Estaremos también atentos en la Comisión III a las propuestas anunciadas por la Delegación de Francia. Nos unimos a otros delegados en el exhorto a países ahora observadores, a que consideren lo más pronto posible su ingreso a esta Organización como miembros de pleno derecho.

Sr. Presidente, no obstante las serias dificultades financieras por las que atraviesa mi país, la Delegación de México tiene el agrado de anunciar que, conforme al calendario de pagos previsto, el adeudo pendiente con la FAO lo saldaremos a partir de diciembre próximo.

Nos complace que se haya mantenido lo fundamental de los programas técnicos y económicos de la FAO, logrando inclusive su ampliación sobre la base de nuevas transferencias de recursos desde los sectores administrativos y de apoyo.

No obstante, habríamos deseado un programa más poderoso para atender las crecientes necesidades de seguridad alimentaria y de lucha contra el hambre, tan argumentadas, analizadas y reconocidas en las instancias técnicas y órganos rectores. Ello contrasta con la inflexibilidad de algunas delegaciones, que continúan exigiendo reducciones, cambios de prioridades y crecimiento 0. Reiteramos, en este sentido, nuestro rechazo al crecimiento 0.

Nuestra Delegación reconfirma su apoyo a las prioridades del Programa, particularmente a la seguridad alimentaria mundial, a la asistencia a los grupos más desfavorecidos en áreas rurales, y a la conservación y mejor aprovechamiento de los recursos naturales y recursos genéticos y a la protección del medio ambiente y la promoción de los cultivos autóctonos en las zonas con déficit de alimentos.

En vista de los últimos ajustes hechos para reducir el nivel del presupuesto y los análisis del Comité del Programa contenidos en el Documento CL 92/4, consideramos importante resaltar algunos elementos y reflexiones: expresamos nuestra conformidad con los ajustes hechos al Cap. de Política General y Dirección.

Respecto al Programa principal 2.1 Agricultura, respaldamos, en general, las metas a medio plazo, las estrategias y los medios de acción propuestos y nos congratulamos del énfasis dado a la CTPD, a la capacitación y a la biotecnología. Todo ello representa sucedáneos a la tendencia de largo plazo de polarización del sistema alimentario mundial con excedentes en algunas regiones y severas carencias en otras

Vemos con sumo interés, la buena voluntad de la FAO y CIRF por complementar sus actividades.

Insistimos en la necesidad de continuar con los esfuerzos para lograr el acuerdo general bajo el Compromiso Internacional sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos, e instrumentar el Programa de Trabajo de la Comisión de Recursos Fitogenéticos. Aceptamos con beneplácito las transferencias propuestas en los párrafos 7 y 8 del documento C 87/3 Supl.3.

Respaldamos el programa 2.1.3 y los cambios organizacionales propuestos para establecer el Grupo de Recursos Genéticos y el Grupo de Piensos en adición a un Grupo de Sistemas de Producción Pecuaria, dentro del Servicio de Producción Animal.

Recordamos que nuestra delegación, junto con otros países, hemos propuesto a la vigésimo tercera Conferencia de FAO, y también en los últimos Consejos la creación de un Comité Pecuario que integre funciones, análisis y foros hoy dispersos. Reconocemos las restricciones presupuestarias, pero consideramos que este paso, aunado a la creación de la Comisión Ganadera Regional para América Latina y el Caribe, coadyuvaría a dar una mayor consistencia a las actividades de fomento pecuario, y podría sustentarse en base a la liberalización de recursos y esfuerzos hoy atados a muchas y dispersas instancias.

Apoyamos las campañas emprendidas por la FAO para combatir las varias, pestes y enfermedades en colaboración y coordinación con diversos organismos.

Asimismo, reconocemos la prioridad y respaldamos el papel que la información, la investigación, la capacitación y el desarrollo de la biotecnología y la ingeniería genética tienen para abordar los problemas de producción, comercialización y promoción del consumo de alimentos. En abono del objetivo de propiciar la colaboración Norte-Sur, conminamos a la FAO a que, a través de los sub-programas respectivos, apoye la transferencia de tecnología apropiada y seleccionada cuidadosamente, y coadyuve al desarrollo tecnológico de los países en desarrollo, impulsando la capacitación y preparación de técnicos, dando mayor énfasis a la CEPD.

Nuestra delegación avala el Programa de Desarrollo Rural, en particular los subprogramas de capacitación, extensión y mercadeo. Coincidimos en la importancia de la comunicación para el éxito de los programas a nivel rural y subrayamos el compromiso que la Organización tiene en apoyar la labor de la mujer en el área rural.

A través del Programa de Nutrición, la FAO puede ayudar a los países en desarrollo, a desarrollar estrategias que elaboren producción y consumo, política agrícola y comercial con política alimentaria y de nutrición, objetivos nutricionales con normas que preserven la calidad nutritiva y sanitaria de los alimentos en bien del consumidor. Por ello, apoyamos también el Programa Conjunto con la OMS y el del Codex Alimentarius, que constituyen importantes instrumentos para coadyuvar el mercadeo de los productos agrícolas dentro de un marco apropiado y justo que evite además prácticas proteccionistas disfrazadas.

Felicitamos a la FAO por su respuesta de coordinación con la OMS, que toma forma y acción en el Grupo Consultivo sobre políticas de Alimentación y Nutrición.

Dentro del programa 2.1.8, le damos toda la relevancia a la continuación del estudio de la participación de las empresas transnacionales en la producción, comercialización y consumo de productos agrícolas y alimentarios. Bajo este programa deben continuarse estudios de caso por caso que permitan reconocer el papel de tales empresas y hacer recomendaciones generales a nivel de país para evitar sus múltiples efectos negativos y optimizar los positivos.

Nuestro Gobierno da gran importancia a la pesca. Apoyamos el programa 2.2 y los subprogramas relativos a la aplicación de la Estrategia y los Programas de Acción derivados de la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca. Hemos expresado al más alto nivel nuestro acuerdo con la mayoría de los aspectos ahí tratados. Sin embargo, debemos reiterar nuestro llamado a la solidaridad y búsqueda de un equilibrio, tanto en la ejecución de los diversos Programas de Acción, como en la debida equidad en su aplicación regional, en vista de que América Latina y el Caribe apenas reciben un 8,2 por ciento de los recursos extrapresupuestarios con que se financian los Programas de Acción. Estos a su vez tampoco encuentran la compensación adecuada en el Programa Ordinario.

Respecto al programa 2.3, nos congratulamos por la respuesta de apoyo al Plan de Acción en los trópicos y el reconocimiento general a la labor de la FAO como líder y coordinador del mismo.

Estamos de acuerdo con el cambio estructural propuesto para el Departamento de Montes, ya que sigue una lógica funcional acertada.

Respecto al Capítulo III, respaldamos la labor del Centro de Inversiones y su papel vinculante entre la FAO y los Bancos y Fondos de desarrollo.

Nos preocupan los recortes realizados a la Campaña de Acción en pro de la Liberalización del Hambre. Lamentamos que, a pesar de la expresión de numerosas delegaciones, particularmente de nuestra región, y del reconocimiento del Comité del Programa sobre la creciente complejidad del apoyo a los programas de campo por parte de la División de Desarrollo, no se plantee el reforzamiento de la Dirección de Programación de las Actividades de Campo que cuenta con un exiguuo personal, particularmente para la región Latinoamericana y del Caribe. Ello necesariamente se refleja en la desbalanceada atención que se da a nuestra región. Insistimos, por tanto, en que se tomen las providencias para modificar esta situación.

La Delegación mexicana se asocia a lo expresado por el Comité del Programa y a las numerosas delegaciones que en el Consejo y ahora han reiterado su decidido apoyo al Programa de Cooperación Técnica. Nos congratulamos de la valoración hecha sobre el riguroso manejo del mismo y nos oponemos a que, a pesar del reconocimiento de su eficiencia y la gran ayuda que significa para nuestros países, no se le permita elevar su nivel presupuestal.

Respecto a los Servicios de Apoyo, concordamos con los pasos previstos para seguir fortaleciendo el Programa de Información y Documentación, que se traducirán, con el tiempo, en una mayor eficiencia en la gestión de la Organización y mayor rapidez en el suministro de datos y análisis.

Con el fin de realizar un análisis a fondo de los recursos con que cuenta FAO y las necesidades que enfrenta, solicitamos que en futuras ocasiones se presente un documento consolidado de programa y presupuesto. Esa fórmula permitiría tener una mejor idea de la situación financiera de la Organización, así como precisar metas, racionalizar gastos, evaluar el impacto social y económico de las acciones emprendidas por FAO y una mayor vigilancia sobre finanzas.

Finalmente, Sr. Presidente, y lamentablemente, tenemos que volver a protestar por la forma poco democrática como está usted conduciendo los debates y porque no ha cumplido usted con los textos básicos en el manejo y la solución de las mociones de orden y el derecho al uso pleno de la palabra sin interrupciones. Apoyamos, en ese sentido a lo dicho por Argelia y Colombia.

Antonio BROTONS DIE (España): La delegación española expresa su felicitación a los Servicios Técnicos de FAO que han redactado un documento muy completo sobre el programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 88/89. Se observa en el documento C 87/3 un empeño, como en bienios anteriores, de reducir gastos administrativos a través de disminuciones en los programas de política general y dirección, programas de apoyo al desarrollo y servicios de apoyo. Esta circunstancia nos complace al ser reflejo de las observaciones realizadas por esta delegación en la última Conferencia General, y en los distintos periodos de sesiones habidos del Consejo de FAO entre aquella Conferencia y la que se está celebrando actualmente.

El aumento en términos reales del nivel de presupuesto ordinario para 1988/89, de tan sólo un 0,25 por ciento sobre el del bienio anterior, nos parece aceptable, aunque, sinceramente creemos que será difícil de ejecutar en sus estrictos términos en razón a la crisis financiera de la Organización, que ha obligado al Director General a proceder a ajustes en los programas del bienio 1986/87 en una cifra superior a los 25 millones de dólares.

Las circunstancias no han cambiado, más bien se agravan. Los países con cuotas pendientes de pago a la Organización siguen siendo muy numerosos, el dólar sigue devaluándose con respecto a la generalidad de las monedas, y los ingresos por intereses obtenidos de los depósitos de la FAO son cada día menores.

Si bien en reiteradas ocasiones esta delegación ha hecho un llamamiento a los países con cuotas pendientes para que se abonen, no es ocioso volver a reiterar aquí la necesidad del pronto abono de las cuotas debidas.

Queremos dejar patente nuestra oposición a aquellas medidas que tengan que adoptarse por razón de los retrasos en los abonos de cuotas que puedan representar directa o indirectamente mayores contribuciones de los países.

Por otra parte, y dado que la Organización satisface sus obligaciones en una gran parte en liras, volvemos a sugerir a la Organización a que la financiación por los países del presupuesto se satisfagan parte en dólares y parte en liras, que obvie el problema del tipo de cambio del dólar con respecto a la lira, dejando exclusivamente el problema de convertibilidad a una pequeña parte del presupuesto que pueda representar los pagos de FAO en otras monedas distintas al dólar y la lira.

En el tema 12, tratado en esta Comisión en días anteriores, hemos realizado una intervención en favor de la mejora del sistema de prioridades y de mayor transparencia del documento presupuestario. Creemos que un sistema de prioridades más estrictas pueden permitir ajustes automáticos a lo largo de la ejecución del presupuesto cuando las circunstancias lo aconsejen, facilitando así las decisiones del Consejo de FAO.

Entrando en el terreno de las prioridades, y desde un análisis del documento del programa de labores y presupuesto para el próximo bienio, manifestamos nuestro deseo ya expresado en la sesión Plenaria del pasado viernes, día 13, por el Subsecretario del Ministerio de Agricultura de mi país, de dar mayor importancia a los recursos fitogenéticos incluidos en el subprograma 2.1._2_.1 recursos genéticos, y mayor apoyo por FAO a los programas de pesca, a los que España presta atención muy preferente, habiendo recogido en sus programas nacionales todas las recomendaciones de la última Conferencia Mundial de Pesca.

De acuerdo, también, con gran número de países que ya han expresado este deseo, manifestamos la necesidad de atención preferente a los programas dirigidos a paliar el deterioro del medio ambiente. Es nuestro deseo que se tenga en cuenta por la FAO la atención a la erosión producida por los incendios forestales en el área Mediterránea, en razón del efecto devastador tan importante que suponen, y que se preste una atención también preferente a la especial silvicultura-Mediterránea.. En estos temas mi país está, como sabe la FAO, dispuesto a colaborar muy estrechamente.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): A estas alturas del debate, creo que soy el penúltimo orador, voy a ser extremadamente breve.

El programa que tenemos a la vista ha sido incluido en los métodos constitucionales previstos por la FAO. Ya se ha formulado por el Director -General pasando al examen del Comité de Finanzas y del Comité del Programa, y, en fin, del Consejo en varias revisiones.

Este programa contempla lo que se suele llamar un crecimiento 0. Desgraciadamente debido a la devaluación del dólar no es un crecimiento 0, sino un crecimiento negativo.

Nuestra delegación apoya completamente este programa debido a la forma y al consenso que tiene, pero quiere hacer sus reservas sobre el concepto de crecimiento 0. El desarrollo no puede tener un crecimiento 0 y el programa de la FAO está creado y pensado para ver la manera de apoyar el desarrollo del Tercer Mundo; para apoyar el desarrollo puede ser necesario en el futuro muchos esfuerzos, mayores de los actuales y, por lo tanto, en el futuro pensamos que el programa tiene que crecer, no estar disminuyendo como parece que hay unas tendencias en esta Conferencia.

Apoyo todas las prioridades que han sido formuladas en el Programa, especialmente la prioridad al sector de la actividad que se refiere a recurso fitogenéticos. Es nuestro convencimiento que los resultados de la investigación científica en forma libre y abierta tienen que ser puestos en común, sobre todo en beneficio de los sectores que más lo necesitan. Estas palabras las estoy leyendo del texto del discurso pronunciado hace dos días por Su Santidad y creo que reflejan perfectamente, digamos, esta prioridad sobre la que insistimos.

Insistimos también en la importancia del Programa de Cooperación Técnica para países pequeños como el mío; es posiblemente uno de los más útiles, o más útil de los programas de la FAO.

A estas alturas, debido a que tengo el uso de la palabra, quería contestar a la afirmación que usted, Sr. Presidente, hizo al terminar la intervención del Embajador Bula Hoyos. Usted afirmó que este Comité es un Comité técnico. No, Sr. Presidente, este es un Comité en el cual los miembros somos todos representantes de estados soberanos. Los temas son técnicos, pero el examen es un- examen racional, completo, en el cual no tenemos que tener ninguna forma de limitación. Por lo tanto, yo lo exhorto y lo exhorto por segunda o por tercera vez, por parte de mi delegación a que se atenga durante su dirección de los debates a los métodos usados en Naciones Unidas y en los organismos de las Naciones Unidas. De lo contrario usted nos va a obligar a presentar en la Plenaria nuestras preocupaciones y nuestros puntos de vista por haber sido destrozado el debate.

CHAIRMAN: The point made by the delegate of Colombia was not the point that you just made, nor did you represent what the Chair said accurately. The Chair did not say it is not a body of sovereign countries: of course it is. The Chair simply observed that the Rules of the Organization say that we are to stick to the topic on hand and not to engage in the political discussions that were about to commence there. The Chair simply observed what the Rules of the organization are and that we must operate under the Rules. If it is the wish of FAO at some future time not to have rules that is a decision to be voted on. But previously you established rules and they must govern our procedures.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Our delegation wishes first to congratulate the Director-General and the Secretariat for this documentation, also the Programme Committee, also to congratulate the Secretariat on its presentation. Given the way in which time is eluding us, the participants in this Commission II, I seek your forgiveness if in part very briefly my comments seem to reach across boundaries of specific agenda items. It simply means that we will not seek the floor again in some instances, unless it is absolutely necessary.

There is perhaps a kind of irony to our proceeding to debate this second item, the Programme of Work and Budget, and even perhaps when we get on to the next item, knowing without a doubt that in this Conference the overall outcome of debate on the various items is very much linked together. Nevertheless I will indicate the position of my delegation at this time.

In the first instance our delegation wishes to re-emphasize its objections, its non-support, for the suggestion that the Director-General and the Secretariat must now up-front make a distinction between a budgetary level based on the constitutional obligation of Member States and another level based on income shortfalls. more so when the scenario of this matter is obviously highly skewed given payment patterns from one or more major contributors. This is clearly no basis for future planning, especially when we are supposed to understand that every effort is being made to correct that situation, albeit with some difficulty. We note, however, the comments of the major contributor. Perhaps the way to proceed is not to assume that Member States will not meet their contributions but to put in place a mechanism for closer liaison activities between the Secretariat and the major contributors. We note that the major contributor has to divide the sum approved by its appropriate parliamentary process between 46 organizations. We feel that every effort must be made to impress upon the important decision-makers in that country that FAO, given its objective and its responsibility for sustaining the very existence of humanity, the right to life, that this Organization must be isolated and treated differently. Beyond this I do believe that in a real sense there ought to be unanimous endorsement of the prevailing point of view expressed in the Report of the Ninety-second Council Session, and I quote briefly: "The Council agreed that the proposals by the Director-General embodied a significant effort on his part to reconcile conflicting requirements and diverging expectations from Member Governments," while at the same time preserving the substance of FAO's Technical and Economic Programmes.

Our delegation endorses-fully this conclusion and urges that the Conference avoid divisiveness on the issue and support the proposals.

Even if we are to take a hard look at the Organization, the planning process and operational mechanisms, on which I trust we will be able to make some progress, let us all say Yes to the Director-General's appeal, when he says, inter alia, in his Introduction to C 87/3 that he has put forward his proposals "based on the premise that they (Member States) value and wish to enhance further the vitality of FAO's efforts."

Thereafter, by a mixture of understanding, good commonsense, facing up to reality and balanced reasoning, we must strive on what we can and will do about the future of FAO.

I cannot in all fairness take up time to repeat much of what has been said before but for the record my delegation simply wishes to emphasise overall support for the Programme of Work and Budget, and to indicate special support for programme and budgetary allocations of resources related to a few specific areas. I shall more or less list them. The main strategies under eight headings identified for world agriculture; action programme for the more productive and efficient use of land, water and plant nutrients on a sustainable basis and without degradation.

This is to emphasise a point made by my Minister in Plenary a few days ago in his address, in that all the evidence suggests the environment must now occupy a prominent niche in our agenda for development activities.

The Technical Cooperation TCP is also fully supported. There is no basis for reorientation. Our fear and concern is with the limitation on resource allocation.

The many elements of production, both crops and livestock programmes; in particular activities on farming systems, irrigation development, water development and management and programmes and projects related to technical support and advice to improve crop production and protection practice. I wish to emphasise that in this regard there must be no policy or programme decision which weakens our anticipated expectations from strong horticultural activity in developing countries. This is a vital area of the production thrust and it is impossible to overemphasise : the need for sustained resources in the development of planting material and production systems for indigenous and new food crops, in particular indigenous and adaptable roots, tubers, legumes and other food sources; for example, amaranthes or bhagi. We feel it is worth reading it into the records again since at a recent regional meeting in Santiago the expert staff was apparently unaware of the most valuable crop for some ecological zones.

Pest and disease management; efforts related to genetic resources seed development. Training, in rural extension and in all areas directed at expanding and improving human resource capability. Forestry, especially Tropical Forestry Action Plan. Women; training, special programmes; deeper intergration into the total development scenario. TCDC; the success in this direction will assist FAO in surviving reduced resources, as may occur from core budget sources. To promote self-help among developing countries. The benefits increase by geometric proportions in relation to the level of investment. Ultimately we may see project implementation with great cost savings.

I cannot but make reference to and support the suggestion made earlier that those countries which have benefited from the fluctuating exchange rates, with a remarkable spirit of generosity, may wish also to ease the burdens of those countries who have suffered a reverse.

I also wish to join Argentina and Mexico in expressing some concern with the indication that there may be some level of under-estimating the seriousness of problems in Latin America and the Caribbean. Hopefully the results of the regional study will help to reverse this trend.

Finally I close with appealing to you to use all your skills, together with the reservoir of negotiating expertise and goodwill and understanding in this Commission, to facilitate our proceeding towards a platform of consensus on crucial issues. You must virtually banish the process of voting from your thoughts. The issues are not of the nature which confrontation and voting by rollcall or secret ballot will solve. It does appear inevitable that we exploit the operational mechanism of a contact committee, or committees in which the spirit of compromise and a vision of the future will emerge, hopefully, in this time of need, so that we can send so to speak the FAO ship, with full financial and moral support, sailing through the current rough waters in this period of uncertainty onto the voyage to the next biennium, fuelled and directed by strong hands of multilateral cooperation, such as will be supportive of the original philosophical thoughts of the founding fathers of FAO.

Afzal QADIR (Pakistan): I would like to start off by congratulating you on your election as Chairman of Commission II. We would also like to commend Mr Shah for the clear and useful introduction he has given to this agenda item.

Thirdly I would like to express our support for the broad priorities, strategies and objectives of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 as contained in document C 87/3 and the relevant amendments and addenda.

Undoubtedly the budgetary exercise has been a particularly difficult and delicate one this time. In view of the resource uncertainties facing the Organization arising from the depreciation of the dollar, decline in miscellaneous incomes and, above all, non-payment of contributions by many member countries. In spite of these difficulties we have a document before us which we find ourselves to be in broad agreement with and we hope we will be able to arrive at a consensus on it.

We fully subscribe to the basic features and parameters of the proposed programme. First, because of its size which, given its very modest dimensions in comparison with the enormity of the needs, one can readily subscribe to. The programme represents the very minimum of work that this Organization should be undertaking.

As regards growth in size over the past biennia, one notes that the Organization has achieved virtually zero growth, or even negative growth. It is also a matter of satisfaction that attempts are being made to cut down on some administrative and support costs while maintaining and even enhancing the technical contents of the programme.

As for the suggestion that the FAO should prepare a core budget, we are of the view that it is a questionable proposition since it would appear to encourage non-fulfilment of obligations on the part of Member States.

As I have earlier said we endorse the Programme of Work and Budget as it stands. We also subscribe to the broad thrust of strategies, objectives and priorities envisaged in it, stressing at the same time the importance of promoting training and technical cooperation amongst developing countries. In this connection we would wish to commend Turkey for the very useful proposal and the generous offer it has made regarding the possibility of setting up a centre of training on agriculture and rural development in Turkey. The modalities of setting up such centres with FAO assistance should be further examined.

Looking at the programme in its totality we would like a special focus to be given to small farms and to aspects of nutrition.

As regards sector and sub-sector activities, we would like to support in particular the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, the Fisheries Programme and activities in the fields of seed production, soil conservation, water development and management and control of waterlogging and salinity. Allied to the general question of seeds we wish to see the strengthening of the work of FAO's commission on Plant Genetic Resources.

We also commend the priority being recommended in the Programme of Work and Budget to biotechnology, in view of the tremendous potential it holds as a weapon against hunger and food problems in the world but at the same time, in view of also the potential problems that could arise in a world dominated by biotechnology, we foresee in the immediate future a need for an international code of conduct on technology similar to the codes already adopted on food security and pesticides.

I would like to conclude by saying that the preparation of the budget, as well as its examination and approval, are difficult exercises in which the really difficult question is not whether this or that activity should be undertaken, the really difficult question is what is it that should not be undertaken or should be scaled down. While we have all along been stressing the need to cut down on unnecessary documentation, meetings, publications, posts, it would appear that in our proceedings we have not been able to say enough as to what should be cut or deleted. But here we may perhaps trust that such questions have already been thrashed out in bodies such as the COAG, COFI, COFO, the Programme Committee etc. Nevertheless the broad question still remains of whether the Programme of Work and Budget as proposed herein would maximise the all important catalytic effect or multiplier effect of the programme because without that this programme is but an insignificant drop in the ocean.

All said and done, we believe that we can reaffirm our confidence in the FAO and its proposed Programme of Work and Budget while at the same time expressing our desire to see the maximum impact of the programme in terms of the catalytic effects it produces and the reduction in its delivery costs. We think there is no crisis in confidence in the FAO, nor in its aims and objectives and we can reaffirm that confidence by adopting by consensus this Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

McDonald Phillip BENJAMIN (Dominica): Since it is the first intervention of the delegation of Dominica in this Commission we would like to add our voices to those who have congratulated you on your Chairmanship. We also wish to congratulate Mr Shah on his very excellent introduction.

My delegation views this Programme of Work and Budget as a balancing act that equates pressures of demand from Member States and the realities of financial budgetary resource constraints. One merely has to sit in some of these committees, Fisheries, Agriculture, World Food Security, and at other committee meetings, the countries rightly expressed their demands for greater involvement of FAO in such fields as, for example, dryland farming and so on. Therefore, I think we can say that this whole Programme of Work and Budget is characterized by stringency and selectivity.

FAO has given great attention to the pre-investment or earlier stages of the project cycle. This is done at three levels. First, there is a planning advice to governments by agricultural advisers in different countries. Secondly, there is the Technical Cooperation Programme, which in part is devoted to the execution of feasibility studies of a short-term nature.

I should like to mention that this special appeal that TCP has to these countries is based in part upon the degree of flexibility and the speed to which FAO can respond to their very urgent needs.

The third dimension of this matter is the work of the FAO Investment Centre which, in assisting governments to prepare and identify projects, has built up a core of knowledge and expertise that is unmatched in any other part of the world. However, my delegation would have wished to see the FAO proceed a little further along the project cycle. The major challenge facing governments of developing countries arises from the problems facing them in the implementation of agricultural projects. This applies specifically to multi-sectoral projects such as rural development projects which require the close coordination of many different agencies. This is different from the straight-line type of project such as agricultural credit, or irrigation projects which may not require the type of coordination that is needed for rural development projects.

The problem is that planners in developing countries do not see project implementation as part of their responsibility. Yet, we are aware that these delays in project implementation involve cost and time overruns and they imply delayed benefits from projects.

This refers to both projects domestically financed and those which are externally financed. Yet, rural development projects represent the hopes of many countries committed to fight against rural poverty. Here, performance has not met the expectations which were fired by Mr McNamara's famous Nairobi speech of 1972 where he spoke of the world's 40 percent poor. We are sure that both donor and recipient countries would welcome whatever assistance FAO can give to the developing countries in this area of programme and project implementation.

Lastly, the delegation of Dominica supports strongly the statement by Argentina, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago in which concerns are expressed about the share of resources devoted to the Latin American and Caribbean region in the various programmes it executes.

Alex Louis TANIS (Haïti): Je commencerai par vous présenter mes félicitations pour votre brillante élection à la tête de cette assemblée; mes félicitations s'adressent également à Monsieur Shah, au Comité du PiDgramme et au Secrétariat technique pour la qualité des documents qui nous ont été soumis. Quant au programme de travail qui couvre toutes les disciplines des productions animales et végétales, il représente à mon avis un dossier extrêmement complet mais peut-être ambitieux quant à sa réalisation dans les conditions économiques difficiles dans lesquelles se débat l'Organisation.

Etant donné le temps imparti à chaque délégation pour présenter sa communication, je me bornerai à formuler de brefs commentaires sur des points précis.

J'examinerai d'abord le Programme et le Budget. Concernant l'autosuffisance, le Programme tel que présenté serait de nature à satisfaire les préoccupations des Etats Membres si un accent particulier était porté sur l'autosuffisance alimentaire, ce qui entraîne la mise sous irrigation effective de certaines régions irrigables de nos différents pays ainsi qu'un appui beaucoup plus efficace à la

pêche et à l'aquaculture pour arriver à compenser les déficiences protéiques de la diète de nos populations. Concernant la formation, un appui tout particulier a été apporté à la formation formelle et informelle oeuvrant sur le terrain. En ce qui concerne l'indication et le choix des moyens susceptibles d'équilibrer notre balance commerciale par l'exportation, compte tenu de la chute des prix des matières premières sur tous les marchés mondiaux - je pense que c'est définitif - et quel que soit l'appui porté au développement des productions animales et végétales, et si une certaine parité n'est pas réalisée concernant les prix des produits manufacturés et ceux des matières premières afin de soulager la balance économique des Etats Membres, je pense que la promotion socio-économique des pays en développement restera définitivement le mensonge de ce siècle de la vitesse et de la révolution atomique.

En ce qui concerne la coopération, le Programme de Coopération technique, la délégation haïtienne exprime sa déception sur le fait que le programme n'ait pas été augmenté. Elle estime que le PCT, qui est appelé à libérer des fonds pour l'exécution et la mise en application de projets ponctuels et de toutes les autres activités susceptibles d'améliorer le revenu et le niveau nutritionnel des populations, est un effort méritoire en direction de cet objectif.

La délégation haïtienne lors de l'examen du Programme de travail et Budget, en particulier au niveau de l'Amérique latine, ne peut s'empêcher d'apporter son appui le plus complet aux propositions formulées par les délégations qui se sont succédées à cette tribune, en particulier du Mexique et du Venezuela.

La proposition faite par le Venezuela exprime sa préoccupation à propos de la participation de la femme dans tout programme de développement régional. En effet, la participation de la femme est primordiale si on tient compte de la tâche qu'elle accomplit au sein du foyer et dans les activités de production, particulièrement au niveau de la commercialisation.

La délégation haïtienne apporte son soutien le plus total à la position de la délégation du Mexique souhaitant créer un comité de l'élevage. Etant donné que dans tout programme de promotion agricole, et compte tenu du fait que c'est une agriculture mixte (c'est-à-dire agriculture et élevage) qui est pratiquée par la plupart des pays, exception faite des grands pays latino-américains, la délégation haïtienne accorde une importance toute particulière à la promotion de l'élevage étant donné qu'on ne peut améliorer les productions agricoles sans arriver à une intégration agri-élevage.

Elle pense également que dans tout programme de conservation des sols, et plus particulièrement des zones montagneuses, aucune activité valable ne peut être réalisée sans le contexte d'une agriculture "conservationniste", réalisant harmonieusement l'intégration agro-sylvopastorale.

Je dirai enfin que le rôle de l'élevage est prioritaire car il permet à nos populations paysannes de réaliser des rentrées quotidiennes au niveau de la vente des oeufs, du poulet et de la viande qui leur permettent de mieux équilibrer leur budget et de mener une vie beaucoup plus humaine.

En ce qui concerne le paiement de la contribution des différents Etats, la République d'Haïti se permet de dire que, compte tenu des conditions économiques extrêmement précaires dans lesquelles elle vit depuis exactement la chute de l'ancien régime, la République d'Haïti a su faire face à ses obligations envers la FAO sur le doublement du paiement de sa participation aux frais de fonctionnement de sa représentation locale et à sa contribution à l'Organisation. Aussi la délégation haïtienne lance-t-elle un appel à tous les Etats Membres qui ne se sont pas acquittés de leurs obligations envers l'Organisation pour qu'ils le fassent à leur meilleure convenance.

Enfin, la République d'Haïti réaffirme une fois de plus sa confiance dans les objectifs de la FAO et appuie le Programme de travail et budget tel qu'il a été présenté par la Direction.

Qu'il me soit permis en conclusion de féliciter la Direction de la FAO ainsi que ses collaborateurs de la persévérance apportée à la promotion technique, sociale et économique des Etats Membres, comme au renforcement des moyens d'étude, de conseil et d'intervention.

Sra. María Eulalia JIMENEZ (El Salvador): La labor de la FAO se inscribe en los esfuerzos concretos para luchar por la paz y resolver los problemas económicos y sociales de la población rural al elevar los niveles de nutrición y la eficiencia en la producción y distribución de alimentos, contribuyendo con esas acciones al mejoramiento de la calidad de vida y a la expansión de la economía mundial.

En esas materias, la FAO enfrenta una tarea monumental con relación a sus recursos, pero acorde con su importancia y con los altos propósitos consignados en su Constitución

Los países en vías de desarrollo tenemos como denominador común una estrecha vinculación con el factor tierra en tanto fuente generadora de riqueza social y crecimiento económico. En el contexto de las actuales relaciones económicas internacionales, ello implica que debemos enfrentar, y la FAO con nosotros, la acentuada caída de los precios reales de nuestros productos agrícolas, forestales y pesqueros en un mercado precariamente estable, cuando mucho. El recurso inexorable y creciente de productos químicos y de tecnología para incrementar la productividad, procurando renovar al mismo tiempo los recursos naturales y enfrentando la degradación de la calidad del suelo.

Lo anterior, Sr. Presidente, aunado a la inexcusable falta de correspondencia entre la oferta y la demanda de alimentos, vuelve perentorio el apoyo decidido de los Estados Miembros para los programas que esta Organización lleva adelante, porque, tal como se ha comprobado en los últimos años, la FAO ocupa un lugar de orden primordial para asegurar que los pueblos puedan en cualquier momento contar con los alimentos básicos que necesitan. Esa estructura de seguridad alimentaria, en la que la FAO cuenta ya con resultados tangibles y alentadores, es el mecanismo imprescindible para enfrentar la realidad demográfica y las situaciones de emergencia. En este orden de ideas, Sr. Presidente, es que la Delegación de El Salvador quiere manifestar su total apoyo al programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1988/89, y los objetivos a plazo medio que nos han sido presentados en forma excelente por el Sr. Shah y sobre el cual, con amplitud, se han referido otras delegaciones, de las cuales queremos recalcar las intervenciones de Panamá y México, en especial en lo que se refiere al Programa de Capacitación Técnica, a la necesidad de lograr una mayor asistencia a la región de América Latina y a la importancia de una mayor participación de la mujer.

Confiamos, Sr. Presidente, que la Conferencia aprobará por consenso este Programa de Labores y Presupuesto.

Hacemos un llamado a todos los miembros para que hagamos un nuevo esfuerzo y paguemos, a la mayor brevedad, nuestras obligaciones para con la Organización.

Reza ASKARIYEH (Iran, Islamic Republic of): On behalf of the delegation from the Islamic Republic of Iran and myself I would like to express my deep appreciation of the elaborate piece of work being done by Dr Shah, the Director of the Programming and Budgeting of FAO.

Concerning the budget of the Organization I would like to state on behalf of the Iranian Delegation that a growth of almost zero for the biennium 1988-89 cannot be satisfactory to meet the demands of the developing countries towards self-sufficiency. I would also like to mention that measures such as cancellation of some 170 posts, cancellation of some very important meetings and the reduction in the number of publications would directly influence the advisory and training services being posted to the Third World countries. We believe that Member Nations wish their prosperity and efficiency in FAO's activities and want this Organization to achieve success in the eradication of hunger among the needy Member States. The recent shortfall in the value of the dollar does not guarantee any security for the requested budget. Under these circumstances it would be wise if we focused our targets upon selecting priorities concerning the short, medium and long-term objectives. Among these measures implementation of large projects such as water management, soil conservation, forestry productivity and fisheries are worth mentioning.

In the context of research and investigation in natural resources we have a sincere belief in this conception in all agricultural areas and the fundamental role it plays in FAO's activities. There still exists a great gap between the requirements of the developing countries and what has so far been done by FAO. We do support the Sub-Programme 2.1.4 of document C 87/3 (Page 69) and still hope that in future much more attention will be paid to this subject, and FAO's activities should continue further in this regard.

One more point which I would like to draw the attention of FAO to is the possibility of establishing a research station for Asia and the Pacific for rain-fed agriculture since by referring to paragraph 8 on page 271 of document C 87/3 which I quote: "...seventy percent of the cropped area is still under rain-fed conditions." Considering this point we would like to suggest a promotion in the scale of TCDC contributions to Member States, since utilization of natural potentials and achieving self-sufficiency requires technical manpower, and as a consequence well-developed training, our delegation would like to suggest more active and efficient cooperation of foreign experts in transferring their experience and expertise to further extension of ECDC and TCDC contributions.

Frankly speaking, if we do have faith in the elimination of hunger and poverty among the Third World Countries, - and we do pay respect to McDougall's aim to remedy their universal poverty - we also come to this conclusion: that we cannot build another responsible organization to fulfil FAO's undertakings.

Now that the establishing of yet another such Organization is not wise and plausible, it is our task to push this present FAO towards prosperity by orientating it to the best accomplishment of its duties. In this regard we would like to suggest that any cease or stagnation in the activities of the current projects could terminate to a failure for FAO. So in the short term host countries should carry out their contributions jointly with FAO in their projects. In the medium term, as we have already proposed, the establishment and increase in the number of country representations, as stated in document C 87/3, page 221, under the title of Major Programme 3.4 - are badly needed.

These measures would direct us to rely more upon our own potentials and as a result the devaluation of US Dollars would not affect our programmes. In this respect we do believe that the slogans supporting the elimination of universal hunger do not accord with continuous fluctuations in the value of currencies as a plain thing to exploit the natural potential of the developing countries and push them further towards dependency. As His Excellency, Dr Saouma, states: "The challenge of world hunger remains as great and compelling as ever. The number of the world under-nourished is still on the increase." In the long run we would like to suggest the creation of a regional session to seek an appropriate solution to the regional economic crisis. Following that an international session should be held for the evaluation and adoption of the resolutions taken here.

One more point worth mentioning. The participation of high experts as consultants from countries outside their region - the proposal which was posed by some developed countries - we strongly believe that the Member Countries of the region are capable enough to find their demands and their measures how to meet them.

In conclusion we want to reiterate: to be passive and domineered by others are no longer acceptable and sensible measures. The cry of the oppressed nations with their open and hungry mouths can no longer be tolerated. Let us do something to reply to the needs of the needy people.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): First I must thank Mr Shah for his clear, lucid and interesting introduction of this item on our agenda. My delegation certainly has a somewhat clearer perception of the thinking behind the present budget proposals after having heard him. That we still have some questions may perhaps be more a result Of having followed another train of thought than of him not having explained his quite fully.

Let me at the outset inform you that my delegation does not have problems with the level of the proposals and let me make it quite clear what we understand this to mean. First, in 1988 we have the proposed programme expenditures and then we have the replenishment of Working Capital Fund, and then the replenishment of Special Reserve Account. Together, we understand this means a level of US Dollars 516 million, representing an increase in contributions from Member States of 18 percent over the next year. In addition there is in the proposed Budget a substantial reduction in the forecast of interest earned on reserves, a reduction which will be covered by assessments on members and actually amounting to 7 percent of the assessment of the last biennium. We therefore seem to have a total increase of assessments of 25 percent in US Dollars for next year, which will affect all members. But the effect on individual members in terms of their own currency will of course also depend on the movements of the currency ratios, which for many members will mean higher increase in their assessment.

My first question is to seek confirmation or correction of my view that all members for the coming biennium will have a 25 percent increase in their assessments, in dollar terms. There might be one unfortunate side-effect if the assessments were to be increased by this magnitude. We are now looking at some considerably increased burdens on members which may for some members prove so onerous that it might lead to an increase in the arrears in members' contributions.

This leads to the next point that my delegation wishes to raise. A budget has, as a plan for our economic activity, two sides: income and expenditure. Indeed this is spelled out in the Financial Regulations as in III.2, where it is stated that "the budget estimates submitted by the Director-General shall cover income and expenditures".. I have already mentioned the 7 percent shortfall in interest income, but there is another expected shortfall that is much more serious - the nonpayment or only partial payment of their obligations by members. In an earlier intervention under another agenda item, I stated that it was unacceptable that legally incurred obligations are not met, and met in full. For the record, I wish to repeat it here. However, when producing estimates of incomes it is impossible to close our eyes and ears and not heed what the largest contributor to the regular budget told us very clearly last week: there will be a large shortfall in his assessed contribution.

In addition we have what I may call empirically expected shortfalls - shortfalls that may well be increased as a result of the large increase in the burdens on member countries in the next biennium, in a situation where many, and in particular many developing countries, find themselves in unprecedented economic straits.

My second question is in two parts. Does the Secretariat agree that there is a large difference between theoretically computed and realistically expected income next year? If the answer is yes and if we have this foreseen shortfall, how does the Secretariat think this can be covered? When planned expenditures are larger than income there are classically only three ways to deal with the situation. You cut your expenditures, you resort to borrowing or you draw down on the reserves. Anything else would demand some creative accounting indeed.

Let me dwell for a moment on the possibility of borrowing. Here there are two possibilities: internal borrowing or external borrowing. Internal borrowing means borrowing from the Working Capital Fund and that Fund is directed by the Financial Regulations, where 6.5 (a) states, and I quote, "Advances from the Working Capital Fund to finance budgetary expenditures shall be reimbursed from the general fund as soon as possible, but in any case within the next financial period, by programme adjustments if necessary."

From this and from other parts of the Financial Regulations it is clear that the Working Capital Fund is intended to be a buffer for very short-term financial problems - normally cash flow problems. But it is not a cash flow problem where money is foreseen not to flow at all and where reduced income is expected over a longer term, perhaps over a considerable period of time. For this the Working Fund was never intended and it would be against the spirit of the Regulations so to use it.

My third question is therefore: Would it be inappropriate in the Secretariat's view to use the Working Capital Fund in such a situation as we are here confronted with? If not, how it is intended to be replenished so as to meet the stipulations of Financial Regulation 6.5 (a)? .

Concerning the external borrowing, my delegation is quite aware that the Director-General has the legal authority to engage in this type of operation, but this authority will fall upon him, so far as my delegation is aware, with the intention of meeting a temporary cash flow problem - for example, the need to meet a catastrophic situation in a member country, or needs that have come up because of an unexpected embarrassment in the cash situation. In fact the conditions are very much like those for which the Working Capital Fund was created. Let me state very clearly that my delegation is strongly advising against the use of the borrowing authority in the present situation; and if this is done it will not agree to share in the responsibility for this decision.

The second possibility-to meet a shortfall by drawing down reserves - seems to be of theoretical interest only, unless the Organization has reserves that have not come to be expressed in the documents before us.

Let me now turn to the last solution, when expenditures will not be covered by the resources, and that is to reduce the expenditures themselves. This can be done either by more cost effective execution of activities or by a reduction of activities.

I stated at the outset that my delegation could accept the proposed budget level, implying therefore that we can accept the Programme of Work, containing some activities which we strongly support, and also some which we do not rate so highly.

To give some examples, we believe the Early Warning System to be most important and we would like to see it expanded and refined. Action in regard to tropical forests, work on fisheries sectors and the work of women are all of great importance. The Codex Alimentarius Commission is a useful instrument to help reduce non-tariff business and to facilitate trade. FAO's ongoing activities in the collection, analysis and dissemination of basic data and information are very valuable and we generally favour what we see as meaningful cost-effective development activities.

On the other hand, my delegation believes that the trend of increasing country offices should be levelled off at least until the Organization finds itself in a better financial position. We also believe that FAO's work at the regional level could be organized in a more cost-effective manner.

I have indicated just some of my delegation's preferred areas of emphasis for FAO's activities, but there are others. The budget lists several more, but what troubles my delegation is precisely that they are areas of emphasis, not priorities in the sense of being set up for sequential execution. This becomes important when income is unsure. When we know what money we have we can state what activities we want to use it for. The order in which we state priorities does not really matter then: it is unimportant. But in our present situation when we do not know, except that we know it will not be enough, either you must implement your plans according to a priority order or you cut something from several of them, making either linear or discretionary cuts. When presented with a budgetary proposal it is essential to be told before deciding what the intentions are in our present situation and to be told what, if any, internal priorities will be cut and whether there will be linear or discretionary cuts. If so, how would they eventually be applied?

In part, the difficulties which the Organization will meet in the coming biennium stem from the current fluctuations of currency rates. My delegation therefore favours the studying of this problem in the appropriate organs. At the outset we would be inclined to favour a contribution split in two currencies: 60 percent in lire and the rest in US dollars. This seems to us at the moment to be the most logical solution, since 60 percent of the expenses of this Organization is paid out here in Rome, whereas the dollar is still probably the most useful unit of account globally. But we would await further discussion before taking a final stand upon the issue.

In the documents before us we learn that "continuity" and "innovation" are the twin elements which have guided the determination of programmes and the formulation of proposals.

Unfortunately there seems to be almost all 'continuation' and not much 'innovation'.

We are all aware of the present environmental problems which are facing agriculture all over the world. I will not go into details on this subject, but just refer to the Report of the World Commission on Environmental Development. I also refer to the statement by Norway in Commission I on Thursday.

My delegation believe that combatting environmental problems will be one major challenge also to FAO in the coming years. Unfortunately we do not see the possibilities of this truly reflected in the Programme of Work and Budget. This is maybe one of the clearest examples of why we feel that there is a need for a general discussion of FAO's priorities. During the present procedure of work there is all too little focus on the change taking place. There is too little strategy-thinking and because of this the process brings out too much continuity and too little innovation.

Let me again stress that the intention of Norway and of the Nordic countries when we are presenting our ideas of possible reform is not to reduce FAO's budget. The technical assistance provided by FAO is relatively small in quantitative terms. We therefore strongly believe that the needs of the member countries are best served by thorough consideration of what FAO is uniquely qualified to do and direct the budget accordingly.

The meeting rose at 12.50 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 50

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.50 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/9

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

NINTH MEETING
NEUVIEME SÉANCE
NOVENA SESION

(16 November 1987)

The Ninth Meeting was opened at 14.45 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La neuvième séance est ouverte à 14 h 45,
sous la présidence de :Fred J. Eckert, Président de la commission II

Se abre la novena sesión a las 14.45 horas
bajo la presidencia de Fred J.Eckert, President de la comision II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-1989 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)

13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et objectifs à moyen terme (suite)

13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y objetivos a plaza medio (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to call the meeting's attention to the fact that some members have observed that sitting amongst the delegations are some representatives of the Organization. We would ask anybody who is not a member of a delegation please not to occupy seats reserved for members of this Organization. There are seats for the press in an appropriately marked spot, and there are seats for members of the UN specialized agencies at appropriately marked spots and there are seats for observers.

Lutf AL-ANSY (Yemen Arab Republic)(original language Arabic): First of all I should like to extend my congratulations to you and wish you every success in conducting our debates.

My country would also like to extend its thanks to the Secretariat for the excellent documents that have been put before us. Allow me to support a statement made by my country's Head of delegation in the Plenary. He expressed our support for the Programme of Work and Budget and for the objectives which have been laid down and set out by the FAO. However, there is one point of clarification. To our mind the programme represents the absolute minimum that can be undertaken, particularly given the current circumstances and the probable difficulties that lie ahead. The documents before the Commission, and the negotiations which have taken place within the Commission, show the agricultural situation as it is in the world, and also give an indication of the difficulties that we have to confront. Therefore, we feel that we should do our utmost to coordinate our efforts to support FAO in order that FAO might achieve its objectives and be able to meet our expectations in a way that gives satisfaction to all the Member States of the Organization.

For this reason we would ask that all countries pay their contributions and live up to their financial undertakings. Similarly, we should like to appeal to all countries which can set up their financial support to the Organization to do so.

The FAO ultimately seeks to promote international cooperation in agriculture and food supplies. The FAO is there to meet the expectations of Member States and for that reason it deserves the support of the Member States. I shall confine my remarks to that in order to give time for other delegations to make their statements.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): Somehow I seem to have lost what I thought was my place in the queue, I am not complaining. It has been a very interesting discussion and listening to it I have been struck by the wide range of suggestions for modifications in the Programme of Work and Budget, both for increases for some items and decreases for others. Of course, not all the suggestions have gone in the same sense. However, what has happened suggests to me in turn that it is a pity that Member States were not able more effectively to put their views on all these matters at a much earlier stage. I will come back to that point later.

Now for my more prepared remarks. The United Kingdom does not waste time in formal congratulations but I do want to thank Mr Shah for so clearly introducing this item. However, I am disappointed that the management have not succeeded in meeting the formal request, which I renewed at the end of the Council discussion, for a detailed statement by sub-programme of actual and expected cash outturn for the present biennium. In fact, we have been pressing for these figures, without success, for over three years.

Why is this important? It matters in any case because, as Mexico pointed out, there is a clear need for better financial monitoring. It matters especially now because only with those figures can the Conference see what we are really being asked to approve for 1988-89 and set that side by side with what is actually now going on. Only those figures will show us what programmes are

lagging, what flexibility there is if the financial crisis is prolonged, and indeed what priorities, in the sense used by Norway, actually underlie the proposals in the Programme of Work.. Australia rightly drew attention to the comments of the External Auditor on the deficiencies of the present arrangements. We think those should be remedied. Management did tell us, however, at the Council that the actual spending of our contributions, the signing of cheques, could continue for one complete year after 31 December 1987 and for two complete years for the TCP. In other words, the last TCP cheque stemming from the authority of the present budget need only be signed by 31/12/89. I must say that if the role of the TCP is to meet really urgent and emergency needs that arrangement seems to me pretty extraordinary. It is an incentive to slackness and inefficiency and regrettably it also makes the TCP the 'first area on which any inescapable cuts are likely to fall. Britain therefore supports the proposal made in Plenary by a developing country minister that the TCP should be pre-planned with a greater input from Member Nations on its allocation and distribution. Those were the exact words. And much more consciously integrated into the national spending plans of the recipient. The Representative of another developing country also called in the Council for a much more realistic approach to the Budget. I agree with him. Realism demands that we compare first of all actual cash outturn with expected actual cash spending. Since cheques can be signed for a full year after the biennium for non-TCP items and two full years for the TCP, we need to know what cash carryovers there will be for 1986-87 and when they will mature: in 1988 for most items, in 1989 for at least part of the TCP. We also need to know what cash spending is projected and when for the budget we are now asked to approve. Will the Management please now give us those projections. It appears to us that the budget is drawn up without regard to outflows. Allocations and commitments are made under it but the cash does not necessarily go out. Yet Member States are asked to pay cash which many of them can ill afford. We have heard about the hardships that this causes some of them, both here and in the Council. I am tempted personally to conclude that perhaps we should move over to the system now in force within the soft funds of all the international financial institutions. Payment is made to those funds only with promissory notes which carry no interest. Those notes are then drawn down pro rata as actual cheques are written, taking into account of course the need for a few months' liquidity. Such a system within FAO would prevent members from having to provide money in advance of its actual need. It might also ease the serious problem of arrears. Another aspect of realism is in the starting point from which the growth in the proposed budget ought to be based. Many speakers have argued, as does Management, that it would be a real rise of only 0.25 percent over the present budget. But we are not implementing that budget. It has in practice been modified with the assent of the Council by a cut of US\$ 25 million. The base figure for calculating the 1988-89 budget is therefore US\$ 412 million, not US\$ 437 million. We consider this to be the legitimate figure for calculating growth, and on that basis of course the real increase is for higher than 0.25 percent. Of course, if all the arrears were miraculously liquidated and we could count on all contributions in the next budget being made within the specified time limits, FAO would be looking to a raise in real activity of that kind, but as Colombia has reminded us, the prospects for such a miracle are exceedingly dim. The effect is, therefore, as Australia has pointed out and as France pointed out in the Council, that the rest of us who are meeting our full obligations are in fact paying for the defaulters and the higher the budget level, the more of their burden the rest of us are taking on. Indeed, the higher the demands on Member States the longer the list of defaulters is going to be. I am sincerely impressed by the enthusiasm of so many countries for this draft budget and for their readiness to accept increased new obligation when they are already far behind with their contributions for 1987. I do sincerely hope that this is going to lead to the full and prompt payment of their existing arrears as a token of their support for the Organization and I strongly support the appeal made on this point by Switzerland, the Congo and the Philippines. But while I consider the action announced on Friday by Brazil and today by Mexico and Haiti we do have a real fear that the higher the demands made the greater these defaults and delays. It is a vicious circle. Britain therefore supports what Japan has said about the level of this budget.

I turn now to the currency question. We believe, like Spain that the right way to deal with this in the future is to adopt the split currency system now in force in the IAEA and UNIDO. In this connection, will Management please tell us whether it is correct - as Norway said that 60 percent of the budget would then be in Lira and 40 percent in American dollars. These figures presumably exist in detail since of course the budget needs to be increased for currency movement reasons only in respect of the Lira element. However, this time round we are stuck with one currency and the U.K. can therefore support the proposal to replenish the Special Reserve Account but I frankly say that I cannot see the logic of picking for the biennium an exchange rate pinned to a single day. We have abandoned this system in all the international financial institutions. Instead we look back there over

a representative past period and apply an average. Argentina has now proposed using the exchange rate applied for the 1986-87 biennium. I can support this proposal. But I could envisage it being varied to determine the actual average exchange rate throughout the biennium. One or two countries have suggested that the UN scale of assessment which is transferred into FAO should be modified, by raising the subscriptions of those whose currencies appreciate and vice versa. We must oppose the notion that FAO should go it alone to make such a change. Factors of this kind are surely taken into account when the UN scales are re-examined, and any suggested alterations should therefore be taken up in New York.

I come now to the idea that some more coherent pre-planning should be done on programme and financial priorities. I was sorry to hear a delegation describing this as unconstitutional. Of course it depends what arrangement you make. The United Kingdom does not agree that sensible planning of this kind would simply incite non-payment of contributions. We should strongly deplore any such result. But you do not necessarily have to have a formal core budget and a supplementary budget. There are other ways of indicating what has to come first, what else has been included and indeed what has been left out. The reasons for those choices can then be discussed. Now the Management has argued that a system of this kind would lead to severe uncertainties for the relevant staff". I think that the effects on staff morale are much more traumatic if the Organization is suddenly faced with the need to make cuts and then has to act in a haphazard and ill-planned way. All we are asking here is for Management to share with all of-us in good time the broad lines of their thinking about the priorities within and between individual activities and to give us all a chance to formulate guidance upon it.

Colombia made specific proposals for this purpose. Since the Conference and the Council are the supreme governing bodies this is really not an unreasonable request and it certainly is not unconstitutional. We completely endorse the specific remarks of Finland on this. We also broadly welcome the initiative now taken by Italy, while regretting that it has been left to a Member State to make such a suggestion. Proposals for priorities should surely have come from the Management and could still come from the Management to this Conference.

Several countries have proposed shifts of emphasis within the Programme. The distinguished delegate from Colombia spoke of the need for more priority-setting and he was quite right. The ideas of Member States are important and we should be able to make some changes accordingly. There is one area in which some immediate changes could be made to allow for some of these shifts and also to relieve some of the pressure on Regular Programme finances. We have noted from the paper CL 92/4...paragraphs 379 and following that the Trust Funds donot pay the full costs of their administration. Switzerland has already drawn attention to this point and the facts are clearly shown in the table in paragraph 381 of that paper. That makes it clear that the Regular Programme had to provide well over US\$ 11 million in 1986 to support Trust Fund operations and that means that all of us, down to the poorest member of FAO, are being asked to subsidize the costs of such operations. We agree with the points made by Switzerland and we therefore appeal to the generosity of those who have provided these much-valued funds to enter into early discussions with Management to ensure that they themselves meet the full costs of delivery. Some of this money might then usefully be reallocated to operational activities such as the Investment Centre and perhaps the TCP, as suggested by Guinea. We ourselves think that some should also go to FAO's internal staff training. This is something essential to better personnel management and to better job and career satisfaction.

Malaysia has referred to the problem of poor staff morale and this is one way in which this might partly be alleviated. As we made clear in the Council, the United Kingdom are against the organization trying to borrow its way out of any financial difficulties.

We are also against any increase in FAO's field representation and we support in this context the view expressed by several developing countries in paper C 87/30 and I quote that "as regards the FAO Country Representatives efforts should be made to reduce costs, through inter alia, shared offices and general services with other UN organizations". We agree both with them and with the Netherlands on this.

I turn now to our own view of the priorities. My Minister set this out for the work programme in the Plenary but I want to illustrate them here by reference to what others have said. I must start with the graphic and down-to-earth plea made by Zambia which critized the FAO for sticking too rigidly to a commodity-by-commodity, speciality-by-speciality approach and for not considering first the integrated farm management problems faced by small peasants on the ground in their specific locality.

Poland added to that a powerful plea for much more macro-economic and sectoral policy assistance to individual countries, also now endorsed by Venezuela and Switzerland. Nothing could better illustrate the need for much closer inter-disciplinary links between FAO's various divisions and the need for a much more specific country approach. These are exactly some of the points that we want examined by a professional management review and by an independent high-level study.

On the programme's geographical distribution we support the calls by the Congo and Algeria for maintenance of the high share now going to Africa. But while the table on page 257 shows that Africa has a proper priority, it also shows a figure of only 29 percent for Asia and the Pacific and the forecast for the TCP in Chapter 4, paragraph 27, is even worse - only 26 percent. The figures are grossly insufficient given the huge numbers of rural poor for whom the governments of the region are responsible. These specific activities to which we believe FAO should give priority in its programme, whatever the size, are as follows:

The global information and early-warning system: this was also endorsed by Lesotho, Malaysia and Barbados among others; regional pest control, including post-harvest losses: this was also endorsed by Lesotho, Algeria and Chile; soil and water management, especially in Africa: this was commended by Brazil and Argentina, but I agreed particularly with what was said about it by Zambia; The Codex Alimentarius was supported also by Barbados, Switzerland, Swaziland and Mexico. The next item is predictions on land capacity, and that links it to Poland's call for work on more rational land use activity; then the production of relative statistics; but I endorse the call here by Egypt, Switzerland and Argentina for more rationalization and reduction in publications; and the improvement of developing country statistical services, which means institutional and training support, as stressed among the others by Kenya and Jordan.

However, I must single out for special mention the Tropical Forestry Action Plan for community forestry, especially as integrated with other land use. I cannot better what Finland and Zambia said about this. We also support The Netherlands in proposing some cut-back in industrial policy to make use of these other activities.

Finally, on the Programme, Italy underlined (as we do) the need for much closer work from FAO in conjunction with IFAD and the UNDP. Lesotho, Mexico and Barbados praised, as we do, the Investment Centre. I think this shows that the United Kingdom does have a consistent and practical view of FAO's priorities which finds very many echoes elsewhere. Nevertheless I have to say that in spite of the welcome further shift away from administrative operational activities, our overall conclusions are that the priorities are still not articulated in a convincing way, especially in the light of the financial crisis, that there is an unfortunate lack of transparency, especially on cash spending, that there is a failure to demonstrate the necessary close correspondence in time between the collection and the use of contributions, that erecting a new programme of this size on top of the present revised programme, is likely to worsen the problem of arrears and that in consequence the skewing of burdens between Member States will get worse. All these factors make it impossible for us to support the budget as now supposed.

CHAIRMAN: That concludes our list of speakers on this topic. At this point in the agenda it is in order for us to have a brief presentation by the Deputy Director-General. That will be followed by a specific response to specific questions raised by the Director, Mr Shah. At that point, if any member country has already raised a specific question with the Secretariat to which they feel the Secretariat has not responded, it would be in order for that country to call the Secretariat's attention to this failure to respond or to have given an inadequate response. A question could then be answered by the Secretariat.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: The Commission has been considering the Programme of Work and Budget. I should like to say a few words, first about the Programme of Work and then about the Budget. The substantive contents of the Programme of Work submitted to the Conference have not, I believe, given rise to major controversy in the course of this discussion. I do not say that all delegations agree with all the activities that we are planning to undertake. Many delegations have indicated that they would have preferred a higher priority to be given to certain types of activity and lower priority to others. Nevertheless, by and large I would say that the fundamental problems facing the Conference are not so much relating to the Programme of Work as to the Budget. On the Programme

of Work, Mr Shah will be answering specific questions and re-emphasizing the process by which the priorities in the document before you have been built up.

On the Budget, this provides for what I would call marginal growth in real terms: 0.25 percent. However, bearing in mind that the provision for coping with cost increases looks ever more likely to be insufficient, unfortunately there may well be at the end of the line a slight negative growth within the framework of a Budget that is approximately stable in real terms, however, there is a major increase in the assessments in dollar terms facing Member Nations. I would point out that we are now discussing the Budget as such. Other questions, such as the Special Reserve Account and the Working Capital Fund, will be coming up separately in Commission III.

In a time of very great economic difficulties for most countries in the world, and extreme difficulties for many, we are well aware of the unwelcome nature of this increase in dollar assessments. Furthermore, we recognize the fact that it falls somewhat unfairly. Some countries - the lucky ones in this context - will find themselves actually paying less in national currencies for their contributions to the FAO budget. Others will pay very considerably more - more even than the percentage increase in the dollar contributions. There is absolutely nothing that FAO can do to counter this highly differentiated and in many respects unfair impact of the change in assessments.

However, it does place an additional responsibility on the Secretariat to ensure that funds and resources made available to us for the next biennium are used in the most effective and efficient manner possible. We shall spare no effort to see that the money made available under the Programme of Work and Budget is handled and set to use in the best possible manner for the benefit of the membership at large.

For the Budget level, there have been many who would have preferred a lower level and others would have preferred a higher. I can only say that considering the many representations that have been made as this Programme of Work and Budget was built up, the Director-General has put forward a budget level I would describe as fair - fair to the membership, and particularly to those who are looking to FAO to provide assistance in their development, and fair to those who are seeking to minimize the amount of taxpayers' money put forward to international organizations.

Besides the level of the Budget in absolute terms, a lot of concern expressed in this debate has related to the possibility of an income shortfall. This will be dealt with in much more detail in Commission III and, for instance, it is to Commission III that we shall be circulating the information on cash out-turn which was requested by one delegation in the Council Session.

There appears to have been an impression among some delegations - I may be wrong and I say "appears" - that by reducing the budget level we would solve the problem of late payment of the arrears. This, I must very strongly emphasize, is simply not correct. We have a major problem of late payments and arrears in the present biennium and I venture to predict that we shall have a similar problem at virtually any budget level. I do not believe it would be appropriate or meaningful for the Conference, within the framework of the budget, to make special allowances for such late payments or arrears for any Member Nation, either the largest or the smallest. To incorporate in the decisions on budget specific planning for late payment or non-payment would surely lead to the unravelling of the entire system on which the Organizations of the United Nations and many other international organizations have been built up in the post-war years.

The basic approach, I would urge, must be to adopt a Budget and a Programme of Work in line with the sacred texts of the Organization. At the same time, the Conference needs to set up a mechanism for coping with income shortfalls if and when they arise. Such a mechanism is proposed in a draft resolution presented by Italy and mentioned by the delegation of our host country this morning. It is contained in LIM/32 and will be going to Commission III, but I should like to draw attention to it now.

It proposes in substance three things, if indeed there is a liquidity problem and an income shortfall in the next biennium. These three things are: that the Director-General should consult the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee at the earliest possible stage if it appears likely that savings and programme adjustments may be required, to use the wording in the resolution. Also the Conference would delegate to the Council the powers that are necessary for deciding on savings and programme adjustments that the situation may call for. In the third place, the Director-General should, if necessary, advance the date of the Council Session now scheduled for November next year.

or call a special session of the Council if necessary. This approach will be before Commission III for discussion and decision. But I would like to say here that it appears to us to represent a valid method for coping with the possible continuation of our financial problems in the next biennium. It is, I am convinced, going to be virtually impossible before the end of the Conference to make a reliable forecast of our cash situation in 1988 and 1989. We shall present some very, very tentative figures in Commission III but I do not believe that they are sufficiently solid for planning purposes at this stage.

The role of the Finance Committee will be to examine the financial situation and decide or recommend on the level of any cuts in activities that may be necessary in order to cope with a new generation of problems. We would wish from the Secretariat side to reduce to a minimum the element of improvisation which we have had to adopt in the course of the present biennium to cope with our liquidity problems. The phraseology that I would suggest for 1988-89 would be "orderly re-programming". Any orderly re-programming that may be necessary would go to the Programme Committee. From the Programme Committee it would go to the Council. So the Finance Committee assesses the financial situation and outlook, the Programme Committee looks at the programme changes that are necessary, and the Council takes the decisions.

Now, in spending quite a few of my words on methods of coping with financial problems in the next biennium I do not wish to give the impression that the Organization is necessarily heading for really major difficulties. I would like to draw a distinction between the short-term, the medium-term and the long-term outlook. For the short-term, I hope I may be permitted to take as a major example the payment of contributions from our largest contributor. The 1986 contribution from the United States, as appropriated, was paid at various dates in 1987. The 1987 contribution we expect to be paid early in 1988. Now, the payment of the appropriated contribution after the end of the calendar year to which it applies does create short-term cash flow problems. That I would cite as an element of the short-term problem. There remains a significant portion of the assessed contribution of the United States which has not been appropriated. In the case of our calendar year 1987 the full contribution was requested but it is unlikely that the full contribution will be authorized and appropriated. There is thus a substantial residual amount neither authorized nor appropriated in the category of arrears. We have heard the delegation of the United States confirming that this part of its contribution is not repudiated. This creates a medium-term problem for the Organization. However, I would very strongly underline that there is no long-term financial problem.

One delegation requested in the course of the debate whether we have a plan for the use of the United States' arrears when they come. There is no problem we should be happier to solve, but I am sure we can handle that one when we get there.

In looking at the basis approach to what I have called orderly re-programming I would like to answer a question in the thoughtful statement by the delegate of Norway. I believe that we shall find ourselves adopting three basic criteria in any re-programming process. The basis would have to be a linearcut; this is unavoidable. However, it would be modified by the selection of what I might call areas of priority. In fact this means areas to be protected from cuts. The selection of these areas of priority or areas of protection will take account of the many observations made in the course of this debate.

The third criterion inevitably must be the contractual situation of staff in various areas of activity in the Organization. Many of our staff members are mobile and can be easily shifted from one type of activity to another: others are not. Highly technical staff must carry out the technical work for which they are trained. This is a situation which must be taken into account when the final decisions are worked out.

I have attempted to outline the basic ways in which we see the problems of the next biennium being tackled. Mr Shah will answer a number of specific questions advanced by various delegations. But I would like to say in conclusion, that following this debate delegations will be preparing for their vote in Plenary on 19 November on the Programme of Work and Budget. I would urge all delegations to rally behind this Programme of Work and Budget as the fairest that could possibly be put together in the difficult circumstances which face not just FAO but most international organizations. The Director-General has made great efforts to achieve a consensus and I would appeal on his behalf -for a unanimous vote in favour of the Programme of Work and Budget on 19 November.

V. J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The debate has been very rich in expressions of opinion and also in a number of questions which have been put to me. I will try to proceed methodically.

First I would like on behalf of the Secretariat to express our appreciation for the generous contribution announced by the delegate of Turkey who indicated his Government's interest in support for a regional agricultural development and training centre in Ankara. My colleagues and I will certainly pursue this proposal with him to bring it to fruition in the best way possible.

Our thanks also to the delegate of Burkina Faso who announced this morning the Government's decision to defer its share of the cash surplus from 1984-85. This generous gesture added to those of other countries who have made the same decision is indeed of great help to the Organization.

The delegate of Italy asked a question last week about the reduction in posts and asked for clarification whether the number was 20 or 25. The number is indeed 25. The reason why the Table in Annex C of the document shows 20 is because, as the footnotes to that page indicate, posts in the Investment Centre are not included in that Table, have not been in all previous documents, being a joint programme with the World Bank, and three of the four interpreter posts which are also to be abolished are from the interpreter pool. So the three interpreter posts and the two posts in the Investment Centre constitute the other five posts.

The delegate of Argentina inquired about a figure of US\$ 510 000 which appears under Programme 1.2.1, the Programme dealing with the Director-General's office, and enquired what extra budgetary project this figure refers to. This figure does not refer to any project. It refers to that part of the support costs, overhead costs, which the Organization receives and which are distributed among a number of offices and units, including the Director-General's office, the reason of course being that a number of units are involved in the direction in the policy guidance of all funds, all programmes of the Organization, and there is no attempt made to indicate individual posts, but to distribute pro rata the extra budgetary support costs received.

The same delegation enquired about the reduction in the Liaison Office in Geneva and whether this was reasonable at a time when we expect much closer collaboration with GATT in the context of the Uruguay Round. I would suggest that the two things be looked at fairly, separately and clearly. The collaboration with GATT will indeed have to be close, will have to be substantive, and it is the kind of collaboration which will have to be extended from the technical and the specialist staff, particularly of the Commodities and Trade Division at headquarters, and is not the kind of collaboration which can be expected to be provided by any one person in a liaison office.

Certainly if we had not had to reduce our budget level it might have been desirable to retain that post as it was but in the present circumstances it was felt that it was a course which had to be resorted to while recognizing that the substantive collaboration with GATT and with UNCTAD will, if anything, have to be closer in the foreseeable future.

A number of questions were raised about priorities and here, with all respect, if I may say that, it was a statement of the delegate of Denmark which struck a cord of the greatest understanding, at least on my part in the secretariat because that statement recognized and explained in a very clear way how the process of priority establishment or priority setting is a long and a complex process. It is based on the guidance of governing bodies. It is based on the whole range of recommendations which are made to the Secretariat in geographical fora, such as that of the regional conferences, in technical sector fora, such as that of the Council committees, and in specialist fora, such as all inter-governmental meetings in which FAO is involved and, and I repeat, and from the distillation of all the requests which are made in the course of every year and every biennium to the secretariat for programme support for Member Nations. So it is a long and a complex process. The delegate also made it clear that it is the guidance and the policy directives of the governing bodies which are important and we, as Secretariat, absolutely recognize the importance of these directives. But the third step, that of distilling the programme priorities is essentially a management process. This also was recognized by the delegates. It is a managerial task, the results of which are then offered to you again for your endorsement or rejection and certainly the debate which this Conference and this Commission in particular has shown to us over the last two and a half days is that there is a large measure of endorsement, a large measure of recognition of the major priorities that you, Member Nations, individually attach importance to and that you, Member Nations, are prepared to

join others in endorsing. There are differences. There are differences in perception; there are differences in the priority to which an individual Member Nation attaches importance. To give two examples; the FAO representative offices; opinions have been expressed in both directions; the importance of pursuing the establishment of four new offices; this is the view expressed by many; I will not do a member's count. There has been a view expressed by others, perhaps many, perhaps several, that they should have a lower priority in the present circumstances but these are differences of opinion which the secretariat respects and tries to reconcile. This is precisely why the Director-General reduced the amount he proposed for the expansion of FAO representative offices from US\$ 950 000 to US\$ 550 000; it is a specific response to try and reconcile different points of view.

Another outstanding example of differing perceptions is your perception of the Technical Cooperation Programme. At least there is no expression that I heard questioning the basic utility, the usefulness, the value of the Technical Cooperation Programme but there are differences as to its level of the budget, as a proportion of the total budget; a figure of 17 percent has been mentioned instead of the proposed level of 14 percent. There are others who are content that it is not going to rise further in the next biennium. There are some, at least one, who mentioned that they would prefer not to see it as part of the regular budget. Again this is an area where the Director-General has tried to respond in the most reasonable realistic manner and his proposal has been for the next biennium to say no programme increase for the Technical Cooperation Programme.

In this connection an opinion, a veiled criticism was expressed of the Programme and Finance Committees on the grounds that they do not change more the proposals submitted by the secretariat. Now I should only say that this question would be better addressed to the Programme and Finance Committees but as there is no one person who represents the Programme and Finance Committees, their Chairman being here in the case of the Finance Committee and not being here present in the case of the Programme Committee, one explanation I would give is that that same delegation may wish to ask itself whether this is not because considered debate and discussion the Committees came to a certain conclusion. They came to the conclusion that after expressing different points of view they, as a Committee, did not feel it necessary to recommend greater changes. Certainly they recommend changes; certainly members of the Committees do, and the Committees themselves, and these are points of view which are taken into account by the Secretariat.

A specific question was also raised by a number of delegations about the growth for the Major Programme, Forestry. The importance attached to this sector is very well recognized. Is the growth proposed insufficient? To those who seek greater growth it may appear certainly insufficient but in the present circumstances it is not felt possible to propose a greater allocation but let us look at some figures, comparative figures. The growth in the Major Programme, Agriculture over the present base works out at 2.21 percent; the growth for the Major Programme, Fisheries, at 2.23 percent; the growth for the Major Programme, Forestry, at 3.64 percent. So you see that even in terms of absolute amounts certain Member Nations may wish to have seen a bigger increase on forestry, there is a discrimination in favour of forestry in the net programme increase proposed and I should also draw attention to the amount of extra budgetary funds which forestry enjoys; forestry with a regular programme base of US\$ 18.4 million in the regular programme is expected to have extra budgetary support of some US\$ 87 million in the next biennium.

A number of delegations also asked about the share of particular regions. Now the figures, of course, are there in the Annex but I would like to draw attention to one aspect. The table which was quoted by some delegations was the table on page 257 of the English text which deals with all funds, regular programme and extra budgetary. Now, it is well known that the extra budgetary funds are estimates for each region; we have no direction over them; they depend on decisions made elsewhere. So what we can comment on more realistically is the share of the regular programme funds proposed to be devoted to each region and looking at the regular programme funds let us first separate the funds which are for global activities because those are of potential benefit to all member regions. Doing this we then find that the share of Latin America and the Caribbean in 1986-87 was 19 percent; in the next biennium it would be 20.87 percent. In percentage terms the increases are not dramatic, from 19 to 20.8, 21 percent but it does show, we hope, that the needs of other regions are constantly examined and taken into account from one biennium to another.

The Deputy Director-General has already referred to one query about what would happen to the contributions in arrears were they suddenly to be paid up. Following his analogy and to take the outlook for the short term, if these arrears of contributions were paid up in the immediate future the first call on these funds at the beginning of the next biennium would be to replenish the Working Capital Fund for the amount of US\$ 13.3 million for which it would have been drawn from the Working Capital Fund, and then to go to the replenishment of the Special Reserve Account above the level of 2.5 percent of the budget for which a special assessment is being sought. This would be the first two calls on the payment of arrears in the immediate future.

This brings me to reply to those questions raised about the Working Capital Fund, the Special Reserve Account and the contributions and assessments of Member Nations. As the Deputy Director-General has said, we, you, the Conference, Commission III will go into much more detail on these aspects but there are certain questions which, as they were raised in the context of this debate, I feel I should reply to now. The Working Capital Fund; this was referred to, among others, by the delegate of Switzerland and by the delegate of Norway and a specific question put to us whether it was considered appropriate by the Secretariat to use the Working Capital Fund, or to draw on the Working Capital Fund, at the end of this biennium. The Regulation under which we would draw on the Working Capital Fund is the Financial Regulation 6, paragraph 6.2(a)(i) which says "Advancing monies to the General Fund to finance budgetary expenditures pending receipt of contributions to the budget". Now the question put to the Secretariat is whether we consider this appropriate. I would say that the Secretariat makes no judgement whatsoever on the motivation of the Member Nation which does not honour its contribution, nor does the Secretariat prejudge or try to predetermine what will be the length of time over which these arrears will not be paid. To us the application of this Regulation is clear enough; it is to advance monies to the General Fund pending receipt of contributions for the budget.

This leads me to the second question which was also echoed by the delegate of Switzerland; how will these monies drawn from the Working Capital Fund be replenished? We have no alternative; Financial Regulation 6.5(a) makes it very clear that, as the delegate of Norway himself read from the Regulation, these sums shall be reimbursed from the General Fund, they will have to be reimbursed from the General Fund as soon as feasible but in any case, within the next financial period, that is within the next biennium 1988-89 by programme adjustments if necessary. So if the arrears in contributions are not paid in sufficient level to permit replenishment of the Working Capital Fund by US\$ 13.3 million, the amount to be drawn upon, then that amount will have to be found from programme adjustments in the next biennium.

There is one last aspect of the Working Capital Fund. There is perhaps not enough clarity about what is being requested from Member Nations. I hope that I have made it clear that the amount up to \$ 13.3 million is not being requested from Member Nations in any new assessment. What is being requested is the increase of the Working Capital Fund, the amount of the increase from \$ 13.3 million to \$ 20 million, so it is \$ 6.7 million which would constitute the new assessment on Member Nations applicable 1 January 1988.

Turning now to the Special Reserve Account, the currency effects have been commented upon both in the context of this biennium and as regards their implications for the next biennium. Let us briefly review the scene. We had a Special Reserve Account of \$ 22 million for this biennium. It was not sufficient to offset the negative impact of the dollar depreciation. There will be an additional amount of some \$ 7.5 million which we will have to absorb in the budgetary provision of this biennium. How does this compare with some other Organizations - ILO \$ 36 million; WHO \$ 41 million; UNESCO \$ 40 million; UN \$ 77 million. I hope it will be noted that the FAO figure is the lowest - why? It is because the adverse impact of currency adjustment is not permitted by you or by your predecessors, to be applied to the whole FAO budget. We can apply it only to the post-adjustment component for professional staff salaries and, for the general service salaries in Rome, that is why the impact is lower than it would be if the whole budget were to be adjusted because of currency adjustments. What have other Organizations done? In the United Nations there was a supplementary appropriation of \$ 35 million. The ILO took the amount from the Working Capital. The WHO drew the full amount from the casual income facility. At UNESCO there was a combination of a supplementary estimate plus the use of miscellaneous income and cash surplus. So, there has been nothing wrong. We have used the Special Reserve Account for the purpose for which it was intended. The provision was not even enough and we have had to absorb half of the impact on the budget. So much for this biennium.

Turning to the next biennium, if the change from 1 760 lire to say, 1 250 lire, if the next budget were to be approved at 1 250 lire that change constitutes a decrease of 29 percent. If the same rate were applied to the proposed budget, you would see a budget level not of \$ 490 million, or \$ 486 million, you would see a budget level of \$ 582 million. So, once again, what we are saying is purely and simply that the currency impact is to be applied to the budget level proposed in constant dollar terms.

Here I would like to recall a very enlightened view expressed by the distinguished delegation of the United Kingdom no now, but in fact in the Council two years ago. They said "donors would not wish to impose the vagaries of currency fluctuations and cost changes on to the International Organizations. They wished neither to penalize them for changes in the wrong direction nor give them the benefit of changes the other way round. The fairest arrangement is to fix the programme in real terms and permit Member States to cope with the inconvenience of most of these capricious factors." A very enlightened view and in fact, if we look at the results of all this, the results on the budget level, what do we find? We find that the budget level at 1 250 lire to the dollar would be \$ 490 860 000 as compared to \$ 437 million for this biennium. That is an increase in dollar terms of 12.32 percent. I can only follow my Deputy Director-General in echoing his hope and conviction that this does represent a very carefully considered judgement in terms of the budget level, especially if you compare it also to Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium which have been approved in some of our sister Organizations. In the World Health Organization the effect of the working level of the budget increased from \$ 543 million to \$ 634 million, an increase of 16.7 percent. The FAO proposal of 12.32 percent can be seen perhaps in its perspective. In the case of the International Labour Organization the increase was at 16.1 percent - 16.1 percent as against 12.32 percent.

In the case of assessments of Member Nations, in the World Health Organization assessments of Member Nations increased by 24.5 percent. In the case of FAO at the level I have just quoted the increase in assessments would be 20.99 percent, let us say 21 percent.

In reply to the questions posed, I have tried to communicate and convey the spirit of the entire proposals which I had the honour to introduce last week. The spirit of the sincere desire of the Director-General and of the Secretariat that this Conference will recognize the efforts made to permit you the Member Nations to reach a consensus. It seems to us that we are not far from the consensus and that it is within your reach. We pray that you will grasp it. Thank you, Sir.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr Shah. At this point the Chair has indicated that it is in order for member countries who have had questions directed to the Secretariat and who want clarifications or feel that the question was not responded to, to have the opportunity now to address those questions through the Chair.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): Considero que mi pregunta no ha sido contestada. Quizás lo fue indirectamente. Quiero repetirla. Sin embargo, considero necesaria una explicación. Necesito hacer una explicación a manera de introducción para que no exista el peligro de que se interpreten mis aclaraciones como una manera de abrir una nueva ronda de debates sobre el tema 13. No es esa mi intención, y es por eso que primero y antes de hablar solicito su permiso y el de los presentes para agregar unas palabras a lo que dije anteriormente. No sé si ha habido una confusión con los intérpretes, porque yo no estoy escuchando la traducción, pero quiero advertirles que había escrito unas cortas palabras antes de pedir este permiso y no quiero que se vayan a confundir al hacer la lectura. Voy a tratar de ajustarme lo más posible al texto de las palabras que ellos tienen en sus manos, pero me voy a ver obligado a hacer ciertos ajustes a medida que vaya hablando. Quiero primero saber si tengo el permiso del Presidente y de los presentes para hacer esa pequeña aclaración.

CHAIRMAN: Please indicate whether I am interpreting your remarks correctly, are you asking the Chair to do what it did earlier for Italy and Algeria on a point of clarification? Complete your remarks, in this instance I understand them to clarify a question.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): Yo considero que mi pregunta no ha sido contestada.

CHAIRMAN: I understand that as part of that you are going to expand. Please do so and if you can please state your questions through the Chair. The Chair will put it to the Secretariat and ask them to respond directly to your questions. Please proceed.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): ¿Puedo hacer la introducción sin que se interprete como que se está reanudando el debate?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): Agradezco que me conceda nuevamente la palabra para agregar un poco más a los comentarios que hice en mi primera intervención. Personalmente, me enorgullece poder decir que no hubiera aceptado representar a mi país si no estuviera convencido de que, para Honduras, los objetivos principales son la libertad, la democracia y la paz. Sus ciudadanos creemos firmemente que no puede haber democracia sin libertad y que estos dos requisitos son esenciales para alcanzar la paz.

Espero que este corto preámbulo ayude a que se conozca mejor a una nación pobre y pequeña con gran des deseos de hacer aportes significativos a la confraternidad universal, a una nación dispuesta a entablar amistad con cualquier país del mundo siempre que esto no obstaculice sus objetivos, no lesione sus intereses, ni comprometa su dignidad.

Honduras es uno de los países fundadores de la FAO y, a pesar de enfrentar serias dificultades financieras, siempre se ha interesado por mantener al día el pago de sus contribuciones. Por eso siente especial preocupación al notar que en esta Conferencia existe un ambiente de discordia que puede obstaculizar la noble labor que debemos desarrollar. Si se continúa fomentando la división y la desconfianza entre ricos y pobres, grandes y pequeños, poderosos y débiles, será muy difícil lograr la solidaridad necesaria para actuar con rapidez, lo cual es muy importante para que la ayuda sea oportuna. Nuestro Director General en su introducción al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988/89 señala con mucho acierto que sigue sin cambiar la magnitud y la urgencia de los problemas del hambre en el mundo.

Me permito sugerir que sería conveniente, para agilizar nuestro trabajo, analizar cada país individualmente para poder formar grupos integrados de acuerdo con sus necesidades y con la urgencia de las mismas. Esto permitiría reunir a los representantes de los países que enfrentan problemas similares para que puedan discutirlos y, con la asesoría de expertos de la FAO, proceder a resolverlos. Aceptemos de una vez que nuestro presupuesto para el próximo bienio tiene que ser' muy reducido y que será necesario hacer lo máximo con lo mínimo.

Estoy seguro que el Director General sabrá hacer uso de las estructuras existentes y de los recursos que tenga a su disposición para cumplir con su responsabilidad, sin embargo, necesita estar respaldado por la buena voluntad de cada uno de ellos para contribuir, en la medida de sus posibilidades, al éxito de la difícil tarea que tiene la obligación moral de asumir.

Por lo expresado anteriormente, Honduras no tiene inconveniente en aprobar el programa de labores para 1988/89 tal como ha sido presentado.

En lo que se refiere al presupuesto hice una solicitud al Director General para que nos dijera claramente cuáles son las cifras del presupuesto sobre las cuales existe incertidumbre, pues nadie puede saber eso mejor que aquellas personas que hicieron los cálculos. En otras palabras, mi pregunta se refería a incertidumbre, no considero que pueda ser contestada diciendo que se ha presentado un presupuesto justo. Para mayor claridad lo que deseo saber es si el presupuesto es realista o no.

CHAIRMAN: Would the Secretariat please explain, to the Representative of Honduras why the Secretariat feels that the budget is realistic or would you please explain to him why the Secretariat feels that the budget is unrealistic. His question leaves you free to go either way.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): I hope you do not expect me to repeat two and a half days debate in answering the question, but in all seriousness I will try to. What are the elements of uncertainty as regards the budgetary contributions for the next biennium? First of all, we rely on the contributions of the Member Nations in a timely and full manner. Our experience so far has shown that for a significant number of countries who have difficulty in making their payments in full and in time, there are nevertheless payments of arrears each year which reduce the greater part of this level of uncertainty. To give you an example: we started this biennium with arrears from Member Nations of some US\$ 24 million and during this biennium we have received or expect to receive payments of these arrears of some US\$ 22 million or just over. The same thing may be expected in the next biennium. The greater part of the arrears of these Member Nations may be expected to be covered by the next biennium by payments against these arrears. The element which we have never encountered before is the unprecedented amount in the contributions due from the largest contributor with the result that the largest contributor will in this biennium be not the largest contributor but the largest delinquent because the amount owing would be some US\$ 67 million which is more than from any one Member Nation. Now the uncertainty is there. When will this amount be paid? At what time? To what extent? This is the area of uncertainty. The third aspect of potential uncertainty is the amount of miscellaneous income which is taken into account in determining the level of assessments. The experience in this biennium was that the estimate of miscellaneous income at US\$ 41 million was totally unrealistic and faced us with a real problem. The estimate of miscellaneous income for the next biennium has been made, as advised to us by the Council and by the Finance Committee on a conservative basis at US\$ 11.7 million so this is not an area where we would expect to run into problems. I hope I am responding adequately to the distinguished Delegate of Honduras.

CHAIRMAN: Honduras indicates he is content.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I have in fact questions to put to both the Management staff who have given the answers so far. I am in your hands as to whether you wish me to put them all at once or to put the first question to the Deputy Director-General and the others to Mr Shah.

CHAIRMAN: It might be easier for the Secretariat to respond to questions and it might be easier for all of us to listen and judge those responses if we took them in order. Please state one at a time, as precisely as you can to assist them in responding, through the Chair, the question you would like answered.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I thought I heard the Deputy Director-General say, and I was most amazed by it, that if there were a lower budget it would not do anything to solve the arrears problem because that was there anyway and it would not be affected by the size of the budget. Can I ask the Deputy Director-General whether he is really saying that a higher budget, given all the other points which we have been considering, a higher budget which is proposed is not likely to intensify, to worsen, the problem of arrears?

CHAIRMAN: I believe the Deputy Director-General has no difficulty understanding that direct question.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: What I said was that at no level of the budget would it be possible to eliminate the problem of arrears and late payments. We already have at the level of the current biennium, 1986-87, a very serious problem of arrears and shortfalls. I did not say that the problem would not get worse, but I said it could not be solved by lowering the budget level. That is what I said.

CHAIRMAN: Does that clear the United Kingdom's point?

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I think that clears up the first point. The second point is to Mr Shah. He corrected the figures which I had given in relation to the geographical distribution of the Programme when we mistakenly looked at the table on page 257 and I think I said then that this showed a figure for Asia and the Pacific of only 29 percent - a figure which I found low. Can Mr Shah confirm that in the figures he has just given us - he was using the table on page 258, leaving aside the global element. It seems to me that that must have been 10. On that figure the Latin American/Caribbean regions would have 20.6 percent as he suggests but I am horrified to see that Asia and the Pacific would then receive 22.5 percent of the allotted regular programme expenditure. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN: Is that correct?

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): I can confirm that it is the table on page 258 and the figures are indeed as given there and as interpreted by the distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom. That for Latin America for 1988-89 would be 20.87 percent as I said, and for Asia there would be 22.49 percent - as he said, 22.5 percent.

CHAIRMAN: That answers the question that was put to you clearly.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I am most grateful for that very clear answer. The next point is in relation to the effect of the currency changes. Mr Shah rightly quoted the British view of two years ago that we were seeking arrangements which would be neutral. That is why we intend to support the proposal in relation to the Special Reserve Account. It is also why we support the split currency budget. But I thought I heard Mr Shah say that - and I may be wrong - that the currency alterations at present are not related to how much of the budget has to be paid out in Lira and how much in Dollars and I know that the distinguished Delegate from Norway asked if these proportions were 60:40. We did not get an answer to that and I asked if we could have it also. I should be most grateful if Mr Shah could confirm that the Lira expenditure is roughly 60 percent and the Dollar expenditure roughly 40 percent of the total. If not, what are the right figures?

CHAIRMAN: Would you respond to the question?

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The answer is: 40 percent in Dollars, 40 percent in Lira, 20 percent in other currencies.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): My last question relates to Forestry on which Mr Shah referred to the possibility of extra budgetary resources and a percentage growth higher than that of other programmes from, however, I would observe, a much lower case. I think in the first place it is surely wrong to presume extra budgetary resources of any kind in any programme. These decisions do not lie in the hands of the organization. What we are looking at is the regular programme activities. But that apart, what is the Management's reaction to the suggestion made by the Netherlands and supported by my delegation that there should be more resources allotted to programme 2.3.1 Tropical Forestry Action Programme and Community Forestry and 2.3.4 while reducing the allocation in respect of 2.3.2 which is Forest Industries? There is surely the possibility even without disturbing the overall total, of improving what is very clearly a general priority demonstrated by all the interventions in this Commission.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The almost unanimous endorsement of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan has certainly not escaped the Secretariat and we shall do everything possible not only to carry out the mandate given to us for the next biennium but, if I may take something that the Deputy Director-General referred to, as "areas of protection", this will be very specifically an area of intense protection in case of examination of measures to adjust or reduce programmes in the next biennium. It is not the practice of the Secretariat to reissue the proposals of the Programme of Work and Budget during the Conference but I can certainly assure the distinguished Delegate of the United Kingdom that the importance that he and other delegates attach to the specific programmes in the Forestry sector will indeed be taken very carefully into account. As regards the remark made about the percentage increase for the major programme of Forestry in relation to its base figure I have no comment or modification. The remark of the distinguished Delegate was entirely factually correct.

CHAIRMAN: Has the United Kingdom completed its direct question to the Secretariat?

J. LYNCH (Canada): I have two short questions, both for Mr Walton. During the debate a number of delegations referred to what has been called contingency planning, pre-planning, and in his reply Mr Walton responded by indicating, first, that the Italian resolution which was introduced very carefully - I do not think the delegation in Commission III will have much to do in this regard - was a very welcome response to the question of pre-planning or contingency measures. He went on to say that it could not be done at this particular Conference because although the Secretariat had some preliminary figures they were not sufficiently solid for planning purposes.

My question is basically, as we are going to embark in Commission III on a fairly large and important delegation of powers from those of this Conference to the Council and as preliminary figures are available, what obstacle is there in this coming Conference giving preliminary consideration to the type of planning which has been urged by a number of delegations? The second question relates to -

CHAIRMAN: Canada, may I interrupt you? I think it would be preferable for the Secretariat to get their thoughts in proper order and also for all the members to fully understand both questions and the responses. I assure you that we shall take both questions but I think we should take the first question and allow the Secretariat to respond to it. Could the Deputy Director-General please respond?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: There are several factors of uncertainty at this time. One is the uncertainty regarding the adequacy of the Special Reserve Account in 1988-89. The dollar has gone through very considerable travail in the last few weeks and months and we would have to assess the danger of currency losses over and above the monies which we can expect to be made available in the Special Reserve Account. That is one.

On a more cheerful note, I would recall that the Minister for Agriculture of Italy, in his statement to the Plenary, indicated that his country would make an additional effort to help the Organization and that this would be the subject of an announcement at a later stage. We do not know exactly what that assistance will be, but we have hopes that it will be of a sufficient magnitude that it should be taken into account in estimating the financial position for the next biennium. This is another unknown factor.

Thirdly, our cash flow estimates are based on a simple carrying forward from one year to the next of the level of the United States contribution, at around \$25 to 26 million per annum. Any additional information that would suggest that the actual figure receipts from our largest contributor would be higher or lower would also have to be included in the calculations. These are just three of the elements of uncertainty at the present time.

CHAIRMAN: Canada, does that answer your question?

J. LYNCH (Canada): It does not really answer it. We see information which gives some preliminary facts. I do not see any obstacle at all -

CHAIRMAN: Canada, if it does not answer your question, can you please say where it does not do so? Is there a follow-up question?

J. LYNCH (Canada): We began with the three factors that Mr Walton has outlined. With those three factors, can a preliminary estimate of the type of savings and programme adjustments that may be required be made at this Conference? I believe Mr Walton has just identified limitations. He has not put up complete bars to a view of what programme adjustments might be necessary.

CHAIRMAN: The question by Canada is: Is it or is it not possible for such an alternative or refinement to be presented to this Conference now? Could you respond to that?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: In my view, there are serious practical obstacles to doing so. If we find that we have to take a figure from the air and say that we have to cut our expenditure by 10 percent in the next biennium, this means going back to every department and division in the house and asking them to reprogramme resources at a lower level. This is a major exercise. We do not feel that we have sufficient justification to launch such a major exercise at the present time: nor are we convinced that had it been done it would have produced meaningful results that could be considered by the Conference in the present state of general uncertainty.

CHAIRMAN: The answer is that it can be done. You had an additional question.

J. LYNCH (Canada): You left your sentence incomplete, Mr Chairman. I think you were going to say "it can be done, but it will not be". My second question relates to priorities. I believe Mr Walton gave a definition and said that a linear cut would be applied, modified by a collection of areas of priority which would be preserved from a linear cut. Mr Walton stated that the comments made in this debate would be taken into account and he seemed to imply all the comments. My question is: to what extent would the Programme priorities which were meticulously Identified in the Budget document be observed in preserving programmes from linear cuts? I am specifically referring to the programme priorities identified by the Secretariat on pages 7 - 12 of the budget document. Will they be used as a key guide and will comments be made in this debate? I am presuming - correct me if I am wrong - that there will be identification of priorities in the budget document.

CHAIRMAN: Did the Deputy Director-General understand the question?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I think so. The verbatim records of this discussion will be carefully analysed by the Secretariat if we have to embark on the melancholy process of reprogramming. A number of areas have been repeatedly singled out by delegations from all parts of the world as being the areas they consider to be of major priority. These will be put alongside the areas of priority suggested in the draft Programme of Work and Budget before any preliminary decisions are taken as to the way cuts can be applied. I say "preliminary" because it would surely be one of the most important roles of the Programme Committee to advise in this process. Ultimately the results would go to the Council so that the membership would be closely associated with the entire process.

CHAIRMAN: Canada, is that the extent of your questioning?

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): I appreciate the Deputy Director-General's response to the questions raised from the floor, and particularly those from Switzerland and Norway. I am somewhat apprehensive, however, about the belief that the United States will be able to pay its full 1987 assessment out of the 1988 appropriation. I expressed yesterday my delegation's serious concern over the fact that only the most optimistic forecast would lead to the expectation that such full payment would occur in the short term. I said that while the United States Executive had requested full funding for international organizations, based on information available as at last Friday, our basic expectation overall was, and remains today, that no more than 40 percent of what was requested would be appropriated.

Unfortunately, the medium-term forecasts covering the 1988-89 biennium is no better. If these assertions are accepted as realistic by the Deputy Director-General, how then would the Nordic questions regarding replenishment of the Working Fund be answered under the Financial Rule 6.5?

CHAIRMAN: I believe your question was because there is a difference between proposing and appropriating money, how in the event that the Congress does not approve the President's request, would that affect the particular point raised by the representative of the United States of America.

V. J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The replenishment of the Working Capital Fund for the amount by which it is drawn depends on the payments of the contributions, due as arrears. The payments due from the largest contributor would be the largest part of the arrears,

but other arrears are also due and the replenishment of the Working Capital Fund would be done as a matter of first call - that is, as soon as the arrears of contributions are paid, whoever they come from, they would go first to replenish the Working Capital Fund.

CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegation have questions to put to the Secretariat in response to the questions raised earlier in the discussions? Seeing none, we move on to the next item.

14. Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes

14. Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux

14. Examen del Programa Ordinario, en particular, evaluación de los programas especiales de acción

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The documents before you are once again fairly voluminous. We have the main document, the review of the Regular Programme and three supplements, supplements 1, 2 and 3. In addition I should like to draw the Commission's attention to document C 87/LIM/19, which gives the views of the last Session of the Council on this item, together with the views of the Programme Committee, as the Council felt they would be of interest and assistance to the Conference.

The Review of the Regular Programme is in the format and presentation with which you will be well acquainted. The three supplements which you have at this time concern the external evaluations of the Special Action Programmes for the control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development, the Seed Improvement and Development Programme and the Food Security Assistance Scheme.

I would firstly submit some comments on the Review of the Regular Programme. We have continued to respond to the directives of the Conference, the Council and the Programme Committee in our efforts to make the Review more analytical and informative, with a focus on implementation of achievements and results.

Since the first review, which was submitted to the Conference in 1979, we have now covered a substantial part of our technical programmes and activities through in-depth reviews and thematic reviews. Thus, two programmes, 21 sub-programmes - that is over one-third of the total - five programme elements and nine thematic topics have been systematically evaluated.

The review is in three parts as usual. Part 1 of the Review is the performance report, which gives quantitative information to the maximum extent possible, as well as raising issues which derive from an assessment of what has been implemented.

These performance reports do not pretend to be evaluations, although attempts are made to assess performance and impact. Of necessity, they are selective and designed to be factually informative.

As the review was prepared before the final impact of the programme adjustments of the current biennium took effect - the review was essentially prepared in the early months of this year - it will be evident that the results of these adjustments can only be assessed after the end of the biennium. Nevertheless the effects are already very evident as has been recognized by the Programme Committee and the Council.

Each chapter of this part of the review comments on the outlook and raises issues which we consider merit the attention of our Governing Bodies.

Part II of the review covers an evaluation of four sub-programmes in terms of their rationale, resources utilization, output, effects and impact. Here also a number of issues are specifically drawn to your attention to stimulate debate.

Part III of the review is the one which seems to be most evaluative and comprises two chapters. Firstly a review of FAO's extension activities: over the last six years more than 700 activities have provided advisory services to member countries in the field of extension; 125 meetings have been arranged with over 3 000 national participants; 480 training activities have been organized involving 12 000 trainees; over 100 publications have been produced and over 500 field projects implemented with an average annual expenditure of \$ 25 million.

The Programme Committee found this specific review a particularly striking example of in-depth analysis of a high standard - and I am not using my own words but the words of the Programme Committee. It considered that the findings merit wide dissemination and fully endorsed the lessons drawn for extension work in general and for FAO's role in particular.

Finally, the thematic review covers an evaluation of 285 Category Three meetings, i.e. sessions of panels, committees and working parties. The examination found that their functions are generally well-defined, they are useful for coordination and are reasonable in cost since many are co-sponsored with other UN agencies. The Programme Committee considered that these meetings play a valuable role in synthesizing experience, both for FAO and for FAO member countries, and cannot be substituted by other means of action.

I should now like to turn to the three independent external evaluations. These evaluations of three Special Action Programmes were commissioned by the Director-General on his initiative in order to have an objective and independent assessment of their performance and their recommendations for future improvements.

The evaluations were conducted by teams of senior external consultants of international standing. Each evaluation comprised three phases: firstly, a comprehensive desk review of the Regular and Field Programme activities; secondly, a series of field visits and finally the preparation of the reports.

All three evaluation reports are before you as submitted by the external consultants. Related to each report we submit the comments of the Director-General on the findings and recommendations and proposals for follow-up action.

The Programme Committee welcomed this initiative in commissioning these external evaluations, which the Committee considered to be an important element of FAO's evaluation system. It felt that such external evaluations, of special programmes which had been under implementation for long periods, could be a particularly valuable management tool and provided a useful means for identifying needed improvements in programme formulation and implementation. The Committee considered that external evaluations of major on-going programmes should continue to be carried out as appropriate and feasible, bearing in mind that they had significant cost implications. The Committee felt that the evaluation reports represented comprehensive, informative, frank and objective reviews of three important priority programmes. It also appreciated that the evaluation reports had been submitted together with the reaction of the Director-General, which facilitated a meaningful consideration of the recommendations and of his proposed follow-up actions.

The evaluation of the Special Action Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and related development has stressed the major constraints of the disease not only on livestock production in Africa but also on rural development in general in the countries of its occurrence.

The findings of the evaluation have endorsed the relevance of the programme and commended the results achieved so far.

This evaluation presented a number of recommendations for FAO which have been accepted by the Director-General. The action taken and planned in response to these recommendations is clearly indicated in the comments. The Programme Committee stressed that the recommendations addressed to member governments were essential for the future development of the programme and expressed the hope, that the Conference would invite member countries to commit themselves to their implementation.

The evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme recognizes the effective role of the programme in mobilizing resources and in building up national seed programmes. The emphasis on training has been found particularly effective. The SIDP has received positive support from donors with extra-budgetary expenditures of some \$ 96 million since its inception. Substantial assistance has been provided in the formulation of national seed programmes and through the execution of field projects.

The recommendations addressed to FAO have been accepted, almost in their entirety. These include the need for a more focussed and programme-oriented approach, and for more selectivity in project development, to ensure effective technical backstopping and to maintain emphasis on countries where

national seed development strategies could be developed. The consultants recommended that increased resources be allocated for seed development programme planning, seed development training, the establishment of regional advisory teams and for strengthening agri-business management for the seed industry. The Director-General intends to respond to these resource needs, under the present financial circumstances, through the redistribution of existing resources, increased inputs to the SIDP from units other than the Seed Service, as well as by mobilizing additional extra-budgetary resources.

A number of recommendations addressed to Member Nations also merit the attention of the Conference.

The evaluation of the Food Security Assistance scheme has found that within its mandate FSAS has identified and implemented a sound programme of activities. The problems and limitations of certain activities, for example in connection with the management of strategic grain reserves, are not overlooked as indeed any other areas needing further effort. Thus it is recognized that while the FSAS has been satisfactory in the area of promoting and strengthening national efforts to enhance stability in the flow of food supplies, it has not yet evolved as a programme to tackle all aspects of the wider concept of food security, owing to policy constraints in countries themselves and the uncertain nature of financial support from the donor community.

Here again, the thrust of the recommendations of the evaluation is accepted by the Director-General who has outlined in his comments a step-by-step approach for future action, taking into account constraints on resources and other factors beyond the control of FAO. Among the recommendations addressed to member countries I would highlight the need for better coordinated action among donor and recipient governments and greater assuredness of donor assistance to permit better medium- and long-term planning of assistance.

The documentation before the Conference is undoubtedly voluminous but in a sense I do not need to make any apology for that. I believe that you will recognize in this documentation the sincere desire of the Secretariat and of the Director-General to respond to all suggestions made by the Conference at earlier sessions, on the importance of evaluation and of its outcome being available to Member Nations.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): Sr. Presidente, permítame iniciar esta intervención sobre el tema 14 de nuestra Agenda, agradeciendo al Sr. Shah su elocuente presentación del mismo.

Al efectuar nuestras observaciones relacionadas con el quinto examen del Programa Ordinario de la FAO, mediante el cual se evalúa el funcionamiento de los programas de esta Organización desde el punto de vista de sus objetivos, de su ejecución y de sus efectos prácticos, la Delegación de Panamá desea primero referirse muy brevemente a algunos aspectos sustantivos de carácter general, y luego analizar más detenidamente otras situaciones que, en las actuales circunstancias, considera de primordial interés.

Estimamos oportuno dar comienzo a nuestras observaciones reiterando el reconocimiento de la utilidad y la necesidad de la evaluación sistemática de los programas, como un instrumento eficaz para introducir adelantos, efectuar enmiendas, corregir errores y, de esta forma, obtener mejoras progresivas en la labor de la FAO.

A tal efecto, coincidimos con que este tipo de examen es el mecanismo básico que permite mantener informados a los Organos rectores de la Organización, así como a los organismos que la asesoran, sobre la ejecución de las actividades que conciernen al Programa Ordinario, incluyendo sus logros y resultados, lo mismo que sus interrelaciones con el Programa de Campo.

Nos complace destacar a este propósito, y por ello elogiamos la labor de la Secretaría, que la presentación del documento C 87/8, al igual que sus suplementos, responden a sugerencias y recomendaciones anteriores, tanto del Consejo como de la Conferencia. Es en este contexto que expresamos nuestra complacencia por los cambios que, en manera creciente, se vienen operando en la estructura y en el contenido del examen del Programa Ordinario, el cual, consideramos, es cada vez más informativo, analítico y orientado hacia los resultados tal como fue sugerido.

Por todo esto, expresamos en forma global nuestro apoyo al examen en cuestión.

Sin embargo, al iniciar el análisis de las diferentes partes del documento y sus suplementos, quisiéramos efectuar algunas breves, muy breves consideraciones y recomendaciones de carácter general que, a nuestro juicio, podrían contribuir a orientar la futura cuestión del Programa Ordinario. A tal efecto, al referirnos al Programa Principal: Agricultura, que está orientado fundamentalmente a dar respuestas a las dos principales prioridades de la FAO, a saber, el fomento a la producción de alimentos y la mejora de la seguridad alimentaria, estimamos que, aunque a nuestro parecer, dichas prioridades son consideradas en forma satisfactoria, sería procedente que se intensificara lo relativo a la reducción de pérdidas posteriores a los procesos productivos, ya que dichas pérdidas representan uno de los mayores problemas que afectan a la producción y a la capacidad alimentaria del mundo en desarrollo.

Para nuestra Delegación, es motivo de gran preocupación las dificultades en que se encuentran algunos importantes sectores de la actividad del Programa Principal, con motivo de las limitaciones financieras que vienen afectando a la Organización. Problemas, que como ya hemos tenido ocasión de manifestar, consideramos, insistimos, se deben en gran parte a situaciones de tipo político.

Sin desmérito a ninguna actividad o programa, la Delegación de Panamá otorga una particular importancia al estudio que en el ámbito del programa 2.1.8: Política alimentaria y agrícola se está realizando sobre la agricultura en América Latina y el Caribe. Asimismo, y dentro del área de acción de dicho programa, concedemos un especial interés al examen sobre la función de las raíces, tubérculos y plátanos en la seguridad alimentaria. Particular mención nos merece también el establecimiento del nuevo subgrupo de cueros y pieles, que nuestro país tuvo el honor de presidir.

La Delegación que represento, ha siempre concedido una atención prioritaria a los programas de acción aprobados por la Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros. Por tal motivo, lamenta y llama la atención, del hecho de que la reducción tajante de recursos extrapresupuestarios está afectando peligrosamente al programa de acción referente a la planificación, ordenación y desarrollo de la pesca, el cual constituye la base para la ejecución de los otros programas de acción.

Dentro del contexto del Programa Principal, nuestra Delegación, al referirse al Programa de Montes, manifiesta su apoyo al plan de acción forestal de los Trópicos. Deseamos, de la misma manera, expresar en este marco de referencias nuestra solidaridad y conformidad con los programas de Cooperación Técnica y Apoyo al Desarrollo.

A propósito del Programa de Cooperación Técnica, la Delegación panameña estima oportuno reiterar su total apoyo al PCT. El mismo representa, a juicio de nuestras propias experiencias, y estamos seguros en el de la casi totalidad de las delegaciones presentes en esta Conferencia, un instrumento de gran beneficio para los países en desarrollo, sobre todo ahora que existe una crisis de la acción multilateral, y que por sus efectos han disminuido sensiblemente otros recursos de asistencia al desarrollo.

Por ello, nos oponemos a que no se permita elevar su nivel presupuestario.

Nuestra Delegación manifiesta también su aprecio por los análisis a fondo efectuados en la segunda parte del examen. Expresamos en este sentido nuestra satisfacción por la manera en que se tratan los cuatro subprogramas que, en conformidad con las recomendaciones de la Conferencia Mundial sobre reforma agraria y desarrollo rural, tienen como objetivo principal favorecer ante todo a la población rural pobre. A este propósito nos identificamos con las actividades y los logros de los subprogramas de Sanidad Animal, Política de Nutrición en los países, Utilización y Comercialización del Pescado y Desarrollo Forestal Comunitario.

Nos complace particularmente los logros alcanzados por el subprograma de Sanidad Animal y en especial, por las actividades efectuadas por la lucha contra la tripanosomiasis y la peste bovina básica, así como para la prevención de la peste porcina africana en América Latina y el Caribe, de cuyo éxito nuestro país puede dar fiel testimonio. Al respecto, apoyamos de manera específica lo expresado en el párrafo 5 del documento C 87/LIM/19, y en particular lo que se relaciona con el apoyo financiero urgente a la escuela de lucha anti-mosca tsè-tsè en Burkina Faso.

Con relación a la parte tercera del examen y que trata de los temas especiales e informa sobre las actividades técnicas de la Organización, a saber: la investigación agrícola y la cooperación técnica entre países en desarrollo, la Delegación de Panamá desea manifestar su satisfacción por los resultados del examen en tal sentido. Expresamos nuestra convicción de que ambas cuestiones son elemento fundamental del enfoque de la cooperación técnica brindada por la FAO y que, por lo tanto, merecen nuestro total y decidido apoyo.

Deseamos manifestar asimismo, que para mi Delegación, la CEPD y la CTPD representan uno de los mecanismos de autosuficiencia colectiva más válidos que poseemos los países en desarrollo y los consideramos una de las premisas fundamentales para la instalación de un nuevo orden económico internacional. Por esta razón las apoyamos de manera firme, decidida y prioritaria en todas las actividades de la FAO. Estimamos, sin embargo, que debe quedar claro que dicha cooperación no sustituye la cooperación Norte-Sur.

Por otra parte, la Delegación de Panamá, agradece la evaluación externa del Plan de Asistencia para la Seguridad Alimentaria (PASA), y manifiesta su seguridad de que, su análisis, conclusiones y recomendaciones, el Consejo, la Conferencia y el Director General sabrán obtener útiles indicaciones para fomentar la seguridad alimentaria. A tal propósito, hacemos nuestras y respaldamos en forma global las consideraciones y conclusiones del Sr. Director General.

Deseamos resaltar el hecho de que nuestra Delegación no ha escuchado nunca por parte de los países en desarrollo quejas graves de ninguna de las actividades que conforman el Programa Ordinario de la FAO. No hemos sabido tampoco que dichos programas sean utilizados como elementos de presión para obtener tal o cual concesión. Por el contrario, en general, todos hemos siempre expresado que los mismos son pertinentes, adecuados y oportunos. Consideramos pues, que esa es la mejor evaluación que se puede hacer de ellos.

Por último, y ya que estamos en el uso de la palabra, nuestra Delegación quiere dejar constancia que reconoce, y de eso no tenemos ninguna duda, el carácter técnico de esta Organización, pero, como bien dijo el distinguido Embajador de Costa Rica, somos representantes de estados soberanos y si bien los temas son técnicos, la discusión de los mismos no puede hacer abstracción de los elementos políticos necesarios para sustentarlos. Por otra parte, consideramos que no es menos cierto que son los mismos países que con frecuencia y para su propia conveniencia se acogen al principio del carácter técnico de la FAO los que introducen en la práctica los elementos políticos a los que hoy se nos quiere impedir hacer referencia. Nos asociamos pues, a las expresiones de preocupación manifestadas por las diversas delegaciones y relacionadas por la manera en que se están conduciendo los debates de esta Comisión.

CHAIRMAN: Once again the Chair would point out that is not what the Chair said in response to the delegate earlier this morning. It simply read the pertinent part of the rules and indicated that we must either live by our rules or change the rules.

Srta. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Aunque tuvimos la oportunidad de pronunciarnos durante el Consejo sobre este tema, consideramos importante traer al máximo órgano rector una síntesis de nuestros comentarios que destaquen lo ya planteado por el Comité del Programa, a cuyos miembros y Presidente felicitamos por el calificado y muy completo trabajo, así como a la Secretaría y al Sr. Shah por la excelente presentación del tema.

El análisis de los resultados en ejecución del Programa Ordinario del bienio 86-87 nos confirma, una vez más la capacidad de nuestra Organización para alcanzar niveles de eficiencia y transparencia mayores y para transformar sus actividades y estructuras de manera firme y paulatina, conforme a las prioridades que el consenso internacional marca.

Por ello, al reconocer la incidencia negativa que los problemas de liquidez tuvieron en el cumplimiento de varios de los programas, reiteramos el imperativo de evitar que reducciones drásticas de los recursos y del personal puedan vulnerar la reconocida efectividad de la FAO e insistimos en que, en caso necesario, esos ajustes continúen a concentrarse en las esferas administrativas y no en los aspectos técnicos de los programas, continuando a identificar mecanismos que le permitan optimizar la utilización de los recursos disponibles. .

Asimismo, que al priorizar actividades, se debe otorgar la máxima importancia a aquellos programas que responden a las necesidades y prioridades de los países en desarrollo con especial cuidado de la debida vinculación entre actividades de asistencia técnica y las necesidades de cada país. La eficiencia de las operaciones de campo dependen en gran medida de la solidez, amplitud y calidad del Programa Ordinario.

Coincidimos con el Comité del Programa en confirmar la eficiencia con que el Director General ha introducido los cambios en los programas dadas las limitaciones financieras impuestas y en que al respecto no pueden aplicarse meros criterios de costo-beneficio (párrafos 2.8 y 2.9).

En el Programa de Agricultura 2.1 nos preocupa la reducción de las actividades de capacitación, y que no haya aumentado el apoyo técnico a proyectos de campo.

Subrayamos la importancia que en el programa 2.1.1 y el 2.1.4 han alcanzado los trabajos y la investigación en materia de recursos fitogenéticos. El avance de esas actividades representa un importante paso hacia adelante en la modernización de las funciones de la FAO y en una mejor respuesta a los intereses estratégicos de los países en desarrollo y de los industrializados, de lograr una mayor seguridad alimentaria mundial viable y sostenida. En esa empresa quisiéramos ver involucrados a todos los países, en particular a los que más pueden ofrecer en este sector dada su experiencia y poder económico.

Respecto al programa 2.1.5, y a pesar del reconocimiento que han merecido las actividades vinculadas a la promoción de resultados de la Conferencia Mundial de Reforma Agraria y Desarrollo Rural, su impacto parece ser todavía exiguo.

Nos congratulamos, de que en el programa 1.2.8, se le haya dado una mayor atención a los tubérculos, raíces y plátanos, que son tan importantes para la agricultura y para la autosuficiencia de la alimentación.

Otro programa que ha recibido un importante impulso es el de la pesca, que representa también un paso trascendental en la transformación y actualización de la FAO, en respuesta a una realidad que exige una explotación más racional y sostenida de los recursos pesqueros, y de una alimentación más diversificada, rica y segura conforme lo estableció la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca.

Aplaudimos la incorporación de la FAO al problema de la crisis de los ecosistemas y la degradación del medio ambiente ya que es indispensable convenir una estrategia de largo plazo para la conservación y aprovechamiento racional de los recursos naturales y el cuidado del medio ambiente. De ello depende en buena parte la viabilidad futura de la agricultura, la pesca y la silvicultura y aunque se encuentra en el programa de montes, quisiéramos verlo también atendido con mucha mayor fuerza en los otros programas. Reiteramos que nuestra Organización debe influir para evitar que intereses económicos de corto plazo sigan imponiendo su lógica miope a un proceso que, de continuar así, compromete la sobrevivencia misma de la humanidad.

Destacamos que el PCT ha probado año tras año su gran utilidad. Ello se ha plasmado en este examen, en donde se refleja el entusiasmo de los países receptores por esos programas y la forma eficiente y transparente con que se aplicaron los recursos, lamentando también las enormes necesidades que impiden ampliarlos.

Reconocemos, en particular, la atención prioritaria a la región del Africa, que continúa atravesando por una crisis agrícola y alimentaria estructural.

Aplaudimos que el proceso de automatización y simplificación en el procesamiento de datos y otorgamiento de servicios, particularmente este último a través del FINSYS y PERSYS, permita ahora una mejor gestión interna y un mayor acceso a la invaluable información de la FAO.

Agradecemos a la Secretaría el examen de los cuatro subprogramas contenidos en la segunda parte, así como el de las actividades de extensión de la FAI que consideramos un aspecto clave para la FAO y los gobiernos nacionales como lo expresa el Comité del Programa en el párrafo 2.21. Tomamos nota del examen de las reuniones de categoría tres en la parte tercera, que han probado su utilidad pero coincidimos con el Comité en que deben precisar en cada caso más claramente sus objetivos.

En cuanto a los tres programas de acción evaluados, confirmamos su utilidad y claridad.

Respecto a la lucha contra la tripanosomiasis, la capacitación e investigación de nuevas fórmulas preventivas y combativas deben alentarse.

El programa de mejoramiento y desarrollo de semillas nos merece una gran importancia, y su evaluación es fundamental ya que la promoción de semillas mejoradas cuando es indiscriminada puede conllevar necesariamente el acompañamiento de insumos: fertilizantes, plaguicidas, maquinaria, sistemas de riego, etc., que terminan beneficiando una agricultura de carácter comercial, haciendo más dependientes a los países en desarrollo, desplazando a pequeños agricultores y ganaderos, erosionando la diversidad genética y causando daños ambientales irreversibles como la degradación de los suelos.

Debemos recordar que actualmente la industria semillera comercial está concentrada en grandes corporaciones que han buscado así combinar e inducir la compra de insumos agrícolas y el control del mercado de los productos agrícolas. Este es el caso, por ejemplo, de corporaciones petroleras y petroquímicas que así han incrementado el mercado de sus productos.

A la luz de la evaluación, nuestra delegación insiste en que este programa debe transformarse para evitar esos efectos nefastos y para impulsar la investigación de variedades y el mejoramiento y desarrollo de semillas que no conlleven a una mayor dependencia externa y que respondan a las condiciones agroclimáticas, sociales y ecológicas de los países en desarrollo. El programa debe ser explícito en cuanto que la introducción de semillas conlleva la introducción de insumos y de sistemas y métodos de producción y mercadeo.

Asimismo, por lo que respecta al PASA, reconocemos que se han iniciado algunos progresos, pero lamentamos que aún no se haya convertido en un programa completo. En ese sentido, al responder al concepto ampliado de seguridad alimentaria, debe darle toda la atención a la comercialización, producción, acceso y uso de insumos agrícolas y al objetivo de que los países en desarrollo alcancen una mayor independencia económica y tecnológica del exterior.

Finalmente, quisiera traer a esta audiencia el comentario personal que hiciera el Sr. Mazoyer, Presidente del Comité del Programa, durante la presentación del tema al Consejo, en el sentido de que estas evaluaciones pueden ser igualmente valiosas si se hacen en forma interna pero independiente y si se fijan adecuadamente los términos de referencia. Esto mantendrá la validez, disminuyendo costos. Nuestra delegación concuerda con esta posición, y esperamos que en ella coincidan otras delegaciones, sin que pudiera ser considerado como un elemento que quite transparencia a la Organización, pero sí racionalizar los costos.

C.B. HOUTMAN (Netherlands): First of all I should like to thank Mr Shah for his usual clear introduction of the documents we have before us, the Review of the Regular Programme; the Evaluation of the Action Programme for the Control of African animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development; the Evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme and the Evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Scheme. As usual the Review gives an extensive overview of the activities of the Regular Programme which, as always, is very informative. Since the Netherlands has always requested external - and I emphasize external - evaluations of programmes and schemes and since three external evaluations are on the agenda today, I should like to restrict this intervention to deal with these three evaluations. Besides, our ideas and priority setting in the Regular Programme have already been elaborated in the preceding agenda item on the Programme of Work and Budget.

However, before touching upon the content of the valuation reports we wish to commend the Director-General's decision to have the Special Action Programmes evaluated in the way they have been. We think these evaluations are examples of how evaluations of schemes and programmes, whether they are intra-budgetary or extra-budgetary funded, should be carried out. Highly competent consultants should be employed for such work. Having said this I would like to make a few remarks. Firstly, concerning the evaluation of the Action Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development.

We think the report is a balanced one. We share consultants' concerns on the fact that, albeit understandable for the difficult economic circumstances they are facing, tsetse and trypanosomiasis

control has not always received by some countries as high a priority as it deserves in their government development programme.

Nevertheless, we agree with FAO and now with Mr Shah when it mentions that it is essential for policymakers to fully realize the importance of tsetse and trypanosomiasis as a major constraint not only to livestock development but to rural development in general. We therefore endorse in principle the recommendations made by the consultants. We are, however, still convinced that whatever organizational structure there will be, and a rather heavy one is recommended, success in the control of trypanosomiasis will be achieved only if at the political level the right priorities are set, nationally as well as regionally.

Finally, we would also like to emphasize that in setting these priorities, which sometimes lead to extensive spraying programmes, another important item often mentioned during this conference should not be forgotten. I mean the ecological priorities set to enable people to live in a healthy environment. Having said this, I come to the evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme.

The results of the evaluation affirm the idea the Netherlands have expressed earlier that modern Western seed development blue prints are often not suitable for circumstances in developing countries. Therefore, the Netherlands will continue to support the SIDP activities which endeavour the development of national, and if necessary small-scale, methods of seed production and storage.

In this respect we share with the Director-Cenerai, consultants' view that increased attention in SIDP should be paid to planting materials and seeds for traditional crops as certain local varieties of roots, tubers, sorghum, millet and grain legumes. We implicitly stressed the importance of this during the last two sessions of the Committee on World Food Security.

We also welcome the intended strengthening of the institutional structure and management of the SIDP and the Seed Information Service as well as the greater emphasis on donor coordination. And, Mr Chairman, my delegation fully agrees with the priority that is given to training and the development of training materials and training facilities. I now come to the evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Scheme. I hope you will allow us to elaborate a little more in depth on this report.

We feel that the consultants, Dr Rao from India and Dr Popp from Switzerland, did an excellent job. They researched critically the role of all three involved parties: FAO, recipient countries and donor countries, and they came out with a well balanced report that together with the comments of the Director-General which constitute document C 87/8-Sup.3. Of course, some remarks are always possible, and we will make a few, but this will not affect our opinion that the consultants used their professional capacity to the maximum extent.

Having said this you will not be surprised that we endorse the recommendations of the consultants in general. Nevertheless, allow us some remarks and comments on a few subjects.

As mentioned in the report the FSAS started with terms of reference deducted from the food security concept then prevailing. In 1983 this concept had been broadened to the total of production, stability and access to food.

The consultants stated rightly that, while the concept of food security was redefined the logical reorientation of the terms of reference of FSAS did not materialize. It is therefore not too astonishing that the consultants found that FSAS did not respond adequately to the new concept, which in our opinion is too broad to be taken care of by FSAS alone. This leads to the conclusion that a new mandate should be defined for FSAS, a mandate that should be restricted more or less to the tasks mentioned in paragraph 57 of page XIV in the consultants' summary. We agree to these tasks on the understanding that "building national capabilities in various aspects of food security" as mentioned under b in paragraph 57 is not referring to capital intensive investments for food security. We do not say FSAS should close its eyes for these investments, related to food security, but, while it could even initiate and finance feasibility studies for those, the scheme should not implement these projects. It should, of course, be a broker who brings in other financing institutions such as World Bank and IFAD or bilateral donors which could finance and implement these investment projects.

We think that a system of monitoring should be developed involving parties concerned. We feel that the present situation of officially dealing with FSAS once every two years during the CFS, is not sufficient. We propose to establish a type of FSAS monitoring consortium that meets regularly. Such a system has to be worked out and we would like the Secretariat to think it over and, to come with proposals in this respect to the next CFS.

We like to put strong emphasis on the recommendations of the consultants on FAO's role in the recipient countries as described in paragraph 95, page XIV in their summary. I quote "FAO needs to assume, and to be seen to have assumed, leadership in assisting Governments to define and attain the objectives of National Food Security, etcetera."

This is a major part of the policy adviser's role FAO should play, as my Minister also stated in his address in the plenary. While we agree with the Director-General as to his comment to this recommendation where he states that coordination of food security could best be instituted by the Government of the aid recipient country, we also think that FAO should do more than waiting for a request. Is it not so that there is a FAO Country Representative in most of the recipient countries? Is such a person only representing as an ambassador or is he supposed to act also as a policy advisor? We feel that this last part should be his main task. And when a country representative is assigned to a country with food security problems, he should carry in his intellectual baggage a profound knowledge of the many, if not all, aspects of food security. This Country Representative has an important and responsible task in this field and he should operate accordingly. Or at least he should have a senior staff member who could deal with this matter.

We would like to rectify a probably unintended suggestion as if donors were responsible for the fluctuations of the contribution to FSAS as stated in paragraph 10 of the Comments of the Director-General to the report. In fact my Government did donate in some years more than others. The fact that some project proposals were not financed had sometimes to do with our own rules. But the decrease in donation was mainly due to the fact that millions of guilders were resting in FAO's bank account waiting for spending, sometimes for several years. And this is the main reason why there was a decrease in contributions over time. It would have been better when the full background of these fluctuations had been presented as well as the ways some of these difficulties have been overcome in the meantime.

We would like to express our appreciation for the fact that the Director-General already has implemented some of the recommendations. He proposed in the Programme of Work and Budget some organizational changes in the Commodities and Trade Division as to the subject of Food Security Policy and the FSAS Unit.

We have the feeling that it could work out in the opposite way as intended. Where an upgrading and strengthening of the Food Security Assistance, Unit is advocated for the proposals for the organizational change in the Commodities and Trade Division effectively decreases the number of people with one half.

This, added to a frozen vacancy of one, boils down to a Unit run by only 3 1/2 persons instead of the five before. We doubt whether this is an improvement. We suggest therefore to wait with the changes until the new mandate is formulated and to decide on an organizational change based on the requirements of the then formulated t.o.r.

In conclusion, we propose the following: 1. That the Secretariat prepare new terms of reference in which a new mandate for the FSAS is spelled out. This mandate should reflect the recommendations made by the consultants and today's debate on this subject; 2. That these new terms of reference should be put on the agenda of the next CFS (1988) for discussion, together with a proposal for organizational changes including staff with due regard to internal and external institutional links in the Organization; 3. That the idea of a monitoring consortium be worked out and be presented to the same CFS.

It is known that we, as the largest donor of the scheme so far, considered FSAS as a scheme that made valuable contributions to food security. We also think that changes have to be effectuated in order to enable the scheme to operate more efficiently. We have confidence that our proposals will be received positively.

Our future contributions to FSAS will be depending on the effectuating of the recommendations and of the proposals to be made by the Secretariat for discussion on the next CFS.

If it all turns out positively, multi-annual project related contributions will definitely be possible.

CHAIRMAN: We have now exceeded the time available to us today for discussion on these issues. Before adjourning the meeting I shall, as I indicated this morning that I would do at this time, give the floor to two delegations who have asked to exercise a "Right of Reply". I will give them in the order in which they were submitted yesterday. They are the United States of America and Israel.

RIGHT OF REPLY

DROIT DE REPOSE

DERECHO DE REPLICA

John COOK (United States of America): The United states would like to reply to the statement made by the Nicaraguan Delegate last Friday. The United States would have preferred to have delivered its reply on Friday but the Nicaraguan delegate had left early. We notice that they have also departed already today but we can no longer delay our reply. We strongly reject the Nicaraguan delegate's intervention of last Friday in which he raised matters not on the agenda, such matters being strictly the policy prerogative of the United States. In this forum no member has the right to raise such matters. We hope that the limited time of this Commission will not be wasted again by gratuitous statements such as those made last Friday by the Nicaraguan delegate.

Yosef HASSEN (Israel): On Friday, when I was absent from my place the Algerian Delegation found it proper to accuse Israel of aggression and succeeded to divert the attention of the Commission from the important problems under discussion to an issue of a completely political nature. I regret that by using my Right of Reply I find myself guilty of the same wrong-doing. But I cannot prevent myself from following the Middle East custom which is first to return fire and then wonder why. I have my doubts if the distinguished delegate of Algeria has ever visited the West Bank because if she did, she would not have such a distorted picture of the true situation there. We have no quarrel with Algeria, nor with Cuba or the Congo, and therefore I would like to extend to them an open invitation to visit the West Bank and be personally convinced that the situation in the Territories is not deteriorating but on the contrary it is improving significantly. The Palestinian farmers are learning and adopting modern Israeli methods of agriculture and irrigation and the food production is improving at a much higher rate than in most of the neighbouring countries of the region, including Israel, and we take pride in it. Strangely enough, the, Palestinian tomato grows better under the Israeli administration than it did before 1967. My invitation to Algeria is also extended to other African-Sahel countries to visit Israel proper, so as to have the opportunity to look at our achievements in fighting the desert area. We are more than ready and happy to share our experience with them in this field and other agricultural development projects.

I do not deny that political conflicts do exist in our region and which cast a heavy shadow on the daily lives of the inhabitants - Palestinians and Israelis alike. It is unfortunately a difficult and complex conflict but the FAO is not the place to express our political grievances. Political declarations or resolutions will not solve the conflict, but merely increase antagonism. I take permission to appeal to our political adversaries if they are honestly concerned with the welfare and well-being of the populations in the Territories to refrain from introducing again political controversy into the discussion. The FAO has an excellent history and record as a strictly technical organization. Let us keep it so.

CHAIRMAN: We have rules that we must go by and let us try to avoid some of this. If we want to see political debate, go to New York.

The meeting rose at 17.40 hours

La séance est levée à 17 h 40

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.40 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/10

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingtquatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

TENTH MEETING
DIXIEME SEANCE
DECIMA SESION

(17 November 1987)

The Tenth Meeting was opened at 10.15 hours
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La dixième séance est ouverte à 10 h 15
sous la présidence de Fred J.Eckert, Président de la commission II

Se abre la décima sesión a las 10.15 horas
bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

14. Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programme(continued)

14. Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris evaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux (suite)

14. Examen del Programa Ordinario, en particular evaluación de los programas especiales de acción (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: We will pick up where we left off yesterday and as I indicated at the end of the session, we have a list of speakers which has since been added to, but first on the list for this morning is Thailand.

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): My delegation would like to express our commendation to the staff for their preparation of the valuable programme review documents. It is noted that monitoring and evaluation of programmes implemented is one of the crucial stages in programme budgeting, which is also called the planning, programming and budgeting system. Hence high priority should be given, and comprehensiveness on monitoring and evaluating methodology and practices should be of great significance.

In this connection we would like to present some remarks about the review and evaluation programming. First, it is our view that clear presentation in the comparison of the actual outputs achievements, vis-à-vis targets set, will be of greater benefit. Such comparison would give light to project managers and the parties concerned to identify clearly the extent of actual achievement of the project and related shortcomings. Secondly, clear identification is also needed concerning the aspect of probable achievement of projects' immediate objectives and whether they are likely to lead to the achievements of the objectives of programmes. Such evaluation patterns and clear verifiable indicators and assumptions of achievement are of great significance in that the effectiveness in budget expenditures depend on how well the projects and programmes achieve the intended objectives that have been stated in the planning and programme process. In case the project or programme's objective is not to be achieved, problems and drawbacks will be easily identified and solved or replanned. And a project or programme may be discontinued if there are great constraints and problems without the possibility of achieving the objective. Then a decision can soundly be made whether to discontinue or phase it out and redeploy the budget for other worthwhile projects.

My delegation therefore would also like to express our view that the concept of certain effective evaluating systems such as the goal attainment approach and the systems approach should be integrated more intensively with the existing monitoring and evaluation work so as to increase the effectiveness in the review and evaluation and budget expenditures.

Another observation which my delegation would like to point out is related to the extent of priority to be given to livestock. In the review document a separate major programme has not been provided for livestock. Instead it appears under one of the programmes in the major agriculture programme, while agriculture, forestry and fisheries are treated as distinct major programmes. My delegation would also like to have livestock to be arranged as a major programme in view of its increasing significance in the developing agriculture-based countries for the following reasons: first, increased livestock is a great potential for the production of food and protein nutrient which are still far from sufficiency in most developing countries. Especially protein food and buffalo and cow milk relate to the better health condition of the poor and malnourished children. Secondly, a major improvement in livestock production in the developing countries would also generate more income to the poor farmers in addition to the meagre income from crops produced. The increase in livestock production would enhance the potential in the development of milk and meat products industry in these countries which is an approach of increasing importance in the aspect of agro-based industry. Such development would also help in reducing unemployment pressure and promote import substitution and would also help boost livestock products exports which will eventually help to alleviate the serious deficit in the balance of trade and balance of payments in most developing countries.

In the sixth five-year agricultural development plan, spanning 1987-1991, Thailand has given high significance to livestock as a major programme in light of the great virtue, as I have stated, and its importance in the diversification from traditional patterns of agricultural production. We therefore would also like to witness a major programme formulation and high priority provision for the livestock sector in the budget to support effectively the livestock sector in our country, as well as other developing countries.

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH. (Bangladesh): We note that the Review document C 87/8 has been produced in response to the mandate given by the Twenty-third Conference. The document consists of 250 pages of discussion and a 20 page summary. We congratulate the Secretariat for such an elaborate presentation. The Review indicates that the Major Programme of Agriculture continues to claim the largest share of both the Regular Budget and the regular programmed allocation for technical and economic activities.

The real increase in allocation for this Major Programme during the biennium was up by 3.6% over the preceding biennium. We welcome the continued importance of this Major Programme. However, the actual implementation is not quite clear. We fear that because of the financial constraints there may be a gap between planned allocation and actual utilization which would indeed be regrettable.

The Review indicates that the financial difficulties are likely to have an adverse effect on activities relating to training, seminar and expert consultations. Since these activities are the means of transfer of technology we consider this unfortunate.

Fisheries development is very important for Bangladesh. This sector is receiving increasing importance in our national planning. We believe there are many other countries which attach great importance to the fisheries sector. We note that the sector received a reduced allocation on both the Regular Budget and extra-budgetary resources. A serious decline in training activities has also been feared. Reduced importance has been attached to resource survey which is very vital for a sound and balanced exploitation of resources. We consider these developments disturbing, besides, they are also contrary to the wishes of the world community expressed in the Resolutions in the World Conference on Fisheries. We hope that these deficiencies will be made up during the next biennium.

In spite of some impressive gains in the Major Programmes on Forestry, the reduction in the number of training activities, seminars and expert consultations are disturbing developments. Curtailment of activities in the forestry sector at the time of growing ecological imbalance in many parts of the world with increasingly disastrous consequences for mankind is clearly unwelcome.

On the major programmes of Technical Cooperation and Development Support performance has been impressive, in particular, the efficiency and effectiveness with which FAO responded to the rehabilitation needs of African countries hit by the 1984 drought deserves appreciation. This shows once again that given the necessary support by all Member Nations FAO could continue to play an effective role in the alleviation of the misery of hunger and privation in the world. It is also mentioned here that the FAO Investment Centre has done an excellent job in identifying a large number of projects in developing member countries. This has helped the flow of investment from multilateral and bilateral sources to a large number of developing countries. We ask that FAO be given unqualified support to continue these activities.

The livestock sector is very important for Bangladesh, particularly because of a tremendous draught power shortage and scarcity of dairy products in the country. Therefore, I support the distinguished delegate from Thailand when he says that livestock should be treated as a Major Programme in the future. I believe that this should be seriously considered.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Le document qui nous est soumis est un document particulièrement substantiel et particulièrement intéressant. Il touche évidemment à des domaines extrêmement variés et extrêmement multiples allant de la pêche à la détection en passant par le système d'alerte rapide et la fourniture de renseignements en matière de publications agronomiques (système CARIS et système AGRIS). Je crois cependant qu'il est impossible de toucher à tous les problèmes.

J'ai entendu, au cours de nombreuses interventions, souligner le fait qu'il fallait, dans le domaine de l'activité de la FAO, déterminer des priorités. Or nous sommes tous d'accord sur le fait que le secteur de l'agriculture au sens le plus large est un secteur prioritaire, mais je n'ai pas entendu jusqu'à présent beaucoup de propositions précises en ce qui concerne les secteurs qui, dans le cadre des programmes d'activité de la FAO, seraient non prioritaires. Je n'ai guère entendu de suggestions et de propositions sur ce point.

Or, manifestement, que ce soit le secteur de l'agriculture, le secteur des pêches, le secteur des forêts, il s'agit de programmes prioritaires pour l'ensemble du monde, et d'une nécessité vitale pour la plupart des pays en voie de développement.

Je voudrais me limiter à deux aspects particuliers: le TCP (le programme de coopération technique et de soutien au développement) et les trois rapports d'évaluation - dont le principe d'évaluation lui-même - qui nous sont soumis en annexe au document C 87/8.

Nous soutenons le programme de coopération technique parce que nous estimons que même s'il est réduit financièrement et budgétairement, il est particulièrement important dans son rôle de catalyseur d'autres sources de financement.

Elaborer des projets est souvent chose difficile qui nécessite beaucoup de patience, beaucoup de mises au point, beaucoup de dialogues avec les partenaires. C'est certainement un domaine où des échecs sont inévitablement enregistrés. Dans ma pratique de responsable de la coopération, assumée pendant de nombreuses années, j'ai vu combien il était difficile de mettre des projets au point. Des projets, c'est un peu comme la vie des hommes: cela nécessite une longue gestation avant un accouchement et toute une évolution qui, selon la nature des projets, nécessite un temps plus ou moins considérable. Et je crois en effet que le programme de coopération technique est un peu la phase prénatale de la plupart des projets qui nécessite d'abord la rencontre d'un père et d'une mère, et ensuite les soins particuliers de celui qui porte le projet de façon à le faire éclore au jour dans de bonnes conditions et de lui permettre d'accéder à l'âge adulte après une période d'enfance suffisamment longue en fonction des besoins.

La FAO s'est préoccupée des programmes de coopération technique - que nous avons soutenus - parce qu'elle estimait (alors qu'un problème se pose à l'heure actuelle) que des sources de financement extérieures, soit de la coopération bilatérale, soit du PNUD, soit de la Banque mondiale ou d'autres organisations internationales, permettaient d'assurer le relais.

Je crois qu'il est important de retrouver le sens des projets de coopération technique et qu'un certain nombre d'organisations internationales, le PNUD notamment (comme j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de le dire à plusieurs reprises) évitent de devenir des agences d'exécution de ces projets mais qu'elles veillent au contraire à confier, dans le domaine de l'agriculture, dans le domaine des pêches, dans le domaine des forêts, ces projets à l'organisation spécialisée, en l'occurrence la FAO.

A plusieurs reprises, nous avons insisté sur le rôle des programmes de coopération technique et, à l'occasion de la discussion du Programme ordinaire, je voudrais à nouveau souligner toute l'importance que nous y attachons.

Je voudrais maintenant traiter et aborder brièvement les trois évaluations qui sont des documents particulièrement bien faits, et particulièrement bien étudiés.

Je voudrais tout d'abord me féliciter que, dans le premier document concernant la lutte contre la trypanosomiase africaine (document mis au point par un ressortissant belge, le Docteur Mortelmans et le Docteur Tjeelink, Directeur des services vétérinaires du gouvernement du Canada) on aborde de manière extrêmement précise et extrêmement concrète un problème difficile, délicat et important, qui est celui de la trypanosomiase animale africaine. Nous savons tous qu'il s'agit d'un programme à moyen et long terme qui nécessite une vigilance constante. Et je voudrais féliciter le Directeur général pour l'initiative qu'il a prise dans ce secteur d'évaluation externe. Je crois que la formule qui a été mise au point de s'adresser à des consultants spécialisés, que ce soit pour la trypanosomiase, que ce soit pour le problème des semences ou que ce soit pour le programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire, a fait ses preuves et qu'elle devrait pouvoir se développer dans l'avenir. La formule d'évaluation externe permet de porter un jugement serein, objectif et lucide sur un certain nombre de programmes.

Je crois que dans d'autres domaines prioritaires, il serait intéressant de poursuivre cette expérience et que les documents d'évaluation puissent être régulièrement soumis aux Etats Membres.

Nous avons parlé des priorités; nous avons pu constater que quelques membres de la FAO soutenaient que certains secteurs étaient moins prioritaires que d'autres. Des suggestions pourraient peut-être être faites sur le caractère moins prioritaire, ou non prioritaire de certains aspects du Programme ordinaire, de façon à ce que certaines évaluations externes puissent être faites, et certaines recommandations soumises au Conseil.

Je voudrais, en clôturant ce bref exposé, féliciter le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents qui nous ont été soumis; qui sont des documents non seulement intéressants à l'étude mais opérationnels pour l'action et qui permettent de tracer des pistes pour les orientations futures des activités du Programme ordinaire.

Václav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): On behalf of the Czechoslovakian delegation allow me to express several comments on document C 87/8 Supplement I. This document, prepared by two external specialists gives very good information on the general situation in the control of African animal trypanosomiasis. The present status and spreading of this parasitosis, programmes prepared for this purpose in the past more than 10 years, as well as the results obtained in these programmes, are analyzed in detail. Special chapters deal with the main problems to be solved in the future period. I have some comments on the material:

(a) It is a pity that the adverse ecological, economic, health and social implications of animal trypanosomiasis are not quantified in detail: the weight of the arguments concerning the social importance depends on verbal evaluation rather than on actual data (that is direct and indirect damage in pecuniary value to express the cost: benefit ratio). The only cogent argument for increasing the degree of priority in the programmes of governments and the financing organizations is a competent and well-documented presentation of the enormous losses caused by trypanosomiasis.

(b) My delegation fully supports the idea to concentrate the available resources and efforts to the selected places where early and permanent results can be expected.

(c) It is stated several times in the report that the worsening of the still very fragile infrastructure of veterinary services in the affected countries is one of the weakest points of the whole action. We fully agree with this view, because without solid organization of the state veterinary service there is little hope that programmes of this type would succeed. We believe, therefore, that some co-financing international organizations' tendencies to privatize the veterinary service are in strong contradiction with the objectives of the national and international sanitation programmes and lead to further weakening or even disintegration of the existing veterinary infrastructure, already now characterized as "very fragile".

(d) My delegation fully agrees with the realistic standpoint of the FAO Secretary-General to this document.

(d) We suggest for consideration that support should be given mainly to the regional FAO institutions in Africa which is the region that will decide how successful the action for the control of this insidious parasitosis will be.

Mme Isabelle GANSORE (Burkina Faso): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de partager l'avis du Conseil lorsqu'il a examiné ce point lors de sa dernière session. En effet, nous partageons les préoccupations du Conseil sur les effets négatifs de la situation financière de l'Organisation sur la mise en oeuvre de certains secteurs du Programme ordinaire, notamment la formation.

Nous approuvons de façon générale les conclusions et les recommandations des rapports d'évaluation sur les trois programmes spéciaux de la FAO.

Nous voudrions particulièrement insister sur l'évaluation du Programme d'action pour la lutte contre la trypanosomiase animale africaine et sur la mise en valeur des zones en cause, ainsi que celle du Programme de développement et d'amélioration des semences.

En ce qui concerne la trypanosomiase animale, des efforts ont été entrepris par mon gouvernement avec l'aide de la FAO et des autres donateurs pour enrayer ce fléau qui constitue un problème majeur, essentiellement dans la moitié sud du pays.

Dans le cadre de la lutte, l'accent est mis sur la lutte intégrée, en particulier sur la lutte biologique et les techniques non polluantes, en plus des méthodes chimiques, grace aux résultats du CRTA.

Le Burkina Faso a abrité la 4ème session de la Commission de la trypanosomiase animale africaine à Ouagadougou en novembre 1986, au cours de laquelle d'importantes décisions ont été prises pour la redynamisation de cette instance, par l'adoption d'une recommandation tendant à ce que les réunions de la Commission se tiennent désormais au niveau des ministres chargés de l'élevage et de la santé animale, et précédées d'une réunion de techniciens.

Par ailleurs, à Bobo Dioulasso notamment, se trouve une école de formation de cadres intermédiaires dans la lutte contre la tsé-tsé pour les pays francophones. La mission d'évaluation a reconnu le rôle majeur joué par cette école et a regretté le manque de soutien financier pour la poursuite de son programme. A sa quatre-vingt-douzième session, le Conseil a souligné la nécessité d'une aide financière à cette école. Je me réfère au document C 87/LIM/19, parlant du Programme ordinaire 1986-87, à la page 2, paragraphe 5. Je souhaite que notre Commission fasse sien l'appel du Conseil à l'intention de la Conférence.

En ce qui concerne les semences, mon pays est conscient de leur importance dans la production agricole. L'objectif de notre politique dans ce domaine vise à assurer aux agriculteurs un approvisionnement sûr, régulier et suffisant en quantité et en qualité de variétés adaptées aux différentes zones écologiques du pays. Un effort est fait dans la collecte, la conservation et la distribution de variétés performantes, afin de constituer des banques de semences au niveau de chaque province, d'une part, et d'autre part, d'intégrer les paysans aux opérations de multiplication de semences à travers les groupements villageois et les coopératives agricoles.

Enfin, nous regrettons sérieusement la façon arbitraire dont sont menés les débats de notre Commission et nous souhaitons qu'un effort soit fait en ce sens en vue d'améliorer le climat.

Salimoen SOERJOATMODJO (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to submit comments on FAO activities under the Food Security Assistance Scheme or FSAS and to refer in particular to the consultants' report on the evaluation of the Scheme, preceded by the Director-General's comments, as contained in document C 87/8 - Sup. 3. We welcome the report which has provided this Conference with valuable material for discussion and review.

First of all, the Indonesian delegation wishes to congratulate the Director-General for having taken the initiative to have an independent external evaluation undertaken of FSAS. We do feel that the timing of this evaluation has been most opportune, for two reasons at least, viz: First : the substantial, and in some respects even dramatic change in the world food situation and food security which has emerged during the ten-year period since the inception of FSAS in 1976; and Second; the adoption by the FAO Conference in 1983 of the wider concepts of food security, encompassing three most important areas, that is production, stability and access.

With regard to the first question the most remarkable feature has been the fact that while there has been a substantial increase of almost 26 percent in total world cereal production during the decade between 1976 and 1986, the performance of developing countries as a group in this respect has been even more significant, with production of cereals having increased by more than 35 percent to 943.5 million tons, or almost 28 percent of world grain production in 1986

In addition, total world cereal carry-over stocks have during the same period more than doubled to 398.6 million tons in 1986 and are forecast to increase further this year to 444.3 million tons, representing 26 percent of consumption, as compared to only 15 percent in 1976. Stocks held by developing countries as a whole are forecast to amount to 122 million tons this year, about 36 percent above the level of those in 1976.

While recognizing that such progress has not been shared equally among regions and countries (in fact, per caput food grain production has declined in several low-income food-deficit countries), these figures nevertheless indicate, or suggest, two most important developments, that is:

(a) Food security at the global level has considerably improved since the inception of FSAS a decade ago (and as a matter of fact conditions have changed from frequent, acute food shortages and tight supplies during most of the seventies to more-than-adequate food grain availabilities and depressed prices during the more recent years.

(b) Maybe even more importantly, developing countries as a group appear to have succeeded in adopting policies and programmes capable of accelerating growth in their food grain production and of strengthening their national food reserves.

As one could have expected, however, these rapid changes have also brought about the emergence of new challenges and as a result, the need for shifting of priorities in respect of national and international action programmes aimed at improving food security.

Thus, if during the seventies, the most pressing need in many countries of the developing world had been the stimulation of production growth, later on the need for assuring stability of supplies and of access to food for the population at large have increasingly called for more attention and effort from national governments.

Bearing this picture in mind and referring back to document C 87/8 - Sup. 3, the Indonesian delegation wishes to present the following views:

One, in endorsing the Consultants' assessment of the continued relevance of FSAS, we also wish to support the Consultants' recommendation, with which the Director-General is also in general agreement, and that is that: the scope of FSAS should be broadened in accordance with the wider concept of world food security in order to increase FAO's capacity in providing assistance to Member Governments in this broad area of food security in a more comprehensive, integrated and effective manner.

Two, we also wish to support the Director-General's view, that: to implement such broadened mandate, what is needed is the creation within the Organization, of a mechanism capable of coordinating in an effective manner FAO assistance in this area of food security, encompassing the three major elements of production, stability and access, without, however, bringing all the activities under the umbrella of a single programme.

Thirdly, we further agree with the suggestion that such coordinating functions could be entrusted to an upgraded steering committee, with membership at the level of Assistant Director-General.

Fourthly, we see the need for this programme to establish, or further strengthen, close cooperation with other programmes outside the Organization, which cannot be over-emphasized - in particular cooperation with such programmes or agencies as the World Food Programme, the World Bank, Regional Development Banks and IFAD; also other organizations within the United Nations family, particularly ESCAP which, for example, has recently been introduced in countries in the regions of Asia and the Pacific in collaboration with USAID, NOAA of the USA, an Agro-climatic Assessment Programme for drought-related food shortages; and other bilateral donors.

The Indonesian delegation is further in general agreement with the Director-General's views and comments as contained in paragraphs 40-45 of the document under consideration.

Abdel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): I should first like to thank Mr Shah for his fine presentation of this document that we have before us; namely the Review of the Regular Programme, as well as Evaluation of the Action Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis, the Evaluation of the Seed Development and Improvement Programme and the Evaluation of the FSAS. We have a broad-ranging review here of the Regular Programme, as has become customary. We find an account of everything that has been achieved which gives us an overall picture of the accomplishments and some of the difficulties. We therefore have an idea of where we might go from here.

In perusing this document, my delegation wishes to welcome the decision to commission the evaluation of the three special action programmes - all the more so since this was done outside regular funding.

My country also wishes to pay tribute to achievements under Major Programme 2.1 - Agriculture, and the work carried out in the Sub-Programmes on Harvesting, World Development and Agricultural Development. Nevertheless, we regret the cutback in funding and in particular we wish to highlight the accomplishments under Programme 2.2 - Fisheries.

My country wishes to thank Mr Shah for his introduction. We support what he had to say regarding the need for decision makers to be made aware of the importance of controlling African animal trypanosomiasis because this concerns not only the livestock sector, but rural development in -general. We welcome the consultants who have dealt in particular with this whole realm. We are also convinced that it would be timely and appropriate to carry out control activity on trypanosomiasis, provided there is proper coordination between national and regional activity.

We also wish to see programmes designed to protect eco-systems being pursued. We think it is important to encourage contributions from donors for the Seed Improvement and Development Programme, SIDP. We also believe that priority should be given to traditional seeds at the same time. We welcome the training component that has been included in this programme and also the progress made in the Food Security Assistance Scheme.

Peter A. WIESMANN (Suisse): La délégation suisse aimerait remercier très sincèrement le Secrétariat pour la documentation riche en informations et clairement présentée placée devant nous, ainsi que pour l'introduction claire de celle-ci par M. Shah.

Permettez-moi de limiter mon intervention à deux points qui nous, semblent particulièrement importants. Le premier se réfère au rôle insuffisant de l'assistance de la FAO à l'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre de politiques agricoles nationales tel que décrit au paragraphe 4.34 du document C 87/8. A notre avis, la FAO devrait participer activement aux tables rondes du PNUD ainsi qu'aux groupes consultatifs de la Banque mondiale. Mais pour pleinement assurer ce rôle, la FAO se doit de mettre en oeuvre les recommandations du rapport d'évaluation du PASA, qui vont d'ailleurs essentiellement dans la même direction que nos propositions de réforme contenues dans le document C 87/30.

Voici mon second point. Ma délégation félicite le Directeur Général et le Secrétariat d'avoir organisé trois évaluations externes dans des secteurs prioritaires à savoir la lutte contre la trypanosomiose, l'amélioration de la production des semences et le Programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire (PASA). Toutes trois ont été exécutées d'une façon très professionnelle. Mon pays a d'ailleurs demandé, depuis des années, que des évaluations externes soient organisées pour des programmes et projets de la FAO.

J'aimerais limiter mon intervention à l'évaluation du PASA, l'une des raisons en étant que la Suisse a toujours montré un grand intérêt pour ce programme et a été le second bailleur de fonds après les Pays-Bas. Le rapport d'évaluation du PASA identifie clairement les forces et les faiblesses de ce programme et donne d'importantes orientations pour améliorer son efficacité dans le futur. La Suisse est en faveur d'un concept large de sécurité alimentaire incluant les notions clés de production, stabilisation et accès. Nous pensons - et nous l'avons dit à plusieurs reprises - que l'approche par le biais d'une politique globale de #sécurité alimentaire permet un impact plus important que l'approche ponctuelle par projet utilisée par le PASA.

Nous constatons avec satisfaction que l'évaluation recommande que l'analyse des politiques et les conseils en matière de politique soient au centre des préoccupations du PASA. Il nous semble que les composantes principales du marché des aliments de base qui devraient être étudiées de façon approfondie sont les suivantes: premièrement, prix garantis aux producteurs; deuxièmement, importance d'une intervention par un office gouvernemental de l'alimentation; troisièmement, politiques de stockage et d'information, y compris de l'aide alimentaire; et quatrièmement, subventions ciblées pour les consommateurs les plus pauvres. Toutes ces études devraient tenir compte du contexte macro-économique.

Nous partageons entièrement l'opinion exprimée par le délégué des Pays-Bas selon laquelle la FAO, par le biais de ses représentants dans les pays en question, devrait prendre des initiatives dans le domaine de la politique de sécurité alimentaire. Et l'idée d'une équipe spéciale, comme le proposent les évaluateurs, devrait aussi être retenue pour remplir ce rôle. Le PASA doit recevoir les ressources humaines et financières requises et doit avoir un statut hiérarchique correspondant.

Nous n'excluons pas a priori la participation du PASA à l'exécution de projets spécifiques pour autant que ceux-ci soient réalisés dans le cadre de politiques alimentaires appropriées, car même de bons projets ne peuvent pas remplacer une bonne politique. Dans le passé, une attention trop grande a été donnée à la construction d'infrastructures de stockage sans politique correspondante. Cette orientation est compréhensible si on pense à la crise due à la sécheresse, surtout au Sahel; mais nous sommes d'accord avec les évaluateurs qui pensent qu'il est temps d'avoir une approche plus globale. L'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire est une tâche centrale, non seulement des pays concernés mais aussi de la FAO; et nous pensons que le Secrétariat doit se donner les structures nécessaires pour mieux répondre aux pays et à leur population.

Dans ce contexte, nous aimerions aussi appuyer les propositions faites par le représentant des Pays-Bas, à savoir la préparation par le Secrétariat d'un nouveau mandat élargi pour le PASA, tenant compte des recommandations des consultants et des résultats de nos délibérations. Les structures internes de la FAO devraient être adaptées à ce nouveau mandat élargi, et nous invitons le Secrétariat à présenter des propositions précises à ce sujet à la prochaine session du CSA.

Nous notons d'ailleurs que la plupart des recommandations de cette évaluation, à l'exception peut-être de celles concernant l'adaptation des structures internes, ont déjà été reprises par le Directeur général dans son introduction au document C 87/8-Sup.3. Cela nous confirme dans notre conviction que de tels exercices d'évaluation contribuent avant tout à renforcer la FAO et à améliorer son impact.

Joachim WINKEL (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): Allow me first of all to thank the Secretariat for this Fifth Review of the Regular Programme. My delegation largely subscribes to the views set out in this document and to the conclusions. Allow me to make some comments of a general nature. We welcome the very clear structure of C 87/8, which is divided up into the now traditional three parts: the performance report of the major programmes in part one; the special action programmes in part two; and the training activities of the Organization in part three which we consider to be of particular importance.

we welcome the evaluations undertaken of the Special Action Programmes for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis; document C 87/8 - Sup.1, of the Seed Improvement and Development Scheme -Sup.2, and of the Food Security Assistance Scheme in Sup.3.

Allow me to come to some of the important points in the documents. First, we very much welcome the fact that within the framework of the programmes in the Major Programme, Section 2.1 - Agriculture, the Study, African Agriculture: the Next 25 Years has been produced. We also support in this connection any strengthening of activities in the field of technical cooperation between developing countries, TCDC. In this respect, we very much regret that there are financial constraints which have also curtailed the activities of the Major Programme: Agriculture and this is particularly true of the training programmes, item 1.9 and table 1.2.

The second point as we see from section 1.16 of the document, in 1986 more than 1600 work-months financed from the Major Programme 2.1 were used in order to support field projects within the framework of the Regular Programme. My delegation recognizes and indeed appreciates the fruitful interaction between the activities within the framework of trust funds and those of the Regular Programme. We see that these have constituted a very valuable source of knowhow over the past 40 years. Nonetheless we believe that 1600 work-months is a very high figure indeed to backstop field projects and we would like to ask the Secretariat to do its utmost to avoid that the servicing of the core activities under the Regular Budget does not suffer from the workload of the support given to the special programmes. In this connection we were somewhat surprised at what was said in Part I, the conclusions on page 7 of the document, according to which some 60 percent of the working time of the technical personnel is devoted to support of field projects, either directly or in advisory capacity. We are not sure that this high value is true in absolute terms. In the last analysis, it is possible to measure exactly how much time is spent only by means of a system of time recording. Have such time recordings been made of all staff of the FAO-Secretariat? In fact we assume that this is probably an estimate based on data collected on a random basis. If this is the case we would recommend that such figures obtained on a random basis not be generalized too much in this way.

Our third point, we consider that a little more than 14 percent of the budget allocation being devoted to TCP to be too high a figure and we will also point out under the agenda item "Review of the Field Programmes" that for us the UNDP is the central agency for handling multilateral development cooperation.

Fourth, in the framework of the Major Programme 2.3, Forestry, we particularly welcome what has been done on the Tropical Forest Action Plan.

Fifth, in Major Programme 2.2, Fisheries, we very much welcome the fact that despite the cutbacks in the Regular Programme the results are nonetheless satisfactory as set out in paragraph 2.4.3.

Sixth, the Investment Centre has again achieved considerable success over the 1985-86 biennium and the total sum of US\$ 3 billion is a very impressive figure.

Seventh, we are very happy that in the establishment of Country Representations the road towards dual accreditation has been taken and in that way some 105 Member States now have Country Representations. We are also very pleased to note the restraint of Country Representatives in making use of their powers in the TCP area; only 34 percent of the powers were used in 1986.

Eighth, we also hope that, as expressed in the document, the operative phase of FINSYS and PERSIS can shortly start and that will give us an overview at any time of the financial situation and the staffing levels of the Organization. In this respect I would once again like to emphasize how very much my country values the work of the working units in FAO dealing with statistics and data processing.

Ninth, the results of the evaluation of the Special Action Programmes, documents C 87/8 - Sup. 1-3, meet to a very large extent with our support. The evaluation report on the campaign against African Animal Trypanosomiasis seems to us a suitable point for discussion among donor experts and we support the suggestion that national coordination committees be established. Individual details would of course have to be discussed by experts.

Tenth, the development of the Seed Improvement and Development Scheme seems to us of great importance and we promote such projects in many partner countries. According to our view sustained success can only be achieved by a long-term commitment to this activity and a continuation of the willingness for dialogue.

Eleventh, we also welcome the external evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Scheme. The consultants were positive in their evaluation and this comes out clearly from the evaluation report. However, we do have some reservations about an extension of mandate as proposed by the consultants. To the extent that it is proposed to make changes to the administrative structure of the Scheme, we consider that the existing structures, which have served us well, should be left in place. So far as we are concerned, it would suffice if the action programme were executed on the same basis as so far and that improvements be made to the weak points that have been identified, particularly with regard to coordination between donor countries, the FAO and the recipient countries.

Jean-Pierre POLY (France): La délégation française souhaite tout d'abord féliciter, M. Shah pour sa brillante présentation du sujet et remercier le Secrétariat pour la richesse du document C 87/8. Ce document qui a conservé la structure et la présentation de la précédente version conformément aux recommandations formulées, fournit de nombreuses données factuelles sur les activités de l'Organisation.

Nous y notons en particulier le souci constant de la FAO de renforcer la capacité de suivi et d'évaluation des programmes.

Ma délégation souhaite rappeler à cet égard l'importance qu'elle accorde à l'évaluation des activités de l'Organisation et souligner le rôle accru que le Comité du Programme devrait jouer dans l'avenir pour permettre aux Etats Membres de mieux apprécier l'impact des projets mis en oeuvre.

Nous considérons en particulier que doivent être favorisées les évaluations indépendantes et externes de programmes d'action spéciaux telles qu'elles nous sont rapportées à l'occasion de cette Conférence en ce qui concerne la lutte contre la trypanosomiase animale africaine, le programme d'amélioration et de développement du secteur des semences et le programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire.

Ma délégation, qui attache une importance particulière à ces rapports d'évaluation a préparé une intervention spécifique à ce sujet; toutefois, pour alléger nos travaux, elle se propose d'en remettre le texte au Secrétariat qui en assurera la diffusion.

La délégation française se félicite de l'orientation constatée à travers une mobilisation importante du Programme Ordinaire au service des activités de terrain, qui traduit la volonté de l'Organisation d'apporter une aide concrète aux Etats Membres sous la forme de services consultatifs ou d'appui technique et opérationnel aux projets de terrain.

Il convient néanmoins de rappeler à ce sujet, que, malgré les liens étroits existants entre le programme de terrain et le programme ordinaire, ces deux programmes poursuivent des objectifs très différents.

Le Programme de terrain, ainsi que nous aurons l'occasion d'y revenir lors d'une prochaine intervention de notre délégation, doit répondre à des besoins précis tandis que le Programme ordinaire -qui traduit la capacité de réflexion, de synthèse et d'orientation de la FAO - vise des objectifs plus généraux dans une perspective à plus long terme.

Cependant le Programme de terrain, dont les moyens financiers sont trois fois supérieurs à ceux du Programme ordinaire, tend à façonner ce dernier selon des orientations qui reflètent davantage la diversité des besoins des Etats Membres que les priorités définies par notre Conférence.

Le renforcement proposé par la délégation française du rôle du Comité du Programme, vise à renverser la tendance et à permettre au Programme ordinaire d'être - conformément à la vocation de la FAO - l'élément central susceptible d'impulser et d'orienter dans le sens des priorités définies au sein de l'Organisation, l'ensemble des programmes de développement agricole.

La délégation française a constaté que le rapport sur l'exécution des Grands Programmes permettait de recueillir de précieuses informations sur certaines activités essentielles de l'Organisation, le rôle des Bureaux Régionaux et l'articulation avec les activités du terrain.

Qu'il me soit donc permis, par un rapide survol du rapport, de présenter les observations suivantes:

Concernant le Programme Agriculture dont les moyens ont été réduits du fait des difficultés financières rencontrées, la délégation française remarque que l'Organisation a su cependant préserver l'appui technique aux projets de terrain et dans une moindre mesure l'appui direct aux Etats Membres.

Par ailleurs, ma délégation se félicite de pouvoir constater que l'Afrique est restée l'une des priorités essentielles de ce programme.

De même l'effort croissant qui a été fait pour promouvoir et renforcer les réseaux de coopération technique et économique doit être souligné.

Enfin nous notons avec satisfaction que la FAO a pris des mesures pour accentuer ses activités d'aide aux pays pour l'élaboration des politiques d'ajustement structurel et pour les conseillers dans leurs négociations avec les institutions financières.

Concernant le Programme des Pêches, la délégation française considère comme autant d'éléments favorables l'intensification des activités de conseil technique, la priorité donnée à la formation, la vulgarisation de systèmes peu coûteux d'aquaculture, l'effort consenti en faveur du développement de la pêche artisanale, la promotion des politiques halieutiques permettant à la fois de planifier le développement des pêches et de rationaliser le choix budgétaire des investissements.

Concernant le Programme des Forêts, ma délégation souhaite rappeler tout l'intérêt qu'elle porte au Plan d'Action Forestier Tropical, au lancement duquel la France a contribué.

Dans le domaine forestier, les activités d'appui aux Etats Membres et le soutien technique aux projets ont été, à juste titre, développés.

Ma délégation encourage l'Organisation à persévérer sur la voie d'une meilleure intégration des activités forestières dans le développement rural en favorisant notamment une réelle participation des populations aux projets.

Concernant le Programme de Coopération Technique la délégation française considère que seul ce programme permet à la FAO de répondre rapidement et de manière souple à des besoins non prévisibles des Etats Membres. Les caractéristiques spécifiques de ce programme doivent donc être soigneusement préservées et les projets retenus doivent répondre aux critères définis par les organes directeurs concernant notamment la durée limitée et le coût modeste des projets.

Par ailleurs, ma délégation saisit cette occasion pour souligner tout l'intérêt de la contribution apportée par le Programme de Relèvement de l'Agriculture en Afrique à la relance de la production agricole dans les 25 pays bénéficiaires.

Je voudrais, enfin, apporter le soutien de la délégation française au Programme de décentralisation engagé par l'Organisation pour une utilisation optimale des compétences techniques de la FAO afin d'aider les gouvernements à formuler et à mettre en oeuvre des politiques nationales de développement agricole et rural.

Les Représentants de la FAO sont à l'évidence de plus en plus sollicités et jouent un rôle de plus en plus important grâce notamment à une meilleure répartition des responsabilités et à un échange d'informations plus suivi entre le Siège et les Bureaux Régionaux.

Ma délégation se félicite de cette évolution.

Telles sont les quelques observations de la délégation française qui saisit cette occasion pour rappeler qu'il serait illusoire d'arrêter comme il convient une véritable programmation respectueuse des priorités définies sans le gage des contributions nécessaires.

CHAIRMAN: There being no objection, the remainder of your statement will as you requested be included in the verbatim at the end of the discussion on this item.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Mi Delegación aprecia en gran medida el documento C 87/8 y sus suplementos, presentados por la Secretaría. Al mismo tiempo deseamos felicitar al Sr Shah por su excelente presentación.

Hay algunos aspectos que merecen un comentario particular. En primer lugar, mi Delegación desea destacar que resulta lamentable que muchas actividades importantes de la Organización se han visto limitadas o suprimidas totalmente a causa de la insuficiente liquidez.

El Programa de Cooperación Técnica continúa siendo, como se demuestra en el examen del Programa Ordinario, uno de los principales instrumentos de la Organización en la promoción del desarrollo y la atención a situaciones de urgencia. Este Programa, cuya eficacia ha sido plenamente demostrada por el impacto benéfico que ha tenido en los países receptores, tanto desde el punto de vista de su capacidad de movilizar recursos humanos y materiales que existen en los países, a veces no explotados, como por la capacidad de atraer contribuciones suplementarias de otros donantes con fines de desarrollo o por situaciones de emergencia.

Además, debemos subrayar que por su razón de ser, este Programa permite a la FAO responder con rapidez a necesidades urgentes de los países. Es lamentable que a pesar de las bondades de este Programa, no pueda tener un incremento mayor en sus fondos.

Un tema de singular importancia, al que ya la FAO viene prestando atención, es el desarrollo de las raíces y tubérculos a partir de las especies autóctonas de los países, como parte de la estrategia de seguridad alimentaria. Sin embargo, estas actividades deben ser reforzadas y potenciarse en beneficio de los países en desarrollo.

Un programa que merece ser analizado con mayor detalle es el referido a la reducción de pérdidas posteriores a la cosecha, cuya evolución y desarrollo a nivel de los países tendrá, sin duda, un impacto benéfico como parte de las medidas a adoptar para la seguridad alimentaria. Somos del criterio de que este Programa sea examinado de manera particular en próximas reuniones.

Otra Delegación se ha referido a la importancia actual y perspectiva del desarrollo ganadero, tanto en lo que hace a la producción de leche como en la producción de carne. Es evidente, que en esta área de acción de la FAO, en la cual queda mucho por hacer, se requeriría de un mayor esfuerzo y una mayor acción de trabajo. Está demostrado que al nivel de los países en desarrollo de zonas tropicales y subtropicales es posible alcanzar buenos resultados productivos en la ganadería, mediante la aplicación de adecuados criterios de desarrollo, ingeniería genética y un manejo adecuado del ganado.

Mi Delegación ha examinado cuidadosamente las evaluaciones independientes realizadas en los programas de Lucha contra la Tripanosomiasis Africana, el de Seguridad Alimentaria y el de Desarrollo de Semillas, todos los cuales merecen nuestro respaldo por su calidad y objetividad de análisis y de las recomendaciones propuestas. En lo que se refiere al Programa de Desarrollo y Mejoramiento de Semillas, mi país ha tenido experiencias muy positivas de la acción de la FAO, al asistirnos para organizar un Programa Nacional para el desarrollo de la producción de semillas de calidad, cuyos resultados son altamente positivos.

El seguimiento y evaluación de toda actividad constituye un elemento determinante de éxito y mi Delegación desea reconocer el esfuerzo que en este sentido viene realizando, el Director General y la Secretaría para el fortalecimiento de los sistemas de seguimiento y evaluación, respondiendo a las demandas de los países miembros. Ello permitirá un examen sistemático de la labor de la FAO en beneficio de todos.

Para concluir, mi Delegación desea respaldar las acciones propuestas para la lucha contra la tripanosomiasis africana, según lo expresado en el párrafo 5 del Documento C 87/LIM/1.9.

Dedan Robinson KAMAU (Kenya) : The Kenya delegation wishes to express the appreciation to the Secretariat for the various documents forming the basis of discussions on item 14 of the Conference agenda. Mr Shah's presentation of the document was lucid and we congratulate him for the clarity in his introduction. We note the documents provide in a synthesized manner information on performance of FAO programmes and activities in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, nutrition, forestry, water development and management.

In most developing countries, agriculture forms the axis around which economic and social development pivot. Stagnation in agricultural growth therefore condemns the countries to economic collapse and social destruction. The programmes focusing on increasing agricultural production, together with those emphasizing prevention of food losses require increased support. We therefore note with appreciation review discussions on plant genetic resources in paras 1.37 and 1.73 of document C 87/8.

We urge expansion of those programmes which are extremely important and hold much hope for increasing agricultural production. Training and documentation components of the programmes should be enhanced. FAO should promote establishment of genetic resource centres, intensified germplasm collection and gene banks, and help to improve the technical and professional capability within the member countries necessary to support these programmes.

The Independent External Evaluation Report on Seed Improvement and Development contained in document C 87/8-S2 has comprehensively outlined issues related to and affecting development and supply of seeds. We are in agreement with the observations in the report and we wish to support action proposals outlined in paragraph 3 sections a-f of the document. However, notwithstanding our support for action proposals, we wish also to reiterate the importance and necessity of ensuring that seed development research emphasises development of seeds best suited to given agro-ecological zones of the countries. Development of new improved seeds must be supported by improvement and expansion of commercial seed distribution and infrastructure along with seed quality control in various countries.

On food security it is important to note the observation of the Director-General at the April 1983 Eighteenth session of CFS that in many countries famines have afflicted people not because of deficiency in food availability at national level, but rather because of erosion of purchasing power of a given community in the nation, especially the rural workers. Often the situation

is aggravated by unfavourable terms of trade which not only substantially reduce capabilities of developing countries to hold strategic food reserves, but prohibits also acquisition or establishment of the infrastructure necessary to distribute food from surplus to deficit areas of the country. Stabilization of prices of commodities from developing countries is therefore one of the most important prerequisites to establishing food security requirement in the developing countries.

The 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development helped stimulate awareness in various Member Nations of the role of fisheries development in: (i) creating additional employment opportunities; (ii) generating rising productivity that facilitates rise in real incomes, ultimately leading to improved living standards which subsequently assist in attaining equitable rural-urban balance in distribution of the benefits accruing from economic growth; and (iii) supply of food and nutritional requirements of the nation.

The Kenya delegation therefore accept the strategies and programmes of action adopted by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development and we shall lend our support to them. We however note with disappointment the observations in paragraph 2.10 of document C 87/LIM/19 that inadequacy of funding support is constraining effective implementation of several programmes, especially the action programmes approved by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development.

The information contained in Chapter 6 of document C 87/8 and the subsidiary document C 87/8 on Animal Health is well articulated. The Kenya delegation appreciates the elaboration of financial and other supportive resources deployed by the FAO in combatting a wide range of livestock diseases prevalent in the Africa region. Eradication of most of these diseases, including rinderpest, foot and mouth diseases, African swine fever, ticks and tick-borne diseases is critical to development in most countries in Africa.

The Kenya delegation notes the allocation of Regular Programme resources outlined on page 119 of document C 87/8 but regrets to note that tsetse trypanosomiasis control operations reflect a declining trend of allocation from 22 percent of the sub-programme budget in 1984-85 to 20 percent in 1986-87. Owing to the linkage between eradication of tsetse fly and trypanosomiasis and integrated human settlement and development in areas prone to this menace, the Kenya delegation would have appreciated at least retention of the budget component at the level of 22 percent if not higher. My delegation otherwise commends the Secretariat for the forward looking action oriented programmes outlined in the documents.

Carl THOMSEN (Denmark): Under this item on the agenda I should like first to make a statement on behalf of the Nordic countries; that is, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. This will be followed by a statement on behalf of the Danish delegation. Both statements will be related specifically to the external evaluations of the three Special Action Programmes. The Nordic statement covers remarks and observations of a more general nature with regard to the external evaluations as a whole, whereas the statement on behalf of my own delegation will be of a more specific nature in relation to two of the evaluation reports.

The Nordic countries would like to join others in welcoming this initiative of the Director-General as an example of what can be achieved by objective and independent assessments of the programme activities of the Organization. In our view, the input from external experts of international standing has provided valuable critical comments and useful suggestions for future improvements of the programmes in question. This should be of particular value to the management and to the Governing Bodies of the Organization when considering the future policy and programmes of the Organization.

We also wish to express our appreciation of the fact that the expert reports have been presented together with the comments of the Director-General. These comments on the recommendations of the experts, together with the proposals for follow-up action, have provided us with a good basis for understanding the overall situation, and for our considerations as to the best possible line of future action. In other words, we find ourselves in a better position to form an opinion about where we should go from here. This applies both with regard to the countries directly involved and in relation to the future activities of the FAO.

In view of this positive experience, the Nordic countries strongly recommend that such external evaluations of major on-going programmes should be continued. In our view they deserve high priority. Furthermore, it appears to us that the results of the exercise have demonstrated that objective and independent review by external experts can be of immense value in connection with the elaboration of the general policy and programmes of the Organization. In fact, this has been the basic contention underlying the proposal for a review which we have submitted under an earlier agenda item.

The following comments will be of a more critical nature. However, they are made with a view to assist in improving the functioning of the Organization. First, the results of the evaluations might, in our view, have led to more clearcut conclusions as to the future policy and priorities of the Organization in the programme areas concerned. Likewise, we would have liked to have seen more explicit links between the results and the Programme of Work.

Secondly, the impact of the activities of the FAO depends to a large extent on the organization of work and on the degree of cooperation between the different departments and divisions at headquarters. In our opinion, the results of the evaluations ought to lead to more organization-wide conclusions, for example, with regard to the need to move from a large number of individual projects to programme activities or so-called umbrella projects. The recommendation for closer links between the core programme and field programme activities to us also has wider implications. This has a bearing on the crucial issue of adequate technical backstopping, which has been referred to in our earlier comments concerning the Programme, of Work.

Thirdly, the impact of the activities of the FAO will also depend on the degree of active collaboration with other international agencies as well as with bilateral donors. In our view there should have been more explicit acknowledgement of the activities of other, agencies which would make it easier for us to appreciate and improve the division of work and cooperation which has been established. It would also provide a better understanding of the justification for the action proposed. A case in point is the trypanosomiasis network of the International Livestock Centre for Africa and the ILRAD Centre under the CGIAR in connection with the Action Programme for the Control of this disease.

I wish to conclude this part of my statement by repeating that the Nordic countries consider the external evaluations of Special Action Programmes to represent a very promising avenue. In our view, the FAO should proceed further in that direction and at the same time sharpen the edge of the conclusions drawn as well as widening the indications for other programme activities.

With your permission I shall now continue with a statement on behalf of the Danish delegation. As already indicated this statement will make some more specific comments concerning two of the evaluation reports, namely, the Report concerning the Seed Improvement and Development Programme and the Report on the Food Security Assistance Scheme. In our view the expert report on the Seed Programme is of a very high quality and provides very valuable recommendations. As stated in the Report, the Seed Programme is an important Programme which can make important contributions to the increased agricultural production in the developing countries. Precisely for this reason Denmark has, over the years, been one of the major contributors to this Programme. However, during later years the ability of the FAO to implement projects under the Programme has not been to our complete satisfaction. Therefore, we welcomed very much the initiative of the Director-General to organize an external review of this Programme. The critical comments made by the evaluation team correspond to the experience of DANIDA during the last couple of years. This applies in particular to the resource constraints within the FAO where the limited capacity of the Seed Unit has been over-stretched by the shift in focus from programme preparation to the preparation of a large number of individual projects. These projects have been formulated in isolation from other key activities in relation to crop development. There has also been a lack of coordination within FAO as regards the different aspects of crop production. In our view such coordination is essential for the adequate formulation of projects and for the correct assessment of the need for technical assistance including the need for training in order to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the Programme.

Denmark supports the recommendations made by the evaluation team and should like to stress the need for clarification of the priorities, the scope and the functions of the Programme. However, under the present circumstances DANIDA will not be able to support the new activities under the Seed Programme. The possibility of future contributions will depend on a successful implementation of the recommendations made by the evaluation team.

I shall then turn to the Report on the Food Security Scheme which we found equally excellent. The Danish delegation fully supports the recommendations made by the experts and in particular the wider concept of food security, which, as indicated several times already, encompasses both production of food, stability in supply as well as problems of access to food. We strongly support that this wider concept should form the basis for the formulation of policies with regard to food security. It is pointed out in the Report that in spite of the fact that the wider concept of food security was approved by the CFS as well as the Council and the Conference back in 1983, so far no redefinition or re-orientation of the scheme has taken place. In order to deal with the implementation of the new concept in an efficient way in our view there is need for a more clearly defined approach to food security and the role of the Food Security Scheme in this regard. Therefore, Denmark fully supports the proposal made by the Netherlands delegation concerning the need to prepare a new mandate for the Scheme in order to have the mandate discussed at the next meeting of the CFS. As other delegations, we find that one of the main tasks of the Food Security Scheme should be to assist member countries in formulating integrated food security policies on the basis of analytical and statistical information. The provision of such information is particularly important in the formulation of medium- and long-term policies.

Furthermore, we are of the opinion that the Food Security Assistance Scheme should give high priority to the coordination and integration of projects related to Food Security at the country level. My delegation welcomes the initiative already taken by the Director-General in order to implement the recommendations of the experts regarding the need for re-organization in order to strengthen the coordination between the different FAO units dealing with food security. In our view the implementation of the recommendations concerning the institutional arrangements within the FAO will be an essential step towards ensuring a more effective approach to food security.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Señor Presidente, le ruego que me excuse, pero es que cuando voy a intervenir en esta Comisión me siento mal y debo hacer esfuerzos para superar la enfermedad democrática que estoy padeciendo.

Este tema es muy importante, comprende numerosos documentos y la delegación de Colombia, al igual que lo ha hecho recientemente Dinamarca, había preparado una serie de notas para intervenir sobre todos los documentos con la esperanza de que hoy estuviera en la Presidencia uno de los vicepresidentes. Ahora tenemos que intervenir con mucho desagrado, y para evitar que usted incurra de nuevo en injustas interrupciones, que no vamos a tolerar, hemos decidido limitar nuestro comentario a un solo documento.

Vamos a referirnos solamente al documento C 87/8-Supl. 3, La Evaluación del PASA, pero para compensar un poco la reducción de nuestra declaración queremos apoyar, en primer lugar, lo que ha dicho nuestro colega y amigo de Dinamarca sobre la importancia de estas evaluaciones hechas por consultores externos que ojalá se sigan aplicando en el futuro cuando sea necesario y conveniente.

La delegación de Colombia registra con complacencia el hecho de que el informe de evaluación de estos prestigiosos consultores confirmen la importante labor realizada por el PASA en los últimos 10 años y estamos de acuerdo en que es necesario reforzar la actividad del PASA, para lo cual se requiere el apoyo constante y creciente de los donantes, entre los cuales reconocemos los aportes de Países Bajos, Noruega y Suiza, entre otros.

En relación con las responsabilidades de los países beneficiarios, esperamos que, como el Director General lo ofrece, éstos sean asistidos por la FAO que, sobre todo los países menos adelantados, puedan llevar a cabo las esenciales tareas de coordinación, adopción de políticas y procedimientos coherentes, tomen disposiciones adecuadas sobre información logística y sistema de distribución, así como para integrar la asistencia externa en los programas nacionales de seguridad alimentaria.

Para todo esto, los gobiernos de los países beneficiarios tienen buena voluntad y son conscientes de su importancia, pero muchos estados del Tercer Mundo carecen de recursos y medios que la FAO y los donantes deben ofrecerles para que el PASA cumpla sus funciones esenciales de contribuir a asegurar oportunamente a todas las poblaciones necesitadas la posibilidad material y económica de obtener los mínimos alimentos básicos.

Estamos seguros de que los donantes acogerán con satisfacción y pondrán en práctica las recomendaciones de los consultores sobre el criterio más pragmático y a más largo plazo para ofrecer la asistencia, la necesaria coordinación entre los donantes y también con los países receptores y el más decidido apoyo al concepto ampliado de seguridad alimentaria; concepto ampliado, afortunadamente concebido por el Director General en 1983 y apoyado por todos los órganos rectores de la FAO y los demás organismos competentes del sistema de las Naciones Unidas.

La delegación de Colombia se complace en que los consultores afirmen que no existe discrepancia entre la FAO y el Banco Mundial en lo que se refiere a cómo ayudar a los países en desarrollo a mejorar su propia seguridad alimentaria nacional. Eso está bien porque teníamos dudas sobre el alcance de un documento al respecto presentado por el Banco Mundial en la reunión del Consejo Mundial de la Alimentación que tuvo lugar en Roma el año pasado.

La delegación de Colombia apoya las recomendaciones sobre la acción de la FAO, programas definidos, basados en el concepto ampliado y ampliación del mandato del PASA para que abarque los tres elementos esenciales: producción, estabilidad y acceso.

Apoyamos igualmente el reforzamiento de la dependencia del PASA, la creación de grupos especiales nacionales y la elevación del nivel del Comité Directivo de Seguridad Alimentaria.

Leif FORVELL (Norway): The Norwegian delegation would like to follow up the Danish intervention . made on behalf of the Nordic countries with some more specific remarks.

The Norwegian Parliament has repeatedly stressed the need to improve the effects and efficiency of both bilateral and multilateral development assistance. The strengthening of the relation, capability and capacity as well as the quality is seen as one way of achieving this. The interest in multilateral evaluations has increased since the Norwegian government in 1984 established a specific Ministry for Development Cooperation. Norway intends to support evaluation activities inside the multilateral agencies themselves and we should also like to see that the results of the evaluations are fairly utilized when guidelines for new projects are drawn up. In certain circumstances we should also like to carry out evaluations of specific aspects of the multilateral agencies' activities, mostly in collaboration with the agencies themselves or other bilateral donors. Our participation, together with FAO and UNDP on the automatic evaluation of agriculture is one example of this.

Let me take this opportunity to discuss in some further detail the experiences from and the output of the agriculture evaluation process. The study on agriculture contains much valuable information from more than one hundred different projects. The study gives many examples of what went wrong and which activities were successful. The main conclusions that may be drawn seem to be that careful choice of species and of technical assistance are prerequisites for being successful in this business.

These are examples of how the agriculture study gives relevant information which should be taken into account in the preparation of further projects. However we must also admit that we should have liked to see the evaluation improved even further. The presentational examples have perhaps detracted from a more complete analysis of experiences so far. Further, we hardly find a clear strategy for the future, although Annex 9 gives some ideas of regional strategies.

The agriculture study recommends strongly that future projects should be planned within a wider context than until now. The choice of species, and technical systems and their relevance according to economy, culture, organizations etc. are such examples. We should also like continuous monitoring and to see evaluations of the impact of certain projects which go beyond the actual targets of a specific project. Inter alia we should have liked to see a more over-all goal-oriented evaluation. Unfortunately the agriculture study in the opinion of my delegation fails to give this over-all goal-oriented analysis. Such a study should also take into account questions of an economic, cultural and organizational nature.

In light of FAO's role as a leading forum in international agricultural policy debate we should like to see FAO preparing over-all agricultural strategies for each region.

According to the evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Scheme we will broadly associate ourselves with the substantial content in the statement made by the Netherlands earlier in this debate.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): There has been some debate about cost benefit in this room. There was even some debate as to whether one should debate cost benefit. One of the costs of the history of my country's interventions on this topic is that there is perhaps fatigue on both sides and the benefit might be that we might all save time by avoiding repetition. I will therefore refer for details to numerous past interventions in Conference and Council sessions. I will also immediately endorse the essence of the statement of Norway, Netherlands and Denmark on behalf of the Nordics. I would like, however, on behalf of the Canadian delegation to add a few remarks.

The Canadian delegation would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this report. In the spirit of seeking continued improvements in the contents and presentation of the review, we would like to offer the following general comments.

Firstly, we see the review of the Regular Programme as one of the precious few opportunities for most member countries to comment on the concrete achievements of the Organization. This document should provide us with information on how well programmes are working and how well the resources have been used. The review should accordingly fully reflect a results-oriented approach. In this regard the document needs to go much further in identifying whether programmes are achieving their intended effects.

It is heartwarming to see that Canada's longstanding concerns about the positive role of evaluation and indeed the need for a results-oriented approach are reflected somewhat in the introduction of this document. For instance in page V of the English text the FAO is indeed now using some of our own language. However the body of the report clearly illustrates that monitoring and evaluation practices are still in their infancy at FAO, to borrow from the imagery of one of our colleagues.

One perhaps useful consideration would be in the packaging of the information: to consider restructuring the report in such a way that FAO activities are described in terms of specific measurable country targets. All FAO actions in each country would thus be identified in one comprehensive document.

The second major point I should like to make is that: we are strongly at odds with the suggestions made throughout the document, for instance in page xxi in the English text, that the assessment of programme effectiveness is an exercise of questionable value. We would certainly agree that this may be difficult but we know that there is a growing body of technical literature and experience to measure the effectiveness of technical programmes conducted by publicly accountable agencies. We encourage FAO to build indicators of effectiveness into programmes and activities at the planning stage. Because we do not recognize such practices in the proposed Programme of Work for 1988-89 biennium we would not be surprised to see the next Review like this faced with the difficulty of not having targets to compare against. Several statements in Plenary and in this Commission have referred to the need for such approaches and for some elements of the methodology required. The external evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme is an example of the general concerns. The consultants identified a lack of "specific programme targets"; yet there are no clear proposals to remedy the situation, as our Danish colleagues have already underlined.

We would also comment that in general we can agree with the indications given in the Review that FAO could improve its effectiveness through group networking, and here I refer to pages 53-57 in the English text. Given the development of many specialized parallel institutions and programmes, it is time that FAO's review of the Regular Programme provided some assessment of FAO's comparative advantage. In many ways the best summary of the spirit of our intervention is that evaluation is only as good as the use that is made of it. It is part of a package of management practices. It cannot improve by itself if it does not have the right elements before and after it to ensure that the seed will be planted in fertile ground. For instance, a number of references have been made already to the need for evaluation and for external evaluation, of the need for increased transparency, the need

for improved priority setting, including input from the membership in the early stages in the formulation of priorities, the need for improved coordination, the need to watch carefully, and hopefully to reduce, the level of cross-subsidization between the Regular Programme and the Field Programmes, the need to strengthen the role of the UNDP and the healthy inter-action which takes place between the FAO and the UNDP.

In conclusion, my delegation would like simply to point to the continuing need for this Organization to demonstrate the effectiveness of its programmes and to look to evaluation as the first priority. Earlier it was said that we do not have clear messages as to what priorities are made and as to what is or is not a priority. I would suggest that the message which seems to be emanating is that before we move to that stage clearly the first priority is evaluation of what we have achieved in the Organization, and then to look at what needs to be increased or decreased.

LI DACHUN (China) (original language Chinese): The Chinese delegation has carefully studied the relevant document C 87/8 and the relevant documents of the other three Special Action Programmes prepared by the Secretariat for the Council. We think these documents, which include some substantial content, have pointed out existing problems and recommended solutions, while reviewing achievements and results. This is helpful to us in reaching an overall understanding of the activities of the FAO Regular Programme, and in studying improved ways of continuing the programmes.

I should like to make the following points; Firstly, the Review of the Regular Programme is an essential part of the whole of FAO's evaluating activities. This Review not only summarizes the work of FAO but also offers an in-depth review of some sub-programmes carried out between 1980 and 1986, and the evaluation of extension of activities in respect of all technical programmes. We are pleased to notice that progress has been made in many aspects of this biennial Regular Programme. This is the result of the implementation of adjustment of programmes, staff reductions, reduction of administrative expenses and measures guaranteeing the priorities when FAO has faced financial difficulties. It therefore deserves approval and appreciation.

However, we have also noticed with concern that the overall reduction of technical programmes by FAO is close to 7 percent, due to financial difficulties. The effects will be seen more clearly in the next Review and so we hope that FAO and its Member Nations will make joint efforts to take measures concerning joint contributions to overcome the negative influence caused by financial difficulties.

Secondly, much of the Regular Programme's direct impact is achieved through field projects. We welcome the fact that 60 percent of FAO's staff time is spent on direct support of field projects. We have noticed that FAO in the past two years has continued to reinforce the relationship between the Regular Programme and the field projects, supporting improved efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the Special Action Programmes and enhanced cooperation between developing countries. We hope that FAO will further strengthen the coordination between the Regular Programme and the field programmes in order to improve work efficiency and to expand its impact.

Thirdly, Chapter 10 has summarized FAO's extension activities. Mastery of a vast technology is a prerequisite for improving the living standards of the rural populations and extension is a major means of transmitting the techniques and knowledge to producers. The active support of extension is a major item in FAO's technical programmes. We are happy to see that in recent years FAO has conducted a large-scale extension of activities in field training, the collection and publication of information, the conducting of seminars in workshops, in connection with research and studies, the provision of technical consultation, with the focus on small-scale farming, increased production and low-cost methods, field demonstrations, women workers and diverse publicity in respect of the current situation. The results are obvious and will surely contribute to facilitating development at the scientific and technological level of developing countries.

Considering the fact that extension in many developing countries is inadequate because of methods of organization, management, funds and staff, we hope that FAO will continue to enhance its work in the extension of knowledge and technology, while emphasizing the maximum use of existing financial resources and institutions, to adapt the extension approach to the prevailing production system, rural structures, social customs and level of development of the recipient countries.

We should like to express our support of the text of 10.139 of Chapter 10, that FAO should now undertake a more comprehensive and definitive study of extension approaches. In this way the extension work can be promoted to a higher level through summing up and consolidating achievements and pinpointing what still needs to be improved.

Fourthly, the Chinese delegation has made a careful study of the documents concerned with external evaluation of the three Special Action Programmes: the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development, the Seed Improvement and Development Programme and the Food Security Assistance Scheme, which were put into operation more than ten years ago. In the past decade FAO has carried out numerous activities under the three programmes and has achieved satisfactory results, which are warmly welcomed by all developing countries. These programmes are of significant importance to developing countries in connection with their food and agricultural production, the control of livestock disease and improvement in the capacity for self-reliance and food security. Therefore, we support independent and objective evaluations of the work that has been accomplished during the past decade, aiming to continue the work in a more efficient way. Of the 15 FAO Special Action Programmes, three have just been put to external evaluation. That is helpful for us to acquire extended knowledge of the achievements, the existing problems and the improvement measures of the programmes. Therefore this kind of evaluation is considered to be desirable. We appreciate the positive response of the Director-General to some of the recommendations.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair would like to announce, first, that we have with us today a very distinguished group of visitors: the Committee on Food and Agriculture of the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany. Their delegation is headed by Mr Sauter. We welcome the members of the delegations here to observe the proceedings.

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Prenant la parole pour la première fois au sein de cette Commission, je me permets de vous féliciter pour votre élection à la tête de celle-ci. Permettez-moi également de remercier le Directeur général pour la qualité des documents soumis à notre examen, et de féliciter M. Shah pour la clarté de l'exposé qu'il a fait hier. Les documents C 87/8 et leurs suppléments sont d'une importance capitale car ils permettent aux pays membres de notre Organisation d'apprécier à leur juste valeur l'impact des projets ainsi initiés. Il n'est pas besoin de rappeler que les documents relatifs à l'examen du Programme ordinaire et des Programmes de terrain constituent le fondement même des activités de notre Organisation.

La délégation gabonaise, ayant analysé attentivement le contenu des différents documents du point 14, apporte son soutien à leur contenu et à leur orientation.

Toutefois, sans négliger les différentes évaluations qui accompagnent le document principal, nous aimerions nous attarder sur le document C 87/8-Sup. 1 relatif à la lutte contre la trypanosomiase africaine et à la mise en valeur des zones libérées de tsé-tsé. Pourquoi, me direz-vous, cette évaluation? Tout simplement parce que mon pays, comme d'autres, situé en zone tropicale humide, est couvert à 85 pour cent de forêts, et n'est pas épargné par la mouche tsé-tsé. Son infestation est estimée à 100 pour cent et constitue un handicap sérieux pour le développement de l'élevage national, ce qui conduit le Gabon à rester tributaire de l'extérieur dans le domaine de la viande.

Face à cette infestation, mon pays s'est lancé dans la création de ranches dont le peuplement se fait à partir de bovins trypanotolérants importés des pays détenteurs.

Le plus important projet que doit abriter mon pays est un projet à vocation régionale de multiplication et de diffusion de bovins trypanotolérants; cela constituera pour la sous-région d'Afrique Centrale (UDEAC), une institution contribuant à la lutte contre la trypanosomiase. Nous lançons pour cela un appel à la FAO et à la coopération internationale pour nous aider à la mise en place de ce projet qui produira dans les années à venir les protéines animales nécessaires aux populations rurales de mon pays, étant entendu que mon pays, n'avait pas, jusqu'à il y a quelques années, une vocation pastorale. Les recommandations faites par les consultants rencontrent donc notre plein appui.

Toutefois, nous sommes inquiets de la diminution des ressources allouées à ce programme au cours de la période 1984-87, comme il est souligné à la page 19 de la version française.

Lorsque le rapport évoque les problèmes rencontrés dans les différents projets il apparaît que la FAO peut jouer un rôle considérable pour permettre aux décideurs de prendre conscience de l'importance de la maladie. Aussi, l'implantation à Ouagadougou de deux projets GCP/RAF/190 et 191/ITA aura permis, à un moindre degré, de tirer la sonnette d'alarme pour que les gouvernements des différents pays comme le mien essaient de se pencher sur cette maladie.

Le document fait état en page 25 de l'éducation et de la formation des techniciens. Si ce volet doit rester une priorité majeure du programme, il apparaît que l'école de lutte anti-tsé-tsé, installée à Bobo Dioulassoet qui a formé plusieurs cadres à tous les niveaux, meurt de sa plus belle mort, les pays donateurs ayant considérablement réduit, voire même arrêté, le versement de leurs contributions. Nous espérons que ces derniers reconsidéreront leur position, et nous encourageons le Directeur général et son équipe à poursuivre les négociations avec les donateurs habituels - et d'autres potentiellement - pour que cet institut reprenne ses activités. Aussi appuierons-nous toute résolution allant dans ce sens.

Pour terminer, la délégation gabonaise renouvelle son appui à l'évaluation du Programme ordinaire présentée par le Secrétariat.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): La délégation de mon pays souhaite s'excuser auprès de notre Commission de lui infliger une déclaration supplémentaire. Celle-ci aurait pu être évitée si notre Président avait été un bon rapporteur. Je plains la délégation israélienne de vous avoir choisi pour assurer une telle mission, celle-ci étant, semble-t-il, mal assurée.

Je dois dire en effet, Monsieur le Président, que vous avez une manière quelque peu cavalière d'interpréter les règlements de notre Organisation.

CHAIRMAN: You are on our list to speak to item 14. Please speak to the subject at hand, unless you have a point of order. If so please indicate under the Rules. If you wish to speak on item 14 please take your turn to speak on it. If instead you have a point of order please indicate so.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Oui, merci Monsieur le Président, mais vous nous interrompez une nouvelle fois. Vous savez très bien que nous avons à parler d'un sujet qui nous préoccupe depuis hier et nous avons demandé la parole avant la fin de la séance d'hier. C'est donc sur ce point que nous voudrions porter notre motion d'ordre. Mais je dois dire que vous avez une manière quelque peu cavalière d'interpréter les règlements de notre Organisation. J'ai moi-même déjà présidé une Commission de la Conférence de la FAO alors que je venais d'arriver à Rome mais j'avais l'avantage, avant cela, d'avoir pris part à de nombreuses réunions de notre Organisation à Rome et hors de Rome, ce qui constitue sans nul doute une école.

Je voudrais rappeler ici très simplement que le Congo, qui est intervenu à la suite d'une motion d'ordre vendredi dernier, n'avait pas cru utile de nommer un pays quelconque et encore moins de critiquer la politique d'un Etat Membre, quelles que soient les relations actuelles de ces pays avec le nôtre.

Notre intervention de vendredi visait uniquement votre manière peu orthodoxe de conduire les débats, ce qui s'est encore vérifié hier quand vous n'avez pas cru utile de nous donner la parole.

Je regrette que la Commission II, qui a à débattre de grands sujets, voie ces délibérations entachées de nombreuses irrégularités qui sont du seul fait d'une présidence faible et tatillonne.

Compte tenu de ce qui précède, je demande ici que le nom de mon pays ne figure pas dans la déclaration du délégué d'Israël quelle qu'en soit la teneur.

Je continue à croire en outre qu'il n'appartient pas au Président de tous les membres de cette Commission d'assurer la liaison avec un Etat Membre non présent aux débats de cette Commission. J'espère que le record des motions d'ordre atteint par notre Commission sera un indicateur qui vous autorisera à céder de temps à autre votre marteau aux excellents Vice-Présidents de notre Commission.

CHAIRMAN: Your point that the Government of the Congo said nothing about the State of Israel on Friday is absolutely correct. If Israel in its statement did make a reference to the Congo the reference was a statement about inviting you, or the whole country, it was not very clear, to come visit. If you are requesting a right of reply the precedent that we would establish would be that every time a country is mentioned, that its name is used, there would be automatically a right of reply, no matter what was said. Let me read to you from the document provided to the Chair. It says: "Where a delegate wishes to reply to a criticism of his government's policy ...". If you wish to take the view that the statement that the delegate of Israel made yesterday, which invited you to visit his country, or a different area, is a criticism of your government's policy, this Chair will not decide what you construe as a criticism of your government's policy. If you view an invitation to visit any part of the world as an implicit implied criticism of your government's policy, fine, it is not for me to suggest what you wish to take as a criticism. If you wish to take that as a criticism of the policies of the Government of the Congo, then the Chair would, as we have found in previous right of reply requests, provide time at the end of the day's session so that you could be recognized for the purpose of a right of reply and you could explain why you are offended, why your Government's policies have been attacked, and why you take exception to that. That is perfectly within your right of reply and if you wish to do so the Chair will put you on at the end of today's session for a right of reply and you can state that you feel that is a criticism of your Government's policies. The precedent that would be set then is that any time a government's name is used it would have a right to give a speech at the end of the day. If that is what you wish to do, do it. If you wish to be put down for a right of reply on that at the end of today's proceedings, we will be glad to do it.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Oui, si vous me donnez la parole, je pourrai m'expliquer plus amplement sur cette question.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it might be time-saving if we took a moment here for me to try to explain what the guidance is that the Chair has to follow in such matters. Under right of reply it says: "While there is no specific Rule of the General Rules of the Organization regarding the right of reply, the Conference at its Twelfth Session decided to adopt the procedure in use in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Under this procedure where a delegate wishes to reply to a criticism of his Government's policy, he should preferably do so on the evening of the day on which such criticism has been voiced after all those wishing to participate in the discussions have had an opportunity to do so. At the end of the afternoon's session the Chairman would accordingly announce: "This concludes our business for the day but before adjourning the meeting I shall give the floor to the delegate of who has asked to exercise the right of reply."

If you have listened carefully you will have observed that the first time we had a right of reply request I stated that following the General Rules of the United Nations procedure we were yielding for that. If you have checked the Verbatim Report you will see that the very phrase I just read off was the phrase that I read off before the statement made yesterday also before one of the earlier ones. That is trying to follow an orderly procedure. I do not think we are wise to get into an area of whether an invitation is an offence to a Government's policy. If you feel that way, fine, state so, but any country whose name was used would have to be given the same right and it could take whatever interpretation it wished to do so.

Now, as a point of clarification for you, the Chair does not have any control over what the representative of Israel says; the Chair personally has some disagreements with some things said in that; it is not for me to get into, but it is not in our control, only to make available that opportunity. I would hope that we would limit ourselves on such things, but if we want to have an end-of-the-day session and go into overtime, fine, but we have to go in proper order and we have to try to proceed so that the countries which wish to speak on the business that is before us can do so.

I must warn you that in a moment, we will have to adjourn because our time has expired, and we will come back on item no, 14.

Now, the delegation that is making some noise back there to my left, let me advise you what the rules say on a point of order. They are very clear. What you ought to do if you want to deal with the rules is get the document C 87/INF/2 and read it. Now the Chair has to operate on a presumption that the members of the Organization have a familiarity with the rules and are used to going by them and we have to go by them. Now, if you wish to make a point of order now, it is difficult for us to know whether it is 'a point of order or something else. The rules state that you stand up and hold up the sign of the country. That is what they state in the rules. Cuba, you have a point of order; state: your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Sí, creo que hay algunas cuestiones de procedimiento. Ud. ha sido muy explícito en cuanto a orientarnos de cómo proceder. Sin embargo, yo quiero señalar algunas irregularidades, por ejemplo, en el Documento del acta de nuestra sesión en la tarde de ayer no escuchamos que se hiciera referencia a nuestro país, y por consiguiente, consideramos que hay una irregularidad en esta acta, que fue incluida, y por lo tanto, esta mención debe ser eliminada.

CHAIRMAN: On the point of order that Cuba was not mentioned in the Israeli statement and ought to have been, I have before me the English text, it is page 27 of the verbatim, and Cuba is mentioned. If Cuba feels, as the Congo does, that this is something on which you wish a right of reply, simply state so and we will put you on following the Congo. Is that what your point of order is?

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Me acojo al derecho de réplica y me inscribo junto al Congo.

CHAIRMAN: You may do so. You will be recognized at the end of the session and you can tell us why it is an offence of your government's policies, the gentleman's remarks about inviting you. You will go on immediately after the Congo.

Anyone else greatly offended today want to speak to us this evening? There are no more, points of order. We will be coming back to speak on item 14.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 45

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas.

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/11

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

ELEVENTH MEETING
ONZIEME SEANCE
11° SESIÓN

(17 November 1987)

The Eleventh Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La onzième séance est ouverte à 15 heures

sous la présidence de Fred J. eckert, président de la commission II

Se abre la 11ª sesión a las 15.00 horas

bajo la presidencia del Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

14. Review of the Regular Programme, Including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes (continued)

14. Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux (suite)

14. Examen del Programa ordinario... en particular evaluación de los programas especiales de acción (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Chair is informed by the Secretary that we finally have a quorum and we will proceed. Once again the Chair must caution that the clock is ticking and at this point we should have been one half-hour into the discussion of item 16. However, we are continuing with item 14 - two items behind schedule - and we have perhaps 15 member countries still to speak on that item. It means that if they are not reasonably rapid we may well have to continue with item 14 tomorrow. We think it would be best to avoid that. We caution that every day we have been late for every session by roughly one half-hour and this means that we shall be a full day behind schedule, at the rate we are going, very shortly. Therefore the Chair now serves notice that it would be prudent to expect a late session tomorrow. We can either work on time or we can work late.

There has been an unwillingness to follow the schedule on the part of most people. That means we shall have no alternative but to continue very late for perhaps two evenings. It would be better simply to have a quorum here so that we could commence business promptly. If the people who are interested in participating would at least show up we could get a quorum and the people who are interested could proceed with business. We do not wish to spend every session talking about how far behind time we are; but we would point out that: those persons who have expressed so much interest in getting work done and who have expressed concern for the financial crisis should be aware that we have interpreters here arriving for duty, but having nothing to interpret. That is not sound financial management.

At this point we will continue with our list of speakers. This morning we had a discussion with the Congo about a topic to be taken up later today, but they also indicated to the Chair that they had wished to speak not only on that matter but on the business at hand; so at this point the Chair recognizes the Congo for discussion on item 14.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Ainsi que nous l'avons déjà signalé au sein des différentes commissions de cette session de la Conférence, sur la plupart des points inscrits à l'ordre du jour de la Conférence la position de la délégation congolaise a été rendue publique par son représentant siégeant à part entière en qualité de membre au sein du Comité du Programme.

Il en est ainsi de ce point 14 de notre ordre du jour consacré à l'examen du programme ordinaire 1986/87 et à l'évaluation de certains programmes spéciaux de la FAO qui ont fait l'objet des travaux de la 53ème session du Comité du Programme qui s'est tenue du 14 au 25 septembre de cette année-ci, à Rome.

A ce titre, nous sommes solidaires des considérations, avis et recommandations formulés à cette occasion par le Comité du Programme, sur cet examen et sur les évaluations de programmes d'action spéciaux.

Toutefois, n'ayant pas pu prendre la parole sur cette question lors de son examen par le Conseil en sa 92ème session, pour des raisons de calendrier très chargé du Conseil au sein duquel nous n'étions qu'observateurs, nous aimerions saisir cette occasion pour réaffirmer brièvement les points essentiels de la position de notre délégation. Tout d'abord, je dirai quelques mots à propos du Programme Ordinaire 1986/87 de la FAO tant pour ce qui concerne son mode de présentation que pour sa teneur intrinsèque.

Au titre de la première partie de l'examen du Programme, notre délégation, tout en se félicitant de la délicatesse avec laquelle le Directeur général de l'Organisation a su opérer les ajustements de programme rendus obligatoires par le non-recouvrement des contributions ordinaires des Etats Membres, notre délégation a exprimé sa vive opposition à une poursuite insidieuse de tels ajustements au cours des prochains exercices. En effet, ce n'est pas sans conséquences fâcheuses sur l'exécution du pro-gr-programme et sur le respect des priorités retenues dans le Programme de travail et Budget à venir de l'Organisation.

En conséquence, notre délégation lance un vibrant appel à tous les autres membres qui ne l'ont pas encore fait afin qu'ils s'acquittent sans plus tarder de leurs engagements financiers vis-à-vis de l'Organisation.

Notre délégation se félicite de l'examen en profondeur de certains sous-programmes dont traite la seconde partie de ce document, examen mettant en lumière les principaux résultats et réalisations de l'Organisation dans différents domaines.

Nous partageons l'avis du Comité du Programme selon lequel les programmes de santé animale, bien que reconnus prioritaires par nous tous, ne sont pas encore assez soutenus. Nous pensons qu'ils mériteront encore un concours financier extra-budgétaire plus accru de la part des donateurs au cours des prochains exercices en vue de la mise en oeuvre de nouveaux programmes de lutte contre les maladies animales, et pour le renforcement des services vétérinaires des pays en développement. A ce propos, nous marquons notre accord avec la proposition faite par la délégation du Mexique visant à la création d'un organe spécifique de la FAO s'occupant de l'élevage. De même, la question de la commercialisation intérieure du poisson étant encore un goulot d'étranglement des programmes de développement des pêches pour bon nombre de pays en développement, la FAO se doit d'aider à trouver une solution adéquate. Nous nous félicitons des orientations et activités de l'Organisation concernant le sous-programme de développement de la foresterie communautaire dans son acception la plus large, orientations et activités qui rejoignent les objectifs du Plan forestier tropical auquel notre délégation attache beaucoup de prix.

Quant à la 3ème partie de l'examen qui traite essentiellement des activités de la FAO en matière de vulgarisation, notre délégation aimerait dire combien elle souhaite voir la FAO améliorer davantage certains aspects de son activité de vulgarisation, en mettant notamment l'accent sur l'intensification du dialogue qui doit exister entre ceux qui conçoivent les méthodes de vulgarisation et ceux appelés à les mettre en oeuvre.

Nous aimerions à ce sujet souligner l'important rôle que les femmes devraient être amenées à jouer l" dans ce cadre.

Quelques mots maintenant à propos des évaluations extérieures des trois programmes d'action spécifiques qui nous sont soumis. Notre délégation appuie fermement les appréciations formulées par les organes directeurs de l'Organisation, dont le Comité de programme en particulier, sur les évaluations soumises à la Conférence et portant sur 3 programmes d'action spéciaux, à savoir le programme de lutte contre la trypanosomiase animale africaine et la mise en valeur des zones en cause, le programme de développement et d'amélioration des semences, et le programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire (PASA).

Nous aimerions simplement ajouter/que nous ne sommes pas en principe opposés aux évaluations des programmes dans la mesure où celles-ci constituent un exercice fondamental pour mesurer le chemin parcouru, recenser les faiblesses et les succès, et permettre de dégager les mesures correctives pour poursuivre les objectifs initiaux avec plus de succès.

Nous redoutons toutefois une multiplication justifiée des évaluations systématiques et répétées de plusieurs programmes à la fois en raison de leur coût trop souvent excessif, surtout quand il s'agit de celles effectuées par des cabinets privés.

Notre délégation estime quant à elle que les évaluations externes devraient être strictement limitées aux seuls grands programmes ayant atteint une certaine vitesse de croisière et qu'elles ne doivent pas devenir une panacée pour tous les programmes.

Avant de mettre fin à notre intervention, nous aimerions saisir la présente occasion pour réaffirmer une fois de plus le soutien de notre pays aux activités que déploie la FAO dans le domaine des ressources phytogénétiques à travers sa commission et son groupe de travail récemment créés à cet effet. A ce propos, notre délégation réfute le fondement des critiques acerbes formulées au sein de cette commission par certaines délégations qui, pour protéger en réalité leurs intérêts politiques et commerciaux, ont cru bon de citer le domaine d'activités des ressources phytogénétiques comme l'un de ceux où des économies restent encore possibles. Nous ne sommes pas du tout de leur avis.

De même, en raison des mérites et de l'appui, du reste bien fondée, que reçoit le PCT, (le programme de coopération technique) de la part de tous les pays en développement bénéficiaires et de la part des pays donateurs, nous ne pouvons pas non plus soutenir la position des délégations qui, prétextant de la cadence modérée avec laquelle sont décaissées les ressources de ce programme, ont avancé qu'on peut également y opérer quelques coupes sombres. A ce sujet, nous nous rallions à la position prise ce matin par la délégation de la Belgique.

Dato'Abu Bakar MAHMUD (Malaysia): My delegation welcomes the Report on the Review of the FAO's Regular Programme, including the Evaluation of Special Action Programmes, as contained in document C 87/8 and the other supporting documents. I wish to congratulate the Secretariat on the preparation of this comprehensive document. My delegation is pleased by the degree of achievement in the planning and implementation of the many programmes and projects under the broad headings of Agriculture, including Livestock, Fisheries, Forestry, Technical Cooperation and Development Support.

Under Agriculture, my delegation would like to see the Programmes on Crop Protection, Livestock (especially feed resources utilizing by-products), extension and nutrition to be further intensified in the coming biennium. My delegation, however, regrets that the Action Programme on Planning, Management and Development of Fisheries was drastically affected by the reduction of extra-budgetary resources. Nevertheless, the importance of the substantive Action Programmes adopted by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development cannot be taken lightly. The catalytic role of the Action Programmes in the development and management of fisheries in the developing member countries cannot be over-emphasized.

My country is now giving special attention and emphasis to the development of deep-sea fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone in the face of declining inshore fishery resources. Therefore we would like to benefit from the latest available technologies and information through multilateral channels as well as through bilateral cooperation.

As emphasized by my delegation in my intervention on the Programme of Work and Budget for the 1988-89 biennium, we would like to see the expeditious implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Programme which has vast economic implications for member countries in the Tropics. With regard to TCP, my delegation is in accord with the nature of the assistance given, that is, the focus on low-income food-deficit countries.

With regard to the evaluation of the three special programmes of FAO by the external consultants, my delegation welcomes some of the findings and would be pleased if these could be used as guidelines and strategies to complement and supplement current implementation modalities so as to ensure the continuing success of these programmes. Such evaluation should of course continue in order to establish not only the degree of achievement of these programmes in socio-economic terms but also to progressively determine their weaknesses and strengths and what necessary changes have to be made to programme implementation.

My delegation would like to reiterate its general support for the excellent field work carried out by the FAO under the Food Security Assistance Scheme (FSAS), particularly welcoming the priority given under the scheme to assist developing countries with their national early warning systems and preparedness plans and provide training and logistical support for security programmes. Nonetheless, FAO should also be mindful of the observation of the Evaluation Report which stressed that the FSAS' activities should be an integral part of the broad framework of food security development assistance to the recipient countries by all donors, including bilateral and multilateral organizations. In other words, there should always be close coordination between FAO's Food Security Assistance Scheme with bilateral and other multilateral donors, with a view to ensuring that new resources available for this purpose are sufficient to respond to the increasing needs for assistance.

With regard to the Seed Improvement and Development Programme (SIDP), my delegation is in accord with one of the recommendations of the evaluation team, and that is the need to ensure greater support of the SIDP from both the governmental as well as private sectors, and that external assistance be integrated with national seed programmes. Indeed, whatever the assistance given, it should have the ultimate aim of strengthening national institutions and programmes. It would be greatly appreciated if FAO could come out with a comprehensive package of guidelines with regard to the establishment of a National Seed Production Scheme covering, inter alia, institutional requirements, production and distribution, pricing and subsidy policies, legislative requirements, privatization, quality control and promotional work in the use of better seeds.

John Redman GOLDSACK (United Kingdom): In our contribution to the debate on this item at the recent Council meeting we commented in general on the review of the Regular Programme and in some detail on the Forestry Programme and on the Evaluation Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis and Related Development.

Our views on these topics are on record and bearing in mind, Mr Chairman, the remarks you have just made about the limited time available for discussion we will now confine our remarks to a general comment on Major Programme 2.1 Agriculture before making more detailed comments on the Evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme and the evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Scheme. We thank the Secretariat for its performance report on Major Programme 2.1 Agriculture and support the content of the Programme. We are particularly pleased to note the general areas of emphasis on the needs of small farmers, on disadvantaged groups, the role of women in the development process, on food security, on environmental factors and the development of national capabilities for planning and managing agricultural programmes.

We would also like to encourage FAO in its intention to produce more in-depth analytical studies like "African agriculture - the next 25 years". No other organization has greater breadth and depth of information on agricultural production and potential in developing countries than FAO and this places our organization in a potentially commanding position to make major contributions to the international policy debate.

Turning to the Evaluation of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme, the United Kingdom thanks the Secretariat for commissioning the evaluation and the consultants for their report. Clearly the programme has come a long way since its inception and now approaches its task with wisdom born of experience. The United Kingdom agrees with the thrust of the findings and supports the Director-General's intention to implement most of the report's recommendations. We hope particularly that the Inter-Departmental Review and Programming Panel which is to be established will in fact include seed specialists from the regions.

While generally agreeing with the consultants' recommendations, in future programmes the United Kingdom would like to see even more emphasis given to a number of issues:

We feel that seed development programmes must be appropriate to the particular time and place - in terms of technologies and methodologies. This particularly concerns standards of quality control, seed crop production, and the institutional arrangements.

Seed production and marketing functions should be encouraged to operate on commercial lines. Business management training should be encouraged. - We note that the consultants have recommended that FAO should be more selective in choosing new projects.'

A critically important point which the consultants seem to have missed is that the final product must be sufficiently attractive to farmers that they are prepared to pay more than they do for their usual seed. To subsidize seed to the extent that it is cheaper than "normal" is a sure formula for waste and malpractice. In planning seed programmes it is necessary to identify and attempt to quantify those attributes of the "new" seed which cause farmers to want it. These may be improved genetic potential, more reliable germination, or some of various other qualities. In other words, in the planning the farmer must be to the forefront of the planners' minds and all too often this aspect is overlooked.

It is essential when planning seed programmes that the quality control and regular functions are institutionally quite separate from the production and marketing functions. The consultants seem to accept this, but it is in the report that compromises have taken place.

The consultants have identified "uneven quality" in the design of seed programmes. Steps to improve this are suggested. We might suggest that this is the particular target of any follow-up monitoring.

Turning to the evaluation of the Food Security Assistance Schemes, the paper gives us a lengthy but clear evaluation report prepared by two experts from India and Switzerland, together with the Director-General's comments on their recommendations. To us the report itself seems broadly satisfactory with one exception. That is that there are insufficiently clear links between the food security activities described in the countries visited and the activities of the FSAS, for example, in paragraphs 5.11 to 5.13 the project concerning the restructuring of the cereals market in Mali is quoted with approval. But it is not made clear whether the FAO Cereal Marketing Study in 1978 which is said to have started this project was an FSAS project, nor why FAO is now participating in this activity.

Turning to the conclusions and recommendations, it is clear from paragraphs 6.2 to 6.15 that the actual results obtained by the FSAS have not in fact: amounted to much. From the food aid side we have always been sceptical about the value of grain reserves for the practical reasons suggested in paragraphs 6.6 and 6.7. We did not find it surprising that the impact of FSAS on the important policy issues identified in paragraph 6.14 have been small. This we think points to a basic problem that if the wider concept of food security referred to in paragraph 6.15 is to make any progress the need is for this to be accepted as a major priority policy objective by both governments and FAO, rather than as a separate question to be handled by relatively unimportant units in national administration and FAO itself.

As regards recommendations, those addressed to governments and donors seem sensible although we would need to be cautious about the implications of the call for assistance to be more programmatic and for increased extra-budgetary contributions referred to in paragraph 6.43.

The Director-General's comments contain a summary of recommendations addressed to FAO and his comments thereon. These seem sensible to us. In particular it is pointed out that the wider concept of food security in fact encompasses much of the work of the Organization. We feel that if the overall mandate of FSAS is to be extended it is particularly important that its programmes are more sharply defined.

In conclusion, the United Kingdom would like to echo the comments made on the use of evaluation studies by the Canadian delegate. Effective evaluation is the first step in identifying programme priorities. We have made it clear in our statements on other agenda items that we consider that greater efforts should be made by FAO to identify and focus on priority activities. But we hope that the statements made by Canada and Denmark will not fall on deaf ears. If FAO is to continue to attract resources it must demonstrate that it is prepared to accept truly independent evaluation and show that it is prepared to use the results in selecting priorities and preparing programmes.

Carlos Moyses ANDREOTTI (Brésil): La délégation brésilienne avait déjà fait, lors de la dernière session du Conseil de la FAO, quelques commentaires d'ordre général sur la révision du programme régulier, ses 3 suppléments et les activités du programme de terrain, tout en les ayant approuvés.

Je voudrais maintenant saisir l'occasion pour féliciter le Directeur général, le Secrétariat et l'équipe technique de la FAO, pour l'excellence technique des documents soumis à l'appréciation et à l'analyse de la 92ème session du Conseil et de la 24ème session de la Conférence de la FAO.

La délégation brésilienne a néanmoins jugé opportun de faire quelques remarques sur certains points spécifiques des documents analysés aujourd'hui par cette Commission, remarques dans le seul but d'apporter une contribution positive, si minime soit-elle, à l'action de la FAO de façon à la rendre toujours plus efficace. Bref, ceci veut dire que notre intervention se bornera aux aspects techniques. J'essaierai donc d'être concis et précis.

Ma première remarque se rattache à la définition des priorités. Il n'y a pas de doute que tous les programmes développés par la FAO sont importants et même très importants, que ce soit pour une région, pour un pays ou pour toutes les régions. Mais peut-être les priorités au sein de ces programmes pourraient-elles mieux ressortir si on utilisait des critères ou des indicateurs pour les classer suivant un ordre hiérarchique et on pourrait du même coup attribuer les ressources financières proportionnellement à cet ordre. L'on peut d'ailleurs se demander si des investissements massifs dans l'éducation alimentaire n'exerceraient pas des effets sensibles, et ne produiraient pas un impact considérable sur la réduction de la mortalité infantile. Peut-être y aurait-il au sein de cette commission des délégations qui pourraient nous donner un témoignage sur ce point.

Lié au problème de l'éducation alimentaire, nous trouvons le problème de la nutrition: savoir manger, savoir se nourrir, signifie ingérer non seulement des carbohydrates et des calories, mais aussi des protéines complètes d'origine animale, des lipides polyinsaturés d'origine végétale, des sels minéraux et des vitamines. Les grains nous donnent surtout les premiers tandis que les aliments d'origine animale, les légumes, les fruits et les micro-organismes morts nous fournissent les autres. Nous savons tous, d'ailleurs, qu'il y a aujourd'hui un excès de grains. Les silos des pays industrialisés en sont pleins. Ne serait-ce donc pas le moment pour la FAO de mettre

l'accent sur des projets d'élevage bovin, porcin, ovin, de volailles et d'autres petits animaux- y compris l'aquaculture; j'aimerais d'ailleurs revenir sur ce problème lors d'une autre occasion -, de production de légumes et de fruits et, simultanément, d'encourager l'éducation alimentaire?

Un autre point qui mérite une attention spéciale est l'extension rurale. Il ressort des documents de la FAO que le succès de ses programmes est conditionné par l'efficacité des services d'extension rurale. Ceci étant, on ne comprend pas trop bien pourquoi on attribue si peu de ressources financières à un sous-programme que l'on estime conditionner tous les autres. On revient ainsi, une fois encore, au problème de l'établissement des priorités. Si un programme ou un sous-programme a été défini comme prioritaire, il faut lui impartir les ressources financières correspondantes.

A propos du document C 87/8-Sup.2, "Evaluation du Programme d'amélioration et de développement du secteur des semences", je veux dire que le Brésil, depuis 1974, fait un énorme effort dans ce domaine. On produit aujourd'hui, en étroite liaison avec le secteur privé, des semences certifiées de plusieurs produits tels que le blé, les haricots, le maïs, le riz, les pommes de terre, les carottes, etc., mais pas encore en quantité suffisante.

Un autre point qui mérite d'être souligné, c'est celui des investissements massifs que fait le Brésil, depuis 1974, dans le domaine de la recherche agronomique et en particulier dans celui de la formation du personnel scientifique, de l'infrastructure de laboratoires, de la documentation et de l'informatique.

Je tiens à souligner ce point car il est très important pour la coopération Sud-Sud. En effet, depuis 1974, l'EMBRAPA - Entreprise brésilienne de recherche agronomique - a formé plus de 2 000 chercheurs au niveau du Ph.D et de la maîtrise et a produit un volume énorme de connaissances et de technologie pour les tropiques. Ces connaissances, ce savoir-faire, cette technologie, produits dans les régions tropicales et pour les régions tropicales, peuvent être facilement adaptés aux régions tropicales des autres continents.

La FAO pourrait jouer un rôle important dans l'échange scientifique et technologique entre les pays de l'hémisphère sud car, enfin, il n'y a que le Brésil qui a fait des progrès dans ce domaine. Une action concertée de la FAO avec ces pays pourrait être bénéfique à tous. Cela ne signifie pas que nous écartions la coopération Nord-Sud.

Dans ce cadre, d'ailleurs, de la coopération Sud-Sud, et pour finir, la délégation brésilienne désire apporter son appui fraternel à la requête de la délégation du Burkina Faso portant sur l'aide financière urgente à accorder à l'école de lutte anti-tsé-tsé de Bobo-Dioulasso.

Gerald Phirinyane KHOJANE (Lesotho): I should congratulate Mr Shah for the most able manner in which he introduced agenda item 14 and as usual he was explicit and to the point.

We are encouraged by the registered success of FAO on integrated pest management research through experiments particularly in Africa. In our view assistance in establishing and strengthening national services for plant protection should receive a priority attention of FAO and TCP - funded training in biological control of pests should be given the widest coverage possible. In this way pest outbreaks such as locusts in sub-Saharan Africa and Mediterranean fruit fly in Central America might be reduced in the longer term.

The idea of prosopis bushes and leguminous shrubs on the marginal lands and under arid saline conditions is of particular interest to my delegation. It would be interesting if experiments could be conducted to see if such bushes and shrubs could be adapted to the high cold and arid altitudes like that of my own country. It is worth noting that some donor countries such as Italy are beginning to set an example to support fodder trees and shrubs projects on marginal lands and semi-arid regions. This is an encouraging development which, if pursued, should go a long way in alleviating desertification and fodder problems of the developing countries particularly those of the sub-Saharan Africa, FAO should therefore encourage and persuade more donors to follow the example of Italy.

We were fortunate to follow the development of the "Study on African Agriculture: the next 25 years" step by step. We are satisfied that the views of the African experts in the field of agriculture were fully incorporated into the study and that its conclusions were in accord with the thinking of the majority of the African policy makers. How could it be otherwise when it was compatible with the relevant sections of the United Nations General Assembly's Programme of Action for African Recovery and Development for 1986/90 agreed at the United Nations Special Session on Critical Economic Situation in Africa? The conclusions of the study suggested nothing less than modalities of the effective implementation of Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery during 1986/90 and beyond in the field of agriculture. Indeed a request for a similar study by Latin America and the Caribbean was in itself a recognition of its quality and the validity of its conclusions.

The Lesotho Government attaches special importance to the technical co-operation programme of FAO. During the current biennium, Lesotho in its capacity as a least developed country has been a beneficiary of the TCP Programme on training, advisory services, emergencies and support to development. As a drought stricken country in sub-Saharan Africa, it has also benefited from the Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme in Africa. Although the ceiling for TCP projects allocation is low the impact of the programme is significant and visible. We have strong reason therefore to give this programme unreserved support.

Another important aspect is that according to document C 87/8, read together with the financial report and statements in document C 87/5, allocation of funds under the TCP Programme has been fair and just in that it was based on the needs of the different continents and countries. Africa in our view has had its fair share with the allocation of 40% of the total available resources. Other regions were also given allocations according to the magnitude of their needs and availability of resources. This approach is sensible and worthy of credit.

Examining the review of the Regular Programme 1986/87 part 5 we note with satisfaction that the Secretariat has confidence that live operation of both phase I and phase II of the newly introduced Financial Systems will provide the organization with a greatly improved ability to process financial data and to exercise efficient and effective control over its financial resources. This assurance signifies a flexible attitude of the Secretariat to accommodate new ideas intended to continue to improve on the operational activities of the organization in order that all resources placed under its control to serve the members can be accounted for.

We are also encouraged by the fact that efforts were continued to increase the number of applications for employment within FAO from countries which were under or non-represented in the organization. Equitable geographical representation from all regions, including those of the developing countries should remain the ultimate goal of the FAO administration. It is indeed most appreciated to notice that some posts at the country and Regional Representations are already given to the locals with the required qualifications. We hope that even at local level, posts are granted and paid according to the establishment.

Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vice-Chairman of Commission II, took the Chair

Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vice-Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence

Ocupa la presidencia Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: (original language Arabic): Before giving the floor to the next speaker I would like to thank all members who were good enough to nominate me as vice-chairman of this Commission. I can assure you that during this session which I shall chair I shall try and do everything so that we can attain our common goals. We have strong links of friendship between me and many of you and I feel that together we will be able to bring this session to a fruitful conclusion.

Usama AL-BILBEISI (Jordan) (original language Arabic): What I have to say here is first a general comment. This is something which I feel has to be a priority in this Organization; here I am talking about coordination and the complementarity which exists between this Organization and other

organizations. This Organization does not exist in isolation. There are bilateral efforts and there are other institutions who are working directly in the area of development. We feel, therefore, that there has to be a matching of efforts here because this is of prime importance and it can allow us to make savings, and of course, savings have to be made because resources are limited. This matching of efforts and coordination is also going to help us to do the evaluation and assessment of what has been done. A lot of evaluation has been carried out to date and we would say that those efforts will help us to clear the undergrowth for donor countries and beneficiary countries. This should be part and parcel of the strategy of this Organization and we are sure that the necessary mechanisms can be introduced by our administration to avoid duplication of effort and any problems in the running.

We would also wish to say something about the role of women in rural development. We think this is of great importance, and what is contained in document C 87/8 paragraph 5 is something which holds true. However, we would like to note that there is a need to develop agricultural extension programs for women, because much of the farming labour in rural areas is done by women. If we can take that into account we will be complementing the already on-going efforts in training women in home economics. In this fashion we will be doing an integrated effort toward the development of the role of women in rural development.

If we look at page 33 of document C 87/8, we feel that this Organization has to attach much importance to ruminants and this has to be done particularly in the north east and in northern : . Africa. We feel that this is one of the important components of livestock wealth and source of meat in our region. Therefore, I hope that sufficient attention will be attached to that.

In the document concerning the Programme of Work we find that the resources made available for research are very scarce. This is something which does perturb us because it is necessary to develop the necessary infrastructure throughout regions of the world so that farmers can acquire the skills and knowledge that they need. It would be interesting to have some information on recent progress made by agriculture. It is important that farmers can keep abreast with developments.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): La délégation malgache se félicite de vous voir présider nos travaux car nous connaissons votre grande expérience et votre compétence. Permettez-nous également de féliciter M. Shah pour sa présentation très claire du point 14 de notre ordre du jour.

Dans son intervention en séance plénière, le chef de notre délégation a fait part de l'intérêt qu'il porte aux rapports d'exécution du Programme ordinaire et du Programme de terrain ainsi qu'aux évaluations indépendantes des programmes spéciaux; Il s'est félicité de l'évaluation du Programme de coopération technique, qui a permis de mettre en exergue le caractère primordial de ce programme pour la relance de la production dans les pays en" développement. Il a en outre invité la Conférence à identifier ceux des domaines qui gagneraient à être également évalués afin d'en connaître les résultats par rapport aux objectifs et pour déceler, le cas échéant, leurs lacunes, leurs imperfections et leurs faiblesses afin de pouvoir y remédier. Et la volonté d'y remédier existe.

Notre délégation se plaît à relever que tous les délégués qui se sont exprimés sur ce point de l'ordre du jour ont reconnu que les examens de programmes et les évaluations externes constituent un moyen intéressant, satisfaisant, efficace et pragmatique d'améliorer les performances de l'Organisation. En procédant de la sorte, petit à petit, l'on renforcera à coup sûr notre Organisation.

Nous faisons nôtres les commentaires et les observations du Comité du programme à l'endroit des documents soumis à notre examen, ce qui nous facilite la tâche, car nous nous contenterons de ne relever que quelques aspects particuliers. En ce sens, nous voudrions dire un mot au sujet des documents C 87/8-Sup.1 et C/87/8/Sup.3. Considérant le rapport d'évaluation du Programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire, nous voudrions déclarer que nous partageons les observations du Directeur général en réponse aux propositions des consultants. Nous voudrions cependant faire remarquer que les très nombreux pays en développement qui ont consenti à mettre en oeuvre des mesures d'ajustement structurel ont nécessairement commencé par élaborer et appliquer une politique nationale cohérente et équilibrée de si ' ' limentaire.

Il faudrait reconnaître les efforts souvent très courageux de ces pays, les encourager et leur assurer un soutien conséquent. Pour Madagascar, cette politique existe et reçoit la priorité élevée, requise par la situation qui prévaut. Le gouvernement malgache a oeuvré avec la FAO, le Programme Alimentaire Mondial et la Banque Mondiale, pour l'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre de telles politiques et nous commençons à en récolter fort heureusement les fruits. Le PASA nous a soutenu très vigoureusement dans la mise en place de notre système national d'information et d'alerte rapide.

Nous convenons avec le Directeur général et les consultants que les actions de sécurité alimentaire ne peuvent être qu'intégrées et multidisciplinaires. Aussi, les entités chargées de s'en occuper, devraient-elles tenir une hiérarchie leur permettant de dominer la situation, de faire appel, de requérir sans difficulté la participation des diverses disciplines. L'entité concernée doit obtenir la confiance des bénéficiaires et des donateurs; elle doit pouvoir intensifier ses actions car elle sera de plus en plus sollicitée dans l'avenir,

Aussi, appuyons-nous toute action qui va dans le sens du renforcement de ladite entité.

Nous manifestons notre reconnaissance à l'endroit des pays qui ont financé le PASA et lançons un appel aux autres donateurs car le programme à réaliser dans le futur est immense. La portée du PASA devra être élargie pour répondre au mieux au concept révisé de sécurité alimentaire.

Enfin, je voudrais dire un mot sur le document C 87/8 sup.l. ' La délégation malgache joint sa voix à l'appel lancé par les délégations du Gabon, du Burkina Faso, appuyé par le Brésil, pour que les problèmes financiers de l'Ecole de lutte anti-tsé-tsé de Bobo-Dioulasso soient considérés sérieusement par notre Conférence et qu'une solution soit apportée dans les meilleurs délais.

Nous faisons nôtre la partie du rapport du Conseil traitant de ces questions.

Ibrahima KABA(Guinée): Tout d'abord, ma délégation tient à vous féliciter vous-même pour votre élection ainsi que Monsieur SHAH pour sa brillante présentation.

Le document C 87/8 et ses suppléments traite de questions touchant au fondement des conditions de développement agricole de nos pays; c'est le garant de la sécurité alimentaire dans la région.

En effet, on n'insistera jamais assez sur l'accent à mettre sur le développement des cultures de tubercules qui contribuent en toute saison à la variation du régime alimentaire de la plupart des pays en développement. Nous accordons un intérêt tout particulier aux programmes de l'élevage et de la pêche en raison du fait que la carence protéique est encore une des grandes préoccupations de nos populations.

En ce qui concerne le Programme d'action forestière, nous disons tout simplement que les 15 dernières années, caractérisées par la désertification, l'avancée galopante du désert et la rareté des précipitations, ont contribué à focaliser l'attention des populations rurales, et à orienter les efforts de nos gouvernements quant à la nécessité de soutenir fermement toute action visant à protéger ou à reconstituer le patrimoine forestier; d'où le succès connu par le PAFT.

Cependant, la poursuite et la réussite de tous ces programmes supposent une base financière sûre, d'où l'inquiétude des Etats Membres face à la réduction des ressources financières de notre Organisation.

Il serait souhaitable que tous les pays s'acquittent à temps de leur contribution afin que le Directeur général ainsi que notre Organisation puissent effectivement réaliser le programme que nous leur avons confié.

Par ailleurs, les travaux d'évaluation dont les résultats sont portés à notre connaissance, revêtent une importance toute particulière. En vérité, ces travaux ont abouti à des documents excellents et précieux nous permettant d'apprécier l'impact et les défaillances des actions mises en oeuvre.

Nous nous appesantirons sur le document C 87/8-sup.l traitant de la lutte contre la trypanosomiase et mettant l'accent sur l'indispensable nécessité de la coopération en ce domaine particulier.

Ainsi, page 2, paragraphe 5 de ce document, la Commission souligne que le succès des programmes de lutte contre la tsé-tsé reste conditionné à un travail qui ne se fasse pas en vase clos. En effet, mon pays s'efforce d'appliquer cette recommandation aux travaux effectués en ce domaine.

Nous faisons nôtre la suggestion soulignant en page 3 paragraphe 8 la nécessité de faire participer les ministres de l'élevage et des services vétérinaires aux sessions ultérieures de la Commission d'évaluation et de faire supporter son financement par l'Organisation dans le cadre du budget ordinaire.

Page 5, paragraphe 20, l'attention de notre délégation a été frappée par la recommandation visant à insister sur les graves risques liés au croisement incontrôlé de bovins trypanotolérants pouvant conduire à leur extermination.

En effet, mon pays étant le berceau de la race N'Dama, race réputée pour son caractère trypano-tolérant, nous considérons cette remarque comme étant de la plus haute importance. Il est certain que le Projet Gui 79/007/Sélection et Amélioration de la race N'Dama de Boké, dans mon pays, tient rigoureusement compte de cette importante observation.

Ce projet réalisé avec l'assistance de la FAO doit être poursuivi avec l'aide du gouvernement italien qui a gracieusement accepté son financement.

Enfin, la formation des cadres compétents pour la réalisation de la lutte contre la trypanosomiase étant la première condition de réussite, nous soutenons le renforcement de l'Institut "l'Ecole de lutte anti-tsé-tsé" (Elat) installé à Bobo-Dioulasso.

Masahiko YASUMURO (Japan): First of all on behalf of my delegation I would like to congratulate you on Chairing this Commission and I would like to thank Dr Shah for his clear introduction of this item and also the consultants and the Secretariat for their excellent work and preparation of these reports.

I should like to give Japan's comments on some selected items. As to community forestry, Chapter 9, my delegation considers that community forestry plays a very important role for rural development in the developing world, for it can absorb the population pressure which is the main cause of forest decrease, by means of the participation of community people in forestry activities, and thereby strives to afforest for fuelwood etc., due regard being paid to the needs of community people. In this context, Japan is of the view that FAO's sub-programme in this sector is very useful.

Though community forestry promoted in each country has its own respective characteristics depending on forestry techniques, socio-economic conditions etc., generalized information based on the experiences of each project is an important tool for the extension of community forestry, as is mentioned in paragraph 9.48. To this end, the gathering of a lot of information with high adaptability is required.

As to Chapter 11, that is the review of the Category III meetings, Japan trusts that these expert meetings, to which experts are invited in their personal capacity, involve important roles both for the Regular Programmes and for all technical programmes of FAO. These meetings could be most useful provided that their results or recommendations are promptly followed up by FAO as well as Member countries. In this context, such a review is meaningful and Japan hopes it will be periodically carried out in the future.

Mr Chairman, Japan is confident that the Action Programme for the Control of African Animal Trypanosomiasis is very important for the promotion of animal husbandry in Africa and therefore Japan has no objection to the proposed intensification of this programme.

However, it will not be effective unless combined counter-measures are taken by all countries. Paragraph 13 indicates that fewer countries have a deep interest in this programme. Given this situation, my delegation would like to draw to the attention of the countries concerned that this disease is no less vital than rinderpest or hoof and mouth disease, and would like to encourage these countries, on their part, to consolidate domestic institutions so as to accept assistance.

In this connection, my delegation would expect FAO to promote this programme with closer cooperation with relevant research institutes, such as ILRAD, for which my country extends support in terms of both capital and experts.

Next, I would like to touch upon the Seed Improvement and Development Programme. Japan fully recognizes the importance of seeds for agricultural production, along with other inputs like fertilizers and pesticides, and believes that its potential role is greater in Africa where the ratio of the use of improved seeds is only 9 percent.

While my delegation supports the recommendations made by the evaluation team in general, the following points should be kept in mind.

In the regions where technologies for inputs are rather under-developed and ecological conditions are not favourable, selection of a better strain of indigenous varieties and their improvement are often more effective than merely introducing high-yielding varieties from outside. But improvement and development of seeds should be promoted also for legumes, millet, sorghum and so on, which are more suitable to local climate, soil, dietary habit etc., so as to try to help improve the food situation in regions which face food shortages.

Lastly, as to the Food Security Assistance Scheme, my delegation can only reiterate that the recommendation of the consultants is too ambitious. The recommendation calls for the intensification of the scheme, particularly concerning concept 1 of food security and concept 3.

However, the food security problem is related to the whole Agricultural Department of FAO, and also involves the fishery and forestry sectors. Since food security is related to such a wide range of sectors, it would be a huge task for FSAS to make overall coordination. Particularly when it comes to concept 3, many of them are beyond the capacity of FAO, such as food aid, food stamps, and even measures against unemployment of the poor.

The recommendation also proposes to establish a Country Task Force in FAO. However, given the limited resources and personnel of FAO, it will not be possible, practically speaking, to establish such new institutions.

In conclusion, despite the recommendations of the consultant, it would be desirable to study how to implement this scheme with a higher emphasis on selected matters out of the already commenced projects like the one which was really effective or which will be highly required continuously.

As for "Global World Information and Early Warning Systems", I should like to request its improvement so that every issue will be more quickly delivered to Member Countries.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): We are hard pressed for time, so I shall try to be brief and concise. In general terms, Ghana supports the review of the Regular Programme. Specifically, we welcome the strategies to be adopted in fisheries management as stated on page 56 of the English version of document C 87/8. Special emphasis is required in the management and development of fisheries resources from inland waters and agriculture as capture fisheries has been showing signs of collapse.

Many developing countries depend mostly on fish as a source of animal protein. Per caput consumption of fish is still low in most of these countries. Development of fisheries is therefore to be directed towards increasing per caput consumption of fish in these countries.

As regards livestock development, the Ghana delegation supports the idea of some other countries, of treating this as a separate subject matter - as Fisheries and Forestry.

The justification for this is that there is the need to develop rapidly livestock in most of the developing countries in order to boost meat production. This will certainly reduce the pressure on the demand for fish and fishery products. For short-term programmes some countries in Africa are concentrating on poultry development. However, not much impact has been achieved as poultry products are rather expensive for the average family.

For forestry, Ghana supports the objectives and strategy for the management of our forestry resources. This particular programme is extremely important, taking into consideration the alarming rate at which tropical forests are being destroyed.

Agro-forestry. This new concept is being introduced into some countries and we advocate that the present programme should be modified to enable FAO to give more support to those countries which have embarked on the development of agro-forestry.

We congratulate the Secretariat for the excellent document that has been produced.

Alex Louis TANIS (Haïti): Je commencerai tout d'abord, Monsieur le Président, par vous féliciter pour votre élection à la vice-présidence de notre Commission, et je remercie également Monsieur Shah pour l'excellente présentation du document qu'il nous a soumis, ainsi que le Secrétariat.

Les différences activités réalisées dans ce programme ont été faites avec maîtrise et compétence, et des résultats positifs ont été obtenus. C'est la raison pour laquelle la délégation haïtienne appuie les conclusions du rapport dans leur globalité.

Je n'ai donc pas l'intention de répéter ce qui a été dit avant moi par de très brillants spécialistes mais je tiens à formuler quelques commentaires dans les domaines suivants:

1- La lutte contre la trypanosomiase: la délégation d'Haïti appuie l'effort réalisé en l'occurrence et est solidaire de toute action visant à aider l'Afrique à lutter contre cette peste - puisqu'il faut bien l'appeler par son nom.

2- L'exécution du programme agricole: elle s'est réalisée dans des conditions économiques extrêmement précaires - celles dont dispose l'Organisation. Nous nous réjouissons toutefois de constater que les restrictions de crédit n'ont pas affecté gravement le programme de terrain ainsi que l'appui donné aux Etats Membres, notamment l'aide fournie au continent africain en vue de l'aider à surmonter la crise qu'il traverse.

La délégation haïtienne pense en l'occurrence que la FAO se doit d'envisager avec les Etats Membres les priorités à accorder dans les différents programmes.

3- En ce qui concerne la formation, la réduction des crédits dans le domaine de la formation constitue une préoccupation de la délégation haïtienne si l'on tient compte du fait que l'homme demeure le principal élément de la promotion sociale et économique de tout pays en développement car nous pensons que le sous-développement n'est pas un phénomène physique mais un phénomène mental.

Si l'on désire opérer des changements durables, susceptibles de déboucher sur un changement de mentalité des exploitants et des gens, la FAO devra étudier les moyens de continuer à renforcer son programme de vulgarisation dans les Etats Membres.

4- En ce qui concerne l'évaluation, nous pensons que l'évaluation indépendante faite par des experts extérieurs au programme doit se poursuivre, mais il est difficile parfois de la faire d'une façon objective étant donné que les objectifs fixés dans les documents de travail ne sont pas hiérarchisés quantitativement. Mais les conclusions des évaluations ne sont pas utilisées en vue de réformes de structures ou de nouvelles orientations à donner au programme; et nous pensons que ceci est dû à un manque de coordination étroite entre les différents services et divisions de la FAO.

Dans cet ordre d'idée nous pensons que si les évaluations se font à la lumière des considérations que nous venons d'évoquer, elles seront de nature à satisfaire la confiance des pays donateurs et des pays bénéficiaires.

5- En ce qui concerne l'assistance à fournir au programme de la sécurité alimentaire (voilà un beau mot qui est lancé!), nous pensons pour notre part qu'il peut être vide de sens si l'on ne tient pas compte du concept élargi de la sécurité alimentaire et, par voie de conséquence, des différentes assistances à fournir dans certains domaines.

Dans cet ordre d'idée, ma délégation tient à renforcer le concept élargi de la sécurité alimentaire tel qu'il a été défini par les délégations de la Suisse et de la Colombie, en mentionnant certains facteurs spécifiques situés en amont et en aval des mots "sécurité alimentaire".

Qu' il nous soit permis de mentionner en l'occurrence, en amont, l'organisation de la production elle-même. Cette organisation ne peut pas s'entendre sans une sécurité en ce qui concerne la culture de la terre. On ne peut pas demander à un exploitant d'apporter des améliorations foncières si ses droits ne sont pas garantis en ce qui concerne sa sécurité.

Parmi les facteurs en amont il faut mentionner l'organisation de la production c'est-à-dire la vulgarisation et la préparation du sol.

Et nous insistons particulièrement sur les semences: les semences constituent à notre avis un facteur capital quant à l'augmentation de l'activité et, partant, de la production agricole. Il faut que la FAO et les Etats Membres prennent les mesures nécessaires en vue. d'obtenir un approvisionnement suffisant et sûr en ce qui concerne le double plan de la quantité et de la qualité des semences à fournir aux exploitants.

Autre facteur, l'utilisation des engrais, des pesticides, des insecticides qui s'échangent actuellement à des prix relativement élevés sur les marchés internationaux, alors que les prix des produits à l'exportation et à la consommation locale ne cessent de chuter. Cette situation est de nature, si certaines mesures ne sont pas prises, à décourager le producteur si l'on n'arrive pas à subventionner les prix payés à la production. Mais la plupart des pays en développement ne peuvent malheureusement pas économiquement supporter les coûts d'une subvention des produits agricoles.

Cette sécurité doit s'entendre dans le domaine de l'irrigation. Dans la plupart de nos pays en développement, les terres irriguées représentent à peu près 15% des superficies cultivables alors que dans des conditions tropicales, sur n'importe quelle superficie irriguée, on peut d'abord obtenir trois récoltes par an et avec des rendements passant du simple au triple. Ceci signifie qu'on obtient sur les superficies irriguées 9 fois le rendement en cultures traditionnelles. Et je pense par conséquent que le programme d'irrigation de la FAO doit être considérablement renforcé si l'on veut déboucher sur une situation alimentaire durable.

Nous venons de passer en revue les facteurs en amont. Et quant aux facteurs en aval maintenant, il faudrait réduire les pertes après récolte qui constituent dans la plupart des cas près de 20% des récoltes. Ensuite il y a la question du transport, de la manutention et de la commercialisation.

Par sécurité alimentaire, il faut également entendre la partie de la ration constituée par l'apport des protéines animales, et comme nous l'avons dit hier, les programmes d'élevage qui figurent au rapport sont vagues et méritent un support beaucoup plus élargi de la part de l'Organisation; en effet l'élevage permet non seulement de fournir la part de protéines nécessaire dans la ration alimentaire mais permet également aux exploitants, par suite des rentrées quotidiennes, de mieux équilibrer leur budget et de mener une vie plus humaine.

Et ma dernière observation concernant la sécurité alimentaire portera sur le concept de l'aménagement des bassins versants dans le cadre d'une agriculture "conservationniste" de montagne alliant le profil agro-sylvo-pastoral.

Nous avons parlé de l'agriculture, nous avons parlé de l'élevage, mais nous pensons qu'une attention beaucoup plus soutenue doit être accordée aux forêts compte tenu de leur dégradation, particulièrement dans les zones tropicales. Si une action renforcée n'est pas entreprise dans ce domaine, près de 2 milliards de personnes risquent de se retrouver dans des zones où le bois de feu manquera.

Je m'excuse d'avoir été un peu long mais la délégation haïtienne pense que les commentaires répondent à la préoccupation de voir la FAO continuer à fournir l'assistance technique et financière dans le sens de la satisfaction des Etats Membres dans un monde de plus en plus interdépendant.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): We are most grateful for your kind consideration. We also wish to thank the Secretariat for this documentation and of course for its presentation. Our delegation wishes to endorse the initiatives and the relevant action of FAO in relation to all forms of evaluation, be they called reviews or actual evaluation. We noted carefully Mr Shah's statement that the Performance Report, Part 1 of the Review, did not pretend to be evaluations. My delegation wishes to suggest that the Secretariat should make every possible effort to ensure the adequacy of resources for specific evaluation activity.

In these times of difficult financial considerations, performance results will go a long way in overcoming the struggle for financial contributions. The percentage of timely and adequate evaluations rather than presentation of timely and adequate evaluation reports will assist in reducing the call for transparency, which in the present circumstances Mr Shah, with all his well-recognized skills in responding to questions verbally, cannot stop.

We also noted that the Director-General and the Secretariat had no difficulty with the three independent external evaluations. In fact, according to Mr Shah's statement, the Director-General accepted the recommendations in each instance. My delegation is of the firm opinion that the area of extension education and, broadly interpreted, the transfer of knowledge and skills and the facilitation of positive attitudinal orientation, leading to appropriate on-farm and community decisions, is an area for continued allocation of resources for evaluation. We feel that properly designed evaluation studies and the effective use of the results will bring considerable benefits to rural development planning and programme execution.

Finally, my delegation wishes to stress to the Secretariat that the presentation of performance and evaluation reports of various activities is one aspect of the performance of this Organization. What we wish to know and to be assured of is that FAO has in place mechanisms for effective, significant and appropriate impact on the operations of the Organization as a result of the evaluation studies. We must know and be convinced that these studies and recommendations lead to budgetary adjustments, to field strategy adjustments and to greater efficiency at all points - and more so in the achievement of the intended objectives.

V.K. SIBAL (India): Allow us to express our pleasure to see you chairing this session. We would also like to show our appreciation for the quality of the document under discussion and for its clear presentation by Mr Shah.

The Review under debate is clear, analytical and of high quality. It shows graphically how cash-flow difficulties of the FAO have affected the implementation of the Regular Programme activities in the areas of training, technical meetings and publications. It is equally clear that such difficulties, if prolonged, might inflict institutional damage through compression of technical support for Field Programmes which would take long to repair.

During the current biennium nearly seven percent of the Regular Programme resources for the technical programmes had to be slashed to accommodate the cash flow difficulties.

It is obvious that the non-payment of assessed contributions makes it impossible to prepare a programme of work the implementability of which can be held to be certain. There is no doubt that the ad hoc measures taken to meet the current difficulties would only affect the implementation of the Regular Programme and the adherence to its priorities. We however appreciate that the Director-General has effected the necessary adjustments during the biennium with discrimination, pragmatism and efficiency.

We appreciate the excellent manner in which the Regular Programme and related field programme activities have been presented in the review. The review shows how lack of adequate extra-budgetary support was a major constraint in the implementation of several programmes, especially the Action Programme on Fisheries.

The review of sub-programme 2.1.3.2 on Animal Health also shows that further extra-budgetary support would be critical to the implementation of additional disease control programmes planned in various parts of the world.

The review of the Programme on Fish Utilization and Marketing has brought out the relative neglect of fish marketing development in relation to export marketing, slow commercial application of many of the research outputs, and the need to ensure greater integration between fish technology research and market development.

We agree with the need to give priority to the protection of fishery resources in the exclusive economic zones of developing countries.

As regards the review of FAO's extension activities, we agree with the preliminary conclusions in Chapter 10 of the review regarding the success of extension programmes. The review has brought out the need for greater in-house dialogue on extension approaches promoted by the various units involved, and we would appreciate it if quick action on the suggestions made is taken by FAO, particularly the suggestion for a definitive study by FAO of extension approaches based on an analysis of the Organization's experience as well as that of other agencies in this field. We are in favour of the use of targeted approaches to ensure that disadvantaged groups, including small farmers, the landless and women, benefit from extension and the need to adapt extension methodologies to specific economic, social, political, cultural and administrative situations.

So far as category III meetings are concerned, it is clear that such meetings are a valuable instrument for synthesizing lessons from implementation experience and gaining consensus in technical and policy areas. We note, however, that these have not proved useful when they lacked clear goals or were devoted to awareness building. This lesson needs to be taken note of while holding such meetings in the future.

We have external evaluations of three special action programmes in the document. We recognize that such evaluations are a part of FAO's repertoire of mechanisms for evaluation and expect these to be utilized for evaluation of long-standing ongoing programmes as may be appropriate and feasible:

The evaluation of the Action Programme for Control of African Trypanosomiasis brings out the need for further training and research and more integrated planning, including land use and area development and not confined to tsetse eradication. We agree that the programme should continue to receive high priority and be further strengthened. In this context the Indian delegation would like to point out that trypanosomiasis is also prevalent in the Asian continent as well as in Latin American countries. FAO may also devote some attention to control of this disease prevalent in countries which are not covered by the current programme outside Africa.

We note with satisfaction that all the recommendations of the evaluation report have been accepted by the Director-General with appropriate action envisaged for their implementation. We also note that the recommendations of the evaluation on the SIDP have also been accepted by the Director-General, including the need for more selectivity in project development. We note that the Director-General intends to find additional resources for the programme through the distribution of existing resources.

In the absence of availability of suitable varieties for subsistence crops there is need for more work on pulses grain legumes, as also on roots, tubers and plantains. Strengthening of internal coordination within FAO would in our view make the programme implementation more effective and beneficial.

So far as the FSAS evaluation is concerned, areas of production of food and access to it have not received sufficient attention under the scheme and we agree that these aspects should be taken in view by FAO when advising Member Nations on appropriate policies and measures bearing on these problems.

FSAS should also concentrate more systematically on medium-term and long-term objectives, strategies and programmes covering food production and access to food and short-term actions should complement medium-term and long-term plans for the alleviation and eradication of hunger. The step-by-step approach suggested by the Director-General to the recommendations is a realistic response taking in view the resource constraints. We are in favour of ECDC TCDC activities covering food security, especially in promoting trade in food-stuffs, training and exchange of experiences. We would also like to appeal to the donor countries to increase their support to the FSAS in the context of a programme-oriented approach.

These are the observations, Mr Chairman, that we wish to make and we thank you for your attention.

MAPELA NGA-MA (Zaire): Nous felicitons le Secrétariat et M. Shah pour la qualité et la présentation des documents que nous sommes en train d'examiner.

Ainsi que ma délégation l'a toujours dit, chaque fois que la question est examinée, nous pensons que la première personne à associer à l'évaluation des activités entreprises dans les pays par des organisations de la famille des Nations Unies est bel et bien le gouvernement de chaque pays où ces activités s'effectuent.

C'est pourquoi, tout en souscrivant aux conclusions des évaluations des programmes dont le document C 87/8 et ses suppléments font mention, ma délégation demande qu'à l'avenir le Directeur général tienne compte de la souveraineté de chaque Etat Membre lors de l'évaluation de toutes les activités réalisées dans le territoire de cet Etat. Ma délégation demande également que le Directeur général utilise désormais au maximum, à ce propos, la compétence des experts des pays en développement, qu'il s'agisse de l'évaluation tout court ou de l'évaluation indépendante de ces activités. Chaque gouvernement bénéficiaire de programmes et activités à évaluer devra donc, à notre sens, être étroitement associé à cette évaluation et, à ce moment-là, la FAO devra prendre en charge - et pourquoi pas? - le délégué que le Gouvernement désignera à cet effet, comme l'a si bien dit le délégué de la Guinée.

En ce qui concerne le Programme de coopération technique, ma délégation estime que, comme l'ont dit d'autres délégations, compte tenu de l'importance que les Etats Membres accordent à ce programme, le Directeur général devra tout mettre en oeuvre pour renforcer sans cesse le PCT.

Ma délégation voudrait appuyer la déclaration faite, ce matin, par le délégué de la France lorsqu'il a parlé du PCT et de l'attention particulière que la FAO doit accorder à l'Afrique dans le cadre de ses activités.

Pour ce que est des bureaux des représentants de la FAO dans les pays, ma délégation appuie ce qui a été dit par plusieurs délégations, à savoir que nous nous félicitons de la manière dont ces bureaux fonctionnent actuellement. En effet, les représentants de la FAO dans nos pays sont de très bons conseillers en matière d'alimentation et d'agriculture; ils nous aident à identifier, à exécuter, à suivre et à évaluer les projets de développement. Il en est de même des bureaux régionaux de la FAO qui, comme nous le savons tous, aident notamment nos pays à développer la coopération Sud-Sud. C'est la raison pour laquelle ma délégation est d'avis que, lorsqu'un pays adresse une requête au Directeur Général afin d'obtenir l'ouverture d'un bureau de la FAO, le Directeur Général doit y répondre favorablement en respectant le principe d'un représentant par pays car nous pensons, nous aussi, que le système d'accréditation double de représentants d'organisations spécialisées des Nations Unies est à bannir pour les raisons qui sont avancées au paragraphes 4.59 du document C 87/8.

C'est pourquoi ma délégation appuie la proposition du Directeur Général d'augmenter de quatre au moins le nombre de représentations de la FAO pour le prochain exercice. J'aimerais que le Secrétariat note ce que je viens de dire et en tienne compte en le faisant refléter dans le rapport de notre Commission.

Ma délégation appuie le contenu des documents qui traitent du point 14 de notre ordre du jour et nous souscrivons à l'analyse qui y est faite. Nous demandons que tous les programmes mentionnés dans ces documents soient renforcés au cours du prochain exercice biennal.

Pour terminer, nous appuyons tous les efforts que déploient la FAO et les pays donateurs en vue d'aider les pays africains à se développer, que ce soit sur le plan des relations bilatérales ou multilatérales.

Sra. Mónica DEREGBUS (Argentina): Mi delegación quisiera expresar su opinión relativa a algunos pocos aspectos puntuales de los numerosos temas que este examen lleva aparejado.

En primer lugar, permítame expresar que mi delegación lamenta las consecuencias sobre los programas que pese a los esfuerzos realizados por la Secretaría ha tenido la crisis de liquidez que afecta a la Organización.

Al respecto estimamos adecuado el enfoque de la cuestión que ha efectuado la Secretaría y que ha permitido preservar, en la medida de lo posible, la integridad del programa de campo en beneficio directo e inmediato de los países en desarrollo.

Observamos que los sectores más afectados por esta lamentable coyuntura son la capacitación, las reuniones y las publicaciones.

Vinculado a ello, la delegación Argentina ve con preocupación la situación en dos campos específicos de acción dentro de la multiplicidad de los que cubre la FAO.

El primero se refiere al alcance que las actividades de la Organización tiene respecto de la mujer como beneficiaria de sus programas. Leemos al respecto en la página 48 de la versión española del documento C 87/8, y cito "se terminó un análisis de los beneficiarios del programa ordinario, por sexo, en el que se llegó a la conclusión de que los programas seguían tendiendo involuntariamente a favorecer al hombre. Se ha iniciado un estudio análogo del programa de campo. En el marco de este subprograma se ha prestado cada vez más apoyo técnico a proyectos no directamente relacionados con las mujeres".

Mi delegación quisiera que en todos los casos en que FAO presta asistencia a los gobiernos, tenga como una de sus metas principales la valorización del rol y del trabajo femenino en la producción de alimentos y como agente principal para la obtención de niveles satisfactorios de nutrición, así como beneficiaria del crédito agrícola y de las actividades de extensión.

El segundo aspecto que nos preocupa es el de la investigación y la capacitación. Estimamos que es mucho lo que puede hacer aún la FAO en cooperación con instituciones de estudio e investigación de comprobado prestigio y capacidad como las que hay muchas en el campo específico de su labor en diversos países en desarrollo, como el mío. Esperamos que en el futuro se imagine y se establezca un sistema de cooperación continua con estas instituciones nacionales, que pueda aprovechar sus notables recursos humanos por medio de la inyección en sus cátedras y laboratorios de los recursos tecnológicos y financieros de que en la actualidad carecen nuestros países.

Respecto de esta posibilidad no suficientemente explorada ni explotada hasta el presente, y su importancia en el desarrollo de la cooperación Sur-Sur quisiera endosar lo dicho hace unos instantes por la distinguida delegación del Brasil.

Este comentario que es de tipo general es motivado por lo específicamente señalado en el párrafo 1 160 de la página 65 de la versión española del documento C 87/8.

Quisiera pasar ahora a comentar sucintamente los tres informes de evaluación independiente que nos han sido presentados en esta sesión.

En primer lugar, deseo dejar constancia del aprecio de mi delegación por la calidad de los trabajos, pero expresar a la vez, nuestro apoyo a lo manifestado en el día de ayer por la delegación de México en el sentido que nos agrada ver que este ejercicio de evaluación, que consideramos positivo y necesario, sea encarado en mayor medida por la propia Organización, es decir, en forma interna aunque independiente.

Esto coadyuvaría, estamos seguros, al esfuerzo de realizar economías.

Paso ahora a formular comentarios específicos. En primer lugar, respecto de la evaluación del PASA, Coincidimos en que el PASA continúa siendo un instrumento idóneo para el logro de la seguridad alimentaria mundial; a pesar de las limitaciones en su mandato ha logrado poner en marcha y ejecutar eficientemente diversas iniciativas.

Estamos asimismo de acuerdo en que las actividades del PASA no han podido abarcar plenamente los tres aspectos inherentes al concepto ampliado de seguridad alimentaria, es decir, producción, estabilidad y acceso a los alimentos. Es por ello que apoyamos las recomendaciones que los consultores formulan con este propósito. Comprendemos, sin embargo, las dudas planteadas por la secretaría en el párrafo 33 del documento y consideramos que ha llegado el momento de analizar nuevamente la posible creación de un mecanismo de coordinación de la FAO en materia de seguridad alimentaria.

Mi delegación ha analizado el documento C 87/8-Sup.1 y ve con una cierta preocupación el futuro del Programa de Acción para la Lucha contra la Tripanosomiasis africana de los animales. Mi país es consciente de lo que significa desde el punto de vista económico esta enfermedad, ya que un 15 por ciento de nuestro ganado equino está atacado por el tripanosoma equinum y nuestras pérdidas al respecto son severas, perjudicando seriamente los ingresos de los productores. Es por ello que Argentina está interesada en recibir asistencia técnica específicamente en materia de quimioterápicos que se utilizan y en su residualidad en las carnes. De la lectura del documento parecería, sin embargo, que no existiera una adecuada respuesta a las propuestas y recomendaciones que se ofrecen en el marco del programa.

Quizá la falta de una evaluación económica de las pérdidas que ocasiona la enfermedad y de las limitaciones en el desarrollo rural que ésta produce podría incentivar la revisión político-técnica de los programas nacionales de modo de asegurar el mayor grado de éxito posible del programa.

Nuestro país encuentra limitado su comercio pecuario y agrícola por barreras sanitarias; las pérdidas económicas que esto ocasiona son cuantiosas; es hora que los gobiernos tomen conciencia que únicamente por el camino de la tenacidad y la perseverancia en programas de control y erradicación lograremos la apertura de nuevos mercados, sorteando las barreras que hoy nos limitan, utilizadas a veces como medidas preventivas y otras como excusas comerciales.

Vemos con preocupación, asimismo, que el informe señala que al desaparecer la ayuda financiera externa se retorna al punto de partida.

Este cuadro de situación es común a muchos programas y mi Delegación considera pertinente, como posible solución, la capacitación de capacitadores nacionales con el fin de dar permanencia y efectividad a la tarea emprendida.

Mi Delegación, efectivamente, estima conveniente que se jerarquice, dentro de las posibilidades presupuestarias de la FAO, la coordinación de los esfuerzos en este campo, de acuerdo a lo sugerido en el Informe de Evaluación.

Mi Delegación ve con agrado las prioridades otorgadas al Programa de mejoramiento de semillas donde se proporcione la base de datos mundiales sobre este insumo. El manejo de dicha información facilitará el crecimiento del sector promoviendo, en algunos casos, la sustitución de importaciones y coadyuvando en otros a una diversificación de las exportaciones agrícolas. La cooperación técnica multilateral y bilateral es de importancia fundamental para el logro de estos objetivos.

Mi país, Señor Presidente, cuenta con un sector privado suficientemente desarrollado para la producción de las principales especies agrícolas; en este sector intervienen semilleros y productores multiplicadores como agentes más importantes. Existen además sistemas de articulación pública y privada mediante convenio de vinculación tecnológica entre el INTA, con agentes del sector privado, para la creación, producción y comercialización de nuevos cultivadores, sobre bases jurídicas donde se establece la participación y la propiedad de los resultados, la exclusividad y las contraprestaciones. Con este mecanismo se intenta mejorar las limitaciones que impone un sistema totalmente público. Quisiera dejar constancia, Señor Presidente, de que mi país está en condiciones de ofrecer su experiencia en estas formas de articulación que han probado ser para nosotros tan exitosas.

Estimamos de particular interés la recomendación de prestar más atención a la descripción de variedades, así como su mantenimiento e intercambio para facilitar la valoración y transferencia de variedades mejoradas. Al respecto, quisiéramos expresar que nos encontramos interesados en recibir asistencia técnica de la FAO. Mi Delegación considera que una manera práctica de avanzar en cooperación, es ofrecer aquello con lo que se cuenta y solicitar nada más que lo imprescindible.

Ahmad ALAVI (Iran, Islamic Republic of): The documents in front of us are very comprehensive and bear a very high calibre in presentation. On behalf of the Iranian delegation and myself I would like to express my deep appreciation to Dr Shah and the Secretariat for their elaborate attempt.

There exist several topics in these documents and reviewing all of them in the limited time we have here is just not possible.

I just could not convince myself what lay behind the adoption of this policy, that some very important topics were chosen to be the matter for discussion in this Commission while certainly every individual Member State has got something to contribute in each regard, and I am sure most of the contributors suffice to be very brief and concise in subjects which would really be of great significance, particularly for the developing countries, to gain the best benefit from this technical gathering.

Since seed improvement, early warning system and prevention of food losses play a very important part in Iran, I would like to orientate my statement very briefly towards these topics. The introduction of new agricultural movement in Iran, which dates back to half a century ago, together with other activities, revealed and emphasized the need for improvement of seeds and plants, finally resulting in the establishment of an institute to materialize this end.

Along with the establishment of the institute, other centres were set up to conduct necessary studies. In the beginning the activities were concentrated on major seeds such as sugar beets, grains, rice and cotton. Under this topic I would like to mention that gene banks, with close collaboration of IBPGR have been established in recent years for protecting inherited reserves and timely utilization of them on emergency occasions.

Bearing all these points in mind, since improved seeds are prepared and sold at higher costs, and in most cases farmers cannot afford, we would like to suggest further close cooperation among the Member Countries, particularly those which share similar ecological and climatological conditions to improve the quality of their obtained seeds and as a result to enhance their total productivity. FAO can play a significant role in this regard and provide the data related to each subject which particularly concerns each individual Member State.

Concerning activities on the prevention of food losses which FAO has paid close attention to, the provision of technical assistance to some African countries, the attempts are highly appreciated. But still much is left to be done to control this multitudinous amount of loss which somehow amounts to over 20 percent of agricultural commodities after harvesting. We seek advisory and technical assistance to help projects in these regards.

If we think realistically about this matter we have gained the food and feedstuff with so much effort and the remaining job is the appropriate preservation. We hope that FAO will continue to enhance its efforts to give more help to the Member States by conducting seminars, introducing plausible recommendations and programmes which can be put into action under the conditions prevailing in the developing countries.

An Early Warning System is another matter for discussion in this Commission and FAO deserves full appreciation and support in this respect. I should like to mention that in Iran we are practising this System successfully together with surveillance network in controlling agricultural pests and diseases.

Since man and its surrounding environment are suffering very severely from the utilization of different chemicals we strongly believe in the decrease, if not the removal, of this practice in agricultural activities by employing such measures. There is no doubt that FAO can be the best forum for the presentation and introduction of these remarkable measures.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de vous dire que c'est pour nous un grand plaisir que de vous voir présider notre séance. Aborder l'examen du Programme Ordinaire de l'exercice en cours, c'est d'abord le situer dans le contexte actuel des difficultés financières que traverse la FAO, difficultés qui ont eu pour résultat l'exécution partielle de celui-ci.

Cette crise financière, due en grande partie au plus grand contributeur, a deux conséquences dommageables pour tous les Etats Membres:

- la première est la réduction ou la suppression de nombre d'activités de la FAO, telles que celles liées à la formation, à la consultation d'experts, ou, plus grave, à l'appui direct aux Etats Membres;
- la seconde - et de loin la plus lourde - entraîne l'épuisement du fonds de roulement dont la reconstitution aura pour conséquence une charge supplémentaire pour tous les Etats Membres, y compris ceux qui se sont acquittés de leur contribution.

Avant d'entrer dans le détail de ce programme, notre délégation souhaiterait féliciter le Secrétariat pour la clarté du document C 87/8 et son objectivité; plusieurs passages témoignent d'un travail autocritique.

S'agissant du Programme Ordinaire 1986/87, globalement notre délégation est satisfaite des résultats atteints par la FAO; elle souscrit aux conclusions de la 53ème session du Comité du Programme.

De même, les priorités à l'Afrique, aux ruraux pauvres et à l'intégration de la femme au développement nous conviennent tout particulièrement.

Concernant le Grand Programme Agriculture, notre délégation apprécie notamment les activités accomplies au titre des programmes cultures, développement de la recherche et de la technologie, et nutrition.

Parmi les programmes cultures, nous félicitons la FAO pour son rôle actif dans la mise en oeuvre du Code international de conduite pour la distribution et l'utilisation des pesticides, et l'encouragement à fournir davantage d'efforts en ce sens.

Nous souscrivons également au principe de la lutte intégrée contre les ennemis des cultures. Enfin, notre délégation approuve en particulier la création en Août 1986 du Centre d'Intervention antiacridienne, ainsi que le renforcement de la formation pour faire face aux invasions de criquets et sauteriaux.

Concernant le développement de la recherche et de la technologie, tout en appréciant le travail fourni dans le cadre de ce Programme, notre délégation aurait souhaité pour sa part, qu'il bénéficie de ressources plus importantes en raison de l'importance des études et analyses entreprises dans différentes régions et sous-régions pour le développement agricole. C'est ainsi que nous avons relevé que le nombre d'experts et consultants engagé en 1986 pour le soutien de ce programme est en déca de la moyenne annuelle de 1982/1983. De même, pour le Programme Nutrition, il nous paraît souhaitable d'élargir le plus possible les activités liées à des aliments et normes alimentaires, notamment celles décrites au paragraphe 1.123 du document C 87/8.

Parmi les activités réalisées au titre du Grand Programme Pêches notre attention a été retenue par le Programme Exploitation et utilisation des ressources halieutiques dont nous approuvons l'augmentation de 3 pour cent des crédits par rapport à l'exercice précédent. Notre délégation souhaite que ce mouvement se poursuive et que la FAO intensifie ses efforts, notamment pour ce qui concerne les activités décrites aux paragraphes 2.25, 2.32, 2.33 et 2.36.

Concernant le Grand Programme Forêts, notre délégation regrette qu'en raison de contraintes financières le manuel FAO d'Aménagement des bassins versants n'ait pu être publié en intégralité.

Le programme intitulé "La Forêt au service du développement rural" mérite une mention spéciale en raison des activités importantes menées dans ce cadre, notamment celles contenues aux paragraphes 3.31, 3.32, 3.33.

Enfin, notre délégation encourage la FAO à accroître sa participation à l'application du Plan Forestier Tropical.

Notre délégation a porté une attention particulière au chapitre 4 "Coopération technique et soutien au développement" et considère que la diversification croissante des sources de financement pour les projets de coopération technique de la FAO, et le resserrement des liens entre aide technique et assistance financière, constituent des arguments solides en faveur de l'accroissement des ressources du PCT.

Notre pays qui accorde un grand intérêt au Programme de coopération technique, car il a démontré son efficacité, regrette que les ressources affectées à ce chapitre soient en stagnation, d'autant plus que de nombreux pays font appel à ce mécanisme.

Au vu de l'examen de l'utilisation du PCT durant les deux dernières années, il ressort que les catégories "appui au développement" et "appui aux activités du CTPD" n'ont pas bénéficié de ressources suffisantes relevant du domaine de la coopération sud-sud. C'est pourquoi nous suggérons un rééquilibrage de l'affectation des ressources entre les différentes catégories.

Concernant les suppléments au document C 87/8 relatifs à l'évaluation extérieure de 3 programmes spéciaux de la FAO, notre délégation félicite le Secrétariat d'avoir pris une telle initiative.

S'agissant de l'évaluation du programme d'action pour la lutte contre la trypanosomiose, de manière générale, nous souscrivons aux conclusions de cette mission d'experts ainsi qu'aux mesures préconisées. Notre délégation estime que la lutte contre la mouche tsé-tsé doit continuer à faire l'objet d'une attention particulière. Pour ce faire, les suggestions émises au paragraphe 27 de ce document tendant à l'amélioration de l'efficacité de ce programme, nous paraissent de nature à rendre l'impact de l'action de la FAO plus perceptible et par conséquent à favoriser la participation des donateurs.

Parmi ces mesures, notre délégation croit que la formation doit faire l'objet d'un effort particulier. A ce propos, nous lançons un appel aux donateurs pour qu'ils contribuent à la reprise des cours de formation à l'Ecole de lutte anti-tsé-tsé de Bobo Dioulasso au Burkina Faso.

Concernant l'évaluation du programme d'assistance à la sécurité alimentaire, notre délégation a apprécié la haute qualité du travail accompli par la mission d'experts et, pour notre part, nous approuvons la recommandation figurant au chapitre 10 pour l'action future de ce programme, notamment en ce qui concerne la mise en oeuvre du concept élargi de sécurité alimentaire.

Nous limiterons notre intervention sur le contenu du programme, étant donné que la plupart de nos observations ont déjà été évoquées par les délégations du Danemark et de la Colombie.

Sur les recommandations relatives au contenu du programme évoquées au paragraphe 35, notre délégation estime qu'un effort particulier devrait porter sur la promotion de la coopération entre pays dans le domaine de la sécurité alimentaire.'

Enfin, nous pensons que parmi les trois conditions à réunir pour assurer la sécurité alimentaire, la FAO devrait porter une attention spéciale à la question de l'accessibilité à la nourriture de tous les points de vue.

Mme Fatma LARBI (Tunisie): La délégation tunisienne est heureuse de vous voir présider notre commission et remercie Monsieur SHAH pour la présentation claire de ce point important de notre ordre du jour: elle réitère son appréciation sincère au Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents C 87/8, C 87/LIM/19 et les trois suppléments. De tels documents, très riches en informations, devraient pouvoir satisfaire les délégations qui veulent connaître en détail les réalisations de notre Organisation; ils contribuent à lever les doutes exprimés quant à l'efficacité des interventions de la FAO.

Ma délégation appuie le contenu du document C 87/8 et plus particulièrement les chapitres 3, 4 et 10.

En effet, nous exprimons à ce propos notre plein soutien au programme de coopération technique (PCT) et appuyons les déclarations faites par les honorables délégués de la Belgique et de la France à ce sujet.

En ce qui concerne le programme 2-3 relatif aux forêts, nous approuvons le contenu du paragraphe 341 du document C 87/8 ainsi que les paragraphes 2.15 et 2.16 du document C 87 LIM 19 relatifs au développement de la foresterie communautaire.

Quant au chapitre 10 du document C 87/8, relatif à l'examen des activités de la FAO en matière de vulgarisation, nous estimons que le rapport d'évaluation, interne de très grande qualité mérite une large diffusion auprès des Etats membres. De plus, nous voudrions insister sur la nécessité de renforcer les liens entre la recherche et la vulgarisation et nous appuyons par conséquent le contenu du paragraphe 221 du document C 87 LIM 19.

Pour ce qui est des trois rapports d'évaluation externe des programmes spéciaux de la FAO, à savoir: l'évaluation du Programme de lutte contre la trypanosomiase animale africaine et de mise en valeur des zones en cause; l'évaluation du Programme de développement et d'amélioration des semences; l'évaluation du Programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire, la délégation tunisienne adhère totalement aux conclusions et aux recommandations présentées par les experts et rend hommage au Directeur général pour la réalisation de ces trois évaluations dont le concours est essentiel aux organes directeurs de la FAO, dans leur mission d'orientation et d'ajustement, en vue d'améliorer l'efficacité des actions de la FAO.

Ces évaluations, quoique coûteuses, se justifient dans la mesure où elles nous imposent de concrétiser leurs conclusions par des actions sur le terrain de façon à atteindre les objectifs qui leur ont été assignés. Ceci nécessite des moyens financiers adéquats. C'est pourquoi ma délégation lance un appel aux pays donateurs afin qu'ils contribuent davantage à renforcer financièrement les programmes de terrain qui sont, par leur nature, intimement liés au programme ordinaire de notre organisation. Notre appel s'adresse également aux pays en développement qui devraient tirer profit de ces rapports en identifiant des projets susceptibles d'être financés par les ressources tant multilatérales que bilatérales.

Fred Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, took the chair

Fred Eckert, Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence

Ocupa la presidencia Fred Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): At the outset I would like to extend my thanks to Mr Shah for his excellent and clear presentation of this report related to the review of the regular budget. In addition to that I wish to seize this opportunity to thank the Secretariat for these excellent documents related to the programme. We believe that an indepth study of this document makes us feel satisfied with the achievements of the Organization for 1986-87. Also we believe that the Organization has adopted the right path.

We will not go into the details of these programmes. Actually my delegation had already expressed its opinion concerning these topics, namely during the Council's meetings. Therefore I will confine myself to the following points and I will be brief.

My delegation wishes to point out the following. The first point is the importance of rural population participation in the development activities in as much as man is the core of all activities and the target at the same time, and therefore we believe that the participation of the population themselves is the pre-requisite for any success of these development activities.

As for the second point, we believe that we need to strengthen the national capabilities basically . in the field of planning and implementing the programme

As for the animal resources we think that we have to give priority to the strengthening of training and the extension works in order to promote the awareness about the environment and ecological problems.

Fourthly, we think that we should support the transfer of technology and enlarge the improvement of national capabilities in the field of research and studies. We believe that scientific progress is a long process and the national capabilities should be improved in order to take stock of all the implementation of the experiences and the progress of science. We wish to emphasise once again the importance of national capabilities in the field of technology and science and we think that exchange of information and experience between developing countries is the essence.

Fifth, we think the technology cooperation programme which is basically geared to service development in developing countries is of high importance and we think that it has a good track record and we hope to promote these activities in future.

Some delegations have already taken the floor and we think that the distinguished delegate of Mexico has stated our attitude and stance but nevertheless we wish to stress once again our support for these programmes, specifically those related to seeds and fertilizers. We believe that we have to warn against dependence on foreign expertise and external evaluation services because we have to train the locals to evaluate and assess their own achievements and experiences and we believe that those programmes should be the object of continuous and permanent evaluation while we have to bear in mind that external evaluation should be kept to the minimum,

Jung Joo KIM (Korea, Republic of): The delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to express its appreciation for the outstanding preparation for the review of the Regular Programme 1986-87 including several action programmes.

In the report, we could find many variable programmes through which agricultural production could be progressed during the biennium. Despite such ongoing effort of the FAO, food and agricultural problems are still existing in this world and the agriculture sector has comparatively lagged behind compared to other sectors. In this connection the delegation of the Republic of Korea would like to mention one point. As we are well aware, agricultural problems are too much inter-correlated with other factors to be solved with FAO's effort only. Therefore it is our sincere hope for FAO to keep close cooperation with other international organizations which are concerned with agricultural and rural development in planning and implementing FAO's projects. For this we propose substantial and effective measures should be considered in future.

Amilcar Spencer LOPES (Cap-Vert): En premier lieu ma délégation voudrait féliciter le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents qui nous sont soumis et remercier Monsieur Shah pour la très claire présentation qu'il a faite de ce même document.

Nous n'allons pas analyser les documents en détail mais seulement focaliser notre intervention sur les points que nous estimons les plus importants.

Concernant le grand programme de l'agriculture du point I, nous sommes d'accord sur les objectifs et la stratégie générale et nous félicitons le Directeur général pour la brillante initiative de l'étude sur l'agriculture africaine des 25 prochaines années. Nous appuyons le lancement d'une étude identique pour l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes.

Nous voulons relever encore qu'étant donné l'importance du sous-programme 2.1.3 "élevage" pour les pays en développement, il pourrait dans l'avenir être traité comme un programme majeur. Tel est déjà le cas des pêches et des forêts.

Concernant le grand programme 2.2 "pêches", nous sommes d'accord avec l'examen qui en est fait et nous voudrions relever l'importance particulière pour notre pays de l'autosuffisance en matière de gestion et de la mise en valeur des ressources halieutiques des eaux marines et Intérieures.

La commercialisation des produits de pêche revêt pour mon pays un intérêt tout particulier. Et nous incitons donc la FAO à poursuivre ses efforts pour que le système mondial d'information sur la commercialisation puisse remplir son rôle effectif.

De même nous voulons relever l'importance que l'implantation d'un laboratoire de contrôle des produits de pêches, destinés à l'exportation en particulier, et que l'institution des normes du Codex au niveau national, auront pour notre économie ainsi par ailleurs que dans le domaine de la santé et des populations consommatrices.

Au sujet du grand programme "forêts", nous soutenons les objectifs et la stratégie et nous considérons, dans le cadre des perspectives, qu'une attention toute particulière doit être portée au plan d'action forestier tropical pour le prochain biennium.

Mon pays soutient le programme FAO "amélioration et développement des semences" puisqu'il vient de bénéficier d'une aide importante dans ce domaine.

Nous saisissons cette occasion pour appuyer les recommandations figurant au document C 87/8-Sup.2, et nous apprécions à juste titre le rapport d'évaluation extérieure, au sujet notamment du point 16 concernant la coordination et la coopération internationales et le point 20 sur la formation.

Nous nous félicitons de la proposition faite au point 26 concernant la nécessité de doter nos pays de laboratoires de contrôle de qualité des semences.

Au sujet de la coopération technique et du soutien au développement, nous relevons une fois encore l'importance des PCT pour nos pays en développement. Les PCT permettent en effet de développer les études nécessaires à la préparation des dossiers en vue de trouver le financement de projets très importants pour nous que nous n'aurions aucune chance de concrétiser d'une autre façon.

Passons maintenant au document C 87/8-Sup. 3: "évaluation du programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire". Nous défendons une sécurité alimentaire axée sur 3 aspects tels qu'énoncés à la page 30 du texte français du document, à savoir: la production vivrière, la stabilisation du flux alimentaire, et la garantie d'accès aux disponibilités existantes.

Le PASA a joué un rôle catalyseur car il a favorisé dans l'ensemble une prise de conscience sur l'importance de la sécurité alimentaire. Il ne couvre toutefois pas encore ces objectifs élargis de sécurité alimentaire.

Nous pensons que la sécurité alimentaire doit rester un des soucis primordiaux de la communauté mondiale et que la FAO doit y jouer son rôle de chef de file en lui réservant une priorité élevée dans ses propres activités.

Pour terminer nous voudrions faire part de notre inquiétude quant aux effets négatifs de la crise financière sur la mise en oeuvre du programme ordinaire, tout en relevant l'importance d'une aide financière d'urgence à l'école de lutte anti-tsé-tsé du Burkina Faso, dans le cadre de la formation au niveau régional.

CHAIRMAN: We have now just about exhausted the time available to us this afternoon for the issue before us and as promised earlier this morning we come back now in our remaining limited time to another issue raised by two governments this morning. Yesterday at the end of business the Government of Israel was recognized for the purpose of a right of reply to statements critical of its policies by another country here. In the course of their representative's remarks he made reference to two other countries. Each of those two countries this morning requested a right of reply. The representative of Israel invited two countries - Congo and Cuba - to visit a certain region of the world. Each one of those countries has advised the Chair that Representative of Iraq, if you have a point of order state it please.

Abdal Halem AL NOMAN (Iraq) (original language Arabic): I have requested the floor and I have already recorded my name. If you allow me, I will take the floor.

CHAIRMAN: No I am sorry, the Chair has already announced that we have exhausted our time for the discussion of these issues today. You will get your time - I will come to that - we have a list of speakers. We are now finished with the business for the day. We will complete this discussion tomorrow morning, and tomorrow morning we have - for your benefit I will announce the list of speakers who have yet to be heard today but we will have to carry over to tomorrow because we did not start our business on time today either in the morning or the afternoon and we have exhausted our time. But tomorrow morning next in line is USA, Iraq, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Uruguay and Peru. Any other country which wishes to be added to that can indicate to the Secretary this evening or first thing in the morning. You will have plenty of time. After the member countries have had their say on this issue, next in line will be the Observers. We do have two Observers who have requested to speak on the issue - the UNDP and EEC and that, with the additions that might come in the meantime, will be the end of our discussion. But the Chair earlier this morning indicated that before the end of business today we would yield the floor and that is what I was proceeding to explain - and I will try to watch the clock - so that we could as I promised this morning we would - give time for requested rights of reply. I was in the process of explaining that. I was in the process of explaining that yesterday the Israeli representative made reference to two countries. The Chair does not presume to speak for the policy of any government: it cannot do that. It can only call to your attention the fact that under the procedures of this Organization, when a delegate wishes to reply to criticisms of his government's policies he is entitled to do so. The representatives of Congo and Cuba have said that the invitation is a criticism of their governments' policies. We have now completed our business for the day but before adjourning the meeting I will give the floor first to Congo, then to Cuba. Each country will have the opportunity to explain and to exercise the right of reply to what they perceive as a criticism of the policies of their respective governments.

Right of reply

Droit de réponse

Derecho de replica

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Monsieur le Président, nous sommes déjà intervenus ce matin au titre d'une motion d'ordre sur ce point précis. Je voudrais, cet après-midi, faire la mise au point suivante et je crois que cette mise au point s'impose: contrairement à ce que vous êtes en train de dire à la Commission, nous ne sommes pas, nous, Congo, contre les invitations qui sont lancées à des Etats. Mais nous pensons, pour notre part, que ce n'est pas ici l'endroit approprié pour nous inviter à visiter des zones actuellement contestées par les uns et les autres.

Nous sommes intervenus vendredi non pas pour agir sur le fond de l'intervention de notre amie d'Algérie, mais seulement pour dire qu'il convenait de respecter les Textes et de laisser le temps à l'Algérie de poursuivre son intervention. Nous sommes intervenus sur des méthodes de procédure et non pas sur le fond de la question abordée par la représentante de l'Algérie.

Malheureusement, en intervenant hier dans cette salle, le représentant d'Israël nous a adressé l'invitation à laquelle vous avez fait allusion tout à l'heure. Cela signifie que nous-mêmes, dans notre intervention de vendredi, avons fait allusion à ce territoire occupé où, sans doute, les conditions d'agriculture ne sont pas forcément les meilleures pour les paysans. Mais nous ne voulions pas porter un jugement sur ce problème. Nous pensions que l'Algérie l'avait bien fait et qu'elle connaissait peut-être mieux que nous encore ce problème-là.

C'est pour cette raison que nous n'avons pas compris pourquoi Israël nous invitait à visiter ces zones. Je crois que nous devons être clairs. Nous ne sommes pas contre les invitations mais nous pensons que le contexte dans lequel s'est exercée celle-ci n'est pas le plus approprié. Si Israël veut inviter le Gouvernement congolais à visiter ces zones, je crois qu'il y a des voies autorisées pour le faire. Et si le Gouvernement congolais recevait une telle invitation, il serait disposé à y répondre par les voies normales.

Voilà ce que nous tenions à dire. Nous voudrions ajouter qu'il convient qu'Israël efface le nom du Congo de son intervention parce que nous n'avons pas été mêlés à la discussion sur ce point précis des territoires occupés. Je pense que tout le monde, ici, a compris qu'il ne s'agissait pas, comme vous l'avez dit vous-même, d'un refus d'invitation faite en bonne et due forme mais plutôt d'un problème politique qu'il convenait d'éclaircir au sein de cette Commission.

CHAIRMAN: For the record, the statement of the Congo that at no time did the Congo make reference to Israel is an absolutely correct statement of the record as it occurred.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Sr. Presidente, mi declaración estará orientada en la misma dirección que la declaración de la distinguida delegación del Congo.

Al intervenir en la mañana de hoy, señalamos que había un aspecto de irregularidad porque al menos no escuchamos esta referencia que hizo la delegación de Israel hacia nuestro país.

La moción de orden presentada por la delegación cubana durante el debate del viernes se refería a una cuestión de procedimiento al considerar que la presidencia había interrumpido a la distinguida delegación de Argelia en su declaración sin otorgarle la posibilidad del derecho a réplica y sin siquiera hacerle la indicación pertinente, según lo establecen los reglamentos.

Queríamos hacer esta aclaración en esta dirección y queríamos decir, además, que este tipo de invitación no suele realizarse en estos foros normalmente; además, plenamente conscientes de nuestra posición internacional declaramos que no estaríamos ni gustosos ni dispuestos a aceptar una invitación de este tipo para visitar experiencias, o supuestas experiencias que se han llevado a cabo en territorios en conflicto y que son objeto de ocupación.

Quisiéramos pedir, finalmente, que dada la irregularidad que hemos señalado y la necesidad de adelantar en nuestros trabajos, realmente anoche el Comité de Redacción tuvo que laborar hasta muy tarde; hoy no hemos podido cumplir el programa porque no se ha podido discutir el proyecto de informe. Quisiéramos pedir tanto a usted, Sr. Presidente, como a toda la asamblea que por favor nos dediquemos a examinar las cuestiones de fondo que son realmente muy importantes para el futuro de la Organización y dediquemos toda nuestra inteligencia y capacidad en esta dirección y no continuemos con prácticas dilatorias que, naturalmente, están entorpeciendo nuestro trabajo y los resultados de nuestra reunión.

CHAIRMAN: For the record, the Chair feels compelled to state that Cuba's recollection that it did not make a reference to Israel is also correct. There is no such reference in the verbatim record.

As a procedural matter, I have to call to the body's attention that on the procedure we have followed on these matters we have consistently completed the business of the day and then adjourned the meeting, pending Right of Reply. At this point the representative of Israel is seeking the Chair's attention for further discussion. Yesterday, when we followed the same procedure, we had the representative of the Congo seeking the attention of the Chair. At that time the Chair ruled that at that point the meeting had been adjourned. Therefore if Israel seeks the attention of the Chair, it must do so tomorrow because we have already adjourned today as at the end of the Right of Reply. We cannot continue with this. The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 17.40 hours

La séance est levée à 17 h 40

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.40 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/12

Twenty-fourth Session

COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session

COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones

COMISION II

TWELFTH MEETING
DOUZIEME SEANCE
12ª SESION

(18 November 1987)

The Twelfth Meeting was opened at 09.45 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La douzième séance est ouverte à 9 h 45

sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 12ª sesión a las 9.45 horas

bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

14. Review of the Regular Programme, including Evaluation of Special Action Programmes (continued)

14. Examen du Programme ordinaire, y compris évaluation des programmes d'action spéciaux (suite)

14. Examen del Programme ordinaire, en particular evaluación de los programas especiales de acción
(continuación)

CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed. We have a report from the Drafting Committee and we expect that it will be ready at around 2 o'clock or shortly thereafter. This afternoon as soon as we are able to take up that issue we will proceed to deal with the report so that we can have it properly before the Plenary session tomorrow morning. It may be necessary, depending on how things develop today, to go late today: we have not yet made a decision on that, but be on guard.

We are keeping a record of never starting remotely on time. If we can break that record this afternoon and in the days ahead we may have less need for costly extra sessions.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): At the outset the United States would like to associate itself with the comments made earlier by our colleagues from the Nordic countries and Canada with regard to the value of evaluation and with respect to the need for appropriate follow-up.

The document prepared by the Secretariat does show in a very comprehensive way the details of the programme which we all need to know, not only as members of the Conference but also because these will help improve coordination with other providers of external assistance. We want to encourage the Secretariat to continue to improve the document through the inclusion of details of important sub-programmes. The Study on African Agriculture covering the next 25 years and the study associated with agricultural price problems have demonstrated FAO's capacity to deal with the complex policy and organizational issues of agricultural development from an analytical standpoint. In our view, however, the FAO has not been active enough in pursuing policy matters in its field programmes. The United States feels - and we have said it in our discussion of aid-in-kind in Commission I - that the policy framework is probably the single most important determinant of success or failure in agricultural development. Repeatedly during the last two decades apparently workable projects and programmes have failed because of the inadequacy of the policy framework. Thus for FAO as well as for all external donors it is important to enter into a dialogue with the recipient governments in order to ensure that scarce assistance resources are used effectively. The FAO, despite its relatively small role as an external donor, needs actively to pursue the policy factor in its programmes in coordination with both recipient countries as well as with other providers of external assistance.

The United States looks forward to the completion of the study currently under way on Latin America and the Caribbean with the hope that it also will be appropriately applied to the field programmes. We remain interested in seeing that the process of review and approval of top projects be more open than has been the case in the past. The document does offer more information than before, a fact that we appreciate, but we believe that TCP should be an even more completely open book, one that can be read by any member at any time.

Lastly, we do have a question for the Secretariat with regard to the status of agricultural rehabilitation programmes in Africa, the ARPA. We would like to know how much of the programme has been completed, what resources remain unobligated and which have been the major problems encountered.

Abdal ila lem AL NOMAN (Iraq) (original language Arabic): Allow me now to speak about some subjects which fall under item 14 of our agenda. I shall be very brief, because I believe that we must save some time and avoid repeating what other delegations have already said.

The presentations and the review of the various items and programmes carried out by the delegation which appear in this document give us a picture of what the Organization has been doing within the framework of agricultural and rural development in developing countries, despite the many financial

stringencies and difficulties, which have had detrimental effects on the programmes which we feel are essential for rural development and for the training of man who is the cornerstone of development. Therefore we would like to urge all member countries to support the Organization so as not to come up with the same difficulties in the future and give assistance to the Director-General to overcome all these problems.

After having account of all the sub-programmes we concluded that they are indeed very important, because they are oriented to those peoples who can benefit from them and have a right to development in all sectors.

Coming to the problem concerning orientation, we share the views expressed by others that these programmes should be implemented in all countries interested in development to improve man's ability to work in all these fields to improve his expertise, and this would have a very beneficial impact on productivity. We can already appreciate the very good results deriving from the training programmes, and this appears quite clearly in document C 87/8 concerning the Organization's activities and programmes.

We would also like to express our great esteem and admiration for the Director-General and the initiative that he has taken for the independent evaluations of the three special programmes of action which has allowed us to have some information about all the problems and work of the Organization in these fields. These programmes I am sure can give some security to all countries, both donor countries and recipient countries.

Now, coming to the point about the seeds sector, a subject that has been incorporated in quite a number of programmes we agree on what has been suggested concerning prices as well as integrating training programmes in this field. We support all this because we are very much in favour of anything that has to do with food security in this programme.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): The Ethiopian delegation has gone through C 87/8 and its three supplements covering special action programmes which include areas of food security assistance schemes, seed improvement and development programmes and action programmes for the control of African trypanosomiasis. Our delegation feels that the three areas which are presented independently are sectors which will have a significant impact on increasing food production and achieving self-sufficiency. We therefore would like to commend the FAO for the action taken and assignment of the independent evaluation team. Even so our delegation's opinion is generally positive in the overall areas considered. We felt that we should make some observations on specific areas which deserve more attention when seen from our own specific country needs in agriculture and development.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia is fully convinced and feels that attention given to improvement of seeds, both in its production and also increased usage by farmers, will to a large extent contribute and determine the extent to which food production increases could be achieved. With this in mind and as a background a seed authority with a legal power to produce and regulate seed production has been established recently even though its operations were started a decade or so ago. However, this is still short of achieving the required target and dimensions. its activities have been limited to providing clean seed and production of improved seeds based on physical characteristics. Schemes have been worked out to link agricultural research and activities of the seed authority in the establishment of basic seed farms. Limitations and resources, know-how and experience in establishing such basic seed farms have been prevalent and our delegation therefore would like to indicate support for the views and ideas expressed in areas of relevance, efficiency and achievement as contained in document C 87/8 - Sup.2.

Seed improvement based on physical characteristics and rudimentary breeding areas will only provide a marginal increase in food production. We strongly feel that further margins of increase in food production could be achieved through intensification of research in breeding programmes for both increasing food production and also resistance to the difficult environmental conditions, particularly those of drought which is prevalent and also the other parts of Africa.

The genetic resources will have further to be exploited so as to overcome the presently prevailing food shortage problems, in addition to the other areas that need to be considered for agricultural development.

In talking about the establishment of a seed authority our delegation would like to voice its appreciation of the support provided by FAO and other donors while, at the same time, indicating the need for more support and assistance in this regard.

In view of the above and the other reasons that we might not be able to state at this stage, mainly due to limitation of time, I would like to mention that budgetary provisions for genetic resources will have a significant role in increasing food production through improved productive capabilities of seeds.

At the global level the establishment of the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources and undertakings of the Commission could be important and very significant and therefore the provision to be considered for the area deserves equally as much emphasis. We would deal with this item at the appropriate time and item of discussion but we would like to air our views that singling out the item will have very little significance to the overall budgetary process and should be left unaffected.

Tsetse and trypanosomiasis, as indicated In document C 87/8 - Sup. I, it is one of the major constraints in the development of agriculture in a potentially rich agricultural area in Ethiopia. The difficulty being faced due to tsetse and trypanosomiasis is limitation both in animal production which could have been used for draft purposes on which we are heavily dependent for farm power and the actual animal protein production, thus affecting human wellbeing in addition to its direct effect on health. Control and eradication of this undesirable infestation would increase food production capabilities of the country. in this connection the Ethiopian delegation gives due regard to the recommendation given by the evaluating team and indicates its support to the recommendations contained in pages 1 - 7 and the question of extra-budgetary support.

Adverse effects of the liquidity on activities like training, meetings and publications will, in our view, have a far-reaching consequence that might cause considerable delay and cannot be adequately censored at present. Support for training institutions like that of the ECOL, DILA, LUTTE and anti-tsetse in Burkina Faso will require our attention and consideration.

Finally in the areas of food security, priority of importance in our country is given to the increase in production so as to achieve self-sufficiency in food. However, resource mobilization has been constrained due to its limited availabilities and priorities of usage in coping with the continuous and repeated emergencies resulting from the drought. We therefore feel that the recommendations contained are in line with our own programme's and actions and therefore indicate our support and appreciation. We also feel that reactions of the Director-General will enrich and improve the quality of the recommendations contained in the documents C 87/8 - Sup. 2.

While on this topic I would like to make a mention of the relationship between items 13 and 14. While going through the document and also considering the previous document our delegation felt that discussion of item 14 before item 13 will provide a better rationale for the discussion of the budget for the coming biennium and facilitate matters. We therefore would like to make this point for the consideration of the Secretariat in future deliberations.

Salim SARRAF (Liban) (langue originale arabe)i Monsieur le Président, nous voudrions remercier le Secrétariat de nous avoir présenté les documents qui traitent de cette question, l'examen du Programme ordinaire 1987-88. Ces documents sont extrêmement clairs dans leur présentation et leur contenu.

Ce cinquième examen est un examen approfondi et global étant donné qu'il contient une foule d'informations et d'analyses portant sur les activités d'un grand nombre de programmes et projets, et en particulier les chapitres deux et trois du document C 87/8, où sont examinés les quatre sous-programmes et les activités qui revêtent une grande importance pour la FAO. Nous avons pu constater que les résultats obtenus dans ce domaine sont excellents.

Ma délégation tient également à dire qu'elle appuie l'initiative du Directeur général qui consiste à demander à un groupe d'experts externes de procéder à l'évaluation de trois programmes d'action de la FAO. Nous nous félicitons d'une initiative de cette nature. En même temps, nous constatons,

tout comme le Comité du programme à la dernière session, que les activités d'évaluation menées par le Bureau de l'évaluation de la FAO sont extrêmement utiles et nous fournissent un travail de qualité. Nous appuyons donc pleinement ce genre d'entreprise de la FAO, qui a pour objectif de renforcer l'évaluation, ce qui se révélera certainement très utile par la suite lorsqu'il s'agira de choisir des programmes et projets pour l'avenir.

Je voudrais ajouter que nous appuyons les bureaux qui représentent la FAO dans nos pays.

Nous espérons aussi que le Programme de coopération technique sera renforcé.

Je tiens à manifester mon inquiétude face à la baisse des ressources destinées à financer le Programme ordinaire due au fait que certains pays n'ont pas respecté leurs engagements et n'ont pas versé leurs contributions, ce qui nous a obligés à laisser de côté certaines activités qui avaient déjà été approuvées.

Carlos DELPIAZZO (Uruguay): La intervención de la delegación de la República Oriental del Uruguay respecto a este tema habrá de ser muy breve a efecto de no incurrir en reiteraciones de aspectos ya tratados y de ahorrar tiempo en ese sentido. Sin embargo, no queremos dejar de destacar la óptima calidad y nivel de los documentos que hemos estado tratando en esta Comisión, tanto a propósito del presupuesto, como del programa de actividades, como del examen de las actividades de campo, como de las evaluaciones que se han sometido a nuestra consideración. FAO ya nos tiene acostumbrados, en realidad, a este nivel en la documentación que sus servicios ponen a consideración de los distintos estados.

Igualmente agradecemos, porque ha sido muy útil, la exposición que el Sr. Shah ha realizado al comienzo del tratamiento de este punto del temario.

Consideramos que la conclusión primaria que surge del análisis de los documentos puestos a consideración de los Estados Miembros con respecto a lo actuado revelan fecundidad en la labor y ello merece ser destacado por cuanto los resultados que se han obtenido y las actividades que se han desarrollado lo han sido aun a pesar de las dificultades financieras por las que ha pasado la Organización.

Igualmente nuestra delegación estima remarcable que nuevamente, en oportunidad de la Conferencia, se reexaminen y repasen los distintos temas y los distintos aspectos en los cuales la Organización ha actuado en el período anterior.

Nos interesa de modo particular desarrollar y destacar la importancia que asignamos a la labor de extensión cumplida por la Organización. Tal como surge de las páginas 203 y siguientes de la versión española del documento C 87/8, buena parte de los esfuerzos de la Organización han estado centrados en la labor de extensión y nuestra delegación considera que éste es un aspecto particularmente remarcable cuando, en definitiva, se apunta a que los sectores productivos, los agentes privados sean en definitiva los auténticos protagonistas de la labor de producción, a cuyo efecto resulta de importancia básica el que se realice una adecuada transferencia de tecnología y de capacitación tal como lo ha venido realizando la FAO en el período bajo examen.

Sin embargo, nos interesa destacar que del examen de las labores cumplidas también en el área de extensión surge una escasa actuación de FAO en América Latina en relación a otras regiones del mundo. Ello se advierte no solamente en lo que tiene que ver con las actividades del bienio pasado, sino que surge también de las actividades programadas para el próximo bienio en el programa de labores y presupuesto que esta Comisión ha estado examinando.

Si bien metodológicamente nuestro examen se está realizando por separado en lo que tiene que ver con el examen del bienio pasado y lo que tiene que ver con el programa de labores y actividades presupuestales para el próximo bienio, obviamente se trata de dos asuntos íntimamente relacionados entre sí.

Es inocultable la íntima conexión que existe entre el presupuesto y el programa de actividades, tanto en lo pasado como en lo porvenir. En opinión de nuestra delegación, y tal como lo señaló el Ministro de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca de nuestro país en el Plenario de la Conferencia, Uruguay comparte en sus grandes líneas lo actuado y el programa de labores presentado por el Director General, aunque estima exiguas las cantidades destinadas a la América Latina.

Si bien no se discute la importancia de los programas llevados a cabo en otras regiones y los que se proyecta realizar, se estima imprescindible volcar una mayor presencia y recursos de la Organización a nuestro continente a fin de obtener un mayor rendimiento de los proyectos aplicados.

Solicitamos, Sr. Presidente, que conste en el informe de la Comisión II ésta nuestra preocupación.

Amador VELASQUEZ GARCIA-MONTERROSO (Perú): Perú aprueba y comparte el informe, recomendaciones y sugerencias de la documentación excelentemente preparada por la Secretaría e igualmente presentada por el Sr. Shah; todo lo que confirma el nivel, capacidad y calidad, tanto de FAO como de la consultoría externa oportuna y correctamente elegida.

Mi país no pudo intervenir activamente en este tema, durante el 92^o. período de sesiones del Consejo, porque lamentablemente hasta ahora no forma parte del Consejo; sin embargo, ello no ha impedido que el Perú otorgue la mayor importancia y respaldo que ameritan tanto la lucha contra la tripanosomiasis africana de los animales, la mejora y desarrollo de las semillas y el plan de asistencia para la seguridad alimentaria básica.

Muchos oradores han coincidido en el impacto positivo del programa de cooperación técnica y la gran utilidad que este programa y los programas especiales de acción tienen. Esta opinión generalizada, y en particular la especial importancia asignada al PASA, lleva al Perú a reiterar ante esta Comisión el planteamiento que, a la luz de dicho respaldo, le satisface haber formulado en la Plenaria cuando señaló: "Los esfuerzos en seguridad alimentaria deben ser acompañados de mecanismos efectivos que, dentro de la Organización de la FAO, tengan que implementarse a nivel regional. Así, proponemos la creación de fondos Regionales de Seguridad Alimentaria que, dentro del esfuerzo por sentar las bases para el nuevo orden agrario internacional, tendrían entre otros los siguientes objetivos: primero, canalizar los fondos financieros complementarlos de los proyectos de desarrollo presentados por FAO a los organismos multilaterales y gobiernos de países de la región que se encuentren en situación crítica de balanza de pagos y deuda externa; segundo, emitir la moneda de comercio regional que permita el comercio de los excedentes de producción agropecuaria de la región, a fin de crear un mecanismo de compensación frente a los precios del mercado internacional y mejorar los términos de intercambio; tercero, asegurar los recursos humanos y económicos necesarios para la realización de la planificación del desarrollo agrícola regional, de tal modo de evaluar e implementar los programas y acciones que identifiquen las reservas alimentarias regionales, las canastas regionales de producción y consumo, y se instrumenten las políticas de seguridad alimentaria regionales; y cuarto, entre otros, formación de los semilleros y centros genéticos en cada región, de modo tal de integrar las actividades de investigación, educación y extensión rural regionales. En principio, los fondos regionales tendrían como objetivo el tratamiento de los temas regionales prioritarios así como el comercio de productos en crisis. Los fondos podrían inicialmente formarse con un autogravamen a las exportaciones y un porcentaje de los proyectos de inversión."

Estamos convencidos que el concepto ampliado de seguridad alimentaria es la estrategia apropiada de acción para la FAO, así como que dicha estrategia requiere claridad de objetivos y que la integración, coordinación y coherencia de los diversos programas de la FAO relativos al fortalecimiento de la seguridad alimentaria son claves.

La propuesta antes reiterada por el Perú se inscribe además en el criterio gradual para la acción futura formulado por el Sr. Director General e inclusive en la necesidad de reformas políticas en los países beneficiarios en apoyo de la seguridad alimentaria, para atraer recursos externos y en la Iniciación de actividades CEPD/CTPD que abarquen la seguridad alimentaria.

Por todo ello, el Perú coincide con el Comité del Programa plenamente cuando consideró que las actividades del PASA podrían ser el elemento catalizador para promover otras iniciativas de FAO tendientes a desarrollar la producción de alimentos y mejorar el acceso a ellos; en ese sentido se hace necesario ampliar la estructura del PASA de manera que la actividad coordinada y efectiva a nivel de cada país se dinamice a través y con el instrumento regional propuesto y cuya implementación o estudio de viabilidad sería oportuno y conveniente encargarle en esta Conferencia.

Pedro Agostinho KANCA (Angola): En premier lieu, nous voulons féliciter M. Shah de la présentation très claire du document dont nous sommes saisis. Ce genre d'examen est d'une utilité capitale car il nous fournit des informations très importantes sur les activités de l'Organisation.

Nous ne pouvons que féliciter le Directeur général de l'initiative prise car ces évaluations constituent pour nous un élément important de la vérification de l'efficacité de la FAO.

Mais notre délégation regrette le fait qu'un grand nombre de projets soient supprimés par manque de ressources financières, particulièrement dans le domaine de la formation, élément essentiel pour nous car il occupe une place de choix. La formation dans la vulgarisation assume un caractère déterminant. Elle est définie dans notre programme de développement comme. forme d'enseignement informel et de formation des paysans, qui constitue une composante indissociable des objectifs que nous nous sommes assignés.

En fait, nous n'allons pas entrer de manière détaillée dans l'analyse de toutes ces questions dont l'ensemble constitue le Programme ordinaire. Nous tenons ici à exprimer notre satisfaction d'une manière globale et nous appuyons les conclusions et toutes les recommandations faites par le groupe de consultants.

En ce qui concerne les forêts, ma délégation appuie le Plan d'action forestier tropical.

Pour ce qui est des ressources halieutiques, nous souhaitons que la FAO accorde une priorité à la protection de ces ressources dans des zones économiques exclusives ainsi qu'à la nécessité d'offrir aux petits pêcheurs l'accès au système d'information sur la commercialisation du poisson, plus particulièrement celle de l'intérieur.

S'agissant du PCT, nous regrettons toujours qu'il soit maintenu à son niveau de 1986-87 car, nous le savons tous, le PCT a toujours joué un rôle important dans l'affectation des ressources du Programme ordinaire aux opérations de terrain. Nous appuyons la création de quatre bureaux de la FAO car nous en savons, l'utilité compte tenu de l'expérience passée.

Concernant les trois programmes spéciaux, notre attention est surtout centrée sur la lutte contre la trypanosomiasse animale africaine car nous possédons de grandes régions dont les conditions sont optimales pour l'élevage mais qui ne sont pas mises en valeur suite à l'infestation de la mouche tsé-tsé. Dans le cadre de ce même programme, nous attirons l'attention de la FAO sur les maladies telles que la peste porcine qui est un fléau dans notre pays; et nous demandons à la FAO de nous aider à faire face à cette préoccupation. Nous appuyons la formation et la recherche en ce domaine et souhaitons qu'une aide financière urgente soit apportée à l'école de lutte anti tsé-tsé de Bobo Dioulasso, au Burkina Faso. Il est important que soient allouées à ce programme des ressources extra-budgétaires.

Concernant le Programme de développement et d'amélioration des semences, nous appuyons les conclusions et recommandations de l'évaluation, et mettons notre accent sur l'aide de la FAO dans le développement de semences traditionnelles.

Nous ne voulons pas laisser passer cette occasion sans remercier la FAO pour l'assistance accordée jusqu'à présent à notre Programme national de semences qui connaît déjà un succès.

Pour terminer, nous voudrions évoquer certains aspects de l'évaluation du Programme d'assistance pour la sécurité alimentaire. En premier lieu, nous exprimons nos remerciements pour l'assistance accordée à la SADCC pour la réalisation d'études de faisabilité et la préparation d'un projet SAR ainsi qu'il est indiqué dans le document C 87/8-Sup.3 paragraphe 3.50.

Ma délégation appuie les conclusions et recommandations de ce rapport et reconnaît les efforts fournis par le PASA dans le but de renforcer les initiatives visant à la stabilité et à l'approvisionnement alimentaire.

Nous sommes bien conscients de trois aspects du concept tel que défini au document C 87/LIM/19 paragraphe 2.38; mais nous tenons à souligner en particulier que la sécurité alimentaire ne peut exister dans un pays sans la sécurité et la paix. Mon pays se trouve dans une situation que personne n'ignore car nous ne pouvons pas mettre en pratique à courte échéance les conclusions et les recommandations du PASA suite à la politique de déstabilisation du régime d'apartheid de l'Afrique du Sud, ce qui est pour nous un grand handicap pour notre développement agricole et notre sécurité alimentaire.

De ce fait, nous exprimons notre satisfaction...

CHAIRMAN: Once again we are in violation of the rules of the Organization by deviating from the topic and getting into side political issues. Please cease that, stick to the subject and carry on.

Pedro Agostinho RANCA (Angola): Je regrette, Monsieur le Président, mais je tiens à vous rappeler qu'il y a deux ans, cette Conférence avait adopté une résolution condamnant les agressions perpétrées par l'Afrique du Sud en Afrique Australe.

Pour vous rafraîchir la mémoire, il vous suffira de demander au Secrétariat qu'il vous fournisse la résolution.

Pour nous la question de l'Afrique du Sud est un handicap...

CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out that we have repeatedly stated that we are to deal with the topic at hand, not side political issues. Please stick to the topic or the Chair will have to proceed and recognize the next in line.

Pedro Agostinho KANGA (Angola): Je regrette, Monsieur le Président, mais je tiens à vous dire que je ne veux pas rentrer dans un dialogue avec vous, mais il vous faut être conséquent; en effet, cette situation du développement agricole se trouve dans le document du Programme de travail et Budget, au paragraphe 20, sur le chapitre Afrique. Il y est bien indiqué que le Conseil a recommandé qu'une étude soit faite en vue d'évaluer les effets négatifs de l'agression de l'Afrique du Sud.

CHAIRMAN: Please stick to the subject. We are not here to debate issues that are before the UN General Assembly in New York. If you want to talk about Africa's agriculture and food needs that is our role. It is not our role to get into the internal political affairs of a country in that continent or any other continent, nor is it our role to debate the political differences in any region of the world. It is our role to discuss the issues that are before our agenda.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): Señor Presidente, cuando recibí la propuesta de representar a Honduras en esta Conferencia, lo primero que hice fue analizar mi capacidad para asumir tan delicada responsabilidad. No hubiera aceptado si no hubiera sabido que me entregaría de lleno al cumplimiento de la tarea que se me encomendaba y si no hubiera creído que mi participación sería valiosa.

He escuchado con atención a todas las personas que han intervenido en las discusiones de esta Comisión. Solamente me he ausentado por breves períodos de tiempo cuando me he visto obligado a atender asuntos relacionados con nuestro trabajo y sólo he tomado la palabra para hacer comentarios que, en mi opinión, complementarían lo que ya se había dicho.

He reflexionado mucho y muy seriamente sobre lo que he escuchado y leído hasta ahora sobre la FAO y sus problemas. He hecho un análisis sobre la situación actual. Deseo compartir mi opinión con quienes deseen conocerla, pero no quiero hablar por hablar. Por lo tanto, consideró que para contribuir a recuperar un poco del valioso tiempo que se ha perdido hasta ahora, lo mejor es poner por escrito mis reflexiones y solicitar que se incluyan en el resumen de esta Sesión. Todos conocemos ya la eficiencia de la Administración en la preparación de los documentos que sirven de base para nuestras deliberaciones.

CHAIRMAN: There being no objection, your statement will, as you requested, be included in the verbatim at the end of the discussion on this item.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): Document C 87/8 and the other documents before us are full of extremely valuable information and my country would like first of all to offer some comments which we hope will be helpful to FAO in carrying forward its development work.

We support technical aid through TCP and other programmes in Member Nations and we also feel that training of field officers is important, as we said before. We notice that there has not been too much done in 1986-87 in this field. There have been fewer symposia and meetings and we feel that the most important ones of these at FAO should be carried out because training is very important.

We also support the animal production programmes being carried out and we would call for better use of pasture land in particular. This is an issue that needs more work.

Extension is very important, as I said before, and it should be promoted and supported by all possible means, both at grass-roots level and intermediate level.

The integration of women in the work places is also particularly important. My country's delegation already made some statements to this effect in Commission I.

As relates to fisheries, we also feel that fisheries is a high priority subject and the fullest possible support should be given. It is regrettable that resources are not sufficient at the present time. Everyone knows how important this area is and the Food Security Assistance Scheme is fully supported. As regards pesticides too, we feel careful control must be exercised and the maximum levels of pesticides must be carefully controlled to avoid negative impact.

As regards the Seed Improvement and Development Programme we feel this is a good idea too, but it should not be developed at the expense of its extension and training.

Animal health of course is very important for agricultural development, and activities at regional and national levels must be enhanced. We support also all work and action within the framework of the control of African animal trypanosomiasis, and we support the special action programmes - the whole concept of special action programmes.

As regards programme priorities, we would focus our attention and our interest on greater transparency so that we may make the proper choice of priorities now that resources are short. Of course, the shortage of resources is due to the fact that some countries are not paying their arrears in time.

Angus Edward MACDONALD (Australia): The review of the Regular Programme for 1986-87 we consider to be a comprehensive, thorough and informative description of FAO's activities by major functional activity. While we welcome this review, we would urge movement towards establishing verifiable performance indicators against which regular programme activities can be measured over time. We recognize the difficulties inherent in assessing the effectiveness of certain FAO activities. However, we note that methodologies are being developed which allow assessment against objectives of non-quantifiable programmes, and we urge FAO to look into this type of evaluative monitoring. We also recognize that certain activities and certain publications produced in the 1986-87 biennium may need to be reduced in the next biennium because of the financial problems and we trust that this will be done in a rational and prioritized way. For example, we note in paragraphs 4.50 and 4.55 of 87/8 reference to the two very valuable publications produced by the Freedom from Hunger Campaign and the Action for Development Office, and we trust that, consistent with the request made by the Programme Committee at its 53rd Session, these publications will be retained.

On regular programme activities Australia, like many other delegations before us, would like to see greater emphasis on FAO's role in agricultural policy dialogue and formulation.

My delegation welcomes the independent external evaluation of the three special action programmes. We see great value in expanding this type of monitoring and evaluating activities.

The trypanosomiasis study was conducted by two of the world's foremost authorities on African trypanosomiasis, and together they have produced an authoritative, well balanced and considered report, the findings of which should be adopted and integrated into appropriate programme activities. Of course trypanosomiasis control is inextricably linked to complex questions of land use, rural development and environmental protection which will require a regional approach for effective solutions.

Similarly the Food Security System Scheme study we consider to be of very high value. As table 2.3 shows, Australia has been a not insignificant supporter of food security assistance scheme trust fund projects and to be frank we have not always found those projects with which we have been associated the most efficient in terms of implementation. Expenditure patterns will attest to that fact. We trust that these initial delays have been overcome and that the activities proceed in an effective and efficient manner.

Finally, we consider these evaluations, the conclusions of which will need to be adopted by future programme and decision makers, are a step in the right direction towards a more transparent and open FAO programme operation and we welcome their advent.

CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing the next speaker, I must announce that Tanzania has requested that its statement on item 14 be included in the Verbatim Records. That will be done.

Jean-Pierre POLY (France): Le rapport qui nous est présenté sur l'évaluation du Programme d'amélioration et de développement du secteur des semences a suscité une réflexion attentive de la part de ma délégation, en raison de l'importance de ce secteur pour le développement agricole.

Je dois dire d'emblée que la lecture de ce rapport nous plonge dans une certaine perplexité: il ne fait pas apparaître en effet un certain nombre de points que nous considérons comme essentiels, que ce soit au niveau de la conception du Programme lui-même ou au niveau de sa mise en oeuvre.

Nous notons tout d'abord que le rapport se présente plutôt comme un rapport d'expert sur les semences que comme une réelle évaluation du Programme. Mais qu'on l'envisage sous un angle ou un autre, nous notons surtout qu'il présente la caractéristique de laisser de côté tant le secteur amont que le secteur aval: il ne souligne pas notamment qu'on ne peut traiter la question des semences sans tenir compte de l'ensemble de la filière des produits depuis la recherche et l'expérimentation jusqu'à la commercialisation en passant par la production.

Sur ce dernier point un lien doit être établi entre les semences et les autres intrants ainsi que les pratiques culturales.

Ma délégation attache, en outre, une attention toute particulière aux problèmes de la commercialisation des produits: nous estimons que l'un des problèmes essentiels dans le secteur des semences est de susciter une demande solvable de la part des paysans, demande qui pour le moment n'existe pas ou reste très faible. A notre sens, cette demande n'émergera que si les agriculteurs sont dans une situation d'incitation à la production, c'est-à-dire s'ils ont de réels espoirs de commercialiser leurs produits à un prix rémunérateur.

Je soulignerai également les conséquences que cela entraîne nécessairement sur la définition de la politique agricole, et sur la mise en oeuvre des instruments appropriés. Mais pour nous il est clair que cet environnement économique favorable permettant la création d'un marché et d'un secteur privé de production et de commercialisation des semences aussi réduits soient-ils, est un préalable à la mise en place d'un programme national semencier.

Monsieur le Président, nous notons ensuite que le rapport ne permet pas de se faire une idée bien précise de l'intérêt et des résultats des projets de terrain qui représentent quand même les 9/10 du volume financier du programme.

Nous observons au passage que sur les seize pays qui ont fait l'objet de l'évaluation, deux seulement - le Cameroun et le Maroc - font partie d'une région de l'Afrique où se déroule plus des 3/4 de l'activité de terrain du Programme. Mais ce qui nous paraît plus important c'est que les données fournies sont essentiellement quantitatives. Certaines d'entre elles d'ailleurs nous sont apparues incomplètes ou même erronées. L'analyse qualitative quant à elle et les recommandations qui en découlent restent très théoriques. Il aurait été intéressant par exemple d'avoir une ou plusieurs analyses de projet portant sur l'efficacité des investissements par rapport à l'accroissement des rendements.

Ces recommandations ne mettent pas en évidence la composante essentielle que constituent les projets de terrain et l'appui qui doit être fourni à ces projets. Seules des mesures d'ordre général sont proposées sur lesquelles je reviendrai un peu plus loin: nous pensons que ces mesures ne peuvent être efficaces que si elles sont prolongées par des actions de terrain précises et bien ciblées, et qu'il appartient bien au Service des semences de la FAO de participer directement à l'appui de ces actions et de les lier à leur opération d'ordre plus général.

S'agissant de ces dernières, ma délégation n'approuve pas l'ambitieux objectif de création d'un cadre mondial pour le développement du secteur des semences qui ne nous paraît pas réaliste car il ne constitue pas à notre sens une réponse appropriée aux problèmes de ce secteur. Il nous semble plus productif de promouvoir une coordination plus étroite avec les institutions et expertises multilatérales et bilatérales disposant d'une solide expérience dans le secteur des semences et rechercher une application adaptée aux régions des thèmes du Programme.

Nous pouvons en revanche adhérer aux recommandations relatives à l'information générale, aux réunions techniques, à la formulation de stratégies nationales et à la formation. Mais cette adhésion est dans notre esprit toujours liée à l'application concrète de ces recommandations.

En ce qui concerne la formation notamment, ma délégation n'est pas clairement convaincue par le résultat des actions menées jusqu'à présent: il apparaît en effet qu'elles ont été réalisées sous la forme de séminaires sans réel contact avec le terrain, alors qu'il nous semble essentiel que soit incluse systématiquement une formation pratique. Une action de formation ne peut servir à grand chose si les auditeurs ne sont pas en mesure d'appliquer immédiatement leurs connaissances, ce qui suppose, de plus l'existence réelle locale d'un secteur semencier.

S'agissant du système d'information nous ne disposons pas d'éléments nous permettant d'en juger la pertinence réelle: est-ce que par exemple le mécanisme des passeports variétaux préconisé par la FAO est réellement utilisable sur le terrain?

D'une façon générale, nous estimons que les propositions du rapport restent trop théoriques et semblent partir du postulat que les filières semencières se conçoivent et se mettent en oeuvre dans des bureaux ce qui n'est pas notre sentiment.

En conclusion, Monsieur le Président, nous avons le sentiment que l'orientation générale du rapport tend purement et simplement au renforcement administratif du Service des semences et à l'alourdissement de sa tâche sans qu'apparaisse clairement de gain réel pour les pays désireux de mettre en place un secteur semencier ou de l'améliorer s'il existe.

Il nous paraît au contraire que la tendance devrait être à une coordination accrue des actions, tâche pour laquelle le Service des Semences nous paraît tout à fait qualifié. Coordination des opérateurs, qu'ils soient multilatéraux ou bilatéraux, au travers notamment de l'assistance à la définition de plans nationaux semenciers, mais aussi coordination avec les activités en dehors du secteur des semences.

La trypanosomiase animale est une des préoccupations de ma délégation et la France mène plusieurs programmes visant à lutter contre ce fléau.

Le rapport qui nous est présenté contient un grand nombre d'éléments intéressants, et j'y reviendrai ultérieurement.

Je souhaiterais auparavant souligner les difficultés de définition d'une politique cohérente en matière de lutte contre la trypanosomiase, qui appelle à notre sens une réflexion supplémentaire de la part de la FAO.

En effet, il existe encore des points fondamentaux sur lesquels nous n'avons pas de réponse sûre.

Je citerai par exemple: la sélection du caractère "trypanotolérant" peut-elle aboutir; l'assainissement des zones peut-il s'accompagner d'une occupation rationnelle du terrain; la chimiopro-phylaxie peut-elle se généraliser et se pérenniser; s'agissant maintenant de propositions formulées dans le document, ma délégation souhaite insister particulièrement sur: a) la nécessité de délégation de pouvoir au Bureau régional d'Accra afin de faire coopérer, non seulement l'ensemble des spécialistes du bureau à un Comité d'exécution de programme, mais aussi les représentants des organisations multilatérales (BIRD, BAD, CEE) qui sont intéressés. Cela permettrait également à ce bureau, en liaison avec la Commission de la Trypanosomiase et l'OMS d'assurer le rôle d'information qui devrait être celui de la FAO; b) les études préliminaires et la préparation des programmes de mise en valeur des terres devront être faites par des projets de terrain suivis par le bureau régional; c) l'Ecole de lutte anti tsé-tsé pourrait être réactivée dès lors que seraient établis, en liaison avec les responsables des pays bénéficiaires, un programme de travail ainsi qu'un programme d'emploi des personnels ainsi formé; d) la FAO a, également, un rôle fondamental à jouer pour coordonner les projets nationaux avec ceux des pays voisins afin de diminuer les investissements, ou éviter leur duplication, et pour réduire les charges récemment entraînées par la lutte contre les glossines; e) enfin, nous sommes surpris que soit rarement fait mention de la coopération menée avec l'OMS dans ce domaine. Nous aurions apprécié de voir détaillé les éléments des actions communes aux deux institutions, qui nous paraissent en tout état de cause devoir être renforcées.

L'importance qui s'attache à la sécurité alimentaire justifie une attention toute particulière. C'est pourquoi ma délégation a examiné avec beaucoup d'attention le rapport d'évaluation qui nous est présenté et qui contient des informations d'un grand intérêt.

Je crois nécessaire, en préambule, de rappeler que la France souscrit pleinement au concept élargi de sécurité alimentaire et à ses 3 objectifs. C'est pourquoi nous constatons avec satisfaction que le PASA a contribué à promouvoir la sécurité alimentaire dans un grand nombre de pays.

Je ne reviendrai pas sur les analyses très intéressantes effectuées par les consultants, et j'en viendrai directement aux recommandations des consultants et aux observations du Directeur général.

Selon ma délégation, le programme élargi tel qu'il est proposé aux paragraphes 35 et 37 ne nous paraît pas tout à fait approprié. Il nous semble en revanche, que le PASA devrait s'orienter selon deux axes essentiels:

- a). une concentration sur les actions pour lesquelles il dispose d'avantages ou de compétences. reconnus, sur lesquels je reviendrai à la fin de mon intervention;
- b). le deuxième serait le renforcement des études interinstitutionnelles pour l'accès aux approvisionnements des couches les plus démunies avec des organisations telles que l'UNICEF, l'OMS, l'OAA, ou l'IFPRI.

Cela signifie que la FAO doit développer les contacts avec ces organisations lors de la conception et la mise en place des activités du PASA et l'on peut s'étonner de ne pas voir davantage mentionnées ces organisations dans le rapport d'évaluation.

En conclusion, Monsieur le Président, je soulignerai que le PASA ne peut avoir d'effet à long terme sans une meilleure connaissance des activités des principaux donateurs.

Cela ne justifie nullement la création de nouvelles structures administratives ou opérationnelles. Cela ne signifie pas, non plus, que la FAO surajoute ses propres interventions à celles d'autres donateurs.

Cela signifie, en revanche, que la FAO favorise les contacts entre les donateurs pour clarifier la politique suivie par chacun afin d'aider chacun à travailler ensemble dans une direction mutuellement acceptée.

Il nous paraît en effet que la FAO ne peut se substituer aux donateurs bilatéraux. En revanche elle a, au-delà de réunions des donateurs, un rôle fondamental à jouer dans certains secteurs précis:

- la mise en lumière, grâce à des études appropriées, des causes freinant l'accès des plus défavorisés aux approvisionnements;
- la logistique;
- les études liées à la commercialisation et à la politique des prix en relation avec la sécurité alimentaire.

De même, la FAO doit jouer un rôle important dans la mise en place, là où il n'existe pas encore, de système d'alerte rapide ou de prévision de récolte.

La FAO doit également continuer ses actions en matière de pertes après récoltes ou de formation du personnel, tout particulièrement en matière de gestion des réserves céréalières.

J.k. KYAMBWA (Tanzania): The Tanzania Delegation would like to congratulate the FAO Secretariat for having prepared a comprehensive review and more specifically the independent evaluation of the three areas. Also let me thank Dr Shah for his excellent introduction. I believe, it is through such regular reviews that Member Nations are enabled to understand how FAO is able to meet its objectives and tasks.

The Tanzania delegation is happy with the findings and recommendations of the consultant reports. It is our hope that in future, we will get similar review in the areas of research, training and irrigation. I am specifically mentioning these areas due to their relevance in enhancing agricultural production.

I agree with other members who have suggested that FAO could also make a review of the programmes and policy measures already undertaken in several countries. One programme which has been the result of FAO efforts is the preparation of a National Food Strategy. A review of the implementation of such strategies will enable FAO to understand the impact so far made and to take remedial measures in those countries which are in the process of preparing such strategies.

The other area where my delegation would like to touch upon is the seed programme. Indeed, the Tanzania delegation has established a national institution that deals with improved seed production. The estimated annual seed demand is 80 000 tonnes but we can only supply 8 000 tonnes locally. Our problem is not land to produce the seed but the processing facility and in some cases the capacity to maintain the standard required. So, this is an area where assistance is required.

Tanzania has rapidly increasing livestock population. As a result, the originally marginal areas are rapidly being reclaimed by arable agriculture thus pushing traditional agriculture in tsetse infected areas. These areas are not only tsetse infested, with a consequence of high trypanosomiasis and elephantitis, but are also generally least developed regarding pasture and management and general livestock infrastructure, such as water etc. We are talking of an area of up to 60 percent of the area of land that is capable of supporting livestock. So you can see, Mr Chairman, how important the trypanosomiasis programme is. It is vital to us as well as it is to almost 90 percent of our livestock population.

Our government attaches great importance to the programme of tsetse eradication and attaches a high priority to it in our national budgets. Likewise, the Government in collaboration with FAO, the EEC and SADCC are jointly participating in a programme of tsetse eradication. ^{1/}

Juan Manuel CALVEZ (Honduras): Mr dirijo a'ustedes en primera persona porque deseo que mis palabras sean tomadas como una evaluación independiente de alguien que, en pequeña escala, hizo frente a problemas similares a los que hoy enfrenta la FAO.

A principios de 1964, se depositó en mí la autoridad y la responsabilidad para dirigir un centro cultural binacional que estaba en quiebra. Una de las dos naciones que formaron esta asociación estaba dispuesta a darle una última oportunidad mediante una donación. La donación, como es natural, iba acompañada de ciertos requisitos que tenían que cumplirse en el término de un año.

Después de pensarlo muy bien, acepté el reto porque estaba convencido de la importancia de la institución y porque estaba seguro de que no hay problema que no tenga solución. Al analizar la situación, me di cuenta de que los motivos de la crisis eran muchos. Había que efectuar reformas considerables en los tres departamentos de la organización: Administrativo, Académico y Cultural. Había que reconciliar las serias diferencias que existían entre los miembros de la Junta Directiva y entre éstos y la administración. Como si eso fuera poco, el personal no vio con buenos ojos que un extraño llegara a decirles qué hacer y cómo hacerlo.

^{1/} Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request.

Sumamente preocupado, busqué ayuda en mis textos de administración de empresas y encontré lo que necesitaba como guía:

- "Cuando los problemas son muchos, lo mejor es tomarlos uno por uno para poder resolverlos." Inmediatamente puse en práctica esos consejos. Señalé prioridades. Distribuí el trabajo indicando a cada empleado cuáles eran sus responsabilidades, teniendo mucho cuidado de que esa responsabilidad fuera siempre acompañada del grado de autoridad adecuado. Establecí estrictas medidas de disciplina, de calidad y de austeridad. Después me dediqué a asegurarme de que cumplieran mis instrucciones. Pronto se notaron los resultados.

Ahora, tres años después, la institución tiene otra imagen y opera normalmente. El personal se siente satisfecho porque su trabajo se ha simplificado y puede ver los frutos de su esfuerzo.

Creo que mi experiencia como Director General de ese centro cultural dedicado a servir a una pequeña comunidad puede ayudar en algo a la administración de esta compleja organización dedicada al servicio de la humanidad. ^{1/}

Jean-Jacques RATEAU (CEE): Je vous remercie de me donner la parole sur ce point de l'ordre du jour et plus particulièrement sur le document C 87/8-sup.3 qui concerne l'évaluation du Programme d'Assistance pour le secteur alimentaire.

Nous avons lu avec attention l'évaluation du Programme d'Assistance pour la Sécurité Alimentaire (PASA) ainsi que les observations du Directeur général. Le document fait ressortir clairement que la PASA a contribué à promouvoir la sécurité alimentaire dans un grand nombre de pays.

La CEE peut pleinement souscrire au concept révisé de sécurité alimentaire qui comprend trois objectifs liés: la production d'aliments en quantité suffisante, la stabilisation des approvisionnements ainsi que l'accès aux approvisionnements surtout pour les groupes vulnérables. Ce concept révisé a été l'élément central de l'initiative "stratégie alimentaire" que la CE a poursuivie dans un certain nombre de pays africains depuis 1981. Nous avons récemment généralisé cette approche, pour les pays qui sont associés à la CE par la convention de Lomé, ainsi que pour certains pays d'autres régions.

La CEE peut globalement appuyer les tâches décrites au paragraphe 57 du rapport et soutenir une continuation et une consolidation des principales activités du PASA. Ceci s'applique surtout aux systèmes d'alerte rapide et pour des programmes de réserves céréalières.

S'agissant des systèmes d'alerte rapide nous estimons qu'il conviendrait de les intégrer progressivement dans des systèmes rationnels d'information sur la situation alimentaire tels qu'évoqués dans les recommandations adressées aux gouvernements. Ceci implique que les unités d'alerte rapide devront être liées aux unités générales de collecte et de traitement des statistiques agricoles et alimentaires. Pour assurer la viabilité des actions d'alerte rapide, il faudrait éviter la création de nouvelles structures administratives et opérationnelles. Les différentes actions d'alerte rapide, y compris celles des ONG, devraient être bien coordonnées, non seulement à l'intérieur des pays, mais aussi au niveau régional.

Il serait souhaitable que les informations des systèmes d'alerte rapide soient diffusées dès lors qu'elles sont opérationnelles par les pays qui en auront la gestion.

Cette situation devra principalement concerner les acteurs économiques et politiques ainsi que les donateurs qui appuient les programmes de renforcement de la sécurité alimentaire.

En ce qui concerne les programmes de réserves céréalières et les programmes de stockage y compris la lutte contre les pertes après récolte il convient de souligner l'importance de la gestion et de l'organisation ainsi que la nécessité d'assurer une formation appropriée en ce domaine.

^{1/} Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

En ce qui concerne le stockage alimentaire, il serait souhaitable qu'il puisse y avoir une bonne répartition du travail entre le niveau villageois de stockage traditionnel, le niveau des intermédiaires privés, et le niveau parastatalique de stockage centralisé, c'est-à-dire lié aux offices de commercialisation.

Le rapport d'évaluation montre que les unités nationales de sécurité alimentaire n'ont pas tout à fait joué le rôle préconisé, par exemple sur les sujets relatifs à la commercialisation et à la politique des prix. Ceci n'est pas surprenant vu la complexité importante de ces thèmes pour la politique économique globale.

Cette problématique élargie constitue parfois un élément clé dans un processus de restructuration et de réajustement des politiques économiques générales. C'est pourquoi le programme élargi, proposé aux paragraphes 35 et 37 des observations du Directeur général pourrait ne pas être le plus approprié.

Il nous paraît en effet plus justifié que le PASA continue à se concentrer sur les actions pour lesquelles il a fait preuve d'un avantage comparatif telles que l'appui au système d'alerte rapide, aux programmes de stockage céréalier et à la lutte contre les pertes après récoltes.

Evlogui BONEV (UNDP): I shall limit my comments to the evaluation reports presented for the consideration of this Commission under agenda Item 14. UNDP attaches a particular Importance to the evaluation exercises of our partner agencies, as we view them as a very important tool for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of our work in the respective areas of activity. We fully support the efforts of FAO in this respect.

It has been most gratifying to witness during the past two days of sittings of this Commission the great interest and importance the speakers have attributed to this matter. Cooperation, coordination, complementarity and so on, were re-emphasized by most speakers. Further initiatives in evaluation work were encouraged.

UNDP has carefully studied the three Evaluation Reports and has reviewed more particularly two of them: the Food Security Assistance Scheme and the Seed Improvement and Development Programme, on which we wish to make the following comments:

FAO must be commended for having undertaken these exercises. Food security and seed improvement and development are issues of highest importance and urgency. In this area learning from experience in order to avoid past mistakes and to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of future efforts is of vital importance.

Regarding follow-up action, in view of the UNDP it is crucial to ensure prompt feedback regarding the findings and conclusions of the evaluation studies. As a possible and appropriate practical measure in this respect, UNDP would suggest, subject to the approval of this Commission and providing FAO finds it useful, that a Programme Advisory Note (PAN) be worked out and issued which, in our view, would assist all those concerned in implementing the recommendations contained in the evaluation reports. We, in UNDP, stand ready to cooperate with FAO in this exercise. UNDP's interest in this matter stems from its own involvement in the area of seed production and distribution. As the SIDP study shows, a large number of the projects evaluated are indeed UNDP/FAO supported. UNDP could contribute with its experience from its own sectoral and cross-sectoral evaluation studies, particularly with lessons learned about institution building and human resources development. The issue of a PAN on seeds would not only be of interest to recipient governments, FAO and UNDP. Seeds are a shared priority concern of the donor community as well. A PAN could facilitate the exchange of experience and information and, as an end result, improve coordination.

With regard to Management of Coordination in the area of Food Security, related to the FSAS evaluation, in the views of the UNDP the study underlines that the promotion of food security is an extremely complex multi-sectoral, multi-level (national, regional, global) undertaking. FSAS activities represent only a fraction of the total effort directed towards this goal. This emerges also from the over-view of the food security situation in selected countries presented in the evaluation study.

Given both these aspects, viz. (one) the multi-dimensional character of the issue, and (two) the multitude of interventions in support of this goal, it is obvious that the management of food-security assistance must undoubtedly place a tremendous strain on the development management capacities of some host countries. UNDP has, in recent years assigned growing importance to strengthening the governments' own capacities to monitor and evaluate their development efforts and would welcome requests to complement these efforts through further projects focussed specifically on monitoring and evaluation of food security related assistance activities.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): This has been a very constructive and stimulating debate so far as the Secretariat is concerned, and I would now like to respond to the questions which were raised and to some of the comments. Among the first questions raised was one by the distinguished delegate of Thailand, followed by Bangladesh and Ghana about their desire to see the Programme of Livestock being made a Major Programme in the programme structure of the Organization.

I respectfully recognize the importance attached to the livestock sector by these countries and many others, but I would draw attention to the fact that whether a programme is called a Major Programme or whether it is a Programme has many reasons. One is conceptual. Fisheries was one of the first to become a Major Programme because conceptually the whole work of fisheries, which is integrated, stands very much on its own. This was followed by forestry, although there are many more links between the Forestry Major Programme and the Agriculture Major Programme. But if we were to take different programmes under the Major Programme: Agriculture and try to have them oil, somehow think this would not be in the interest or according to the desire of the Member Nations themselves because the work under the Major Programme: Agriculture is integrated to the maximum extent possible.

Looking also at the point of view of resources, livestock has a Regular Programme allocation of some US\$ 14.5 million. Would it make sense to have that as a separate Major Programme, compared to Rural Development which has US\$ 25 million or to Crops, which has US\$ 24.8 million?

I hope not to be at all cantankerous but just would point that this is a matter which needs reflection from several points of view. I hope that the distinguished delegates who made this valuable suggestion will recognize that we will certainly give further consideration to it, but I would not be in a position to indicate any further reply at this stage. I hope they realize that their comment was very well appreciated.

Le distingué délégué du Zaïre a fait un commentaire à mon avis très important sur la responsabilité et les droits des gouvernements souverains en matière d'évaluation. Et je voudrais le rassurer sans hésitation en disant que le Secrétariat respecte beaucoup cet avis.

Par exemple, dans toutes les évaluations que nous entreprenons - ce qui est le cas des évaluations des programmes d'action spéciaux - les pays concernés ont été consultés et ont participé à toutes les visites que les consultants et mes collègues ont entreprises. Ensuite, en ce qui concerne chaque évaluation d'un projet de terrain, qu'il soit financé par le PNUD ou par d'autres fonds extrabudgétaires, le gouvernement qui est responsable du projet sur son territoire participe toujours à l'évaluation. C'est à mon avis un principe qu'il ne faut jamais oublier malgré tout l'intérêt que pourraient porter l'Organisation ou d'autres pays membres à l'importance de l'évaluation.

The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany asked whether the indicators of time, the work months spent on technical back-stopping, were based on a random survey or whether they were based on a systematic survey which could have greater credibility. FAO is to my knowledge the only organization in the UN system which continues a cost measurement system related to field programme activities. This was something which started in the 1970s, we have kept it up, we report on the results of this to the Finance Committee and the figures are taken from the time recording of this monitoring system.

The delegate also asked for some clarification or expressed some surprise at the statement in the beginning of the Review of the Regular Programme that nearly 60 percent of the technical staff time is spent in direct support to field activities in the form of advisory services and technical support to Member Countries. I would clarify, yes, this is entirely what we have stated, but it is

not only the technical back-stopping of field projects, it refers also to all the advisory and assistance missions which are undertaken at the request of Member Governments by our technical divisions and departments.

The delegate of the United States of America requested information on the African Rehabilitation Programme, ARPA. The majority of projects which were funded under the TCP, the Technical Cooperation Programme, amounting to US\$ 15 million, have been completed or are in the final stages of completion. In terms of funding, out of the US\$ 15 million of the TCP, US\$ 14.7 million have been spent and committed so it was only the balance of US\$ 300 000 which was unobligated I believe in recent days.

A good number of the trust fund and the UNDP funded projects in support of ARPA are still under implementation because the funding for these was only mobilized in late 1985 and in early 1986, but these projects are of a relatively medium-term duration, three years in most cases. As the Council has been informed, an evaluation of the ARPA is under way. This is something which again the Director-General decides to arrange. The ARPA programme as such is now closed, because it referred to a very specific time period. It is our evaluation service, I am pleased to say, which is undertaking this evaluation in consultation with the Development Department and with the FAO representative involved in the countries concerned. So far the work is at the stage of desk study, also checking into the records and performance of the operating units. We are sending out a questionnaire very shortly to the FAO representatives, in which the governments involved will also be consulted, and following the response to this questionnaire we will then arrange a certain number of field visits. I think the timing of this exercise will be good because by arranging field visits at too early a stage we would not have seen a sufficient number of completed projects in order to assess the effects and the impact. The result of this evaluation will certainly be submitted to our governing bodies and as far as the Conference is concerned I think the most convenient form will be to have the results of that evaluation in the next Review of the Regular Programme and the next Review of the Field Programme.

Le distingué delegue du Gabon a posé une question au sujet d'un projet pour le bétail trypanotolérant: un tel projet est-il envisagé?

Mes collègues m'informent qu'un projet régional a été formulé à la demande de l'UDEAC.

Le distingué représentant du Burkina Faso a attiré l'attention de la Commission sur le centre de formation de la trypanosomiase (ELAT).

Je puis affirmer que mes collègues poursuivent une démarche dans le sens de la suggestion des consultants pour cette évaluation mais nous n'avons pas obtenu de réponse positive jusqu'à présent des bailleurs de fonds que nous avons approchés et qui regroupent un certain nombre de pays ici présents, aussi bien le PNUD que la Communauté européenne.

The delegate of Malaysia asked a question about guidelines for seed industry development. The preparation of such guidelines is in the pipeline but it will take some time before it is finalized. It may interest the delegate to note that a seminar on the subject of guidelines for the seed industry was held in Pakistan in 1985 and I will certainly arrange, if he is so interested, for him to be informed further about this activity.

As far as the three evaluations of the Special Action Programmes were concerned, we in the Secretariat are delighted at the response you have given them. First, I believe that there is no doubt that on the part of the Secretariat we pay tribute to the very distinguished consultants who undertook these tasks at our request and it is a matter of some pride to us that they come from many countries and from all corners of the world, in the case of trypanosomiasis Belgium and Kenya, in the case of the Food Security Assistance Scheme India and Switzerland, in the case of the Seed Improvement and Development Programme Egypt, France and Germany.

There is no doubt also that we share the satisfaction expressed by the Commission about the value of such evaluations, a value which is undisputed but which has only to be considered in relation to the magnitude of the programme which is being evaluated, the duration of its life, its lifespan, its existence, and the resources available because, as you will realize, these are fairly costly exercises, not just in terms of the external expertise that we get but in terms of the arrangements to be made and the staff support which also has to be mobilized for them.

On these Special Action Programmes we have taken careful note of all comments made, whether in support or whether as additional comments for the Secretariat to consider in implementing the recommendations made. But I think a special word would be in order regarding the Food Security Assistance Scheme. First, we take very well the suggestion made by the Netherlands and supported by Switzerland and a number of the Nordic countries about the role of the Committee on World Food Security. I make no apology, I state it as a matter of fact, that at the last session of the Committee on World Food Security the committee was not able to examine the report of this evaluation because it was still under way. It did receive an interim progress report given by the head of the evaluation team, Dr Rao of India, who expressed great satisfaction and interest, but naturally this is a matter which the Committee should consider and will have the opportunity to consider. At that stage we are arranging for the Committee also to examine what action the Director-General is taking in the light of your comments and get its blessing and guidance in ensuring the full implementation desired.

With regard to a comment made by the delegate of Switzerland - I regret he is not here, but out of respect to him I would like to reply - the use of additional donor contributions to the FSAS, we envisage should be used for more comprehensive food security programmes. In these comprehensive programmes, what do we mean? We mean a full analysis should be made of the food security problems in the country concerned, the context, including production, stability and issues of access, and then the preparation of a food security programme taking into account the development plans of the country concerned and, most important of all, what is being done or proposed to be done by donors of external assistance. It is our view that the minor restructuring in the food security assistance unit will make it better equipped to carry out these tasks, as it will be more closely merged with the food security service in the same division.

As regards the Implementation of the recommendations on food security, the Commission has no doubt noted the paragraphs, and in particular paragraphs 32 to 43, of the comments of the Director-General. In brief, all I should perhaps emphasize at this stage is that what is recommended as broadening of the scheme to reflect the broader aspect of food security is something which on the one hand involves the whole Organization, it does not involve one division nor does it involve just one 'programme. Secondly, if it is to be carried out in the spirit and intention of the recommendation, then it can only be done progressively. That is why acceptance of this recommendation by the Director-General is explained in terms of a step-by-step approach.

My colleagues who are more knowledgeable about this than I would be happy to speak further on the subject, but in view of your time I would limit myself to this response and assure all members of this Commission that this subject will certainly be pursued at the next Session of the Committee on World Food Security.

Finally, in reply to many remarks of reflection, on the nature of evaluation activities and where FAO should move, in this context a number of delegations referred to the desirability of verifiable indicators in monitoring and measuring and evaluating programme performance.

The response that I can give on my side would only be one of encouragement, not one of saying we know it all, certainly by no means, nor to say it cannot be done because we are all trying and learning to improve our processes of evaluation and reporting the evaluation, but I think that some of these delegations recognize. In making these suggestions, that the existence of a methodology for assessing the effects, let us say of meetings, or of publications, or of statistics, within any one country is not entirely simple. There is certainly literature on the subject but there are no entirely established and proven methodologies. We generally cannot go beyond the level of outputs in relation to specific programmes or sub-programmes. It is possible to do so, let us say for something like a school feeding programme. This is a large-scale programme and it is possible to see what the indicators should be before the programme is established and what the performance should be before it is established, but the FAO indicators, particularly when you go down to the lower levels are very finite and they are very small. To give you an example, statistics; statistics are used as an input for studies and for analysis, they are used to produce other outputs. The measurement of indicators showing the use of FAO statistics and the value of these statistics is not an entirely simple matter. It will be very difficult similarly to ascertain the impact and the result of participation in a training activity or in a meeting. One can certainly see that effective participation would mean that the person involved would be able to go back and implement part of what he has learnt to improve the unit or organization in which he is engaged. The costs of measuring such impact on an individual basis at the level of activity are substantial, I think one should recognize that, how much further analysis of that nature can be pursued will certainly be considered by- us, will be studied by us in collaboration with all those who may have further experience.

This leads me to my final remarks, which I hope will be accepted in the spirit in which they are intended. This whole discussion has shown the Secretariat, or me, if I may speak personally, that the subject of evaluation presupposes three qualities in the whole process; firstly, the quality of professional integrity. This quality of professional integrity is of enormous importance for the credibility of any evaluation work done and I am pleased to see from the response given by this Commission to the documents that we placed before you that this has been in large measure recognized. Secondly, the quality of professional competence; the praise that you have bestowed on the Secretariat goes, of course, to the colleagues who are responsible and mainly responsible for the preparation of these documents and I am pleased to say that this professional competence is recognized by you, our sovereign masters, and it is also recognized by Member Nations and organizations who have evaluation units and services. I can give you many examples, the evaluation service of UNDP when it was being set up relied to a great extent, and we still rely very closely on it in evaluating our procedures and projects. The evaluation department of the European Community recently contacted us in order to establish closer links. We are always happy to have such links with evaluation departments. Finally, the aspect of professional collaboration; we value the guidance that you have given us and we will do our best, as we always seek to, to respond further to your wishes by improving the kinds of evaluation and the results of the evaluation that we place before you. I will only ask you, the Commission, to recognize that despite all the voluminous documentation that we placed before you on this item, this is not all the evaluation work of FAO. There is a great deal more which is done, a great deal more, some of which will also be drawn to your attention when you consider the item under review of the Field Programme.

Mr Chairman, I hope I have done justice to the questions raised and I thank you.

CHAIRMAN: At this point it is in order for any country which has addressed a question to the Secretariat to which the Secretariat has responded, or has not responded, where any country has put a question and feels it was not answered to so indicate at this point so he can have a follow-up with Mr Shah. India, you had a question; do you need a clarification?

V.K. SIBAL (India): Yes, we had a question on which we think the reply has not come. We have suggested that so far as trypanosomiasis is concerned some work is also required in Latin America and Asia and if you could let us know as to what the position is. I think we have not had a response to that.

V. J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): My apologies to the delegate of India for not responding. I took it more as an expression of a wish by the delegate, something that the Secretariat should look into and that is why I did not respond with a specific answer. I think all I can say is that this desire this wish will be looked into by myself and by my colleagues concerned.

CHAIRMAN: India is indicating the Chair that it is satisfied by your response. Thailand, you had a follow-up on your question?

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): Yes, thank you. My delegation appreciates greatly the clarification given by Mr Shah. However, I also have some questions about your answer because it seemed to us that the amount of budget currently provided to livestock, or any other sector, should not be a justifiable measurement for being a major programme or programmes. That is not the case. Rather, according to the programme budgeting system philosophy, it is the policy, problems and needs priority that decide whether a sector should be a major programme or programmes. Therefore, it will be highly appreciated if such aspects are taken into consideration concerning livestock.

(Mr Shah nodded his assent).

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr Shah. At this moment the Chair has one item I will proceed to, but at the moment we would like to make an announcement. We do have a "Friends of the Chairman" contact group agreement. We have a list of participants; let me read off the list of the countries that will be participating in that discussion. There are 14 countries. They are in no particular order: Norway, Libya, United Kingdom, Congo, France, Cameroon, United States of America, Costa Rica, Switzerland, Mexico, Germany, Philippines, Japan, India. All members will be contacted about where the first meeting will begin. Some of that will depend on how we proceed with the report but as soon as we have some definitive information to put before you on the meeting place you will be informed. Someone will be notifying you as soon as reasonably possible.

Srta. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Mi delegación no quiso interrumpir el ya retrasado debate, sin embargo, no puede dejar de declarar en este foro que está dedicado a los problemas de la alimentación y la agricultura de nuestros pueblos cuando éstos se ven afectados por ella, aquí puede ventilarse el asunto y en este contexto, como bien lo dijo el delegado de Angola, el 91° período de sesiones del Consejo de la FAO solicitó que esta Organización completara sus estudios aquí y en otros órganos iniciados con objeto de evaluar la situación de la seguridad alimentaria y la agricultura en los territorios árabes ocupados y en los países de la línea de enfrente, por lo cual es muy normal que uno de los países involucrados inquiriera con pleno derecho los aspectos relacionados con el tema y no se le debe interrumpir.

CHAIRMAN: The answer to your question is that you are right, and there was a resolution dealing with the policy on apartheid and you are right in stating that there was a reference to that - the word used was not apartheid, the word used was aggression and we got into all sorts of political conflicts in that region which was out of order. Libya, do you have a point of order? Please let me explain, so we know whether someone is wishing to speak on the issue or on a point of order, the rules of the Organization ask that members stand up with the sign of the country. That is what, your rules say.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I simply would like to stress the point which you yourself raised just now as regards the contact group. You said that the group would be known as the "Friends of the Chairman" but what we said during that debate a few days ago was rather that we would call it a contact group, not "Friends of the Chairman", which you said today.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

CHAIRMAN: As I stated, I made a vague reference, I said whatever you call Friends of the Chairman. I do not know what you usually call them. I do not care what you call them. Let us hope you do some work.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Tenemos constancia de que usted mismo es el que rompe los reglamentos. Hice un punto de orden y no me dio la palabra. El delegado de Libia con mucho respeto no ha hecho punto de orden e hizo un punto de aclaración. Le pido no me interrumpa.

Antes de hacer esta moción de orden quiero expresar brevemente los motivos que me llevan a ello. Usted ha estado presidiendo esta Comisión como si se tratara de un corral de un rancho de California. Eso es inaceptable. Todos conocemos las reglas del procedimiento para presidir esta Comisión y considerarnos que su aplicación ha sido parcial y arbitraria. Nicaragua dejó de ser neocolonia en 1979 y puede hablar libremente sobre cualquier tema de interés para el trabajo de esta Comisión.

Angola fue injustamente interrumpida en el uso de la palabra esta mañana cuando hacía referencia específica al contenido de un informe del 91^o Consejo de la FAO. Nuestra moción, por tanto, es que usted respete por igual el derecho al uso de la palabra de todos los delegados aquí presentes.

CHAIRMAN: In responso to your point of order, which was an opinion more than a point of order, the Chair would point out that the reason it recognized Libya in place of Nicaragua was not because of any personal views of the United States of America that it happened to favour Libya over Nicaragua, but solely because the representative of the Government of Libya was the first to catch the Chair's attention with the sign of his country and he was mouthing in English "Point of Order". Therefore he was recognized ahead of you. Cuba has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Quiero, Señor Presidente, apoyar y respaldar la declaración que acaba de hacer la distinguida delegada de México y apoyar la moción de orden propuesta por Nicaragua.

Ayer hablamos de que se han cometido ciertas irregularidades e hicimos un llamado a la concordia para facilitar nuestros trabajos. Creo que usted, Señor Presidente, dijo algo en lo que estuvo acertado y voy a tomar su palabra: hay que respetar las normas y los reglamentos de la Organización, esas normas establecen como principio elemental la soberanía de todos los países que estamos aquí representados y el derecho al pleno respeto a nuestra condición de países libres y soberanos.

Por favor, Señor Presidente, ayude a que esta conferencia no deje un mal sabor en el plano internacional.

CHAIRMAN: With your help may be we can. Congo has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Nous ne pouvons pas aller de motion d'ordre en motion d'ordre; nous sommes au sein d'une commission avons la possibilité de nous exprimer. Nous voulons parler des incidents qui ont eu lieu lorsque l'Angola est intervenu.

Nous voulons d'abord rappeler que ce n'est pas la première fois qu'au sein de cette Organisation il est fait état de l'impact des agressions de l'Afrique du Sud sur les secteurs productifs des Etats de la ligne de front. Peut-être est-ce une surprise pour le Président, mais par le passé ces questions ont été débattues, et je voudrais même rappeler que lors d'une de ses dernières sessions le Conseil a recommandé que l'on envisage une étude sur la possibilité d'aider ces pays à reconquérir et redresser leur, appareil de production dans l'optique de la sécurité alimentaire.

Nous n'avons pas du tout apprécié le fait que vous ayez interrompu l'Angola qui, en fait, n'abordait pas la question sous un angle uniquement politique mais visait à faire comprendre à tous ceux ici présents que les attentats perpétrés par ce régime raciste d'Afrique du Sud ont une incidence négative sur leur secteur productif.

Il faudrait que cela soit entendu une fois pour toutes, afin que nous n'ayons pas à intervenir plusieurs fois sur ce genre d'incidents. Nous appelons l'attention de la Présidence afin que tant qu'une question est vue sous l'angle de nos débats visant à l'alimentation et à la sécurité alimentaire, liberté soit donnée à chaque délégation de s'exprimer, même quand il s'agit de condamner, sur cet aspect, une puissance quelle qu'elle soit.

15. Impact of Financial Problems on Regular Programme Activities in 1986-87

15. Effets des problèmes financiers sur les activités du Programme ordinaire en 1986-87

15. Repercusiones de los problemas financieros sobre las actividades del Programa ordinario en 1986-87

CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to the next item, item 15, which will be introduced by Mr Shah immediately following my calling to your attention, as we are talking about Rules of the Organization, that made reference yesterday to document C 87/INF/2. Page 8 of the English text of that document states: "A delegate wishing to make a point of order must stand up and raise his country sign. He may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion". These are the Rules of the Organization. The Chair has tried to be flexible in that and obviously does not insist on everybody standing and holding up his sign. But, if there is confusion as to whether or not you want the floor for a discussion of the issue at hand, or on a point of order, there are the Rules of the Organization which this Body adopted long ago and which provide that that is the method of the Organization. The Chair has to go by the rules which this Organization adopted.

V. J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The item before you now has a very brief document. Perhaps this will come as a welcome sign to the distinguished members of this Conference. The impact of financial problems on the Regular Programme activities 1986-87 - this subject has already been referred to a number of times, if not repeatedly during your consideration of the Review of the Regular Programme which you have just concluded. The purpose of this document (C 87/23) is simply to recall the facts as they occurred and the action taken, and to give some preliminary tentative assessment of the impact of these financial difficulties on programme implementation.

The facts: as explained in Section 2 of the document there were three factors at the origin of the liquidity problem. First, an erring on the optimistic side in the estimate for Miscellaneous Income for the present biennium. This certainly helped in reducing the member countries' contributions - when the Programme of Work and Budget was approved but it led to an income shortfall of \$12 million.

Secondly, a shortfall in the payment of contributions by member countries but including this time the largest contributor with all too obvious consequences. Thirdly, the dramatic fall in value of the US\$ from the budgetary rate of exchange of Lire 1760 adopted by the last Conference. In fact, on that score there seems to be no end in sight to our woes as evidence of the continuous turbulence of the international currency markets.

Now for the action taken. It was clear that the Organization was facing an exceptional situation which required exceptional measures. There was no other option left (in view of the prospective income shortfalls) than to propose to the Council the enactment of economy measures. Action was therefore taken in three successive steps, as the magnitude of the estimated cash shortfall increased and cash flow forecasts became more accurate. The cumulative effect of these measures has been to reduce expenditure under the Regular Programme by US\$ 25 million against an approved budget of US\$ 437 million. You will find details of the resulting savings by chapter and major programme in a table in Appendix 1.

The situation was kept under constant review by the Council and the Programme and Finance Committees. The summary of the actions of these bodies is provided in Section 4 of the document, as it was felt useful and appropriate that we bring them to the attention of the full FAO membership. The predominant reaction was, of course, of deep regret that the Organization was forced to curtail approved programmes due to external factors beyond its control. The second predominant feeling was that in situations of this nature it was essential to keep a cool head and to take appropriate decisions flexibly and in the most pragmatic manner. There was agreement that these problems were of a purely financial nature and in no way reflected a crisis of confidence in the Organization.

I turn now to the impact of measures taken. The effect is always painful and the circumstances through which FAO has had to live are no exception. Section 5 provides, therefore, very succinctly an assessment of the negative impact of the programme adjustments. In fact, it is precisely for reasons of economy - and I am sure distinguished Delegates will appreciate this matter - that the length of this document is reduced to a strict minimum and we do not reproduce the detailed information submitted earlier to the Council.

The document ends with very brief concluding remarks. One is to stress the limitations to programme adjustments in handling income shortfalls of a substantial magnitude. The other remark underlines it will take some time for FAO to recover from the effect of the measures and restore operational and technical activities to the level desired by our Member Nations.

CHAIRMAN: Those countries who wish to speak on these matters please so indicate.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): First of all I want to clarify something. I am gaining experience. I am taking an intensive course in how this type of assembly conducts its debates. Therefore I would refrain from speaking if that means that I cannot make additional comments later. I just want to point one thing out for clarification so that I can analyse better what I would then say on this subject. What I want to ask, and forgive me if this sounds ignorant, but all these documents were given to me the day I had to start attending these meetings. I have had no time to go into them in detail, but all I want to ask is: is there in another document, a table compared to the one in an appendix of this document, showing what the desipuacion presupuestarle of future budget or of the previous budget is compared to the liquidation of that budget. I mean how we complied with the previous year so that we can have a comparison, sort of a comparative result. There must be one from the year before and this gives us a better basis for our judgement. Is there a history of what has happened in the past?

CHAIRMAN: I am just trying to follow this procedure. It appeared that there was just one country that wished to speak on this. If that holds true we can then proceed to the end of this item which would leave Mr Shah's role to respond to questions raised by members. But before proceeding on that the Chair must see if there is any other country which wishes to speak. We will come back to that at the end of this discussion on this item.

Mourad BENCHÉIKH (Algérie): Avec une clarté et une concision remarquables, le document C 87/23 recense les raisons pour lesquelles notre Organisation traverse une crise financière, d'une ampleur sans précédent dans son histoire. Le paragraphe 8, notamment, dresse le constat que la cause essentielle de cette crise provient de restrictions imposées par voie législative aux contributions du plus gros bailleur de fonds à de nombreuses organisations du système des Nations Unies, dont la FAO.

Voilà qui confirme l'opinion exprimée dès le Conseil de novembre par la délégation algérienne que la crise financière de la FAO ne découle pas d'une mauvaise gestion mais d'une volonté délibérée d'un Etat Membre de transformer les règles établies par les Pères Fondateurs de notre Organisation, de telle façon que cette dernière devienne un instrument au service de la philosophie politique et des objectifs à court et à moyen terme de cet Etat.

Je ne voudrais pas alimenter une polémique avec vous et je voudrais que vous sachiez que ce que je dis n'a absolument rien de personnel contre vous; mais la délégation algérienne a nourri les plus vives appréhensions lorsque, en vertu de la mécanique habituelle qui régit les élections aux postes de Président et de Vice-Président de la Conférence, c'est la candidature américaine qui a été retenue. Encore une fois, il ne s'agit pas d'un problème personnel.

Dans le souci élémentaire de prévenir toute interruption je voudrais que vous considériez que ce que je vais dire n'est pas hors sujet, mais est une réflexion générale sur les difficultés qu'ont connues les débats de la Commission II. Et je dirai d'emblée que ces difficultés proviennent essentiellement du fait qu'il n'est pas possible d'être à la fois juge et partie. Il vous est difficile en d'autres termes de présider sereinement et en toute impartialité une commission qui traite de questions sur lesquelles vous avez une opinion préconçue et dont vous souhaitez à l'évidence qu'elles soient traitées selon l'optique de vos mandants.

Je passerai rapidement sur le fait que la délégation algérienne a été interrompue de façon indue et abusive par vous-même lorsqu'elle a abordé un problème qui était directement lié à la question dans la mesure où il s'agit incontestablement d'un avis donné par une délégation - la délégation algérienne - considérant que dans le rapport C 87/3, un des facteurs les plus importants de déstabilisation de l'agriculture au Proche-Orient avait été passé sous silence.

Je crains fort que si nous continuons à porter atteinte au droit souverain des Etats à s'exprimer, nous allons dans une impasse. Et je voudrais appuyer en l'occurrence les délégations du Mexique, du Nicaragua et du Congo qui m'ont précédé pour réaffirmer la pleine légitimité de cette Conférence à parler des aspects ou des conséquences, sur l'agriculture, d'un certain nombre de réalités objectives.

Monsieur le Président, puisque vous avez annoncé la composition du groupe de contact - ou du groupe des amis du Président -, je voudrais simplement vous rappeler que la délégation algérienne a indiqué dès le départ qu'il était préférable, dans un souci de transparence, que la composition de ce groupe de contact fut arrêtée au sein de la Conférence avec l'avis de tout le monde et sur la base d'un équilibre régional.

Je ne crois pas - je suis en tous les cas très sceptique personnellement - à la faculté qu'aurait ce groupe de contact de parvenir à une solution dans l'immédiat, ou à une solution tout court, compte tenu de l'importance et de la difficulté des problèmes qui nous occupent.

Je lance par conséquent un appel de façon très solennelle pour que vous introduisiez dans nos débats toute la transparence voulue. C'est le seul moyen, de l'avis de la délégation algérienne, d'instaurer un climat de confiance et de permettre aux différents points de vue de s'exprimer dans la sérénité et avec le réel souci de surmonter la grave crise que nous traversons.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): We note that on several occasions in this body the United States has been singled out, either by name or otherwise alluded to, as being solely responsible for the financial crisis in which the FAO currently finds itself. We would like to observe that there are also many other countries who are in arrears with their payments, and would like to ask that the names of those countries be read. In closing, I would also like to reiterate the statement of our Secretary who spoke to the Conference, in which he reaffirmed the support of the United States and the fact that it will meet its commitments to this body.

J. LYNCH (Canada): I was not going to intervene but I figured, seeing that there was a shortage of speakers, something should be said about such an important subject which has had such a large impact on the Organization during the past biennium. We can join others who have complimented the Secretariat in terms of the production of a document which gives us a very clear idea of what the crisis which they have just gone through was. The one area where we would think that there might have been a little bit more work, and this I think would not have required a great deal of documentation, perhaps just a little bit of additional reflection, particularly as the problems which we encountered in the last biennium are in the view of at least some members here, likely to occur in the next biennium, and that is what guidelines, what particularly unique knowledge the Secretariat has gained during this biennium which will guide it during the course of the coming biennium. There are a couple of things that are referred to in section 6 on concluding remarks,

for example during the course of the debate on the budget there was a reference to priorities. Now I do not see in this particular document a very close connection between the identification of priorities and the care with which they were chosen for the Programme of Work and Budget in the coming biennium and the experience of the last. For example again, just to take one of the items which was cut, and it is referred to I think in paragraph 31, was a workshop with respect to forestry. If I recall, the Secretariat has identified forestry in the Tropical Forest Action Plan as being an area of high priority for the coming biennium. Now am I to take it from this particular incidental reference that priority areas will be cut? My question is in a nutshell and it is a comment: Can the Secretariat give us some guidance about their ability to preserve priority areas from cuts, from programme re-adjustments, even though they are going to have to do this in a reactive way? What type of guidance have they learned from the experience of the last biennium?

Ms Anne-Lise PETERSEN (Denmark): As the Danish delegation did not comment on the financial situation under agenda item 13, I therefore want to make some remarks under this agenda item. The Danish delegation agrees that the present financial situation of the Organization is a difficult one which has had and will continue to have considerable influence on the possibility of implementing the Programme of Work. The shortfall for the 1986-87 biennium is estimated to fall within the range of US\$ 40 - 80 million, which has only partly been offset by measures to reduce the expenditures level by a total amount of \$25 million.

As mentioned in the document, the financial problems stem partly from a decline in interest rates, currency fluctuations and arrears in payment.

At the outset, let me state once again that the Danish delegation finds it very unfortunate that a great deal of the present financial difficulties originate from some Member States not having fulfilled their legal obligations to the Organization timely and in full.

Concerning the currency fluctuation, my delegation has already stated in the Council that this problem could be dealt with by using a basket of currencies. However, the financial problems have made it necessary to make savings within the original Programme of Work and the results are presented in document C 87/23. In this connection my delegation was somewhat concerned when the Deputy Director-General, in a reply to a question concerning possible cuts in the next biennium, under agenda item 13, mentioned that the basis for savings would be a linear cut, although modified by the selection of areas of priority or protection, together with a contractual precision of the staff. Looking through the annex of the document before us, this seems to have been the general guideline for the 1986-87 savings as well. The linear cut approach is precisely what my delegation has been arguing against since the subject was first discussed at the 90th Council Meeting. The Danish delegation, therefore once again wants to reiterate that we realize the need for making savings in the present financial situation and that it is the Director-General's prerogative to put forward the appropriate proposals. We wish, however, to stress that the savings should follow a selective approach within the framework of clearly defined priorities. My delegation therefore urges the Secretariat to follow that line when further savings will be necessary.

Clifton E. MAYNARD (Barbados): My delegation would like to compliment Mr Shah on his introduction of this rather sad document which explains the position in which FAO finds itself at this time. I think all I would wish to do is to note the information in the document and particularly the assessment of the impact of the crisis on the Organization as outlined in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the document, to support and emphasize the conclusions of the Council as recorded in paragraphs 24-26 and particularly to emphasize the considerations which forced the Programme Committee at its September session to recognize that every effort had been made to avoid indiscriminate, across-the-board reductions; but it stressed that a regime of semi-permanent financial emergency and uncertainty would entail serious disruptions of the programmes and lead to severe damage to the Organization's capital of expertise and direct contact with member countries.

It seems to me that what Conference has to do is to focus now on paragraph 28 of this document because it would wish to give the Director-General the necessary authority and flexibility that he will obviously need to implement the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89.

Khalid HASSAN (Bahrain) (original language Arabic): I should like to thank Mr Shah for the presentation of this document and also to thank the Director-General, who has given some programmes to the Organization in spite of the financial difficulties. We know very well that FAO is undergoing a financial crisis and has to adopt measures that will allow it to confront this crisis. The deficit is somewhere between US\$ 40 and 80 Million. All these initiatives are well known to all of us. We also know that the crisis has led to a drop in the number of meetings, despite the importance of the meetings themselves, especially when their aim is to discuss the development problems of the various countries involved.

It has also had an impact on extension services for developing countries. We all know that we need these activities to carry out development activities and we also know that the Technical Support services have declined sharply. Some programmes have not been adopted at all. We know also that there will be a cut in professional staff, and of course this will have a negative impact on FAO's thinking. FAO's field projects for member countries, directly or indirectly, deserve our full support. But these programmes will certainly be affected as well by the drop in financial resources available to FAO. The decisions adopted by FAO will have a temporary effect, but the effect of the delay in payment of certain members may well cause difficulties to FAO. We must deal with all due clarity with these matters now because we are the first to be affected by this crisis.

V.K. SIBAL (India): We have this brief document which has been very clearly presented. It makes somewhat sad and not altogether pleasant reading. We have heard in some of the interventions which have just been made some regret expressed that certain valuable programme elements have had to be sacrificed as a result of the measures which are necessary to meet the financial difficulties faced by the FAO. Unfortunately there is no escape from this kind of sacrifice. There are no easy solutions here and no stark choices between what is essential and what is non-essential.

The Programme of Work and Budget, we have said before, is an integrated set of proposals and there is no golden scale for assessing relativities which will yield clear choices. The process of preparing the Programme, if carried on for too long - and there is a clear warning of this in the document - will have to be a matter of informed and professional judgement which is bound to result in a sacrifice of some valuable programme elements. If assessed contributions are not forthcoming we cannot maintain with any complacency that FAO has any chance of preserving all that the membership of the FAO would desire to be preserved.

This document brings out very clearly the painful process of programme adjustments in the face of financial restraints arising from a fall in miscellaneous income, a shortfall in contributions from the largest contributor and in contributions in arrears of other countries, and the damaging effects of such adjustments. A cut of US\$ 25 million, resulting in the withdrawal of 7 percent of the resources from the Technical and Economic Programmes, is a substantial cut which has been carried out by the Director-General with care, pragmatism and discrimination, keeping in view the need for maximizing the protection of Technical and Economic Programmes, including the TCP, within the bounds of feasibility. For this we would like to congratulate the Director-General.

It is mentioned in paragraph 6 that the income shortfall will be in the range of US\$ 40 to 80 million. This is a very wide range and we would like to know whether there has been any change in this assessment since the preparation of the document and whether the amount due from the largest contributor of US\$ 67.4 million, as indicated in paragraph 8, has suffered any change. While we appreciate that straight across-the board cuts were not resorted to by FAO, we deeply regret that the cuts have had the effect of impairing FAO's capacity to provide advisory assistance to Member Governments and have put added strains on the technical backstopping of the field activities, and that the scope for further staff cuts is now more or less exhausted and future cuts are likely to

be cuts of staff components of FAO's organizational units, with obvious effects on programme health and programme effectiveness. In this context, we would like to express our appreciation for the relinquishment or deferment of their share of the surplus by several Member Nations and the generous gesture by the Host Government to meet FAO's financial costs for 1986-87.

I should like to stress again the urgent need for countries to meet their constitutional obligations of paying their assessed contributionsto avoid the disruption of orderly programming and institutional damage. We support the Council's view that it would be necessary perhaps to give the Director-General the authority and flexibility, as in the past, to take appropriate decisions on the Programme of Work and Budget for 1988-89 in the context of the likely continuation of the financial difficulties. We agree with the mannerin which the programme of adjustments has been made and also we agree that the negative effects of the adjustments will be felt for some time. These will be available for analysis and review when we meet again in two years' time to review this Programme in 1989.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): A l'instar des autres delegations qui se sont exprimées avant la nôtre, nous voudrions nous aussi joindre notre voix à celles-ci pour remercier M. Shah de l'exposé tout à fait clair qu'il a bien voulu nous faire sur cette question soumise à notre appréciation.

Pour nous qui sommes ici à Rome, les éléments contenus dans ce rapport nous sont en fait connus et c'est d'ailleurs ce qui explique que le démarrage du débat soit un peu ralenti par le simple fait qu'en réalité ces éléments ont été plus ou moins abordés à l'occasion de l'examen des autres points, notamment les points 3 et 8.

Cela étant dit, nous n'allons pas nous appesantir sur l'historique de ce document, que l'on retrouve dans l'introduction et les trois premières parties dudit document. Nous pensons nous arrêter un instant sur les conclusions de ce rapport.

En premier lieu, nous pensons que le Secrétariat mérite toutes nos félicitations pour avoir su tenir le cap en ce ment difficile en assurant l'efficacité constante de l'Organisation tout en s'efforçant de faire face à la crise qui a prévalu et qui l'a contrainte à des ajustements.

En ce qui concerne l'avenir, nous pensons que ce qui est dit au paragraphe 28 de ce document est bienvenu puisque, en effet, nous donnons ici au Secrétariat des directives à suivre désormais en pareille situation si - nous le savons d'ailleurs - celle-ci perdure.

Je voudrais également attirer l'attention de notre assemblée sur la teneur du paragraphe 35, qui fait ressortir que, dans le processus des ajustements, il y a quand même des limites. Nous voudrions saisir cette occasion pour dire qu'il ne faut pas nous appesantir et compter uniquement sur des futurs ajustements. Ce faisant, il faut réitérer l'appel que nous avons déjà lancé précédemment, à savoir que la meilleure façon de protéger notre Organisation, c'est que chaque Etat sache qu'il est impérieux que chacun s'acquitte de ses obligations financières. C'est la seule solution pour aider l'Organisation à continuer de s'acquitter de sa tâche tout en maintenant son efficacité. Toute autre proposition, notamment celle d'ajustements, ne serait qu'un palliatif sur lequel nous ne pouvons pas compter.

Encore une fois, je pense que le Secrétariat a su naviguer, comme il est dit au paragraphe 38, avec prudence entre les extrêmes, tant était grande la tentation soit de procéder à une réduction systématique des publications et des postes, auquel cas l'efficacité de l'Organisation aurait été affectée, soit de ne pas être en mesure de tenir le cap face aux frictions et aux difficultés de trésorerie auxquelles l'Organisation était exposée.

Nous ne voulons pas nous étendre davantage car, heureusement, au paragraphe 28, nous avons su dégager des directives concernant l'avenir face à cette situation qui, nous le savons bien, persistera.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I think that our report on consideration of this item will be easy to draft. The main differences of view seem to be the choice of adjective to describe the situation. May I add sober and depressing as a description of this report's account of the impact of the financial crisis on our Organization.

This item is of course not the place fully to debate the budget over again, but I would note that many Member Nations, including my own, are also experiencing severe financial and economic difficulties involving programme cuts and reductions of services and staff. It is a painful process but one that we hope will lead to a stronger and more adaptable economy and society.

I would like to raise one possible avenue of enquiry not covered in document 87/23, which is of course an account of past and current pressures. It may be that there is a simple answer that for one reason or another there are impediments, but my delegation wonders whether there might be scope for improving the revenue-raising or income-earning side of FAO's activities. For example, is there scope for commercially oriented publications or better cost recovery on a selective basis? It occurs to us that the publication area of FAO has much talent and might see opportunities. Similarly, in Australia virtually all universities and colleges, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and many State Governments have commercially oriented units which are able to provide expertise from within the broader organization and respond to requests in the marketplace for that expertise on a commercial basis. Perhaps such arrangements could help smooth out staff establishment problems, as noted in paragraph 36.

I repeat that there may be some impediment to these ideas, which are of course offered in a constructive manner. Perhaps the Secretariat might care to offer comment. It is certainly more positive to consider income generation rather than cuts and savings. We are, after all, living in a time of change and new challenges, and flexibility and innovation seem required.

J. Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): Is regrettable that a multilateral decision of a member country aiming at "decision-making system for budgetary matters providing voting strength in proportion to the size of its contribution" - that is paragraph 8 of document 87/23 - has brought financial insecurity to FAO and deeply affected the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget as approved by the 1985 Conference. This is the main factor of our present difficulties.

Arrears incurred by developing countries are, after deducting the recent payment of Brazil from the total presented in document C 92/LIm/1, around the same level as in the preceding years and as a result of an extremely difficult economic and financial situation.

Furthermore, we deeply regret that FAO had no choice but to enact a series of programme adjustments in the Programme of Work and Budget which was approved totalling US\$ 25 million. We deplore that important meetings had to be cancelled, publications stopped and established posts frozen. We are especially concerned at the reduction of work in areas whose priority has been supported by several delegations to this Conference, such as the advice on trypanosomiasis control, nutrition, land evaluation for forestry, and land use planning. It is also disturbing to verify the adverse impact of the financial difficulties in the recruitment and retaining of qualified staff. We do appreciate, however, that amidst the financial problem it has yet been possible to fulfill the statutory requirements and to maintain FAO's food programme. Taking into consideration the great support given to TCP by the majority of Member Nations and its direct and immediate benefit to developed countries, the TCP must be protected from programme adjustments and cuts in activities.

As I have the floor, may I support the views expressed previously in this Commission by the delegations of Congo, Nicaragua, Mexico and Cuba defending the prerogative of the delegation of Angola to allude to and condemn the aggression suffered by his country, to which we also want to express our solidarity.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would point out that we are once again getting into the political area, and aggression can mean one thing to one party and another thing to another. We are not sure whether you mean the presence of overseas military or whether you mean problems with the neighbours.

J. Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): As my delegation has been mentioned by you, Mr Chairman, what I referred to is aggression by South Africa.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Chair is clear on that.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): As during this Commission there have been a number of comments on the Chairmanship which are now on the record, I would like to begin this intervention by clearly stating that my delegation has full confidence in your Chairmanship. Members of my delegation who have participated in a number of FAO meetings over the years consider that this particular Commission has been marked by the quality of its Chairmanship. In particular we welcome your impartial adherence to the rules of debate of this Organization. It is this which has distinguished this meeting. Sir, you have set a very high standard of debate and it is one that we hope will be maintained in future meetings of FAO.

Turning now to the substance of my intervention, document C 87/23, we found this a brief but significant document. It is a particular concern to us, as it may be a precursor, a forewarning, of how adjustments to the programme may be made in the next biennium unless this Conference has a much more detailed involvement in identifying priorities and indicating activities which can be phased out. We find that the process outlined in document C 87/23 provides a picture of a weak management taking soft options, not filling vacant posts, cutting travel, etc. This is always the front line for management but not necessarily the best and we expect a much more dynamic approach by management and we believe that this can only be achieved if management works with Conference, which represents all the Member States, to achieve this process of identifying priorities.

I would like to refer to the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture of Turkey when he spoke in Plenary, and I would echo his views, where he says that this Conference is a supreme body of our institution and then goes on to make the particular point of the need for recognition, of the need for all Member States to participate in the programme budget preparation in all its stages. I would emphasize here "participate in the programme budget preparation in all its stages". We would very much like to associate ourselves with this remark of Turkey.

The process that is before us and described in these documents can hardly be described by any stretch of the imagination as orderly reprogramming. Mr Shah gave three reasons for the financial situation - an over-optimistic assumption about miscellaneous income, currency fluctuations, and United States of America non-payments. We would like to point out a fourth point, and that is arrears from other Member States as well as the United States. It is quite noticeable that what we have had here is a situation in which a number of Member States have not been able to pay because of their economic circumstances. The effects of this on the programme are quite clear. We will return to this point in a debate on the budget, but in our view this document shows us that it is quite ludicrous to attempt to increase budget levels when the economy of many of the Member States - and we have personal experience of many of the poor Member States who have to make sacrifices, and these economies certainly do not have the foreign exchange to meet existing budget levels.

There has been talk in the debate of the possibility of FAO being in deficit. I have a question for the management, that we would appreciate if they could say whether there will be a cash deficit at the end of December 1987 and if so what is their forecast of this.

We certainly appreciate the spirit of economy which has kept this document thin and the economy of Mr Shah's introduction, and with your permission, Mr Chairman, I would now like to ask management a number of questions which we have in relation to this text.

At paragraph 30 of the document there is a reference to 170 posts being frozen. We would like an explanation of how these frozen posts are distributed across divisions and what is the split between professional and general service grades. We would also like to know if there are plans to transfer staff in the departments and divisions which have been most hardly hit by the cuts and if so what are these plans.

Some activities within FAO, within the management, are timebound, in other words they must take place by a certain time. I am thinking here particularly of FINSYS PERSYS, the computerization system of the accounts, so where you have a situation in which one part of management must meet a deadline, unfilled vacancies there are much more significant than they are perhaps in some other areas. They can certainly produce a knock-on effect which has a significant effect on the administration. We would therefore be interested to know if management has introduced a process of review to identify those sorts of vacancies and taken steps to give them priority in any recruitment.

We would also be interested to learn to what extent, if any, TCP spending has been slowed down and what are the estimated proportions of TCP spending now expected to take place in 1988, 1989 and 1990.

Finally, paragraph 33 of document C 87/23 refers to measures of a trivial character. I would like to ask some questions about this. Certainly when the people in the Secretariat speak to us they mention they have problems in obtaining photocopying, paper, and so on, and we can understand the problem and sympathise. But at the same time they also say that nevertheless official entertainment, the work of the Organization still seems to go on unabated. In this mention of trivial measures we would like to know if management has issued any indication to staff asking them to curtail and limit official entertainment. Also we would be interested to have figures for spending on entertainment for 1986 and 1987 on a comparative basis.

In conclusion I would like to emphasise our dissatisfaction with the proposals for the future outlined in paragraph 28. I think it is what a very senior member of my government, if she was asked, would call wet. We have made it quite clear in our interventions, as have a number of other delegations, that it is up to Conference to indicate the priorities for this Organization. It is not something which is to be left to management in a closed room. This is very much within the scope and mandate of the Conference. Speakers in these debates have indicated that they would wish to participate in this process. We believe it is now up to management to provide us with the information and the facility so that Conference, which represents all Member States, can take these decisions which are important to us all.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La Delegación de Colombia considera que la Secretaria ha procedido adecuadamente al presentarnos este Documento dirigido, sobre todo, a informar a la Conferencia sobre las circunstancias negativas y las repercusiones que todos conocemos.

Pensamos que también se presenta muy bien en este Documento las reacciones del Consejo y de los Organos Auxiliares a las medidas que ha debido tomar el Director General. Nuestro colega de la India se ha referido a los párrafos 4 y 6 en relación con las cifras citadas en esos párrafos, y también deseáramos saber si hay actualización al respecto.

Pensamos que la parte sexta de este Documento, en las observaciones finales, se presenta un balance adecuado de lo que se ha hecho. Pensamos que además de la preservación hasta donde ha sido posible en los programas técnicos y económicos, estas observaciones finales indican que se ha procedido adecuadamente. Tal vez no podríamos compartir la impresión que nos han producido algunas declaraciones de otros colegas en el sentido de que parecería que esta situación forzosa de crisis de liquidez no debería como se ha logrado hasta ahora, mantener en plena vitalidad a la Organización, sino causar problemas que realmente no entenderíamos.

Pensamos que afortunadamente, sobre todo para el futuro importantes países desarrollados y también países en desarrollo, han hecho notables esfuerzos para pagar oportunamente sus contribuciones. Nuestro país, Colombia, tiene una difícil situación económica. Poseemos escasos recursos, sin embargo, hemos logrado pagar todas nuestras contribuciones al bienio 1986-87 y figuramos entre los veinte Estados Miembros que han aceptado recibir en el futuro los excedentes de caja.

Con esa autoridad moral muy modesta en nuestro caso, quisiéramos decir que es necesario que se haga de nuevo otro llamado al primer contribuyente, y también a los otros países que no han cumplido con el pago de sus contribuciones para que procedan a pagarlas lo antes posible ya que, como dijo el colega del Congo, ésta es la única garantía en favor de la ejecución del Programa de Labores.

Lamentamos la reducción de 25 millones de dólares en el año 1987, pero como este documento lo indica, lo que más nos preocupa es las repercusiones negativas para el futuro. Las limitaciones de 1987 no van a quedar limitadas a ese año. Tendremos que afrontar el futuro y somos conscientes de que este tema es apenas uno entre otros, los que se relacionan con esa situación difícil. Hay temas vinculados entre sí; pero convendrá ahora en esta ocasión insistir en que la Conferencia debe conceder al Director General flexibilidad indispensable, pero a la vez delegar en el Consejo algunas facultades. El Consejo es el organismo que cumple las funciones de la Conferencia en el intervalo de dos años, durante los cuales la Conferencia se reúne. Además convendría también, y esto esperamos verlo más adelante en la Comisión III, la función que en todo ello habrán de desempeñar los dos Comités, asesores más importantes del Consejo: los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

También convendría pesar en una sesión especial como ya se hizo en 1974. En fin, creemos que si bien el Director General debe disfrutar de la más amplia flexibilidad y seguir contando con el apoyo que se le ha ofrecido hasta ahora, porque todas las actuaciones del Director General han sido acertadas, convendría a la propia Organización que en ese lamentable proceso de reajuste contara con el apoyo permanente de los representantes de Gobierno de todos los Estados Miembros.

Finalmente, sin ánimo polémico, pero con convicción democrática, la Delegación de Colombia apoya las declaraciones que hicieron esta mañana los distinguidos colegas de Angola y de otros países.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair presumes my friend from Colombia did not include the United Kingdom among those other countries.

Sami SUNAA (Jordan) (original language Arabic): It is very clear that the main reason behind this critical financial situation of the Organization is largely due to the non-honouring of a big number of states of their commitments. I deem it appropriate in this connection that the Conference would reaffirm its call to Member States to examine every possible effort in order to pay their contributions as early as possible in order to alleviate the adverse impact of the current financial situation. This crisis is not created by the management but it is created by us.

It is also definite and clear that the impact of this financial crisis will continue for some time. Therefore the delegation of my country endorses what has been contained in the document, namely to give the management the necessary prerogative to intervene through amending the decided programmes. However, we deem it appropriate that we should take into consideration two important criteria or principles; first, to give priority to existing programmes and projects and to avoid the creation of any new projects before we see signs showing the improvement of the financial situation of the Organization. The second principle seen by my delegation is the necessity to put an order on priorities for the cuts which will be undertaken and this order of priority differs from one country to another and from one region to another. Therefore, although we support giving the authority to the Director-General in this respect, we deem it appropriate that the management would solicit the viewpoint of member countries and perhaps regional officers to set these priorities and to consider them by the Council before they are approved.

Jabula DUBE (Swaziland): The Swaziland delegation wishes to thank Mr Shah for the clarity of document C 87/23 and its brevity. The Swaziland delegation regrets the reasons for the cuts, i.e. the decline in interest rates and shortfall in payment by the largest contributor due to home policies, and also the non-payment by other Member Nations. The Swaziland delegation hopes the affected Member Nations will find ways and means to alleviate the situation so that the FAO is armed with the resources for the task that this Conference gives it.

My delegation like other Member Nations, would like to highly commend the Director-General for the efficient and proper management of the available resources. He has demonstrated managerial maturity in adjusting programmes and yet protecting urgently needed major programmes like the TCP. My delegation hopes that this situation can be averted- in the 1988-89 biennium by all Member States supporting FAO with all appropriate resources.

CHAIRMAN: We have now exhausted the time available to us this morning for this discussion.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours '

La seance est levée à 12 h 45

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/13

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

THIRTEENTH MEETING
TREIZIEME SEANCE
13ª SESION

(18 November 1987)

The Thirteenth Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La treizième séance est ouverte à 15 heures, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 13ª sesión a las 15.00 horas, bajo la presidencia de
Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to indulge in some informality. Technically we do not yet have a quorum although there are a number of people here. We announced before our recess for lunch that if we started at 2.30 we might be able to continue item 15 before us and then interrupt that about three o'clock, when we anticipated having the Report. We also advised that it would not be prudent to proceed with discussion of the Report without members having had the opportunity to read it. Obviously I think there is a general consensus that the Report item has higher priority, as a more critical issue, than the other item and that we would try to have discussion for a period of time and then adjourn and have the reading of the Report.

I understand that we have now acquired a quorum, but what we would like to do now is to take this opportunity, while members are assembling, to distribute the Report. Then we could recess for a period of time, allow member countries the opportunity of reading the Report and consulting with their delegations about it; and then come back with a quorum, please, in perhaps about half an hour. The Chair will act in accordance with your wishes but I would venture to say that perhaps we should allow half an hour. Those countries which have not yet started to speak on item 15 and are still considering, will obviously be reading while we are proceeding, and doing two things at once.

Then when we have finished with this item we can take up the Report, try to proceed with orderly discussion on that, and then at the end of the proceedings today we will not be late this evening. The reason is because we will try to provide an opportunity for the Contact Group to meet at the end of our discussions today and start their discussions, which are very important to the whole success of this endeavour. I sense that this is a generally accepted method of proceeding, and at this point the Chair will exercise its prerogative of declaring a recess of one half-hour.

A valuable and instructive suggestion has just been received from the delegate of France. He has pointed out I stated that we would come back to the item before us and then try to take up the Report, finish with the Report and then go into the Contact Group. He has suggested to me that with the member of speakers we have before us it might be better to suspend our meeting on the item before us, read the Report, go to the issue for which we have a clear deadline, take that up this afternoon, have the Contact Group meet and then tomorrow we will convene on this item. The Chair feels that is a very constructive and useful suggestion and would like to adopt it. Therefore when we come back we will not do what I earlier suggested but we will do what has been suggested by France. We will proceed immediately with the Report and use all our time this afternoon for that purpose.

The meeting was suspended from 15.10 to 15.45 hours.

La séance est suspendue de 15 h 10 à 15 h 45.

Se suspende la sesión de las 15.10 a las 15.45 horas.

ADOPTION OF REPORT

ADOPTION DU RAPPORT

APROBACION DEL INFORME

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART I

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE I

PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE I

CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin with the adoption of C 87/II/REP/1 which covers item 13 of our agenda, the Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89. Before giving the floor to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to introduce the Report, I should like to recall a few of the procedures which normally assist us in ensuring a smooth adoption procedure. First, we are here to adopt a report which reflects the debate which has already taken place. Therefore, it will not be necessary to enter into any lengthy discussion of substance. We should confine our interventions to suggestions for additions, deletions or modifications to the text which is being presented to us. Secondly, we should remember that the Report is being adopted simultaneously in several languages. Page numbers of the several language versions are not always the same. We should therefore always identify the number of the paragraph to which we are referring and also the sentence within that paragraph.

Thirdly, changes which affect only one language, for example grammar, style or punctuation, may be given directly to the Secretary in order to take up the time of the Commission.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Le Comité de rédaction, composé de 16 représentants d'Etats Membres, a siégé deux jours durant, pendant environ 12 heures, à raison de 6 heures par séance, pour essayer de mettre au point un rapport susceptible de refléter les points de vue qui ont été exprimés au cours des débats de la commission.

Le rapport qui vous est présenté, sans peut-être refléter complètement tous les points de vue qui ont été exprimés ici, reprend les points essentiels que le Comité a estimé nécessaire d'introduire dans ce rapport. Nous avons donc, au cours de douze heures de débat, fait un examen minutieux de ce rapport qui vous est soumis et je dois dire que l'atmosphère qui a régné au cours de nos discussions a été très amicale, grâce à quoi nous avons abouti à ce résultat. Certes, les discussions ont été âpres, mais, chaque fois, nous avons pu aboutir à une solution acceptable pour tous.

Voilà pourquoi nous pensons que le rapport qui vous est présenté et qui est le fruit des délibérations des membres de notre Comité de rédaction est un rapport suffisamment fouillé et équilibré. C'est pour cette raison que nous espérons de tout coeur qu'il sera adopté sans problème à la Commission.

Je dois ajouter que dans ce rapport, qui est composé de quarante-trois paragraphes, deux paragraphes n'ont pas été suffisamment discutés au sein de notre Comité pour une question de temps. Nous n'avons pas pu disposer de tout le temps nécessaire pour pouvoir étudier complètement ce rapport. Ces deux paragraphes sont les paragraphes 41 et 43. En tant que Président de ce Comité, je pense qu'il va de soi que chaque membre de la Commission, y compris les membres du Comité, auront le loisir d'intervenir sur ces deux paragraphes puisque nous ne les avons pas suffisamment discutés au cours de nos séances.

Vous aurez pu constater que, dans le texte anglais, la dernière phrase du paragraphe 8 est entre crochets - dans les textes français et espagnol, ces crochets ont été supprimés. En effet, nous avons estimé que cette phrase n'était pas bien placée et qu'elle devait être insérée à un autre endroit. Or, faute de temps, nous n'avons pas eu l'opportunité de placer cette phrase où il fallait. Peut-être nous entendrons-nous, au cours de nos débats, pour soit laisser cette phrase où elle est, soit la supprimer, soit la placer ailleurs.

Je crois que tous les membres du Comité seront d'accord pour surtout laisser la parole, au cours de ce débat, à ceux qui n'ont pas eu l'opportunité, comme nous, d'examiner ce rapport. Nous espérons, de toute façon, que les discussions qui ont eu lieu au niveau du Comité ont permis à ce rapport de refléter les points de vue de tous les membres de la Commission.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): I am sorry, but in the haste of preparing this Report for you there are a few corrections to the various language versions which the Secretariat has already noticed.

The first correction affects all language versions and is in paragraph 41 of the Report. The second sentence which reads: "Several Member Nations asked that the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean be strengthened". This should be: "Several Member Nations asked that the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean be strengthened". It is a question of title. In Spanish the title should be: "Oficina Regional de América Latina y el Caribe". In French it should be: "Bureau de la Région Amérique latine et Caraïbes". In addition there is a change I should like to announce in the French version of modification which was made in the other languages but not in French and it is between paragraphs 32 and 33 of the French version only. The last sentence in paragraph 32, which I will read in French states: "La Conférence a confirmé l'importance de la conservation des ressources naturelles et de la protection de l'environnement". This sentence should, in fact, be the first sentence of paragraph 33. In other words, for the French version, the last sentence of paragraph 32 should become the first sentence of paragraph 33.

The next correction is the one already announced by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee regarding the square brackets at the last sentence of paragraph 8.

CHAIRMAN: Does Mexico have a question regarding the corrections?

José Ramon LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): deseo aclarar que la traducción al español de la enmienda necesaria en el párrafo 41 me llegó que quedaría igual y quiero precisar que en español se cambia también el nombre de la enmienda de la segunda oración del párrafo 41, de tal suerte que diga: "la Oficina Regional de América Latina y el Caribe". Me había llegado la traducción que quedaría igual y quiero hacer esa precisión.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary advises the Chair that they have it as you just stated it.

Sra Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La delegación Argentina simplemente quería, con el beneplácito de su atención, solicitar que procediéramos despacio en el estudio de este documento puesto que no hemos podido siquiera terminar de leerlo íntegramente por falta de tiempo.

CHAIRMAN: Your point is very well taken and it is precisely for that reason that I asked us to have a recess. Perhaps it should have gone longer but we will take it slowly and we shall take it paragraph by paragraph and that ought to enable persons to read ahead and keep abreast - keep ahead so that you have adequate time but your point is very well taken and we will do our best to accommodate that.

PARAGRAPHS 1-4

PARAGRAPHES 1-4

PARAFOS 1-4

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 1. Is paragraph 1 agreed to? Is there any member country which has a suggestion? This is going to be the easy one. It is one sentence. There being none - the Chair observes that as we look around the room - we see no problem with that one-sentence paragraph.

Ismael DIAZ YUBERO (España): No sé exactamente si es un tema que afecta sólo a la versión española, pero en lo que se refiere a la frase tercera creo que está mal construida porque parece ser, según está expresado en la versión española, que el número de personas malnutridas crece en términos absolutos aunque no en relativos debido a la lentitud de los cambios en la pauta de distribución de ingresos y a la pobreza todavía generalizada.

Yo creo que no es ésa la razón por la que crece el número de personas desnutridas o malnutridas, sino por otras razones completamente distintas. Por lo tanto, propongo cambiar el orden en que está estructurada la frase y que quedase de la siguiente forma; si le parece, lo leo primero a velocidad normal y si usted me concede lo leeré a velocidad de dictado: "en términos absolutos, no en términos relativos, el número de personas desnutridas y malnutridas seguía creciendo debido, sobre todo, a la lentitud de los cambios en las pautas de distribución de los ingresos y a la pobreza todavía generalizada". Si le parece lo puedo leer a velocidad de dictado: "en términos absolutos, aunque no en

términos relativos, el número de personas desnutridas y malnutridas seguía creciendo debido, sobre todo, a la lentitud de los cambios en las pautas de distribución de los ingresos y a la pobreza todavía generalizada".

CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any objection to that sentence realignment? The chair observes none. That is approved. Are there any other member countries which have a point on paragraph 2?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): It is not a question of substance but I think it is partly due to the haste with which the Secretariat had to prepare the final draft report that is in front of us. I believe - and you can consult the Chairman of the Drafting Committee on this - that it was agreed in the Committee that references to speakers or to points of view should be made with the same phrase throughout the report - either "delegations" or "Member Nations" or whatever, but that it should be the same throughout the report so no distinction could possibly be read into it. I have no personal view upon what phrase should be used or where, but it was that which was agreed generally in the Committee and the Secretariat undertook to see to it.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee: is that a fair and accurate representation of what was agreed to?

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Oui, Monsieur le Président. Je crois que la remarque a été faite lors des discussions au sein du Comité. Il a effectivement été demandé au Secrétariat d'uniformiser les termes dans tous les textes. J'avais constaté moi-même qu'il existait des variations mais je pensais qu'il suffisait que nous le signalions au Secrétariat pour qu'il tienne compte de ces remarques dans notre rapport définitif.

CHAIRMAN: Shall we now have an understanding then that the point of Norway is well taken, that it is concurred in by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee and that throughout the text when that issue comes up we can permit the Secretary and the Secretariat to pick up any of those references and put them in proper order. Any problem with that? Thank you. Are there any additional points with paragraph 2? The Chair hearing none, we now proceed to paragraph 3.

Juan Manuel GALVEZ B. (Honduras): Estoy de acuerdo con lo que han expresado anteriormente de que no ha habido suficiente tiempo para estudiar este documento, pero sí quiero referirme al párrafo 3 que he podido verificar. Lo que observé en el documento en español ocurre también en el documento en inglés y quiero señalar cuál es ese párrafo. Cuarta oración del párrafo 3 que dice así: "Esto era lo que ocurría en los países en desarrollo afectados por pesadas obligaciones del servicio de la deuda y las condiciones desfavorables del intercambio en su comercio exterior, pero también en algunos países desarrollados.". Para mí el pensamiento no está claro, o no está bien expresado. Sugeriría que se cambiara por lo siguiente: "Esto era lo que ocurría en algunos países desarrollados y en los países en desarrollo afectados por pesadas obligaciones del servicio de la deuda y las condiciones desfavorables del intercambio en su comercio exterior".

En inglés ocurre lo mismo, es muy sencillo ponerlo en ese orden.

CHAIRMAN: No objection to that?

V. K. SIBAL (India): We had the same concern which has been expressed by Honduras and we also felt that the sentence was not very clear in its intent.. We thought a very minor amendment, however, would set matters right and the amendment that we had in mind would involve the least change but reflect the sense more clearly. We would suggest that in this sentence - I will read it as it is: "This was the case for those developing countries which were affected by heavy debt servicing obligations and unfavourable terms of exchange in their external trade...." - "as also..." rather than "but also" so that it would now read "as also for some developed countries". This will mean that the pressures on domestic budgets of shortage of foreign currency were exerted on both.

Ismael DIAZ YUBERO (España): Habís pedido la palabre para apoyar la propuesta de Honduras ya que me parece que queda el párrafo mucho más claro, pero además quería intentar aclararlo un poco más. La realidad es que la situación de falta de pago en unos países o en un tipo de países u otros, es sustancialmente distinta. Por ello, yo creo que para aclarar más la propuesta que ha hecho anteriormente Honduras yo pediría que la ultima frase de este párrafo se sacase en un párrafo nuevo. Podría decir algo así como: "La Conferencia observó también por primera vez". Seguiría hasta el final, pero en un párrafo nuevo para que no parezca que las circunstancias de falta de pago en un caso y en otro tienen factores comunes.

CHAIRMAN: We now have two different proposals for the same sentence. We also have four member countries which have caught the attention of the Secretary. They are Colombia, Mexico, Costa Rica and Venezuela. We would ask you to make your comments and we will try to work out these differences as we proceed.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Yo voy a referirme al párrafo 3, pero no a esta parte sobre la cual se está discutiendo. Prefiero que usted, Señor Presidente, termine de resolver las propuestas que se han hecho y luego antes de adoptar el párrafo 3 me conceda la palabra.

CHAIRMAN: This is a good suggestion. We shall do so.

José Ramon LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (Mexico): Mexico fue Miembro del Comité de Redacción y tenemos como regla general no intervenir cuando se debate el Informe, y menos aún hacer propuestas de ningún tipo, ya que expresamos nuestra plena solidaridad con el Informe. Sin embargo, en este caso debo advertir que este párrafo en particular nos llevó muchas horas de trabajo y tratamos de hacer un distingo entre los países en desarrollo que, evidentemente como puede corroborarse, estamos pasando por una crisis financiera y económica muy grave y la circunstancia que quizá por primera vez enfrentan algunos países desarrollados en cuanto a su situación presupuestaria y el manejo de sus divisas.

Parece que no logramos en el Comité de Redacción expresar esta diferencia muy bien; pero creo que si vamos a ayudar a que este texto sea más claro deberíamos inclinarnos por la propuesta de la India, porque aquí lo que queremos subrayar y destacar es la condición en la que se encuentran prácticamente la totalidad de los países en desarrollo y, ciertamente, como una novedad la de algunos países desarrollados. Yo me inclinaría, por tratarse de un asunto delicado por la propuesta de la India.

CHAIRMAN: At this point I think I would be appropriate to ask if the Chairman of the Drafting Committee would wish to intervene here and make any suggestion on the different approaches.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): En effet, il s'agit là d'un point qui a retenu l'attention du Comité de rédaction pendant une période suffisamment longue. Il me semble que nous étions arrivés à refléter presque ce qui avait été dit dans cette Commission.

Pour ma part, je suis prêt à accepter qu'on remplace le mot "mais" par le mot "et"; il me semble qu'ainsi il n'y aura pas de changement important dans ce texte que nous avons obtenu au prix de beaucoup d'efforts au sein du Comité de rédaction.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone have any objection to the compromise suggested by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee? The Chair sees no objection. That is approved. At this point, with this back-and-forth, the Chair will have to rely heavily on the Secretary to advise on who has the floor, particularly when we now get into the requests asking us to come back. The Secretary advises me that it is now proper, under our order of proceeding, to recognize Colombia.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La Delegación de Colombia propone que se suprima la última frase del párrafo 3. Hacemos esta propuesta porque sinceramente consideramos que tal vez no conviene entrar en detalles sobre cuestiones que pertenecen al fuero muy respetable de un Estado soberano. Si quisiéramos proponer una enmienda, sin duda entraríamos en controversia que deseamos evitar a estas alturas. Por ello, creemos que la propuesta más sensata que podemos hacer es suprimir la última frase del párrafo 3.

CHAIRMAN: Once again, this is the Drafting Committee; and the Chair will make great efforts to try to provide adequate opportunity for the Chairman of that body to clarify what was discussed there. We will try to have communications up here, but at this point I would ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, as I shall be doing throughout the afternoon, to try to clarify these points.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Au niveau du Comité de rédaction, nous avons pensé que ce membre de phrase était suffisamment important pour figurer ici. Nous ne pensions pas que cela pouvait heurter l'Etat visé ici; mais il me semble qu'il appartient plutôt à notre Commission de se prononcer elle-même sur cet aspect des choses.

Le Comité de rédaction n'a pas vu d'inconvénient! ce que cela figure ici.

CHAIRMAN: We have before us two suggestions. One is by the representative of Colombia, that that paragraph be deleted; and one is by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee, that it should be retained. The Chair's impression is that there is a consensus to retain that. Is that an inaccurate or an accurate perception? Would those persons who are opposed to the view expressed by the I would say to Venezuela that I have already said I would recognize the Point of Order as soon as we have finished this. Unless it is a Point of Order on this point, I have been trying to be sensitive to the fact that some countries object to being interrupted on Points of Order and I have been trying to do them at the end of their speaking. The proper procedure would be to give the Chairman an adequate opportunity to speak. At that point I intended to recognize you for your Point of Order. If you wish to make your Point of Order now I would be glad to recognize you for that purpose if you so desired. But we would prefer to finish this point. What is your wish?

Sra.Mercedes FERMIN-GOMEZ (Venezuela): Tengo ml cartel alzado y el señor Presidente no so digna mirar. Ruego igualmente al Presidente del Comité de Redacción que se digne mirar para este lado porque aquí hay delegaciones que también quieren hablar.

Voy a tomar la palabra porque el Señor Presidente dijo que iba a preferir dar la palabra a las personas que no habían intervenido en el Comité de Redacción. Quiero referirme a una cosa sencilla y que no implica ninguna controversia. Yo no estoy de acuerdo con que es lo mismo decir que las pesadas obligaciones del servicio de la deuda que afectan a los países en desarrollo, es lo mismo que las que pesan sobre los países desarrollados. Por esta razón, Señor Presidente, no estoy de acuerdo en poner "así como" o "así también" porque eso identifica las dos situaciones. Estoy de acuerdo con que se deje la palabra "pero", porque pudiera ser que algunos países desarrollados tengan problemas, pero no por las mismas razones que los países en desarrollo, cuya razón es la pesada carga del servicio de la deuda.

Como puede ver el Señor Presidente, no estoy creando problemas para punto de orden. Estoy tratando de respaldar la redacción del Comité originalmente como vino, porque me parece lógico.

En cuanto a la proposición de Colombia voy a apoyar plenamente lo que ha propuesto el Señor Embajador de Colombia.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but that is not a Point of Order: it is a discussion on the proposal made by India.

V.K. SIBAL (India): At this stage we are not clear whether the discussion on sentence 4 is still on. Our impression was that you had pronounced upon it. Assuming that to be so, we are not going to say anything more on that subject. However, on the Colombian proposal we also agree that the point made by Colombia is very reasonable because when we see that the payment of the main contributor is seriously affected by its domestic financial conditions it seems very final in its intent. The American delegation of course is here and they could perhaps best interpret what their stand is. But we understood that they are thinking of full-funding, requests are being made to the legislature, the process is still continuing and the commitments are all there. In the light of all that, perhaps it is not an accurate enough reflection of the American position; but we are subject to correction by the American delegation.

CHAIRMAN: I think it might facilitate things if we could be just a little less formal for a moment. The Chair would call your attention to the fact that we have Costa Rica - and we appreciate your patience: you will be next to be recognized - and after that we have a couple of other items.

Venezuela, the Chair tried to deal with Points of Order after speakers have commenced but the Chair's recollection is exactly what the representative of India has just stated: that we asked whether or not there was agreement on the changing of "but" to "as". At that point it would have been appropriate to indicate that view, but as we went around the floor to see if there were any objections to India's suggestion, we did not see any raised at that point. That is why we proceeded. If you now wish to resurrect that, we will be glad to clarify that and backstep just a little bit. However, our impression here, and I think it is the impression of most countries here, was that there was a broad consensus in favour of the suggestion made by India. I am perfectly willing to be corrected, but that was the Chair's understanding, and we proceeded on that basis.

Briefly, is there or is there not - as we have already declared it closed we will re-open - a view for an acceptance the suggestion made by India? The Chair's impression is that there is. Is the Chair wrong? Will those countries who feel that the Chair is wrong in concluding that there is a consensus on India's suggestion please so indicate. This is going to be very difficult, as we are quibbling over words: so let us try to be as precise as possible. Is there agreement or is there disagreement with the Indian suggestion? The Chair has ruled that there was agreement with that suggestion but since then it appears that there has been a misunderstanding on a Point of Order and an opinion. We want to clarify this. Please let us stick to one point. We have before us one question: is there agreement on the suggestion of India, or is there not? That is simple. Could those countries which disagree with India's suggestion - I called for this before - please state. Could we try to clarify whether anyone disagrees with India's suggestion? In the order that we have before us made by the Secretary, which we are trying to follow, Costa Rica was first, as I believe I stated a moment ago.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Quería manifestar antes que usted dictara su posición que estoy de acuerdo con la Embajadora de Venezuela. "Pero", no es la misma cosa que "así como". El debate como se celebró aquí puso de relieve la gran situación de dificultad en que se encuentra por su deuda los países en desarrollo. Acepto la idea de que hay también algunos casos de países desarrollados; por lo tanto esta situación se refleja mas por la palabra "pero" que por "así como".

Ya que estoy en el uso de la palabra, si usted me lo permite señor Presidente, voy a referirme a la enmienda del Embajador Bula Hoyos. La acepto plenamente ya que me parece muy razonable y si nos ponemos a hacer una enmienda efectiva, o un cambio del texto del último párrafo, vamos a empezar un debate bastante largo.

Me parece, además, que la gran mayoría de las delegaciones expresaron un concepto completamente opuesto a lo que contiene el último párrafo. Este último párrafo habla únicamente de dificultades internas del mayor contribuyente. Sin embargo, aquí ha sido puesto de relieve que había dificultades no sólo de carácter económico, sino de carácter político. No eran dificultades internas, sino que era una actitud deliberada. Esto no me gustaría que fuera reflejado en el Informe y me quedaría más conforme si en una atmósfera de conciliación, insisto en la palabra conciliación, se aceptara la propuesta del Embajador Bula Hoyos de suprimir completamente el último párrafo.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your suggestion. The Chair will try to be objective but it is going to be very difficult to argue over fine points of language. None of us would want to have to defend this before any university. The argument that we are talking about, we are defining a developing country as one that is affected by heavy debt servicing obligations and unfavourable terms of exchange in their external trade. That applies to the United States of America. On the 'as' and 'but' we have before us a number of countries who wish to speak.

Ismael DIAZ YUBERO (España): Yo estoy totalmente de acuerdo con lo que ha expuesto la Representante, la Sra. Embajadora de Venezuela. Por eso, yo me había pronunciado por la propuesta que había hecho Honduras, y que creo que debería ser reconsiderada, pero, Sr. Presidente, Ud. fue demasiado rápido, y prácticamente no nos dio tiempo a reaccionar y podernos oponer a la propuesta que había hecho la India. En todo caso, y le ofrezco como solución intermedia, en lo que se refiere a esta penúltima frase, digo la penúltima porque quizá de la última haya que volver a hablar más tarde, mantener el texto como está, y en caso de no ser así, prefiero la propuesta de Honduras a la propuesta de la India.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry if I went too fast but the Chair thought that there was adequate time for persons to express opposition to India's proposal. The Chair is certainly not trying to support one proposal over another. I assure you that the Chair has no intention to ramrod through India's proposal or anybody else's.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): It was my intention originally to ask you to state clearly the proposal by India but it seems to be simply a matter of "as" versus "but". In that regard we support the use of "but", since there is something unusual about the situation applying to the developed countries.

A word on the next sentence: throughout the debate there were numerous references to the main contributor and so there may well be some reasonable argument, some good reasoning why there could be mention of the main contributor in the report. But I think we have to be careful with the language and we must be careful as to what conclusions we draw. The way it reads seems to suggest a conclusion that there will be some difficulty in the payments because of That being so we may wish to consider wording such as "The main contributor indicated that ..." we may want to govern the way in which we conclude the sentence, or that it was likely to be. I think we have to be very careful as to how we word that last sentence.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would hope that we can do the "as" and "but", which to most persons generally means about the same.

Juan Manuel CALVEZ B. (Honduras): Es obvio que hay controversia en cuanto al párrafo 3. Ahora quisiera sugerir que debería de reescribirse con mucha calma, y luego leerlo nuevamente, para poder llegar a un consenso, y lo creo muy importante porque debemos llegar a un consenso que permita que todos podamos defender este Informe tan importante en cualquier universidad del mundo.

V.K. SIBAL (India): We had asked for the floor not to get an opportunity to speak on this subject but in order to explain why we were suggesting what we were suggesting and we thought this explanation might help. It is not simply a question of the replacement of one small word by another; I think there is a distinct change in meanings. We have to see sentence 3 in order to appreciate sentence 4. Sentence 3 says that certain countries are not able to pay as per their constitutional obligations on account of two reasons, pressures on domestic budgets or shortages of foreign currency. This is the crucial point which qualifies the next sentence. The two factors operated in the case of developing countries who have their problems of debt servicing obligations and unfavourable terms of exchange in their external trade, as also for some developed countries. The reference is not to debt servicing obligations but to shortages of foreign currency or pressures on domestic budgets. This is how we interpreted what the Drafting Committee has done and we thought it would reflect the meaning of what they were trying to say more clearly if we did not use the word "but", because "but" would mean that this is not the case, when you said this was the case. This applies equally to developing countries and some developed countries. That is the reason behind our suggestion.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let us try to be flexible on two points, the "as" and the "but" and the "first time" business and go through the remaining list of speakers and deal with the whole paragraph.

McDonald Phillip BENJAMIN (Dominica): With regard to the phraseology implied by the use of "but" or "as", I think we can say that "as" is a softer expression, "but" implies a larger differentiation, between the situations. In light of this we would prefer the use of the word "but".

With regard to the sentence dealing with the main contributor, we find that this is so loosely worded as to confuse the situation. For example, financial conditions can refer to the stock market crisis situation. So our impression is that the Colombian proposal to delete this is acceptable to us.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair observes that at the rate we are going to be a long time.

Salimoen SOERJOATMODJO (Indonesia): I would agree with the proposal of India for deleting the last sentence, because if it is not deleted I think it will give the impression of giving the justification for the contributor not to pay the arrears.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): I am not going to refer to the English text, but as far as those who speak Arabic are concerned I think that the idea in the Arabic text is correct, but I want to say that the name of the main contributor is repeated twice, at the beginning of the paragraph and at the end of the paragraph, and their name is mentioned in the Arabic text at the end of the paragraph. I propose that we delete the reference to the United States in the last sentence of paragraph 3. This concerns the Arabic text only.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): I just wanted to give a little background to the last sentence of paragraph 3, why this sentence is written down here. I think it was agreed that the reasons for

the arrears of the biggest contributor should be as indicated by the American delegation itself. So I think these are words quoted from the intervention of the American delegation. It is vague, but if we look at the context of where it was said we realise that it is no so vague at all. Therefore I believe that the suggestion made by my neighbour, Trinidad and Tobago, that this is indeed coming from the United States delegation itself is probably a good one because then we would realize that it is to be read within the context of the intervention made by the American delegation.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Chair can make a suggestion. The Chair would suggest that you delete the phrase "For the first time". The reason the Chair would suggest that is because the Chairman served in the United States Congress, and believe me that was not the first time. We may adopt it, but that is not factually true. I can tell you that the phrase "for the first time" is an inaccurate statement of the facts, but do with it as you wish.

Apolinaire ANDRIATSIAJATO (Madagascar): Je souhaitais abonder dans le sens de votre proposition de ne pas languir sur une conjonction et sur le fait de mettre "et" ou "mais" dans cette phrase qui fait l'objet actuellement de controverse. Mais, en faisant preuve de souplesse, je voudrais également dire que le problème n'est pas aussi souple que cela car, lorsqu'on parle du service de la dette et de l'échange défavorable du commerce extérieur, et lorsqu'on dit que certains pays développés souffrent également des mêmes problèmes, je pense que les effets ne sont pas par comparaison les mêmes dans tous ces pays concernés. Les pays sous-développés subissent de plein fouet les effets du service de la dette et des termes de l'échange défavorable, tandis que certains pays développés, en faisant une comparaison d'une façon peut-être plus atténuée que pour les pays sous-développés, subissent les effets de ces mêmes problèmes.

C'est pourquoi j'abonderai dans le sens de l'intervention de Trinité-et-Tobago, pays sous-développé comme le mien, pour dire que "mais" serait plus approprié que "et" qui place sur le même pied d'égalité pays développés et pays sous-développés, alors que les effets de ces problèmes ne sont pas du tout les mêmes. Pour être clair, je répète que "mais" conviendrait plutôt mieux que "et" dans cette phrase concernant le commerce extérieur.

Je pense d'ailleurs que nous avons nous-mêmes imaginé qu'il s'agissait surtout pour certains pays développés de l'échange défavorable du commerce extérieur et non pas du service de la dette.

Quant à la dernière phrase, je me rallierai à la proposition de la Colombie, de l'Indonésie, et du Venezuela portant sur la suppression de cette phrase qui semble justifier et cautionner le non paiement des contributions qui sont prévues dans l'acte constitutif de la FAO. Il s'agit d'une obligation statutaire qui avait été acceptée par le principal bailleur de fonds sans tenir compte de la situation intérieure financière, ou autres facteurs, qui pouvaient à l'époque peser sur ce principal bailleur de fonds. Il y a une obligation contractuelle qui doit être respectée. Et le fait de mettre cette phrase, alors que cette situation est peut-être occasionnelle ou circonstancielle, me semble personnellement tout simplement justifier le comportement actuel de verser ou de ne pas verser, ou de ne verser qu'en partie, la contribution qui fait évidemment vivre cette Organisation.

C'est pour cela que je serai également d'avis de supprimer tout simplement cette dernière phrase qui ne me paraît pas tellement importante, comme vous l'aviez suggéré, pour avancer plus vite et pour ne pas nous éterniser davantage sur ce point.

CHAIRMAN: At this point of the consultation with the Secretariat the Chair thinks it might be appropriate to back up a little bit and remind you that the debate has already taken place; we are not re-doing the debate, that was done before. We have before us the Report. Now, at the rate we are going the Report on what was said will take longer than what was said and we have before us really a couple of fairly simple items. The Drafting Committee has come back with their Report.

The Chairman of that Committee is here to defend that Report and to speak about it but I must caution you that at the rate we are going we are going to be here for a very long time, defining the English and Arabic "and other languages which will seriously delay the work. What we ought to be able to do is to decide rather quickly who likes 'as', who likes 'but'; that is not that difficult, it shouldn't take that long. It doesn't matter that much and we ought to be able to decide that but. let us get on with the 'ases and buts' and to work. The Chair would suggest that it would be more constructive for us as a body to say simply who likes 'as', who likes 'but'. You know, it is like ice-cream; some people like chocolate and some people like vanilla and the fate of the world doesn't matter which you order; whereas we ought to be able to decide such a relatively simple question in a relatively simple manner and if we are not we are going to have a long, long time getting on to other issues, but this is not the time to re-open the discussion which has already taken place and which has already been reported about. Now, if you do not like the Report and the discussion that occurred maybe you should have said something other than what you said at the time we were having that discussion but the responsibility of the Chairman of the Drafting Committee and the members of the Drafting Committee was to do a report on what was said, not on what some people wish they had said and that is the difficulty that now confronts us. The Chair would recommend, it is up to you, that we ought to, right now, here and now, dispense with a protracted discussion on the niceties of the various languages of the world and have a show of feeling for who likes 'but', who likes 'as', and who does not like either.

I would like to be a little bit informal. I am a believer in parliamentary procedure, as some people might have observed but, or as, we go on here, I think a little bit of informality here may be in order and we may wish to proceed and dispose of this and see if we can get to the fourth paragraph of a document which has 43 paragraphs. Is there a reaction to that? The Chair has the feeling, sitting up here, that most people would like to get on.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): Pour notre part, nous estimons que ces phrases - la première comme la dernière - constituent des expressions d'excuse que la Conférence trouve à l'égard des pays membres qui ne se sont pas acquittés de leurs obligations. Ces phrases ne ressortent pas des débats qui se sont déroulés. Nous les considérons comme des commentaires. A mon avis, la Conférence n'a pas à trouver d'excuse aux pays membres qui ne se sont pas acquittés de leurs obligations.

C'est pourquoi je proposerai que toutes ces phrases soient carrément éliminées. Les pays membres ont l'obligation de s'acquitter de leurs contributions.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry but at this point the Chair finds itself defending a report in which the Chair did not participate. The Chairman of the Drafting Committee participated. I will yield the floor for the next few minutes and will give carte blanche to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to respond to your questions

On the order of business here we have some other countries who are on the list and who wish to speak - Argentina, you are one of them - and we will try to go down that list and, Chairman of the Drafting Committee, your report is being challenged here; you can defend it. The order of speakers is Iran, Trinidad and Tobago, Argentina, the United States of America, Panama and Iraq and the Chair will act as a conduit to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee who will tell you why they came to the conclusions that they came to and at this point I will back off from my efforts to try and explain that 'as' and 'but' do not mean a lot in the order of things when we have 43 paragraphs to get through. At the rate we are going it is going to take literally longer to get through and to hold the discussion than to deal with the explanation of what was discussed. Now, if that is what we wish to do, I have to call your attention to the fact that the clock is ticking, it is almost five o'clock; we have a contact group which has taken more than a week to establish, which has its first meeting this evening which may mean we may end up running late and blocking that and if we want to spend all of our time talking about 'as' and 'but' go ahead and do it. It will be of interest perhaps to three or four people at Oxford University one day but it will be of minimal interest to the work of this Organization. That is what I would caution but from this point on, for the remainder of the afternoon, Chairman of the Drafting Committee, you have the distinct pleasure of explaining the difference between 'as' and 'but'.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Comme je l'ai dit au départ, nous avons mis douze heures pour adopter 41 paragraphes. Autant vous dire que tous les aspects ont été passés au peigne fin. La rédaction qui est proposée ici constitue un compromis qui n'a certainement pas satisfait tout le monde mais auquel nous sommes parvenus pour pouvoir avancer, pour vous permettre, Monsieur le Président, de présider cette séance, aujourd'hui.

Je l'ai déjà dit tout à l'heure, entre "mais" et "et", il y a peut-être une nuance, mais nous, au niveau du Comité de rédaction, nous avons préféré le "mais". D'abord, la question ne s'est même pas posée de savoir s'il fallait mettre "mais" ou "et". Pour nous, c'était le "mais" et nous l'avons adopté.

C'est pour cette raison que j'ai dit, tout à l'heure, que si le vœu de la Commission est de changer le "mais" en "et", nous n'y voyons pas d'inconvénient. La Commission est souveraine. Ce que nous avons fait, c'est proposer un texte. Il appartient à la Commission de trancher.

D'autre part, je voudrais rappeler aux membres du Comité de rédaction qu'ils n'ont pas à intervenir ici et que, s'ils le font, c'est pour défendre le projet de rapport et non pour y apporter des amendements qu'ils n'ont pas apportés au cours du débat du Comité. Je crois que cela est important si l'on veut clarifier les choses au sein de la Commission.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and I am sure you will have more opportunity.

Ahmad ALAVI (Iran, Islamic Republic of): It is just concerning the fourth sentence of this paragraph, 'but' and 'as' and it is if we read as it is like this was not only the case for those developing countries but also all this discussion would be solved. "This was not only the case for those developing countries", and so on, "but also for some developed countries."

CHAIRMAN: Iran has suggested to say "but also". The Chair observes that the Chairman of the Drafting Committee has admonished the members of the Drafting Committee. As I heard him, the Chairman said that the members of the Drafting Committee who wanted to talk about "but" or "as" should have talked about it at the meeting. Iran is a member of that Drafting Committee, but you now disagree with the Drafting Committee, and you propose "not only" and you would also put "but also". Chairman of the Drafting Committee, any time you wish to have the floor to explain something, you are welcome to it.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Firstly, I wish to agree totally with the previous speaker because on consideration I think Iran is correct. If we add there "not only" after "this was the case", I believe that we need not go back to this matter again and everybody would accept it. I feel perfectly convinced about it. Let it read "This was the case not only" and then "but" will stand and we need not go back to that matter again for the rest of the afternoon. That is point No.1 and I believe you can almost take that as read. The second point concerns the suggestion made earlier to let the last sentence read "that the main contributor" - if the main contributor says so, let it be so.

CHAIRMAN: Representative of Trinidad and Tobago, I admire your optimism, but I have to point out in all due fairness the Chair cannot accept your statement that each of the following speakers will agree. The Chair has to let them say whether or not they do and we have seven people to talk about "as" and "but".

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La delegación de Argentina concuerda con usted en que tenemos que tratar de reflejar en este informe lo que fue dicho durante el debate. Por consiguiente, estamos de acuerdo con la delegación de Colombia de que la última frase del párrafo 3 debería, en honor de la verdad, ser suprimida de este párrafo, por cuanto da una imagen inexacta de lo que fue nuestro debate.

Con relación a las alegaciones habría que considerar que esto fue dicho por la delegación de Estados Unidos, quisiera recordar a las distinguidas delegaciones que señalaron esto, que en el párrafo 22 se expresa extensamente lo que dijo el mayor contribuyente, de manera que no necesitamos tener esta interrupción en el párrafo 3.

Con relación a las palabras "pero" o "así como" mi delegación no encuentra diferencia sustancial, pero sí la encuentra con la propuesta que acaba de ofrecernos la distinguida delegación de Trinidad y Tabago, que lamentablemente no podemos aceptar.

La delegación de Argentina quisiera proponer que usted encargara tal vez a las delegaciones que tienen sentimientos muy acendrados con relación a las expresiones "pero" o "así como" que se reunieran entre ellas para ver si pueden dirimir esta situación en beneficio de todos los miembros. En caso contrario creo que tendremos tal vez que proceder a suprimir la última parte de esta oración.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair has to say under no circumstances would the Chair ever appoint anybody to figure out whether "as" or "but" is preferable for fear that I would be laughed out of any city in the world. We are getting to the point of being foolish. The Chair has before it a note from a member country, Trinidad and Tobago, which makes a respectful suggestion that what I called his optimism be put to the test and ask if there are any objections to what Trinidad and Tobago said. Unfortunately, as I was reading that note I distinctly heard the Government of Argentina expressing an objection to what Trinidad and Tobago said. I believe I am clear in that, Trinidad and Tobago?

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I was right.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): If it was not so serious I would be laughing, but if one looks in the original text at the fourth sentence, which is under discussion in the context of the third sentence which it modifies, the language proposed by the Drafting Committee is perfectly reasonable and should not be changed. It is perfectly reasonable.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): Sin entrar en cuestiones de fondo en lo que se refiere a la tercera frase del párrafo 3, nuestra delegación considera que tal como había explicado anteriormente el Presidente del Comité de Redacción y había sido ratificado después por el delegado de México, miembro de ese Comité, esta frase fue resultado de un compromiso o de un equilibrio logrado a nivel de dicho Comité; por lo tanto, estimamos que debe permanecer tal como aparecía en la versión original. Por lo tanto, apoyamos lo propuesto por Colombia y que fue apoyado luego por otras muchas delegaciones en lo relativo a la eliminación de la última oración de dicho párrafo 3.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair notes that each of ray vice-chairmen has the wisdom to be absent this afternoon. I would be delighted to call either one of them forth and then they could tell me tomorrow whether "as" or "but" won. But they are not here for that purpose, nor did I think the rest of us were.

Abdal Halem AL NOMAN (Iraq) (original language Arabic): In fact, I support the Chairman when he says that we must not go on forever in this discussion on "as" or "but". There can be a difference amongst the various languages because in Arabic there is no "but". Though it just shows that this situation can also apply to certain developed countries. Therefore, I suggest as we go through this Report paragraph by paragraph and adopt the paragraphs we just have certain brief amendments and that is all.

CHAIRMAN: On this point the Chair is surprised to learn that there are no "buts" in parts of the world - it prevents them from being kicked, I guess. On this point the Chair would observe that that is a very important linguistic distinction, because as we are going through this discussion I noticed at one point that when the Chairman of the Drafting Committee was speaking - he was speaking in a different language than my native tongue - he used the word "and". Only a moment before that I said to the Secretary "may be they just ought to say 'and'". Then I noticed he said that. I ask if there was any significance, she said "no because they do not have that word". I do not mean to open up a new front here by suggesting in addition to "as" and "but" there is "and". However, I want to tell you something, there is no-one to sit in my place and I am not going to spend one minute past 5.30 this evening talking about "as" and "but". Anybody who wants to talk about "as" and "but" are going to be talking somewhere else other than at a meeting over which I am presiding. At this point the Chairman of the Drafting Committee has the floor.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): En effet, la discussion s'éternise sur ce point; des propositions ont été faites, et nous-mêmes au Comité de rédaction avons présenté un texte.

Nous avons retenu le mot "mais"; il y a une autre proposition pour le mot "et".

il me semble qu'il convient de mettre tout cela aux voix pour voir s'il y a une majorité pour le "mais" ou le "et", sinon nous risquons de rester sur ce point jusqu'à demain.

Une autre proposition a également été faite sur le point de savoir s'il fallait ou non supprimer la dernière phrase; les discussions ont suffisamment duré et il me semble qu'il faut mettre cela aux voix pour passer au point suivant. Si nous continuons à écouter les commentaires de chacun, nous n'y arriverons jamais. Ce sont des méthodes que nous avons parfois utilisées ici pour avancer et que, ce me semble, vous pouvez appliquer aujourd'hui.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair is torn between trying to be sensitive to countries which have expressed their right to speak and trying to be sensitive to common sense. The Chair would suggest that it might be a prudent way out to simply have a show of hands and those people who want a sentence left as the Drafting Committee drafted it - I would caution you that there are sixteen sovereign nations of the world who put their heads together and wrote this sentence. Now, I would suggest it might be prudent and worthy of this Organization if we simply had an indication of those people who think that the sixteen sovereign nations of the world knew what they were doing and those persons who think Your point of order is well taken, we are not going to press that point. We will continue with the "as" and the "but" until five-thirty. State your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Anwar Mohamed KHALED (Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of) (original language Arabic): We have just learned that you have wide experience in Parliament and I have nothing to add to your information, but I should like to say that with regard to such meetings and conferences there should be a proposal and we should give the opportunity to delegates to object or to support the proposal. So, if we cannot decide on this question, then it should be put to the vote. This proposal has been made by the Chairman of the meeting, so we have to stop talking and put this matter to the vote. So should we keep this as it is put already or not? We have to decide upon this question.

CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken. The Chair apologizes. In the confusion, the Chair did not hear that there was a formal proposal to vote and on that I stand corrected. We were up here in the confusion of things trying to put our heads together and come up with a quick resolution of what seems to many persons here an inordinate discussion of a minor point and in the course of that the Chair never heard that there was a motion to vote and for that I stand corrected. At this point ... Excuse me just a moment. I beg your indulgence for a moment. We have before us a request for a vote. Now the Chair would advise you further that under the rules of this Organization if a single delegate - one, only one - asks for a roll call vote we will have a roll call vote on "as" or "but". It may well be historic. Argentina, you have a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Sinceramente le pido, Señor Presidente, su máximo apoyo para salir de esta situación extraña, de la que todos somos responsables, pero tenemos que confesar que usted, Señor Presidente, no nos ha ayudado a salir.

Mi Delegación no tiene objeciones en que usted nos ponga a votación ahora o como quiera, pero dejando también constancia de que hay una tercera alternativa con respecto al uso o no de las conjunciones, y es la eliminación de esa parte de la frase. Así que si usted lo va a someter a votación, ponga a votación las tres opciones. Yo lo pido formalmente.

CHAIRMAN: I must correct you. The Chair did not move the vote. The Chair was corrected by a representative here. The representative of the People's Democratic Republic of the Yemen took the floor and chastised me for not having heard that there was a motion to vote. The Chair stated that the Chair had not heard that motion, stated that we were discussing things here and I had not heard that motion. I apologized for not having heard that. I stood corrected and I asked the Secretariat to proceed under the orders of this Organization. Now that was in response to - I did not initiate that - someone else made that motion. I did not hear it - it was called to my attention that I had failed to respond to it because I had not heard it and I then responded. So please do not sit there and tell me that the reason we are in for a vote on that is because I thought so. I think it is rather clear that the Chair thinks this is a bit foolish and if you did not understand that I thought the fact that I said that as of 5.30 this evening I will exercise the prerogatives of the Chair, which include the right to adjourn or close debate - and promptly at 5.30 I am not going to preside over a meeting about whether or not "as" or "but" is proper when

we have some forty other paragraphs to decide. Now I would think Argentina that that is not an indication from me that I want to spend this afternoon doing those things, so please do not state that when it is not true. Yemen pressed the point. I had not heard it. I publicly apologized for not having heard it. I said I stood corrected and that there was a motion and I then asked the Secretariat to proceed under the proper order. I cannot follow my personal views on this, because if we were following my personal views we would not be talking about such dumb things for so long. We are now in a voto. I am sorry, the Chair is going to consult with the legal staff of FAO and ask them for some interpretation. You will be recognized if in their view you are correct. Argentina, is your Point of Order on the vote? Yes or no? If it is yes

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Ha hecho usted, Señor Presidente, alusiones a mi intervención que estimo son incorrectas y tengo el derecho a dar mi respuesta. No acepto interpretaciones erróneas, y no se si de mala fe, ya que usted está utilizando la Presidencia.

CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. I am sorry, but the Chair just said that I would defer to the Secretariat's legal staff for an opinion on this. I then turned to the legal representative and asked him. I said my recollection of the rules is that we are now in a vote only, it is in order. I then asked you if your point of order was on the vote and you indicated otherwise. So therefore it is not in order. The vote before the body is this: Do we accept the Drafting Committee language on this sentence? I will ask the Secretary to read the sentence. Do you have a point of order on the vote?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joãoaugusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): yes. I insist that we vote also on the third alternative as proposed by Argentina. That is a point of order on the vote.

CHAIRMAN: That is a point of order on the vote and there can be a separate vote on that. The Chair has upheld the point of order of Brazil which is for a separate vote on that.

The Chair would tell the delegates that under the rules of the Organization - the Chair reminds you those rules were here long before the Chair arrived here - that if any delegate requests a roll call vote there will be one. The vote before the house will be this; Do you accept the language of the Drafting Committee as it relates to this sentence?

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): "This was the case for those developing countries which were affected by heavy debt servicing obligations and unfavourable terms of exchange in their external trade, but also for some developed countries."

CHAIRMAN: Is that clear? Is there any member country that does not understand what the vote is on? We will not come back to this. If any member country does not understand what is being voted on, state so now. Everybody understands what is being voted on. Now does any country wish a roll call

vote? God bless you. We can have it by a show of hands. Those countries which support - which favour - the Drafting Committee language, please so indicate. Before we do this, for clarification the Chair will have to ask that those persons who are members of staff who are otherwise not with a national delegation here, please go to a spot other than the signs of the members countries. Would the member countries who support the draft statement as submitted by the Drafting Committee so indicate by this procedure, which should be unmistakeable. Please stand up with the sign of your country. Please understand the Secretary has to canvas this entire room and you may think she has already counted you, but she may not have. Please make every effort to make your position as clear as possible.

Vote by show of hands

Vote a main levée

Votación a mano alzada

The proposal was adopted by 51 votes to 14 with 11 abstentions.

La proposition est adoptée par 51 voix contre 14 et 11 abstentions.

Por 51 votos contra 14 y 11 abstenciones queda aprobada la propuesta.

Paragraphs 1 - 4 not concluded

Les paragraphes 1- 4 sont en suspens

Los párrafos 1-4 quedan pendientes

CHAIRMAN: You may all go home today knowing that the world will sleep tonight, knowing that this has been resolved. The Chair indicated earlier that at 5.30 we would adjourn, it is now past 5.30. I would urge that tomorrow we will be more productive.

The meeting rose at 17.30 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 30.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.30 horas.

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/14

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

FOURTEENTH MEETING
QUATORZIEME SEANCE
DECIMOCUARTA SESIO

(19 November 1987)

The Fourteenth Meeting was opened at 12.00 hours
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La quatorzième sance est ouverte à 12h00
sous la présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 14 sesión a las 12.00 horas
bajo la presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to apologize for the terrible tardiness of this morning's session. The reason for that is that we had a discussion of the General Committee that each one of the Member Countries of the General Committee felt was productive for the future activities here and that perhaps with the indulgence of the members the time you had to waste this morning waiting might be made up by a more orderly proceeding henceforth. At this point the chair recognizes the Secretary-General of the Conference who will submit to us a report of the General Committee.

Fifth Report of the General Committee
Cinquième Rapport du Bureau
Quinto Informe del Comité General

SECRETARY-GENERAL: The fifth report of the General Committee reads as follows:

"At its fourth meeting on 19 November 1987 the General Committee reviewed the progress of the work of Commission II. Noting with concern that the discussion of the Draft Report on item 13, Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and Medium-Term Objectives, was taking more time than scheduled, the General Committee recommends that this Draft Report be approved en bloc by the Commission without further debate."

J'ajoute que suivant la pratique de la FAO, si la Commission décide de procéder de la sorte cela n'interdit nullement aux Délégations qui auraient des observations à formuler sur telle ou telle partie du projet de rapport, de le faire.

CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the Member Countries? Are there any countries that object?

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)
APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)
DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART I (continued)
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE I (suite)
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE I (continuación)

13. Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and
Medium-Term Objectives (paras 1-43) (continued)
13. Programme de travail et budget 1988-89 et
objectifs à moyen terme (par. 1-43) (suite)
13. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1988-89 y
Objetivos a Plazo Medio (párrs.1-43) (continuación)

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): We would oppose this proposal and seek to take the Report through either paragraph by paragraph or chapter by chapter. The reason for our opposition is that we consider that there are serious omissions in the Draft as it now stands. We also believe from reading the Draft that it is in fact unfinished. We are also very concerned at the situation we find ourselves in where we had a very unproductive discussion yesterday afternoon and we now find ourselves being brought under pressure to agree to something as a result of this. We consider that this is a very dangerous principle to sanction.

As far as the substance is concerned, we are very concerned there is no mention in the Report of the subsidy of US \$11.5 million from the Regular Programme towards the delivery costs of the Trust Funds in a situation where the Organization must look for all the income it can. We are also concerned that there is no mention that countries considered it was unrealistic to propose an increase in the level of the budget when so many countries are in arrears and also there is no mention that many of the countries who indicated, they were in favour of the budget are in arrears. We also think that the treatment of the question of field representation has not been satisfactory and fails both to deal with the outright opposition of many countries to an increase of this but also fails to take up the point made in other documents.

Finally, we are very unhappy with the paragraph as it stands on Trust Funds. As I said, we oppose this motion and we would like to call for a roll call vote on it. If it is passed we do reserve our right to add footnotes to the Report giving the United Kingdom's comments on it and to return to these issues when the Report of this Commission is considered in Plenary.

CHAIRMAN: If we can, the Chair will assure you will come back to your points. We have a couple of other member countries which have sought recognition, we will come back to it. There is on the record a request for a roll call vote. The Rules provide that when one country calls for a roll call vote there must be a roll call vote.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): En tant que membre du Bureau, voudrais faire un appel pressant à tous les délégués; un maximum de bonne volonté et d'esprit de conciliation régnent dans l'enceinte de la Commission II.

Les différents groupes géographiques se sont réunis pour trouver une formule qui est peut-être de compromis, mais qui permettait d'accélérer les travaux, de poursuivre des discussions; et des contacts particulièrement importants ont été pris sur des sujets importants.

Je viens d'écouter avec beaucoup d'attention le représentant du Royaume-Uni; et je me permets de faire un appel pressant à nos collègues britanniques pour leur demander s'ils ne donneraient pas leur accord à une formule d'adoption en bloc avec, éventuellement, le dépôt d'une note explicative concernant leur position; cela permettrait de mener nos travaux à bonne fin ce matin et à la Commission II de poursuivre ses activités. Est-ce que nos amis britanniques ne pourraient pas, en annexe du rapport, déposer une note reflétant le point de vue de leur pays? En effet, il y a un large consensus, en tous cas du groupe Europe pour une adoption en bloc du rapport.

Tous les rapports, vous le savez mieux que personne, Monsieur le Président, sont imparfaits; on peut en discuter à l'infini. Nous avons eu une discussion; il nous faut accélérer le rythme de nos travaux dans le cadre de cette Conférence et je fais un appel pressant pour qu'il y ait une véritable volonté de conciliation permettant de réunir les différents points de vue.

Et si un seul pays ne marque pas son accord, peut-être pourrait-il accepter la formule d'une note additionnelle au rapport.

Carlos DI MOTTOI-Á BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr. Presidente, en nombre del Grupo Latinoamericano apoyo la propuesta del Secretario General, con el entendimiento de que antes de pasar a la votación termine el examen del párrafo 3, que ayer dejó suspendido. Al terminarse esto, pienso que se podría proceder a una votación sobre lo que queda del Informe, en bloque.

Las delegaciones que tienen reservas, como es de costumbre en la FAO podrían presentar estas reservas sin ninguna discusión o debate al respecto, después de la votación.

Hago un llamado para que esta propuesta sea aceptada, porque eso nos ayudaría a proceder más brevemente en nuestro trabajo. El tiempo ya está bastante avanzado.

CHAIRMAN: We will try to complete the list of speakers who requested attention, before coming back for clarification. Costa Rica, for your thought in the meantime, as we come back to you, the motion put was different from how you stated it and we will have to come back and ask you to give some thought as to whether you are putting an amendment to the motion as put.

Philippe PIOTET (France): La France a participé avec d'autres pays aux travaux du Comité de Rédaction. Nous avons beaucoup travaillé sur ce rapport, qui, bien sûr, n'est pas parfait; mais nous avons le sentiment qu'il représente l'équilibre que l'on pouvait souhaiter entre les points de vue des différents pays.

Ainsi donc, je m'associe à l'appel lancé par mon collègue l'Ambassadeur de Belgique pour que ce rapport soit adopté en bloc; il constitue un ensemble, et d'autres paragraphes que le paragraphe 3 - je pense au paragraphe 22 - contiennent des dispositions qui apportent un équilibre entre les positions des différents pays.

Si on considère ce rapport dans son ensemble, et compte tenu du travail du Comité de rédaction, il me semble qu'il pourrait être accepté en l'état.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): As Chairman of the Asia Group I would indicate that the Asia Group agrees to adopt the Report en bloc. As you indicated before we broke up this morning, there had been regional consultations, and I was wondering whether a roll call would be necessary if the Regional Chairmen would indicate to you that there is indeed agreement to adopt the Report en bloc. That does not prevent you, however, from accepting the reservations of the few countries that would not be in full agreement.

CHAIRMAN: Since you put a question to the Chair I will answer it at this time. If there was that kind of consensus that could be done but the Rules provide that if a member requests a roll call vote it must be granted. It is not within the power of the Chair to decide times in which it agrees or disagrees with a request from a member country for a roll call vote. That is the right of every sovereign country in this body. The Chair cannot in any way overturn that or modify it.

George Henry MUSCROVE (Canada): As a member of the Drafting Committee are loathe to intervene in the debate on this particular Draft and do have sympathy for the proposal that has been put that it be adopted en bloc. Our country participated in the Drafting Group and can agree with the observations that were made by our colleague from France, that there was a full discussion, in a large part the Report reflects accurately that discussion. However, some members may not be aware, members of the Commission here, that in fact this Draft was not completed in the Drafting Committee and I do not wish to pre-empt any explanation that might be given by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee but I would draw attention to members that at least with respect to paragraph 8, paragraphs 41, 42 and 43, there was not time to complete the Committee's deliberations on those paragraphs and it was agreed that they in fact would be completed, consideration of those paragraphs would be completed in the Commission itself. That being the case we do not have a complete Draft in front of us that has been given full treatment by the Drafting Committee but there are some incomplete portions that have not been given full complete consideration. Having said that, as so often happens in a Draft, there are obviously omissions. Even when one participates in a Drafting Committee it is not possible to get everything that one would wish into the draft but with respect to those paragraphs, they need special treatment, apart from en bloc adoptions.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): The Netherlands was also a Member of the Drafting Committee and to our reconciliation the Chairman of the Drafting Group concluded at the end of the drafting session to continue discussions on these paragraphs which have not been discussed completely, so we support the opinion of the Canadian delegate just expressed to the extent that the paragraphs which should be completed will be discussed before the Report can be adopted.

V.K. SIBAL (India): We are exploring the art of the possible. We lost a lot of time yesterday and some of it perhaps could have been saved. We are totally in sympathy to adopt this en bloc. It is not a perfect Report and I am sure that if the debate were thrown open a lot of countries would have a lot of things to say but still, the Drafting Committee has worked hard on it and they have balanced it and we would like to respect their judgement. While saying so we would like to say in paragraph 8 there is a square bracket and possibly there is a need for this to be taken separately also.

S. RAJASEKAR (New Zealand): As a member of the General Committee and having discussed the proposals at hand within the Region our preference would be to see the Draft Report discussed on a chapter by chapter basis to resolve any particular differences. But if there is a general consensus for adoption of the Report en bloc our region would be prepared to go along with that consensus.

Bashir EL Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Despite the fact that we have some difficulty in accepting some of the paragraphs in the Draft Report the members of the Near East Region whom I have the honour of representing, after having consulted among themselves and in a spirit of constructive cooperation have decided to accept the proposal put before the Committee, namely to accept the Report en bloc.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): Norway was a member of the drafting group and therefore will stand behind the text that the drafting group which have already been mentioned. In addition, there is another sentence. I stand behind the text of the drafting group. I also think that delegations who have substantive comments to make should have the chance to have those discussed. At the same time I am very conscious of the need to speed up the adoption of the report. Therefore, as we have to consider those paragraphs anyway I do not see how we can adopt en bloc paragraphs that have not been discussed. Therefore, could we not adopt the rest of the report en bloc excluding the paragraphs that were not discussed, that were in square brackets or those to which any delegation has indicated there should be substantive amendment? Listening to the distinguished representative from the United Kingdom it did not seem to me that his proposals concern too many paragraphs. I think it would be only a small number of paragraphs which would be left for adoption en bloc and we could still have a fairly good chance of getting the report passed through today.

Vaclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): My delegation fully shares the view, and supports the proposal of the distinguished delegate from Costa Rica because the last sentence in paragraph 3 is absolutely unacceptable to my country.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): As a member of the General Committee I support the general proposition for adopting the programme en bloc. I said at the meeting I was concerned about paragraphs that had not been discussed before, and the substantive concerns that were expressed by my delegation and others. I share completely the thoughts presented by the delegate of Norway as a means of getting put of this dilemma. Perhaps as a compromise, as there is no consensus of approval en bloc, we could approve those paragraphs and chapters with which there are no substantive problems and then proceed to deal rapidly with those to which there are significant additions or suggestions.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): Le Cap-Vert a assisté ce matin à la réunion du Bureau et a ensuite consulté le groupe africain. Nous nous rallions à la proposition faite par l'Ambassadeur du Costa Rica.

CHAIRMAN: That is the end of the list of countries which have indicated a preference to speak. In a spirit of trying to get things moving the Chair would like to exercise its prerogative under the rules which includes occasionally suggesting a possible compromise. It would observe that in the discussions some countries have mentioned the report is not complete. The Chair would suggest that maybe what we could do to get out of this situation would be to have the motion to adopt en bloc all paragraphs except for the four which have not been completed. Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that they are paras. 8, 41, 42 and 43. We are literally four minutes past our deadline today,

we have a few minutes more to go, not too many. The Chair would suggest in the interest of recovering lost ground and achieving some results, that we adopt the report in toto as it was agreed to by the Drafting Committee. That would mean it would be the adoption of all paragraphs except paragraphs 8, 41, 42 and 43. The Chair would further suggest that there would be an understanding as part of that resolution that any country which wishes to express its views on any other paragraph would be able to have its remarks delivered and included in the verbatim records. The Chairman of the Drafting Committee would like to make a comment at this point.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Je voudrais apporter un rectificatif à ce que vous venez de dire - et en cela vous n'êtes pas fautif s'il s'agit de ce qu'ont dit certains Membres du Comité de Rédaction.

Pour être clair, au sujet du paragraphe 8, seule la dernière phrase est concernée, et il s'agit de savoir si on la laisse ou si on la met ailleurs. Je crois que c'était le seul problème concernant le paragraphe 8.

Ensuite, les paragraphes qui n'ont pas été examinés par le Comité de Rédaction sont les paragraphes 41 et 43. Le paragraphe 42 a été adopté.

En tant que Président du Comité de Rédaction, je pensais pour ma part que compte tenu des débats d'hier, nous avions déjà commencé par mettre aux voix une partie de ce qui a constitué le conflit d'hier. Et je croyais qu'il était entendu qu'on devait également mettre la dernière phrase aux voix et dire si on était pour ou contre le maintien de cette phrase.

Je pense pour ce qui me concerne qu'il convient d'apporter un règlement définitif au paragraphe 3, notamment pour sa dernière phrase, et de faire des observations au niveau des paragraphes 41 et 43 s'il y en a.

Je crois qu'il convient effectivement de laisser les gens s'exprimer; et j'avais même autorisé les Membres du Comité de Rédaction à pouvoir intervenir pour ce qui concerne les paragraphes 41 et 43.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would respond by trying to make this situation more flexible and smooth matters along. I mentioned the paragraphs as I wrote them down when one Member Country named them. When I phrased that I suggested that we amend it so that we could adopt the work of the Drafting Committee as it was completed - you are correct with regard to paragraph 8, it was exactly as you said it, all was completed but one sentence. Let me make it clear that the Chair was proposing that we adopt entirely what the Drafting Committee had agreed to and that those areas which the Drafting Committee did not agree to, or had not finished its work on, we would continue to take up. It would mean exactly as you stated it on paragraph 8. The Chair would caution that the General Committee in its meeting this morning did not recommend what you have just said. You were not there so you would not be aware of that. What was put before the body as their suggestion was to adopt en bloc not to go back and resurrect some of yesterday's discussions and proceed on them. The Chair would say that that could well lead to a situation which will be right back to where we were yesterday, which is what we are trying to avoid.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr. Presidente, sin duda el distinguido Embajador de Argelia tuvo razón cuando hizo alguna referencia a la situación difícil en que se puede encontrar no sólo usted, sino cualquier presidente cuando uno debe ser juez y parte. Por eso nos extraña que usted haya propuesto incluir entre los párrafos que van a adoptarse en bloque, el párrafo 3 después de que dos representantes de regiones más Checoslovaquia han dicho que ese párrafo 3 no debe ser incluido en la adopción en bloque.

No queremos prolongar la discusión, pero recordamos que usted ayer había dicho que los vicepresidentes estaban ausentes. De manera muy gentil y atenta me permito informarle que en el sitio de Libia está uno de los vicepresidentes, el Embajador Bashir Said. Usted ha hablado mucho, debe estar cansado, ha trabajado intensamente, podríamos desearle felices navidades y volverle a ver a principios de 1988.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair is glad that the representative of Colombia is feeling better today, and assures him that the Chair always feels good and up to it. I appreciate your "Merry Christinas" and hope, that you do not repeat it here while we are still working at Christmas. The Chair was trying to point out that the Chair came from a meeting in which a number of member Countries participated and we have a report of that General Committee. The decision taken there was that the General Committee should recommend that this draft report be reported en bloc by the Commission without further delay. You are right that the Chair yesterday stated some personal disagreement with the phrasing of that, I am trying to follow what the General Committee has recommended in suggesting a way which would address the concerns of those countries which seem to agree with all of it except the parts which have not been agreed to.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Sr. Presidente, la delegación de Argentina cree que la situación en este momento es muy clara. Tenemos una propuesta del Comité General que fue leída por el Sr. Savary y que fue contestada por el Reino Unido. Tenemos una enmienda a dicha propuesta efectuada por el Embajador de Costa Rica y que fue apoyada por el Embajador de Cabo Verde y por el Representante de Checoslovaquia. Esta es la situación. Yo creo que debemos analizar las propuestas en el orden en que fueron planteadas y salir de este debate que no nos va a llevar a ningún lado.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair agrees with you, but the Chair made clear we would come back to that, and if you were listening you would have heard the Chair state to the representative of Costa Rica that the Chair interpreted it precisely as you have just stated it, that that would be a motion. It then indicated we would try to proceed so we could give everybody the opportunity to speak on this issue which concerns us all, and then come back to an orderly resolution of it which, you are correct, will include voting on the amendments first - if there was a demand for a vote on them.

Rainer PRESTIEN (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): In regard to the adoption of this report on the Programme of Work and Budget - I do not want to prolong the discussion - I agree that we should adopt the proposal which was suggested by the General Committee of the Conference. However, in Report of Commission II we notice at paragraph 37 there is a representation of facts which is out of place in any report on item 13. It is the second sentence which refers to the consolidation of the food security activities as undertaken by the Secretariat of the FAO.

It is surely under item 14 that we mentioned this, and not under item 13 which is the subject of this Report and therefore we would prefer the second sentence of paragraph 37 be struck out of this Report because it is out of place.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): We would like to help you and the Secretariat here in the difficulties that we seem to be in. As is often the case we were particularly struck by the sound common sense which we heard coming from the distinguished delegate of Norway and also we could understand why Costa Rica and Czechoslovakia had some difficulties with a particular part of the text. We do not have these difficulties but we would be the first country to stand up for their right to see an amendment. In these circumstances, as I understand it we have a motion before us which has been

amended - an amendment proposed by Costa Rica - to the effect that paragraph 3 should be discussed and then the Report taken *en bloc*. Following the Norwegian suggestion and listening to our German colleagues I would like to suggest that we amend this to make it paragraphs 3, 8, new paragraph 24 bis, 26, 28, 37, 42 and 43. This would certainly take account of our problems and I hope it will speed the discussion.

CHAIRMAN: We have the United Kingdom which has exercised its right to rephrase its own amendment. Let us state for the purpose of clarity that the unfolding of the debate is!s was represented a couple of moments ago by Argentina, there was a motionon that, but further than that there was also aneed for clarification on the points made by Canada, joined in by the Netherlands as to whether that was a motion to exclude those enumerated paragraphs or not. In addition to that, we just had a view expressed by the Federal Republic of Germany on something that it would prefer to be able to discuss here. We then had the United Kingdom alter its motion to provide that it include all of those paragraphs. We now finda difficult parliamentary item in that the motion advanced by Costa Rica has been concurred in by the United Kingdom so they have accepted your alteration of their motion. The United Kingdom has accepted and has incorporated

James AITKENited Kingdom): Could I perhaps make my proposals clearer for the benefit of the meeting? What the United Kingdom proposed was a modification to the proposal made by Costa Rica. If you recall, Costa Rica proposed that there should be an amendment which would permit discussion of paragraph 3. We proposed an amendment which would permit discussion of other paragraphs which I named

CHAIRMAN: That is clear. We have an amendment. We have a resolution. We have an amendment and we have an amendment to the amendment. It is perfectly normal and in the order of business the rules provide that you must vote in what is reverse order. You must vote first on the amendment to the amendment. The first vote - if we had a vote - would be on the amendment to the Costa Rican amendment. Then you could have possibly - you may or may not have - a vote on the Costa Rican amendment.

José Ramón LOPEZ-RTTLLO ROMANO (México): Moción de orden en el siguiente sentido: que someta a votación propuesta por Costa Rica y que para hacerlo se asista uted del Asesor Legal.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your suggestion Mexico, but the facts are that you have an amendment to an amendment and you must vote in that order. Those are the rules. I cannot change that.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I support the proposal raised by the Mexican delegation: I think we should vote first on the Costa Rican motion.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair has had two suggestions - those are not points of order, those are suggestions - and the suggestions are that the Chair not follow the Chair now is going to yield to the Legal Counsel. The Chair is going to ask the Legal Counsel to rule on the order of voting on what is now before us.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): You have just said that the proposal of the United Kingdom should be put to the vote first, but in fact in time the Costa Rican proposal pre-dated the amendment of the United Kingdom which is why I think that the Costa Rican proposal should in fact pass first in voting order because that was the one that was raised first in time.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair notes your opinion. The Chair recognizes the Legal Counsel. Please state the order and the rules.

LEGAL COUNSEL: The basic proposal was to adopt all the Draft Report en bloc. To that an amendment was proposed by Costa Rica and supported by Czechoslovakia. A further amendment was proposed by the United Kingdom. Now the procedure is that you vote on the amendment which is furthest removed from the original proposal. This is quite clearly the United Kingdom's amendment. If the United Kingdom's proposal is not upheld, then you will proceed to vote on the Costa Rican one. And of course, in this particular case rejection of the United Kingdom proposal does not affect at all the proposal made by Costa Rica, since both delegations made their reservation on paragraph 3. So I think the orderly way of proceeding is: you vote first on the most remote proposal as compared with the original proposal and then you work back and if both the amendments are defeated you go back to the original proposal which was to approve the draft report en bloc, with the understanding which was explained by the Secretary-General that those governments who had statements to make could make them after the vote.

CHAIRMAN: Isn't that what the Chair said? We now move a vote.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom would like to call for a roll-call vote on both this amendment - our amendment - and on the Costa Rican amendment. That is in addition to our call for a roll-call vote on the original motion.

CHAIRMAN: There will be a roll-call vote on the United Kingdom's amendment to the Costa Rican amendment. That is the first order of business. The Chair must warn you that the Secretary has said that the interpreters will be here for five more minutes. We beg your indulgence while the Chair asks the Secretariat what they normally do under such circumstances. We shall now proceed with the vote on the United Kingdom's amendment to the Costa Rican amendment. United Kingdom, so that everyone clearly understands what is being voted on, please state your amendment. The Chair would caution we are not into another discussion of the amendment. This is simply a repetition statement of it for the purpose of clarity. State your amendment. Following your statement of your amendment the body will vote.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom proposal was that the motion of Costa Rica - the amendment proposed by Costa Rica - should be amended so as to read: "That in addition to paragraph 3, paragraph 8, new paragraph 24 b, paragraph 26, 28, 37, 42 and 43 should also be considered."

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will now proceed with organizing the roll-call vote which has been requested and which under the rules must be provided.

Vote
Votation
Votación

Session of the Conference ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT
Session de la Conférence APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN
Período de sesiones de la Conferencia VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Vote on
Vote sur
..... Votación para UK AMENDMENT

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan		X			Cambodia			X		Pakistan		X		
Albania			X		Germany (Fed. Rep. of)			X		Panama		X		
Algeria		X			Ghana		X			Papua New Guinea			X	
Angola		X			Greece		X			Peru			X	
Antigua and Barbuda			X		Grenada		X			Philippines		X		
Argentina		X			Guatemala			X		Poland		X		
Australia			X		Guinea		X			Portugal			X	
Austria		X			Guinea-Bissau		X			Qatar			X	
Bahamas			X		Guyana		X			Rwanda		X		
Bahrain		X			Haiti			X		St. Christopher & Nevis			X	
Bangladesh		X			Honduras		X			St. Lucia			X	
Barbados		X			Hungary		X			St. Vincent & the Grenadines			X	
Belgium		X			Iceland			X		Samoa		X		
Belize			X		India		X			Sao Tome and Principe			X	
Benin			X		Indonesia		X			Saudi Arabia		X		
Bhutan			X		Iran (Islamic Rep. of)		X			Senegal			X	
Bolivia			X		Iraq		X			Seychelles			X	
Botswana		X			Ireland		X			Sierra Leone		X		
Brazil		X			Israel		X			Solomon Islands			X	
Bulgaria			X		Italy		X			Somalia			X	
Burkina Faso		X			Jamaica			X		Spain		X		
Burma			X		Japan		X			Sri Lanka		X		
Burundi		X			Jordan		X			Sudan		X		
Cameroon		X			Kenya		X			Suriname			X	
Canada		X			Korea (Rep. of)		X			Swaziland		X		
Cape Verde		X			Kuwait		X			Sweden		X		
Central African Rep.			X		Laos			X		Switzerland		X		
Chad			X		Lebanon		X			Syria		X		
Chile		X			Lesotho		X			Tanzania		X		
China		X			Liberia		X			Thailand		X		
Colombia		X			Libya		X			Togo			X	
Comoros			X		Luxembourg			X		Tonga			X	
Congo		X			Madagascar		X			Trinidad and Tobago		X		
Cook Islands			X		Malawi			X		Tunisia		X		
Costa Rica		X			Malaysia		X			Turkey		X		
Côte d'Ivoire		X			Maldives			X		Uganda			X	
Cuba		X			Mali		X			United Arab Emirates			X	
Cyprus		X			Malta			X		United Kingdom		X		
Czechoslovakia		X			Mauritania		X			U.S.A.		X		
					Mauritius			X		Uruguay			X	
D.P. Rep. of Korea		X			Mexico		X			Vanuatu			X	
Denmark		X			Mongolia			X		Venezuela		X		
Djibouti			X		Morocco		X			Viet Nam		X		
Dominica		X			Mozambique			X		Yemen Arab Republic			X	
Dominican Rep.			X		Namibia			X		Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)		X		
Ecuador		X			Nepal		X			Yugoslavia		X		
Egypt		X			Netherlands		X			Zaire		X		
El Salvador		X			New Zealand		X			Zambia		X		
Equatorial Guinea			X		Nicaragua		X			Zimbabwe			X	
Ethiopia		X			Niger		X							
Fiji			X		Nigeria		X							
Finland		X			Norway		X							
France		X			Oman			X						
Gabon		X												
	3	32	1	17		3	34	1	15		5	24	1	19



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

Vote on
Vote sur
.....Votación para UK AMENDMENT
.....

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	11
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	90
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	3
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	51

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	101
--	-----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	51
--	----

REJECTED
REPOUSSEE
RECHAZADA

Date ..19.11.87..... Elections Officer B. Linley.....
Fecha Fonctionnaire électoral.....
El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) GRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

CHAIRMAN: The United Kingdom amendment to the Costa Rica amendment has been rejected.

We now proceed to the next order of business, which is the amendment of Costa Rica. At this point the Chair asks - this is not for discussion, we have already gone through that - that prior to the vote the country making the motion, Costa Rica, now state the motion.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Mi enmienda se basa en el hecho de que ayer hemos aceptado sólo una parte del párrafo 3. Quedó sin discutir la última frase porque usted, muy apuradamente, cerró la Sesión. A estas alturas, yo creo que deberíamos discutir la última frase, si es necesario someterla a votación y, en lo sucesivo estoy de acuerdo en que se proceda como ha propuesto el Sr. Savary. Mi propuesta es de que la aprobación en bloque del Informe no incluya la última frase del párrafo 3. La considero extremadamente importante, y creo que deberíamos terminar un trabajo iniciado ayer, y que fue, contra la costumbre, suspendido por razones de horario o no sé cuáles otras razones.

CHAIRMAN: For a point of information, Costa Rica, that would have been the first order of business to discuss today. The Chair did not adjourn discussion on that next sentence. We are in a vote. A point of order on the vote is in order. A point of order on other than the vote is not in order.

V.K. SIBAL (India): I think we could save some time if we have had a show of hands at this stage because when we asked for a roll call, this is the previous amendment.

CHAIRMAN: You are mistaken. The United Kingdom very clearly stated that it requested a roll call vote on this. That is in the verbatim report. That is a clear statement. The Rules provide that there must be a roll call vote when any member country requests it.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

George Henry MUSGKOV (Canada): I have both a point of order and seeking a point of clarification. I would be pleased for your ruling as to whether it is in fact a point of order before I proceed.

With respect to the Rules, when a motion is put and a division is called the motion may have two speakers in favour and two speakers may speak against the motion. If that is so, I should seek permission from the Chair to speak against the motion that has been put.

Secondly, I seek a point of clarification. The clarification that I seek is this, that at one stage I had thought that the amendment being put forward by the delegate of Costa Rica was to the Chair's suggestion that the report be adopted en bloc with the exception of those portions of the report that have not been considered in the Drafting Committee. I see heads shaking at the table. There were indeed three speakers who spoke on the fact that there were portions of the report not considered and I thought I heard the Chair sum up that the rest of the report might be considered for approval en bloc with the exception of those sections. What happened to that particular motion? Should the present motion of Costa Rica be adopted, do we then only have the right to consider paragraph 3? That is the point of clarification.

I shall speak to the point of order, Mr Chairman, subject to your approval.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair will rule on that. As you will have observed, the Chair is very careful in amendments in requiring that the person making the amendment state the amendment. The Chair has never stated an amendment for the body to vote on. Earlier the Chair made an informal flexible suggestion on what it thought might be a way out, but it was called to our attention by Argentina, quite correctly, that under the Rules that we had developing an order of votes, and their interpretation of the Rules which they asked to be enforced at that time is correct. Then the United Kingdom subsequent to that made an amendment to the amendment. We then had suggestions that, we should not do that and the Legal Counsel confirmed that the Chairman's interpretation of the Rules was correct. We then proceeded to the Costa Rica amendment. The United Kingdom amendment was rejected. The next order of business must then be to proceed to Costa Rica's amendment which is what they were amending. The Chair asked the delegate of Costa Rica to state its amendment. The delegate of Costa Rica has not stated it as you interpret it. You cannot vote on what you think he meant to say: you must vote on what he said. What he said was that Costa Rica feels that we ought to adopt the report in toto with the exception of the portion of paragraph 3 that we did not reach in our discussion yesterday.

If Canada's question is, does that mean that if that motion carries this body will concur in the unfinished work of those enumerated paragraphs, the answer is yes. It would mean that you are giving approval to work which has not been completed. That is a correct interpretation. He did not exclude anything other than that.

George Henry MUSCROVE (Canada): Thank you for the point of clarification, Mr Chairman have I your on to proceed now on the point of order?

CHAIRMAN: As I understand your point of order, and that the Chair had said that the discussion had taken place and you are pressing that under the Rules you can have a division of two for and two against, the Rules are as you state them. You are correct. The Chair backs off from its attempt to have a rapid vote on this, and since that point of order is pressed, Canada has the right to speak for or against and has the floor and then the Rules provide if you speak for there can be but one other country that can be recognized for the purpose of speaking for. If you speak against there be but one other country that can be recognized for the purpose of speaking against; and there can be two on the other side. That is what the rules say. Let us finish with Canada's point of order first. Does Canada wish to do this?

V.K. SIBAL (India): We would be grateful if you could tell us which rule is being quoted for supporting this proposition. We are trying to find it. We are not able to find it.

LEGAL COUNSEL: Rule XII-18 provides that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately if a delegate or representative requests such division, provided that if objection is made the question of division shall be decided upon by the Conference or the Council. In addition to the delegate or representative requesting the division, two delegates or two representatives may speak for and two against the motion for division. The motion for division has been clearly accepted by this Commission. That is why you have already reached the point at which you were about to proceed to a vote. From a purely practical point of view and on a strict interpretation of the Rule the delegates who wanted to speak against should have spoken immediately after Costa Rica. Costa Rica was supported by Czechoslovakia and subsequently you went on to consider the sub-amendment that has now been voted on. So to apply the Rule strictly Canada is perhaps speaking too late in the proceedings and should have spoken immediately after the original proposal was made.

George Henry MUSGROVE (Canada): I shall propose to ignore the last few "sentences that have been said and address myself to the motion put forward by the delegate of Costa Rica. Do I have the floor, Mr Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: India has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

V.K. SIBAL (India): When we asked the question earlier it was precisely because we felt that there was no rule under which this intervention could be made now. The intervention is only possible on • the subject of voting the parts separately, and we are long past that stage. So I think the advice of the Legal Counsel is absolutely clear and we would like you now to confirm that the situation is what the Legal Counsel has stated.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair is going to take a recess of five minutes and we will consult with the Legal Counsel.

The meeting was suspended from 13.30 to 13.35 hours

La séance est suspendue de 13 h 30 à 13 h 35

Se suspende la sesión de las 13.30 a las 13.35 horas

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry for the recess. We have what is called in some parts of the world 'a sticky wicket', because the Chair could take a very strict interpretation and sustain India. The Chair has been in a long meeting this morning talking with other members about trying to be perhaps a little more flexible. We are trying to do that. The Chair would point out that it has recognized just recently two countries on Points of Order and permitted them to speak on their Point of Order knowing full well that their Point of Order was not remotely a Point of Order and could be ruled out of order because it was not a Point of Order but we let it go by. Canada may have been trying to get the Chair's attention earlier and wasn't seen at that point but on consultation with the Legal staff and different interpretations up here the Chair and the delegate of India have discussed that India would be willing to withdraw its objection if Canada would make a brief, I believe he underscored the word 'brief', statement and then we would proceed to Costa Rica being re-recognized for the purpose of stating its motion so that it will be fresh in your minds immediately before the vote. Thank you India. Canada, you have the floor for the purpose of making a very brief statement.

George Henry MUSCROVE (Canada): As far as I was concerned I was the first delegate recognized from the floor following the clear statement of motion put forward by the delegate of Costa Rica. It was on those grounds that I sought leave to speak against this motion, as one of the two speakers allowed to do so under the Rules.

I would like through you, Mr Chairman, to assure the delegate of Costa Rica that I have no argument in terms of substance with the last sentence of paragraph 3 and I would really welcome him his opportunity to put his comments on that statement. We carry no brief for that particular sentence, nor for that paragraph and indeed, it could have the justice of some better drafting. However, I should like, Mr Chairman, through you, to appeal to him to withdraw his motion and for the following reasons, that what he is seeking is his right to comment on a particular portion of this Report whilst suggesting that all others be deprived from their right to do so. If each of us were to

demand and insist on our right to comment on what is in this Report with which we do not agree then we would be very much back in the situation we have had yesterday. I think, if I could appeal, to his democratic sense, and perhaps to the sense of those who support his motion, it is in effect depriving delegates here, including our own delegation, from completing our comments on certain portions of this Report that have not otherwise been discussed. It also deprives the right of members of this Commission who were not participants in the Drafting Committee from making their comments on particular paragraphs.

Our delegation supports the Draft that has been considered by the Drafting Committee in line with the regular rules. We also support the suggestion put forward by the General Committee through the Secretary-General to adopt those portions of the Report en bloc by having given due consideration. However, the motion that is in front of us for vote, I think is tantamount to accepting en bloc everything, except that portion which the delegate of Costa Rica insists in addressing. I should therefore like to speak against this motion and to appeal to that delegate to withdraw it.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Canada. Canada, the reason there is what I call a 'sticky wicket' is because you would normally be correct, you were the first speaker to be recognized after the statement of it. However, the Chair clearly recalls stating earlier as we were going through the procedure that it interpreted Costa Rica's statement as a motion at that time. Now, you may not have heard that and then we laid out the more informal order for the procedure, we said we would proceed with all the speakers and then come back and take them up in order but the Chair clearly identified Costa Rica as an amendment at that time.

Now, the Chair would also take, under advice, your remarks to intervene with Costa Rica and point out that the Costa Rica amendment as stated at that time is somewhat different from the Costa Rica amendment now stated most recently and for clarification the Chair would ask that before we commence a vote that Costa Rica may be clear. Do you wish to close everything except the portion of paragraph 3 which was not reached yesterday or do you wish to do that, plus those other items that the Drafting Committee did not complete its work on with the understanding that all countries who wish to address their concerns about any point have the right to do so by submitting the document that would be included in the Verbatim? I think it would facilitate the operations here if Costa Rica would, very carefully now, state its motion, not in the form of an explanation or why you came to want that motion, but rather state what the motion is.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): No puedo retirar mi moción, sin embargo no pido la votación nominal sino la votación por levantamiento de mano; entonces la resolución puede ser tomada durante los próximos tres minutos. Mi moción se refiere a un punto de fondo, tal vez el punto más importante de este documento y no puedo retirar la moción.

CHAIRMAN: Costa Rica, please could you state your motion. The Chair well recognizes that you did not request a roll call vote and that is true and accurate. However, another country did and the Rules say if any country requests a roll call vote, there must be a roll call vote, but before we proceed to that we must have your amendment clear and I think the members need to know what they are voting on. Could you please state the wording of your resolution? Please state what it says.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): El texto exacto de mi moción es que se termine el examen del párrafo 3 que ayer ha sido dejado sin terminar y por lo tanto que haya debate sobre la última frase del párrafo 3. Por lo demás, estoy de acuerdo con su propuesta, Sr. Presidente.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for the clarification. That point of clarification is very important because had we proceeded to vote otherwise the Chair would have had to rule that the body had voted . not to take up the other paragraphs, but you have made it very clear. The Chair will recognize your Point of Order in order but the Chair also believes that Czechoslovakia seconded your motion, Czechoslovakia is it your understanding that you seconded that motion? Could you so indicate.

Vaclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

John CLISTRUP (Denmark): My Point of Order is that I am totally confused on what we are going to vote on because as I have got the interpretation of Costa Rica, I have had three different versions. The last one we had now was not the one we had before and the original one was the third variation.

CHAIRMAN: Your Point of Order is well taken and the situation is as exactly as you said it and that is why we have, before the vote, we have the motion stated. You are voting on the motion that they just stated. Because of the request of the United Kingdom for a roll call vote we will now proceed on the roll call vote. Costa Rica, if you have a Point of Order what is your point?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DIMOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): sr.Voy a leer mi propuesta en inglésy así tal vez no haya confusión: adopt the whole report, except the last sentence of paragraph 3.

CHAIRMAN: Let us try to get some work done. The Chair would like to be of assistance, if we vote on that language we have total confusion. I will attempt, on behalf of all Member Countries, to state what we believe has developed from your Resolution. Our understanding is that Costa Rica concurs with the recommendation of the General Committee to adopt the report in toto, except that Costa Rica feels that the items in paragraph that were not discussed at yesterday's proceedings would be open for discussion. I am sorry, the last sentence of paragraph 3 is the part that was not discussed. Let me start again and please do not interrupt until I finish. Let us try to make it clear. From what has been said at various points in the discussion the Chair interprets Costa Rica's resolution as follows - that Costa Rica moves: that this body hereby agree to the proposal of the General Committee that the report of the Drafting Committee be adopted by this Commission in toto, except however that the final sentence of paragraph 3 shall remain open for discussion before this Commission. Furthermore, that the paragraphs on which the Drafting Committee has not completed its work shall be open to discussion and that Member Countries... Please have order.

The previous time that the representative of Costa Rica took the floor he said – I cannot quote him exactly – “and your recommendations”. He used that phrase. It will be in the verbatim. That is why there was wide discussion this morning on whether or not we concur with the paragraphs that have not been completed. As we now seem to be going back once again to saying that you would concur with Paragraphs that have not been completed, that is a departure from what you stated earlier. Furthermore, we need a clarification on the point concerning whether or not countries which have not had the Opportunity to speak on matters on which they might wish to speak, should have the opportunity to Express their thoughts on any item in the verbatim. That was something which countries spoke about. Costa Rica, the Chair has tried to clarify that and took your previous remarks to include that, It Is not my role to say what is in your motion, but simply to observe that your motion has gone through four different forms and it is somewhat unclear. The Chair has to now ask Costa Rica to please take five minutes to write out your resolution and read it. We will then take up a vote on it. Until you do that we will recess – five minutes.

The meeting was suspended from 13.50 to 14.15 hours

La seance est suspendue de 13 h 50 à 14 h 15

Se suspende la sesión de las 3.50 a las 14.15 horas

CHAIRMAN: We will try to proceed. Costa Rica do you seek the attention of the Chair?

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr Sr. Presidente, después de consultar, me ha convencido de que la mejor contribución al consenso es el retiro de mi moción.

Los países latinoamericanos y del Caribe nos limitaremos a formular una breve y muy general reserva a pie de página sobre el párrafo 3. Nada más, Sr. Presidente.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Chair believes that, those countries which have such footnotes will be granted them, there being no objection to the footnotes being put into the place where requested. Costa Rica, the Chair would like to thank you for taking the time and consulting with friends and advisers so as to reach a solution. We will now proceed with the main motion. As the Chair interprets it, what is wished to be done is that we hereby concur in the recommendation of the General Committee and that the Draft Report be approved en bloc without further debate, that member countries which wish to state their points on any item be permitted to do so and they will be inserted into the Verbatim Record at the appropriate spot; and that the interpretation of the phrase "the Draft Report" is the Draft Report work as completed. There is no misinterpretation that the Body is concurring in conclusions where conclusions have not yet been made.

If I might have the indulgence of the United Kingdom for a moment, let me try to phrase this clearly; Does the Body agree that this Commission hereby adopts the completed work of the Draft Committee; that any member country which has a point to make on paragraphs or points will be entitled to do so by submitting a record to the Secretary for insertion into the Verbatim at the appropriate spot, as determined by the Secretary?

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): On a point of clarification on what you have said, our position was that we requested an opportunity for Costa Rica to put footnotes into the actual Report of the Commission and not just the Verbatim Record of the debate. Perhaps you could confirm that is correct. When you refer to Verbatim we always take it as the Verbatim Record of our debates.

CHAIRMAN: I believe I was careful to phrase my remarks to indicate that those who wished to put in footnotes were entitled to do so as they requested. Is that motion clearly understood? I gather from the general sense of relief here that we have a consensus on that. Does any country object ?

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): On another point of clarification, which part of the work was not completed? In other words, which part of the work have we yet to complete in this Commission?

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would suggest that we have language which says "work completed as determined by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee" and leave to his discretion those items that the Drafting Committee did not get to. We have a Drafting Committee from many countries: it has a Chairman. The Chair is not suggesting in its suggested motion making any conclusions on what was not arrived at. The Chair is suggesting that obviously you can only concur in conclusions that have been concluded. Therefore some parts of the Drafting Committee's work were not concluded and we suggest what was inconclusive at that point should be determined by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee so that it would be for him to state which sentence or paragraph was still to be reached. Those things would then be open.

V.K. SIBAL (India): I just wanted to observe that it is true that some parts of the Draft Report were not scrutinized by the Drafting Committee, but that is a draft which was put up by them and it is now before us. In the interests of completing this work quickly for this Body, of which the Drafting Committee is a part, if we feel that what is in these paragraphs is okay I think it is open to us to take the view that this is also okay and can be passed as part of the en bloc resolution which we are proposing to pass.

CHAIRMAN: That is perfectly possible; or an alternative could be that the Body could delegate to the Drafting Committee the responsibility for completing that work.

Joseph TCHICAYA (President, Comité de rédaction): J'ai déjà indiqué que le Comité de rédaction a travaillé sur l'ensemble du rapport, moins les paragraphes 41 et 43. Nous avons néanmoins un projet de texte pour les paragraphes 41 et 43; mais nous n'avons pas eu le temps matériel de les examiner et d'y apporter éventuellement les amendements qui s'imposaient.

Et nous avons indiqué, au sein du Comité de rédaction que ceci serait le travail de la Commission.

Nous estimions que le Comité de rédaction avait accompli son travail et -comme nous n'avions pas eu le temps matériel de le terminer -que le travail se ferait au sein de la Commission. Nous sommes ici, maintenant, devant la Commission. Elle est souveraine. Il y a devant nous un projet de rédaction des paragraphes 41 et 43. Il appartient maintenant à la Commission de dire si elle est d'accord ou pas avec le texte présenté; et si, comme il semble se dégager, le texte est adopté en bloc, j'avais cru comprendre que le bureau nous invitait adopter tout le texte devant nous, y compris les paragraphes 41 et 43.

Nous estimions qu'après la rédaction ne devait plus revenir sur cette question; c'est à la Commission à décider si la rédaction lui semble appropriée. Personnellement, je pense que l'on n'a plus à demander au Comité de rédaction de se réunir à nouveau pour examiner ce texte; en tout-cas, le Comité de rédaction n'avait pas envisagé après discussion devant la Commission de se retrouver à nouveau pour achever ce travail. Nous estimions que le travail devait se faire ici, en Commission, et si la Commission estime que le projet qui lui est présenté lui convient, c'est à elle d'en décider de manière souveraine.

Voilà ce que je tenais à dire sur cette question; je reconnais que nous n'avons pas examiné les deux paragraphes indiqués, mais je reconnais également que nous avons dit que c'était à la Commission à le faire.

CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. The Chair would suggest, if we may beg your indulgence for a second, that the best course might be simply to have a vote on adopting the entire Report. The Chair felt that there were a number of questions about certain paragraphs remaining. We could adopt all the Report that was gotten to and take up separately the part that was not; that was one option. We could adopt the entire Report. We could go through it paragraph by paragraph and see whether there were any objections. That would take a very long time. The Chair would suggest that it might be best to have an up or down vote on adoption of the Report as it is before the Body.

That would be a motion, if someone wishes to make it and second it, that would then be open to discussion. It would be open to amendment, but it would get us going I hope fairly rapidly.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): The point of order is this. I believe that at the beginning of this debate we had before us a recommendation from the General Committee that the report should be voted en bloc as it stands. Certainly I had the same interpretation as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee as to the implications of that. This is why we then called for a roll call vote. My point of order is that I suggest we now proceed to a roll call vote on the basis of the recommendation of the General Committee.

CHAIRMAN: India, you have a point of order. Please state it.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

V.K. SIBAL (India): My point of order is that we are in agreement with what you have just said but there is a problem with the sentence in square brackets in paragraph 8. If that could be deleted we could go on to the roll call.

CHAIRMAN: We have other points of order, and that is not a point of order. You have a disagreement with part of the text. The motion is to adopt the text as it is.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

José Ramón LOPEZ-PORTILLO ROMANO (México): Sí, la moción de orden es que se había establecido ya un procedimiento, como lo había indicado el asesor legal, y tenemos que seguir ese procedimiento; de manera que ahora le corresponde votar a esta Asamblea la moción presentada por el Comité General.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been suggesting that we have an up or down vote on it, which is what we are at. We have had to recognize points of order. At this point we have before us a motion, let us clearly establish that. Does any country here so move that the report be adopted en bloc?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Waliur RAHMAN (Bangladesh): I am a bit confused. My understanding of the interpretation that you gave was that you are referring to the recommendation made by the General Committee this morning that we adopt this report en bloc and that is the recommendation as has been read out by the Secretary-General of the Conference and we can proceed with the process of voting in the context of the clarification given by the Legal Counsel. I do not see any need to ask for any delegate from the floor to make a motion on this.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair was under the impression that some countries were going to signal their support for it. I stand corrected. The motion is before the Body. The motion is by roll call. There has been a roll call vote requested by the United Kingdom. Is the Chair correct or incorrect in stating this?

Vote
Votation
Votación

Session of the Conference
Session de la Conférence
Período de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT
APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN
VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Vote on

Vote sur

..... Votación para GENERAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan				X	Gambia				X	Pakistan				
Albania				X	Germany (Fed. Rep. of)				X	Panama				
Algeria	X				Chang	X				Papua New Guinea				X
Angola	X				Greece				X	Peru				X
Antigua and Barbuda				X	Grenada				X	Philippines				X
Argentina			X		Guatemala				X	Poland				X
Australia			X		Guinea	X				Portugal				X
Austria			X		Guinea-Bissau	X				Qatar				X
Bahamas				X	Guyana				X	Rwanda				
Bahrain				X	Haiti				X	St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Bangladesh	X				Honduras	X				Saint Lucia				X
Barbados	X				Hungary	X				St. Vincent & the Grenadines				X
Belgium	X				Iceland				X	Samoa				
Belize				X	India	X				Sao Tome and Principe				X
Benin				X	Indonesia	X				Saudi Arabia				
Bhutan	X				Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	X				Senegal				
Bolivia				X	Iraq	X				Seychelles				X
Botswana	X				Ireland				X	Sierra Leone				
Brazil	X				Israel				X	Solomon Islands				X
Bulgaria				X	Italy	X				Somalia				X
Burkina Faso	X				Jamaica				X	Spain				X
Burma				X	Japan				X	Sri Lanka				
Burundi				X	Jordan	X				Sudan				
Cameroon	X				Kenya	X				Suriname				X
Canada			X		Korea (Rep. of)	X				Swaziland				X
Cape Verde	X				Kuwait	X				Sweden				X
Central African Rep.				X	Laos				X	Switzerland				
Chad				X	Lebanon	X				Syria				
Chile	X				Lesotho	X				Tanzania				
China	X				Liberia	X				Thailand				
Colombia			X		Libya	X				Togo				X
Comoros				X	Luxembourg				X	Tonga				X
Congo	X				Madagascar	X				Trinidad and Tobago				X
Cook Islands				X	Malawi				X	Tunisia				
Costa Rica	X				Malaysia	X				Turkey				
Côte d'Ivoire				X	Maldives				X	Uganda				X
Cuba	X				Mal	X				United Arab Emirates				
Cyprus	X				Malta				X	United Kingdom				
Czechoslovakia	X				Mauritania	X				U.S.A.				X
D.P. Rep. of Korea	X				Mauritius				X	Uruguay				
Denmark			X		Mexico				X	Vanuatu				X
Djibouti				X	Mongolia				X	Venezuela				
Dominica	X				Morocco	X				Viet Nam				X
Dominican Rep.				X	Mozambique				X	Yemen Arab Republic				X
Ecuador	X				Namibia				X	Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)				
Egypt				X	Nepal	X				Yugoslavia				
El Salvador	X				Netherlands				X	Zaire				
Equatorial Guinea				X	New Zealand	X				Zambia				X
Ethiopia	X				Nicaragua	X				Zimbabwe				X
Fiji				X	Niger	X								
Finland			X		Nigeria				X					
France	X				Norway				X					
Gabon	X				Onan				X					
	25	2	5	21		27	2	6	18		22	3	5	19



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

Vote on
Vote sur
Vote sur
Votación para GENERAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
.....

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	74
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	7
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	16
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	58

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	81
--	----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	41
--	----

ADOPTED
ADOPTÉE
ACEPTADA

Date 19.11.87 Elections Officer B. Linley
Fecha Fonctionnaire électoral
El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) CRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

CF 13 1185 654321 - W/22644/c

CHAIRMAN: The Recommendation is approved. The Chair declares that the motion has been approved.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): Thank you Mr Chairman. At your request I would like to explain the proposals for slight modification of the Commission's schedule following the adoption of the Report. Remaining before the Commission at the moment is item 15, on which discussion had commenced. The next item was item 16, Review of Field Programmes. It is proposed that the Commission may, instead of considering these two items later on this afternoon, pass directly to items 17, which is the Implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development: following that the Commission might pass to item 18, Follow-up to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and the International Conference on Trees and Forests. This proposal is made because we have been informed that a number of delegations have technical specialists in Rome for the consideration of these items and who were planning to depart over the weekend. The proposal, therefore, would be to take up these two items first and as soon as the Commission has completed its consideration of these two items to return to item 15 and item 16 and then to the rest of this agenda.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that, trying to reschedule ourselves a little bit for the convenience of some of our member countries who have persons in town for this purpose?

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I regret to say that we are in a different position, we are expecting to have the item on Forestry to be discussed later on so that I do not know whether we can make a compromise, have the item on Fisheries, then the Review of the Field Programme and then go to Forests.

CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair would have to point out that under such circumstances, under normal circumstances like that, the Government of Brazil clearly is right and that here we have the presumption that the Organization would follow the schedule, it is a presumption that the member countries ought to be able to assume is valid and the Chair would suggest that may be it would be best informally to discuss it if we could.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): We have a number of footnotes to the text and we would like your advice on the process, normally we would read through these footnotes and the paragraph numbers and then we would give the text to the Secretariat.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair's understanding in informal discussions is that you could work that out with the Secretary and that your points will be put in at the proper place.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): There is one point here, while we do not object with this procedure you have outlined, the difficulty is that there may be some countries who would wish to associate themselves with our footnotes and equally we may find there are some countries with footnotes with which we would like to associate. So that under those circumstances the normal procedure is that there is an oral statement of the footnotes.

CHAIRMAN: State your footnotes.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): I will now continue to state the United Kingdom's reservations. A footnote to paragraph 8: the United Kingdom delegation noted that some delegations expressed the view that the current programme review proceedings did not provide adequate and meaningful opportunities to make their views known during the consideration of the Programme of Work and Budget.

The next footnote would be a new paragraph 24 bis: the delegation of the United Kingdom noted that in identifying potential additional sources of income which could be used to finance operational programmes, two Member States, India and Pakistan, drew attention to the subsidy of US\$ 11.5 million from the Regular Programme to meet the cost of delivery of the Trust Funds in 1986. An appeal was made to Trust Fund donors to enter into early discussions with management with a view to meeting the full cost of Trust Fund delivery.

The next footnote is a footnote on paragraph 26: the delegation of the United Kingdom considered that an increase in the budget was unrealistic in view of the level of arrears and the number of Member States to meet their obligations in the current biennium.

Next we have a footnote to paragraph 42: the United Kingdom delegation noted that attention was drawn to the statement by a number of developing countries in document C 87/30 which stated that efforts should be made to reduce costs through inter alia shared offices and general services with other United Nations Organizations.

Finally, on paragraph 43: the United Kingdom noted that some countries expressed concern at the slow rate of spending on TCP and the absence of any pre-programming of funds. These countries believed that these factors made TCP very vulnerable to unplanned cuts at a time when the Organization was under financial pressure.

That concludes our footnotes.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair has a list of speakers we will follow.

Matti HANNULA (Finland): I would like to make an explanation after the vote on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. The Nordic countries voted for the United Kingdom proposal and against the proposal of the General Committee to vote en bloc for the following reasons; the Nordic countries were prepared to accept the Report of the Drafting Group on the part that had been completed. Because on some paragraphs no consensus had been reached the Nordic countries maintained the view that these paragraphs should have been debated in the Commission. We regret that the Member States have not been able to exercise their basic democratic rights in this matter when the Report C 87/II/REP/1 was defeated by vote in the Commission. We see this as a matter of principle not substance.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): The US delegation would like to express a general reservation namely that the approval of the Draft Report of the Drafting Committee en bloc impeded developed countries, and non-members of the Drafting Committee to offer their views and suggestions for change. Having said that, I should like to join the UK in their suggestion of footnotes for paragraphs 8, 24(bis), 26, 42 and 43.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Ceux qui sont intervenus avant nous ont bien fait de nous faire connaître la teneur des notes de bas de page qu'ils souhaitaient voir figurer, encore qu'ils ne nous aient pas précisé le document où devaient figurer ces notes de bas de page. S'agit-il du rapport ou du procès verbal? C'est une question à laquelle il faut répondre.

Pour notre part, nous pensons que ces délégués ont bien fait de nous faire connaître leurs notes de bas de page, non seulement pour susciter des adhésions et des souillons, mais égal orment pour nous permettre, à nous qui ne sommes pas úans le même camp, d'ajouter une contre-note de bas de page.

Voilà en ce qui concerne les notes de bas de page pour lesquelles l'endroit reste à préciser.

Ensuite, je voudrais saisir cette occasion pour dire au Bureau que nous sommes sensibles aux arguments qui ont été évoqués au sujet des propositions d'aménagement du calendrier qui nous a été soumis ce matin. Nous voudrions demander à la présidence que ce genre de modification en pleine séance n'intervienne plus; que l'on nous propose les changements au moins vingt-quatre heures à l'avance parce que, lorsque nous sortons de nos bureaux ou de nos maisons pour venir ici, nous sommes préparés pour traiter d'un certain nombre de questions précises. Or, lorsque vous changez brusquement le programme de séance, cela rend les choses difficiles pour nous car, pour certaines délégations, ce ne sont pas toujours les mêmes personnes qui sont présentes. Nous venons ici en tenant compte du programme du matin et des changements du genre de celui que vous nous avez proposé nous mettent dans d'assez grandes difficultés. Nous voudrions qu'à l'avenir, cela ne se répète pas.

Cela étant dit, je voudrais ajouter que les notes de bas de page dont on nous a donné lecture sont, à notre avis, très longues. Plutôt que des notes de bas de page, ce sont des documents, des protestations. On peut leur donner un autre titre, ce ne sont pas des notes de bas de page. Quand on parle pendant cinq minutes pour annoncer des notes de bas de page qui sont plus longues que les paragraphes auxquels elles se rapportent, on peut vraiment commencer à se poser la question de savoir s'il faut traiter ces choses comme des notes de bas de page ou plutôt d'autres sujets sur lesquels on veut, en quelque sorte, ouvrir le débat.

Je donne ces commentaires à l'appréciation de la présidence.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair must state that your point is very well taken with regard to coming prepared for one subject and the subject being changed by scheduling. That was not as you stated the recommendation of the Chair. That was the suggestion of the Secretariat, and the Chair yielded to the Secretariat to explain that proposal, but it was not adopted - it was a proposal. When Brazil made clear that it had a problem that we knew may well arise, the Chair certainly made it clear that its sympathy lay with the point you have just made, namely, that Member Countries have a right to expect the schedule to be followed. The Chair asked if the Secretariat and Brazil could work that out. I have no idea what decision they have come to, but we will return to that matter.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic) : We have the impression that the distinguished delegate of the Congo made a very valid point. We thought that when we were voting on the report of the General Committee that this report would be brought to our attention in its entirety and, in fact, submitted to Conference in this way. We thought that what we would do now would avoid the need for footnotes. However, we seem to be involved in a vicious circle and I believe there will be no end to this. If we open the door to further remarks and footnotes there will be an avalanche of such footnotes. In fact, it will come to much more than we find in the report as it stands. We have no objection to any country's right to make remarks or even introduce footnotes. However, bearing in mind our interest in the work of this Commission and the possibility of achieving a consensus we believe that we should adopt a general policy for the Commission to avoid this situation. I trust that as a result of your experience and wisdom, we can now move as quickly as possible to a solution of this issue concerning footnotes. We should like to hear the views of Legal Counsel on the actual amount of footnotes that we could include. I think that this is of great importance in the report on this essential issue that we have been debating.

CHAIRMAN: Legal Counsel advises the Chair that there is no limitation on footnotes.

Francisco MORA (Costa Rica): Señor Presidente: para la siguiente nota a pie de página. Los países de América Latina y el Caribe habríamos preferido que se suprimiera la ltima frase delpárrafo 3.

Ton A.J.M.OOMEN (Netherlands): In fact, the motion we voted on a few minutes ago does not in our opinion agree with the tradition of FAO because in effect it is neglecting the rights of delegates to speak on items in the report before it is adopted. In our opinion the paragraphs which have not been formulated by the Drafting Committee should have been completed, otherwise we have to accept the proposals in paragraphs 41 and 43 as they have been drafted by the Secretariat, and that is the task of the Drafting Committee. Therefore, we want to associate ourselves with the explanation of the note of Finland on behalf of the Nordic countries, and we wish to associate with the footnotes on paragraphs 41 and 43 as put forward by the UK.

Rodolphe de POURTALES (Suisse): L'explication de vote de la Suisse rejoint, largement celle des pays nordiques et des Pays-Bas.

En ce qui concerne le contenu du rapport, ma délégation a une remarque à faire au sujet du paragraphe 37, remarque qui rejoint celle faite par la République fédérale d'Allemagne au sujet du PASA. En effet, ce Programme a été discuté beaucoup plus largement au titre d'un autre point de l'ordre du jour et il ne faudrait pas que les deux rapports soient, en contradiction.

Nous souhaitons également apporter une addition à la fin du rapport, au chapitre 3, et nous allons en remettre le texte au Secrétariat (texte fourni par la délégation de la Suisse): "42 bis - Il a été suggéré que les publications de la FAO fassent l'objet d'un examen quant à leur audience et que celles qui jouissent d'une grande audience sur le terrain, comme par exemple Idées et Actions de la Campagne mondiale contre la faim/Action pour le développement, ne soient pas sacrifiées au bénéfice de publications dont, l'impact serait moindre".

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Con su venia, Señor Presidente, quisiera hacerle dos preguntas al Señor Savary: primera, si la propuesta que él nos presentó a nombre del Comité General fue hecha en forma unánime por ese Comité y, segundo, si Estados Unidos hace parte del Comité General.

Hacemos estas preguntas Señor Presidente porque nos parece incoherente, para usar un calificativo benévolo, que un Miembro del Comité General se asocie a la propuesta que aprobó la Comisión y que luego se adhiera a aquellos que hacen reservas y critique la adopción de la propuesta hecha por el Comité General.

Nos asociamos a los comentarios hechos por Congo y Arabia Saudita sobre la inconveniencia de extensas e inconvenientes reservas, y algunos países procederemos de conformidad.

Dos palabras más, Señor Presidente. Tengo hambre ¿hasta cuándo vamos a seguir trabajando y a qué hora nos volveremos a reunir?

V. K. SIBAL (India): We should like to state that when we voted for the en bloc adoption of the report, we had in view the number of times in FAO that reports have been adopted en bloc. We also had in mind the explanation given by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee that except for two paragraphs the report had been examined by the Drafting Committee, and the Drafting Committee had decided that these two paragraphs should be left to the decision of the Plenary. India went through the two paragraphs carefully and felt that there was nothing objectionable in them.

We also wish for clarification on the footnotes. What has been stated is that a certain delegation noted that certain other countries said this. We felt that the purpose of a footnote was to reflect a particular country's view in case that view did not find reflection in the report. We should like to have clarification whether it is open in giving footnotes to start interpreting the views of others. Perhaps Legal Counsel could also advise on that matter.

CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken. In a footnote there is a difference between stating your own view and stating the other view. However, it can easily be avoided by saying that you felt that "they said". The Chair would suggest that we could have a quick and easy resolution of that matter if the United Kingdom would be willing to say - 'in its views comma'. Is that acceptable? Yes. Thank you, that was quick.

Philippe PIOTET (France): Je voudrais tout d'abord faire un constat: en tant que membre du comité de rédaction, j'ai passé une vingtaine d'heures dans ce comité pour préparer ce rapport; en tant que membre de la Commission II, j'ai passé 5 à 6 heures à examiner ce rapport, et à entendre un certain nombre de déclarations.

Je constate que, finalement, nous en sommes revenus au rapport du comité de rédaction. Dans ces conditions Monsieur le Président, je suis inquiet pour l'avenir car en effet, nous avons beaucoup de travail à faire, nous sommes amenés à modifier on partie l'ordre du jour de notre comité pour nous occuper de manière approfondie d'un certain nombre de questions techniques pour lesquelles des spécialistes sont venus d'un grand nombre de pays du monde.

Mais au-delà de ce point, un problème de fond me semble très important: c'est que nous recherchons toujours dans cette instance à nous rapprocher le plus possible d'un consensus entre les Etats Membres sur les rapports présentés et discutés. Il me faut constater - et c'est un simple constat -que la formule actuelle d'une part prend beaucoup de temps, et d'autre part laisse un assez grand nombre de pays insatisfaits.

Sur un plan pratique, je voudrais savoir si nous nous orientons vers des formules avec de multiples notes en bas de page qui, si elles éclairent le point de vue d'un certain nombre de délégations, nous conduisent à nous éloigner du consensus, que, pour sa part, la France a toujours recherché avec beaucoup d'ardeur dans cette enceinte.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I will be brief. Australia respects the right of any member to discuss draft reports. We feel that members of the Drafting Committee should not become involved in debate on the Report or indeed how the broader membership handles that Report. That is why we abstained. However since the Drafting Committee did not consider through lack of time paragraphs 41 and 43 my delegation wishes to be associated with the footnote put forward by the United Kingdom which I would have supported in drafting group had those paragraphs been considered.

R. MACINTOSH (Canada): Like the delegate of Australia we regret very much that the procedures that have been followed have impaired the rights of delegations who were not members of the Drafting Committee to have their minority views represented in the Report. We regret all the more that some delegations seem to wish to eliminate their sovereign rights to have those views reflected in the appropriate footnote. Therefore my delegation wishes to associate itself with the general reservation offered by the distinguished delegate of the United States of America. We would point out that while we are a member of the drafting group and we support the Report, we interpret the reservation of the delegate of the United States of America as one of protest. We fully agree with it and we wish to be associated.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): My delegation really need not answer Colombia's pointed question but will do so in a spirit of solidarity. Indeed the United States of America is a member of the General Committee. Indeed we agreed this morning to seek consensus on a compromise proposal that the Secretary-General announced. There was no consensus. Thus the object of our endeavour was not reached, therefore freeing us and others from the original endeavour. The principle represented by our reservation remains despite our commitment to the spirit of compromise and consensus. Therefore we want that principle to be shown in a footnote to the Report, as is our right of course.

James ALTKENUnited Kingdom): Just for the record to associate the United Kingdom delegation....

CHAIRMAN: Before you continue, I thought the United States of America might have had a point of order there. The Chair is trying to follow a pattern of never going into a second round of discussion until all countries who wish to speak on a topic have spoken. My feeling was that no-one else had indicated but I just wanted to make that absolutely clear before proceeding. If anyone has not spoken who wishes to speak you would be given preference at this point.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): The delegation of the United Kingdom wishes to associate itself with the footnote proposed by the distinguished delegate of the United States of America and supported by the delegation of Canada. To qualify a point, we certainly intend our footnotes to be part of the Report of the work of this Commission.

Draft Report of Commission II, Part I, as amended, was adopted

Projet de Rapport de la Commission II, partie I, ainsi amendée, est adopté

El proyecto de informe de la Comisión II, parte I así enmendada, es.- aprobado

CHAIRMAN: My friend from Colombia if you are hungry this is the time to go eat. Because of the Secretariat's insistence on speaking you have to wait a moment or two before you eat. After she has completed I will declare the meeting recessed and will try to commence business at five o'clock. I would say 4.30, knowing that people would not be here until five o'clock, but in all honesty I would like to try at five o'clock, and why don't we all try at five o'clock and maybe things can move along.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): With regard to the question you asked me to investigate earlier, we had had a proposal that items 17 and 18 be taken up earlier, but what I have understood is that the reservation advanced by the Ambassador of Brazil was only for item 18. He would agree to start with item 17, dealing with fisheries, this afternoon when the Commission returns to business. The original timetable of the Commission was that this item was to be taken up this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN: That may be true but it is irrelevant since we haven't followed it.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): There will be no Drafting Committee meeting this afternoon for the Commission but there will be a meeting of the Contact Group at 5.45 p.m. in the Malaysia Room.

The meeting rose at 15.20 hours

La séance est levée à 15 heures 20

Se levanta la sesión a las 15.20 hours

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/15

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

FIFTEENTH MEETING

QUINZIEME SEANCE

15ª SESION

(19 November 1987)

The Fifteenth Meeting was opened at 17.15 hours

Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vice-Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La quinzième seance est ouverte à 17 h 15, sous la

présidence de Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vice-Président de la Commission II

a, Se abre la 15ª sesión a las 17.15 horas, bajo la presidencia de

Bashir El Mabrouk Said, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

17. Implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference On Fisheries Management and Development
17. Application de la stratégie et des Programmes d'action approuvés en 1984 par la Conférence mondiale de la FAO sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches
17. Ejecución de la Estrategia y Programas de Acción aprobados en 1984 por la Conferencia Mundial de la FAO sobre la Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): As we agreed, what we are going to do now is to take up item 17. I am delighted to welcome Mr Lindquist, Assistant Director-General, for this section.

Armin H. LINDQUIST (Assistant Director-General, a.i., Fisheries Department): The relevant paper for this agenda item is document C 87/24. It provides a report on the progress so far achieved in implementing the Strategy and the five associated Programmes of Action endorsed by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development. I will confine myself in these introductory remarks to drawing attention to certain highlights and major points. My colleagues and I will be pleased to respond after your debate to any question of detail or requests for further explanation.

With regard to the Strategy for Fisheries Management and Development endorsed by the World Fisheries Conference, you will recall that it comprises guidelines and principles for consideration by governments and organizations when planning the management and development of the fisheries sector. The Conference when endorsing the Strategy took great care to emphasize its flexible and non-mandatory character.

On the evidence of the materials received by FAO from governments and organizations in response to the Director-General's request for their collaboration in preparing this first progress report, the recommendations of the Strategy clearly have been found to be most pertinent and useful when planning the future of the fisheries sector.

In particular fisheries administrations in both large and small countries have found the text of the Strategy to be a very valuable advocate when seeking the allocation of higher priorities in fisheries. Responding governments also referred to the direct action they had taken to strengthen their fisheries institutions and reformulate their plans in the light of the Strategies' guidelines.

The review underlined the fact that the rate at which fisheries can be developed or adapted is so gradual that quantifiable changes are unlikely to be identifiable over the short time that has elapsed since the World Fisheries Conference. It emphasized the continued need to promote self-reliance in fisheries through training and the acquisition of technology and capital. It drew attention to the further efforts which are required to improve capabilities to collect and analyse even the basic data required for fisheries planning, development and management.

The survey illustrated that in line with the relevant sections of the Strategy serious attempts are being made in many parts of the world to design and implement schemes for the better management and utilization of fisheries resources. It also illustrated the widespread steps being taken as recommended by the Strategy to promote and protect artisanal fisheries and improve the standards of living of small-scale fishing and fish-farming communities.

Finally, reference should be made to the great importance that governments attach to technical and economic cooperation in fisheries research, development and management. The many bilateral agreements, joint ventures and other cooperative arrangements described by responding governments and the value they place on FAO and other regional mechanisms demonstrate the impetus being given to world fisheries development through international collaboration.

I would now like to turn to the five Programmes of Action approved by the World Fisheries Conference. The objectives and scope of these programmes are fully described in paragraphs 26-28 of document C 87/24, and the following sections of the document provide a detailed review of the assistance which has been delivered by FAO under each of these Programmes. Appendix A presents a breakdown of the funding status and the sources of financial support for the programmes.

In summary, it is pleasing to report that financial support for FAO activities to implement the programmes has grown steadily, in 1987 even exceeding the target indicated by the Conference of US\$ 15 million per annum.

Inevitably because of variations in the priorities of donor agencies imbalances remain among the different Programmes of Action and among regions. In particular programme No. V, which aims at tackling the problems of post-harvest and other wastage in fishing industry operations, has received rather limited extra-budgetary support. Regional support for activities planned in Latin America and in inland fisheries have fallen short of expectation.

We are vigorously maintaining our efforts to fill these gaps. Our own activities at Headquarters are reinforced by support from FAO regional offices for implementation of the Programmes of Action.

An increasing number of recipient countries are making contributions in both cash and kind to FAO regional projects being carried out within the scope of the five Programmes.

I would also draw attention to the very extensive assistance being provided by bilateral donors outside the framework of FAO but in support of activities related to these various Programmes of Action. It is difficult to assess accurately the funds being allocated by those donors for this purpose but the partial information available leads us confidently to assume that total support from sources within the overall context of the Programmes now well exceeds US\$ 20 million per annum.

The Committee on Fisheries at its last session in May 1987 very closely examined the reports prepared on progress in implementing the major recommendations of the World Fisheries Conference. Although it observed that because of varying conditions and capacities some countries had found it more difficult than others to implement relevant guidelines and principles contained in the Strategy, the Committee agrees that the Strategy was proving to be a useful tool for both governments and international organizations as they sought to improve the contribution of fisheries to national social, economic and nutritional goals.

The Committee therefore recommended that further reports on progress in implementing the Strategy should be prepared at four-yearly intervals - that is, for presentation to every alternate session of the Committee. It was agreed that countries should again be encouraged to provide national reports and other information that they consider pertinent for use in the preparation of such future evaluation. It was further suggested that such future evaluation of the continued usefulness and pertinence of the Strategy might be combined with surveys of the overall state and prospects of world fisheries, thus permitting the Committee to deal regularly with two important issues in a logical and effective manner.

I would also note the Committee's comments on two important, individual initiatives taken within the context of the Strategy.

The Committee reviewed and welcomed the report of the First Session of its new Sub-Committee on Fish Trade, which has been established in direct response to a specific recommendation of the Strategy, and endorsed a proposal for a special technical assistance programme designed to promote the participation of developing countries in international fish trade.

The Committee also reviewed in a preliminary manner draft technical specifications for a standard system of marking and identifying fishing vessels, which was the subject of a recommendation in the Strategy. Such a system would represent an important step towards the better management and control of fishing operations, and the Committee agreed to consider this matter again in a future session.

The Committee expressed its overall satisfaction at the progress achieved in implementing the Programmes of Action and drew attention to the need to continue these Programmes after the conclusion of the initial five-year period approved by the World Fisheries Conference and suggested that the FAO Regional Fisheries bodies should make proposals regarding future priorities and the adjustment required to the Programmes in their respective regions.

The FAO Council, at its 91st Session In Juno this year endorsed the Committee on Fisheries' recommendations with regard to the Strategy and Programmes of Action and also welcomed the progress so far achieved in implementing other resolution endorsed by the World Conference concerning special aspects of fisheries management and development, it drew particular attention to the success of the World Food Day in 1986 in increasing public awareness of the significance of fisheries, especially small-scale artisanal communities in human nutrition and rural employment.

It would be remiss of me if, before concluding this brief review on the progress achieved in carrying out the recommendation of the 1984 World Fisheries Conference, I did not take this opportunity of paying tribute to the memory of the late Jean Carroz, Secretary-General of the Conference and Assistant Director-General of the Fisheries Department whose untimely death occurred almost two years ago during the last session of this Conference. Jean Carroz was the architect of the World Fisheries Conference. His dedication to the FAO and to world fisheries will long be remembered and valued.

In commemoration of this remarkable contribution, the Director-General has commissioned the preparation and publication of a series of essays by distinguished jurists and other outstanding students of international fisheries law and policy. Many of them were Jean's friends and colleagues. Their experience and wisdom has been combined in a volume entitled "The Law and the Sea". The book in a single multi-lingual edition is a unique source of reference to the extra-ordinary seas of change which international fisheries have experienced in recent decades and represents a fitting tribute to the life of Jean Carroz. A copy of the book is available to each delegation of the present Conference.

Experiences over the last three years have amply demonstrated that the 1984 Fisheries World Conference has already had a significant impact on the fisheries sector. The Strategy it endorsed has created a great awareness of the place and potentials of the fisheries in the overall economy and has provided a valuable source of guidance to those charged with the well-being of fisheries and the fishermen. The associated Programmes of Action are providing a sound basis for FAO and other agencies to aid and advise countries as they seek to enhance their capabilities for fisheries management and development. We look forward to receiving the comments of the present Conference on the steps already taken to implement the Strategy and the Programmes of Action and its advice for further efforts required to build upon the progress already achieved.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Thank you very much, Mr Lindquist. I am much obliged to you for your very clear introductory remarks. We are very grateful for all the information you have provided. It gives us great pleasure to realize that considerable progress has been achieved in many countries as regards ensuring better management and development of fisheries.

The floor is now open for any statements you have to make on this item. Please be as constructive and as effective as possible in your remarks on this item.

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH (Bangladesh): I congratulate Mr Lindquist for a clear presentation of the Report.

We have studied the Report and we find it very clear and concise. We agree that the time gap between the Resolutions adopted by the World Fisheries Conference and now has not been adequate for making a review of the progress of implementation really worthwhile. There were also other factors like planning and budgeting which in many cases had been done before the Resolutions became available to the governments concerned. Therefore, the progress could not be as it might have been otherwise but we are sure that the Resolutions adopted in the World Fisheries Conference already started having a favourable influence in all countries. In my country particularly we have noticed that

increased budget allocation, planning allocation and importance is being attached to the fisheries sector and it has become really much easier now to get projects related to fisheries approved by the Government in my country and I am sure the statement made in this Report about other countries must be the same. In fact, in Bangladesh we have some kind of an open-ended allocation for fisheries development and it has been promised by the planning authorities at the highest level that if you can show sufficient progress in implementation of the projects already initiated then there would be adequate allocation and there would be no limit on it.

In this connection I wish to invite your attention to Appendix A where a picture of allocations is shown for different regions. Here we find that in the case of Asia and the Pacific Region, although in 1986 there was slight increase over 1985 but in 1987 it has been a little lower, both in absolute terms as well as in percentages. Well, the regions are not quite clear but we would prefer to see at least a token rising trend considering the fact that millions of people in this region are vitally dependent on fisheries development for their livelihood and their income and their nutrition. In this connection permit me to point out that this Table does not show one thing, how these allocations have benefitted the poorest countries of the world. Perhaps in future reviews it would be worthwhile to present a picture of allocations programme-wise and year-wise in respect of the least developed countries.

Turning to Table 2 in the Appendix, the presentation of a picture of donor allocations over a period of three years, we find that in the case of a number of bilateral donors there has been a steady increase and I wish to mention in this connection in particular Sweden, Japan, the United States of America, Australia, Netherlands and also the EEC. Mr Chairman, through you I wish to convey my congratulations to these donors for taking an increasing interest in this sector. At the same time we are a little uncomfortable to see that allocations of UNDP for the year 1987 has been lower than that of 1986. The reason is not very clear to us but certainly we would wish UNDP as a donor agency to take greater interest in this sector.

Alhasi Durodola D. APANPA (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to express our appreciation to Dr Lindquist for the clear and eloquent presentation of the document under discussion C 87/24, that is the "Implementation of the strategy and programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development".

Again my delegation wishes to congratulate the FAO Secretariat in general and the Fisheries Department in particular for the various steps that have been taken in sequence on the follow-up necessary actions towards the effective implementations of the Programme of Action from 1984 to date.

Nigeria being one of the 57 nations that positively responded to the rendition or submission of their national reports and in accordance with the FAO Director-General's request have found the adoptions based on many points of the format extremely useful in the guidelines of our fisheries policy and planning. It is very interesting to note and to inform this august gathering that the guidelines and principles which have been adequately and positively considered by the present Nigerian administration include all the identified eight major elements of fisheries management and development as enumerated in paragraph 11, page 3 of the document under discussion, that is the contribution of fisheries to Nigerian economic, social and nutritional goals.

They include the improvement of our country's self-reliance on fisheries management and development and the needs of small-scale fisheries and rural fishing and fish farming communities.

It is true as expressed in the document under discussion that most rendered national reports, having been diligently and painstakingly analysed by the FAO Secretariat, observe that any appreciable success in such national reports should have been due to the various Fisheries Policies and Planning from 1980-85. The national report that was submitted by Nigeria also referred to these indications and observations. However, my delegation would like to register our appreciation to the FAO Secretariat because the guidelines and principles of the World Fisheries Conference has yielded many possible and tangible results to our fisheries growth in 1987 to date when planning and policy have been due to circumstances prevailing on annual trends and based on strategy and guidelines. For example, major strides have been made on the investments in fisheries in Nigeria from 1986 to date, where Nigerian entrepreneurs now own more than 300 fishing and shrimping trawlers as against less

than 120 before 1986. Also, the creation in 1986 of the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructures - mainly for the development of rural areas - has contributed immensely to the production of fish fingerlings and fish foods and towards the national development of aquaculture. Millions of viable fish seeds are now being produced at the grassroot levels from all the 301 local governments in all the 21 states of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The Nigerian Fifth National Development Plan which in the first instance starts from 1988-92 will be followed by perspective planning, that is, the overall planning period will be between 20 to 25 years. The fisheries sector within the 5th Plan period is expected to be given a well recognized pride of place because policy and planning, together with effective implementation, are based on the World Fisheries Conference strategy and Programmes of Action. In this respect our delegation is in complete agreement with the observation expressed in the document under discussion where, at paragraph 16, it states: - "A number of fisheries administrations, in both large and small countries, have found the text of the Strategy to be a most valuable, advocate when seeking the allocation of higher priorities to the fisheries sector. The high level of attendance and debate at the World Fisheries Conference created a new awareness among decision-makers of the importance and potential of the fisheries sector."

My delegation would like to thank the FAO, UNDP and IFAD in particular for all the technical and funding assistance, and the facilities that have been rendered towards the general development of fisheries in Nigeria. However, we would like IFAD to accelerate the implementation of the proposed development of small-scale fisheries and aquaculture programme to start without any further delay. In accordance with the expressed opinion in paragraph 20 of document C 87/24 the integration of small-scale fisheries within the wider programmes for rural development; the encouragement of cooperatives and similar participating organizations; the provision of credit and extension services; the recognition of the role of women and young people were all factors of common concern and action in programmes for small-scale fisheries development. The FAO and consultants to IFAD on the Programme had concluded their investigations, and the earlier IFAD start the programme the better for Nigeria.

My delegation is seizing this opportunity to thank FAO and UNDP for the successful implementation of the Artisanal and Inshore Fisheries Development Project in Nigeria and the initiation of a follow-up programme in line with the phased out programme, but different in scope and concept, that is, the Programme captioned as Integrated Rural Fisheries Development. All the preparations at the national level have been completed and the project had been expected to commence in July 1987. This is also reflected in the document under discussion in the next to last sentence of paragraph 29.

We appeal to the UNDP to do everything possible for the immediate commencement of this project which falls in line with the dynamic activities and policies of the national government towards general development of rural areas in Nigeria.

My delegation wishes to direct this important observation to the FAO Secretariat in particular, and more especially to the operations section of the fisheries department. It is in respect of the type and calibre of the technical personnel that are sent to Nigeria for the fisheries projects. It is adequately on record that we do everything possible to satisfy the personnel in order to assist them to achieve their assignment objectives. Most of the time we accord to them treatment above our own standards to encourage them - after all Nigeria is a developing country. In this respect we expect the personnel to bear with our local position to satisfy their needs. Most of them are quite understanding and feel at home with us and perform their jobs with enthusiasm and satisfaction. However,

unfortunately for some immediately they arrive they complain of trivialities, and in certain cases come back to FAO headquarters to complain that their assignments could not be achieved because of the inadequate provision of certain amenities. Ridiculously enough some personnel complained of the excessive heat in Nigeria which is an African country. The FAO local representative in Nigeria can never support trivial excuses because we make him aware of how well we treat FAO technical personnel. In short, we would like the FAO Secretariat to re-examine this important issue for future reference. As regards the problems, it has been expressed in paragraph 19 of document C 87/24 our government is one of the governments still referring to problems being encountered in establishing effective systems for the control and surveillance of the fishing operations and to the need for further assistance. Attention is also drawn to the recurring need for, and frequent lack of, sufficient data both biological and socio-economic when elaborating and introducing management measures.

As regards CEEAF my delegation would like to reassure the regional committee (CEEAF) that in spite of the Nigerian economic situation something will be done to assist the regional body. The Permanent Secretary who spoke for the government last year when the former CEEAF Chairman Mr Joof, of the Gambia and the FAO Director of Fisheries Policy and Planning, Mr Dada, visited Nigeria and confirmed this. The procedure of fulfilling the contribution in personnel to CEEAF secretariat is not very easy. However, soon things will work out according to our hopes.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to endorse the contents of the document C 87/84 and we are in full support of the last three paragraphs, namely paragraphs 60, 61 and 62.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): We would like to commend Mr Lindquist for his excellent presentation. The World Fisheries Conference convened by FAO in 1984 was a useful and successful forum in that it brought together many experts to discuss common ideas on various concepts and approaches in solving fisheries related problems. We feel that the fisheries strategy and programmes of action, as adopted by the 1984 World Fisheries Conference, provide helpful guidance. The United States feel that the implementation of these strategies, however, should be at the discretion of the individual states concerned. Reports prepared by the Fisheries Agencies or ministries of the individual states for national use or for submission to regional or other international bodies than the FAO, might suffice for an admission to FAO on progress on implementing these guidelines. Initial reports could serve as the reporting framework, while updates could follow the format of the first reports. Such reports would preferably be prepared no less than every two years. In the interest of time we will not elaborate about our own fishery interest, but we thank you for the opportunity of commenting on this presentation.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): First we wish to join Mr Lindquist in paying tribute to the memory of Mr Jean Carros. Canada has developed its own focus for fisheries development strategies which are incidentally considered in full accord with the strategies recommended by the 1984 World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development.

Canada's emphasis has been placed upon five major areas: first, continuing assistance to small-scale fisheries; secondly, emphasis on the development of human resources in, training, especially increased and meaningful participation of women in the development process. Thirdly, the assistance in the improvement of the data base of knowledge of modern resources, protection of the environment and related policy and development planning. Fourthly, creation of conditions resulting in economic returns to the fishermen through improved organizational structuring policy development, improved planning and coordination of private and public sector rules. Fifthly, assistance in the improvement of infrastructures.

In addition to the development concerns, I seize this opportunity to reiterate that Canada would like to have an early resolution to the question of the marking and identification of fishing vessels since this issue has now been studied for seven years.

Zbigniew KARNICKI (Poland): The Polish delegation wishes to congratulate the Secretariat for their well-prepared and concise document and also Dr. Lindquist for the very clear introduction to this document. There is no doubt that the Fisheries Conference made an important impact on setting up clear guidance and principles for fisheries development, and many countries including Poland have taken advantage of it. Five Programmes of Action approved by the Conference have made a solid frame for FAO's activity in the area of fisheries during the five years following the Conference. Poland wishes to express its appreciation for the results and FAO's persistence in the implementation of these programmes.

The summary presented in document C 87/24, as well as the documentation prepared for the Seventeenth COFI Session provided sufficient background for evaluation. Before going into more detailed comments on Programme of Action, our delegation wishes to make a general comment, particularly in view of the discussions held on agenda Item 12. As the Polish delegation sees it, the budget allocation for fisheries in the next biennium does not reflect the role fisheries are playing in world nutrition. For the information of this Commission, fish constitutes 16% of the world's protein consumption, and it is highest in the developing countries, ranging from 20% to 33% in the least developed countries. With the world's fish resources already under severe pressure, real price increases for fish are occurring faster than prices in general. The impact of this will be most severe on the rural poor where protein intake will be further reduced. As is often the case, fisheries issues are not adequately taken into consideration within the general agriculture context simply because agriculture is a form of farming where additional inputs increase production, while fisheries is mostly hunting for a resource that is finite in size and in its replenishment. Given the world's fisheries situation as presented at the 17th COFI Session, the budget for FAO Fisheries activity is simply in our opinion not adequate for the problems being faced and the importance of fish as food. We are talking about a budget level of 6.1% for fisheries out of the total FAO budget and if we are serious about the fight against malnutrition and hunger, we should recognize the dependency of the poor on fish and provide the resources to tackle the problem.

Moving to the five Programmes of Action, the Polish delegation shares the concern of the FAO Programme Committee over the limited extra budgetary support provided so far for projects under Programme of Action V - Promotion of the Role of Fisheries in Alleviating Under-nutrition. It is our opinion, that this important Programme covers much wider scope than indicated by its title. It has a substantial part of training in fish technology, a very wide area of an issue of such importance as the prevention of post-harvest losses and also cooperative research programmes in these areas. Therefore it can be said that in fact this Programme precedes Action Programme IV - International Trade in Fish and Fishery Products, preparing conditions and the ground for its implementation. Trained manpower and sufficient knowledge of processing technology, which is nothing more than technology transfer, are indispensable for the preparation of fishery products able to meet export market requirements. Still too many developing countries are faced with severe economic losses due to the unstable quality of their products, which puts the shade on their credibility as exporters and this is often reflected in the lower prices paid for their products.

Research programmes are essential in technology transfer which is so vital in the process of development. FAO's coordinated programmes in fish technology are good examples of well-designed programmes adjusted to regional needs, strongly backing up the very practically oriented technical advisory services provided by FAO under Action Programme IV. These research programmes have very strong TCDC elements which we consider very important. Therefore it is worrying to know that these research programmes are receiving very limited financial support and the Programme for Africa is based in practice on the Regular Programme budget only.

These two Action Programmes, V and IV, are closely linked and the shortage in funding or implementation of one of them will have a negative effect on the other, particularly in the longer term.

Another problem with which Action Programme V is dealing is the better utilization of under-utilized species and their increased use for direct human consumption. This is a difficult technological and economic problem and FAO alone, without strong involvement and support from member countries, will not be able to make further progress.

Therefore the Polish delegation recommends that all these aspects should be taken into account by FAO and we also urge donor countries to do so as well when considering future programmes.

It is also regretted that too limited funds are allocated to Action Programme I - Planning, Management and Development of Fisheries. We would like to emphasize the importance of this programme.

FAO's forecast for the year 2000, prepared for the Seventeenth COFI Session (our congratulations to the Fisheries Department for this excellent document), indicates that by the year 2000 mankind will need in addition to present catches about 20 million metric tons to meet global demand. On the other hand, however, it is clear that the world is slowly approaching a global maximum sustainable yield of fishery resources and this is why the management of these resources is so important.

This is why the Polish Government attaches such importance to cooperation with FAO, its member countries and other organizations on the management of world resources. Poland is carrying out extensive, and I have to say very expensive, research not only in our own economic zone but also in all other areas where our fisheries operate. The results of our research, as always, are available to all interested. Poland is open to the further widening of international cooperation, making our research vessels and facilities available and sharing our knowledge with others. We do believe that only through close International cooperation coordinated by FAO can we enhance our knowledge to assure proper management of resources and the further development of world fisheries.

The Polish delegation noted with appreciation that in 1987 UNDP approved preparatory assistance to start two subregional projects for fisheries planning for East and West Africa respectively. We believe that these two much needed projects will be implemented soon.

Training is one of the most important elements in development which was clearly reaffirmed in the response of most developing countries to the Director-General's letter on the implementation of strategy endorsed by the World Fisheries Conference.

I wish to repeat what has been said by our Hon. Deputy Minister for Maritime Economy, Ryszard Pospieszynski, during the Seventeenth COFI Session: "Following recommendations accepted by the famous World Fisheries Conference, Poland is offering excellent possibilities for training in all areas of fisheries and at any level required, starting from ordinary schools for fisher-men up to PhD in our universities". Here we wish to encourage FAO to make better use of these opportunities.

A few more comments on Action Programmes III and IV. Programme III on Aquaculture in our opinion is going well and though progress in some regions is slower than expected it is our opinion that it does not cause concern as investment made in the last years particularly in manpower training as well as other areas should bring better results in the years to come.

Regarding Action Programme IV which is International Trade, we have very little comment to offer. It is a well-designed and implemented programme and the best proof of its usefulness is the fact that the Regional Fish Marketing Information Service for Asia (INFOFISH) became an intergovernmental organization funded by the cash contributions from participating countries and its own income. Also other similar regional projects are expanding and we do hope that these projects will follow the INFOFISH way in the near future. Poland highly regards the practically oriented technical advisory services provided by these projects and we wish to encourage FAO to expand these new services further.

These five programmes of action have a termination date in 1989. We would like to support what has been said by Dr Lindquist that these action programmes should be evaluated and proposal for future priorities and adjustment should be presented at the Eighteenth COFI Session.

And finally, in June this year Poland hosted in Gdansk the first UNIDO/FAO World Consultation on the Fisheries Industry'. The Polish delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Department of Fisheries of FAO for -its involvement and very active role in this important meeting. FAO's participation and excellent cooperation with its UN sister organization, UNIDO, made the consultation a success. During the meeting a number of recommendations were prepared and we do believe that these two distinguished organizations in the spirit of good cooperation will make every effort to implement this recommendation. This particularly refers to the improvement and modernization of fishing boats and gear to increase productivity and efficiency, improvement of the fish production chain and the increased added value of fishery products.

E.D. MUYANGA (Zambia): My delegation would like to congratulate Mr Lindquist for his clear presentation of the paper. We would also like to congratulate the Secretariat for preparing a brief but comprehensive paper which provides the necessary information. The progress report submitted by the Director-General on the implementation of the strategy and programmes of action clearly shows that many countries have adopted the guidelines for fisheries management and development approved by the World Fisheries Conference. it is also gratifying to note that FAO spared no efforts in mobilizing the necessary financial resources for the implementation of the various programmes of action. Some of the programmes of action have received substantial support from donors and others have received very little support. We hope that FAO will find some way of assisting member - countries in implementing those programmes of action which hitherto have not been receiving sufficient donor support.

Zambia attaches great importance to the implementation of the strategy and programmes of action. All our fisheries development programmes are now critically scrutinized to ensure that they do not only meet the needs of the fishermen but they are also within the strategy and programmes of action approved by the World Fisheries Conference.

Since Zambia is a land-locked country, all our fish production comes from inland waters and aquaculture. We are therefore giving a lot of emphasis to the development of additional fishers in aquaculture. Aquaculture offers great opportunities for increased fish production but in order for us to succeed in this field we require well-trained aquaculture extension officers.

In Africa we have only one regional aquaculture centre where aquaculture is taught. The centre has been producing aquaculture experts who are spearheading the development of this sector in their countries. We are now worried about the future of this regional centre as it appears very little support is being given to it. This has frequently resulted in delays in starting new training programmes. If FAO is giving a lot of support to other regional aquaculture centres we do not see or understand the reasons why support for the African region's aquaculture centre is rather lukewarm.

As I said earlier, Zambia is giving a high priority to the development of aquaculture and we would like to see that the support we are receiving from FAO and some donors is consolidated by having officers who are capable of conducting extension to fish farmers. In this regard we would like to set up a national aquaculture centre where research in different systems of aquaculture could be conducted and where training of aquaculture extension officers would be carried out. We hope that FAO will assist developing countries in setting up their own national centres as stated in the programmes of action.

May I now be permitted to refer to Programme of Action V: the Promotion of the Role of Fisheries in Alleviating Undernutrition. This is a very important Programme of Action and we would like more efforts to be concentrated on fish processing and the reduction of post-harvest losses. Although some studies on post-harvest losses have been conducted, a lot needs to be done in the way of educating fishermen in good fish-processing methods. This could increase the availability of fish to the rural poor.

I should also like to make a few comments on the development of small-scale fisheries. These make a significant contribution to the provision of fish to rural areas. They are also a source of employment and income to small-scale fishermen. My country, for example, has fisheries which are regarded as small-scale fisheries and therefore in order to develop these we need a lot of support. FAO should assist developing countries in planning the development of small-scale fisheries because they are always in danger of being over-fished.

In regard to the fish trade, we support the efforts being made by FAO; to ensure that the developing countries take an active part in fish trade.

Lastly, I should like to mention that investment in fisheries has tremendously increased in Zambia since 1984. This is largely due to the response to the World Fisheries Conference. We have a number of projects in the pipeline which we hope, if the donor countries honour their pledges, will start to operate very shortly. We are also grateful for the support we have been receiving from FAO in development, especially aquaculture, but a lot needs to be done in the way of national fisheries.

In order for us in developing countries to exploit our resources effectively, we require a lot of training, especially in the monitoring and evaluation of our resources. This is an area where we feel FAO should play a major role. We know that a lot of workshop seminars have been organized, but we do not feel that these can be used as a substitute for formal training in fisheries.

LI DACHUN (China) (original language Chinese): First of all I should like to thank Mr Lindquist for his introduction of this document. The Chinese Delegation has carefully studied document C 87/24 and wishes to express its satisfaction with the progress made since the 1984 World Fisheries Conference and the efforts made by FAO in this regard.

I should like to make the following comments. First, the 1984 World Fisheries Conference, and especially the Strategy and Programmes of Action and the other resolutions adopted by the Conference have great significance to all countries in formulating their respective studies, principles and policies for fisheries development. We wish to highly praise the progress made and the good results achieved in the implementation of the Strategy Resolutions of the Conference.

Secondly, we agree with the importance given to the aquaculture service. Aquaculture is important for inland fisheries and some coastal countries where their marine resources have been over-exploited to develop fisheries. Aquaculture development cannot only increase the output of fishery products but also increase the income of fishermen and provide job opportunities for the labour force, including women.

Thirdly, we entirely agree with the recommendations in paragraphs 54 to 59 of the document. Both developed and developing countries have their strong and their weak points in elements essential to aquaculture development: namely, resources, funds and technology. With a view to making common progress, our country is willing to give full play to strong points, especially in aquaculture technology, so as to contribute its share to economic and technical cooperation among the countries.

Fourthly, we feel that in order to further facilitate the development of fisheries it is necessary to hold an international conference on aquaculture. At the Seventh Session of the Committee on Fisheries held last May, the Tunisian and Spanish delegations suggested the convening of an international conference on aquaculture. We think this suggestion is worthy of our attention and that a decision on this matter should be made as soon as possible. We hope that FAO will seriously study the suggestion and do a good job in preparing the meeting so as to enable Member States to have sufficient preparation before the meeting or conference in order to achieve good results.

Fifthly, our government has always attached importance to the development of fisheries and has regarded this as an important aspect in ensuring food security and helping rural people to get rid of poverty and helping them to become rich. In recent years, FAO, WFP and some friendly countries have given us assistance and support for the development of fisheries in our country. Here we wish to express our sincere thanks to them.

Philippe PIOTET (France): La délégation française voudrait tout d'abord exprimer sa satisfaction de constater la priorité accordée au secteur des pêches dans le prochain Programme de travail et budget. Le taux de croissance de 2,2 pour cent en faveur de ses actions est certes modeste mais il devrait permettre, en concentrant les moyens sur les activités les plus importantes, d'assurer une mise en oeuvre satisfaisante des programmes adoptés par la Conférence mondiale des pêches de 1984. Ma délégation tient à rappeler ici son attachement à ces programmes qui constituent un cadre cohérent pour une coopération internationale efficace dans un domaine où la FAO a un rôle de tout premier plan à jouer.

En ce qui concerne tout d'abord la politique halieutique, je voudrais mettre l'accent sur le bien-fondé de certaines orientations retenues par la Conférence mondiale des pêches. Les travaux menés par la FAO en matière d'évaluation des ressources, les perspectives à moyen terme de la demande mondiale en produits de la mer mettent clairement en évidence la nécessité d'une exploitation de plus en plus prudente des richesses halieutiques. Tout indique en effet que les prochaines années seront marquées par le plafonnement des captures mondiales et par un décalage croissant entre l'offre et la demande de poisson. Dans ces conditions, la première priorité doit être accordée aux politiques d'aménagement en privilégiant les actions visant à mieux organiser l'accès aux ressources et en limitant le plus possible les pertes de toute nature. La France appuie tout particulièrement, à cet égard, les orientations définies dans le paragraphe 19 du document. C 87/24.

Ma délégation a examiné en détail les recommandations de la dix-septième session du Comité des pêches, qui s'est réuni en mai dernier. Elle souscrit à l'ensemble de ces recommandations et tout particulièrement à celles signalées au paragraphe 51 du document C 87/24 concernant la nécessité de coordonner les apports des donateurs. La consultation des donateurs organisée à Paris en octobre 1986, sous les auspices de la Banque mondiale, de la Communauté économique européenne, du PNUD et de la Banque africaine de développement, avec la participation de la FAO, a fort justement mis l'accent sur cette nécessité. Cette consultation a également mis en évidence, à juste titre, que de nombreux projets n'aboutissaient pas aux résultats attendus parce qu'ils se situaient trop souvent dans une perspective à court terme. Ma délégation propose à ce sujet que la FAO fasse sienne

la recommandation de cette consultation visant à privilégier, dans le cadre des programmes et des projets, une approche à plus long terme s'appuyant sur des analyses prospectives et sur les résultats de la recherche.

Je voudrais maintenant faire quelques observations sur l'exploitation et l'utilisation des ressources halieutiques. Ma délégation tient tout d'abord à souligner l'intérêt particulier de la pêche artisanale et l'utilité d'intégrer ce secteur dans des programmes plus larges de développement rural, comme le souligne fort justement le paragraphe 20 du document C 87/24. La modernisation du secteur de la pêche artisanale, si elle est bien adaptée aux besoins des pays en développement, peut apporter une contribution importante à l'amélioration de la situation nutritionnelle des populations. Il faut donc l'encourager.

L'aquaculture, comme vient de le souligner le délégué de la Chine ainsi que celui de la Zambie, peut elle aussi concourir à cet objectif par l'expérience qui nous enseigne que, dans ce domaine, il faut se garder d'appliquer des schémas trop théoriques. Les expériences les plus réussies sont, en effet, celles pour lesquelles on a su maîtriser les techniques tout en tenant compte des conditions locales et régionales.

Le secteur des pêches est l'un des secteurs d'activité importants de l'Organisation qui mérite une attention particulière au sein des différents comités. Je pense, bien sûr, au Comité des pêches et aux sous-comités qui lui sont rattachés. Je pense aussi au Comité du programme, qui pourrait fort utilement renforcer sa capacité d'expertise dans ce domaine. La présence au sein de ce Comité de membres plus particulièrement compétents dans le domaine des pêches permettrait de renforcer les liens entre ce secteur et les autres secteurs et d'intégrer ses différentes activités dans des programmes plus larges de développement rural.

Je souhaiterais maintenant insister sur certains aspects de la coordination internationale. Dans le domaine de la commercialisation, tout d'abord, il conviendra de continuer à éviter tout double emploi avec les travaux menés au GATT et à l'OCDE et à concentrer les activités de la FAO sur certains besoins prioritaires des Etats Membres qu'elle a vocation de satisfaire.

Je pense, en particulier, à la collecte et à la diffusion d'informations sur le commerce des produits de la pêche, notamment dans le cadre du réseau GLOBEFISH.

Dans un autre domaine de la coopération internationale, ma délégation voudrait rappeler l'importance qu'elle attache à la coopération entreprise dans le cadre du Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est, la COPACE. Cette Commission a développé, au cours des dernières années, des activités particulièrement utiles pour l'ensemble des pays membres. Toutefois, son avenir apparaît incertain à la suite de la décision prise par un de ces pays de suspendre son aide à la fin de cette année. La France, qui participe à la coopération engagée dans le cadre du COPACE, souhaite qu'une solution soit rapidement trouvée avec le soutien de la Communauté économique européenne pour que les activités du COPACE puissent se poursuivre et se développer.

Enfin, ma délégation voudrait se féliciter de la bonne coordination entre la FAO et l'ONUDT dans le domaine de l'industrialisation de la pêche. La première Consultation mondiale organisée sur ce sujet à Gdansk, en Pologne, en juin 1987, a été très utile et nous sommes persuadés qu'elle renforcera la coopération entre les pays membres pour la mise en oeuvre de projets concrets de modernisation des pêcheries tant industrielles qu'artisanales.

Nous pensons également que la FAO, dans le cadre de son Programme ordinaire, ne manquera pas de mettre en application les conclusions de cette Consultation dans les domaines qui la concernent comme la formation, la recherche, le développement, la vulgarisation et l'amélioration des techniques de transformation et de consommation du poisson.

Peter A. WIESMANN (Suisse): J'aimerais remercier le Directeur général d'avoir autorisé la publication "Le Droit et la Mer" en mémoire de M. Jean Carroz. Ce recueil constitue un hommage à la fois pertinent et permanent à sa vie et à son oeuvre.

Quoique mon pays ne puisse contribuer de façon substantielle au développement mondial des pêches pour des raisons évidentes de compétence, nous sommes heureux et fiers qu'un de nos concitoyens,

M. Jean Carroz, ait pu, au cours de sa carrière, contribuer de façon importante au développement du droit de la mer, condition essentielle pour un développement harmonieux du secteur des pêches dont l'apport à l'alimentation de la population mondiale n'est plus à souligner.

Personnellement, j'ai eu le plaisir et le privilège de bien connaître M. Carroz. Dans un temps malheureusement relativement court, il est devenu un ami. Sa mort a été pour moi, mais aussi pour tous ses nombreux amis et collaborateurs, une perte très douloureuse.

Jean Carroz était un homme de grande valeur intellectuelle mais aussi humaine. Nous tous qui l'avons connu garderons certainement un très bon souvenir de ce personnage hors du commun.

Rainer PRESTIEN (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): My delegation welcomes document C 87/24 and the progress report on Strategy and Action Programmes which was adopted by the World Fisheries Conference of 1984.

First I wish to thank Mr Lindquist for his informative introduction to this document. The Federal Republic of Germany took an active part in the World Fisheries Conference.

We support the objectives of the World Strategy and the five Action Programmes for fisheries management and development.

The three main focal areas from our point of view are: first, the improvement of fisheries management; second, effective promotion of breeding of fish and other aquatic organisms under controlled conditions, aquaculture; and third, increased utilization of fisheries resources for human consumption, particularly by bringing about a drop in catch losses. In this way we want, to achieve fisheries playing a greater role in the future for the nourishment of men.

We know from document C 87/2 that over the past calendar year landings of fish again reached a record level of 89.2 million tonnes, which is 4 million tonnes higher than the previous figure, which shows that fish has already begun to play a greater role in human consumption.

This development benefits from the overproportionate share in funds envisaged for fisheries in the 1988-89 Programme of Work and Budget. Together with most experts in this area we also feel that we should promote small-scale fisheries in developing countries as being particularly important. Although in most developing countries up to 80 percent of the total of catches landed derive from this labour intensive sector, nevertheless this is not always given enough focus. The promotion of this sector has been given top priority already for a number of years in fishery development cooperation in the Federal Republic of Germany.

From the point of view of our national development cooperation, the promotion of fisheries improves the qualitative and quantitative food supply and also creates jobs and incomes.

The focal point of our development cooperation consists of promoting research and training and improving the breeding and processing methods. Also we are promoting more independence on the part of developing countries in the management and utilization of the living resources of the sea.

The recommendations and conclusions of the Committee on Fisheries and the Council, paragraphs 44-62 of document C 87/24, are largely supported by our delegation.

The activities of our Organization in the area of trade in fish, we recommend that all forms of duplication and overlapping with the activities of other international organizations be avoided.

The Federal Government will also in future carefully watch the further development of world catches and contribute its fruitful cooperation with developing countries in the area of fisheries.

Pedro OYARCE YURASZECK (Chile): Permítame, Señor Presidente, expresar nuestro reconocimiento a la Secretaría por la preparación del documento C 87/24 y al Asistente del Director General del Departamento de Pesca por su compelta presentación.

Mi delegación desea igualmente sumarse al homenaje al señor Carroz. Quienes participamamos en la Tercera Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre Derecho del Mar, tuvimos la oportunidad de apreciar su dedicación a laausa de ios países costeros en la búsqueda de un nuevo orden jurídico en los mares y océanos. La Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros inició en 1984 una nueva estrategia en este sector, en particular promoviendo actividades tendientes a crear mayor conciencia de la importancia y el potencial de la pesca para la economía global y de su contribución a la seguridad alimentaria, como un concepto amplio.

Paralelamente ha facilitado la orientación de los esfuerzos nacionales e internacionales en la búsqueda de una nueva Ordenación más eficaz de los Recursos Pesqueros Mundiales y a maximizar los beneficios después del desembarque. Mi delegación desea destacar aquí la especial prioridad que a nuestro juicio debe concedérsele al Programa principal 2.2 "Pesca", del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1988-89 y sus objetivos a mediano plazo.

Chile, como queda reflejado en el párrafo quinto del documento mencionado, se encuentra entre ios 57 países que han dado respuesta a la solicitud del Director General, para la preparación del primer Informe sobre los progresos en la aplicación de la estrategia. En esa respuesta se hacen algunas observaciones de nuestra experiencia pesquera y se identifican temas de interés nacional y otros susceptibles de esquemas de cooperación internacional.

Mi delegación desea formular algunas observaciones generales y puntuales al documento C 87/24. En primer término, consideramos que en él se reflejan los avancesdel sector en el marco global, pero al mismo tiempo so observa un cierto desequilibrio intrarregional, como el propio documento lo señala expresamente en los párrafos 30, 57 y en el cuadro número 1 del Apéndice A.

Este desequilibrio, más que responsabilidad de la FAO, obedece a una problemática vinculada a las prioridades seleccionadas por los países donantes. Se puede percibir con claridad en la pesca interior.

Si bien en Latinoamérica hay áreas que disponen, en términos comparativos, de una política e infraestructura tecnológica y humana sectorial importante, también se perciben áreas que indudablemente requieren de un reforzamiento de ios mecanismos multilaterales de cooperación internacional. En tal sentido, existen países como Chile, con experiencia útil eneste ámbito, y con capacidad y disposición para ofrecer líneas de cooperación en el marco del CTPD.

En este aspecto vemos con complacencia las actividades de la Organización a través de sus Oficinas Regionales y de las comisiones de pesca.

Las acciones relacionadas con la estrategia han contribuido a reforzar nuestra política nacional para el desarrollo de este sector de gravitación sustantiva, si se considera que Chile es el quinto país pesquero del mundo. Existe una preocupación permanente en materia de administración y desarrollo pesquero. En este ámbito, estamos realizando acciones a tres niveles: profesional, de formación y de capacitación de pescadores.

En cuanto al Programa 2: Desarrollo de las pesquerías en pequeña escala, el documento destaca precisamente un enfoque integrado coincidente con los esfuerzos que mi país está llevando a cabo a nivel nacional, ai objeto de obtener un mejoramiento de las condiciones socioeconómicas de las comunidades de pescadores artesanales y sus familias. Ello se ha traducido en la ejecución de diversos proyectos orientados a solucionar problemas de infraestructura tecnológica, seguridad en las embarcaciones y otros.

Como se indica en la respuesta de nuestro país al requerimiento del Director General, los resultados a nivel doméstico han sido hasta la fecha positivos.

En relación al Programa 3: Desarrollo de la acuicultura, el documento recoge la idea de reforzar y diversificar las acciones destinadas a implementar el desarrollo, la investigación aplicada, la capacitación y la creación de una base datos sobre acuicultura.

Con ocasión de la cuarta reunión del Grupo de Trabajo sobre Recursos Pesqueros de la Comisión de Pesca Continental para América Latina (COPESCAL) celebrado en mi país, en septiembre de 1986, se abordó detalladamente el desarrollo nacional y regional de las actividades de acuicultura, tanto marinas como continentales. En esa oportunidad, se destacaron los estudios destinados a la normalización pesquera y a mostrar la experiencia nacional, en especial respecto del salmón.

El nivel técnico y la experiencia alcanzados por nuestro país; nos permite disponer de una capacidad de ofrecer líneas de cooperación horizontal. En los aspectos vinculados a las transferencias de tecnologías, también los consideramos valiosos.

En cuanto al Programa 4: El comercio internacional de pescado y productos pesqueros, Chile apoya las acciones de esta agencia y otras organizaciones, con el objeto de aumentar los beneficios del comercio internacional del pescado y los productos pesqueros. Junto a otros países en desarrollo, hemos alentado en el GATT, específicamente a través del CGP, y en la Asociación Latinoamericana de Integración (ALADI), entre otros foros, las acciones destinadas a eliminar las barreras arancelarias y no arancelarias que dificultan el ingreso a los mercados y el establecimiento y acuerdos con otros países.

El sector pesquero chileno es básicamente exportador, por cuanto el noventa y cinco por ciento de su producción industrial se destina al comercio internacional. Liberalizar el mercado constituye, en consecuencia, una tarea prioritaria para nuestro país.

En términos globales, es interesante tener presente que el valor del comercio pesquero presenta una tendencia creciente. En poco más de dos décadas ha aumentado de mil trescientos millones de dólares a diecisiete mil millones de dólares en 1986. La participación de los países en desarrollo en ese mercado, se ha elevado desde un veinticuatro por ciento en 1965, a aproximadamente el cuarenta y cuatro por ciento en el primer trimestre del presente año.

Por otra parte, mi Delegación comparte el enfoque planteado frente a las actividades futuras del Subcomité de comercio pesquero.

En relación al Programa 5: Promoción de la función de las pesquerías para mitigar la desnutrición, mi delegación coincide con las ideas contenidas en esta sección. Deseamos subrayar la necesidad de que el fomento de las acciones en esta esfera contribuya al bienestar real de los sectores de menores ingresos mediante un aprovechamiento óptimo de los recursos hidrobiológicos. La acción del DMA el año pasado constituyó un instrumento valioso en tal sentido.

Mi país, como miembro de la Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur, junto a Colombia, Perú y Ecuador, tiene un interés particular en la preservación, protección y racional explotación de los recursos del medio marino en las zonas económicas exclusivas en alta mar, de conformidad a las disposiciones contenidas en la Convención de Naciones Unidas sobre el Derecho del Mar. Deseamos reconocer el buen entendimiento y cooperación existentes entre ese organismo y FAO, en especial en un área donde ese organismo subregional absorbe funciones propias de las comisiones de pesca regionales de la FAO.

Dentro de este marco de cooperación se trabaja conjuntamente en variados temas, como el desarrollo de la pesca en el Pacífico sudeste, evaluación de los recursos de pesquerías artesanales, estadísticas pesqueras y del Pacífico sudeste, alimentos pesqueros no tradicionales. Ello representa un nivel de aproximación e intercambio de experiencias especialmente valiosos.

Nuestro país será, además, sede de un simposio internacional sobre recursos vivos y pesquerías, que se llevará a cabo en Viña del Mar en mayo de 1988.

Mi Delegación confía que esta relación entre ambos organismos, en una de las áreas geográficas que ofrece perspectivas en de gravitación política, económica y social, dentro del sistema internacional como es el Pacífico, sea apropiadamente evaluada y respaldada por los países miembros.

Sr. Presidente, el sector pesquero chileno, compuesto por los subsectores: industrial, artesanal e institucional, ha alcanzado un nivel de desarrollo importante, y ello se ha traducido en una contribución sustantiva en la generación de divisas, productos geográficos brutos y fuentes de empleo, con el consecuente impacto social.

Los objetivos de nuestro sistema institucional en este sector son coincidentes con la filosofía, principios y directrices propuestas por la FAO en la Conferencia Mundial sobre Ordenación y Desarrollo Pesqueros, lo que ha sido una guía ideológica en la permanente revisión y evaluación de la política pesquera nacional y en el fomento de la cooperación en los mares y océanos.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): Ghana congratulates the secretariat for the document as presented. Ghana is one of those countries which have already initiated the action on the Strategy and Programmes of Action. We have not got any comments on the document but we have a few suggestions to make for the consideration of FAO.

Page 6, paragraph 27, II, the English version, the Ghana delegation would like to add the subject matter of utilization of under-utilized species. I was happy to hear the delegate from Poland mention this. An example I had in mind, Trigger fish, the species of Balistes, which is common in the East Central Atlantic.

On III, I wish to refer to the ADCP Programme. I have in mind specifically the African Regional Aquaculture Centre at Port Harcourt in Nigeria. Again my colleague from Gambia has already made reference to this. The future of this Centre seems to be hanging in the balance. We therefore appeal to FAO to continue in its efforts to secure the assistance of donor agencies to keep this Centre going because this programme is very dear to countries in Africa.

The programme of fish handling and processing requires special attention in favour of artisanal fishermen and women. This is suggested in view of the present high rate of post-harvest fish losses, which is rated at 20% in the tropical countries.

Finally, the Ghana delegation supports the Programme as contained in the document before us.

Tomofumi KUME (Japan): First of all, my delegation would like to thank Mr Lindquist for his clear introduction.

With regard to the realization of Programmes of Action for Fisheries Management and Development, Japan has been expanding and implementing various financial and technical cooperation schemes bilaterally, and has also been providing cooperation through FAO, in view of assisting fishery development in the third world. When implementing this cooperation, Japan tries to take Programmes of Action fully into account.

We have therefore already contributed to the Trust Funds established for the implementation of FAO Programmes of Action at a total amount of 700 thousand US dollars per annum, of which 400 thousand dollars are for the Regional South Pacific Aquaculture Development Project and 300 thousand dollars for the Indian Ocean Fishery Resource Analysis and Development Project. We would like to continue such a contribution to the Action Programmes in the future.

As to the implementation of Programmes of Action by each country, development should not be concentrated to certain areas, but balanced and integrated development is very important, involving all sectors like fishery resources, fishing technology, fishing vessels, port infrastructure, processing and marketing, promotion of consumption and so on.

Along with this, it is especially important for the success of the development to foster human resources which will have responsibility from the formulation of the development plan to implementation.

Japan fully agrees with the delegate of Zambia who stressed the importance of extension officers for the development of fisheries production. In my country extension officers play a very important role in disseminating new technology and in providing managerial skills of fisheries to fishermen and this is one of the major factors of the development of fisheries in Japan.

Finally, because of the importance of fisheries we support the strengthening of the Fisheries Department activities in FAO.

Vàclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): First I would like to congratulate Mr Lindquist for his comprehensive introduction.

My delegation appreciates how easy it is to survey the C 87/24 document, and attach particular value to the suggested trends and the expected further development of the Programmes of Action accepted by the FAO World Conferences on Fisheries Management and Development in 1984. The importance of fisheries was also pointed out at the 91st session of FAO Council and at other sessions.

Czechoslovakia as an inland country fully agrees with the conclusions of the World FAO Conference on Fisheries Management and Development and with FAO's plans for bringing these conclusions into life.

According to the Czechoslovak delegation's view, due attention should be paid also to the problems of the development of aquaculture which is included in Programme of Action III. Freshwater fisheries still have considerable reserves in both European and - in particular - developing countries; mobilization of these reserves would make a significant contribution to efforts to remove the protein problem in human nutrition.

Czechoslovakia has been a regular member of the FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC) since 1979. The Czechoslovak institutions and experts actively participate in the work of EIFAC subcommissions. With the several hundred years tradition of fisheries and with the present high standard of fish culture, Czechoslovakia is undoubtedly one of the leading European countries with advanced fisheries.

Czechoslovak experts have been, and are, involved in the FAO/UNDP field programmes in the developing countries as well as in bilateral technical assistance schemes.

I would like to confirm again in this context Czechoslovakia's willingness to organize short training courses for experts from developing countries and full readiness to use for this purpose part of the accumulated voluntary Czechoslovak contribution to the UNDP.

The Czechoslovak Delegation uses this occasion to inform the delegates that - as a manifestation of our effort to expand cooperation in aquaculture - Czechoslovakia is ready to hold the 1990 EIFAC session in our country.

Dato' Abu Bakar MAHMUD (Malaysia): The Malaysian delegation is pleased to welcome the Secretariat's Report in Implementation of Strategies and the Programmes of Action as endorsed by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development as contained in document C 87/24. I would like to congratulate Mr Lindquist for the very useful and informative introduction of the subject.

It has been three years since the World Fisheries Conference endorsed the Strategies and Programme of Action and in spite of the short time that has passed since then it is encouraging to note that a number of positive aspects have been highlighted in this Report.

It is evident that the matter of fisheries development and its contribution to the national economy, in terms of providing food, employment and foreign exchange, have been recognized by many national planners and policy makers. There is no doubt that fishery planners themselves have made use of the strategies and programmes of action when advocating a higher priority in terms of financial allocation to the fishery sector. There has also been a conscious effort by these administrators to align their national fishery plan in accordance with the strategies and programmes of adopted by the World Conference. These positive aspects that have emerged from the World Fisheries Conference, augur well for the fishery sector as a whole, and have instilled the sense of recognition to national planners on the importance of fisheries in their national development.

It is also clear that the strategies and programmes have given solid guidelines for future development and most countries, including my own, are in the various stages of implementing the strategies and programmes of action.

Since the declaration of Malaysia's EEZ in 1980, the optimal utilization of our resources in the economic zones has been the focus of our programmes. We are determined to be self-sufficient in

fish production through the development of our deepsea fisheries fleet. Effort in this direction have been preceded by the completion of a comprehensive survey of the fisheries resources of the EEZ using the chartered vessel, R.V. Rostrelliger. The survey was conducted from December 1985 to January 1987. Both pelagic and demersal fish stocks of the EEZ were assessed. Another complementary survey of tuna stocks in the EEZ is being carried out by the Fisheries Department of my Government. Data obtained from these surveys are being analyzed and used to plan the rational exploitation of our fishery resources and will be the basis for future resource surveys to be conducted by our Fisheries Department from time to time.

The encouraging results of the surveys has enabled the Government to give full encouragement to the private sector in the country to embark upon the expansion of its deep sea fishing fleet.

Licences for fishing on the offshore regions have been issued more liberally, subject to the availability of resources. The response from the private sector in this field has been most encouraging. Cooperation on a joint venture basis with our neighbour, Thailand, has been set up in the catching as well as marketing of tuna.

My delegation does not wish to stress the importance of each of the strategy and programme of action, since they have been fully elaborated and discussed in the COFI and Council meetings prior to this Conference. Nevertheless, we only wish to take this opportunity to reiterate our strong support to these strategies and programmes, especially in the importance of formulating effective systems of management, including the surveillance and control of fishing activities. We attach particular importance to this aspect of fishery, on account of the over-fishing problem in inshore areas, where we feel that prudent utilisation of renewable resources is of paramount importance in ensuring optimal returns.

We have improved our legislative instruments with the passing of the Fisheries Act 1985 by Parliament. For effective utilisation of manpower, we have set up the National Maritime Coordinating Centre, to coordinate all maritime enforcement agencies, such as the Navy, Maritime Police and Fisheries Department. Aerial surveillance of the EEZ is being carried out to supplement surface surveillance by patrol vessels. The control and protection of our resources in the EEZ is part of our responsibility under the EEZ declaration to ensure the rational exploitation of our fish resources.

The other important aspect which we attach particular importance, is aquaculture development, where we think the potential is not fully exploited and the likelihood of this activity to play its role in upgrading the income of fishermen is greatest. We agree with the findings of the document that the need for strengthening the manpower and expertise in developing countries is still great and should be continually stressed. Technical cooperation among developing countries and active collaboration between North and South have to be actively pursued in research, development and management.

We are also gratified with the financial support from bilateral and multilateral donor agencies in having responded positively to the funding requirements to implement the strategies and programmes of action. The \$15 million level recommended by the World Fisheries Conference, is now nearly fully met and with the possibility of further increase from other sources for the year. We are appreciative of the efforts of these donors.

We note also that the FAO budget for an increase of \$156 000 has been proposed for the fishery sector. Although we would like to see a much greater increase than this amount, the financial constraints faced by this Organization would not allow it to be realised. Nevertheless, we strongly support the level of the budget for fishery as proposed by the Director-General.

In conclusion, we wish to give our support to the work of FAO in the field of fishery, which we have found very useful and has guided us in the planning and implementation of our national fishery programmes.

McDonald Phillip BENJAMIN (Dominica): I think the invitation is to Dominica rather than to the Dominican Republic. I will follow the example of FAO in the presentation of this document which is characterized by brevity and succinctness. In the presentation by the Chinese delegation reference was made to the opportunities offered by aquaculture and inland fisheries for increased income and employment especially for women. I have had the pleasure of seeing this process at work in China and have been very much impressed with the integrated nature of these operations involving such things as livestock raising, ducks, the cultivation of sugar cane and so on. This all helps to provide a very strong active biological base for these fish ponds. I would add one more dimension to this possibility of aquaculture and inland fisheries. Where such areas of water exist they could become very precious assets in the government's fight against rural poverty and landlessness. For example, in one Asian country I have seen a preliminary start being made with this approach where a common resource of an inland lake was being exploited by landless people. I think this offers one opportunity that many countries with that type of facility may be able to exploit.

Lastly, at the COFI meeting my delegation expressed its concerns about the shares that went to the Latin American and Caribbean region of these Programmes of Action. For that whole area we are talking of an allocation of roughly 8 percent of these resources for these programmes. This cannot be justified either on the basis of population or other considerations. I should like to highlight the fact in particular that for the Caribbean sub-region water and the sea resources are very important because the countries do not have the opportunities or the grassland or ecological conditions favourable for the raising of intensive livestock. In the light of that, Imports of meat, dairy products, poultry and fish are very high and so we would like to see that this point, which was fully recognized in paragraph 57 of the document where it is mentioned in the last sentence that the Council requested FAO to consult with donor countries and financing institutions in order to remedy the situation. Our delegation will be following up this request very closely.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): My delegation wishes to commend the Secretariat for the document submitted to facilitate discussions on item 16 of the Conference agenda.

Mr Lindquist's introduction of the item has been pleasant and we express our appreciation to him for this.

The 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development has helped to sensitize those who formulate development policies on the importance of fisheries in national socio-economic development programmes. Policy decision-makers now show greater appreciation than before for the role fisheries can play to facilitate development goals, especially those relating to the creation of additional employment opportunities, raising income levels to improve living standards, particularly in the rural areas and achieving self-sufficiency in food supply and nutritional requirements. It is important that the awareness and Interest stimulated amongst decision-makers on the role of fisheries in development is maintained. However, since the resources available for development are extremely scarce, while high priority programmes bidding for the resources are excessive, it is essential that the fisheries projects selected for funding be those that do not require unduly long gestation periods before attaining their set goals and consequently creating the impact necessary to attract even more the interest of decision-makers in fisheries development.

The strategy and action programmes adopted by the World Fisheries Conference provide a good basis for sustaining the interest generated in fisheries development programmes. The FAO pronouncement in paragraph 29 of document C 87/24 that it will continue close contact with potential donors to mobilize funds for the Programme of Action is therefore welcome. We hope that these efforts will bear fruit and rehabilitate the rather sad situation reported in paragraph 2.10 of document C 87/LIM/19 that the inadequacy of extra budgetary support funds has constrained effective implementation of several programmes, especially the Action Programmes approved by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development.

Kenya has accepted the strategy and programmes of action and the Government has incorporated these in the National Development Plan and Planned Implementation Programmes. The Government promotes maximization on a sustainable yield basis, production and subsequent utilization of the country's fisheries resources from both capture and culture fisheries. Capture fisheries from the inland waters account for 93 percent of total fish output. However, most of the inland fisheries resources have

either hit or are about to obtain their maximum sustainable yield limits. Therefore if the country is to realize an appreciable increase in fish landings then emphasis must be put on developing marine fisheries and aquaculture.

Production from the marine resources has continued to be small, accounting for just about 6 percent only of the total country's production. It has however been realized that low production from the coastal waters is primarily due to the limits in capture efficiency and capacity of both fishing boats and gear coastal fishermen use in their fishing operations rather than absence of fish stocks. Coastal fishing fleets consist almost invariably of small fishing boats exclusively restricted in their fishing range to waters within the creeks. These boats have severely limited load capacity for carrying fishing gear. They are also not adaptable to the use of more efficient and modern fishing gear methods. The Government has therefore tested and introduced to the fishermen better and more seaworthy boats with a higher fishing range and bigger capacity for carrying fishing gear. It is also easy to rig these boats to use modern fishing gear. The fishermen who have acquired these boats have realized a marked increase in their landings and income. Supply of these boats will therefore be intensified. That is in relation to Action Programme I of the 1984 World Fisheries Conference.

The Government is giving special attention to deep-sea fishing in the management and development of our marine fisheries so that the resources within the 200 miles Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and beyond may be exploited for the benefit of the country's economic growth. Because of constraints arising from non-availability in the country of technological competence and sufficient capital outlay required to start a national deep-sea fishing fleet, the Government is open to receipt and consideration of proposals that would lead to fishing under either joint ventures with Kenyans or special licences. We are aware that long-distance fishing fleets from the fishing nations have been fishing in our region for many years. Kenya therefore offers its cooperation on a mutual interest basis, to those from within and out of the region who wish to exploit the deep-sea fishing resources in EEZ.

To a large extent the substitution fish farming operations have been successful. Fish farming - with regard to item 3 of the Action Programme - is another important sector of fish production and fisheries development. Fish farming has been practised in Kenya for about 25 years now. Basically the programme has remained a subsistence occupation with farmers cultivating fish in a small pond near his/her house from where the farmer would harvest a few fish about twice weekly to supplement the family animal protein food supply. There are about 4 000 subsistence fish farmers in the country owning between them about 10 000 ponds covering an estimated aggregate land area of 3 000 hectares. Prevailing pressure on land which correspondingly increases with growth in population and increased awareness amongst the people of opportunity cost for the land, mitigate that fish farming, like many other rural-based activities, must graduate from subsistence to commercial operations and compete on an economic basis with alternative economic employment of both land and time of the farmer if fish farming is to proceed. Pilot projects have proved that commercial fish farming is viable and can be successfully developed in most parts of the country. The Government therefore plans to expand commercial fish farming activities in suitable areas throughout the country. It is envisaged that about 10 000 hectares of land will be put under commercial fish farming within the next five years.

To increase fish supply the Government is providing infrastructure which includes improvement of fish landing, handling and preservation facilities. These facilities will reduce post-harvest losses to the minimum so that the landed fish are utilized well in good condition by the consumers. Good quality fish will also fetch higher prices for the fishermen who should therefore realize higher income for their efforts.

In conclusion, Kenya wishes to express sincere gratitude and appreciation to various countries and agencies which have given us assistance that has facilitated expansion in development of our fisheries resources. This assistance has been in the form of personnel, equipment, capital finance and manpower development.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypty) (Original language Arabic): My delegation would like to express its appreciation to Mr Lindquist for the presentation of this document. We welcome this report which has become very clear and we join the representative of Bangladesh when he says that the lapse of time since the World Fisheries Conference in 1984 does not allow for the assessment of the progress

in the field of fisheries at the global level. We would also point out that the resolutions of this Conference have had positive effects, as we have noticed an increase in the allocations in the fish sector and better planning of this sector.

Table I shows the position of FAO's financing provided under the Programme of Action for the Management and Development of Fisheries in the period 1985-87. We are pleased to note the increase of this funding in the Near East region. We are also satisfied under Table II of the document - the increase of funding provided by the donor countries to the Programme of Action in the Field of Fisheries.

My country grants the fish sector special attention. Therefore we have set up a special department which elaborates the action programmes for the development of this sector. We have had successful experiments of cooperation with FAO in this field and we hope it will increase its aid to this sector. We are ready to cooperate at the regional level in this sector in which we have acquired experience from our collaboration with FAO in its assistance programme, namely the Red Sea Project. We availed ourselves of this opportunity, for the countries with whom we have concluded bilateral agreements for the promotion of this sector.

My country has elaborated the programmes for the development of the fish sector in the light of the programmes of action adopted by the World Fisheries Conference because we are convinced of the importance of fish and the vital role of this sector in bridging the protein gap and in the production of food. Some of my colleagues mentioned in their interventions on this item the need to train personnel in the field of fisheries. We welcome personnel for training in our centres that are within the framework of the FAO programmes, and particularly the technical cooperation among developing countries.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): En primer lugar Señor Presidente, y por ser la primera vez que hago uso de la palabra bajo su presidencia, deseo felicitarlo sinceramente por haber sido elegido para presidir este debate. Estamos convencidos de que con su experiencia y sentido práctico, nuestro debate en este tema culminará exitosamente. Quisiera asimismo felicitar al Señor Lindquist por la clara presentación del tema y a la Secretaría por la calidad y concreción del Documento C 87/24, que ños ha presentado.

Mi Delegación considera que aun es un tiempo insuficiente para poder realizar una evaluación a profundidad y en extenso, de los resultados de la aplicación de las estrategias trazadas por la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca celebrada en 1984. No obstante, hay que reconocer que se han realizado progresos y las decisiones adoptadas progresivamente se vienen aplicando por una cantidad importante de países.

En este sentido se debe tomar en cuenta la mayor importancia que cada día le conceden los países y la FAO al desarrollo de la pesca, como parte importante de la seguridad alimentaria, constituyendo una fuente de alimentos proteicos que aún es suficientemente explotada en los países en desarrollo.

Por otra parte, mi Delegación concede una gran importancia a la pesca como parte del comercio internacional.

Mi país mantiene excelentes y estrechas relaciones de cooperación con la FAO en este sector, y a pesar de que hemos contado con contribuciones en cierta medida limitadas dada la limitación de recursos de la Organización, podemos decir que estas contribuciones han tenido un impacto importante en el desarrollo de la pesca de nuestro país.

En cuanto a los Programas de acción, Señor Presidente, podemos apreciar que ya estos vienen poniéndose en práctica. Quisiera de manera particular referirme al Programa de Acción para el Desarrollo de la Agricultura, habida cuenta de que existe un gran potencial en este sector y donde las inversiones de recursos escasos pudieran tener un beneficio inmediato, especialmente para los países en desarrollo, abarcando un plano mucho más amplio, pues incluye a los países mediterráneos. Nos satisface saber que este Programa ha sido uno de los más beneficiados en la asignación de recursos.

Nos complace mucho los esfuerzos realizados por la FAO para obtener fondos de posibles donantes para apoyar los programas de acción en el período 1985/89, cumpliendo así la Resolución N 2 de la Conferencia Mundial de Pesca.

Dentro de las Contribuciones externas recibidas se debe poner de relieve la participación del PNUD y esperamos que este Programa siga brindando su importante aporte a los programas de acción. También deseamos hacer un llamado a otros posibles donantes para que brinden nuevas contribuciones y a aquéllos que ya lo están haciendo, alentarlos a que continúen, y de ser posible los aumenten.

Para finalizar, dire que el Director General, a pesar de las dificultades financieras por las que atraviesa la PAO, ha tenido

incrementar los fondos destinados al Programa principal, Pesca, para el bienio 1988-89, lo cual debe recibir nuestro respaldo.

Resumiendo, mi Delegación apoya las proposiciones hechas por la Secretaría en el Documento C 87/24.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav Delegation would like to welcome and express its satisfaction with the progress achieved in the implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Fisheries Conference. At the same time we regret the imbalances in the support received by the different Programmes of Action as well as the geographical imbalances, as was also underlined by the Council. Let us hope that additional support to rectify these imbalances will be forthcoming.

Our Delegation shares the view of other delegations that the associated Programmes of Action are providing a sound and integrated basis for FAO and other technical assistance and financial agencies to aid developing countries to enhance their own capacities for fisheries development.

In this connection we are of the opinion that there is a necessity to give greater emphasis to the needs for training, transfer of technology and financial resources as a contribution to the efforts of developing countries aimed at ensuring self-reliance in planning and implementation of the Fisheries Management and Development Programme. Equally important is the more adequate use of fish, particularly in under-fed regions, having in mind the place and potential of fisheries in the rural economy and the prospective role in increasing food supplies in developing countries.

Finally the Yugoslav Delegation looks forward to more significant and substantial progress in the implementation of the Strategy and Programmes of Action in forthcoming years.

Mohammed ROUCHDI (Maroc): Je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter M. Lindquist pour sa présentation claire et concise du document qui nous est soumis. Je voudrais aussi remercier le secrétariat du Département des pêches pour les efforts qu'il a déployés en vue de la préparation du présent document.

La Conférence mondiale de 1984 sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches marque une étape fondamentale dans l'évolution de la noble action de la FAO et confère une dimension nouvelle à son oeuvre au profit du bien-être de l'humanité. En effet, le texte de la Stratégie élaborée par d'éminents experts internationaux appartenant à cette Organisation et adoptée lors de la Conférence a constitué et continue de constituer pour l'ensemble des pays membres un document de référence combien utile au niveau de la préparation des plans nationaux pour l'aménagement et le développement des pêches.

Pour le cas de mon pays, l'adoption de la Stratégie et des programmes intervenant à une période où le Maroc entreprenait l'exécution d'un plan quinquennal intégrant le développement des pêcheries, on ne pouvait introduire de modification ou de révision et ce, pour les raisons suivantes: premièrement, parce que la stratégie revêtait un caractère souple et non contraignant pour les pays membres; deuxièmement, parce que les principes et les objectifs qui étaient énoncés au niveau de notre plan de développement cadraient parfaitement avec ceux de la Stratégie avec lesquels ils étaient en parfaite harmonie. On avait donc jugé qu'aucune révision de ce plan n'était nécessaire ou justifiée.

Le Maroc, conscient du rôle de plus en plus croissant que jouent les protéines halieutiques dans la satisfaction des besoins alimentaires de la population mondiale, entend faire de sa zone économique exclusive un facteur de développement économique et social. Il s'efforce néanmoins d'éviter toute exploitation irrationnelle de ses ressources halieutiques, laquelle va à l'encontre même de toute stratégie d'aménagement et de développement des pêches. En effet, le secteur des pêches au Maroc est conçu: premièrement, comme un réservoir stratégique de ressources alimentaires à même de participer à l'équilibre nutritionnel de la population; deuxièmement, comme une source importante de devises pouvant contribuer, au rétablissement de l'équilibre de la balance des paiements; et troisièmement, comme une source d'emplois et une activité pouvant contribuer à la promotion du monde rural et à la fixation des populations dans leur zone d'origine par la création de pools de développement.

Les résultats enregistrés jusqu'à présent au niveau de la contribution du secteur des pêches à la réalisation de ces objectifs socio-économiques sont fort encourageants. Toutefois, il convient de signaler que d'importants efforts restent encore à entreprendre en vue d'améliorer davantage le niveau de ces contributions. Nous sommes convaincus de la nécessité de préserver ces ressources dont la valeur nutritive en protéines permettrait de remédier aux carences alimentaires dont souffrent les pays les plus démunis.

Nous sommes convaincus de la nécessité de préserver ces ressources dont la valeur nutritive en protéines permettrait de remédier aux carences alimentaires dont souffrent les pays les plus démunis.

Le Maroc, se basant sur des études scientifiques, faites avec l'assistance de la FAO, s'est attelé à l'élaboration d'un plan d'exploitation optimale des ressources halieutiques et a recherché des zones économiques exclusives.

Ce plan détermine pour chaque pêcherie, premièrement le niveau de l'effort de pêche, et en second lieu le niveau admissible de captures pouvant être réalisées, sans risquer de compromettre le cycle normal de reproduction des espèces. Cependant, et en l'absence d'un contrôle et d'une surveillance appropriés, et d'autre part d'une législation maritime adaptée, toute politique de planification et d'aménagement des pêches n'aurait qu'une portée limitée. Sur ce plan, le Maroc, grâce à la précieuse assistance de la FAO et d'autres organisations s'occupant des questions maritimes en général, procède actuellement à la refonte et à la révision de son code maritime afin de l'adapter aux nouvelles conditions et circonstances imposées par le progrès technologique et l'évolution du droit de la mer.

Ma délégation saisit cette occasion pour rendre un vibrant hommage à la FAO pour le travail remarquable qu'elle a accompli et qu'elle accomplit toujours en vue d'aider les pays membres à améliorer le niveau de leur capacité nationale en matière d'aménagement et de développement des pêches. En effet, que cela soit au niveau de la formation, de la collecte des statistiques et des Informations qu'elle traite et diffuse, ou au niveau des avis scientifiques et techniques qu'elle donne, la FAO joue indéniablement un rôle capital dans le cadre de la planification et de l'aménagement des pêches. Comme nous le savons tous, la pêche artisanale, particulièrement dans les pays en voie de

développement, fournit l'essentiel des approvisionnements en poisson, de l'emploi et des devises, et reste parfaitement intégrée aux économies des états côtiers. A ce titre, elle bénéficie, au Maroc, d'une attention particulière, concrétisée par des mesures incitatives et des aides instituées en sa faveur. Parmi ces mesures, il convient de signaler qu'outre le code relatif à l'encouragement des investissements maritimes, le Gouvernement marocain s'apprête à mettre en place une institution de crédit maritime qui financera les activités tant en amont qu'en aval de la pêche côtière en général. Ces crédits seront accordés à des conditions bien adaptées aux spécificités de ce secteur.

En outre, l'importance que revêt la promotion économique et sociale du marin pêcheur ne nous a pas échappé et c'est la raison pour laquelle, conformément aux principes énoncés dans la stratégie d'aménagement et de développement des pêches, nous projetons, le long du littoral national, l'implantation de villages de pêche. Ces centres de pêche, qui seront équipés aussi d'installations de froid, de manutention et de commercialisation des produits de la pêche, sont susceptibles d'améliorer les conditions économiques et le niveau de vie du marin.

En ce qui concerne le développement de l'aquaculture, nous nous réjouissons de ce que ce secteur ait reçu un important soutien financier de la part des donateurs car nous considérons que c'est là un créneau qui renferme de larges possibilités pour l'accroissement des disponibilités alimentaires.

Grâce au projet régional de développement de l'aquaculture en Méditerranée, (MEDRAP), il y a eu un accroissement des stocks de manière très encourageante et le projet mis en place est déjà dans une phase d'exploitation industrielle. Aussi, souhaitons-nous vivement que la FAO prenne contact - si ce n'est déjà fait - avec les donateurs pour la prorogation de ce projet -qui expire, en principe, au cours de cette année.

Par ailleurs, et sur le plan de la commercialisation, nous considérons que la FAO a accompli un travail remarquable par la mise en place dans tous les continents du globe, de systèmes d'information destinés à fournir aux pays membres des indications régulières sur l'évolution du commerce international du poisson et des produits de la pêche.

Dans ce cadre, le Maroc s'apprête à abriter une consultation internationale entre les opérateurs publics et privés du commerce international des produits de la pêche, consultation organisée par le service régional d'information Info-Pêche. Cependant, en vue de permettre au commerce international des produits de la pêche de connaître un développement réel, nous aimerions que les barrières douanières et tarifaires soient progressivement supprimées alors que les produits de la pêche pays en voie de développement puissent accéder aux marchés des pays développés et ainsi accroître leur part dans le commerce international de poisson. De même, il serait souhaitable que le Programme alimentaire mondial (PAM), utilise de plus en plus et en plus grande quantité le poisson et les produits de la pêche en général, dans son programme d'aide alimentaire aux pays les plus démunis.

Je voudrais signaler enfin que le Maroc vient d'achever la préparation d'un nouveau plan national de développement de son secteur des pêches et, à ce niveau, tous les principes énoncés au niveau de la stratégie d'aménagement et de développement des pêches ont été observés. Je signale également que les crédits budgétaires alloués au secteur maritime, au titre du nouveau plan sont quatre fois supérieurs à ceux de l'ancien plan, et ce, malgré une conjoncture financière des plus difficiles.

Paul MUSCAT (Malta): I join my colleagues in congratulating Mr Lindquist for his very clear exposition of the report.

My Minister in his address to the FAO has stressed the importance on fisheries to Malta. In view of this and considering that the Programmes of Action seem to have been fully accepted by almost all the countries concerned, I wish to go through these areas of action and highlight items of importance to us.

We also believe that Programme No I provides developing countries with access to a range of skills required for planning and development of marine fisheries. We observe, however, that such training is mainly based on short-term ones. We agree with such courses but certainly feel that courses of a higher standard leading to MSc and PhD in marine biology, maritime law and management be also made readily available.

Programme No II on small-scale fisheries aims at improving the socio-economic conditions of communities.

My government has as its avowed aim to raise the social and economic level of fishermen by helping them build better houses, buy better boats, engines, fishing gear and equipment; by advancing to them credit facilities; cold storage facilities, and by improvement in fishing ports.

Fishermen, too, like all other citizens in Malta, benefit through a free health service, a free education service and a system of social services aiming at providing assistance to cover interruption in earning power and exceptional needs.

However, it is in the processing of fish that Malta needs assistance and this mainly in the canning industry. As fish catches are not on a continuous basis, Malta needs to consider entering into joint ventures with other countries to set up such an industry who would provide the fish when the catch is low and also the markets, we would of course provide labour and other facilities.

Programme No III, aquaculture development, we feel that a more effective organization of aquaculture development in the Mediterranean is needed. It is true that a great deal has been done in this direction in recent years. Certain attempts met with failure, as for example the earlier attempts to improve wild stocks, as for example of plaice in the North Sea, by breeding and transplantation, failed due to absence of enforceable controls over harvesting. The project that had the cooperation of MEDRAP - the FAO/UNDP Mediterranean aquaculture project - was instrumental in the setting up of various pilot projects in the Mediterranean and included training sessions and the establishment of a training centre. Unfortunately MEDRAP terminated its activities at a very early stage of aquaculture development in the region.

We feel that MEDRAP is still required to follow up this development and that funds should be made available for its re-establishment. Here Malta requires special assistance and attention to develop aquaculture in view of its small size and position in the Mediterranean. It is felt that aquaculture should be well developed in Malta for various reasons.

In the first instance the products of marine aquaculture go direct to human nutrition; they have a high unit value and the work is labour intensive. Malta has the availability of labour and a relatively unpolluted sea. Above all, aquaculture products would boost the increasing tourist trade in Malta. For these reasons Malta should pursue aquaculture on commercial lines. Malta can too with FAO assistance participate actively in researches to be undertaken at the International Ocean Institute which was set up in Malta not very long ago. Technical and professional assistance at a high level would be required to achieve good results from such research. I mean here people coming from other countries, people at a high level of professional ability.

Turning now to Programme No.IV, international trade in fish and fishery products, most countries would benefit by the maintenance and extension of the regional fish marketing information and technical advisory services already established by FAO.

In the case of the Mediterranean region I wish to submit the following. The Mediterranean countries consume about ten percent by weight of the world fish production. As Malta has developed a trans-shipment centre we are prepared to consider offering Malta as a clearing house for fish and fish products. Malta too can serve as a regional fish marketing information service within the Programme of Action proposed and approved by the World Fisheries Conference.

Another point that emerges in the case of planning and of international and regional trade is the fact that the number and type of fishing vessels available and required to ensure a sustainable harvest is not known. I am talking of the Mediterranean here. Such information is required just as much as data on fish landings. It is generally accepted that the Mediterranean is heavily exploited and that it has an excessive number of fishing fleets.

Malta has an established merchant vessel registration system and the staff for the setting up of a regional register for fishing vessels is in our opinion competent. It is proposed that Malta be set up as such a registration centre.

Now I come to Programme No. V, promotion of the role of fisheries in alleviating undernutrition. All agree that fish and fish produce are a vital source of food.

Unfortunately the Mediterranean and other seas have been severely depleted by over fishing, bad fishing techniques that kill the young fish and also by pollution.

With regard to the last cause, Malta takes an active role in combatting pollution in the Mediterranean through the Mediterranean Oil Pollution Combatting Centre. However, in the case of fisheries management much remains to be done in the international field.

My Minister in his address to the FAO welcomed the proposal of the General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean to initiate as early as possible the project entitled "Fisheries Resources evaluation and management in the Mediterranean."

It is said that the annual Mediterranean fish catch is somewhere around 1 million tons. The size of the catch is considered to be low. But as it is consumed directly its money value is high and in this sense it is regarded as being worth more than the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries or the famous Peruvian Anchovy Fishery before its unfortunate collapse. To prevent a similar fate in the Mediterranean, we wish to see the project proposed by the General Fisheries Council in the Mediterranean become a reality as early as possible.

Now I come to my final point. Following Malta's initiative taken about 20 years ago, the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Law of the Sea in 1982. This convention under Articles 276 and 277 mandates the establishment of regional centres which should be effected through States in coordination with the competent international organizations and national marine scientific and technological research institutions.

Article 277 provides inter alia for:

- (a). The training and educational programmes at all levels on various aspects of marine scientific and technological research, particularly marine biology, including conservation of living resources.
- (b). Study programmes for the protection and preservation of the marine environment and the prevention, reduction and control of pollution.
- (c). The close cooperation in the dissemination of marine technology, marketing etc.

My Prime Minister in his recent address at the 42nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly pointed out that despite the importance of these centres, yet no such centre had so far been established.

At the 5th Ordinary Meeting of Parties under the Barcelona Convention held in September 1987, it was proposed that the first centre should be in the Mediterranean region. The reason for this is that the Mediterranean Basin, bordered by developed as well as developing countries, countries having different social and economic systems, should provide an ideal setting for a pilot project for research and development in marine industrial technology.

While fully aware that such issues pertain mainly to other United Nations organizations, such as UNEP, yet I feel that the FAO can help by proposing to the competent authorities the setting up of such a centre. If approved, Malta may perhaps be considered for the setting up of such a pilot regional centre. The International Ocean Institute in Malta may serve as such a centre.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): Je vais suivre votre appel et tenir compte de l'heure tardive de nos débats.

Ma délégation s'associe aux orateurs qui nous ont précédés et félicite Monsieur Lindquist pour sa présentation brillante du document C 87/24 concernant la mise en oeuvre de la stratégie et du programme d'action approuvés en 1984, par la Conférence Mondiale à laquelle mon pays assistait et qu'il a suivie avec beaucoup d'attention; ma délégation comprend tout l'intérêt de ce programme d'action.

J'aimerais également féliciter le secrétariat pour son travail, car il nous a présenté un document très fouillé et ordonné, nous permettant une analyse très simple mais concrète. Je saisis cette occasion pour associer ma voix aux orateurs qui m'ont précédé pour rendre un hommage à notre regretté ami Jean Carroz; c'était un ami pour nous tous.

Le gouvernement du Cap-Vert a adopté le programme d'action tel que présenté dans le cadre du Plan de développement.

Je vais passer brièvement en revue certaines actions en tenant compte des préoccupations et stratégies dégagées dans le cadre de cette Conférence.

A notre niveau, avec l'aide de la FAO et des pays amis, nous avons pris nos responsabilités et nous participons dans l'application de la stratégie adoptée par cette Conférence. Le Conseil des Ministres vient d'approuver plusieurs décrets en matière de politique d'économie et de gestion des ressources halieutiques au début de l'année 1987. Nous avons créé une nouvelle entreprise publique pour la commercialisation des produits de la mer au capital d'environ 1,8 million de dollars, une entreprise de pêche industrielle au capital de 2,4 millions de dollars, chiffres colossaux pour un pays de la dimension du Cap-Vert.

La vente au détail est laissée au secteur privé qui est tout à fait bien organisé; nous n'avons négligé ni les recherches ni la formation car ces deux volets - et en particulier le volet formation - constituent la base du développement de la pêche à tous les niveaux du pays. C'est ainsi que nous avons créé un institut national de promotion de la pêche artisanale et un institut piscicole.

Mais toutes ces institutions ont été dotées d'une large autonomie administrative et financière. Avant de terminer, tout en appuyant le contenu de ce document et de ses pertinentes recommandations et en tenant compte de l'importance particulière que la pêche revêt pour mon pays, non seulement comme source nutritionnelle très importante, mais aussi comme source de devises pour l'exportation; je me réfère au point 19 et tiens ici à appuyer ce qu'a dit le délégué de la France en ce qui concerne l'aide que la FAO, dans le cadre du programme, dispense aux Etats Membres pour ce qui concerne les données tant biologiques que socio-économiques qui permettent aux Etats de mieux maîtriser les éléments et mieux programmer leur stratégie nationale. Nous avons également pris note de la coopération fructueuse qui existe entre la FAO et l'ONUDI, tenant compte de ce qui s'est dégagé de notre comité des pêches. Nous attachons une importance particulière au contenu du point 27.I et 27.II notamment on ce qui concerne la planification, l'aménagement et le développement des pêches et plus particulièrement le point 2 pour l'intégration, l'approche intégrée du développement de la pêche artisanale qui nous paraît très important pour l'encadrement des pêcheurs et de leurs familles. Au point 31, en ce qui concerne le programme d'action I "Planification d'aménagement et développement des pêches", nous félicitons de toutes les actions entreprises dans le cadre du programme qui nous est cher, Comité des pêches atlantique Centre-Est (COPACE). Nous connaissons les difficultés que le COPACE vit actuellement. Nous tenons ici à remercier les pays donateurs qui ont soutenu ce programme et nous lançons un vibrant appel afin que d'autres pays puissent soutenir la FAO dans le cadre des actions du COPACE.

Le point 32, Actions et programmes régionaux, entamés par la FAO en Afrique de l'Ouest méritent l'attention de la délégation du Cap-Vert et nous tenons à dire que nous encourageons les travaux qui vont dans ce sens, particulièrement la question de la commercialisation des pêches, la promotion des opérations techniques entre pays en voie de développement qui figure au paragraphe 34 et revêt une grande importance pour nous de même que les programmes définis dans le cadre d'INFOPECHE.

Pour terminer nous voudrions souligner l'action particulière au programme d'action V: "Promotion du rôle des ressources que la FAO a octroyé aux pays sahéliens dans le cadre du programme de technologie de transformation et de contrôle de la qualité du poisson". Voilà. Nous désirons, encore une fois, réaffirmer l'appui total sur toutes les recommandations figurant au point 45 et celles formulées sur le rôle du Comité des pêches.

S. RAJASEKAR (New Zealand): I would first of all begin by congratulating the Secretariat for its efforts in preparing and presenting document C 87/24. Let me begin by saying that fisheries is a very important sector of the New Zealand economy. New Zealand, by virtue of its location in the South Pacific has one of the largest Exclusive Economic Zones in the world and our approach to the management of our zone reflects the principles and guidelines endorsed by the World Fisheries Conference. New Zealand was one of the countries that provided a comprehensive response to the FAO questionnaire on progress in implementing the guidelines of the Fisheries Conference. In the various specialist committees of FAO, New Zealand has provided detailed explanation of its fisheries management and development policies. I do not therefore propose to go into details of our fisheries policy. I would simply observe over the last three years or so we have taken a number of difficult decisions to protect our fishery resources and set in place a management regime that provides for sound commercial development of our fisheries sector while meeting the needs of conservation.

New Zealand's interest and concern in the area of fisheries management is not solely restricted to its own territorial sea and exclusive Economic Zone. We firmly believe in the benefits of cooperation and have worked closely with our island neighbours in the Pacific region through our involvement in the Forum Fisheries Agency. As was highlighted in the Plenary by several delegates from the South Pacific, fisheries is important to the future prosperity and development of the island nations of the South Pacific and we would urge the FAO to give greater attention to the needs and aspirations of these countries. Their relative isolation, vast fisheries zones and small population base make such special attention imperative for the realization of their fisheries potential.

I might add that my comments would equally apply to the field of agriculture.

Jung Joo KIM (Korea, Republic of): First, congratulations for your election to the Chair.

The Republic of Korea would like to express its sincere appreciation for the FAO's thoughtful measures to develop the fisheries sector.

As is well known, marine projects are regarded as an important animal protein source with minor harm for health caused by such as cholesterol. Furthermore it is possible to utilize fully the irrigation facilities for agriculture, such as lakes and the rivers through aquaculture bringing about an increase of rural farmers additional income.

in this context, as a peninsular country, the Republic of Korea is trying to develop a seashore under the Marine Ranching project and it is our sincere hope to develop fisheries skill through exchanging experience among member countries under the FAO's initiation. Also on a bilateral basis we want to open the door to any member countries for the fisheries development. So far the Republic of Korea has had many opportunities to share experience with developing countries.

In conclusion, we will fully support FAO's efforts for the fisheries development project and we hope more considerable efforts should be taken into account in FAO's fisheries projects; first, management skill development at the individual fisheries farm level thereby cutting the cost down; secondly, encouragement of fisheries cooperative activities so that small-scale fishermen could utilize their resources; thirdly, development of fisheries raw data processing and their distribution for RRD:urthly, development of fisheries marketing which is laid in the primitive stage compared to other commodities; fifthly, efforts to eliminate sea pollution caused by the process of industrialization.

Carlos Moyses ANDREOTTI (Brésil): La délégation brésilienne souligne le document C 87/24 et l'elicitale Directeur général de la FAO pour la manière objective avec laquelle été traité.

Tout d'abord je voudrais souligner à la page 4 au paragraphe 12 du texte français le caractère tres souple et peu contraignant de l'action de la FAO.

Je voudrais souligner aussi au paragraphe 17 page 5 du texte français l'importance accordée au développement de l'aquaculture. Au paragraphe 22 de la page 6 du texte français nous soulignons "le rôle important que jouent dans de nombreux pays les sources intérieures d'investissement tant publiques que privées" ainsi que "l'aquaculture intégrée au développement de la pêche continentale" (paragraphe 27 page 7 programme II du texte français). La délégation brésilienne a analysé le document sur l'approche intégrée du développement de la pêche artisanale. En exprimant sa satisfaction elle aimerait saisir l'occasion pour faire quelques observations à propos de l'expérience brésilienne dans ce domaine, qui je pense pourrait être utile pour l'action de la FAO et peut-être aussi pour les pays membres.

Je me rapporte, en premier lieu, à l'aquaculture, qui est devenue pour le gouvernement brésilien, une priorité: "la surintendance de la pêche", et j'aimerais bien citer le Centre international de pisciculture au Brésil qui est un grand soutien pour la FAO. Bien que cette surintendance, en plus de faire de la recherche sur différentes espèces de poissons, de crevettes d'eau douce et d'eau salée et aussi sur des grenouilles et d'investir dans la formation de cadres moyens, et supérieurs produise des allevins et les vende aux éleveurs privés. Cola veut dire pour nous que l'aquaculture ne se borne pas seulement à l'élevage de poissonsecadre de la pêche maritime et continentale soit à un niveau artisanal ou non, mais qu'elle travaille aussi avec l'élevage de crevettes et de grenouilles. On essaie de mettre l'accent sur la production soit de poissons, soit de crevettes, soit de grenouilles au niveau familial, pas seulement: au niveau artisanal ou à des niveaux de grandes entreprises commerciales. Pour ce qui est de l'intégration de la pêche artisanale, il me semble que le concept, dans ce document, donne une idée un peu vague, un peu générale, et je l'avoue, je ne l'ai pas bien saisi. De toutes façons, chez nous, l'intégration de l'acquaculture peut être à deux niveaux. En premier lieu au niveau de l'intégration de l'initiative privée et du secteur public. Le secteur public, y compris les grandes entreprises hydro-électriques fait le travail de base, c'est-à-dire, va jusqu'à l'éclosion des oeufs, (soit de poissons soit de crevettes, soit de grenouilles). Peut-être les grands réservoirs dans les grandes entreprises hydro-électriques fournissent, de l'autre coté, les allevins et les girins aux éleveurs privés. L'importance de

l'entreprise de l'éleveur compte peu. Il peut s'agir d'un éleveur au niveau familial. Dans un second niveau, cette intégration se fait au niveau de la production à l'intérieur de la ferme elle-même et peu importe l'importance de la ferme. Cela peut-être une petite ferme ou une grande ferme. D'ailleurs, je pense que nous connaissons tous le concept de ferme intégrée ou de ferme auto-suffisante. Peut-être ce n'est pas le cas de préciser. On peut le comprendre, car si l'on pense que la production de grains et de graminées alimente l'élevage des porcs, des animaux soit des poissons, soit des grenouilles, soit de crevettes, des lapins ou autres animaux, les fumures permettent d'alimenter l'élevage soit de poissons, soit de crevettes, soit de grenouilles. En même temps, c'est un cycle qui dans certaines fermes peut être plus élargi. Cette même fumure peut être utilisée pour la production de gaz méthane ou pour la production agricole. Peut-être par exemple dans la production de canne à sucre, ou de sorgho lesquels peuvent être utilisés pour la production d'alcool et une autre partie reviendrait sur les champs pour continuer le cycle de production de graines et de semences qui continuent à alimenter les animaux etc. Le programme d'aquaculture ne se limite pas aux pêcheurs marins ou continentaux, il est ouvert à tous les agriculteurs.

Pour ce qui est des investissements internes, publics comme privés, le Gouvernement brésilien doit garantir le crédit à tous les projets d'élevage de poisson, de crevettes ou de grenouilles. Mais l'initiative privée intervient aussi. D'ailleurs, cette participation est marquante surtout dans l'élevage des grenouilles, non seulement du point de vue financier mais aussi du point de vue de la découverte de nouvelles méthodes d'élevage. Elle a travaillé cette année à la formulation définitive d'un concentré pour l'alimentation des grenouilles, ce que l'on ne croyait pas possible encore au début de l'année et elle espère arriver prochainement à un processus plus simple de traitement de la peau tandis que le traitement des viscères pour la production de fils chirurgicaux est déjà un processus normal.

Pour finir, je voudrais tout simplement souligner, en guise de conclusion de mon intervention, que l'initiative privée, lorsqu'elle n'est pas bloquée par la lenteur ou l'étroitesse de la bureaucratie publique, peut aller loin et très vite, apportant une contribution beaucoup plus importante qu'on ne le croit au développement de nos pays.

Luis de Andrés ORTIZ (España): Seré breve y esquemático. Comenzaremos felicitando calurosamente a la Secretaría por el documento C 87/24 quo estamos debatiendo y al Sr. Lindquist por su exposición.

Asimismo deseamos sumarnos al homenaje al Dr. Carroz; estamos seguros de que su recuerdo perdurará en la memoria de cuantos tuvimos el alto honor de conocerle.

Queríamos señalar que la política pesquera española ha incorporado los principios recogidos en la estrategia aprobada en la Conferencia de 1984. Desde entonces en este intervalo de tiempo se ha producido un hecho importante: es nuestra adhesión a la Comunidad Económica Europea y, en consecuencia, desde el 1 de enero de 1986 adoptamos los principios y normas de la política común pesquera.

Por último, querría hacer una alusión particular al proyecto CECAF señalando nuestro interés en que dicho proyecto continúe también a partir del 1 de enero de 1988 en nuestra doble condición, por un lado como país ribereño, y por otro lado por la presidencia del CECAF que actualmente ostenta España.

Espero haber sido breve.

Pedro SEBASTIÃO (Angola): Permettez-nous, au nom de la délégation angolaise de vous féliciter de présider notre Commission. Nous espérons que votre sagesse et votre compétence seront la garantie de la réussite de nos travaux.

Nous voudrions également associer notre voix à celle des délégués qui nous ont précédés pour féliciter le Secrétariat de la qualité du document qui nous est soumis.

A notre avis, cette enceinte est le lieu idéal pour échanger les expériences vécues et dresser un bilan de ce qui a été réalisé après la Conférence mondiale de la FAO sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches.

Dans mon pays, la pêche revêt une importance capitale et son développement s'inscrit dans le cadre global des priorités établies par notre Gouvernement pour atteindre l'autosuffisance alimentaire et constituer une source de devises. A cet effet, un programme a été établi et mis en oeuvre pour l'organisation et la gestion des entreprises appropriées que l'on est en train d'équiper de bateaux industriels pour remplacer les anciens en bois.

Vu l'augmentation de la capture, nous envisageons des investissements dans le domaine de la transformation, dans l'augmentation de la capacité de réception, dans la création et l'adoption de nouvelles structures de production de poissons salés et dans l'utilisation des déchets. Par conséquent, des entreprises de manutention sont mises sur pied et équipées pour l'entretien des bateaux.

Nous pouvons affirmer ici que notre Gouvernement a accordé une attention spéciale au développement de la pêche artisanale. En effet, les résultats du premier séminaire sur les ressources halieutiques de l'Angola, réalisé à Luanda, cette année, nous ont encouragés à promouvoir la pêche artisanale. Nous espérons entreprendre, avec la FAO, l'année prochaine, l'initiative qui constituera la plateforme de la pêche artisanale grâce à laquelle l'Organisation pourra nous venir en aide. Nous remercions la FAO, le PNUD et le Gouvernement norvégien pour la réalisation dudit séminaire.

La formation, dans ce domaine, est l'une des grandes préoccupations de notre Gouvernement. Deux écoles seront créées pour la formation de cadres de base, ce qui élèvera à cinq le nombre de centres de formation. A ce sujet, nous ne pouvons laisser passer cette occasion sans remercier le Gouvernement suédois pour l'aide précieuse, qu'il nous apporte dans ce domaine, dans le cadre de la coopération bilatérale de nos gouvernements.

En ce qui concerne la commercialisation du poisson, nous souhaitons que la FAO puisse poursuivre son action afin, dans le cadre du Programme spéciale d'assistance technique, d'offrir son aide aux pays en développement pour assurer leur participation au commerce international des produits de pêche.

Pour terminer, nous appuyons les recommandations faites par le Comité des pêches de la FAO telles qu'elles figurent dans le document C 87/24, aux paragraphes 46 et 47.

Kjell Arne HAGEN (Norway): Due to the late hour and taking into account your request to be brief the Norwegian delegation will present a more concentrated statement than originally intended. The Norwegian delegation welcomes document C 87/24 and the discussion of the implementation of the strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development.

We endorse the work being carried out by the Secretariat of FAO related to the collection of information on national measures taken by various countries in follow-up of the strategy approved by the World Fisheries Conference. The Norwegian delegation recommends that FAO continues its work in collecting information on the status of activities being carried out at the sub-regional, interregional and global levels. The principles entailed in the report from the World Fisheries Conference are the basis for FAO's fisheries programmes. However, these principles should also be taken as guidelines for the development programmes in the fisheries sector carried out on a bilateral basis. We strongly support measures taken to improve management of resources as such. The improvement of fisheries management is a prerequisite for a balanced and sustainable development in the fisheries sector. We want to put special emphasis on the development of small-scale fisheries and the need to promote the participation of women in the fisheries sector, not necessarily implying that women should go fishing or be directly employed in the fish production; but that project effects on women and children in the fishing communities are taken into due consideration when projects and programmes are planned and executed.

In the discussion under item 14 my delegation made some remarks about the thematic evaluation of aquaculture. We will not repeat these remarks under this item but only underline that such evaluations should be carried out and presented in an independent manner.

Norway will stress the importance of bearing in mind that we have only one earth and that all investment and development projects have to be based on the fact that the fish resources, although renewable, can easily be depleted. We all have a responsibility for our common future and safeguarding the sustainability of our marine resources is of greatest importance. This we do in our opinion best through improved management of our fish resources through research, planning and coordination of development cooperation.

Angus Edward MACDONALD (Australia): My delegation welcomes the papers presented to the Commission on this item. Australia favours regular reporting by governments on the extent of implementation of the strategy and programmes of action approved by the 1984 World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development. We of course view the strategy as a guide, not intended to be binding on governments. We believe that regular reviews will not only help in determining the extent to which governments adhere to the provisions of the strategy, but will provide a continuing assessment of the relevance of the strategy itself.

Australia submitted its report to FAO in mid 1986, in which we advised that we had moved further towards developing fisheries management regimes for Australian fisheries. Government and industry management committees had been promoted and the Fishing Industry Policy Council of Australia continues to provide for high levels of consultation between government and industry on proposed fisheries measures. Australia manages the Australian fishing zone in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is prepared to advise other countries on management techniques as required, and within its capacity Australia is ready to help in training activities in this sector.

We particularly welcome FAO's reporting on international trade in fish and fishery products, regional fish marketing information services, international fish marketing indicators and the multilateral framework for consultation on international trade in fisheries products. Consistent with our position on agricultural trade liberalization, Australia supports a policy of freeing up trade in fish and fish products.

In conclusion I would like to associate my delegation with the remarks made by the New Zealand delegate concerning the role of FAO in fisheries activities in the South West Pacific region. We believe there is very considerable potential economic benefit to be gained by Pacific island countries in the fishing sector and we would urge FAO to be more actively involved in this region.

Jacobus J. NEETESON (Netherlands): I have four brief remarks: one. the establishment of exclusive economic zones has focused the attention of countries on the possibilities for increasing returns from fisheries. However, expectations of higher catches have hardly come true yet. The reasons for this include lack of knowledge about existing fish resources which may lead to too high expectations of catches, and second, inability of countries to exercise the necessary control for the correct management of their EEZ. Since it appears that the FAO regional committees for the management of fishery resources have proven their value, we suggest that these points receive more attention from these regional committees.

My second remark, the Netherlands delegation finds the strategy for fisheries management and development approved by the 1984 World Fisheries Conference a useful and guiding instrument for the development of fisheries. Likewise the programmes of action have contributed to the selection of priorities for our development cooperation programme. They also facilitate donor coordination and exchange of information, to which we attach high importance. The Netherlands has a major interest in Action Programme V: Promotion of the Role of Fisheries in Alleviating Under-nutrition, and has already supported several activities in this respect. One of these was in consultation with FAO: the workshop on fisheries and nutrition, held in June this year in the Hague. In the framework of Action Programme V our emphasis will be on including nutritional considerations in existing fishery activities. Such projects should firstly benefit the fishery community itself, both in terms of consumption and improvement of incomes. In our opinion fish should be considered as part of the total food package that is available to the people, and not just as a product that can remedy undernutrition. The role of women in this respect needs special attention.

My third remark, apart from Action Programme V, other priority areas being considered by the Netherlands are integrated development of small-scale fisheries, especially the reduction of post-harvest losses, inland fisheries and aquaculture, and improvement of organizational and management aspects.

Finally, we appreciate the priority attached by the FAO to fisheries development. In this respect we welcome that the FAO Sen award this year has been won by a fisheries expert in the person of my fellow-countryman Mr Scheffers.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): Since I am the last man I will take my statement as brief as possible so that we can leave the room. The delegation of Ethiopia would like to join the other speakers before us to thank the Secretariat for a brief and clearly presented report.

Ethiopia has given great emphasis to fishery development in its strategy of food self-sufficiency. There is a good potential for developing fish in my country. Ethiopia has many lakes, rivers and coastal fishing areas. Moreover, with the current emphasis given to the development of small and medium-scale irrigation schemes, a number of ponds, small-and medium-size dams have been constructed and more are under construction or are in the planning stage. These water bodies provide a great potential for developing fishing and fish farming. To this effect, to develop the fishery industry, the Government has taken a number of steps. Of these the most important ones are to organize farmers into producer cooperatives; organizing of marketing schemes or providing marketing facilities for fishermen; providing fishing materials such as boats, gear and other facilities on credit. In regard to this we are currently building a boat-building plant mainly catering for fishermen.

This brief outline of the activities we are doing, I hope will give an idea as to how much we are following the guidelines and the strategies developed by the Fisheries Conference.

As has been pointed out by the distinguished delegate of Bangladesh, time has now allowed to evaluate the implementation of the strategies as outlined.

I would like to thank those countries and organizations which have given assistance to the Government of Ethiopia in supporting our fishery development. We also want to indicate our great need for technical as well as financial assistance requirements in the future to develop our fishing industry.

Mme Anna Teresa FRITTELLI ANNIBALDI (Italie): Je serai très brève; je voudrais tout d'abord, Monsieur le Président, vous féliciter de votre élection, et féliciter le Secrétariat pour la qualité et la clarté de ce document. Je voudrais également unir ma voix aux délégations qui m'ont précédée pour rendre hommage à Monsieur Carroz.

Enfin, je ne veux pas manquer cette occasion de confirmer tout l'intérêt que mon pays, entouré par la mer, porte aux conclusions de la Conférence Mondiale sur la pêche. Le Plan général italien sur la pêche de 1981 se rallie déjà aux grandes lignes confirmées par la Conférence et nous nous efforçons de mettre en place dans notre pays tout ce que la Conférence a recommandé. L'aménagement de la pêche, l'aquaculture, la pêche artisanale et la formation sont l'objet de toute notre attention, et les activités que nous poursuivons dans le cadre de la coopération et du développement vont dans le même sens. Toute notre bonne volonté suit ce même chemin.

Mme Isabelle GANSORE (Burkina Faso): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de féliciter le Secrétariat pour la présentation du document que nous examinons actuellement.

La Conférence mondiale sur l'aménagement et le développement des pêches a eu des effets positifs sur l'orientation de la politique nationale en matière de pêches. Notre pays s'inspire beaucoup des résultats de cette Conférence dans l'élaboration de ses programmes en matière de pêche.

Pays enclave, les activités de pêche au Burkina Faso se concentrent dans les rivières, fleuves, étangs. Au Burkina Faso, nous sommes conscients du rôle que peut jouer le poisson dans la nutrition. Nous tenons à remercier particulièrement la FAO et la Communauté économique européenne pour l'appui qu'elles nous apportent.

S'agissant de la mise en œuvre des différents programmes, il y a lieu de se réjouir de l'appui généralement satisfaisant qu'ils ont reçu. Nous voudrions insister sur l'importance, pour les pays sans littoral, de la formation, l'organisation des pêcheurs et de la planification et l'aménagement des eaux. Nous appuyons les propos des délégués de la Zambie, de la Chine et de la France sur l'importance de l'aquaculture et sur la nécessité urgente de la tenue d'une Conférence mondiale sur le thème.

Enfin, nous faisons nôtre la déclaration du délégué du Ghana sur l'avenir incertain du Centre africain d'aquaculture basé au Nigeria. 1/

Evlogui BONEV (UNDP): I will be very brief. May I, at the outset, allow me to congratulate the FAO Secretariat for the excellent document C 87/24 prepared for the consideration at this Conference. Similarly I would like to thank the Assistant Director-General of the Fisheries Department, Mr Lindquist, for his clear and enlightening introduction. As can be seen from the document, UNDP remains the major contributor to the implementation of the various programmes of the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the 1984 FAO World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development.

This proves the importance that UNDP attaches to this sector of development. UNDP's Fourth Five-Year Programming Cycle has started this year, I mentioned in my statement during the general debate at Plenary that the majority of the country and the regional programmes funded by UNDP had already been approved by its Governing Council. These programmes have been designed by the recipient governments themselves, with the assistance of the UNDP Resident Representatives' offices in the respective countries, and in close cooperation with the country representatives of our partner agencies, particularly with the major ones like FAO.

The sectoral priorities and objectives reflected in these programmes are established by the recipient governments themselves. Thus, the distinguished delegates who expressed regret concerning the reduced UNDP allocations for 1987, appealing to UNDP to give higher priority to fisheries development, should look into the procedures of their country coordinating institutions, in most cases the planning authority, - in order to ascertain whether this sector could be given the priority they feel it deserves. One of UNDP'S greatest merits in this respect is perhaps that it gives good and neutral advice, but it is left to the sovereign governments themselves to decide on priorities. This is in answer to the comments by the distinguished delegate of Bangladesh and to the comments of other countries who have referred to the reduced UNDP allocations in 1987. I should, however, invite the attention of those delegates to paragraph 29 of the document which may help raise their expectations, as 1987 is not yet over and possibly projects in this sector are still in the process of appraisal and approval.

In concluding, I should like to state clearly that whatever statistics or forecasts you may see in the documents regarding UNDP support for one or another sector, these data are nothing but a reflection of the priorities and the importance attached to the respective sectors by the recipient governments themselves.

Finally, I should like to thank those delegations who referred favourably to UNDP, we appreciate their cooperation with UNDP/FAO in implementing fisheries development projects and thank them all for their pledge to further strengthen their support for our common endeavours.

1/ Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.

Armili H. LIDQUIST (Assistant Director-General a. i., Fisheries Department): On behalf of the Secretariat, I should like to express gratitude for the overwhelming information we have received on the fishery situation in the different countries. This information will of course be used within the Fisheries Department and it will be used when updating our files on the situation in different countries. Likewise, it was very important and interesting for us to know where the main interests are in fisheries development. I also wish to express thanks for the many guidelines we got for our future work in very many different fields. I will not even try to summarize them.

A number of offers have been made here, for which we are very grateful: for example, training opportunities, as offered by Poland, by Chile, by Czechoslovakia, the Republic of Korea, and others. They will be considered when we are discussing training possibilities. We were also very grateful for the activities offered by different countries; for example, for regional cooperation or for hosting meetings and so on.

Turning now to the Programmes of Action, they reflect, as has been said - and I wish to underline this - with the exception of the UNDP, the preferences of the donor agencies. We are trying to do our best to show what is important; and what we have learned tonight is another argument to show to the donors. That is of the greatest importance. The Programmes of Action are concerned with regional activities. Therefore it would not be possible to have a list for the next meeting of the latest regional activities of developing countries. Of course, we could perhaps make a compromise and see in each region which were the least developed countries. I think the Delegate from Bangladesh put forward this idea.

Ninety eighty-seven is not yet finished, as the observer from UNDP mentioned. These are not the final figures for 1987. There were specific questions about the Mediterranean Aquaculture Programme (MEDRAP) - in new phases formulated now with the support of Italy. With regard to the Eastern Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (CECAF), several delegations have expressed the wish that everything should be done to continue its activities and projects there. We have every hope that something positive will develop and we have approached different donors. As we have heard, the present President of CECAF, who comes from Spain, has made her own efforts too. So although we cannot be entirely sure, we are fairly positive that something will happen and that there will be continuation.

Finally, there was the question of ARAC, the Aquaculture Centre in Algeria. The project, as such, has been evaluated by a UNDP Evaluation Mission. I understand that its extension will be supported, with some modifications. Other donors will be asked to participate in this activity. These are the most important questions which I wanted to answer.

CHAIRMAN (Original language Arabic): In the name of all members of the Commission, I should like to thank you very much for all the information you have been good enough to provide us with during this meeting. We have just finished this agenda item. The interventions have been serious and constructive. As it is very late, I shall not sum up everything that has occurred during this meeting. However, I believe the Secretariat will take note of the comments which have been made and they will reflect all points of view in the report of the Drafting Committee which will be submitted to you later. I should like to thank all delegates for their constructive cooperation.

The meeting rose at 21.00 hours

La séance est levée à 21h 00

Se levanta la sesión a las 21.00 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/16

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

SIXTEENTH MEETING
SEIZIEME SEANCE
16^a SESION

(20 November 1987)

The Sixteenth Meeting was opened at 16.30 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La seizième seance est ouverte à 16 h 30, sous la

présidence de Fred J.Eckert, President de la Commission II

Se abre la 16^a sesión a las 16.30 horas, bajo la presidencia de

Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat informs the Chair that we have a quorum, and we shall now proceed. As part of our procedure, the Chair requests Mr Sucre, Vice-Chairman, to please identify himself as soon as possible so that at some point I can turn over the proceedings to my Vice-Chairman. I have been looking for him several days now but have been unable to locate him here in Rome. If Mr Sucre would please identify himself I shall assign him certain presiding duties. As soon as he possibly can, will he please come forward and I will list the items and the remaining procedures over which I will ask him to preside. It is Friday evening and I have tried to reach him since Monday morning.

We will have a session tomorrow morning over which he will preside if he is available. Otherwise, we will proceed for a while this evening and reconvene on Monday morning. To introduce the agenda, we have the Assistant Director-General for the Forestry Department.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZATION(continuación)

18. Follow-up to Tropical Forestry Action Plan and International Conference on Trees and Forests

SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)

18. Suite donnée au Plan d'action forestier tropical et à la Conférence internationale sur l'arbre

et la forêt - SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)

18. Aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos y de la Conferencia Internacional sobre

el Arbol y el Bosque - SILVA 1986 (C 87/25; C 87/28)

M.A FLORES RODAS (Subdirector General, Departamento de Montes): El Documento C 87/25 que tengo el honor de presentar, tiene por objeto informar a la Conferencia sobre los progresos logrados en la puesta en práctica del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical. Bajo el título de Consideraciones Generales, el documento describe brevemente las principales dimensiones de los recursos forestales tropicales. Su importancia para el desarrollo de los países que los poseen y para la humanidad en general, la magnitud, las mayores causas y las más graves consecuencias de la deforestación tropical y por último, las razones que, en este contexto llevaron a la preparación del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical. Esta información y estas consideraciones son de suma importancia, pero creo, Sr Presidente, que no es necesario insistir ahora en ellas, puesto que sin duda están muy presentes en la mente de Los señores delegados. Tampoco voy a describir el Plan, cuyo contenido se presenta en forma resumida en el documento. En cambio, antes de referirme a la puesta en práctica del Plan, quisiera recordar brevemente algunos de sus principios y conceptos básicos, reafirmados por la experiencia adquirida en la aplicación del Plan.

Como dijo el Director General en su declaración a la Conferencia, el Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical concilia objetivos de conservación, uso y desarrollo de los bosques, en un marco universalmente aceptable para la acción a nivel nacional, regional y mundial.

El Plan es un instrumento para reorientar, intensificar y armonizar esfuerzos hacia la conservación, regeneración y uso sostenido de los recursos forestales tropicales en favor de un desarrollo socioeconómico que pueda mantenerse a largo plazo. Tiene por objeto apoyar a los gobiernos de los países en desarrollo que así lo deseen, en la determinación de prioridades nacionales relativas a los recursos y potencialidades de sus áreas forestales, en la puesta al día de sus planes de desarrollo y en la preparación de programas y proyectos para poner en práctica dichos planes, ya sea con ayuda externa o sin ella.

Las condiciones más importantes para el éxito del Plan son las siguientes: el empeño decidido y duradero del gobierno de cada país en desarrollo interesado en aplicar el Plan; la armonización de enfoques entre el sector forestal y los otros sectores relacionados de la economía nacional; la participación genuina de la población rural, de las organizaciones no gubernamentales del país y de su sector privado en el planeamiento y ejecución de actividades y el apoyo de la comunidad internacional, principalmente a través de una mayor coordinación y un aumento de la cooperación y del financiamiento externo.

Hasta la fecha, cuarenta y un gobiernos de países en desarrollo han comunicado su decisión de aplicar el Plan a nivel nacional con alguna forma de apoyo externo, coordinado por la FAO. Una vez informado de las distintas posibilidades y modos de actuación, el gobierno de cada uno de esos países, también decidió, o decidirá, en el caso de las solicitudes más recientes, la línea de acción a adoptar para aplicar el Plan a su caso particular. Por esta razón, y para ajustarse a situaciones y necesidades muy diversas, la aplicación del Plan a nivel de los países se está llevando a cabo con gran flexibilidad y es precedida en cada caso por una fase preliminar de diálogo y preparación. Los ejercicios de aplicación del Plan a nivel de un país consisten en prestarle apoyo para realizar todas o parte de las actividades siguientes: llevar a cabo un estudio del sector forestal; determinar los factores positivos y negativos que inciden en la contribución del sector al desarrollo nacional y poner de manifiesto los vínculos del sector con el resto de la economía; definir o revisar los fundamentos y elementos principales de una estrategia o plan forestal a largo plazo, incluyendo, si es necesario, una revisión de las prioridades nacionales para asegurar que el sector forestal pueda desempeñar un papel apropiado en el desarrollo social y económico, tomado como un todo; proponer un programa de acción a plazo corto o medio, en el marco de la estrategia, junto con una cartera de perfiles de proyectos de cooperación técnica y de inversión, que contribuyan a la realización del programa, principalmente reforzando las capacidades institucionales y humanas y eliminando obstáculos al desarrollo del sector; organizar una reunión entre las autoridades pertinentes del gobierno y los posibles donantes para examinar los resultados del ejercicio y darles seguimiento.

Las tres primeras actividades que acabo de citar se han completado en cinco países y se encuentran en diversas fases de ejecución en otros once. Para los restantes países que han solicitado la aplicación del Plan, las actividades se encuentran en la etapa preliminar de diálogo y preparación.

Durante los primeros meses de mil novecientos ochenta y ocho se habrá completado el ciclo de actividades de lo que podemos llamar la primera generación de ejercicios de aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical a nivel de los países. Entonces, probablemente habrá llegado el momento en que será útil y factible realizar una primera evaluación sistemática de la ejecución del Plan. Entretanto, se han podido identificar ya algunos aspectos positivos y algunos puntos débiles como los que se citan en los párrafos 53 al 59 del documento y que me permito señalar a la atención de esta Comisión. Por lo demás, el Comité de la FAO de Desarrollo Forestal en los Trópicos en su 8 Sesión celebrada en Roma del 14 al 18 de septiembre recién pasado, examinó y discutió varias recomendaciones a este respecto, que no voy a detallar ahora, pero que estamos tomando muy en cuenta en la aplicación y ulterior desarrollo del Plan.

Sr. Presidente, durante el nonagésimo período de sesiones en noviembre de 1986, el Consejo de la FAO acordó que el 24 Período de Sesiones de la Conferencia constituiría la ocasión apropiada para examinar el seguimiento dado a la Conferencia internacional sobre el árbol y el bosque (SILVA) celebrada en París, en febrero de 1986, a iniciativa del Presidente de la República francesa.

La Conferencia SILVA tenía por objeto, no sólo sensibilizar a las autoridades competentes sobre los problemas de la degradación forestal, sino también movilizar los medios para actuar concretamente en este campo. Entérminos geográficos, el objetivo de SILVA también era doble:

- reforzar la cooperación entre los países europeos en materia de protección de sus recursos forestales, y
- sensibilizar a los responsables y a las opiniones públicas sobre el problema de la conservación

y ordenación de los recursos forestales en el África seca, y fortalecer la cooperación y el apoyo técnico y financiero en este campo.

El motivo de esta iniciativa era la situación crítica de los recursos forestales, tanto en Europa, debido al deterioro de los bosques, atribuido a la contaminación atmosférica y a la persistencia de los incendios forestales en la zona mediterránea, como en el caso del África seca, donde esta situación se manifiesta en la desertificación y la degradación de las tierras que son la base de recursos para la producción agrícola y para el desarrollo rural.

La FAO aportó un apoyo técnico activo a la preparación de la Conferencia SILVA, principalmente en los aspectos relativos al África seca, conforme a sus responsabilidades en materia de lucha contra la desertificación, la deforestación, y la degradación de los recursos naturales y sus efectos sobre

la producción agrícola y sobre el desarrollo rural.

Para asegurar mejor el logro de sus objetivos, la Conferencia SILVA, según la expresión de su iniciador, debía reunir, al más alto nivel, a los responsables políticos de los países interesados. De hecho, once jefes de estado y de gobierno y más de 50 ministros representaron a los veintitrés países industrializados y veintiséis países africanos participantes, a los que se sumaron como observadores otros seis países de Europa y seis del Africa. Era la primera vez que una Conferencia forestal reunía a tantos dirigentes importantes.

La Conferencia aprobó "el llamamiento de París sobre el árbol y el bosque" mediante el cual los jefes de estado y de gobierno y los representantes de los gobiernos, instituciones y organizaciones internacionales participantes instan solemnemente a que se conserven y fomenten los árboles y los bosques. También aprobaron tres series de resoluciones relativas a las políticas y acciones en favor del árbol y el bosque, respectivamente, para Europa, Africa y el conjunto de los países templados y tropicales.

La segunda resolución relativa al Africa aprobada por la Conferencia SILVA, recordaba los esfuerzos desplegados por la Comunidad Internacional, para coordinar las actividades en favor del árbol y del bosque en los países en desarrollo, y en particular la existencia del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical. Asimismo recomendaba la aceptación del Plan como marco común de referencia para guiar el reforzamiento de las actividades y asegurar su armonización entre los países y las agencias.

El número y nivel de las delegaciones, así como sus declaraciones, demostraron que hubo efectivamente una movilización de los responsables políticos, tanto de los países industrializados como en desarrollo en torno al tema del árbol y del bosque. De este modo los dirigentes de los países interesados reconocieron colectiva y públicamente la gravedad de la situación tanto del norte como del sur. Se puede estimar que SILVA logró así su objetivo de sensibilización al más alto nivel.

Además, las resoluciones aprobadas y las declaraciones de las delegaciones incluían medidas concretas sobre la protección, conservación y desarrollo de los recursos forestales del norte y el sur. Las medidas anunciadas de este modo - y su puesta en práctica eventual - corresponden al segundo objetivo principal de la Conferencia, que era el de movilizar medios para emprender acciones concertadas en este campo.

El presente período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO permite examinar, veinte meses después de la Conferencia SILVA, las acciones concretas llevadas a cabo gracias a las informaciones que tengan a bien aportar las delegaciones de los Estados Miembros y los representantes de las organizaciones internacionales.

La FAO, por su parte, mediante las acciones emprendidas en el marco de sus programas Ordinario y de Campo y en el de sus órganos estatutarios pertinentes, ha aportado una contribución activa a la puesta en práctica de las resoluciones de SILVA, en cooperación con los Estados Miembros y las otras organizaciones internacionales interesadas.

Estas acciones se desarrollan, y se detallan en los párrafos 20 al 23 del documento.

La participación en la Conferencia SILVA de las más altas autoridades políticas de los países de Europa y Africa, el reconocimiento por dichas autoridades del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical como marco común de referencia y los compromisos adquiridos durante la Conferencia que parece deberían ser mantenidos por la comunidad de los donantes, constituyen otros tantos signos alentadores. Por su parte la FAO, como Organización promotora y coordinadora del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical, está dispuesta a proseguir con sus programas de acuerdo con la resolución de SILVA y apoyar todas las iniciativas en tal sentido.

Para terminar quisiera decir que, con su venia, me esforzaré en todas y cada una de las aclaraciones o complemento a esta información al documento C 87/25 que sea solicitada por los Sres. delegados.

CHAIRMAN: The Chairman thanks the Assistant Director-General for his introduction. We will now proceed with the countries that wish to speak on this subject.

On a procedural matter, however, on scheduling the Chair had announced that we would have a session tomorrow if my Vice Chairman, Mr Sucre, could be here to preside over it. However, we have been informed that he is not in Rome, he is in Panama. If he arrives in the next hour or so we can change tills, but otherwise there will not be a meeting tomorrow, there will be one on Monday.

Armana DARSIOI (Indonesia): I have listened with great interest to the explanation of Dr Flores Rodas, Assistant Director-General of the Forestry Department on the matter of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan.

With reference to the document No. C 87/25 allow me to make a brief statement on the matter. First of all, I would like to underline the importance of maintaining forest resources which, unfortunately, in many developing countries have been threatened by devastation, and even by extinction. This is a most serious situation indeed, which calls for effective measures without delay, in order to check further deterioration. Something must be done about it immediately.

The reason is that well-kept forest resources have the potential to contribute substantially to economic and social development by meeting some of the basic needs of rural populations, by contributing to food security, by supporting industrial growth and also by maintaining environmental stability.

In the light of the foregoing, my delegation wholeheartedly supports all measures which are aimed at improving the conditions of tropical forests, with special reference to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan launched by FAO, which contains a strategy in the formulation of a more profitable conservation and rational use of tropical forests. I venture to say that the Tropical Forestry Action Plan may serve as a useful guide for countries in the preparation of their forestry development plans.

As far as Indonesia is concerned, the National Tropical Forestry Action Plan has been formulated along similar lines as the Tropical Forestry Action Plan launched by FAO, which was also supported by: the Ninth World Forestry Congress; the Eighth Session of the FAO Committee on Forestry; and also the Ninetieth Session of the FAO Council.

For your information I may say that Indonesia is looking forward to receiving a FAO mission which, among others, will review the National Tropical Forestry Action Plan. The Ministry of Forestry has already made provisions for making available the personnel which will be entrusted with the task of carrying out the Action Plan. We express the hope that, in the framework of the realization of the Action Plan, FAO would play its role through the mobilization of technical and financial assistance needed for forestry development. It would be of advantage if the technical assistance could also cover activities which would enhance the national capability of efficient planning and implementation of investment programmes. FAO should, therefore, endeavour to stimulate the development of human resources through activities in the fields of education, training and research, and as far as possible also in strengthening the various forestry institutions in the developing countries. Furthermore, in order to enhance the smooth implementation of the Action Plan, FAO should keep monitoring the need for assistance and the flow of funds in the framework of protection and conservation of forest resources in developing countries.

Finally we express the hope that FAO will be able to play its coordinating role in the implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and in the mobilization of support from various donating countries destined for the realization of programmes for forestry development in tropical developing countries.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked the Chair to read the list of the countries which have caught the attention of the Secretariat so that we can be absolutely sure that no one is missing. We will also try to facilitate your work here and the planning, and the planning of your Delegations, let you know we have had a request from a number of members who have asked that we not take up Item 19 this

evening because they strongly feel that they want to be prepared to take that up on Monday. We have had an identical request on the same point of going back to Item 15 this evening. So for your planning purposes the Chair can assure you that we will not take up Item 19 or return to Item 15 today.

We will announce the names of those countries which have caught the attention of the Secretariat and anybody who wishes to speak and be added to the IISL and does not hear their name tailed, please just raise your country's sign and we assure you that you will be added to it. Next will be the United Kingdom, France, Honduras, Finland, Germany, Madagascar, Malaysia, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Panama, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, Poland, Morocco, United States of America, Nicaragua, Zambia, Japan, Italy, Cuba, Norway, China, Brazil, Tunisia, Switzerland, Thailand and Yugoslavia. Any country which did not hear their name called on that list wishes to add? Denmark, Canada, Peru, Spain, Angola, Mexico, and Argentina.

John Redman GOLDSACK (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom strongly supports the Tropical Forestry Action Plan as an international framework which helps both the developing countries of their own priorities in development plans and the donor community in its efficient and coordinated response to requests for assistance in the forestry sector. The United Kingdom has played an active part, both in the international meetings to plan and coordinate the TFAP and in the joint donor missions to assist the sector of use in policy discussions in countries which have requested action under the Plan. We shall continue to play our part, together with other members of the donor community in the further development of the TFAP and 'in our response to requests for assistance under our bilateral aid programme to individual countries in the context of their own priorities for development assistance in the light of the TFAP reviews.

We welcome the action taken by FAO to establish the Tropical Forestry Action Plan coordination of this and to encourage integration of action related to TFAP objectives both within the Forestry Department and within the Organization as a whole. We endorse the call made in the paper for all concerned in the TFAP to support arrangements to manage and coordinate its implementation. The FAO has itself accepted a central responsibility for the coordination of international action in the TFAP in the Eighth Session of the FAO, Committee on Forestry Development in the Tropics recommended that FAO accord high priority in the allocation of resources to ensuring adequate staff and other support for the TFAP coordination office. This should extend to strengthening the support to the Forestry Department from within the Regular Programme budget in accordance with the increased priority to the sector given by the international support for the TFAP. The lack of funds within the FAO Regular Programme budget for the Forestry Department has constrained its capability to take the leading role in TFAP missions and to fund the preparation and operational costs of them. This role has been filled in some cases by other international organizations or by a bilateral donor. While such sharing' of responsibilities made it desirable in some ways it should not be imposed by failure to budget adequately for FAO's part in the TFAP process.

Many recipient countries have expressed a preference for FAO as the leading agency and if followed consistently this would help the accumulation and transfer of experience.

I now turn to the follow-up to the 1986 Silva Conference summarized in document C 87/28. The United Kingdom applauds the appeal by the Silva Conference to serve and promote trees and forests and in common with FAO we have focused our attention and action primarily on support for the Tropical Forestry Action Plan to help solve the forest-related problems in Africa and other tropical regions.

As stated by my Minister, at the Silva Conference the United Kingdom Government agreed that the forestry situation in the African countries is very serious and there is a need to focus attention at the highest level of government on the problems posed and the action required. We endorse the emphasis given to the need to review national policies and priorities and to support the forestry sector within overall development and land-use planning. This is the approach taken up under the TFAP and it is through this approach that we feel effective follow-up action will be achieved.

Philippe PIOTET (France): La délégation française voudrait tout d'abord adresser de vives félicitations au Secrétariat pour les documents précis et complets préparés à l'intention de la Conférence. Ils nous permettent, sous une forme synthétique, d'aborder de façon rigoureuse et cohérente les multiples questions auxquelles nos pays ont à faire face pour protéger et mettre en valeur des ressources forestières de plus en plus menacées.

Le Plan d'action forestier tropical approuvé en 1985 constitue pour la communauté internationale le cadre de référence des actions concrètes entreprises au niveau de chaque pays. La France, qui a participé avec d'autres donateurs au lancement de ce plan, se félicite de le voir intégré maintenant au sein du Programme ordinaire de la FAO.

Sans entrer dans le détail de la mise en oeuvre du PAFT exposé dans le document C 87/25, je voudrais tout d'abord marquer l'accord de ma délégation sur l'ensemble des dispositions prises. A un moment où les organes directeurs de la FAO se préoccupent d'une façon plus systématique de réorienter les actions de l'organisation sur des priorités clairement définies, le PAFT nous semble constituer un très bon exemple de la méthode à suivre.

Ma délégation se félicite, en particulier, des dispositions prévues au paragraphe 33 qui indiquent que les stratégies forestières à long terme seront révisées et clairement énoncées et que des programmes prioritaires seront identifiés et appliqués.

De même, les déclarations du paragraphe 34 concernant la nécessité de prendre en compte, dans le cadre du PAFT, tous les liens entre le secteur forestier et le reste de l'économie nous semblent parfaitement justifiées.

Enfin, nous ne pouvons qu'appuyer les orientations définies dans les paragraphes 59 et 60 concernant le rôle du PAFT comme mécanisme de coordination dans la coopération technique et d'investissement dans le secteur forestier.

S'agissant maintenant du suivi de la Conférence SILVA, la délégation française tient tout d'abord à marquer sa profonde satisfaction de voir cette question figurer à l'ordre du jour de la vingt-quatrième Conférence de la FAO. Mon pays, qui a eu le privilège d'accueillir cette conférence, considère en effet que la FAO constitue l'enceinte internationale la plus appropriée pour examiner en profondeur les actions menées à la suite de SILVA, comme elle le fait d'ailleurs pour d'autres activités de coopération internationale. Je ne reviendrai pas sur le cadre et les objectifs de cette conférence si ce n'est pour rappeler qu'elle a réuni, comme le disait le Secrétariat dans sa présentation, les chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement de nombreux pays ainsi que les chefs des grandes organisations internationales concernées par l'arbre et la forêt et, au premier rang d'entre elles, la FAO,

Comme le précise clairement le document C 87/28, la Conférence SILVA poursuivait deux grands objectifs : tout d'abord, la sensibilisation des responsables au plus haut niveau mais aussi des opinions publiques sur les problèmes de l'arbre et de la forêt; en second lieu, la mobilisation des moyens accrus pour faire face à ces problèmes grâce à des mesures concrètes et concertées entre tous les partenaires concernés.

C'est ainsi que les hauts responsables des pays et des organisations internationales qui ont participé à SILVA ont pris non seulement des résolutions mais aussi des engagements précis quant aux actions à mener pour lutter en Europe contre le dépérissement des forêts, et en Afrique contre la désertification.

Ma délégation a examiné en détail et avec beaucoup d'intérêt les suites données à SILVA par la FAO, et qui sont décrites dans le document C 87/28. Elle tient à féliciter vivement le Secrétariat des mesures prises, tout comme elle exprime sa satisfaction aux pays et à l'ensemble des organisations internationales qui se sont attachés à traduire dans leurs programmes et leurs projets de développement les décisions prises à l'occasion de cette Conférence.

Comme tous les participants à SILVA, la France est attachée depuis bientôt deux ans à mettre en oeuvre les résolutions de la Conférence, et à donner suite aux engagements concrets qu'elle a pris à cette occasion. Sans entrer ici dans le détail, je voudrais simplement faire part à notre Conférence des actions les plus importantes qui ont été entreprises.

Tout d'abord en ce qui concerne la protection de la forêt tempérée, à côté des mesures purement nationales prises en France concernant la formation des ingénieurs forestiers ou le suivi des phénomènes de dépérissement dans nos forêts, nous avons renforcé notre coopération avec nos partenaires européens, tout particulièrement dans le cadre de la CEE. L'observateur de la CEE dans cette Commission donnera certainement à ce sujet toutes les indications utiles et que je ne développerai pas ici.

Nous nous sommes également attachés à définir les bases d'une coopération scientifique plus étroite au niveau européen en vue d'intensifier les recherches sur la physiologie de l'arbre. De nombreux phénomènes, comme le dépérissement des forêts sont, en effet, mal expliqués, faute de connaissances fondamentales suffisantes sur la physiologie des végétaux ligneux.

En étroite concertation avec un autre pays européen nous nous sommes attachés dans un premier temps, à identifier les thèmes de recherche les plus importants à approfondir ainsi que les laboratoires les plus compétents pour mener à bien cette tâche. Cette étape préliminaire étant déjà avancée, nous pensons qu'à brève échéance le champ des recherches pourra être élargi à d'autres pays européens.

La seconde série de mesures prises à la suite de SILVA concerne la lutte contre la désertification, en coopération avec les pays africains concernés par ce fléau. Les actions entreprises sont assez diversifiées et, pour ne pas entrer dans le détail, là aussi je me limiterai à citer les actions qui nous semblent les plus significatives.

C'est ainsi que pour appuyer les institutions nationales, neuf conseillers techniques ont été mis à la disposition de plusieurs pays africains. Par ailleurs, un projet de développement intégré a été lancé dans la région du sud-est de Fouta-Djalon. Il en est de même de plusieurs projets pilotes de lutte contre la désertification, projets qui sont intégrés dans des Projets de développement rural. Par ailleurs, afin de renforcer les dispositifs d'analyse, de prévision et de suivi des phénomènes de désertification, des moyens financiers ont été dégagés pour renforcer le Programme AGRYMET et les centres de télédétection de Ouagadougou et de Nairobi pour mettre en oeuvre dans le cadre des activités de la FAO une méthodologie d'utilisation des images fournies par le satellite SPOT.

Dans le domaine de la formation, la priorité a été accordée à la mise au point d'une session de sensibilisation destinée à des fonctionnaires de haut niveau des pays en développement, sur le thème de l'économie, du développement, et de la lutte contre la désertification.

Dans le domaine de la recherche, les efforts ont porté sur la mise en place d'un réseau unissant les chercheurs d'institutions appartenant à 16 pays.

Enfin, l'opinion publique française et les ONG accordent de plus en plus d'importance aux actions de lutte contre la désertification.

La délégation française souhaite vivement qu'à la suite de l'expérience de SILVA qui ne concernait que les pays d'Europe et d'Afrique tropicale sèche, des conférences de même nature puissent être entreprises dans d'autres régions du monde. Nous ne doutons pas que la FAO puisse une fois encore apporter son appui à de telles initiatives.

Dans le même esprit, la France attache la plus grande importance au dixième Congrès forestier mondial qui se tiendra en 1991 et qu'elle serait heureuse d'accueillir pour la première fois. Ce congrès pourrait fournir l'occasion, comme la Conférence SILVA mais à l'échelle mondiale, de renforcer la coopération entre tous les pays sur les grands enjeux des politiques forestières dans les années à venir. Comme elle l'avait déjà indiqué lors du Congrès forestier mondial de Mexico, et avec l'accord de ses partenaires européens, la délégation française conçoit l'organisation du prochain Congrès forestier mondial dans le cadre d'une étroite coopération avec tous les pays concernés. Elle est toute disposée, dans le cadre de la présente Conférence comme dans tout autre cadre approprié, à approfondir les réflexions à ce sujet, avec tous les Etats Membres qui le souhaiteraient.

Arturo Guillermo LOPEZ LUNA (Honduras): Señor Presidente, es ampliamente reconocida por la Comunidad Internacional la importancia económica y social que para mi país tiene el recurso forestal. Desde años el Gobierno de la República viene haciendo esfuerzos para emplear su utilización como una fuente importante en el desarrollo del país. Esto, sin embargo, no impide que al mismo tiempo este recurso continúe soportando los impactos ya tradicionales de las frecuentes extracciones para leña, los efectos de las quemaduras anuales y de las plagas y enfermedades, sin olvidar las grandes superficies de selva que año a año son cambiadas de uso, y los desperdicios que se generan en los aprovechamientos industriales.

Una componente importante dentro de la estrategia gubernamental para hacer de la actividad forestal una palanca de desarrollo, se reflejó en la creación de la COHDEFOR en 1974, con el propósito de efectuar un manejo más racional del recurso forestal, mediante la incorporación de las poblaciones rurales a los procesos de la actividad forestal, y obtener al mismo tiempo por parte del sector público los beneficios provenientes de los aprovechamientos para ser revertidos en el desarrollo económico social, y buscando una mayor integración industrial de la materia prima.

En los últimos años, el Gobierno de la República ha iniciado una serie de acciones tendientes a revitalizar el sector forestal y dar un impacto positivo al desarrollo de la actividad forestal.

La definición de las Políticas, Acciones y Estrategias que norman la actuación de la Administración, las modificaciones a las formas de comercialización, la reestructuración orgánica de COHDEFOR, la búsqueda de la coordinación institucional a través de proyectos priorizados, el mejoramiento de la planificación institucional y el fortalecimiento del Sistema Social Forestal, son Programas que se encuentran en proceso de implantación.

Algunos de los Gobiernos amigos presentes en esta Conferencia están conscientes de esta realidad en cuanto colaboran, de diversas formas, con nosotros en esta tarea.

Con la asistencia de l Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo. PNUD, y de la FAO, que desde años viene colaborando con mi país en los esfuerzos de desarrollo del sector forestal, trabajó para incorporar este sector a los lineamientos estratégicos de política para el período 1986-1989, preparado por la Secretaría Ejecutiva del Consejo Nacional de Planificación (CONSUPLANE), en forma tal que dicho documento y el Plan de Gobierno reflejaran adecuadamente la importancia económica y social del sector forestal.

Al mismo tiempo se iniciaron acciones tendientes a enmarcar en los lineamientos del Programa de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos (PAFT) el Programa Nacional de Desarrollo Forestal derivado de la definición de Políticas, Acciones y Estrategias de la Corporación Hondureña de Desarrollo Forestal.

Me complace anunciar acá que este esfuerzo se encuentra prácticamente terminado y que mi Gobierno ha organizado, con el apoyo del PNUD, FAO y de la Coordinación del Programa de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos, entre el 25 y el 27 de enero próximo en la capital de la República, Tegucigalpa, una Mesa Redonda sobre Coordinación y Concentración de "La Participación Internacional en el Desarrollo Forestal de Honduras", enmarcada en el Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos.

Invitaciones a participar en esta mesa redonda han sido enviadas por mi Gobierno a todos los Gobiernos, agencias, multilaterales y bilaterales, así como a agencias privadas y organismos no gubernamentales tales de carácter internacional que potencialmente pudieran estar interesados en colaborar con el desarrollo forestal del país en el marco de los principios de desarrollo económico y social definidos por el Gobierno.

A través de esta tribuna internacional, que representa la Conferencia de FAO, mi Gobierno desea reiterar su invitación a la Comunidad Internacional a participar en el desarrollo de los recursos forestales de Honduras. Siendo esta Mesa Redonda, la primera en el marco del Programa de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos, pienso que ella podrá servir de estímulo a todos los países envueltos, sea como beneficiarios de su acción o como contribuyentes al desarrollo de los recursos forestales tropicales. Pero servirá también de prueba a la capacidad del Programa mismo para concretar en hechos sus importantes objetivos.

Agradecemos a los gobiernos, Instituciones ya presentes en el desarrollo forestal de Honduras su apoyo y esfuerzos. Esta Mesa Redonda permitirá sin lugar a dudas, coordinar aún más los esfuerzos

de los organismos nacionales e internacionales que ya actúan en el sector, así como a traer otros nuevos, para poder reforzar los programas en ejecución e iniciar nuevos.

Matti HANNULA (Finland): The Finnish delegation considers forestry as an important agent for development. Our Government will pay increased attention to following the recommendations expressed in TFAP. The Plan has already been shown to offer a conceptual framework as well as a number of operational guidelines for forestry activities in developing countries. The TFAP does not limit its scope to the tropical countries alone. In contrast, it offers a policy model for all countries with either tropical, sub-tropical or temperate forests which need strengthening in their development. It is also important that the TFAP offers guidelines not only for technical experts but for political leaders in particular. This peculiar feature of the plan has much facilitated planning of the development cooperation. To date a great number of countries have requested TFAP exercises which will be carried out in different ways, depending on the aims in each case.

A very useful form of exercise has been the compilation of national forestry sector studies. Finland has successfully supported such studies, even if they have not necessarily been carried out within the TFAP framework.

Support to forest research institutions in developing countries constitutes an important channel for forestry development. Cooperation with the International Union of Forest Research Organizations is very much needed. In recent years the IUFRO has paid increased attention to forestry research in the tropical countries. Education and extension should be similarly considered as crucial targets of institutions building in tropical forestry. Without well-trained young forestry specialists developing countries cannot fully benefit from international cooperation in the field of tropical forestry.

The exercises initiated within the framework of the TFAP will apparently continue to rely mainly on external funding but the possibilities of allocating more funds of the internal FAO budget for the implementation of the TFAP should also be carefully considered.

In financing the activities, attention has to be paid also to the joint planning of tropical forestry contributions which takes place in the Forestry Advisers Group set up by the principal donor agencies. This Group has a crucial role both in monitoring the process of TFAP implementation and in providing FAO with information.

Reiner MORBACH (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): First of all I would like to thank Mr Flores Rodas for his introduction to documents C 87/25 and 28 which we welcome. Let me refer first of all to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. On various occasions, most recently at the Eighth Mooting of the Committee on the Development of Forestry in the Tropics in September this year, we indicated the great importance that my country attaches to the TFAP, and that we agree with the objectives of the Plan. We consider that the TFAP is an appropriate response to the world-wide challenge through increasing deforestation. We view indeed with great concern the fact that every year some 11 million hectares of forestry are lost, as set out in paragraph 3 of document 25, and we agree with the analysis of the main reasons for this development in paragraphs 4 and 5.

We also share the concern that with deforestation genetic resources are lost forever. We think that there are not only economic reasons that should prompt us to preserve nature's diversity. As trustee of nature, as human beings, we feel that it is our duty to preserve the beauty and diversity of nature for future generations, not simply from economic motives but also for their own sake. We see one of the central causes of world-wide deforestation in the tropics is rural poverty as set out paragraph 8 of the document.

We consider it a wise decision of the Organization to have determined to be at the forefront of the endeavours for the preservation of tropical forests.

But the staff and financial appropriations set out in the draft budget for 1988-89 seem to be insufficient. The coordination office of the TFAP has only four full-timers. We doubt whether the TFAP is going to be able to handle the additional burden of work with this very meagre staff provision. At previous Council Sessions and meetings of the Committee on Forestry a great number of delegations, also my delegation, had requested to increase the share of the forestry programmes in the budget volume by shifts within the Programme of Work and Budget.

Let me now come to the follow-up to the Silva 1986 Conference. We welcomed the initiative of the President of the French Republic and took an active part in this Conference in Paris in February 1986. We thank the FAÜ Secretariat for the technical support as we see from paragraph 6 of document C 87/28.

As regards Resolution "oak" 3 we can now say that one and a half years after its adoption, the preparatory work for "EUROSILVA", a European network for research on tree physiology, has advanced to the point where a start can be made on scientific cooperation. In accordance with Silva Resolution, "EUROSILVA" is open to cooperation with other European research institutes within the network envisaged.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will continue its fruitful cooperation in the forestry sector with the states of the international community.

As regards the question which Member State will host the next Forestry Congress I will not make a comment now. But I would like to say that Munich in my country would be interested in hosting the coming World Forestry Conference. But since France has already made its bid we would postpone this to a later date.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): La délégation malgache félicite chaleureusement M. Floros Rodas, Sous-Directeur général, Département des Forêts, pour la présentation complète et limpide du sujet et des documents soumis à notre examen.

Les efforts du gouvernement malgache pour simultanément protéger la couverture forestière naturelle existante et réduire l'érosion du sol classé par les spécialistes parmi les plus intenses du monde datent de plusieurs années. Aussi, lorsque l'idée du Plan d'Action Forestier Tropical a vu le jour, Madagascar n'a pas hésité à l'appuyer de toutes ses forces, car il répond à ses préoccupations. Madagascar se félicite de l'approbation unanime du Plan par la Conférence lors de sa 23ème session, ainsi que de son inscription dans le Programme du travail et Budget 1988-89.

La Conférence est maintenant saisie d'un document qui traite de la suite donnée au plan.

La délégation malgache félicite le Secrétariat pour la qualité du document C 87/25, malgré son apparente concision. C'est un document très précieux qui dégage avec clarté la situation dans laquelle se trouve la mise en oeuvre du PAFT.

Des éléments positifs encourageants sont à relever et à mettre à l'actif du Secrétariat et de tous les protagonistes, surtout les Etats Membres et les institutions qui ont pris part à la promotion des nationaux et régionaux, et qui ont pris part à la promotion des projets d'investissement répondant aux priorités définies par le programme.

La délégation malgache voudrait partager avec cette auguste assemblée sa grande satisfaction pour le passage à la phase opérationnelle du fonds fiduciaire destiné à financer certaines investigations dans le cadre du PAFT. Nous tenons à remercier vivement la Belgique, la Finlande, la France, les Pays-Bas, la Suède et la Suisse, mentionnés dans le document, qui ont contribué au fonds. Nous voulons également remercier le Japon qui a accepté de financer l'examen du secteur forestier du programme.

Nous profitons donc de l'occasion pour lancer un vibrant appel aux autres très nombreux donateurs qui ont manifesté à plusieurs occasions leur soutien au programme, afin qu'ils apportent eux aussi leur part de contribution, nécessairement généreuse si l'on considère les besoins qui ont été évalués et qui ont figuré dans d'autres documents traitant de la question.

Parmi les facteurs positifs, nous pouvons encore relever au paragraphe 47 du document que le programme des Nations Unies pour le développement ainsi que les banques de développement assument la responsabilité de cinq opérations.

D'autres éléments sont encore encourageants. Si on regarde le paragraphe 60, il est précisé que la communauté des donateurs considère le programme comme un mécanisme efficace de coordination de la coopération technique et des Investissements dans le secteur financier. C'est donc un atout d'encouragement et de garantie pour eux.

On doit malheureusement reconnaître que les réalisations sont encore trop peu nombreuses. Le temps est peut-être trop court et le délai qui nous sépare de l'approbation du programme n'est pas encore suffisant pour réaliser de très nombreux projets. Mais il faut reconnaître qu'il faudrait activer et intensifier la réalisation, qu'il faudrait intensifier les missions de préparation, d'identification et d'évaluation. Il faudrait les multiplier afin d'élaborer des dossiers de projets d'investissement nombreux et variés, qui cadrent en tous cas avec le programme forestier.

En outre, les organisations non gouvernementales devraient faire l'objet d'une sensibilisation intense et soutenue afin qu'elles contribuent elles aussi au plus vite aux activités du programme. A signaler que certains groupes commencent à se manifester, certains d'entre eux nous ayant déjà contactés. Il faudrait à notre sens les encourager et définir la nature de leur contribution. D'ailleurs, pourquoi ne pas les inviter à quelques-uns de nos travaux et à quelques-unes de nos sessions où l'on traite de cette question? Notre délégation pense que ce serait une manière de sensibiliser ces organisations non gouvernementales.

Pour clore notre intervention, la délégation malgache souhaite que le Secrétariat continue à faire des rapports et des comptes rendus périodiques au Comité des forêts, au Conseil et à la Conférence, sur les progrès enregistrés dans la mise en œuvre du programme. Le Secrétariat ne devrait ménager aucun effort pour une mobilisation maximum de toutes les parties concernées par le Programme.

CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing Mali, the Chair would observe that the representative of Mexico has asked that we insert their statement in the verbatim record, which we will do as they were listed in the order of speakers. Let me just point out that there are 36 additional speakers. We shall continue for another two and a half to three hours, so I would ask you to try to speak fairly briefly.

Nampaa SANOGO (Mali): La délégation malienne voudrait féliciter M. Flores Rodas de la bonne présentation du point 18 de notre ordre du jour.

Il est évident que le plan d'action forestier tropical est un cadre idéal de planification des activités forestières. Ce plan tente de concilier la protection et l'aménagement des ressources forestières leur exploitation pour la satisfaction des besoins de plus en plus grands des populations des zones tropicales. J'avoue qu'il s'agit d'une œuvre gigantesque dans le cadre de ce plan. Mais je suis sûr qu'étant donné le soutien que le plan recueille déjà, il n'y aura pas de difficultés à y parvenir.

Il est bien sûr encore trop tôt pour évaluer le PAFT et son implication sur la politique forestière des pays concernés. Cependant le nombre très élevé des demandes qui parviennent à la FAO est un indicateur encourageant pour penser que ce plan sera adopté par tous Les pays tropicaux.

En ce qui nous concerne, nous avons estimé particulièrement important le programme relatif à la foresterie dans l'utilisation des terres, et la mission PFT que nous avons demandée devra nous aider dans la mise en œuvre de notre programme national de lutte contre la désertification qui réserve lui aussi une place importante à l'utilisation rationnelle des terres.

La planification est une chose et la réalisation d'un projet planifié en est une autre. C'est pourquoi nous estimons qu'il est d'ores et déjà important de donner à la formation et à la recherche forestières une place de choix afin que ces projets puissent être exécutés avec le succès qu'on attend d'eux, grâce à ce programme important.

La forêt représente pour beaucoup de pays africains une ressource naturelle de première importance. Elle est un moyen privilégié pour la mise en valeur des terres marginales et Dieu seul sait combien mon pays est touché par la désertification et quelle est l'importance des terres marginales au Mali. C'est pourquoi notre délégation estime qu'il est essentiel qu'une attention particulière soit accordée au programme de conservation des écosystèmes forestiers en général et à la faune en particulier.

S'agissant de la Conférence Silva, nous avons salué et soutenu l'initiative de cette Conférence et nous souhaitons que de telles initiatives puissent se répéter. On peut cependant regretter que la suite réservée à cette Conférence par les Etats et les organisations qui y ont participé soit encore très peu de chose, mises à part les actions menées par la FAO. Pour le suivi de la Conférence Silva, nous voudrions dire ici que nous appuyons fortement l'initiative de la FAO de créer un réseau de foresterie des zones arides pour la zone soudano-sahélienne, et que nous y participerons volontiers.

Vaclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): First I should like to congratulate Mr Rodas on his excellent introduction of the document. Czechoslovakia is a country rich in forestry resources where forests cover almost one-third of the national territory and in which high attention is paid to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and to problems regarding conservation and further development in forestry in the countries of the tropical zone, and the follow-up to the National Conference on Trees and Forests.. Czechoslovakia is an inland country situated in the geographical zone of temperate climate and it manages its forest riches in conditions different from those in countries in the tropical forest zone. Nevertheless we are interested in these resources, as we have already suggested by giving our full support to the Manifest from the 9th World Forestry Congress, held in Mexico in 1985. The most important parts of the Manifest are those concerning tropical forestry and its further development.

In this context I should like to offer an adequate proportion of Czechoslovak participation in the works specified by the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. The reason for such an offer is that Czechoslovakia has many experienced and well-prepared experts who have gathered many years' experience in forestry surveying and forest inventory efforts, especially in Africa and South East Asia. Their experience covers remote sensing for forest inventory, forest inventory as such, forest taxation, planning, establishment and regeneration of forests, establishment and operation of forest nurseries, education and training of forestry workers, building of laboratories and research stations, their setting in operation, instruction and training of local workers of these stations, and so on. I would like also to inform you that the Prague University of Agriculture has a separate Institute of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Agriculture, with a special section for forestry, where attention is also paid to the forests of the tropical zone. Most of the students of this Institute are from the developing countries.

The reason why I am drawing attention to this fact is that education and training are given special attention in the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. Czechoslovakia secured for FAO the implementation of an extensive project in India for the processing of tropical wood mass into pulp. In the same country, Czechoslovak experts participate in work on a training centre and have been involved in similar efforts in Malaysia and several other countries. Czechoslovak research institutes developed projects of intermediate technology for the mechanical processing of wood, and held an international workshop at a specialized Forestry and Wood Processing Industry University in Slovakia.

I have mentioned these examples as evidence to prove that Czechoslovakia is ready for active participation in the tasks involved in the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, the effective implementation of which we are of course very interested in.

My delegation supports the role of forest wood industries in the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. A forest without value will not be saved by the people. Forestry industries, if planned and managed properly, can provide social and economic benefits to the people of the country. Therefore, we encourage FAO to assist developing countries to implement appropriate forest industries which provide benefits to them and for which the environment is fully respected.

Ibrahima Kegneko DIALLO (Guinée): Je voudrais féliciter tout d'abord Monsieur le Sous-Directeur général pour la présentation claire de ce document C 87/25 qui nous tient informés du soutien international dont le PAFT a bénéficié et des dispositions pratiques qui sont prises en vue de son succès. Pour notre part, nous voudrions porter à la connaissance de notre Commission l'intérêt, tout particulier avec lequel le PAFT a été accueilli en Guinée et les dispositions appropriées mises en oeuvre pour assurer son suivi et sa réussite.

Ainsi, conformément au paragraphe 43 de ce document, la Guinée figure parmi les 5 pays dans lesquels les examens du secteur forestier du PAFT sont en cours. En effet, suite à une requête qu'elle a adressée à la FAO en fin d'année 1986, la Guinée a déjà bénéficié de plusieurs missions d'experts dans le cadre de ce programme. Compte tenu des conditions spécifiques du pays, les cinq éléments ou programmes d'action énoncés au paragraphe 12 du même document C 87/25 ont été décomposés et étudiés en 12 thèmes.

L'originalité du PAFT en Guinée réside dans le fait que chacun de ces thèmes est analysé et discuté par une équipe multidisciplinaire constituée de l'expert fourni par le bailleur de fonds et des cadres nationaux de haut niveau représentant les différents départements ministériels concernés. Ainsi, huit thèmes ont déjà été abordés avec l'assistance de la FAO, du PNUD, de la CEE, de la France et de la Grande-Bretagne.

Il s'agit de: L'équipe A: Bois-Energie; B: Bois-matériaux; C: Foresterie en zone sèche; D: Foresterie en zone forestière; E: Mangrove; F: Bois-industrie; H: Législation; et G: Conservation des ressources naturelles au service du développement.

Les équipes "Macro-économie et Programmation", "Institutions et structures" et "Emploi des ressources humaines et formation", pour lesquels les bailleurs de fonds présumés ont désisté, devraient être effectives d'ici la fin de l'année avec l'aide de la France qui assure la coordination de l'ensemble du programme.

La synthèse de tout ce travail devrait aboutir, entre autres, à l'élaboration d'une politique forestière nationale pour les vingt-cinq prochaines années et d'un projet de programme pour six ans (1988-94). Ce travail, qui tient compte de l'expérience et de l'expertise des différents projets en cours d'exécution, aussi bien dans le secteur des eaux et forêts que dans celui du développement rural, est suivi de très près par les autorités nationales et par les bailleurs de fonds.

Pour finir, vous me permettrez de présenter très brièvement le projet d'aménagement intégré du Massif du Fouta-Djallon, qui s'inscrit dans le cadre de la protection des ressources naturelles, et qui focalise actuellement l'attention non seulement de tous les Etats africains tributaires des eaux de ce massif, mais aussi de la communauté internationale des bailleurs de fonds.

Suite à la requête des autorités guinéennes, à la troisième Conférence interafricaine des sols de Dalaba, en novembre 1959, le dossier de restauration du "Chateau d'eau de l'Ouest africain" a été inscrit en 1979 et en 1980 dans les programmes respectifs de lutte contre la désertification de l'OUA, des Nations Unies et du PNUE, et il a abouti à la définition en trois étapes du Projet régional de restauration et d'aménagement intégré du Massif du Fouta-Djallon.

La première étape, qui avait pour objectifs immédiats l'amélioration de l'état des connaissances sur le massif et la formulation des grandes lignes d'une stratégie pour sa protection, vient de s'achever grâce à un financement extérieur fourni à égalité par le PNUD et l'UNSO et son exécution par la FAO. Elle a abouti au choix de douze bassins représentatifs qui seront le lieu d'expérimentation de la stratégie définie et de quatre autres projets dits horizontaux parce que couvrant soit l'ensemble des bassins représentatifs, soit l'ensemble du massif. Ces seize actions constituent la plateforme commune que vient d'adopter, au mois de mars dernier, la Conférence d'engagement politique des Etats intéressés.

Quant à la deuxième étape, qui va maintenant démarrer, il faut dire que, suite aux contacts et aux négociations menés tant au niveau bilatéral que multilatéral, sept des douze bassins retenus ont déjà fait l'objet d'un engagement ferme de financement de la part du PNUD, du Canada, de la France, de la CEE et de l'Italie. Sur ces sept bassins, quatre ont déjà fait l'objet de formulation de projets et les trois autres devraient en faire d'ici début 1988.

Parmi les projets horizontaux, deux ont été soumis au PNUD et le projet de cartographie a été accepté par la CEE et devrait démarrer incessamment, L'OUA, pour sa part, est intéressée à la réalisation du Centre de documentation.

Compte tenu de la complexité de cette deuxième étape, une structure de coordination adéquate a été adoptée et un accent tout particulier est mis sur l'association totale des populations à la définition et à la réalisation des actions d'aménagement qui doivent obligatoirement contribuer à leur développement.

Commo vous le constatez, mon pays accorde une importance particulière au PAFT, dont la stratégie s'inscrit dans nos préoccupations de développement économique et de conservation du patrimoine forestier de notre sous-région.

Que tous les bailleurs de fonds qui se sont engagés à nos côtés ou qui ont l'intention de le faire trouvent ici toute la reconnaissance de mon Gouvernement et soient remerciés.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panama): Sr. Presidente, antes de referirnos a los aspectos específicos de nuestra intervención queremos agradecer al Sr. Flores Rodas su exhaustiva y clara presentación del tema a examen.

Nuestra delegación, reconociendo la importancia y reiterando en forma global su apoyo a los principios de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Árbol y el Bosque, SILVA 86, desea, sin embargo, concentrar su atención en la aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal de los Trópicos.

En efecto, nuestro gobierno además de estimar que dicho plan constituye una respuesta real y efectiva a la preocupación derivada de la destrucción continua y creciente de los bosques tropicales con el consiguiente deterioro ambiental, considera que el mismo representa no sólo el marco adecuado para intensificar las acciones necesarias para el fortalecimiento de una estrategia sostenida y responsable del desarrollo nacional, sino también el instrumento adecuado para la ejecución de los programas indispensables para el reforzamiento de una de las metas prioritarias con las cuales estamos comprometidos todos los panameños, como es la de asegurar el funcionamiento del Canal de Panamá en forma permanente y eficaz.

Dentro de este contexto concedemos también particular importancia a la necesidad de garantizar a la población un medio ambiente sano y libre de contaminación y en el que el agua, el aire y los alimentos satisfagan además de los requerimientos para el desarrollo adecuado de la vida humana, aquellos aspectos necesarios para asegurar que el aprovechamiento y la utilización de la fauna silvestre, fluvial y marina se lleve a cabo racionalmente de manera que se evite su depreciación y se asegure su preservación y renovación permanente.

En este orden de ideas, la delegación de Panamá concede una especial importancia al hecho de que en los programas de desarrollo rural se incluyan componentes de participación en la silvicultura como un medio encaminado para proteger los recursos forestales tropicales ya que estimamos que Los mismos representan un valioso aporte al desarrollo económico de los países.

Nuestra delegación, se manifiesta, igualmente, de acuerdo con el contenido del párrafo 9, aspectos en los que hemos efectuado algunos avances efectivos encauzados a estructurar un plan de acción a nivel nacional. Nos referimos a dichos aspectos consideramos un deber reconocer el indispensable apoyo que nos brinda la FAO a través de su Departamento de Bosques y específicamente mediante el PAFT para hacer efectivas las políticas y estrategias que hemos delineado en este sector.

En este marco de referencias nos identificamos con lo enunciado en el párrafo 28 que definen al PAFT como el instrumento principal para introducir a las actividades de desarrollo rural las medidas destinadas a desarrollar y conservar los recursos forestales y de suelo.

Asimismo estimamos oportuno hacer nuestra y apoyar las consideraciones relacionadas con los organismos donantes y que se incluyen en los párrafos 46, 47, 48, 49 y 50.

Con el objeto de resaltar la importancia que concedemos a los aspectos relacionados con la conservación de los recursos forestales deseamos repetir en esta Comisión los conceptos expresados por el Jefe de nuestra delegación, el Ministro de Desarrollo Agropecuario de mi país, en la Plenaria, y cito: "Contrariamente a la imagen que algunos desean proyectar, Panamá no es sólo un canal; en nuestro país existe una realidad agraria que se refleja en el hecho de que un 40 por ciento de la población total es rural y que el 80 por ciento de ella deriva su sustento de la agricultura; sin embargo, nuestro gobierno se siente plenamente responsable por garantizarle al mundo el funcionamiento eficiente y permanente de esta importante vía de la navegación mundial, el Canal de Panamá.

Dentro de este orden de ideas, los recursos hídricos de Panamá tienen, además del uso normal para la agricultura, el de mantener el funcionamiento de esta importante vía interoceánica. Al respecto basta señalar que la cuenca hidrográfica del Canal de Panamá actualmente produce unos 3.800 millones de galones de agua diarios, de los cuales 1.624 millones, o sea, el 58 por ciento, fluye a través de las esclusas al mar; cada barco que atraviesa el canal demanda un consumo de 52 millones de galones de agua dulce que van al mar y no se pueden recuperar; es éste un recurso natural que mi país pone a disposición de la humanidad. Además es válida la oportunidad para declarar en este tribuna mundial que Panamá pone todo su empeño en la conservación de la cuenca del Canal de Panamá que representa 3.400 kilómetros cuadrados, más del 4 por ciento de su territorio. Por 77 años esta vía ha funcionado ininterrumpidamente y el gobierno y el pueblo de Panamá han decidido que así seguirá funcionando para beneficio del mundo". Fin de la cita

Para terminar, ya que estoy en el uso de la palabra, quisiera informarle que mi país es un país pobre, por lo cual un ministro no puede darse el lujo de estar fuera por mucho tiempo, sobre todo cuando los problemas que se nos imponen en los actuales momentos requieren soluciones urgentes y que no pueden esperar a que el representante de un país rico y opulento desee cuando le es cómodo y durante un fin de semana encargarlo de la presidencia. Con todo respeto, Sr. Presidente, estimamos que sus ironías están completamente fuera de orden. Muchas gracias.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me respond. Since you make a personal comment, your country nominated someone to be Vice-Chairman of this Commission who was not here when he was elected and who has not shown up. If you want, I will turn the Chair over to him at this moment or tomorrow morning.

Now, you have a sense of responsibility, I would presume. If you want to exercise your responsibility, then do not sit there and complain day after day that I did not yield the Chair to your Vice-Chairman when you know the truth is he is not even here, he is not doing his job.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): (Pronuncia palabras que no se le entienden).

CHAIRMAN: So do not give me such statements which you know are false. If he wants to show up and do his work, then let him show up and do his work and not sit in Panama and pretend that he is here to do his job when you know the truth is that he is not here and will not do it and cannot do it.

Now quit, because I am not going to take that crap one second longer. I hope the Spanish translation was correct. You produce that Vice-Chairman and I will let him preside: otherwise quit the nonsense.

Nicaragua, I regret to inform you that Cuba is ahead of you.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Sr. Presidente, voy a intervenir en esta moción de orden con bastante pena y desagrado. Mi delegación se siente muy ofendida porque usted acaba de ofender a un delegado de un país plenamente soberano y con plenos derechos en este foro.

En más de una oportunidad se ha señalado la manera personal de dirigir usted estos debates. La delegación cubana ha sido muy respetuosa con usted y pedimos a esta Asamblea que tome muy en cuenta la actitud que usted acaba de asumir porque no continuaremos tolerando estas prácticas inadecuadas que se vienen aplicando por primera vez en 24 conferencias de la FAO. La FAO es un organismo muy prestigioso y muy respetuoso y hay que cuidarlo porque los países que estamos interesados en la FAO tenemos que responder por ella.

Por favor, nuevamente respete los que estamos aquí presentes que somos representantes dignos de nuestros países. Gracias.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair appreciates the comments of the Communist Government of Cuba and would point out to them that what the Chair said is that if the Panamanian Vice-Chairman which their country's delegation and others have asked me to turn the gavel over to, would show up for work I would do it. But I am sick of this nonsense and I will tell you the truth; that country was totally irresponsible to nominate someone when that person has not been here. I have asked the Secretariat to locate him for four days now and they cannot find him. I sent a note to the Government of Panama and asked where he was because I would like to discuss his duties with him and I was informed that he was not in Rome, was not in Italy, but in Panama. So we are not here to make the world safe for hypocrisy.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Señor Presdidente, muchas gracias. Antes de que usted lo diga lo digo yo mismo: soy sandinista y no tengo problema alguno en afirmarlo.

En todo caso, Sr. Presidente, queríamos unirnos a la protesta que hace el Gobierno de Cuba. Yo creo que cualquier cosa que se pueda decir en esta Comisión, incluso las que usted tenga a bien expresarnos, tienen que ser como usted ha mencionado anteriormente, de una manera ordenada, pero también de manera cordial.

Yo croo que usted ha sido y está siendo soez y vulgar, para ponerlo en palabras muy tenues, con países soberanos, independientes y considero, además, que esto es una falta de respecto.

Se dijo anteriormente con toda franqueza que no es intención nuestra obstaculizar o entorpecer sus trabajos como presidente, pero también creemos que tiene una manera muy particular de interpretar y aplicar los reglamentos, y hago un llamado a usted al orden para que en su manera de expresarse hacia nosotros tenga el respeto que merecemos.

CHAIRMAN: Nicaragua, let the Chairman ask you a question. Do you think a Vice-Chairman of this Organization ought to be here, or ought not to be here?

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Le puedo responder sencillamente: hay dos vicepresidentes en esta Comisión, uno está aquí presente en todo el término de esta Comisión y usted no le ha llamado a presidir más que una vez por una hora o dos horas; ahora, el hecho de que nosotros dentro de las prácticas establecidas hayamos decidido quienes serían los vicepresidentes es un derecho que tenemos los delegados y las regiones en particular y no es usted, perdóneme que se lo diga, el que va a indicar si somos o no irresponsables. En este sentido tengo que decir que usted nos está provocando, perdóneme que se lo diga de nuevo. Usted está equivocado Sr. Presidente, está equivocado.

CHAIRMAN: Nicaragua, for the record the Chair did not accuse you of irresponsibility in this. The Chair accused a different country of irresponsibility; stated that a different country, not your country in this particular case, but your statement just made is a false statement. The Chair has twice turned over, more than twice I guess, to the Vice-Chairman, the representative of Libya. Believe me, it is not because of any particular prejudice on the part of my country in favour of Libya. The Chair has also asked for the other Vice-Chairman to take his turn because this evening the Representative of Libya has called to my attention, correctly, that he is a member of the Contact Group. He feels that they have a limited delegation and that he wishes to spend as much of his time as he can on the Contact Group activities. He spent considerable time last evening here helping me in these proceedings, even though he has some personal plans for friends to visit his house last night and on which he was inconvenienced. Now, he does not wish to preside this evening. I do not wish to be here this evening presiding and we had hoped that the other Vice-Chairman could be here. Since the early part of this week I have searched for the other Vice-Chairman. I have asked the Secretariat to find him. Nobody can find him. I have asked where he is, nobody knows. Finally, I heard rumours that he was not here. In fact, I heard he was not here when he was elected. Finally I sent a note to his Country Representative here this evening asking if I could please see him and discuss his duties, where is he, and I received back a two word message. It said "In Panama". Now I would point out that it is very difficult to preside over these meetings when you are in Panama and that is the point that I made.

Now on several occasions when we have got into conflicts here it has been suggested that we allow somebody else to proceed. I will be glad to have my counterpart from Panama preside but I think if someone stands for election for the purpose of being on reserve to preside, then it is a disservice to the Organization, an affront to some people to do that knowingly, to do that when you know that you are not going to be here. That was my point. Continue if you have a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Solamente quería mencionar la diferencia que existe entre el tratamiento que usted hace en este momento del tema, frente al planteamiento que ha hecho anteriormente.

Mi punto de orden, Señor Presidente, se refiere exclusivamente al modo en que usted conduce esta presidencia y el modo de expresión que usted utiliza. Además, usted es una persona exaltada. Incluso la situación que se crea aquí es por la conducción indebida de los debates y por su personalidad. Inicialmente creía que usted quería obstaculizar el trabajo de la Comisión. En realidad creo que es problema de carácter. Por lo tanto mi moción es que usted se calme.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I assure you, my friend from Nicaragua, that we are calm and we have permitted a flexibility in the rules and we are not going to be too rigid. There are a number of points of order that have been made that are not points of order as we have witnessed for many days here. The point is that there is a limit to the patience of the Chair. The Chair would remind you that under the rules there are certain things that can be done. I have other things to do. We all do. None of us wishes to be here late because of the failure to do the work of this Organization. The Chair personally has enormous sympathy with the points made by the Nordic countries yesterday on the failure of opportunity of people to speak on important issues. We spent a half day talking about two words of the English language which mean nothing different in the context in which they were used and then proceeded to go into the following day on a crisis basis to ram through a report on the basis that there was not enough time to discuss the substantive issue when there was more than enough time to discuss non-substantive issues.

What the Chair has pointed out is that time is passing by. We are going to have to go into long sessions. I want to show proper concern to my Vice-Chairman who is here for the work and I have no problem, none whatsoever, none whatsoever, with my Vice-Chairman from Libya. You know and I know that your country and my country have strained relations outside here. You know and I know that my country and his country have strained relationships outside here but within this body the representative of that country has been helpful, has been available, has been willing to carry his share of the load. He has done so on short notice, on more than one occasion. He personally inconvenienced himself last night. He has made it clear to me that he feels that with his limited delegation he must be elsewhere this evening. I could have walked out and turned the gavel over to him this evening and let him sit here, but I knew that it would be an inconvenience for his priority of being at the Contact Group. The two of us have but one other person. For more than a week now I have sat in this Chair while some of you - you included - have admonished me to let the Vice-Chairman participate and finally, after being polite about it for a week I told the truth, and the truth is that the other Vice-Chairman is not doing his job; that the country that advanced him should have known that ahead of time and should not have taken the irresponsible action. It is an affront to me as a Chairman. It is an affront to the Organization. That is the truth and I will not apologize for that. I think that a country that knows that it won't do a job should not offer a candidate on the grounds that it will do a job and those are the facts.

Panama, you have a point of order. State your point of order. If it is a point of order it will be recognized. If not, we will proceed with business.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): Yo creo, Señor Presidente que es inútil hablar porque la moción de orden usted la considera como usted cree conveniente. Sin embargo voy a tratar, a ver si me deja. Primero de todo deseo rechazar lo de irresponsable. Usted ha hecho aquí algunas afirmaciones que no son ciertas, y eso debo dejarlo claro. Usted ha afirmado aquí que el Ministro de mi país, que fue elegido vicepresidente, no estaba en Roma durante las elecciones; eso es totalmente falso.

Segundo: usted dice, Señor Presidente, que se ha puesto en comunicación con nosotros infinidad de veces, que ha mandado cartas, eso también es falso, una sola vez la Secretaría se nos presentó a nosotros. La segunda vez, cuando usted dice que se le comunicó que estaba en Panamá, fue hace pocos minutos, antes de comenzar. Yo ya le he dado las explicaciones, mi país es un país pobre y no se puede dar el lujo de mantenerlo.

Yo considero su actitud irresponsable e irrespetuosa para con un Ministro de un país con el cual el suyo mantiene relaciones de amistad y dice ser socio de la administración del Canal ¡Vaya socio! ¡Vaya amigo! Con amigos así quien necesita enemigos. No voy a intervenir más y diga lo que usted quiera.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Chair will have to say that it was not a point of order. The Chair said that it was understood, not that he was not here during the "elections" but when he was elected the Chair heard that. The Chair said he has repeatedly asked the Secretariat to locate him. If you are saying that he was available to the Secretariat, that is a different matter. All you have to do is tell us when he was here but the Secretariat has been asked for days to please find this man so I could ask him to help preside, and from Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday they have not been able to find him. So I finally sent you a note and asked where is he, I want to discuss it with him, I will talk to him, if they cannot find him, and you sent me a two word response and it said "In Panama". I pointed out that it is rather difficult to have him preside if he is in Panama. That is all I am trying to say. Now, if you think that is a responsible course of action, that is, of course, your opinion, but my opinion is that it is not a responsible course of action and I would certainly understand if you are a poor country, of course we would, but Libya has a representative here and they are able to do and I think if Libya can, Panama can and that is my opinion. Cuba, you have a point of order. State your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Usted Señor Presidente ha hecho una referencia a mi Gobierno y quisiéramos completar esa referencia. Debo decir que mi Gobierno, mi país y mi pueblo, se sienten doblemente orgullosos de ser comunistas, primero por serlo y, segundo, por aclararle a usted y poderle decir aquí el punto en que estamos enclavados nosotros. Quizá esto sea doloroso para usted, Señor Presidente.

CHAIRMAN: The Chairman simply said "Communist Cuba". The fact that you took it as an insult is for you to decide. If you are insulted by being called a Communist, that is fine, but that is an appropriate adjective. It is an adjective that your government uses and if you would say that an adjective you use is an insult- I simply used an adjective that you use and as a statement of fact, not necessarily a pejorative statement.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Quiero proponer, Señor Presidente, con la venia de la Sala, que no consten en los verbatim las discusiones que se han llevado a cabo e incluso que se borre también la referencia que usted hizo al principio de la sesión en relación con la falta de asistencia del Vicepresidente de Panamá. Yo creo que esto ayudaría mucho a nuestros trabajos.

Es una propuesta que estoy haciendo dentro de un punto de orden.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Nicaragua, "verbatim" means what it says, "word for word". It is the very definition of the phrase.

Frits PRILLEVITZ (Netherlands): May I remind you that we are speaking about the Follow-up to Tropical Forestry Action Plan. At the end of his speech in the plenary, the head of our delegation, the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Netherlands stated that a strong FAO is needed "to better serve the threatened world". From an ecological point of view the threats to the human and natural environment are many, but one of the biggest is in our opinion the fast reduction of the area covered with natural tropical forests at a rate of some 11 million hectares per year. The background of this process is well analysed in the paper C 87/25.

Right from the start my Government enthusiastically welcomed the Tropical Forestry Action Plan as a device to re-orient and intensify action in tropical forestry and to stimulate countries and donor agencies to work together towards solving the problems of tropical forests. As you know, my country has been active in this respect in at least two ways; namely, the last two years we have played a leading role in the coordination of the donor community and we will continue to do so, as long as necessary and desirable. We have also committed ourselves to double our financial aid for projects related to tropical forestry within a period of five years. Now the plan is being executed my delegation is on the one hand very pleased with the response of the countries involved in TFAP, but on the other hand worried about the work-load caused by this response for the small special TFAP coordination office within the Forestry Department. In fact we want to stress the necessity, as we did already in other fora of FAO and in this Commission when the PWB was discussed, that FAO should give more attention, in terms of resources and staff to the forestry-sector in the regular budget.

The TFAP can become a success only in the long run if FAO reconsiders the place of forestry within its total work programme. The 7% share for forestry is too small, given the seriousness of the problem of de-forestation in the tropics and the demand for support by FAO and the donor community.

My delegation wants a clear answer in this matter: what can we expect of FAO during the next two years in more incorporating the TFAP in the regular activities of the Forestry Department? In this respect a suggestion has been made earlier during this Conference by my delegation namely an internal shift within the Major Programme of the Forestry Department from Forest Industries and Trade to Development and Management of Forest Resources, in favour of the TFAP.

We believe that a positive effect of this would increase more TFAP bilateral and multilateral donor activities. As a Dutch proverb goes: "throw out a sprat to catch a whale".

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has called the attention of the Chair to the fact that Argentina also has a statement it wishes to enter into the records because they cannot be here, and with no objection it is hereby ordered.

Antonio MAGALHAES COELHO (Portugal): Ma délégation désire féliciter le Secrétariat au sujet de son document C 87/25 que nous considérons du plus grand intérêt.

Quoique mon pays n'ait pas de territoires dans la zone tropicale, il a cependant une expérience de plus de 500 ans de vie dans cette zone et, par ailleurs, il ne peut pas rester indifférent à la conservation et gestion de ces ressources, par les conséquences sociales, économiques et écologiques. que telles situations provoquent, non seulement dans cette zone mais. aussi dans tout le monde.

Mon pays- donne tout son appui au Plan d'Action Forestier Tropical et aux moyens Indiqués sur le document pour l'exécuter.

La grande surface occupée par la forêt dans le milieu tropical et la destruction à laquelle nous assistons de l'ordre de 11 millions d'hectares par an, comme le fait si bien ressortir le document C 87/25. constituent des motifs pour une grande pondération.

La déforestation dangereuse provoquée, en premier lieu pour faire un élevage de bétail extensif, et aussi pour l'obtention de bois pour brûler et finalement pour le type d'agriculture itinérante pourra en partie être réduite s'il y a une augmentation d'intensification de culture de façon à réduire les surfaces nécessaires pour l'élevage de bétail et pour l'agriculture, raison pour laquelle il faudra introduire des techniques nouvelles et adaptées, augmenter l'emploi d'engrais et pesticides, améliorer les pâturages.

Aux facteurs énoncés, nous devons ajouter le feu incontrôlé, effectué parfois par besoin et d'autres fois par habitude, ce qui altère profondément la végétation, modifie la disponibilité d'eau et accélère les phénomènes d'érosion.

Il existe de grandes surfaces mondiales de végétation naturelle, que les techniciens affirment vouloir préserver. Par ailleurs, les pays qui les possèdent ont besoin d'augmenter leur surface agricole au détriment de la forêt. Cependant, cette limitation d'intérêt universel ne peut pas être supportée seulement par les pays qui possèdent ces réserves considérées intouchables. La communauté internationale, qui bénéficie de cette situation devra contribuer à maintenir l'équilibre écologique.

Il existe une préoccupation plusieurs fois exprimée que les pays en développement doivent augmenter leur production agricole. Par ailleurs, nous avons aussi la préoccupation de conserver les ressources naturelles en les maintenant autant que possible intactes.

Il est donc nécessaire d'établir une harmonisation entre les deux points de vue.

Si la politique forestière conduit les peuples à protéger leurs ressources naturelles et cela est indispensable, comme condition de survie, la pression démographique provoquera une augmentation de la destruction de la forêt si les hommes n'obtiennent pas les aliments dans les terres disponibles.

Pour cela, le Plan d'Action Forestier Tropical ne sera efficace que s'il n'oublie pas les besoins de base des peuples qui sont les besoins alimentaires : pour que la forêt ne soit pas détruite, il faut tirer un meilleur parti de l'espace agricole existant au moyen de techniques adaptées augmentant les rendements unitaires. S'il n'en est pas ainsi, l'homme continuera à détruire la forêt pour ne pas mourir de faim et ce ne seront pas les préoccupations écologiques des hommes de science qui empêcheront que cela continue dans ce sens, avec une intensité de plus en plus grande, parce que la population augmente rapidement, particulièrement en Afrique.

Sabri KESKIN (Turkey): I would like to take this opportunity to express the views of the Turkish Government in the field of forestry. The Turkish Government is interested in organizing a series of training programmes within the framework of document C 87/25 called "Activity Field in Tropical Forestry" in order to assist erosion control and range management activities, oriented specially to the Mid-East and African countries.

In this respect a series of training programmes have been organized in Turkey for the developing countries and have proved to be quite satisfactory.

The Turkish Government endorses in particular the following items which take place among the general objectives of the SILVA Conference entitled International Agriculture and Silviculture (document C 87/28); namely, the improvement of sensitivity and awareness in European and African countries *in* the respect to future forestry and arborial activities and the transfer of this awareness into planned action; also, the review of all possible means of strengthening the preservation and protection of trees and forests in general, to provide specific aid and support for those countries which have faced deadlock in this respect.

To extend the necessary activities for the creation and evolution of a sound cooperation at the regional and international levels for the prevention of long-term pest control and trans-boundary pests infection specially.

Turkey supports the views expressed concerning the realisation of possible activities in the prevention of forestial land in cooperation with the national and international organizations, collection of data, improvement of the existing international coordination for the vigilance -devices and methods, exchange of experience as to the outcome of research work and observation findings, and to increase the flow of experience and information along with the coordination activities with respect to forestry pests.

In Turkey the specific data and findings are to be collected such as forest fires, insects and pest diseases ,etc. which cause deforestation. These are to be used for the exchange of information and data. Turkey is willing to take part in any cooperation effort in this respect.

The researchers of the research institutes are ready to contribute to any joint research work on this subject.

We give great importance to the proposed cooperation specially for the prevention of deforestation in the Mediterranean Region due to forest fires. A major part of the measures set forth in the Report have already been implemented.

Turkey would be willing to provide the necessary experts and consultants for the "Silva Mediterranean" Group meetings arranged in order to serve the development of the Mediterranean forestation and to solve the problems arising in the field of joint research work to be carried out for the Cedir and Pinus pinea plantation with respect to the silvicultural process.

Wojciech JASINSKI (Poland): First of all let me thank Mr Flores Rodas for his interesting and inspiring introduction to our discussion, highlighting the need for a coherent and coordinated action aimed at protecting the forest resources on the global level and the role FAO plays in this major effort.

Poland, Mr Chairman, gave its support to the Resolutions of the Conference SILVA - 86. At that Conference we renewed the suggestion previously made by Poland in the forum of the United Nations General Assembly in September 1985 on setting up an international system of unrestricted flow of information, experience and technology serving the environmental protection, forest environment included. We believe that this idea deserves further pursuing within the FAO.

As signatory of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, Poland actively participates in the structures and works of the International Cooperative Programme on the Assessment and Monitoring of Air Pollution Effect on Forests, the centres of which are in the Federal Republic of Germany and in Czechoslovakia. We have set up a network of technical monitoring of forest areas and are in the course of setting up a biological monitoring system. We count on international and FAO assistance and cooperation in this respect.

Although Poland is not, as yet, due to the difficult economic situation, a party to the Helsinki Protocol of 1985 on the reduction of the level of pollution emitted to the atmosphere, it supports the implementation of the objectives of that Instrument and, to the best of its possibilities, conducts the activities consistent with the spirit and letter of that Protocol. The result by now is a marked checking of deterioration and a local improved condition of the natural environment in our country.

In the early eighties Polish forests have been afflicted with a powerful gradation of Lymantria monacha L., which was liquidated after a long and intensive campaign. There remained, however, negative consequences of that disaster, aggravated by damage caused in the forests by wind storms, a prolonged drought and high concentration of atmospheric pollution of both local and transboundary derivation. There is being successfully implemented the "Complex Programme of Forest Management Improvement", the aim of which is the overcoming of consequences of damage in forests.

However, the protection of European Forests has become nowadays an international problem, which can be solved only by joint efforts of countries of the European region through mutual cooperation and assistance and advice from international organizations, the FAO figuring prominently among them. For that reason Poland actively supports all the actions undertaken by the FAO European Forestry Commission and by the Timber Committee of the Economic Commission of Europe, aimed at improving the existing state of affairs. We wish in this connection to express our appreciation and thanks to the FAO Secretariat for their interest, support and advice concerning the solution of the forestry problems in our country. We hope that the discussions we had with the Assistant Director-General, Mr Flores Rodas, during his recent visit to Poland will contribute to further extending and expanding fruitful cooperation with FAO for the benefit not only of our country but for the whole region. We also welcome the results and the Declaration of the just completed joint FAO European Forestry Commission and the ECE Timber Committee session held on the occasion of their fortieth anniversary. We wish to underscore in this connection that the work of these two bodies is of value also for countries in other regions, especially for the developing countries.

In the forum of the Joint FAO/ECE Working Group on Forest Economics and Statistics, Poland presented its methodology of evaluating forest damage and is presently preparing guidelines which may prove to be of use also for other countries in the region.

In March 1987 Poland was the host country for the International Workshop on Forest Destruction and their Reconstruction in Global and Regional Aspects, organized jointly by the International Institute of Applied System Analyses, the Polish Academy of Sciences and IUFRO. That Conference, similar to the Seminar on the utilization of damaged timber, organized by Poland under the auspices of the ECE Timber Committee, brings us closer to finding the solution of the fundamental problem of protection of the joint European natural heritage, a part of which *are* the forests of Europe. We hope that the 16th European Regional FAO Conference in Poland in August 1988 will result in further increasing the countries' and FAO's contribution to the preservation and protection of European forests. We are convinced that this will also be of importance towards solving the forest problems in the other regions of the world.

Poland expressed its support and appreciation for the FAO "Tropical Forestry Action Plan". We would like to make a contribution, to the best of our possibilities, to practical realization of that comprehensive programme. We presented an offer of our expertise and our best experts in forest and timber problems are willing to add their forces and skills to the world action aiming at preservation and protection of tropical forests. We would also be ready to assist in FAO training activities in this respect. In conclusion we wish to state that Poland fully supports FAO activities aimed at preserving and protecting forests worldwide. We also wish to join other speakers who have pointed out the leading role of FAO as a coordinator, promoter and organizer of these global cooperations.

Before I conclude, Mr Chairman, I would like to make a comment in connection with the heated exchange of words between you and some delegations here in this hall. We believe that the question of our Commission's chairmanship could be discussed outside this hall and solutions found to it. Indeed there has already been one case where a change of presiding officer - a vice-chairman in one of the Commissions - took place. We regret that the above-mentioned exchange which could be considered offensive to some delegations took place during our debate.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair observes that there does not appear to be a quorum present and under the Rules of this Organization we cannot consider items on our agenda in the absence of a quorum. The Chair will declare a recess for ten minutes and we will have a quorum call. If there is not a quorum present we cannot proceed. The Chair would urge you to find a sufficient number of member countries. If we cannot produce one-third of the membership we will not carry on a discussion with two-thirds absent.

The meeting was-suspended from 18.40 to 19.50 hours

La séance est suspendue de 18 h 40 à 19 h 50

Se suspende la-sesión de las 18.40 a las 19.50 horas

CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to announce that before we left we had a request from Mexico, Thailand, Malaysia, Denmark, Yugoslavia and the European Economic Community, each to have their statements entered into the record. We have no objection here and we do not believe any member countries would,

We are noting the absence of a quorum and we need to establish whether or not we have a quorum. We do not have a quorum. The Chair recessed for ten minutes - and being flexible went well beyond that time - for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there were at least one-third of the members of this Organization who wished to participate in its business. We do not have one-third of the member countries of a mind to participate. That being the case, I think it would be best if we announced the Drafting Committee activity which does not require a quorum. Would you care to state their schedule?

Michel SAVINI (Secrétaire adjoint, Commission II): Si la réunion de la deuxième Commission se tient pas, il y aura un Comité de rédaction de la deuxième Commission dans la Salle de la Malaisie à 20 h 30. Les documents ont déjà été distribués aux membres du Comité de rédaction.

Salira SARRAF (Liban): Je voudrais signaler que nous n'avons pas déjeuné à midi et je crois que nous ne pourrions pas dîner ce soir. J'aimerais savoir quand nous saurons s'il y a séance ou non. Si le Comité de rédaction se réunit à 8 h 30, il va se passer un peu de temps. Nous aimerions être au courant.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I read the Rules carefully and among my duties recommending restaurants is not listed. I would be accused of being partial as an American if I suggested fast food at McDonalds but I would venture to guess on past performance that there probably is what you would euphemistically call flexibility on the time of 8.30. But the Chair has to observe that the Rules of this Organization are that there be one-third of the members present for business. Unless there are one-third of the members present we cannot conduct business. We have taken some time and many representatives have tried to go and find enough members to add to that, but we do not have a quorum. The Chair is in sympathy with your point and we will try to conduct things up here as quickly as possible so that you can eat.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Philippe PIOTET (France): Je suis très étonné par nos méthodes de travail et par certaines remarques qui viennent d'être faites. Je crois que nous sommes ici pour discuter de choses sérieuses et graves, en particulier les problèmes de la faim dans le monde et de l'alimentation. Je ne suis pas sûr que dans un quart d'heure ou vingt minutes nous -ayons un quorum plus important que celui que nous avons actuellement. Je crains même que la tournure de nos débats ne conduise un certain nombre de délégués à ne plus participer aux travaux de ce soir.

Je fais appel à vous, Monsieur le Président, pour que nous puissions enfin reprendre nos travaux et achever ce point de l'ordre du jour concernant les forêts, pour lequel sont venus de nombreux spécialistes de toutes les parties du monde qui n'auront peut-être pas la possibilité de rester la semaine prochaine pour dire ce qu'ils ont à dire sur ce point important de l'ordre du jour.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would tell the delegate of France that it is in sympathy with its point which by the way is not a Point of Order, it is a statement - and it is not a matter of having a quorum or a larger quorum, it is a matter of having a quorum. A quorum is one-third. Now you have got to have more than a quorum but there is no such thing as a quorum or a larger quorum. We do not have a quorum and we cannot proceed with business. Now you said we are here the point is we are not here. Two-thirds - more than two-thirds of the countries are not here. That is the problem.

The meeting was suspended from 20.00 to 20.20 hours

La séance est suspendue de 20 heures à 20 h 20

Se suspende la sesión de las 20.00 a las 20.20 horas

CHAIRMAN: The Chair declares we now have a quorum. We are proceeding on the business of this Organization. The Chair recognizes Morocco.

Abdelouahab KARMOUNI (Maroc): Je ne sais pas si je dois parler de la forêt ou si je dois parler du quorum de notre Conférence.

Permettez-moi en tout cas de féliciter le Secrétariat pour le remarquable travail de synthèse qu'il nous a présenté dans les documents C 87/28 et C 87/25 relatifs aux suites données à la Conférence internationale sur l'arbre et la forêt - SILVA 1986 - et au Plan d'action forestier tropical. Je voudrais également saisir l'occasion pour féliciter M. Flores Rodas pour le brillant exposé introductif qu'il vient de faire à notre intention.

Les termes qu'a retenus la Conférence pour parler des forêts sont d'une importance capitale pour l'ensemble des pays, qu'ils soient sous les tropiques, l'équateur ou dans toute région du monde. Les difficultés que connaissent les forêts tropicales ont été analysées dans le Plan d'action forestier tropical. Les causes essentielles de la destruction de forêt ont été identifiées, et des solutions appropriées proposées. L'analyse de la situation de nos forêts, au nord et surtout au sud de la Méditerranée, rejoint les préoccupations et les conclusions du PAFT; des remèdes et des médications ont été préconisés qui sont applicables à nos forêts, et sans doute à toutes les forêts sous toutes les latitudes.

C'est pourquoi le PAFT est considéré par la délégation de mon pays non pas comme un plan dont la portée se limiterait aux seules forêts tropicales mais comme un plan d'action pour la forêt, pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine forestier, pour le bien-être de l'humanité, en particulier dans les pays en voie de développement.

La délégation de mon pays se réjouit des priorités accordées par le PAFT à l'arbre, à la forêt, dans l'utilisation des terres, et au rôle assigné à la foresterie dans le développement rural, en particulier par sa contribution à la sécurité alimentaire et à la création d'emplois dans le monde rural, et par sa participation à l'augmentation des revenus des agriculteurs.

L'objectif de ce rapport, en dehors de celui d'informer la Conférence des progrès réalisés dans la mise en oeuvre du PAFT, est sans nul doute la protection de la forêt et son développement, mais dans une optique nouvelle, qui est celle de la forêt mise au service de l'homme. De ce fait, la délégation de mon pays ne peut que souscrire aux propositions du PAFT et apporter à ce projet tout son soutien.

Toutefois, les moyens à mettre en oeuvre pour ce programme paraissent insuffisants: un bureau de coordination avec deux professionnels et deux secrétaires, appuyés par un assistant spécial du Directeur général, peut-il mettre en oeuvre un plan de développement de cette envergure? De même, avec les deux postes de conseillers régionaux programmés pour 1988 et 1989, la tâche ne sera pas aisée et il est à craindre que ce poste ne connaisse des difficultés dans son démarrage. Plutôt qu'un bureau, une structure organique plus adaptée devrait être mise sur place pour donner à ce plan la dimension de ses ambitions.

Voilà les commentaires qu'a suscités à la délégation de mon pays la lecture du document C 87/25.

S'agissant du document C 87/28 relatif à la suite à la Conférence internationale sur l'arbre et la forêt, la délégation de mon pays a suivi les travaux de cette conférence et a essayé de tout mettre en oeuvre pour faire connaître les résolutions de SILVA et sensibiliser l'ensemble des partenaires des forestiers au problème de la forêt méditerranéenne. Les recommandations de SILVA ont été suivies, tant au niveau de l'appel de Paris qu'au niveau des résolutions. Je ne rentrerai pas dans le détail de l'application faite des résolutions mais je citerai quelques exemples. En ce qui concerne le problème de la protection des forêts, des mesures importantes ont été prises pour associer davantage les populations aux activités forestières et à la réhabilitation des forêts dans le milieu rural et dans les propriétés agricoles. En outre, mon pays, avec la participation de la FAO a mis sur pied un plan de lutte contre la désertification.

La stratégie adoptée pour la mise en oeuvre de ce plan touche à tous les écosystèmes identifiés: sur le littoral, la fixation des dunes; à l'intérieur, les dunes continentales et donc l'érosion éolienne, la lutte contre la désertification; et dans les bassins versants.

Pour ce dernier point, un séminaire sera organisé par les pays avec la participation du PNUD et de la FAO, dès janvier 1988; et ce séminaire aura pour but de sensibiliser les responsables à tous les niveaux, et les décideurs, au problème de l'érosion hydrique, des envasements des barrages, et du développement de l'économie de montagne. Plusieurs pays ayant participé au financement des barrages construits par mon pays participeront aux travaux de cette Conférence.

A cette occasion, il me plaît d'informer la Conférence de la priorité accordée par le plan de développement économique et social de mon pays, pour les années 1988 à 1992, à la lutte contre la désertification, l'érosion des sols, la déforestation et la pollution des eaux.

Au niveau de la formation et de la sensibilisation des hommes, des mesures sont prises par mon pays pour inclure l'arbre et la forêt dans les programmes scolaires. Les programmes forestiers des écoles forestières sont quant à eux revus à la lumière des orientations du PAFT, des besoins du secteur forestier et de l'intégration de la foresterie dans le développement agricole général.

La réforme de l'enseignement à l'école en cours de préparation doit permettre aux cadres formés d'affronter avec succès les problèmes qui se posent aux secteurs, notamment dans les domaines de la recherche, de la vulgarisation et du développement.

Voilà en bref, la suite réservée mon pays aussi bien au document relatif au PAFT qu'à la Conférence de Paris SILVA 1986.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): At the outset allow me to congratulate the Assistant Director-General on his excellent presentation. The United States would like to indicate its strong support for the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. In this regard we would like to urge FAO to both continue and strengthen its coordinating role.

The United States, along with other countries, was a participant in the development of the TFAP. The programme offers increased hope for worldwide cooperation on solving many of the serious problems confronting the forests of the tropics and the people who depend upon them.

We encourage the FAO to increase its efforts to involve the non-governmental organizations in the implementation of TFAP. As implementation progresses, evaluation will become vital to the TFAP's future success. Hence we encourage the FAO to develop a timetable and a framework in which to evaluate TFAP activities.

Finally, the United States would like to reiterate its long-standing concern over the low proportion of the FAO Regular Programme Budget which has been allocated to the Forestry Department. A more substantial increase in the Forestry Department's Regular Programme Budget which has been allocated to the Forestry Department would send a signal of FAO's own commitment to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan.

In July of 1987 a high-level meeting of donor organizations and interested countries met at the Rockefeller Foundation's Center in Bellagio, Italy, to deliberate the fate of tropical forests. Among other things the meeting urged countries to support TFAP.

The United States especially supports those aspects of TFAP which deal with forest ecosystem conservation.

Regarding the International Conference on Trees and Forests SILVA, in which the United States participated and which took place in Paris in February 1986 with the initiative of the French Republic, the United States wishes to congratulate the FAO for working closely with the French Government to convene the SILVA Conference. This, the highest level forestry meeting which has ever taken place, raised awareness of the problem of forestry decline to the highest political level possible. The United States Government is working to implement many of the recommendations of the Conference, especially those dealing with acid rain in temperate regions and development assistance in Africa. The United States urges continued close cooperation on an international level to solve the global problem of forest decline.

We thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission on this issue.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): En primer lugar, queremos unirnos a las felicitaciones al Director General Adjunto, Señor Marcos Flores Rodas, porque su presentación del documento ha sido excelente. Debemos señalar que la aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos, constituye un esfuerzo muy importante para resolver los principales problemas que aquejan a la gran mayoría de los países del Trópico, considerando que la función de las actividades forestales enmarcadas dentro de los programas de acción del PAFT están encaminadas a contener la devastación de los bosques tropicales, erradicar la pobreza rural e identificar las políticas pertinentes para esta finalidad.

Nicaragua, al igual que el resto de los países tropicales, ha sido objeto de la explotación racional de los recursos naturales. Esta situación se acrecienta aún más debido al uso irracional por un período prolongado de tiempo, agravado a partir de la década del cincuenta, como producto del modelo desarrollista agro-exportador que dejó como resultado el deterioro acentuado de los suelos y la devastación de las áreas boscosas.

A menudo, la deforestación en los Países tropicales ocurre sobre suelos que no pueden sostener agricultura intensiva. La expansión inexorable de la frontera agrícola en las tierras forestales, no sólo ha venido destruyendo vastas cantidades de maderas, sino que rápidamente agota la productividad natural del suelo, conduciendo a su abandono. Existen grandes presiones socio-económicas y políticas que provocan la deforestación. Los programas del PAFT reúnen inteligentemente las principales actividades y acciones de desarrollo forestal que influyen en forma significativa en el desarrollo forestal, lo que a su vez, se traduce en beneficios sociales y económicos para la población rural.

A partir de 1979, la situación del sector forestal en Nicaragua sufre un profundo cambio, que lleva a crear conciencia en la población de la importancia de los recursos naturales y se da inicio a algunos programas y proyectos de desarrollo forestal.

Actualmente podemos decir, que a pesar de la situación militar, económica y financiera por la que atraviesa mi país, hemos logrado llevar adelante un proceso de desarrollo en el sector forestal. La mayoría de nuestros programas y proyectos se enmarcan dentro de los componentes del PAFT, coincidiendo con los conceptos y objetivos primordiales del mismo.

En nuestra actividad forestal se consideran las acciones para recuperar y conservar los suelos para la producción de alimentos y el abastecimiento de madera y leña para la población, así como el constante ordenamiento de los distintos sectores productivos, en armonía con las políticas definidas orientadas a favorecer el desarrollo económico nacional, de tal forma que responda a mejorar las condiciones de vida de la población y satisfacer sus necesidades prioritarias.

A pesar de la reciente activación del sector forestal, Nicaragua presenta logros muy destacados. Para señalar algunas de las actividades que hemos desarrollado, podemos mencionar las siguientes: la formulación del Plan Nacional de desarrollo forestal, con asistencia del Gobierno de Suecia, el cual constituye mayores esfuerzos de planificación en el manejo ordenado de nuestros recursos y contemplaciones específicas en el corto, mediano y largo plazo. Este plan se refiere al potencial del sector forestal, a la oferta y demanda presente y futura, a las necesidades de inversión, a proyectos de desarrollo rural e industrial, al balance económico y a las necesidades de formación de recursos humanos calificados. Hemos también establecido el primer laboratorio de tecnología de la madera para la investigación y promoción de nuestras especies, un banco de semillas forestales programas de reforestación con especies de uso industrial y energético, programas de conservación de suelos, estudios de ordenamiento y manejo de cuencas en un veinte por ciento del territorio nacional, y programas de extensión.

Tratando de encontrar las mejores soluciones a las problemáticas de los recursos naturales renovables, se hace imprescindible la búsqueda de sistemas agro-forestales que proporcionen alimentos y productos forestales, integrando la agricultura y la silvicultura para alcanzar un sistema de producción que sea favorable para la población rural y para la conservación de los recursos forestales con los consiguientes beneficios.

En síntesis, consideramos, que a pesar de la situación particular por lo que atraviesa Nicaragua, desde hace seis años, es decir una guerra de agresión unida a un injusto bloqueo económico, hemos realizado avances significativos en el manejo nacional de los bosques tropicales.

Estamos de acuerdo particularmente con los párrafos 34 y 37 del Documento C 87/25. El párrafo 34 específicamente expresa que para que la aplicación del PAFT obtenga los resultados deseados, es necesario que se tengan en cuenta las relaciones del sector forestal con el resto de la economía nacional. O sea, que el desarrollo forestal debe tener también en cuenta los problemas generales del desarrollo económico y social.

El párrafo 37 menciona que entre las diversas actividades que pueden resultar necesarias antes de comenzar los proyectos de inversión en el sector forestal, figuran las siguientes: a) La identificación de políticas y estrategias nacionales, b) el examen de los puntos de interés e identificación de las zonas problemáticas, c) el estudio del sector forestal, y d) la identificación y formulación de proyectos.

Consideramos que la FAO juega un papel relevante en este sentido, y esperamos que se materialice la previsión de que las actividades del PAFT por países facilitarán la ejecución de más proyectos de inversión, de cooperación técnica y el apoyo coordinado de los donantes a los países en vías de desarrollo.

Para concluir, deseamos hacer un merecido reconocimiento a Bélgica, Finlandia, Francia, Países Bajos, Suecia, Suiza y Japón por su apoyo a las actividades de la FAO en el sector forestal, según consta en el párrafo 49 del Documento 87/25.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair will not admonish you about your political statements since you phrased them in a way which is open to wide interpretation.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vice-Chairman of Commission II took the chair

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vice-Président du Conseil, assume la présidence

Ocupa la presidencia Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

J.S. AKAPELWA (Zambia): Thank you for allowing my delegation an opportunity of contributing on this item. My country is among those developing countries which are seriously affected by deforestation. We estimate that some 120 000 hectares of forest are being cleared every year to meet the ever increasing demand for agriculture land and for fuel wood. Every day we are witnessing a gradual decline in the quality of our environment which in the last 8 years has been characterized by continuous drought in most parts of the country with its attendant consequences on hunger, poverty and disease. In this connection allow me to associate myself with those delegations who have congratulated FAO for initiating the severe heavy measure aimed at holding, and even reversing this trend through the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. Allow me also to thank the donors who have shown willingness to support this vital programme.

My delegation has no reservation that the measures proposed in the TFAP, if implemented properly, and with full support, will go a long way in alleviating the problems of deforestation. Most important among the measures proposed in our view is the programme proposed at paragraph 17 of document C 87/25 which calls for the strengthening of governmental and non-governmental institutions without which the other four programmes of Action cannot succeed.

We all know that you cannot raise the awareness of rural people about forest conservation or tree planting in the absence of properly trained extension officers, just as you cannot launch a successful tree planting programme in the absence of suitably qualified people to plan the logistics of such a programme.

My delegation is fully aware of the efforts FAO has made to bring TFAP to the attention of the governments of the countries concerned. However, we are also aware that we in the developing countries with our multitude of problems and the limited resources have a tendency to view forestry programmes as long-term programmes which do not bring quick results. As a result we give them a lower priority rating so that although the ministers and heads of forest services in the countries concerned will have received the letters from the Director-General and the Assistant Director-General respectively they will not expedite their participation in the Programme unless they are constantly reminded of the importance of the Programme. In this regard my delegation would like to suggest that in addition to the efforts already made and resources permitting, FAO should consider holding regional seminars which will bring together ministers responsible for forestry, heads of forest services and other leaders in the regions concerned at which TFAP will be explained and discussed in detail.

My delegation wishes to concur with the paragraph 8 of the document under discussion that deforestation is a consequence of the general poverty prevailing in tropical countries. The people of these countries engage in forest destruction for agriculture only because they have no other means of making a living and have no access to improved methods of agriculture. They engage in deforestation for fuel only because they have no access to other forces of energy. Therefore, although we support the measures proposed in the TFAP fully we view this as stop-gap measures only. In my delegation's view the permanent solution to the problem of deforestation will only be achieved by raising the standard of living of the peoples of these countries. This in turn can only be achieved by relieving the dead burden on these countries, opening up the markets of the developed countries to the products of the developing countries and by paying fair prices for such products.

My country has taken measures to implement, some of the aspects of TFAP. For example, we have declared the period 15 December to 15 January as "Tree Planting Month" during which time all Zambians are expected to engage in tree planting and other forestry activities. In addition, we have this year initiated a project in conjunction with FAO to prepare the strategy for community participation in forestry.

In conclusion, my delegation supports the resolutions of SILVA 1986, as contained in document C 87/28.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Before I give the floor to the next speaker I should like to welcome you all. I am extremely happy to preside over this meeting. I should also like to welcome Mr Walton and Mr Flores-Rodas. I certainly hope that our work will proceed as desired.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Tomofurai KUME (Japan): My country is of a view that Tropical Forestry Action Plan could form an important conceptional framework for the effective, as well as efficient, promotion of international cooperation related to the development and conservation of tropical forests, my country also recognizes the importance of establishing country-level action plans.

Responding to FAO's proposal, my country has already despatched experts to a couple of missions to formulate country-level action plans in Cameroon and Peru, and intends to respond favourably to such requests in the future as well. Besides, in view of further contributing to the promotion of TFAP, Japan is seriously considering to provide a trust fund to FAO, as you see in paragraph 49.

My country appreciates that the whole Forestry Department of FAO is tackling the TFAP, and is pleased to know the satisfactory progress of the country-level action plan formulation mission at present.

For the effective implementation of TFAP, however, cooperation as well as adjustment with other international organizations such as ITTO are indispensable.

Taking into account the resolution by the International Conference on Trees and Forests, my country has already taken follow-up action in Africa. Presently, we are cooperating with 5 countries financially or technically. For example, Japan is extending technical cooperation in Kenya for fostering fuel-wood forests to cope with the shortage. In Nigeria, a technical cooperation project is being undertaken, which seeks technical afforestation systems to prevent desertification in semi-arid regions.

However, Japan puts a higher priority on the promotion of social forestry, which is defined as increasingly important by various fora. Furthermore, Japan has been contributing to a trust fund at FAO for "Forestry for Rural Energy and Afforestation Scheme in Tanzania" since 1986.

Manilo MARIANI (Italie): La Conférence sur l'arbre et la forêt, "SILVA 1986", qui s'est tenue Paris au mois de février avec la participation des plus hautes autorités au niveau national et des organisations internationales, a présenté sous les aspects historiques, culturels, économiques et sociaux, le rôle de l'arbre et de la forêt dans l'apparition, le développement, l'évolution de notre communauté, même différenciée technologiquement.

Cette conférence s'est conclue par un appel, souscrit par les participants mais destiné non seulement à ceux-ci, par lequel pour la première fois on lance à un niveau aussi élevé plus qu'un appel, un impératif à "protéger l'arbre et la forêt de toutes sortes de menaces... dans l'intérêt des générations présentes et futures". Suivent des appels plus articulés pour des problèmes spécifiques dérivant de différents facteurs de danger pour diverses zones géographiques.

L'Italie, par son patrimoine historique et ses conditions géographico-climatiques, a toujours eu la considération qui est due à l'ensemble des thématiques discutées, que ce soit pour les problèmes continentaux ou pour ceux à caractéristiques méditerranéennes et dont l'appel de Paris ne peut que trouver une confirmation à ses propres politiques sur l'arbre et la forêt.

Sur la base des indications et des engagements pris au neuvième Congrès forestier mondial de Mexico (juillet 1985), l'attention du Gouvernement national en matière de politique forestière et d'environnement s'est manifestée par une série d'actions renouvelées ou d'encouragement et de développement pour d'autres actions en cours.

Enquête sur le dépérissement de la forêt: Commencée en 1984 avec des critères synthétiques, l'enquête sur le dépérissement de la forêt s'est poursuivie dans les années suivantes en perfectionnant la méthodologie, en adoptant des critères d'analyse qui se répètent dans le temps, par des points coïncidant à ceux de l'inventaire forestier national.

Le programme de travail se développe aussi en relation avec les organismes internationaux comme la Communauté économique européenne et la Commission économique des Nations Unies pour l'Europe.

Conjointement avec l'administration forestière italienne engagée dans le relevé des dégâts sur les écosystèmes forestiers, d'autres organismes nationaux développent des études et des actions tendant à repérer et éliminer les causes possibles de cette dégradation de l'environnement.

Zones protégées: Dans le contexte des exigences et des possibilités du territoire, le problème forestier, écologique et économique à la fois, est un facteur d'une dimension qui n'est pas seulement nationale. C'est un problème qui se pose comme le rapport entre disponibilités et consommation, entre agriculture et forêts, comme l'équilibre entre développement et conservation, comme la défense contre la dégradation de l'environnement, comme la lutte contre la désertification progressive, comme la récupération des terres abandonnées, comme la reconstitution des écosystèmes.

Notre politique actuelle suit les orientations avec une attention toujours plus grande *pour* obtenir le respect des normes qui tutèient les zones protégées, dans le perfectionnement et l'augmentation du niveau de ces normes-, dans l'augmentation en nombre, superficies et qualités des zones protégées, dans la création de méthodes et structures pour une éducation à l'environnement plus diffuse et approfondie.

Lutte contre les incendies de forêts: Les incendies de forêts constituent aussi pour notre pays un autre grave danger de dégradation de l'environnement. Ils peuvent frapper en même temps tous les éléments de l'écosystème: les arbres et les arbustes, l'herbe et la litière, l'air, l'eau et le sol, les micro-organismes et les animaux.

Outre le perfectionnement progressif des méthodes de lutte directe, que ce soit terrestre ou aérienne, notre administration forestière développe avec une intensité croissante les secteurs des études et de la recherche, de la prévention, de l'information et de l'éducation civique à tous les niveaux.

Par ailleurs, dans le contexte international, le problème des Incendies de forêts a trouvé ces derniers temps une attention renouvelée et pressante.

L'échange d'expériences et d'informations sous forme de collaborations opérationnelles avec quelques pays (France, Allemagne, Grèce, Yougoslavie) en sont le témoignage.

Dans le cadre de la Communauté, la CEE a émis le règlement 3529 (Protection des forêts dans la Communauté contre les incendies) et la CEE et l'OAA elle-même suivent attentivement les développements et les implications de cette grave calamité qui frappe surtout les régions de la zone méditerranéenne. Dans ce contexte il faut souligner l'intérêt renouvelé du groupe "SILVA MEDITERRANEA".

Inventaire forestier national: Basé sur le critère de l'échantillonnage systématique en une phase unique, le projet se base sur les points d'intersection d'un réseau idéal à maille carrée avec un côté de trois kilomètres, représentant une zone de 900 hectares.

Les résultats de l'inventaire apparaissent au début de 1987 et dénotent depuis le début un vieillissement des formations forestières et une augmentation consistante de masse. En l'état actuel des choses, il ressort une tendance à l'action d'économie, résultant aussi de la diminution des utilisations.

La disponibilité des données obtenues par l'inventaire forestier national permet de programmer la gestion des ressources forestières, leur renforcement et leur disponibilité dans le temps: celui-ci prend une importance remarquable dans le cadre d'un développement ordonné de l'économie nationale, la forêt étant la composante la plus importante de l'environnement naturel.

Plan forestier national: La promulgation du Plan forestier national est imminente.

Le plan intéresse non seulement des activités ayant pour fin la production directe et immédiate de biens ou de services mais surtout tend à la conservation et à la reproduction de la forêt qui représente un élément essentiel d'équilibre du territoire vu dans l'intégralité et la complexité de ses composantes naturelles et humaines. La forêt entendue comme "ressource" est source complexe de matières premières à prélever selon des critères bien déterminés et des programmes spécifiques, de biens et de services.

Le cadre de référence et d'évaluation du plan est "écologique" sous un premier aspect, "économique" sous un second aspect; mais il est simultanément écologique et économique si l'on considère les interrelations complexes et réciproques entre ces deux versants du "système forestier", ainsi que la concurrence des ressources économiques à destiner chaque fois à leur renforcement et amélioration. Ces deux aspects ont une égale importance pour nos sociétés qui demandent que leurs fonctions respectives soient remplies de manière conjointe, que ce soit sur le plan écologique, économique ou social. Les intérêts et l'intervention publics et privés doivent pour cette raison être considérés comme concurrents en mesure égale sous tous les aspects.

Le Plan forestier national est un instrument programmatique qui identifie des objectifs permanents à atteindre par des actions à insérer dans des programmes d'au moins dix ans, dont les effets devront être sujets à des contrôles et vérifications périodiques. Des actions coordonnées et finalisées sont soutenues par des instruments législatifs opportuns qui définissent également l'engagement financier.

Ceci dit, pour les activités que l'Italie poursuit dans le contexte national et qui témoignent l'intérêt et l'importance qu'elle attache au secteur forestier, même en ce qui concerne la coopération au développement, les lignes que l'Italie poursuit sont tout à fait en harmonie avec les conclusions des enceintes internationales et mettent en oeuvre les indications du Plan forestier tropical et des spécifications qui ont été mises en évidence lors de la réunion de Bellagio.

L'Italie, touchée comme tous par la prise de conscience de ce que la forêt représente, des dangers qui l'atteignent et de l'importance de la sauvegarder et de la reconstituer, assure qu'elle ne fera pas manquer son soutien à ce patrimoine essentiel pour la vie et le bien-être commun.

Pour conclure, en ce qui concerne le Congrès forestier mondial, (le premier s'est tenu ici en 1926), l'Italie, qui a déjà posé sa candidature, confirme sa totale disponibilité pour accueillir cette importante manifestation et pour donner à cette dixième réunion, l'importance qu'elle mérite.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Y realmente nos complace mucho volverlo a ver presidiendo nuestros debates. Es motivo de satisfacción para mi delegación y para mí en lo personal por la amistad que nos une.

Quiero, en primer lugar, felicitar al Sr. Flores Rodas por la excelente presentación que nos ha hecho del documento C 87/25. Este documento nos parece muy completo, muy preciso y muy orientador porque enumera pormenorizadamente que se ha hecho, de dónde partimos, en que situación estamos y hacia dónde pretendemos llegar.

En consecuencia, felicitamos también a la Secretaría por la calidad de este documento.

La hora es bastante avanzada y no voy a ser muy extenso, pero sí quisiéramos poner de relieve que el deterioro continuado de los bosques, sobre todo en los trópicos, se debe a una exagerada e indiscriminada explotación de estos bosques como medio, en unos casos, para buscar maderas preciosas con fines comerciales, y en la mayoría de los países en desarrollo estas explotaciones se realizan por vía de empresas transnacionales. Digo esto porque ésa es exactamente la experiencia de nuestro país.

El segundo factor importante de afectación de los bosques en el trópico es las limitadas posibilidades que tienen los grandes grupos de campesinos de encontrar adecuado asentamiento en zonas que han sido previamente colonizadas o fomentadas.

Esto determina, naturalmente, un avance continuado de la frontera agrícola y establece en ocasiones sistemas de explotación que, naturalmente, deterioran los bosques y conjuntamente con los bosques el ecosistema existente condicionado por ello.

Por esta razón consideramos que los problemas relativos al bosque no solamente deben mirarse desde el punto de vista de proteger el medio ambiente, sino como elemento fundamental de la posibilidad económica que brinda para hacer una explotación adecuada de ellos y como un elemento derivado para garantizar en ciertos sectores la seguridad alimentaria y el desarrollo económico estable de importantes grupos de población.

En nuestro país en el año 1959 contábamos solamente con el 9 por ciento del área total del país cubierta por bosques. Esto fue el producto, el resultado de una colonización desmedida para extender grandes plantaciones cañeras y grandes pastizales de la ganadería. Esto, naturalmente, deterioró, considerablemente el sistema ecológico nacional y nuestro gobierno está empeñando grandes esfuerzos en promover una recuperación forestal en el país. Para ilustrar lo que acabo de decir señalaremos que en 1959 existía bajo bosques solamente el 9 por ciento de la superficie total y ya en estos momentos contamos con un 17 por ciento de áreas bajo bosques. Esto ha sido un gran empeño; pensamos continuar avanzando en esta dirección, y un hecho muy importante que queremos destacar es que la repoblación forestal en Cuba se ha tomado no solamente desde el punto de vista económico, sino que constituye una acción también popular porque las masas en nuestro país participan directamente en la siembra de árboles.

Asimismo, otras medidas han sido tomadas, como la declaración de Parque Nacional Sierra Maestra, una de las importantes zonas del país que es conocida por muchos.

También desarrollamos un instituto para la preparación de ingenieros forestales y sus resultados son muy elocuentes en estos momentos.

Sr. Presidente, el párrafo 37 del documento C 87/25 nos ilustra en cuanto a un conjunto de indicaciones, de criterios y enfoques adoptados muy útiles para todos los países en desarrollo. Por lo tanto, nos asociamos completamente a lo que aquí se expresa.

Quisiéramos lamentar que dada las limitaciones financieras de la FAO no haya sido posible incluir una mayor participación del programa de bosques en el presupuesto que aprobaremos para 1988/89.

Al mismo tiempo deseamos hacer un llamado para que aquellos donantes que han venido contribuyendo en el plan de acción forestal en los trópicos lo continúen haciendo y algunos otros donantes potenciales también se incorporen en esta dirección.

Nos permitimos llamar la atención de la FAO en el sentido de explorar o de estimular un tanto más a las organizaciones no gubernamentales en el sentido de que contribuyan con este programa teniendo en cuenta que muchas de estas organizaciones tienen como filosofía ayudar a los sectores más pobres de nuestras poblaciones y, naturalmente, los hombres y las mujeres que dependen del bosque o que están próximos a él son sin duda alguna en su mayoría poblaciones marginales y son, naturalmente, los más necesitados.

Olav LINDSTAD (Norway): The World Commission on Environment and Development has brought to public attention some alarming trends in the development of natural resources. One of the more important tools in creating a sustainable development is to secure a rational management of forest resources taking into account the protective as well as the productive role of the forests.

In realizing the crucial importance attached to forests on a global scale, the Norwegian delegation welcomes the two documents now under discussion in this Commission.

First I want to make some brief remarks on the follow-up to the International Conference on Trees and Forests, Silva 86. I will then comment on the follow-up to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. My delegation concurs in the basic ideas of the Silva resolution. We also support the work done by FAO in this respect. Norway is paying and will be paying due attention to the basic ideas inherent in Silva both within our own forestry policy and in our development assistance.

A unique structure for cooperative effort in the field of rational management of forest resources has been created through the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. All the relevant interests from conservation to industry are joining forces with the emphasis on rural development. The common goal is to establish a coordinated procedure to turn the on-going destruction of the tropical forests into a positive development serving society as a whole. Since the Tropical Forestry Action Plan was initiated two years ago there has been a significant increase in financial resources allocated to forestry from many of the development agencies. However, this increase is by far not sufficient to stop the destruction, not to mention what is necessary to secure the future needs of the world's growing population.

At a meeting in FAO's Committee of Forest Development in the Tropics, statistics were presented which demonstrate the great variation between developing countries concerning the availability of bilateral assistance. The multilateral and in particular the multi-bilateral assistance can be used to fill these gaps.

To meet the situation just outlined it seems necessary to review priorities in an attempt to find the financial means necessary for the purpose. Furthermore there is a need for bilateral agencies to integrate both their bilateral and multi-bilateral activities in this field in a realistic perspective of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan.

Finally, my delegation wishes to express its satisfaction with the work carried out by FAO related to SILVA and the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. We welcome this increased awareness of the importance of securing a rational management of the forest resources where both protection and production are highlighted. Norway will in the years ahead give even more attention to the forestry sector in its development assistance and the Tropical Forestry Action Plan is considered as a useful framework for this increased attention.

ZHANG YESUI (China) (original language Chinese): I shall be brief. First of all I would like to thank Mr Flores Rodas for his excellent introduction to this discussion here in this Committee and I would also like to thank the Secretariat for the documents we have before us - document C 87/25 and C 87/28, documents which the Secretariat prepared for this Conference and we found these to be excellent documents.

Now allow me to make some brief comments on the follow-up to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. In order to implement the Tropical Forestry Action Plan the FAO has set up new machinery, it has provided additional funding and has organized a series of consultations. Similarly it has

established links with multilateral agencies and the financing bodies of the UN System for project programming. The FAO has proceeded to an exchange of information with intergovernmental and nongovernmental organisations, has published a variety of reports on this topic. All of this has enhanced public opinion relating to the concept, the role and the significance of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan which greatly facilitates the implementation of the Plan and we would in this respect like to say how much we value what has been done. We have, however, noted that the Tropical Forestry Action Plan is an overall plan comprising five areas of action and if we had the necessary financial resources to implement it then I think that Indeed we would set, that it would play a very positive part in production, management, development and use of world forestry resources. I think it is quite obvious that the availability of funding is an a priori condition to the implementation of the Action Plan and we hope that the FAO will continue both to undertake and coordinate these activities while seeking the necessary funding for the Action Plan. We similarly hope that the international community will lend its financial and technical support. Thus this Action Plan could in the very near future play an extremely important part in the medium and long-term development of the world's forests and in particular of the tropical forests.

Almir F. DE SA' BARBUDA (Brazil): Let me first say that we are very happy to see you chairing our meeting tonight.

We would like to start by reiterating the support of my Government to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and thank the Secretariat for the preparation of this document on the follow-up of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. We appreciate as well the priority that FAO has given to this initiative in the allocation of resources and the effort that is being made by the Organization to promote the initiative and coordinate its implementation such as the creation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan Coordination Office and the Steering Committee for the Tropical Forestry Action Plan.

As stated in paragraph 8 of the document, Mr Chairman, we agree that poverty is the principal factor of the deforestation. But we believe that the document that is under review at the moment should have placed more attention on the causes that are leading to the increase of poverty in the developing countries in the last few years. This is an aspect that has been very properly examined in the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. From that report, my delegation wishes to quote the following sentence: "Growth in many developing countries is being stifled by depressed commodity prices, protectionism, intolerable debt burdens, and declining flows of development finance". These factors, as demonstrated in the report, are leading to the increase of poverty in the developing countries, to the widening in the gap between developed and developing countries and to an undue pressure on natural resources of the poor countries. We agree as well when the report states that "it is neither desirable nor acceptable that the food consumption of the poorest people should be reduced to secure funds required to service external debts". We must realize, however, that this is exactly what is happening and that a sincere political will among all nations must be shown in order to tackle the basic problems affecting the environment. In this sense, while considering the TFAP a most important initiative, it must be agreed that unless effective steps are taken towards a new and more equitable international economic order, problems concerning environment will not be solved. It would be naive to believe that the simple imposition of environment conditions, by bilateral or multilateral financial organisations would be enough to stop environmental degradation. Such restrictions would actually lead to a vicious circle, where barriers to development would aggravate the situation of the poor.

And in its turn would aggravate the environmental degradation. A positive approach - that is financial contributions to projects aiming at curbing environmental problems would be a much more effective approach.

Turning to the document Mr Chairman, we would make a reference to the efforts made by Mr Flores Rodas in his introduction to this document in relation, to the flexibility and implementation of the TFAP. This is a very welcome reference and we need not keep repeating our well known positions. But anyway I would like to mention that we regard paragraph 35 a very important one where it repeats that "the initiatives for adopting the TFAP approach in a country lies with its government, which will also decide what course of action to take to implement the TFAP in the national context".

Brazil is fully aware of the importance of a rational use of its resources, but considers, an exclusive and sovereign task, the formulation of its environmental policy and the management, according to national priorities of its natural resources.

We do consider, however, of relevance the existing international mechanisms of cooperation. In this regard we wish to mention that FAO and some individual countries have already given us valuable assistance in the field of forestry. At this moment, FAO is collaborating in an important integrated forestry development project in the Northeast of Brazil, which involves dendroenergy, agrosilvi-culture and forestry hydrology.

In the same line, as stated in paragraph 46 of the document, FAO and the Government of Brazil collaborated in the promotion of a round table in Brasilia on TFAP cooperation at the regional level. We hope therefore to widen this cooperation with FAO and, in accordance with our national priorities based on the needs of our people, eventually to participate in projects related to the TFAP. In this regard we wish to mention our support for paragraphs 35 and 36 of the document, stating that the implementation of the TFAP has to occur "under widely varying situations and therefore no standard procedure may be applied".

In our specific case, Brazil does not accept any external review of its policies and priorities, as we have several times affirmed. In this regard I wish to point out again that we appreciated listening to the confirmation by Mr Rodas that a review is not always needed. We also wish to mention that we highly appreciate the support given by the world community to the TFAP. However, we regret that the same concerns for environment are not always shown by some industrialized countries in relation to other important proposals presented in this Organization. I refer to the creation of a truly multilateral fund for the protection of world forests, as proposed by Austria in the last World Forestry Congress, and supported by the majority of Member Nations; secondly, to the inclusion of the "prior informed consent" (PIC) principle, to the International Code of Conduct on the Use and Distribution of Pesticides. This principle is also highly recommended by the Brundtland Report.

Finally, we recommend that the Secretariat pay due attention, in future documents dealing with the environment, to UNEP's Environmental Perspective to the Year 2000 and Beyond, an important, document resulting from years of discussions among representatives of Governments. The document was approved by consensus last June by the 14th Session of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme.

I am sorry if the importance of this item to my Government did not allow me to be as brief as would be desirable at this late hour, but we believe that the amount of our tropical resources justifies our deep interest in the matter.

Taiel JALEL (Tunisie): Etant donné que nous sommes en retard et que nous sommes tous fatigués par un débat houleux, je vais être bref. La délégation tunisienne se félicite du fait que ce point important concernant la suite donnée à la Conférence SILVA soit inscrit à l'ordre du jour de la 24ème session de cette Conférence. Cette occasion nous permettra de faire le point de la situation et d'évaluer les progrès accomplis et les étapes franchies depuis la Conférence de Paris, il y a environ vingt mois.

Dans ce contexte, la Tunisie, consciente de la situation critique des ressources forestières du fait de la déforestation, du phénomène de la désertification et de la dégradation des terres, a déjà exprimé son adhésion totale aux recommandations de SILVA et en particulier aux grandes lignes du Plan d'action forestier tropical qui constitue un mécanisme efficace de coordination de la coopération technique et des investissements dans le secteur forestier.

C'est ainsi que la Tunisie a élaboré une Stratégie nationale de lutte contre la désertification comportant 22 projets axés sur la recherche, le développement, la vulgarisation et la mise en valeur agro-sylvo-pastorale intégrée des zones arides et en a déjà engagé vigoureusement la réalisation.

De même, un Plan de développement forestier a été mis au point qui comporte notamment l'inventaire sylvo-pastoral national, la création de boisements de production, l'amélioration de la gestion forestière et le renforcement des institutions forestières.

Ce plan de développement a été réalisé avec la collaboration de la FAO et co-financé par la Banque mondiale. D'autre part, une action de vulgarisation et d'encouragement des plantations sylvo-pastorales dans le secteur agricole a été entamée dans le cadre des projets de développement rural intégré. Par ailleurs, il a été procédé à la révision de la législation forestière pour l'adapter aux nouvelles exigences du secteur forestier. Le nouveau code prévoit entre autres un chapitre relatif à l'encouragement des particuliers et des usagers des forêts pour le développement des actions sylvo-pastorales, et l'amélioration des conditions de vie des populations forestières. Un fonds spécial de développement sylvo-pastoral a été créé à cet effet, pour appuyer la mise en oeuvre de cette politique.

Enfin, les efforts intenses de sensibilisation et de réflexion entrepris au niveau national pour trouver à temps une solution au problème immense de là é qui prend un tour angoissant sous la forme de désertification galopante, ont commencé à porter leurs fruits.

Au niveau régional, des réunions à tous les niveaux, dans le cadre de structures régionales de concertation, ont permis de définir les lignes directrices d'action et de projets majeurs destinés à lutter contre la déforestation et la désertification.

La Conférence Silva, tenue à un niveau aussi élevé, a été une occasion déterminante pour avancer dans ce domaine et concrétiser dans les faits une solidarité internationale justifiée par la morale, mais également par la raison. C'est pourquoi il nous paraît éminemment souhaitable que l'appel de Paris, qui a émané de la Conférence Silva puisse proclamer solennellement et avec toute la vigueur voulue, la nécessité d'un engagement significatif et durable des pays développés et des organisations internationales à participer plus activement, sous forme à la fois technique et financière, au plan d'action adopté par la Conférence de Paris.

Certes, les efforts déjà consentis par ces pays et ces organisations, notamment la FAO, le PNUE, le PAM et l'OAA, pour le développement du secteur forestier dans les pays en développement sont appréciables, mais la Tunisie souhaiterait que de tels efforts puissent être poursuivis et accrus et que le principe de réserver au développement du secteur forestier et à la lutte contre la désertification dans les pays, principe retenu par la Conférence Silva, tienne une place privilégiée dans les programmes bilatéraux et multilatéraux de coopération.

Il conviendrait également et surtout de prévoir dans ces programmes de coopération, une participation constante et soutenue au financement des projets visant la réalisation d'aménagement rural intégré et la réhabilitation des ressources forestières.

Rodolphe de POURTALES (Suisse): Ma délégation aimerait tout d'abord remercier M. Flores Rodas, Sous-directeur général du Département des forêts, de son introduction très claire et complète sur les progrès réalisés dans la mise en oeuvre du plan d'action forestier tropical, et se réjouit du fait qu'un nombre croissant de pays se proposent de passer aux actes.

La Suisse attache une grande importance au rôle des forêts tropicales ainsi que des forêts tempérées dans l'équilibre naturel et pour l'avenir de l'humanité, non seulement dans les régions concernées mais également à l'échelle globale. Pour cette raison les montants de l'aide bilatérale au développement accordés à la foresterie ont quintuplé entre 1976 et 1986, atteignant plus de 7 pour cent de l'aide bilatérale.

Mon pays apporte également un soutien actif à la mise en oeuvre du Plan d'action forestier tropical en finançant avec d'autres bailleurs de fonds le bureau de coordination du plan d'action forestier tropical auprès de la FAO, et en participant aux missions de revue sectorielles dont le but principal est l'élaboration de stratégies cohérentes dans le secteur forestier. Les expériences faites jusqu'ici dans cette participation nous permettent déjà de tirer certaines conclusions préliminaires dont deux nous paraissent dignes d'être mentionnées ici.

Il nous semble tout d'abord que les missions réalisées dans le cadre du PAFT ne sont pas encore assez mises à profit pour lancer des campagnes de sensibilisation et de promotion de la cause forestière aux différents niveaux, et par les médias existant dans les pays concernés.

Ensuite, les mêmes missions pourraient jouer un rôle plus important pour animer le dialogue entre les divers ministères impliqués: Agriculture, Énergie, Tourisme, Protection de la nature, etc.

De l'avis de ma délégation, les stratégies proposées doivent envisager des solutions multidisciplinaires, innovatrices, et orientées vers les besoins immédiats des populations. Dans ce contexte, l'agroforesterie est à même d'apporter des contributions très précieuses, voire décisives. En effet, les limitations des ressources humaines et financières des services publics qui, selon toute probabilité, ne seront pas éliminées à court ou moyen terme, même avec une aide accrue au développement institutionnel, rendent indispensable la participation consciente et active des populations dans la mise en œuvre des stratégies proposées. Cette participation est liée aux avantages à court et moyen terme qu'en retirera la population; et elle est aussi garante de la continuité du processus de conservation, de reconstitution et d'utilisation rationnelle du patrimoine forestier.

Ismael DIAZ YUBERO (España): Muchas gracias, Sr. Presidente. Quiero felicitar a la Secretaría por la elaboración de los dos documentos, y al señor Flores Rodas por la magnífica exposición que nos ha hecho de ellos.

España ha venido colaborando con FAO a lo largo de los últimos meses realizando un seminario sobre Silva Mediterránea, en Zaragoza, del que se formó un centro de sensibilización sobre la importancia del sector forestal, otro seminario de incendios, en Valencia, un seminario más sobre el uso múltiple en zonas áridas, también en Zaragoza. Ha puesto en marcha un programa de puesta a punto de una tecnología para la corrección de cuencas sometidas a los efectos torrenciales, de aplicación a la Cuenca Mediterránea y en otras zonas donde se producen estos fenómenos que tanto contribuyen a la desertificación.

En el Plan de Acción Tropical, hemos enviado expertos a diversos países latinoamericanos. En esta línea continuaremos, Sr. Presidente, en el futuro.

Apoyamos los documentos que nos han sido presentados, en su totalidad, y queremos felicitarlos por tenerle a usted presidiendo, aunque, por otra parte, lamentamos que no esté el Presidente, porque queríamos decir algunas cosas con respecto al incidente que se ha producido esta tarde. Se ha acusado a un país de irresponsabilidad y se ha dicho que no era digno. A un país o a un representante, me es igual. Este país, este gobierno, esta persona ofendida merecen una satisfacción y le ruego, Sr. Presidente, que transmita al Presidente, al Sr. Presidente Titular el ruego firme, muy firme, de que presente las disculpas correspondientes.

Sr. Embajador de Panamá, Sres. de la Delegación de Panamá. Yo me siento, nosotros nos sentimos muy orgullosos de contarle entre nosotros y queremos que siga comportándose como hasta ahora se ha comportado.

Edoardo Tomás MIRANO (Angola): Monsieur le Président, nous sommes ravis que vous soyez présent ce soir pour diriger nos débats. Nous tenons tout d'abord à remercier Flores Rodas pour la présentation claire et concise du document relatif à notre thème de ce soir; nous voudrions également remercier le Secrétariat pour la qualité du travail fourni à cet effet.

Comme nous l'avions vu antérieurement, le Plan d'Action Forestier Tropical est d'une importance capitale par son rôle dans notre pays et nous souscrivons entièrement à ses objectifs.

La région forestière du sud de mon pays est située dans une zone de grand élevage et comme le bois constitue également pour nous une source d'énergie pour une grande partie de nos populations, nous connaissons actuellement de sérieux problèmes dans notre foresterie sur l'avance accentuée du désert.

du Kalahary. Nous soulignons par ce fait le problème difficile auquel mon pays est confronté et pour lequel il est impérieux de trouver les solutions adéquates et urgentes pour faire face à ce danger imminent qui menace nos forêts.

Notre préoccupation essentielle dans ce domaine est concentrée sur le Programme de formation et de recherche pour résoudre ces problèmes complexes que présente le secteur car il nous faut nécessairement des cadres compétents en cette matière pour le développement rural.

Nous voudrions remercier tous les pays, et plus particulièrement la Direction générale de la FAO, pour les actions entreprises en vue de rendre le PAFT très opérationnel comme il est indiqué au document C 87/25, sans oublier de mentionner notre reconnaissance aux institutions internationales et aux donateurs multilatéraux pour leur appui financier au PAFT. Nous profitons de cette occasion pour féliciter plus particulièrement le Japon pour son accord de principe de financer les examens du secteur forestier du PAFT et ses activités connexes pendant la période triennale 1988-90.

S'agissant de l'évaluation du PAFT, il a fait preuve, à notre avis, de beaucoup de réalisme dans ses premiers temps, malgré le non-achèvement de certaines de ses opérations programmées. Pour la mise en oeuvre du PAFT, nous insistons surtout pour qu'il soit mis un accent spécial sur le développement des infrastructures qui constituent l'un des problèmes fondamentaux pour l'exploitation de nos forêts. Ma délégation souhaiterait recevoir des informations relatives à l'expérience nécessaire de la part des pays qui ont déjà grandement bénéficié des activités du PAFT.

Pour terminer, nous remercions sincèrement la FAO pour son assistance au projet qui va être lancé incessamment et qui consiste à procéder à la fixation des dunes dans la zone sud du pays. Nous lançons un appel pressant aux organisations non gouvernementales et à certains pays déjà cités par les délégués qui m'ont précédé afin qu'ils intensifient leur participation aux activités de terrain du PAFT car elles ont un rôle très important à jouer.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): My delegation wishes to compliment the Secretariat for the two documents - that is, C 87/25 and C 87/28 - which form the basis for discussion on item 17 of the Conference agenda. We also wish to congratulate and express our appreciation to Mr Flores-Rodas for his eloquent and pleasant introduction of the document. Both documents have articulated clearly and adequately the role and significance of forests in socio-economic development of the people, especially those resident in rural areas where agriculture and activities ancillary to agriculture are the primary source of livelihood.

Whereas interdependence between agriculture and forest is obvious, short-term interests have tended to mitigate for destruction of forests, especially in tropical areas, consequently causing accelerated land degradation which often leaves the people helplessly writhing in the jaws of famine and hunger due to the decline in land productivity.

The revelation in paragraph 3 of document C 87/25 on the rate of destruction of tropical forests is disturbing and alarming. If this rate continues unabated tropical forests will be extinct very soon. It is therefore with this fact in mind that we express our appreciation and support for the Tropical Forestry Action Plan programme. The 1986 SILVA International Conference on Trees and Forests was a good corollary to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan. The objectives of TFAP and the SILVA Conference are complementary and supportive of each other. As a consequence the TFAP and SILVA Conference have helped to increase awareness in the importance of tropical forests and commitment to actions that will not only help to conserve tropical forests but will also facilitate the development of forests to meet national needs for wood and timber requirements. For most developing countries, especially in Africa, forestry products account for substantially large inputs in the building, furniture and paper industries, as well as being the primary source of energy for the rural populations and the local income groups in urban areas.

Kenya has initiated actions to implement TFAP. Sector review detailing assistance requirement for forest sector development has been completed. The information gained from the review is now being used to formulate projects. Already as a consequence of the importance the Government attaches to the significance of forestry in the conservation of flora and fauna the Government has statutorily

protected the tropical forest remaining in the country by gazettement as national parks the forests where rare species of plants and wild life are still to be found. The priority Kenya attaches to conservation and development of forest is also evidenced in the establishment by the Government recently of a National Forestry Development Research Institute. Furthermore, the Government recently established a university which majors in forestry degree courses.

Regarding forestry in land use, Kenya is emphasizing afforestation of dryland and development of agro-forestry. The National Forestry Development Research Institute collects, propagates and subsequently distributes to farmers seedlings of both indigenous and exotic species. Increasingly agro-forestry is becoming an important source of supply of fuelwood and forage for livestock. Kenya hosts, as some of you may know, the International Centre for Research in Agro-forestry (ICRAF). We find the work of the ICRAF useful.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to reiterate the needs and importance to increase support for research programmes related to the tropical indigenous species which consist of important genetic resources and may furthermore be developed for economic and social progress in pharmaceutical and other technical uses.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): Let me first assure you that I will only talk about forestry and that I will be brief.

I have three points to make. The first point relates to tropical forests in general. Although Canada has not had tropical forest since the zinozoic period we do import tropical timber and we are a member of the ITTO, the International Tropical Timber Organization, which addresses some of these issues. We are also heavily involved through the work of CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency. Indeed Canada is the second largest bilateral donor to forestry development in the third world.

Recently in July of this year the Bellagio strategy meeting, which was intended to save tropical forests, agreed to establish an international task force to prepare specific recommendations for policy responses, funding strategies, institutional mechanisms, etc. There will be a second Bellagio meeting within a year to review the task force recommendations. We were very much involved in the first one and we look forward to the second one.

My second point relates to the TFAP proper. The Ottawa Conference on Conservation and Development, supported the wholistic approach of the TFAP. In this regard I would like to associate my delegation with those of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands and that of Czechoslovakia in making a point that the TFAP is a package deal, you cannot separate or emphasize components. The deal has been made in a way in the last two years and I think it is far too late to attempt now to change portions of it or the various percentages in terms of budget and so on. In that regard I would like to emphasize particularly what the delegate from Czechoslovakia said with respect to forest industries. Of course, this is something which you will appreciate Canada has some experience with and we recognize very much the importance of that particular component of the TFAP but above all we hope that the TFAP will proceed from here on without any further discussion whether we should change a little portion or change another one.

The third point I wish to make is in connection with the work of the Bruntland Commission on Environment and Development which mentioned more attention and efforts must be devoted to the sustainable utilization in conservation of tropical rain forests. In this regard I wish to refer to a resolution which has now been accepted by the Resolutions Committee and which will be presented by Canada, the Netherlands and Norway under Item 20.2. I will not bring forward the resolution in its entirety at this stage but I will refer to one portion of it which is relevant to this discussion. It says in part of the preamble "noting that the World Commission on Environment and Development has addressed these issues and made recommendations for common action" and then one of the operative paragraphs will read "concur that integrated forest management to preserve forestry resources is also the basis of sustainable agriculture".

Angus Edward MACDONALD (Australia): Forests and forestry are important sectors of Australians economy. Our forest areas ranged from dry, arid, through the temperate zone to tropical rain forests and coastal tidal areas. Australia is probably unique among developed countries in this diversity. A key element of forestry policy and forest development in Australia is the role that trees play in maintaining environmental balance, particularly in soil erosion. We have learned the hard way through failure or lack of policy and respect for our environment in the past. We have seen the disastrous effects that forest mismanagement can have on our agriculture and the environment. Today our forests provide significant employment and economic benefits in addition to environmental amenity and a long term support for our soil.

The FAO work on tropical forests has coincided with an Australian initiative to promote awareness within governments of the developing countries of the potential of the Australian forestry sector to contribute to their development.

At this stage, it would appear that the most positive action that Australia can take to implement the Tropical Forestry Action Plan's proposals would be the continuation of assistance to tropical developing countries through, for example, the provision of seeds and of attendance of technical advisers at seminars and work shops and by making advisers available for specific projects.

The seeds of Australian Trees for Developing Countries' Projects has provided genetic material to multilateral and other bilateral donors as well as to locally-funded forestry activities in developing countries. A current review of the project indicates that the financial benefits of this genetic material amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. The prevalence of eucalyptus species in a number of Asian and African countries is a testimony to past programmes.

FAO has rightly identified the marked emphasis away from funding large scale industry oriented projects to social forestry, watershed management and conservation forestry. Australia believes that with closer examination of current institutional arrangements and priorities, there would be more scope for self-help in developing countries, if at least part funded by the developing countries themselves.

Australia also believes that greater information exchange and collaboration on a regional basis • could contribute significantly to cost-effective solutions to many common technical problems.

The TFAP also considered the establishment of mechanisms for the multiple channelling of forestry investments in a World Forestry Fund. While Australia expressed preference for making full use of existing mechanisms over the establishment of a world forest fund, we note that the FAO Secretariat has work in hand on a feasibility study for such a fund.

Major international forestry conferences held in 1985 agreed that urgent action was required to combat destructive exploitation particularly of tropical forest resources.

The International Tropical Timber Organization was established following the ratification of the International Tropical Timber Agreement by twelve producing and fifteen consuming countries in April 1985 under the aegis of UNCTAD. This is also seen by Australia as a most effective organization in meeting the challenges facing the exploitation of tropical forestry resources. Australia expects to become a signatory to the agreement within six months.

Australia is keen to see the maximum cost-effectiveness in the work of both organizations in tropical forestry. Accordingly, both FAO and ITTO should establish effective means of ensuring that there is no duplication in functions and activities.

As a developed country with considerable expertise in the professional management of tropical forests, we are well placed to promote within our development assistance activities, and other mechanisms, forestry management in developing countries and to cooperate with them in maintaining a self-sustainable viable tropical timber economy.

Hermann REDL (Austria) (original language German): Firstly, I would like to thank Dr Flores-Rodas for his introduction to this important agenda item and I would also like to thank the Secretariat for documents C 87/25 and C 87/28.

As you know, 44 percent of Austrian territory is forest. For years Austria, within the FAO framework, but also during the World Forestry Congress in Mexico proposed a whole series of measures. Given the late hour I do not want to run through these proposals in detail, but the pollutants emitted by industry and vehicles considerably harm Austrian forests and for that reason at the European Regional Conference at Reykjavik Austria presented a series of very detailed proposals and we look with particular interest at the consultations during the European Regional Conference in Poland during 1988. There we are delighted that there is to be an agenda item on the forest economy. We think that the protection of the whole forests throughout the world is of very considerable importance. The loss of forests does not only lead to a deterioration in the climate, but it also affects the agricultural land available and we consider it essential to adopt careful measures to combat the dying of forests and we strongly support the measures advocated by the FAO.

I can assure you that Austria in the past and in the future will continue to support FAO's activities and we believe that the area of forestry education and further training as well as forestry research should be given particular importance and I would just like to note, by way of conclusion, that the work within the framework of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan receives our total and wholehearted support.

Tommie SJUBERG (Sweden): As the representative of a forestry country I could speak for hours on this issue. However, at this very late stage of the deliberations in this item I will be very brief.

I have listened to my Nordic colleagues and I can assure you that Sweden fully shares their views. During recent years Sweden has been among those member countries of FAO who have been claiming that more emphasis should be paid to the forestry sector as a basis for rural development. Sweden therefore welcomes the importance that has been made on the implementation of the TFAP. As we see it, the priority of the TFAP is as to forestry a development away from small technical solutions, to solutions within the countries concerned of political, socio-economic and cultural character too. We note with satisfaction the increased knowledge of FAO to work in this direction. I would therefore like to express Sweden's support to the TFAP and my delegation welcomes that further resources have been redistributed to the TFAP to make it possible to implement the plan.

V. K. SIBAL (India): First of all I would like to state that the papers that we are considering are excellent and comprehensive. They were very ably presented by Dr Flores-Rodas, the Assistant Director-General and we would like to compliment him for that.

The Indian delegation fully supports the TFAP and FAO's central coordinating role in its implementation. The plan is an integrated and coordinated approach to development through forestry and forestry in the service of the man in the village. It connotes not only the areas of deforestation and the deterioration in the environment but also aims at providing a live and vital base for rural development.

The massive reduction in the tropical forest area at the rate of 11 hectares per year with its adverse effects on the fertility of land, water reforms, the rates of soil and land erosion and marginalization of land underscore the priority which needs to be attached to the plan. This is compounded by the insatiable hunger for fuel wood leading to forest degradation and such forest degradation in turn leading to the destruction of valuable plant and animal genetic resources, which also points to the primacy that needs to be attached to the implementation of the plan.

We agree that people's participation is extremely important in these programmes and is a necessary condition for the necessary implementation of the plan. The plan would require strengthened institutional framework developing the necessary skills to make forestry more productive in a changing environment to achieve the maximum impact on the rural environment.

We support the plan for its coordinated action at national and international level to promote tropical forestry. We support it because it promotes intersectoral linkages and cooperation, for example between forestry, agriculture, industry, energy and ecology. We endorse it because it maximizes forestry contribution to socio-economic development and environmental management and because it increases the force flows in technical assistance projects for holding deforestation.

India has had the benefit of an FAO TFAP mission earlier this year regarding the strengthening of forestry research and education infrastructure in the country. The government has made a major policy initiative for a massive reforestation campaign with the target of five million hectares per year. The programme is aimed at augmenting fuelwood supplies, promoting rural development, increasing further availability, ameliorating the environment, among other things.

India has undertaken social forestry for people's participation, so that forestry becomes truly in the service of the Indian people.

The Indian delegation would like to offer some comments on two aspects of the plan concerning forest-based industrial development and fuel wood and energy. The majority of the forest-based industries are in the private sector. The organized industries at times get their raw material supplies from the State governments at predetermined prices under long-term agreements. Such cases are, however, limited mainly to organize and capitalize intensive industries such as paper and pulp, ply and veneering, particle board, fibre board. Other industries obtain their raw material from public auction sales or intermediaries. In general there is a scarcity of forest based raw material and a large number of units are not in a position to obtain their full requirement of raw material.

A number of steps have been taken to increase and supplement the raw material supplies for these industries. So far as concerns fuel wood, it occupies a predominant place as an energy source in the rural areas. As against the estimated requirement of approximately 133 million tonnes fuel wood per annum, the supply is around 49 million tonnes out of which the recorded production is only 15 million tonnes. Considerable quantities of cowdung (estimated around 73 million tonnes) and agricultural residues are also burnt as fuel because of the scarcity of firewood. The National Wastelands Development Board has been set up during 1985 with the object of bringing 5 million hectares of land every year under fuel wood and fodder plantation. The development of alternative sources of energy to replace fuel wood in domestic and commercial sectors is in hand.

We agree that at the present time too few TFAP exercises have been completed to provide the basis for a meaningful evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach. Nevertheless, we would agree that the experience gained so far suggests that TFAP stands a good chance of making a significant impact on tropical forestry development in the medium term.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Je vous remercie de me donner la parole à cette heure tardive. Je serai extrêmement bref. Je viens d'écouter avec intérêt notre collègue de l'Inde, M. Sibal, et je suis convaincu que le problème forestier est un des problèmes clés du développement. Je sais combien la FAO a mis l'accent sur l'importance des problèmes forestiers, et mon pays, la Belgique, qui participe au Plan d'action forestier tropical, a une expérience, peut-être limitée mais intéressante, de collaboration avec la FAO dans le domaine forestier à l'aide de fonds fiduciaires.

Depuis des années nous avons un projet intéressant au Cap-Vert qui a été couronné de succès et ce, grâce à l'excellent climat mais aussi aux liens qui se sont créés avec tout le personnel du service de M. Flores Rodas, et en particulier avec le Directeur, M. Muthoo.

Nous avons également un certain nombre de projets forestiers qui ont été menés soit sur le plan bilatéral, soit avec des financements de la CEE, et notamment dans le milieu andin dans des conditions particulièrement difficiles.

Je peux dire d'après mon expérience personnelle (car j'ai circulé dans de nombreux pays d'Afrique, d'Asie et d'Amérique latine) que la forêt est un élément déterminant d'équilibre tant sur le plan écologique que sur celui de l'équilibre agro-sylvo-pastoral.

Sans une politique courageuse en ce domaine, et sans une vision à long terme, il n'y aura pas de développement harmonieux possible; la condition sine qua non d'un équilibre entre l'agriculture et l'élevage nécessite que l'on fasse une large place à un plan d'action dans le domaine forestier; c'est indispensable pour l'équilibre entre ces trois secteurs, et en particulier pour régler les problèmes énergétiques, notamment ceux du bois de feu qui devient particulièrement crucial et angoissant pour un certain nombre de pays d'Afrique.

Je voudrais remercier la FAO pour tout ce qu'elle a fait; bien-sûr, tout ce qu'elle a fait est insuffisant par rapport aux besoins; mais il nous faut être conscients que des efforts supplémentaires seront nécessaires dans les années qui viennent car si nous voulons construire un monde meilleur et plus juste, la forêt doit trouver la place qu'elle mérite c'est-à-dire sinon la première en tout cas l'une des priorités essentielles.

Mon exposé est très court; il est tard, mais nous ne pouvons négliger un aspect particulièrement important de l'activité de la FAO; mais, me direz-vous, il existe bon nombre de priorités que nous avons soulignées au cours des divers projets que nous avons examinés. On a dit à plusieurs reprises qu'on ne sélectionnait peut-être pas suffisamment les priorités mais j'ai rarement entendu dire quels étaient les secteurs de la FAO qui n'étaient pas prioritaires.

Il me semble incontestable que le secteur des forêts est aujourd'hui de tous un secteur prioritaire; nous avons à en tirer les conclusions et pour ce faire il faut travailler tous ensemble pour essayer de le renforcer.

Victor Eduardo MACHINEA (Argentina): Mi delegación desea poner de manifiesto la importancia que revisten para la Argentina los temas involucrados en la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Árbol y el Bosque.

Si bien esta Conferencia analiza aspectos de la problemática de Europa y África, algunas cuestiones allí tratadas son problemas sensibles en otras regiones, como lo son en la República Argentina.

Señor Presidente, en nuestro país los incendios forestales han repercutido en forma negativa, intensa y repetida en bosques nativos de la Región Andina Patagónica y en bosques xerófilos de la Región Central del país, así como también en algunas ocasiones en bosques cultivados en el Noreste del país.

Los procesos de desertificación tienen un desarrollo importante en la Región Central, también donde las precipitaciones son reducidas.

Por ello son de interés para Argentina los avances que se produzcan en estas dos áreas temáticas.

Señor Presidente, con respecto al documento C 87/25 la delegación argentina desea expresar su apoyo a las ideas que generaron el plan de Acción Forestal de los Trópicos, así como también manifestar su acuerdo con los programas de acción, que se han determinado para el mencionado plan.

En gran medida lo planteado por dichos componentes se compadece con la problemática que muestran en la actualidad los recursos forestales en cuanto a su conservación y utilización.

El aprovechamiento de los recursos forestales en la Argentina crece al par de la ocupación territorial cobrando intensidad desde las postrimerías del siglo pasado hasta nuestros días.

Si bien nuestro país no cuenta con un relevamiento forestal exhaustivo, algunos datos son reveladores acerca de la explotación irracional que se ha hecho de los mismos.

En 1915 la superficie ocupada por vegetación leñosa, arbórea y arbustiva, era de 106 000 000 ha. En 1956 CEPAL estimaba esa superficie en 60 300 000 ha mientras en 1980, IFONA estimaba que la misma era de 44 000 000 ha.

Estos bosques que fueron explotados irracionalmente, no han sido evaluados en forma precisa ni en lo que hace a la superficie que ocupan, a sus características productivas y menos aun en lo concerniente al manejo que permita extraer de ellos producciones sostenidas a perpetuidad.

Por otra parte la experiencia desarrollada en los últimos años, en materia de cultivo forestal, ha permitido poner de manifiesto un elevado potencial productivo en cultivos que alcanzan unas 700 000 ha. en diversas regiones del país, con posibilidades, muy importantes de expansión territorial.

Este potencial productivo, deberá desarrollarse de modo tal de colocar a la Argentina, de una posición actual de país importador a una de país exportador de productos forestales.

La oferta maderera para que ello ocurra se deberá originar en un adecuado manejo de los recursos forestales nativos, en un crecimiento tanto cuali como cuantitativo de las forestaciones cultivadas así como en un armónico desarrollo de las actividades industriales vinculadas.

Este crecimiento de la actividad forestal en la Argentina plantea necesidades de diverso tipo, en gran medida contempladas en el PAFT que han llevado a nuestro país a manifestar su interés en participar del mismo y a emprender acciones en tal sentido.

Señor Presidente, nuestro país espera iniciar a breve plazo contactos con instituciones donantes que permitan efectivizar tareas en el marco de este plan y así iniciar el camino hacia el crecimiento del sector. Muchas gracias, Señor Presidente.

Raúl LOPEZ LIRA (México): Mi delegación desea felicitar a la Secretaría por la calidad de los documentos que nos ha presentado.

México no pertenece al PAFT, no obstante, todas las acciones que se están realizando en el país en las áreas tropicales se están llevando a cabo bajo la misma orientación que señala el mencionado plan. En un plazo próximo México desearía ser aceptado como miembro o parte del PAFT, con lo que inmediatamente iniciará la etapa de aplicación del mencionado plan de acuerdo a las prioridades nacionales.

Al respecto señalamos algunos elementos sobre la experiencia nacional para evitar el deterioro de los recursos forestales, así como su participación en diversas iniciativas internacionales para coordinar en este sentido la acción de los países que cuentan con importantes recursos silvícolas.

México, al igual que otros países con recursos forestales tropicales, está atravesando por una etapa crítica en cuanto al aprovechamiento de dichos recursos, es decir por un lado se han subutilizado y por otro cada vez más se han ido empobreciendo y reduciendo sus áreas arboladas.

Sin embargo, la política federal en el Plan Nacional de Desarrollo ha establecido como prioridad "El Programa Nacional de Bosques y Selvas" el cual tiene como objetivo promover el desarrollo económico de las áreas forestales a partir del aprovechamiento, protección y fomento de los recursos silvícolas.

En lo que se refiere a selvas en base a esta política y con participación del Gobierno del Estado en 1983 se inició el "Plan Piloto Forestal de Quintana Roo" sobre la base de establecer una relación de equilibrio entre la selva, sus dueños y poseedores y la industria y con ello lograr armonizar los factores económicos y ecológicos.

A cuatro años de haberse iniciado el Plan Piloto Forestal de Quintana Roo se pueden resaltar las siguientes experiencias:

Las Selvas se revaloran cuando los pobladores de las áreas forestales, obtienen en forma permanente beneficios directos de su aprovechamiento.

Hay que aprovechar la iniciativa y experiencia de los campesinos para que ellos mismos apliquen y mejoren el aprovechamiento de sus recursos.

En el corto plazo se pueden incorporar a los dueños y poseedores forestales al proceso de producción de materias primas con un considerable incremento en sus ingresos y conocimientos.

No puede haber aprovechamiento forestal maderable sin la coparticipación de campesinos e industrias y menos haber silvicultura sin contar con una industria integrada, y con una organización productiva de los campesinos.

No se puede pensar en protección ecológica si ésta no se combina con una alternativa productiva y económica.

Respecto al "Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos" (PAFT) nuestra posición es la siguiente:

En el Manifiesto de México presentado en el IX Congreso Forestal en 1985 se asentó que se apoya en forma decidida todas las iniciativas tendientes a acelerar la ejecución de las acciones definidas por el PAFT en las siguientes cinco áreas prioritarias: "Lo Forestal y el Uso del Suelo", "Leña y Energía", "Conservación de los Ecosistemas Forestales Tropicales", "Desarrollo de las Industrias Forestales", "Instituciones".

Durante el período del 25 al 31 de enero del presente año, en cooperación con la FAO y el Servicio de EE.UU. se efectuó en Chetumal, Quintana Roo México, la "Conferencia internacional sobre Evaluación de Tierras y Recursos para la Planeación Nacional en las Zonas Tropicales".

Del 11 al 20 de mayo también en Chetumal Quintana Roo a través de la Comisión Forestal de América del Norte, se llevó a cabo un "Taller Internacional sobre Silvicultura y Manejo de Selvas".

Se tiene experiencia en el aprovechamiento forestal de Quintana Roo con la participación del Sector Social e instituciones la cual puede compartirse con otros países.

En la Octava Reunión del Comité de Desarrollo en los Trópicos celebrada del 14 al 18 de septiembre próximo pasado a través de la Dirección de Asuntos Internacionales de la SARH se hizo llegar una ponencia bajo el título de "La Situación y Perspectivas de las Selvas en México".

En relación a la inclusión de México dentro del PAFT, del 10 al 20 de julio del presente año se tuvo la visita de un experto de la FAO a diferentes regiones tropicales del país para conocer la problemática y definir las perspectivas de un plan de acción forestal tropical en México.

Las experiencias de otros países son necesarias para enriquecer las propias.

Si México es aceptado como país miembro del PAFT inmediatamente iniciará la etapa de aplicación del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical para México.

En espera de dicha aceptación los grupos regionales están elaborando proyectos específicos a incluir dentro del "Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos" considerando la posibilidad de participación de otros países y organismos internacionales interesados en México.

La segunda parte del tema 18 corresponde al seguimiento de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Árbol y el Bosque, SILVA 1986.

El espíritu y las resoluciones derivadas de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Árbol y el Bosque, realizada en París en febrero de 1986, revisten una trascendental importancia, no sólo para los países (europeos y africanos) directamente involucrados sino, para toda la comunidad internacional dado el virtual alcance de las mismas.

Para nuestro país, especialmente han resultado trascendentales los resultados de esta Conferencia en la medida que tomaron como punto de partida y profundizaron en las resoluciones y la Declaración del Congreso Forestal Mundial del cual fuimos anfitriones en 1985.

La aceptación por la Comunidad Forestal Internacional de los alarmantes avances que registran, la deforestación, la desertificación, la hambruna, la escasez de leñas, la degradación de los recursos naturales, y el reconocimiento de la urgencia de emprender medidas concretas y en el corto plazo de protección, conservación y desarrollo de los recursos forestales y que tomen en cuenta a las comunidades rurales, constituyen un llamado a la acción a los gobiernos nacionales y organismos de cooperación, asistencia y financiamiento. Como ha sido el caso de nuestro país que ha elevado al rango de prioridad nacional la atención de los bosques y selvas.

Nuestro país enfrenta crecientes problemas relacionados con la contaminación ambiental; la deforestación avanza a un ritmo de 200 mil ha anuales, más del 60% de nuestra superficie productiva se está erosionando, la desertificación avanza sobre 17 millones de ha totalmente deforestadas y ya improductivas, un panorama que no resultaría tan crítico a no ser por la dura crisis financiera que enfrentamos y que limita las posibilidades del gobierno federal para responder con acciones a la medida de los requerimientos.

Aquí es donde adquiere trascendental importancia la cooperación y el apoyo de los organismos internacionales de asistencia y financiamiento.

En cuanto a las resoluciones de la Conferencia Internacional sobre el Arbol y el Bosque, SILVA 1986, éstas resultan de sumo interés para nuestro país.

En lo particular:

"De las resoluciones relativas a Europa; las "Roble" 2 y 3.

De las resoluciones relativas a Africa; las "acacia" 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 y 6, siendo fundamental la resolución "acacia" 2, relativa a la adopción del Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos como plataforma común para los países con trópico húmedo, de los cuales forma parte México".

Resultará de gran importancia que en el 24 período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO, se pueda promover la adopción por parte de los países miembros de las resoluciones y el llamamiento de París sobre el árbol y el bosque.

Para nuestro país resultará favorable promover y apoyar la realización de conferencias interregionales en el ámbito latinoamericano y del Caribe, que se orienten a la definición y adopción de medidas concretas especialmente en lo relativo a los trópicos y a problemas como el de la leña y la desertificación.

Asimismo, puede ser importante la celebración de reuniones conjuntas entre las comisiones forestales regionales por la oportunidad de favorecer el intercambio y la cooperación en torno a problemas y medidas de acción comunes.

México reconoce el esfuerzo y los recursos que los miembros de la Conferencia disponen para lograr acciones de toda índole en favor del árbol y del bosque.

Es importante destacar que los miembros de la Conferencia únicamente son países de Europa y de Africa, y que sus acciones están enfocadas hacia la protección y conservación de los recursos forestales de estos continentes. Sería oportuno y conveniente ver la posibilidad de incorporar a la Conferencia países como México y otros, cuyos recursos forestales exigen disposiciones y medidas legales y técnicas, programas serios y realistas, y acciones concertadas y concretas, a fin de reducir el deterioro que actualmente están confrontando nuestros recursos forestales.

Dentro de las resoluciones de la última Reunión de 1986, cabe destacar la importancia que tienen , para nuestro país los aspectos de relevancia: - La formación de personal de investigación, el fortalecimiento de instituciones de investigación y desarrollo, así como el establecimiento de programas nacionales, regionales y subregionales; - La difusión de los resultados de la investigación, fundamentalmente para el desarrollo rural; - La importancia que la Conferencia concede a las fuentes renovables de energía (carbón y leña); - El combate a la explotación excesiva de los recursos naturales; - La contaminación ambiental y el deterioro ecológico.

Es importante también reconocer el enfoque de concertación, colaboración, participación, que esta Conferencia le da a las acciones. La pretensión de llevar a cabo medidas técnicas, legales, económicas y sociales coparticipativas, a nuestro juicio, es la mejor alternativa de solución a problemas que afectan no sólo a un grupo, sino a una región, a un país y a varios países en su conjunto.^{1/}

^{1/} Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): The Tropical Forestry Action Plan, with the coordination of government forest agencies, UN agencies and non-governmental organizations is a very good initiative for many countries which locate in the tropical zone. It is the fact that these countries are faced with forest deterioration crisis. So my delegation feels that the Tropical Forestry Action Plan will be most useful for those countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This Plan covers forestry in land use, forest-based industrial development, fuelwood and energy, conservation of tropical forest ecosystems and institutions. I am sure this Plan, if it takes action carefully, effectively and more cooperation and coordination among governments, UN agencies and non-government organizations with best evaluation, it will be a great profit for human beings and our planet.

On this occasion, my delegation would like to indicate our forest situation in Thailand.

Thailand is located in Southeast Asia with total area approximately 51 000 000 ha and the latest information shows that forest land area covered is 15 400 000 ha or 29 percent of the total land. We are now facing the loss of some 5 600 000 ha below our national target of the Sixth National Economic and Social Development Plan. Our Sixth Plan plans to reduce forest deterioration growth, to develop and provide land for landless people and some nomadic hill tribes including to reduce malpractice of shifting cultivation of agricultural areas which is caused by landless people, also hill tribes.

In addition, our Sixth Plan will cover the urban development and some infrastructure projects providing for some rural area in the north and north-eastern regions in Thailand.

In this connection, Thailand initiates the Forest Village Programme and Forest Land Settlement. In these Programmes the cabinet decided to offer programmes and grant through the right of holding at 2.4 ha per family for cultivation, we are now granting more than 40 000 hectares for 40 000 landless farmer families. Moreover, we also persuade our poor people dwelling in forest watersheds to join our forest village programme. This programme is not only providing cultivated land, public facilities and schools for children, but also receiving daily income. Up to now we have 101 project sites which can help 60 000 people living together under the application of agro-forestry.

Thailand also has reforestation and forest improvement projects. We are now taking into action more than 500 000 hectares; but we are faced with budget constraints and can increase planting capacity at the rate of only 25 000 hectares per annum while the annual rate of deforestation is 5 000 000 hectares. Therefore the private sector might have to play a vital role in reforestation programme in the near future.

My delegation would like to draw your attention to the fact that His Majesty the King has kindly launched a development programme for the north-eastern region which is the area of most drought and dryness in Thailand. This programme will provide a sufficient supply of water for drinking and agriculture and at the same time a large-scale reforestation of 2 000 000 hectares will be established within five years.

Besides our reforestation and development programmes, we have protected our forests by increasing national parks every year. Nowadays Thailand has some 50 national parks covering 3 060 000 hectares and 50 recreation areas covering 25 000 hectares have been declared as restricted areas for management of beautifully natural and well protected scenery. By the way, we have 29 wildlife sanctuaries covering 2 019 000 hectares, 27 non-hunting zones of 305 000 hectares.

I would like to draw your attention to the timber utilization and development in Thailand. In the past teak was the second main export commodity of our country. But now, due to the trend showing that a shortage of log might occur in the near future, we have totally banned log and lumber export. However, we can increase the trend in the production and export of processed timber products like wood-based panels and furniture.

In this connection, I appreciate the fact that FAO also has greatly assisted Thailand, especially in watershed management and the socio-economic aspects of forestry and in formulating strategies for the "regreening" the north-eastern region of Thailand.

We strongly support FAO's forestry programmes, especially the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, to prolong tropical forest fertility which will the benefit of humanity as a whole. 1/

1/ Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request

Abdul Aziz YAACOB (Malaysia): The Malaysian delegation has read with interest the follow-up to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan on the steps undertaken by FAO to implement the Plan. We wish to record our support for the Plan and the recommendations that need to be adopted. As mentioned in paragraph 43, in document C 87/25, Malaysia is one of the five countries to take the lead in the preparation of the TFAP forestry sector review. This review is being carried out by local expertise with technical and financial support from the FAO.

We would like to report that a task force comprising the Forestry Departments, the Department of Wild Life Management and the Department of Science and Environment has been established under the Ministry of Primary Industries to prepare the Tropical Forestry Action Plan for Malaysia. The task force is currently in the process of identifying the appropriate programmes and projects to be included in the Plan. Tentatively, activities to be adopted include projects for the management of natural forests and forest plantations, harvesting methods and procedures and processing.

TFAP's programmes of action, which basically cover (i) forestry in land use, (ii) forest-based industrial development, (iii) fuelwood and energy, (iv) conservation of tropical forest ecosystems and (v) institutions, are in various stages of implementation in Malaysia currently and now only require to be coordinated to be included as part of the TFAP.

Malaysia has stressed both upstream and downstream activities in forestry and forestry-based productions, particularly since the mid-70s. Various incentives for reafforestation have been provided to the private sector, mainly in Sabah, to undertake plantation of fast-growing hardwood on a commercial basis. The Government itself has launched the Compensatory Forest Financing Programme in four states in peninsular Malaysia since 1979 with part financing from the Asian Development Bank to undertake plantation type reafforestation with fast-growing hardwood, which have shown to be successful, and may likely be extended to other states in the near future.

The Importance of research in forestry has also been supported by Malaysia by a World Bank financed project signed in 1987 to upgrade research and training of the Forest Research Institute of Malaysia. This Institute undertakes both upstream (covering biotechnology) and downstream research, including the development of rubber-wood and rattan production that have potential for development in downstream production of furniture and finished products.

Projects on research and development will necessarily require adequate financing. In this connection, Malaysia is exploring various possibilities including the possibility of introducing a research cess on timber producers. Meanwhile, we would appreciate any assistance - technical and financial - that the FAO can offer to Malaysia in designing and implementing the TFAP.

A course of action undertaken to remove institutional constraints impeding wise use of tropical forest resources is the establishment of the National Council for Forestry in which the Federal Government coordinates and harmonises exploitation of forest resources by the various states on a sustained yield basis, the ceiling for each state being agreed to in this Council. This is an important step undertaken to guide the various states which have the ultimate control over land usage. 1/

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): On this agenda item I will concentrate my remarks on the Follow-up to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, the report gives a good overview of the progress achieved in the implementation of the Action Plan.

The Danish delegation finds that the Tropical Forestry Action Plan is an important and useful framework for development and protection of the forestry sector in tropical countries. We also agree that FAO has an important role to play as coordinator of TFAP activities and especially in preparation and dissemination of information on the Action Plan.

There is an increasing awareness of the importance of forestry sector as stated in the report in para 7, forestry is an important element for sustained development of tropical countries as a major renewable resource for economic development as well as for maintaining a productive environment for

1/ Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request

the present and for the future. When mentioning the tropical forestry as a renewable resource it is necessary to make a distinction between tropical rain forests and plantations. To our knowledge only the latter category is likely to be renewable and only if adequate seed is available in sufficient quantities at the right time. In this connection we agree with the report that close cooperation between recipient countries and donors as well as among donors is of crucial importance. Likewise, the conservation of tropical forest ecosystems [that is the rainforests] is an important issue in order to protect the genetic resources and in our view this can be pursued by the establishment of refuges, which can exist along with plantations for production of timber and fuelwood.

Furthermore my delegation wants to stress the importance of forestry in land use and the necessity of adopting an approach which takes into account the integration of forestry in agricultural systems and forestry's role in combatting desertification. We also agree with para 34 stating that it is an imperative for the success of the implementation of TFAP that links of the forestry sector to the rest of the economy is appropriately taken into consideration.

Turning now to the part of the report which deals with the evaluation of the TFAP approach, we agree with what is said in para 56, that TFAP is an area, where NGO's could play a very important role for instance in conservation, protection of the environment and the role of women in land use and forestry. Here we specially want to stress the role of women in nurseries and the planting of trees. A prerequisite of a successful implementation of the TFAP is that the tropical countries are able to and willing to incorporate the sector plans into their national policies and priorities.

In conclusion, the Danish delegation fully supports the Tropical Forestry Action Plan as a basic strategy for development and finds that it should be given high priority in FAO's Regular Programme in order for FAO to fulfil its coordination role efficiently. 1/

Milutin TAPAVICKI(Yugoslavia): Bearing in mind the critical state of tropical forest resources, the Yugoslav delegation supports the activities of FAO in the further elaboration of the stands and guidelines contained in TFAP, as it considers its implementation necessary for the further development of tropical forestry, as well as the comprehensive development of world forestry. We call for the greater involvement of the whole international community in addressing this problem, and support the elaboration of a FAO study on the feasibility of a new mechanism for financing forestry development, which should indicate whether the introduction of such a mechanism is justified or not

Mr Chairman, the Yugoslav delegation supports the resolutions and conclusions adopted at the International Conference on Trees and Forests "SILVA" and considers their implementation to be of the utmost importance for all the countries of the world.

Bearing in mind the importance and urgency of the problem, we advocate granting full support to FAO activities in the field of forestry.

The implementation of Resolutions 1 and 2 "The Oak" is particularly important for Yugoslavia due to the acute problem of forest die-back caused by air pollution which has already reached alarming proportions. In this context I would like to inform you that Yugoslavia is preparing an inventory of the extent of forest die-back, based on a uniform methodology which is consistent with the FAO/ECE methodology. 1/

1/ Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request

Jean-Jacques RATEAU (CEE): La Conférence SILVA à laquelle les Etats Membres et la Commission des Communautés européennes ont participé activement, a été l'occasion de constater - au plus haut niveau de responsabilité politique - la volonté de renforcer la coopération communautaire pour améliorer la protection, le développement et la valorisation de la forêt.

Dans la ligne des conclusions de cette conférence, la Communauté a accentué ses propres efforts visant à sauvegarder et à promouvoir la forêt tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de la Communauté.

I.A l'intérieur, la Communauté, suite à la Conférence SILVA, a relancé les travaux engagés depuis 1983 dans le but de renforcer la protection des forêts contre la pollution atmosphérique d'une part et contre les incendies d'autre part. Ces travaux ont finalement abouti le 17 novembre 1986 à l'adoption de deux règlements communautaires. Une contribution communautaire de 30 M ECU a été ainsi octroyée à la protection de la forêt contre ces deux agressions d'ampleur européenne. La résonance de la Conférence SILVA a eu en outre pour effet de faciliter l'adoption par la Communauté de dispositions forestières relatives à la politique des structures agricoles ou à des programmes de recherche.

Par ailleurs, la Conférence SILVA s'étant déroulée alors que la Commission venait de présenter un memorandum sur l'action de la Communauté dans le secteur forestier, l'élaboration d'un projet de programme d'action forestière pour la Communauté annoncé dans ce memorandum a bénéficié du climat favorable à la forêt auquel cette conférence a largement contribué.

Enfin, c'est en tenant compte des enseignements de la Conférence SILVA que la Communauté a organisé de concert avec la FAO, une étude comparative des politiques forestières dans les Etats Membres. Les rapports nationaux établis dans le cadre de cette étude font actuellement l'objet d'une analyse qui donnera lieu à des échanges de vues entre les deux organisations. Cette action spécifique devrait conduire à une meilleure appréhension des politiques forestières nationales et faciliter certains rapprochements.

II.Pour l'extérieur, la Communauté a établi en Avril 1986 - quelques semaines après la clôture de la Conférence SILVA - un "plan d'action européen de protection des ressources naturelles et de lutte contre la désertification en Afrique", plan dans lequel la foresterie joue un rôle important.

Au titre de la coopération au développement dans le cadre de la 3ème Convention de Lomé, les préoccupations relatives à la forêt et à l'environnement se sont traduites par la mise en oeuvre de deux sortes d'actions: 1) des actions directes en matière de protection des ressources naturelles: aménagement du territoire, protection des bassins versants, conservation de la flore, utilisation rationnelle de l'énergie; 2) des actions indirectes ayant pour but principal de faire baisser la pression de la consommation sur les ressources naturelles (bois de feu par exemple).

A titre d'exemple, je citerai comme action directe en matière de protection des ressources naturelles, le projet de réaménagement du haut bassin versant du fleuve Niger en Guinée. Ce projet, qui se trouve déjà au stade de pré-réalisation, aura en outre des effets bénéfiques pour le Mali et le Niger grâce à une régularisation du régime du fleuve et permettra une meilleure utilisation de l'eau pour l'irrigation. Plus de 15 000 hectares sont concernés. Il aura un impact également sur le bassin du fleuve Sénégal influençant ainsi les conditions hydrauliques en Guinée, au Mali, en Mauritanie et au Sénégal. (Coût approximatif: 40 millions d'ECU).

Au titre des actions indirectes dont le but est de faire baisser la pression de la consommation sur les ressources naturelles, je citerai trois exemples de projets financés par le Fonds européen de développement: i) les études entreprises sur les moyens de remplacement du bois de feu dans les villes en Afrique de l'Ouest: ce projet vise à étudier les possibilités concrètes de substitution du bois par d'autres produits tels que le pétrole et le gaz. (Coût approximatif: 20 millions d'ECU) ; 2) l'exploitation de l'énergie solaire pour le pompage de l'eau dans les pays de la zone sahélienne en vue d'exploiter des pépinières et d'effectuer un reboisement à la périphérie des villages. (Coût approximatif: 40 millions d'ECU); 3) la réalisation d'un programme de "Petite irrigation" au Niger qui prévoit une meilleure utilisation de l'eau souterraine et de surface pour la constitution de pépinières de villages. (Coût approximatif: 20 millions d'ECU).

La Communauté s'apprête en outre à approuver un programme de recherche sur la médecine et l'agriculture tropicales pour la période 1987-1991. Ce programme qui bénéficiera d'un crédit de 80 M ECU ouvre de nouvelles perspectives pour le développement de la recherche appliquée aux forêts tropicales.

Par ailleurs, la Communauté a joué un rôle prépondérant et essentiel dans l'établissement de l'Accord international sur les bois tropicaux dont elle est partie contractante avec les Etats Membres. Elle a pris notamment une part active aux premières réunions du Conseil de cette organisation.

Le 17 novembre dans le cadre du Comité de coordination des politiques forestières (COFOR) qui regroupe les directeurs généraux des forêts de la CEE, la Commission des Communautés Européennes a eu l'occasion de faire le point sur les effets de la conférence SILVA sur les politiques forestières de nos Etats Membres.

Permettez-moi enfin d'ajouter que la Communauté économique européenne apprécie tout particulièrement les efforts de la FAO pour sauvegarder et promouvoir la forêt notamment en région tropicale, conformément aux orientations qui se sont dégagées de la Conférence SILVA. La Plan d'action pour les forêts tropicales (TFAP) constitue à cet égard une initiative majeure à laquelle la Commission entend participer activement. Le renforcement de l'action de la FAO et de la CEE en faveur de la forêt offre ainsi de plus larges perspectives de coopération en la matière entre nos deux institutions. 1/

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Having listened to all the constructive and valuable interventions concerning this item on our agenda, I am pleased to called upon Mr Rodes, who is the head of the department dealing with forestry, to answer your question.

M.A. FLORES RODAS (Subdirector General, Departamento de Montes): Qué puedo decir Señor Presidente como resumen cuando ha habido un apoyo total al Programa del Director General que se refiere al Plan de Acción en los Bosques Tropicales. Y lo digo así porque precisamente cuando todo el mundo está de acuerdo es mucho más difícil hacer algún resumen de lo que se discutió. Sin embargo, Señor Presidente, quiero hacer un par de comentarios sobre dos o tres puntos que creo son importantes de mencionar.

En primer lugar, creo que todos los distinguidos Representatnes de países aquí presentes al expresar las diversas opiniones de lo que es el bosque tropical y la contribución que el bosque debo hacer al desarrollo, han expresado en una forma resumida lo que verdaderamente es el Plan de Acción Tropical. Me refiero a que no hay una definición de lo que es la contribución del bosque al desarrollo, como tampoco, Señor Presidente, hay una definición de lo que es desarrollo. Yo simplemente quiero hacer énfasis en el hecho de que este Plan no es, ni pretende ser un plan de desarrollo forestal. Es simplemente. Señor Presidente, un pian de desarrollo con la contribución del sector forestal, que es aplicado conforme las características ecológicas, sociales y políticas de cada país que quiera aplicar.

Algunos de los distinguidos representantes mencionaron la conjugación de las funciones de protección y producción del bosque. Correcto. El Plan de Acción Forestal va un paso más allá al conjugar en una forma dinámica las funciones de producción, de protección o de medio ambiente y la' función social en una forma integral y total. Se mencionó también que es cierto que el Plan de Acción Forestal es un paquete, es un paquete multidisciplinario donde, como se dijo en la Conferencia Regional de la FAO en Latinoamérica hará unos cuatro o cinco años, donde el hombre juega un papel de protagonista y único objetivo del desarrollo. Esto es así que cuando hablamos de desarrollo tenemos que definir el bosque en su más amplia magnitud, el sistema bosque.

He notado en algunos comentarios que probablemente hay todavía la confusión de que el bosque sólo produce madera; sin embargo produce agua, produce recreación, produce alimentos, produce medicinas, y produce diez mil cosas diferentes a largo plazo, pero empieza a producir en función de desarrollo. Señor Presidente, en al año cero de la rotación, si queremos hablar más o menos técnicamente. Por eso, yo siento disentir cuando se dice que la industria debería no estar permitida. Si hablamos de desarrollo hablamos de la productividad y de la producción y de la absorción de la población rural dentro de los beneficios del bosque. Los beneficios del bosque necesariamente tienen que derivar algún beneficio económico para ayudar a la población rural a empezar a escalar los puntos de desarrollo.

1/ Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.

Si definimos la industria como una actividad económica agregada que tenga en una forma simultánea las condiciones económicas de producción y de productividad, las condiciones ecológicas de respeto al medio ambiente, la capacidad gerencial necesaria con todos los factores de educación que un país necesita, es el tipo de una industria apropiada que ya es parte, Señor Presidente, y lo subrayo, ya la actividad industrial es una de las cinco partes principales del Plan de Acción Forestal Tropical que ha sido aprobado hace dos años por ustedes.

En este sentido Señor Presidente, ¿de qué hablamos? ¿hablamos de preservar o de conservar? Yo creo y ha sido aceptado ya por la Comunidad Internacional de que se preserve probablemente un ser inanimado, una momia; pero se conserva un ser animado que es el bosque en función de desarrollo. Cuando hablamos de conservación tenemos en mente permanentemente la preocupación de todos nosotros, el medio ambiente, la ecología o como queramos llamarlo. En todo caso, es el uso sabio de los recursos forestales. He aquí, Señor Presidente, que cuando hablamos de desarrollo hablamos de producción, de productividad y hablamos de quién recibe qué y en qué momento.

Hemos hecho énfasis los Países miembros de FAO que definen su política de trabajo, han hecho énfasis para sacarla del problema ecológico y de la contaminación más grande que existe, que es el hambre y creo que lo hace en una forma muy práctica y muy directa y depende, por supuesto, de la claridad y de la definición política de los países que lo han aceptado y lo hacen suyos. Señor Presidente, creo que así en una forma tal vez un poco exaltada, pero sí desde el punto de vista de la seguridad alimentaria, el Plan de Acción Forestal en los Trópicos que todavía empieza y que, ciertamente, no hemos resuelto todos los problemas, porque sí es esencialmente un plan dinámico, no es un plan estático, y lo que hoy tenemos aquí en este documento y espero que el próximo año, o en la próxima Conferencia, cuando lo volvamos a discutir, lo que está escrito hoy aquí sea diferente en función de la permeabilidad y del dinamismo de este Plan y en función, estoy seguro, del éxito no sólo de FAO como coordinador de toda la acción internacional, sino de todos los Países Miembros de FAO y su preocupación hacia el desarrollo.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Thank you for your excellent and clear presentation. My thanks also for your answer to the various questions which were raised during our discussions. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that we have exhausted the discussion of item 18 and I believe that all the views which have been expressed so far will be reflected very clearly in the Report to be submitted to you next week.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as for item 17, I would propose that we listen to Mr Lignon for fifteen minutes I think that all of you know him because he is the Deputy Director of the Department of Development - and I will give the floor to one or two delegations, and after that we shall finish our work.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): It is indeed a Point of Order. I believe we do not have a quorum in this room and with all due respect I believe our business could best be conducted if we all came back later. The delegations would be better staffed and we would at minimum meet the requirements of this Organization under Rule XIII.5.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): I was going to make the same point as the delegate of Canada. I feel that it would be better if the introduction to this item could be taken when there are more delegations present and this would lead to a better debate.

CHAIRMAN: This is the proposal made by the distinguished delegates of Canada and the United Kingdom. Is this proposal agreeable to you, Ladies and Gentlemen? So, Ladies and Gentlemen, we shall call it a day, but before concluding our works I would like to apologize to all here, particularly those who come from their capitals in order to take part in a constructive manner in our works, far away from non-serious discussions and despite the limited time and for reasons well known to all of you, we hope that we shall continue our work in the following days in a constructive manner and in a fraternal manner in order to render better service to our common targets.

The meeting rose at 22.25 hours

La séance est levée à 22 h 25

Se levanta la sesión a las 22.25 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/17

Twenty-fourth Session

COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session

COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones

COMISION II

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

DIX-SEPTIEME SEANCE

17ª SESION

(23 November 1987)

The Seventeenth Meeting was opened at 10.55 hours
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La dix-septième séance est ouverte à 10 h 55, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 17ª sesión a las 10.55 horas, bajo la presidencia
do Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

16. Review of Field Programmes

16. Examen des programmes de terrain

16. Examen de los programas de campo

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat advises me that we now have a quorum. The Chair would point out that we have a quorum one-and-a-half hours late, and that presents serious difficulties for the effective operation of the proceedings.

Raymond S. LIGNON (Sous-Directeur général du Département du développement): Dans mon introduction, je voudrais vous présenter le document C 87/4, l'Examen des programmes de terrain. Ce document est complété par des informations supplémentaires sur des développements récents, c'est-à-dire ceux qui sont survenus depuis que le rapport a été rédigé, au début de l'été. Comme vous le savez, ce rapport a été examiné par le Comité du Programme et le Comité financier - le résultat de cet examen se trouve dans le document CL 92/4 - ainsi que par le dernier Conseil; et vous avez entre les mains le document C 87/LIM/20, qui reproduit l'examen effectué par le Conseil. Comme les délégués pourront le noter, ce document comporte quatre chapitres.

Le chapitre 1 fournit des informations globales sur le niveau des ressources, leur évolution et leurs tendances, ainsi que sur la structure des programmes de terrain.

Le chapitre 2 présente l'évaluation qualitative des programmes et des projets, qui s'appuie, dans une première partie, sur les commentaires des représentants de la FAO et, dans une deuxième partie, sur les résultats du Service de l'évaluation de l'Organisation.

Dans le chapitre 3, nous avons présenté, comme à l'accoutumée, une analyse plus détaillée de nos activités dans un domaine particulièrement important, qui a été souligné par de nombreux délégués au cours de leurs interventions à cette Conférence, c'est-à-dire le renforcement de la capacité des pays dans la planification et la programmation de leur développement rural, y compris les examens sectoriels et sous-sectoriels.

Enfin, le chapitre 4 présente les principales tendances et les approches nouvelles des activités de terrain de la FAO.

Permettez-moi de souligner quelques points importants de ce document. Globalement, les activités d'assistance technique de la FAO se sont accrues modérément au cours de ce biennium par rapport aux biennia précédents, comme vous pouvez le noter dans le tableau 1 de l'Annexe statistique du rapport.

Les dépenses proposées par ce programme atteignent une valeur de 315 millions de dollars en 1986 et atteindront probablement un niveau légèrement plus élevé en 1987. Ces dépenses couvrent les activités d'environ 2 500 projets, qui représentent une valeur globale d'environ 2 milliards de dollars. Quatre-vingt-dix pour cent environ de ces dépenses proviennent de ressources extrabudgétaires -essentiellement du PNUD et des fonds de dépôt - et les 10 pour cent restants proviennent des ressources du Programme de coopération technique.

Les activités financées par les fonds fiduciaires, soit sous forme d'accords multi-bi, soit sous forme de fonds fiduciaires unilatéraux, c'est-à-dire de fonds mis à la disposition de la FAO par le pays bénéficiaire lui-même - au moyen de prêts bancaires ou de leurs propres ressources - ont continué à progresser. Je voudrais rappeler ici le rôle important joué par le Centre d'intervention d'urgence de lutte contre les sauterelles et les criquets migrateurs de la FAO, qui a mobilisé environ 93 millions de dollars en 1986-87 dont 20 millions environ ont été confiés à la FAO. Je voudrais dire aussi que ce programme constitue un volet d'une stratégie à long terme de lutte contre

les sauterelles et les criquets migrateurs, en liaison avec les gouvernements, les organisations régionales et sous-régionales, le PNUD et la Banque mondiale. Je dois dire aussi que le Programme de coopération technique, pour sa part, a contribué à cette campagne pour environ 3 millions de dollars.

En réalité, la bonne santé des programmes de terrain est le résultat de l'intense coopération qui s'est établie entre le pays bénéficiaire, le PNUD et les pays donateurs de plus en plus nombreux, que je voudrais remercier ici, et la FAO. Comme le montre le document, on assiste à un renversement de la tendance à la baisse des activités de la FAO financées par le PNUD, ainsi que je vous l'avais annoncé lors du Conseil précédent, mais ce renversement apparaît plus clairement maintenant.

Sur la base de la récente Conférence des annonces de contributions du PNUD (Pledging Conference) à New York, un peu plus d'un milliard de dollars de ressources seront à la disposition du PNUD en 1988; et nous espérons que la contribution du PNUD au financement de nos programmes de terrain augmentera significativement au cours du prochain biennium. Une première indication, d'ailleurs, est le montant des projets approuvés en 1987, première année du quatrième cycle de programmation, qui sera sans doute proche de 170 millions de dollars - en réalité, 140 millions de dollars, le 30 octobre, ce qui me permet de faire une estimation aux environs de 170 millions pour la fin de l'année - soit environ 50 pour cent de plus qu'en 1986 où ce montant s'élevait à 112 millions de dollars. Il faut tenir compte, en tout cas, du fait que 1986 était la dernière année du troisième cycle, donc une année plus délicate sur le plan des aménagements du PNUD. Je voudrais souligner aussi qu'il est beaucoup plus difficile de faire des prévisions sur le montant des projets approuvés dans le cadre des fonds fiduciaires parce que le financement de ces fonds dépend essentiellement d'un engagement annuel de la plupart des pays donateurs.

Cette augmentation reflète non seulement l'augmentation des ressources mises à la disposition du PNUD, mais aussi la coopération très intense qui s'est développée avec le PNUD dans la préparation du quatrième cycle et dans la programmation et l'exécution de ces projets. En outre, il faut souligner la priorité plus nette que les gouvernements ont accordée à l'agriculture dans les nouveaux programmes par pays.

De toutes les institutions spécialisées des Nations Unies, la FAO a le programme le plus important de soutien à l'investissement et de préparation de projets en vue de leur financement. Le principal partenaire du Centre est la Banque mondiale, mais le Centre maintient également une coopération active avec le FIDA, les banques régionales et d'autres institutions financières ainsi qu'avec des banques privées et des banques de développement nationales dans le cadre du projet FAO/Banques (FAO Bankers Programme). Pendant l'année 1986, plus de 3 milliards d'investissements, dont la moitié provenant de sources extérieures, ont été approuvés sur la base de projets identifiés et préparés par le Centre d'Investissement. De même, le Centre examine les projets d'assistance technique, plus particulièrement ceux financés par le PNUD, pour vérifier s'ils ont un potentiel d'investissement; sur cette base, plus de 500 millions de dollars ont été mobilisés par des institutions financières à la suite des propositions du Centre d'investissement basées sur des projets d'assistance technique financée par le PNUD.

Au chapitre 2, nous avons présenté une évaluation qualitative globale - tout au moins, nous l'avons tenté - aussi objective que possible des programmes et des projets. Comme vous pouvez le noter, les représentants de la FAO jouent un rôle important et croissant dans la surveillance des programmes de terrain mais aussi dans l'identification et l'évaluation des propositions de projets, ainsi que dans les actions de suivi prises par les gouvernements et dans le soutien qu'ils apportent à la gestion de ces projets. L'information systématique qu'ils fournissent au Siège sur le déroulement de nos activités de terrain est analysée dans la première partie du chapitre 2.

Le Service d'évaluation de la FAO qui, pour sa part, a été constamment renforcé au cours des biennia précédents, a apporté une contribution essentielle présentée dans la deuxième partie du chapitre 2. Ce service organise chaque année une évaluation détaillée d'une centaine de projets aussi bien que des évaluations de programmes sectoriels ou sous-sectoriels avec le PNUD, les pays donateurs et les gouvernements bénéficiaires. Vous pourrez noter que nous avons inclus dans cette partie un résumé des conclusions de deux évaluations indépendantes de projets dans un certain nombre de pays dans le cadre du Programme Engrais financés avec la participation du Danemark (DANIDA) ainsi que d'un groupe de projets visant à promouvoir la mécanisation agricole de certains pays d'Afrique, évaluation financée par le Gouvernement de l'Italie et à laquelle les experts italiens ont participé.

Les résultats de ces évaluations permettent de réaliser progressivement des améliorations visant à accroître l'efficacité et la gestion de nos activités de terrain. Par exemple, au cours du biennium 1986-87, un large éventail de dispositions ont été mises en place, comme par exemple les plans de travail standardisés, les procédures pour la préparation des rapports, la gestion du portefeuille des projets (pipeline). Ces améliorations progressivement réalisées au cours de ces dernières années sont intégrées maintenant dans un système global d'information et de surveillance des programmes de terrain sur lequel je reviendrai un peu plus tard.

L'objet du chapitre 3 est un examen détaillé de l'action de la FAO en matière d'assistance aux institutions de planification et de programmation du développement rural en mettant l'accent sur la formation du personnel local, qui peut ainsi jouer un rôle plus efficace dans l'élaboration des politiques agricoles, des plans et des programmes de développement rural ainsi que dans la coordination de l'aide. Comme vous le savez, nous attachons une grande importance à ce que les gouvernements puissent assurer eux-mêmes la coordination de l'aide.

Près de 300 projets sont en cours d'exécution en ce domaine et leur valeur totale s'élève à environ 150 millions de dollars. La plupart de ces projets sont étroitement liés à des activités du Programme régulier telles que l'Agriculture: Horizon 2000, le Plan d'action forestier tropical, le Plan d'action adopté par la Conférence mondiale des pêches, l'étude sur l'agriculture en Afrique dans les 25 prochaines années, et d'autres encore.

A ce propos, je voudrais rappeler que la plupart des programmes de terrain s'inscrivent soit dans ces plans d'action, soit dans les programmes d'action spéciaux tels que le Programme d'action pour la sécurité alimentaire, le Programme engrais, le Programme laitier, bref, l'ensemble des programmes spéciaux que vous avez vus en examinant le programme régulier de la FAO.

Et je voudrais souligner ici l'importance que la FAO attache à ce type d'assistance technique, décrite dans le chapitre 3, et sa part croissante dans le Programme de terrain notamment pour apporter une contribution utile et valable à la mise en œuvre des politiques d'ajustement structurel, tenant compte de la situation du groupe le plus défavorisé qui est essentiellement le groupe ciblé, le plus important de l'ensemble des programmes de la FAO. C'est d'ailleurs pour cela que l'accent est mis sur le renforcement des institutions nationales et l'amélioration des ressources humaines et cela plus particulièrement en Afrique.

Cette assistance, ainsi que les projets liés aux études sectorielles ou sous-sectorielles, ont permis à la FAO d'apporter un concours précieux, à ceux qui en ont fait la demande, pour la préparation et le suivi des Tables-Rondes et des Groupes Consultatifs. Vous savez que les Tables Rondes sont présidées par le pays bénéficiaire et le PNUD, alors que les Groupes Consultatifs sont présidés par la Banque, et pour que la FAO puisse participer activement à la préparation de ces Tables Rondes et de ces Groupes Consultatifs, encore faut-il qu'elle soit invitée par le gouvernement et par le PNUD d'un côté, et par la Banque Mondiale et le gouvernement de l'autre. Je tiens à souligner cette différence.

Nous pensons pouvoir renforcer cette activité dans le futur biennium comme de nombreux délégués l'ont d'ailleurs souhaité, notamment grâce à une coopération plus active encore avec le PNUD dans la préparation de ces Tables Rondes, ou grâce à la contribution que nous pourrions apporter en coopération avec les institutions financières avec lesquelles nous avons eu de nombreuses réunions à ce sujet au cours de ces derniers mois.

Enfin, dans le chapitre 4, nous avons essayé de montrer que notre programme de terrain a pour thème commun de renforcer la capacité des pays bénéficiaires. Le concept et l'exécution des activités de terrain se modifient substantiellement depuis quelques années.

La composante de formation de l'ensemble des projets se renforce, et au cours de cette décade, plus de 500 000 personnes ont été formées, pour une grande partie d'entrées en Afrique, et avec une participation plus grande des femmes à ce programme de formation.

Les changements auxquels on assiste portent notamment sur le support aux projets exécutés par le gouvernement; de plus en plus l'exécution des projets par le gouvernement prend une place importante dans notre Programme de Terrain, ce qui ne va pas sans poser des problèmes de gestion et de surveillance pour l'ensemble des projets. La nomination de plus en plus fréquente de directeurs de projets nationaux, la participation de plus en plus grande d'experts nationaux, le rôle des femmes dans le développement, l'impact sur l'environnement, en sont des exemples.

Dans le même sens, le rôle de la FAO dans la programmation de la coopération technique entre pays en développement est de plus en plus grand, en favorisant la création de réseaux régionaux de transfert de technologies qui ont déjà pris une très grande ampleur en Amérique Latine et fonctionnent maintenant sur leurs propres ressources; ces réseaux se développent en Asie également mais avec plus de difficultés et ont été créés plus récemment qu'en Afrique.

Tous, ces réseaux sont institués en étroite liaison avec les activités du Programme régulier. A ce propos je voudrais souligner le rôle catalytique fondamental de petits projets financés par le PCT ne dépassant pas 30 000 dollars; ce rôle catalytique a permis le lancement de ces réseaux qui fonctionnent aujourd'hui par leurs propres moyens.

Dans ce chapitre 4, nous avons aussi montré la part croissante des activités de terrain consacrées à la promotion du rôle des femmes, ainsi que le support aux ONG. Toutes ces initiatives sont largement influencées par la Conférence mondiale sur la réforme agraire et le développement rural qui s'est tenue en 1979 et qui a défini comme cible principale de l'assistance technique de la FAO les communautés rurales les plus pauvres et les groupes les plus marginaux.

Dans le document soumis à l'attention de la Conférence, nous avons essayé d'être le plus concis et le plus objectif possible, mais il faut reconnaître que le Programme de Terrain est de plus en plus complexe en raison de ces nouveaux concepts et mécanismes de programmation de l'aide, de la diversification et des besoins évolutifs des pays bénéficiaires, de la nécessité d'accroître l'efficacité du soutien apporté par la FAO aux pays bénéficiaires, en coopérant le plus activement avec les multiples acteurs des programmes d'assistance technique et d'aide financière.

Je voudrais citer un exemple; il est encore difficile de mesurer les conséquences de la réorganisation de la Banque Mondiale et de ses nouvelles orientations sur le Centre d'Investissement. Nous avons certes reçu des assurances de la part de la Banque Mondiale sur la poursuite de notre Programme Coopératif, mais on assiste toutefois à une diversification des services demandés et peut-être à une participation plus active dans l'évaluation des politiques d'ajustement, comme d'ailleurs plusieurs parmi les Membres ici présents l'ont souhaité.

Face à cette complexité croissante, la gestion et la surveillance du Programme de Terrain est de plus en plus importante et se renforce sur plusieurs plans.

1). Comme il a été souligné lors de la dernière réunion des représentants de la FAO qui s'est tenue à Rome en septembre dernier, la mise en œuvre des nouvelles dimensions, la multiplication des missions de courte durée de consultants -la plupart du temps de haut niveau -le caractère multidisciplinaire des projets, la coordination avec les autres programmes d'aide placent une responsabilité de plus en plus grande sur les représentations de la FAO qui sont les mieux placées pour veiller au bon déroulement des projets sur place.

2). En second lieu, la multiplication des exercices de programmation de l'aide (NATCAPs, Tables Rondes, Groupes Consultatifs, Programmation PNUD, etc) conduisent à renforcer les cellules de programmation et d'évaluation des Ministères du développement rural, pour leur permettre de jouer un rôle mineur dans ces réunions et d'assurer une relation avec le Représentant de la FAO et le Résident Coordonnateur, et pour permettre également une meilleure coordination des aides dans le domaine de l'agriculture, des pêches et des forêts.

3) comme je l'ai indiqué précédemment depuis de nombreuses années des améliorations ont été apportées à des stades différents du cycle des projets par différentes unités de la FAO concernées par cette programmation et son exécution. Sous la conduite du Comité de Programme de Terrain intérieur à la FAO, un système global d'information et de surveillance de ce Programme va maintenant être mis en place suite à un long travail préparatoire qui a mobilisé toutes les unités concernées, et ceci grâce au recours à l'informatique.

Je dirai pour être bref que ce système permettra en premier lieu le suivi de l'état d'avancement des projets tout au long du cycle et en particulier pour en assurer le démarrage; il permettra en second lieu d'assurer le suivi des activités au Siège, suivi dont dépendent la qualité des projets, leur financement et leur mise en oeuvre, notamment la formulation et le soutien technique; enfin, ce système permettra le suivi de l'évolution des caractéristiques du Programme dans son ensemble ainsi que dans ses composantes, par rapport au thème prioritaire de la FAO et au Programme régulier.

Je m'excuse d'avoir peut-être été un peu long, mais j'espère que cette introduction facilitera l'examen du Programme de Terrain par la Conférence, et je suis naturellement prêt à fournir les informations complémentaires que les délégués souhaiteraient avoir et à répondre aux questions qui pourraient être soulevées.

CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding in our list of speakers, the Chair needs to announce that because of the fact that because of failure to start on time, we have wasted more than ten hours, we will need to have a night session this evening. We will proceed this morning until 12.30. We will recess at that time and will return to take up our activities at 2.30. We will then try to go quite late and do as much work as we can to make up for the many hours that have been wasted. The Chair needs to caution that we have to have a quorum present to conduct business: that means one-third of the members. If at any time during the proceedings we lack a quorum we may well find ourselves halting our activities and we could have this Conference continue for extra days. Accordingly we must urge you, please, to try and ensure that your country's seat is covered so that all those countries which wish to do business have the opportunity to do so.

Also, because of the problems we have encountered by reason of the fact that one of the vice-chairmen left Rome without advising us that he would not be present to perform his duties, the General Committee has nominated, and the Conference and Plenary have approved, a new vice-chairman. He is Mr. Temel Iskit of Turkey, a gentleman who is known to all of us here as a permanent representative to FAO. He is a man who has been very active in the affairs of this Organization and I am sure he will play a very constructive role in trying to help all of us to meet the deadlines that we have before us.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Con su excelente presentación nuestro distinguido colega y amigo el señor Lignon, Subdirector General Jefe del Departamento de Desarrollo, ha confirmado la capacidad y competencia que le distingue.

El bienio 86-87 ha registrado un aumento muy moderado de los programas de campo de la FAO, pero esa leve recuperación de nivel, tal vez no justifica la expresión demasiado alegre que aparece en el prefacio y que dice: "veo con mucho optimismo la posibilidad de un aumento considerable de este importante programa en el próximo bienio".

Decimos esto, porque si bien en 1986 se prometieron al PNUD recursos en un monto sin precedentes, al punto tal que en 1987 esos recursos alcanzarán la cifra de 1 000 millones de dólares, es igualmente evidente y lamentable el declino constante de la participación de la FAO en la ejecución de proyectos agrícolas dentro de los fondos del PNUD. Convendrá observar que en el Gráfico 1.2 se muestra como han descendido considerablemente las asignaciones del PNUD a la FAO, después de que en el segundo ciclo 1976/81 esas asignaciones alcanzaron su nivel más alto, ahora parece son estimaciones, dice el gráfico, ya en este primer año 1987 del cuarto ciclo, por lo menos si no han descendido no están alcanzando un nivel que corresponda al crecimiento de los recursos del PNUD.

El Cuadro 1.2 cuantifica en porcentajes ese descenso. Del 31 por ciento en 1972 se ha pasado al sólo 19 por ciento en 1986. El decrecimiento es nada menos que del 40 por ciento. Esa situación es preocupante y deberemos consignarla en nuestro Informe.

No debemos limitarlos a la afirmación demasiado tímida del párrafo 1.12, según la cual "en el pasado reciente los programas de la FAO que cuentan con el apoyo del PNUD han sufrido fluctuaciones y en general han disminuido". Pensamos que hay que ser más objetivos y realistas.

El párrafo 1.15 contiene una expresión de resignación, dice: "hay razones para creer que la parte correspondiente a la FAO se estabilizará o mejorará". Cuando se habla de estabilización preguntamos, ¿querrá esto decir estabilizarse en el mínimo del 19 por ciento alcanzado en 1986?

Sabemos muy bien que la participación de la FAO en la ejecución de proyectos agrícolas depende de la decisión política de los gobiernos, por ello convendrá que la Conferencia recomiende que los Estados Miembros sobre todo acogidos a la coyuntura favorable del aumento excepcional de los recursos del PNUD consideren la posibilidad de asignar más alta prioridad a la agricultura en sus planes nacionales de desarrollo.

Somos conscientes de que es un problema complejo, porque algunos países en desarrollo en los últimos ciclos de programación del PNUD han venido asignando hasta el 50 por ciento de su participación a las actividades industriales por ejemplo y de otros órdenes; pero, consideramos oportuno que se haga esa recomendación, sobre todo porque no obstante los hechos que estamos señalando, la FAO sigue siendo la primera agencia de ejecución del PNUD y ese Programa sigue siendo la primera fuente de recursos para proyectos de la FAO.

La Delegación de Colombia piensa que la Conferencia debe registrar con satisfacción el hecho de que, como se indica en el párrafo 1.14 "se ha llegado al 6 por ciento en la proporción de los recursos del PNUD para proyectos ejecutados directamente por los gobiernos. Oímos la declaración del señor Lignon y nos pareció entender que la ejecución por parte de los gobiernos podría generar problemas de vigilancia y gestión. Esperamos que si se presentan esos problemas la FAO pueda superarlos porque juzgamos que es esencial que los gobiernos que estén en capacidad de hacerlo puedan seguir ejecutando directamente los proyectos.

Consideramos que sería ilustrativo y daría cierta orientación una más amplia explicación sobre la creciente participación de los gobiernos en la ejecución de los proyectos. Por ello preguntamos: en cuáles regiones, y si fuere posible, en cuáles países, se está produciendo ese incremento, cual es la tendencia en cuanto a la naturaleza de los proyectos, que disciplinas son las más notorias en los proyectos que ya los gobiernos beneficiarios están ejecutando directamente?

Esto nos lleva a apoyar plenamente la necesidad y conveniencia de que en la ejecución de los proyectos se intensifique el mayor uso de expertos nacionales y de instituciones de nuestros países. El documento dice que en cuanto a expertos de países en desarrollo se ha llegado al 45 por ciento. Esperamos que en el próximo Informe se llegue por lo menos al 70 por ciento. Así la FAO cumpliría en verdad la función de Agencia de las Naciones Unidas establecida para servir al Tercer Mundo. También apoyamos el mayor uso de las instituciones nacionales de nuestros países. El documento habla del 57 por ciento en el bienio, pero se refiere a un decrecimiento de esa participación de las instituciones nacionales en el año 1986. Parece, y hemos leído el documento con mucho cuidado, que no se especifica hasta que porcentaje descendió la participación de las instituciones el año pasado, pero según el gráfico, un cálculo aproximado, descendió a cerca de la mitad 'del 57 por ciento. Esto es preocupante y las explicaciones que se dan en el documento no nos convencen. Deseamos oír nuevos argumentos y, sobre todo, pedimos que se restablezca ese uso creciente de las instituciones nacionales de los países beneficiarios. Este documento indica que ya muchos nacionales de países en desarrollo han asumido, con competencia, la dirección de importantes proyectos y creemos que debe seguirse en esa acertada dirección.

La Delegación de Colombia opina que en este documento se hace un análisis adecuado de la Evolución de las Actividades de Campo a través de los años, respecto a la cual queremos apoyar la nueva orientación que debe darse en la FAO en cuanto a la calidad de los expertos y a los períodos de su utilización, a la luz de las características y condiciones de los países y proyectos a que sean destinados.

Nuestra larga vinculación a la FAO nos permite reconocer que esa evolución ha sido bastante favorable, aunque podrá aún mejorarse.

Entre los años sesenta y principios de los setenta muchos de los expertos que eran enviados, por ejemplo, a los países de América Latina y el Caribe, provenían de estados muy diferentes a los de nuestra región, no hablaban nuestra lengua y eran alérgicos a las condiciones de vida de nuestros países.

Cuando llegaban, necesitaban varios meses para aclimatarse, no resistían nuestras deliciosas comidas, no aprendían las hermosas lenguas castellana o portuguesa, les abrumaba la simpatía y alegría de nuestras gentes, y luego volvían a la Sede, invadían los bares y las cafeterías con las pipas humeantes en los labios y el periódico debajo del brazo, se sentaban luego en sus cómodos escritorios, y desde aquí, lejos de la realidad de nuestros países, escribían informes que, en general, eran copias, repeticiones de informes anteriores de otras misiones, y así se vanificaba, en buena parte, el objetivo fundamental de las actividades de campo de la FAO.

Era el período en el cual parecía pensarse que los países beneficiarios tenían que decir: "a caballo regalado, no se le mira el diente".

Afortunadamente, a partir de 1976 las cosas han venido cambiando, muchos países en desarrollo han alcanzado un grado intermedio de desarrollo y pueden prescindir de la asistencia técnica tradicional, para que ésta sea reemplazada por expertos de alto nivel a corto plazo.

Naturalmente, estamos de acuerdo con el documento en que todavía hay algunos países que requieren la asistencia técnica de expertos en largos períodos. Será necesario analizar cuidadosamente cada circunstancia, a fin de tratar de lograr un adecuado equilibrio.

En el primer párrafo sobre la evolución de las actividades de campo, se afirma que "muchos países necesitan todavía distintas formas de asistencia en un momento dado". Convendrá que el Departamento de Desarrollo mantenga y actualice, en permanente dinamismo, la lista de expertos de alto nivel especializados en disciplinas particulares, los llamados rosters, para que, en determinadas circunstancias de urgencia, causadas por plagas u otras calamidades, los Estados Miembros puedan recurrir a esa asistencia.

La Delegación de Colombia atribuye gran importancia a las actividades de formación y por eso nos complace que en los últimos diez años se hayan formado aproximadamente 500 000 personas, entre ellas muchas mujeres, y que ahora a las mujeres se les esté asignando mayor participación en importantes proyectos multidisciplinarios.

Nos preocupa la distribución geográfica de los Proyectos de Campo.

Y lo que es más grave, la primera frase del párrafo 1.37 que dice "la distribución regional refleja tendencias existentes desde hace algún tiempo", es decir, siempre América Latina y el Caribe ha venido siendo relegada a una asistencia menor. El Cuadro 1.3 y el gráfico 1.4 señalan que sólo el 7 por ciento de los proyectos de campo ha correspondido a nuestra región en el bienio 86-87.

En relación con el área a la cual pertenece Colombia, en los últimos años se ha venido procediendo con base en indicadores y cifras obsoletas, ya superados.

Será necesario revisar y actualizar, con realismo, la situación de América Latina y el Caribe, región en la cual muchos países y zonas de países padecen graves y difíciles condiciones.

Esperamos que el Estudio sobre las Condiciones de nuestra región, solicitado por la última Conferencia Regional, celebrada en Barbados en agosto pasado, podrá contribuir a que las actividades de campo, en América Latina y el Caribe en el futuro, se adelanten dentro de un marco más sensato, más justo y más equilibrado.

Quisiéramos preguntar si será posible oír sobre este tema al Representante del PNUD. El Gobierno de Colombia está satisfecho con la administración del Señor Draper, administrador del PNUD. Pensamos que la manera en que el Sr. Draper viene trabajando hace ya casi dos años, ha sido factor determinante en la recuperación afortunada de los recursos del PNUD, y opinamos que esa circunstancia favorable debe ser utilizada al máximo por la FAO.

Finalmente, la Delegación de Colombia desearía saber cómo se adelantan las relaciones PNUD-FAO. ¿Son cordiales y fructíferas esas relaciones? Además de los factores que hemos señalado, ¿hay otros factores que hayan determinado el decrecimiento de la participación de la FAO en la ejecución de proyectos financieros por el PNUD?

Jean-Pierre POLY (France): Tout d'abord, permettez à la délégation française d'adresser ses plus vives félicitations au Secrétariat pour la clarté du rapport très documenté que nous examinons, qui permet à la fois de mieux comprendre la nature des actions engagées, les critères des choix opérés et le rôle respectif des différents intervenants.

Naturellement, c'est avec satisfaction que nous constatons que le volume des programmes de terrain a continué à augmenter au cours de l'exercice dans un contexte pourtant difficile, et nous espérons que la récente amélioration des ressources financières du PNUD, partenaire privilégié de l'Organisation pour le financement des programmes de terrain permette d'accomplir un effort plus important encore, à la mesure des problèmes alimentaires et agricoles qui se posent aujourd'hui aux pays en développement, en Afrique notamment.

Nous souhaitons toutefois que le redéploiement des activités de terrain gagé sur des ressources extrabudgétaires ne se fasse pas au détriment du programme ordinaire. Tant il est vrai que ces programmes doivent garder leur identité et se compléter.

Concernant les tendances et les perspectives des programmes de terrain, ma délégation souhaite présenter les observations suivantes:

- La conception de projets pluridisciplinaires, plus soucieux des réalités socio-économiques, doit être favorisée. Ces projets contribuent à la réalisation de programmes à la fois plus intégrés et plus ambitieux.-

- A cet égard, nous considérons que l'évolution constatée dans la répartition par programmes des dépenses extrabudgétaires pour les projets de terrain va dans la bonne direction, grâce notamment au renforcement des aides aux projets de développement agricole et rural tels que l'agroforesterie par exemple.-

- A propos de cette même répartition par programme, ma délégation se félicite qu'une attention particulière soit désormais apportée aux activités d'analyse des systèmes agricoles afin d'améliorer la coordination entre la recherche, la vulgarisation et les services agricoles.

- La délégation française considère qu'il est judicieux de laisser à la recherche appliquée l'importance qu'il convient dans un grand nombre de projets de terrain et que le renforcement des programmes et des systèmes nationaux de recherche dans le cadre de réseaux régionaux doit être encouragé.

- En matière de vulgarisation, enfin, pour renforcer l'indispensable coordination dont je viens de parler, l'Organisation devra veiller à renouveler sa démarche, parfois trop traditionnelle en adaptant ses activités aux situations particulières, en dégagant les priorités nécessaires en faveur de certains groupes ou de certaines cibles, en améliorant l'articulation avec les programmes de recherche et en favorisant délibérément les innovations in situ.

- Ma délégation retiendra par ailleurs, comme autant d'indicateurs favorables le recours accru de l'Organisation aux moyens et aux techniques modernes (informatique du gestion, télédétection, énergies nouvelles,...) le souci de développer l'analyse économique de la production et l'appui

à la gestion des exploitations, la priorité donnée à la formation et au renforcement des institutions de développement local dans les projets les mieux intégrés.

- Pour la délégation française, il est encourageant de constater qu'en dépit d'une évolution défavorable des conditions des engagements multilatéraux de prêt à l'agriculture, l'activité du Centre d'Investissement ne s'est pas relâchée. Ma délégation y voit le gage de la considération dont bénéficie l'OAA auprès des Organismes Internationaux de financement du développement pour une meilleure identification ou formulation des projets.

- Le Programme de relèvement de l'agriculture en Afrique (PRAA) a retenu toute notre attention. Il permet de soutenir les efforts des gouvernements africains pour passer progressivement du stade des mesures d'urgence à un processus de développement afin d'enrayer le déclin de leur production alimentaire et agricole. Tout en cherchant à satisfaire les besoins immédiats, l'aide alimentaire doit être mieux intégrée aux programmes de développement en faveur des couches les plus pauvres de la population. Les renseignements apportés par le Secrétariat laissent bien augurer de la réussite de ce Programme.

Concernant l'évaluation des projets de terrain, ma délégation s'accorde à reconnaître les efforts consentis par l'Organisation pour s'engager dans une procédure d'évaluation rigoureuse et concertée des activités de son programme.

Il est encourageant de constater que de premiers enseignements peuvent être tirés de ces évaluations qui permettront à l'OAA d'améliorer le fonctionnement et le rendement de ses projets sur le terrain par une définition plus précise des objectifs du projet, par un cadrage mieux choisi en fonction des objectifs de développement, par un recours accru à la gestion et au soutien technique.

Plus que par le passé l'Organisation devra se préoccuper de l'environnement du projet et de son avenir en veillant à l'indispensable participation, à l'appui politique nécessaire et aux capacités contributives des Gouvernements bénéficiaires.

En outre, l'aspect démonstratif et pédagogique de certains projets pour les autorités locales ne doit pas être mésestimé, car ces projets peuvent ainsi favoriser l'émergence, la formulation ou l'inflexion d'une politique de développement économique.

Enfin, ma délégation souhaite réaffirmer l'importance toute particulière qu'elle attache au rôle de l'organisation dans l'assistance à l'analyse, la définition et la conduite des politiques agricoles et alimentaires.

En l'absence de réelle planification, la diversité des demandes formulées est à la fois un facteur de richesse des programmes de terrain, mais également une cause de dispersion qui contrarie leur efficacité.

L'OAA s'est certes préoccupée très tôt de mettre en place une assistance à la planification agricole à l'échelle des pays bénéficiaires. Elle a conçu des projets centrés sur la planification sectorielle et l'analyse des politiques agricoles afin, notamment, d'améliorer la sécurité alimentaire et la gestion des ressources naturelles.

Ma délégation considère néanmoins que cet objectif, pour permanent qu'il soit, doit être aujourd'hui dépassé et que l'OAA doit constituer un pôle d'intervention pour un appui systématique à l'analyse, la définition et la conduite des politiques agricoles et alimentaires.

Un effort important de formation est à faire pour accroître la capacité des pays qui le souhaitent à porter un diagnostic sur les politiques mises en oeuvre, à en analyser les conséquences pour les secteurs de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation, à identifier et mettre en oeuvre les instruments de politiques agricoles permettant de faire face à ces conséquences.

Cette action de formation doit donc s'adresser aux cadres chargés directement de la mise en oeuvre des politiques agricoles et alimentaires mais aussi à ceux qui auront à en tenir compte dans l'établissement des programmes d'ajustement.

C'est dans cet esprit que la France a pris la décision d'appuyer la FAO au travers d'une contribution financière annoncée par notre Ministre de l'Agriculture au début de notre Conférence.

Telles sont les quelques observations et recommandations que ma délégation souhaitait présenter en cette occasion, afin que les programmes de terrain de l'OAA, riches de leur diversité, soucieux d'une meilleure intégration, permettent de mieux concilier les besoins exprimés avec les priorités reconnues de façon-unanime.

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): We thank the Assistant Director-General for his excellent presentation of the document C 87/4 which presents a review and evaluation of the FAO's Field Programme activities, the write up covering over 4 chapters is enriched by an appendix of 7 tables. We thank the Secretariat for the pains taken by them in preparing this document. I wish to deal with just a few points arising out of the review.

It appears that for 1986 a total amount of US\$ 315 million was available for financing the Field Programme and a similar level is expected to be maintained during 1987. Out of this total amount FAO's TCP fund was just US\$ 35.1 million or 11 percent of the total. Nearly 50 percent of the resources came from the trust funds, UNDP share accounting for about 13 percent. Selection of activities for utilization of UNDP and trust funds is perhaps largely determined by the recipients and the donor agencies concerned. FAO has little, if any, say in the matter. The size of resources to be available in any given year is, of course, for the donor agencies to determine. However, the size of the TCP fund has been continuously increased since 1976 and in 1986 it was highest. At this level, that is at the level of US\$ 35.1 million it was 33 percent higher than 1985. This level, but not the growth rate recorded in the past may not be maintained in 1987, the previous trends must be considered satisfactory.

The total budget level of Field Programmes at about US\$ 2 billion covers some 2 500 projects. Distribution of the resources according to the region shows Africa had the highest share of 44 percent; the share of Asia and the Pacific region was 23 percent; that of the Near East 18 percent and that of the Latin America and Caribbean region 7 percent. The Review claims that this pattern of distribution conforms to the regional needs, perhaps that is a correct explanation. The regional picture as presented in the review, however, does not show the share of the poorest countries of the world in the Field Programme's expenditure. It would perhaps be worth while to find out this in future. We therefore suggest that future reviews should show the share of least developed countries in these expenditures.

The analysis of the distribution pattern of Field Programme expenditure among various programme categories in 1984-85 and 1986-87 biennia shows that the share of livestock has fallen from 17 percent to 13 percent; similarly share of fisheries has also declined from 11 percent in 1984-85 to 10 percent in 1986-87. These sectors are of vital interest to us and to many other countries of the world. Hence this decline is clearly unwelcome. In particular the decline in the case of livestock appears to be too drastic.

The evaluation of project activities presented in the review shows that performance in respect of project output, project effect and project implementation has been rather unimpressive. On these criteria not more than 30 percent of the projects have been rated "good". The rating of the rest had been either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" rating seems to be within 15 percent. The Review explains that the factors responsible for bringing down the performance of the project lie largely outside the control of FAO but all the same we are disturbed at this relative ineffectiveness of the expenditure.

The Review has devoted a separate chapter to show the changing nature of field activities. It shows that over a period of four decades the number of field projects has increased from 22 to 2 506. The corresponding growth in expenditure has been from US\$ 0.1 million to US\$ 315 million, that is annual. It is indicated that several member Countries have built up their own technical capacity and now need only short-term and highly specialized inputs. Training activities undertaken through field projects have contributed significantly to the growth of self-reliance in the recipient countries. Over the last ten years 500 000 people were trained through field projects.

The latest trends in field projects show increasing utilization of services of national professionals in execution of field projects, growing support to TCDC and ECDC and promotion of the role of women in agricultural and rural development. These trends are not yet significant but are extremely promising. We welcome these trends.

Ms Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): I should like to thank the Secretariat for the comprehensive background document C 87/4 on this agenda item and also for the informative introductory statement.

Finland has studied this agenda item with particular care. As we all know the operational activities of the United Nations system are currently under review in the special commission of the ECOSOC. The results of these deliberations will also have effects on the field programmes of FAO as an executing agency of multilateral technical assistance of the United Nations system.

In the United Nations context Finland has continuously emphasized the need of the agencies in the United Nations operational system to strengthen the capacity to plan, implement and evaluate their activities in a mutually supportive way.

Naturally, all funded programmes need to promote the national primary objectives of the developing countries and the selection of priorities rests solely with them. It is quite obvious that agricultural development has a key role to play in most countries. Therefore, the scarce resources of the UN system should be used in the most efficient and effective manner. At the programming stage flexibility must prevail. The change in economic circumstances can be incorporated into project funding. It is against these general principles that my delegation has studied the background document. It contains a wealth of information which describes the characteristics of the FAO Field Programme regardless of its source of funding.

Finland welcomes Chapter 2 of the assessment of the Field Programme, as well as Chapter 3 which describes the role of FAO in providing assistance for planning purposes. My delegation would also like to offer some specific comments. First, Finland would have expected a more analytical report which would have placed the FAO programmes into wider perspective because the very severe economic constraints, which many developing countries face, nowadays will affect the programme delivery of FAO.

In paragraph 3.12 reference is made to the difficult choices many developing countries are making while carrying out economic structural adjustment programmes. The report also mentions in several places that FAO programmes are facing difficulties at the implementation stage when the government cannot report that resources - both human and financial - are forthcoming. Owing to this fact Finland would have liked the report to have traced this problem in more depth so that this Conference could have taken a stand on the Secretariat's proposals in order to deal with this issue. If this problem continues and expands it may have serious consequences to the sustainability of FAO's inputs.

The Review Document makes some welcome references to cases where governments have used FAO assistance when they have prepared themselves for a World Bank Consultative Group meeting or a UNDP round table meeting. The document also states that this input has favourably influenced the outcome of this meeting. Finland would have welcomed additional information concerning the Secretariat's intentions to broaden its consultations with the developing countries in order to use this kind of assistance more systematically in the future.

Finland supports the African emphasis in the FAO Field Programme. It is concerned however to note that the average size of an FAO programme is in the order of US\$ 500 000, and about 70 percent of the programmes are of relatively short-term duration. There are a large number of projects, about 2 500, which spread to 145 countries and territories as stated in paragraph 1.36. This causes some concern to my delegation. If we also keep in mind that these inputs are divided between several sectors, as can be seen from table 1.4 on page 14, the issue raises what kind of impact and long-term developmental effects that this kind of assistance has.

My delegation would have wished to see a Secretariat assessment on the reasons for its allocating resources in this manner, as well as what criteria it has used in determining priorities for its assistance when it negotiates with the government concerned in order to get integrated programmes with multiplier effects. Let me illustrate what I mean. There is a general agreement that rural development requires an integrated effect to prove successful. Integration means joint planning and the promotion of primary and secondary production, as well as infrastructure, in such a way that institutional arrangements and other inputs support each other. In the context of agriculture the essential unit is naturally the farm where economic decisions concerning land uses and production alternatives are made. For administrative reasons agriculture and forestry are, however, promoted through separate channels. FAO in-house activities are also organized along these lines. Close cooperation between two sub-sectors at all levels of administration and project implementation is needed. For example, the development of agro-forestry cannot be successful unless it is closely supported by agricultural extension. Another example is the close relationship between animal husbandry and forestry' in many developing countries where joint development of pasture management and forestry production and conservation is a pre-requisite for sustainable development. These illustrations point out that in future reporting the Secretariat should concentrate more in its reporting on the impact side of its programmes at the national level rather than listing and describing numerous programmes and projects without showing how they relate to the national priorities and how they promote sustainable development.

In their assessments of ongoing projects the FAO representative noted that project prospects are uncertain as stated in paragraph 2.39. This point deserves careful analysis and reporting by the Secretariat on their plans to cope with this issue. Therefore, my delegation considers it important that in the project design attention should be devoted to those matters stated in paragraph 2.129, namely, that projects need to be integrated into national policies and programmes so that they can contribute to building a national capacity for wider action.

Finally, my delegation would like to state that all these remarks imply that the FAO Field Programme is a part of a total effort of the international community to improve the agricultural situation and living conditions of the people in the developing countries. Therefore, FAO must cooperate closely with the rest of the UN system, and in particular with the UNDP, so that their combined efforts would lead to the maximum benefit to recipient countries.

R. MACINTOSH (Canada): In our intervention in Plenary, and under item 11 before this Commission, our delegation expressed a set of broad objectives, the achievement of which will govern our future approach to FAO. Specifically we argued for a disciplined and rigorous approach to priority setting, for an organizational structure which adequately equips this Organization to achieve the priority of objectives established for managerial systems in FAO which fully respond to the diversity of FAO work; for the most cost-effective approaches possible to programme delivery in FAO; for an intergovernmental framework which enables Member States to play a meaningful role in governing the activities of the Secretariat and for a fully cooperative partnership with other agencies of the UN system.

These principles are simple in concept and reasonable in scope. They reflect a certain ambition of FAO, an ambition centred on the high standard of performance required if the struggle against hunger and poverty is to be advanced. Many of our perspectives were raised in the context of our paper on the document C 87/30. We wish to emphasize a number of points. Our concerns basically start from the belief that the development of FAO's organization structure, management systems and intergovernmental review processes have not proceeded at pace with the demand placed on the Agency as the result of its assumption of massive operational responsibilities over the past 15 years. We know there has been some progress and we appreciate the comments made by Mr Ligrion in his introduction. We are encouraged by them. We would appreciate further details on such positive features as the functioning of FAO's internal committee structure and the building of project cycle approaches to the programme. We also welcome the more analytical and forthright approaches to the problems of programme management as indicated in Chapter 2 of the Field Programme Review. Not only is the information presented in this Review useful to our understanding of FAO Field Programmes, but the frank discussion of problems encountered from time to time was refreshing. However, we would still prefer a greater stress on impact assessment in the document as in other aspects of FAO's evaluation work. Nevertheless we commend the healthy and professional attitude in the Review on how to learn from mistakes as well as from successes. We still all have work to do. The successful completion of this work is not a matter which should divide north from south or Member State from Secretariat. We believe that this work has to do with building confidence in FAO's field programmes. We believe it has to do with working together to improve the selection of activities undertaken, increasing the efficiency of delivery systems and enhancing the impact of programmes implemented on the lives of the poorest.

We agree with the thrust of the Swiss proposal which was also in document C 87/30, that is to create a Field Programme Review Body in FAO. This would provide members with a real sense of participation in FAO development activities, including TCP. It would also tap the ample reservoirs of expertise which exists in capitals. Whatever improvements may be agreed, one and a half or two days every two years is not enough time to afford Member States an effective opportunity to comment on the full range of technical, policy and managerial issues involved in FAO field programmes. These programmes comprise over two-thirds of FAO's total resources.

Our paper under C 87/30 has highlighted the potential advantages of considering a more unified Field Programme delivery structure for FAO. Now we fear there is too much dispersal of operational responsibility for field programmes among FAO's many divisions and departments. In our view, there is also a need for a more geographic orientation to programming. For example, this could be useful in designing programmes relevant to the particular situations of small island states or, in responding to different land use or market systems which prevail in different countries.

In the personnel sector a consolidated administrative structure could facilitate the development of a cadre of skilled project managers, thereby leaving technical specialists in FAO largely free to confine their involvement to backstopping for projects. We believe this would also help to preserve more of their time for the FAO Regular Programme activities which we continue to value.

We also believe that transparency would be served in part by such arrangements which, if fully pursued, would clarify the long-standing uncertainties - even unfairnesses - surrounding the cross-subsidy by the Regular Budget of trust-fund or UNDP activities.

These issues are admittedly complex - another reason why we think a detached, high-level committee of experts would be best placed to consider them, perhaps with the assistance of a professionally conducted management study.

We believe that FAO's field programmes could take on a much higher measure of relevance if there existed (a) a stronger policy framework within which activities were authorized and implemented and (b) a much higher profile for policy advice in the actual programmes themselves. We need in FAO a more tightly defined strategic approach to programming. What is FAO really best at, against a backdrop of United resources? What is the best way to ensure that the often esoteric task of technology transfer is made relevant and meaningful to the problems of the world's rural poor? How best can we target activities towards particular objectives in respect of the environment and of the role of women in the development process? We are concerned that too often what FAO chooses to do is guided by ad hoc assessments of simply by what money is available at any given point in time. This is in contrast to what we would prefer - that is its conformity to an agreed set of priorities and objectives.

In the realm of policy advice may we again make a plea for a greater effort? In our view one well-conceived piece of policy advice on such a matter as producer incentives can be worth twenty TCP projects in terms of its impact on medium to long-term development prospects. As the Dutch Delegation has mentioned under a previous item and as the Finnish Delegation has just mentioned, we do not wish to see FAO find itself on the side-lines of this historic debate on economic adjustment.

While recognizing progress where it is evident and while appreciating some real improvements in the quality of the document before us, there remain in our view weaknesses in the orientation and administration of FAO field programmes. We do not believe FAO is fully availing itself of the managerial concepts and programming methodologies of other development assistance institutions.

Our own experience as a modest trust-fund donor, has been less than satisfactory. Apart from earlier noted concerns of a broader nature, we are disappointed at FAO's persistent reluctance to accept any of our normal, reasonable and legislatively required audit requirements. Without this level of confidence provided by such basic elements of transparency and accountability, and despite the very high degree of emphasis Canada gives to agriculture and food security in its development assistance programmes, we have regretfully considered it necessary to severely restrict - in effect to suspend - future Canadian participation in FAO Trust Fund Programmes. We have alternatives and we will use them.

Nevertheless, we strongly support FAO's involvement in field programmes and recognize the benefits they have brought to developing countries. We especially applaud the skill and dedication of FAO's field staff in making the best of an uncertain financial and managerial environment. Our call is, we consider, one of optimism. We can do better. We have options we can consider - we must consider. We hope that our colleagues will agree the issues involved are worthy enough to be included in the context of an independent high-level review of FAO's goals and operations.

CHAIRMAN: Before recognizing the Federal Republic of Germany, the Secretariat has asked the Chair to announce that Commission III needs a quorum for a vote. We would hope that those who can assist will assist but not that so many will assist as to create the same problem here.

Alois BAIER (Germany, Federal Republic of)(original language German): My Delegation would like to thank the Secretariat for the submission of document C 87/4; Review of Field Programmes 1986-87 just as. we would like to thank Mr Lignon for his presentation of it. I would like to say this on the document itself. We appreciate the traditional structure which has been adhered to this year as well, because this facilitates comparability with previous biennia. In the document itself, there are a lot of interesting statements, for example on the activities of the Investment Centre. That is something we have already spoken of when discussing the ordinary programme. Then strengthening training activities, support for TCDC and ECDC as well - as also the proceedings relating to WCARRD.

We welcome the further increase in field project expenditure shown by Table 1.1. In 1987 too, field programmes will probably increase, even though by a smaller amount. Priorities in field programmes set out in Table 1.3 and Graph 1.4 seem to us to be correctly selected. This also follows traditional trends.

As far as Table 2.2 and Graph 2.1 are concerned, we see that more than one-third of the projects have been assessed as being good or satisfactory. My Delegation would like to encourage the Secretariat to continue its efforts to enhance project evaluation. Better project appraisal makes it possible to draw more worthwhile conclusions. This in turn will help to decrease the number of unsatisfactory projects and it will enhance the value of our cooperation. We believe that improved coordination at national level can make a very considerable contribution to achieving this particular end.

As far as the Federal Republic of Germany is concerned, UNDP will continue to be the centre for multilateral cooperation in development. We therefore feel that the increase in the share of the Regular Budget accounted for by TCP, which has increased for years, should not continue to increase.

The Federal Republic of Germany cooperates in particular through its own agencies. The rural development sector plays a very important part in our work. The share of this aspect of cooperation continued to rise last year, to 39.4 percent of our technical and financial cooperation. The Federal Republic of Germany will continue its fruitful cooperation with developing countries in the future as well.

John Redman GOLDSACK (United Kingdom): When this agenda item was discussed at the recent meeting of Council we expressed our views on a number of administrative aspects of the review of the Field Programme. These are on record and in view of the time constraint we will now confine our remarks to three specific activities covered by the Report.

The first of these is the Special Trust Fund activities for locust and grasshopper control. During the recent locust, grasshopper and army worm emergencies in Africa, FAO has attracted and directed very substantial donor aid to the National Plant Protection Services of affected countries. This has enabled them to perform more effectively their traditional role of protecting crop areas - that is tactical pest control. Far less assistance has been sought or directed by FAO to regional pest control organizations which are traditionally the front line task forces concerned with destroying pests at source outside crop areas and before they multiply and spread to the crop areas - that is strategic pest control. While the 1986 and 1987 harvests have been assured through tactical campaigns costing donors some US\$80 to 100 million not enough has been done at the strategic control level to prevent the recurrence of epidemics and upsurges in 1988 and future years which could require similar levels of expenditure by donors. Whilst the need for strong national plant protection services is undeniable, for effective and lasting relief from highly migratory pests such as locusts, grasshoppers and army worms, adequate strategic control capabilities are essential. With the advent of wetter climates in many areas which favour locusts and grasshoppers there is cause for concern that continuing upsurges may lead to plagues. Plague prevention is not possible without strategic control by regional pest control organizations. Lastly on this topic, we recognize that FAO as the international centre for locust forecasting has a central role in the strategic control of these and other migrant pests.

I would like now to turn to physical and area development planning. This is dealt with in paragraphs 3.70 to 3.76 and is basic to successful development in the natural resources sector. It is in our view a high-priority activity as far as FAO is concerned and much remains to be done in this field, particularly in view of the ever-increasing pressure of population on the natural resources base. In this respect, I should like to make the following points. Integrated river basin planning and development is a legitimate activity for our Organization, especially when it involves decisionmaking in an international context. Care must be taken however to ensure that data collection and analysis does not get out of phase with progress on tackling political issues arising at intergovernmental level. A carefully phased approach is therefore essential. Environmental concerns relating both to human and to physical resources are key elements in the calculus. FAO's interest in small-scale irrigation, especially in Africa, should be maintained. Field programmes should focus on opportunities for development based on low-level technology that are capable of being sustained locally both in technical and organizational terms. FAO's approach of linking up land evaluation activities with specific programmes or projects is to be welcomed. This is much to be preferred to planning in a vacuum or merely in the hope that the results of the exercise would be of use eventually.

Rangeland projects will often have to encompass an interface between extensive grazing regimes and rain-fed crop production in areas of low or uncertain rainfall as the two activities are often related. The context in which farm management and farming systems work is carried out by FAO is not in our view very clearly explained in paragraph 3.76. The sub-head to this paragraph seems to be a catch-all for odds and ends. Farming systems work should be part of the activity area mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. Apart from the training element it is not easy to see where the main thrust of FAO's interest in this area lies.

Two areas which receive relatively little attention in the review are soil and water conservation, both as an activity in its own right and as a component of other, broader activities; and agro-climatology in general and how climate and climate changes relate to FAO's programme.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about activities in support of women's development. The United Kingdom places a high priority on the integration of women both as agents and beneficiaries of rural development. We are happy to note the emphasis the Organization is placing on integrating women into the projects of its Regular Programme, for example in fisheries and forestry activities. It is hoped that the number of projects which involve women will continue to increase. With regard to the individual field projects focussing on women's development, we would like assurance that the Department concerned has the professional capacity to design and monitor adequately the 36 projects currently being undertaken.

Jan DOORENBOS (Netherlands) : First I should like to thank Mr Lignon for his clear introduction. In his foreword on the report "Review of Field Programmes", the Director-General correctly states that the report should be read in conjunction with the review of the Regular Programme. In his statement to the 24th Session the Director-General persistently referred to the world economic situation and the place of agriculture therein. It is against this background that FAO will frame its actions, both in the Regular and Field Programmes.

It is in this light that FAO cannot be viewed only as a technological institution and without political weight. FAO should apply its mandate and use its highly skilled expertise towards both the implementation of much needed policy changes and, the greatly needed technological changes. We feel FAO should push along both, with a vigour which matches its professionalism equally in the Regular and Field Programmes. In this, FAO cannot rely on automatism. Being the specialized agency in agriculture, FAO must raise its strong voice on the world stage in economic adjustments issues, this in harmony with other United Nations agencies and finance institutions. Inter alia, in the report, I missed a reference to the European Development Fund. This will include assistance and even stronger participation in the work that others have been used to perform. In concrete terms this would mean, as Mr Lignon has mentioned already, the continuation and strengthening of FAO's participation in UNDP's round tables, participation in consultative group meetings organized by the World Bank, participation with several financial institutions and with available FAO expertise in bilateral and multilateral activities - in fact, participation in decision making in an international context. Words which would apply here would be ambition, persistence and above all quality.

As to the report before us, my delegation is happy to note FAO's assistance in planning and policy analysis being a major feature of the Field Programme. We feel, however, that the stated 8 percent of the value of the current field projects must gradually be raised, this notwithstanding the 20 percent of the total budget of all projects being identified as a planning component.

It is in the capacity of policy adviser that the FAO can play a forceful intermediate role and provide the much needed coordination between the donor community and the recipient countries. Specific mention must be made of the investment and support activities by FAO. While the outcome is impressive at the present stage, in the light of what has been mentioned, we feel that the role in investment support, including feasibility studies, can be even further enhanced. This equally applies to the practical training to increase the capacity of countries to identify and prepare investment projects.

Being aware of many administrative complications, we applaud the diversified funding of country activities which not only, as was stated, increases FAO's ability to meet the developing countries' need through flexible approaches, but it also highlights the important broker's role of FAO between the donor countries and the recipient countries. This does not necessarily mean that FAO should by itself execute all project activities: FAO should also indicate to donors feasible bilateral activities in the framework designed. In this regard we are happy to note the new project format which, on the one hand, facilitates project formulation and above all enhances cooperation and integration of the various technical divisions working necessarily together on different projects.

It is in this respect that the growth in FAO Trust Fund Programme with the Dutch Government is an indication of our confidence in the role of FAO both as broker and as an executing agency, applying its accumulated knowledge and designing high priority assistance and cooperation projects. We note the very positive contribution made by TCP in smoothing the implementation of Project activities and closing gaps when problems of funding sometimes appear. Furthermore, as stated in the report, we share the continued emphasis given to research, extension and training. We are happy to be closely associated in terms of financial resources and expertise with the success of a number of special programmes such as Integrated Pest Management in South-East Asia, which we hope will soon be extended to Africa, the remote sensing activities, FSAS, and in particular Early Warning, the prevention of food losses, the fertilizer programme and last, but not least, forestry. The report before us is presented in clear language and it provides many interesting figures and observations. For this we offer our sincere compliments. However, allow me to make some more critical observations. First, the report appears to present the results in a rather quantitative manner. The outcome looks particularly promising, comparing results of the evaluation of 1981-82 with those of 1985-86 - this, unfortunately, with the exception of the subject "institutional framework". Is this not too sunny a picture, contrary to what is stated on page 46 under 2.42? I quote: "... projects which are subjected to evaluation are often those which have run into operational difficulties and, therefore, require in-course correction."

My second comment is to stress with FAO the need for a regular internal monitoring and evaluation system. However, we see this as complementary to a combined FAO-external consultant evaluation when major programmes are reviewed. As good examples, I should mention the external evaluations on the anti-tse-tse activities, food security and seeds.

Many of the observations made in the report are recognized, viewing also our own bilateral experiences. One observation deserves our particular attention, and I quote: "A major negative factor which emerges from the survey is the general deterioration which has occurred in the ability of recipient countries to meet the local financial costs of projects and to make available and adequate a number of suitably qualified counterpart personnel.

It is in regard to this item that I should like to have the Secretariat's comments regarding this phenomenon. I should like also to ask two specific questions. First, is this not contrary to the decrease in FAO's training activities, on which several delegations have already expressed concern, which we share, during our discussion on the Regular Programme? Added to this, I would ask: does not FAO encounter any problems, as we do, in finding the highly - qualified expertise which is required for proper execution? We would like to have the Secretariat's views on its strategy to overcome and remove some bottlenecks which have been experienced, particularly regarding the need to enhance the sustainability of projects and impact assessments. That was a point which was also raised by Finland.

A last comment: through working closely together with FAO in multilateral ways we have learned much about FAO's way of operation, of meeting problems and finding solutions. While being critical, we have established mutual confidence and trust, which is the basis on which we can work. We should not have attained this position by not participating or, even worse, by suspending our participation.

CHAIRMAN: I have to announce from the Chair that the Secretary of Commission III is still trying to get a quorum and they are unable to proceed. They have to take a vote and something like half an hour ago we asked whether some delegates present here could make arrangements for their country's representatives to attend Commission III in sufficient numbers to make a quorum. If anyone can possibly assist, will they please do so now.

The meeting rose at 12.40 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 40

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.40 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/18

Twenty-fourth-Session

COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième -session

COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones

COMISION II

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

DIX-HUITIEME SÉANCE

18ª SESION

(23 November 1987)

The Eighteenth Meeting was opened at 14.50 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La dix-huitième séance est ouverte à 14 h 50, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 18 sesión a las 14.50 horas, bajo la presidencia
de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

16. Review of Field Programmes (continued)

16. Examen des programmes de terrain (suite)

16. Examen de los programas de campo (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary advises the Chair that we now have a quorum and can proceed on business. The Chair will observe that consistent with practice we are 25 minutes late and we will be going late this evening. We are towards the end and in order to make up time we may go very very late today and we may go very very late tomorrow. We would suggest that one way to avoid going too late tomorrow would be to be on time tomorrow morning.

Zbigniew KARNICKI (Poland): Like other delegations which have spoken so far during the discussion of the topic in hand, Poland attaches great importance to the FAO Field Programme since this Programme is closely linked to and receives feedback from the Regular Programme activities. We also see the Field Programme as an expression of international solidarity and commitment to work together and to solve acute global problems in an increasingly inter-dependent world. The document C 87/4 which we are discussing now is a comprehensive and a very good one. We wish to congratulate the Secretariat for its preparation and we also appreciate the excellent way Mr Lignon has introduced this document to this Commission.

The Polish delegation shares the pertinent and thoughtful remark on the importance and orientation of the Field Programme in the Director-General's statement to the Plenary session on 9th November. This delegation supports efforts of FAO to enhance further cooperation with countries and international organizations in increasing both resources for and the effectiveness of Field Programme activities. In our view the findings and conclusions of the document C 87/4 and statements made during this debate are of value not only to FAO but also to the Member Governments, United Nations agencies as well as countries and institutions concerned with aid and technical cooperation programmes thus permitting better coordination of these activities. In this connection the Polish delegation notes with appreciation that a comprehensive and integrated field project information and monitoring system will become operational during the next biennium. It should help a lot in current management of FAO activities in the field projects. It is not possible to make comments on such a broad document in such a short time, and therefore I wish to limit myself to just a few remarks which I consider to be the most important.

We particularly appreciate very frank and sober comments and evaluation of project performance carried out by FAO country representatives. Their assessment comes from the front Line - if we can use this military term. These findings should, therefore, be studied thoroughly and conclusions drawn and appropriately applied.

The Polish delegation notes with appreciation the fact that project evaluations - made by independent evaluation missions have been strengthened and new improved procedures implemented. However, performances of evaluating missions have to be still improved and it is worrying the fact that 27 percent of the total evaluation reports have produced recommendations which were not supported by adequate analysis (see paragraph 2.47). It goes without saying that implementation of such recommendations may have a serious negative impact on future project performance.

We tend to agree, with the assertions made in the evaluation chapter with regard to the final analysis that the motivation and dedication of the international and local staff involved in a project, and their understanding and cooperation is the major, if not the most important factor, together with planning, which determines what a project can or cannot achieved.

With reference to Chapter 4 - the Changing Nature of Field Activities - the Polish delegation would be satisfied if the future priorities of field activities were to be spelt out in a clear way. We

feel that to define the priorities clearly will help us utilize available resources in a better and more efficient manner.

I should like to highlight a few other brief comments on the Field Programme. First, in our opinion, the TCP is vital for the FAO Activities Programme. This is a programme which can respond quickly to requests for urgent assistance and we found it extremely important, knowing particularly that the approval procedure for trust fund projects is very often lengthy. Secondly, as regards training, we consider this element as the best long-term investment. We urge FAO, therefore, to further expand this element in its field programmes. For our part, we offer training opportunities which exist in Poland, particularly in the area of agriculture and fisheries.

The amount of expertise available in developing countries is growing continuously. My delegation is in full agreement with the comment made by the distinguished representative of Colombia regarding the increased use of national experts and institutions in the implementation of FAO field programmes as a means to link this programme more effectively with the recipient countries' needs, thus ensuring a quicker implementation. What is most important is the continuation of necessary activities after the termination of the FAO project.

Thirdly, we wish to encourage FAO in the continued expansion of TCDC and ECDC approaches. In our opinion TCDC is of particular importance in applied research programmes and the implementation of the results. Our delegation notes with satisfaction the expansion of TCDC initiatives in Africa, the Near East and recently in the Caribbean. In the area of ECDC (given the present financial constraints in the developing countries) our delegation sees some achievements. The best example of success in this area (though not mentioned in this Review of Field Programmes) is the Regional Fish Marketing Information Service for Asia, an FAO project which recently became an inter-governmental organization funded by cash contributions from participating countries and from its own income. Its activities involve the use of experts from developing countries.

Finally, in the time of economic constraints all over the world coordination of field project activities between all donor countries and institutions involved, it is essential to avoid the duplication of activities and the waste of scarce resources. Therefore our delegation wishes to recommend strongly that this matter should obtain the attention it deserves in the implementation of FAO field programmes.

CHAIRMAN: The next speaker will be Denmark, but to ensure that the speakers this afternoon are not speaking to a distinct minority, we are going to have a quorum roll call. I will ask the Secretariat to read the names of all the countries so we can establish if we have one third of member countries here. We *are* not going to conduct business in which more than two thirds of the member countries do not participate. The rules state a quorum for discussion is one third. We will now have a roll call.

Roll Call

Appel Nominal

Apelación Nominal

CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum.

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): Trends in the world economy during the past years have not improved the outlook for developing countries. Add to this that the total net resource flow to developing countries fell in 1986 in real terms. In such a situation it becomes even more important that the resources flowing to developing countries are optimally spent. Decisive action concerning priorities in and coordination of basic elements in agricultural development policies need to be taken into account when assessing the feasibility of projects in order to ensure an effective project implementation. During the past years FAO seems to have lost sight of this very important aspect of

its activity. increasingly, projects seem to be planned in a sort of vacuum. In most cases they are technically sound, but often they are identified, prepared and implemented without the necessary consideration to the overall political framework including the country programmes worked out by UNDP. Some projects appear over-ambitious, without due consideration to the conditions in the recipient country and the donor resources. A strengthening of FAO's activities towards policy issues is therefore necessary, also in the context of field programmes, in order to enable FAO to place the concrete project in a coherent agricultural policy and overall development framework in the individual developing countries. This does of course not imply that FAO should not continue formulating and implementing projects. But we would like to emphasize that these projects should be of an innovative nature based upon the eminent technical expertise in FAO encompassing the research and analysis which is undertaken by the Organization. This is important to DANIDA as we would like to continue to see FAO also as a widening of our own resource base which we can draw upon in our bilateral development efforts in the developing countries.

Allow me to turn to the financial situation in FAO over the past years. For some time the Trust Fund section in the Field Programme has been steadily growing whereas the UNDP-Funded Share has been decreasing. The report before the Conference on the field programmes shows however that the UNDP Share is now growing. Denmark welcomes this trend. It is a positive development reflecting the improved resource position of the UNDP which Denmark, together with other countries, considers the main funding agency of the UN systems development activities. This could eventually lead to a decrease in the need for future Trust Fund financing. We have noted with satisfaction that allocations to field projects in Africa after a period of stagnation in the biennium 1984-85 increased to 40 percent of the total. My delegation welcomes an expected additional increase of 5 percent during the period 1986-87. This trend should be further strengthened considering the growth in activities due to increased UNDP funds. It seems to be possible without cutting the nominal aid to other geographical parts of the world. We do not want to see a fixed low limit for Africa. We would however like to underline that recently in a World Bank context the donors agreed to a percentage for Africa of 40 to 50 percent. Let me also mention that the Danish Aid to Africa equals 60 percent of the total bilateral development assistance.

According to the report the main project component is still personnel although declining as it should be. At the same time a shift from long-term to short-term consultants is on the way. More and more developing countries wish to increase the use of national experts. This is a healthy development which must be encouraged, although at the same time an effective project implementation based on thorough local knowledge and professional competence must be ensured.

Once again FAO has appraised the quality of project activities. This assessment is based on reports from the FAO Country Representatives and evaluation reports with the aim of improving the field programme. My Delegation appreciates this effort, including the reporting on negative tendencies. , We would however have liked to see a more analytical approach to the development impact as stressed by Finland. The Report does not show drastic changes in the overall project performance although we would have preferred to note an upward trend instead of a recorded slight decrease. The FAO Representatives' judgements on the prospects for project follow-up is worrying. Adjustments are more pessimistic than earlier and are linked to budgetary problems in the developing countries over the recent years. The Danish Delegation feel once again obliged to stress that the reported low output of the least developed countries should not lead to cuts in FAO's activities in these countries.

The Danish Delegation welcomes the strengthening of FAO's Project Formulation and Evaluation Division which should enhance FAO's ability to learn from past experience. We would like to see this trend continue and at the same time stress that we find independent evaluations very important, as we said, in connection with the discussion on the Regular Programme.

Denmark attaches great importance to two aspects of development - that of environment and that of women. Denmark supports FAO's efforts in these areas. One must insistently point to the importance of environmental considerations when dealing with development issues. When assessing new projects the inclusion of the concept of sustainable development as defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development, in its report published early this year, is supported fully by my Delegation.

Concerning the "women in development" issue we want to stress the necessity of increased emphasis on the impact of women on project activities at all steps in the project cycle. So far specific women's activities have dominated FAO's approach to women and development. Denmark hopes that FAO will feel encouraged to pursue and increase the Organization's efforts to integrate women in development aspects in the projects and programmes, in the light of this discussion in Commission I on the progress report on WCARRD and the Nordic resolution on the FAO activities related to the integration of women in development which was adopted last Thursday.

Saiim SARRAF (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le Secrétariat qui nous a présenté un document très intéressant sur l'Examen du programme de terrain 1986-87. Tout cela nous a donné des informations et une analyse des programmes de terrain et de l'Organisation.

Je voudrais remercier tout particulièrement M. Lignon qui nous a présenté une introduction fort claire.

Ma délégation voudrait dire combien elle est satisfaite de ces programmes de terrain dans leur ensemble. Nous nous sommes attachés particulièrement au Chapitre III de cet examen qui porte sur l'assistance fournie par la FAO aux pays et gouvernements dans la planification des politiques. Les projets dans ce domaine sont d'une importance capitale pour mon pays qui a récemment bénéficié d'un projet concernant la relance ou la remise en état des structures du Ministère de l'agriculture, compte tenu des circonstances difficiles dans lesquelles le Liban se trouve placé en ce moment.

Je voudrais souligner tout particulièrement le rôle du Programme de coopération technique qui nous a permis d'avoir des activités d'investissement. Le PCT a été particulièrement utile et actif.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de faire une longue intervention. Nous avons fort peu de temps à notre disposition et nous sommes bien en retard par rapport à notre calendrier. Je voudrais toutefois insister sur la nécessité d'accroître la capacité des pays en développement pour qu'ils puissent eux-mêmes résoudre leurs problèmes. Il faut également de plus en plus faire appel aux experts locaux pour qu'ils participent aux projets et aux programmes. Cela va dans le sens objectif des pays en développement pour accroître leurs possibilités de résoudre leurs propres problèmes.

Vaclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): First I would like to congratulate the Assistant Director-General on a comprehensive introduction. My Delegation appreciates how well prepared and easy to survey document. C 87/4 and C 87/LIM/20 are, and attaches the highest value to the suggestion of the trend and the expected future development of the FAO Field Programmes. We believe that the projects and other operating activities in the field are among the major links of the Organization's work, as for the development of agriculture production, forestry and fisheries in the developing countries. What we also appreciate is that the document analyses the causes and implications of the economic development of the countries of the developing world in the past period, and the influence of this development on agriculture. It must be stated that under the present conditions FAO activities in the developing countries have a growing importance in overcoming the internal and external obstacles to the development of agriculture and the foodstuff industry.

It is generally known that the sums of UNDP money provided for the development of the agriculture sector have decreased considerably and that this has of course also affected the joint FAO UNDP projects. According to information contained in the document of the Fourth UNDP Programme Cycle 1987 - 1991, some increase of UNDP's contribution to the projects implemented through FAO can now be expected.

In our view it is essential that this should be exercised effectively and therefore we propose that the effectiveness of the evaluation service be enhanced in all stages of field projects. We consider it necessary that the UNDP contribution to the agriculture sector should be increased. Although good results have been achieved, extraordinary attention has to be paid to developing agriculture and food production, especially in Africa and some other developing countries outside the African continent where the situation is particularly complicated. It is Czechoslovakia's interest that the proportions of the developing countries should be improved in regard to participation of their

experts, consultants and institutions in the implementation of FAO's field programmes. Czechoslovakia's proportion is too low and does not correspond to the high quality and long traditions of its technical institutions. The possibilities of training and education at universities, research institutes and other such institutions are also used insufficiently: hence there are considerable resources remaining in the cooperation between Czechoslovakia and the FAO. We believe strongly that they will be utilized in the implementation of the first programme cycle of the UNDP. In this context, we are ready also to discuss the use of our country's accumulated contribution to the UNDP international currency in order that FAO could use it for strengthening new programmes, implemented in favour of the developing countries. Although Czechoslovakia will not receive UNDP technical assistance from 1988 onwards, we are still interested in being involved in the regional programmes of the UNDP.

Usama AL-BIBEISI (Jordan) (original language Arabic): At the outset, my delegation would like to thank the Secretariat for the commendable effort exerted in the preparation of document C 87/4, which indicates clearly the field programmes of the Organization. However, it is worthy of note, regarding these programmes and especially the present budget expenditures on field programmes, especially in Table 4.1, that research is given only 1 percent of the total reserve allocations and these allocations were stagnant for the two years 1984-85 and 1986-87. This is a cause of concern. It indicates that the efforts are modest in order to increase the research capabilities of beneficiary countries. In this respect I should like to support what was said by the representative of France as regards research and extension work. Secondly, my delegation believes there is some vagueness in relation to Table 1.4 as regards crops. Did it include also research on these commodities, and what is the difference between this item which has got the lion's share and the one relating to research? We should like to have clarification about that from the Secretariat.

Thirdly, it is also noted while analysing the expenditure for field programme 1.5 that a high proportion of expenditures are related to consultants. This has reached 35 percent of the total expenditures. Noting that this percentage in the programmes implemented by the Secretariat was not better, training was given in only 9 percent, and that shows this is not given due care in spite of its paramount importance in building the self-capability of beneficiary countries. This has been a criticism in respect of bilateral contacts but if this is also the approach to be followed in the field programmes of the Organization, this is really strange. We hope the Organization will review the approach not only to cut down the expenditures but also to support training and to avail itself of domestic capabilities in order to cut down expenditures and support the Organization and to make it really competitive vis à vis the bilateral contracting.

Poonsup PIYA-ANANT (Thailand): Our delegation would like to express our admiration for the work spent in preparing the document and its outstanding presentation concerning the Review of Field Programmes. We further notice that the various points contained in the document C 87/4 spell out useful information, conceptual framework and systematic approach to monitoring and evaluation. We are especially happy and impressed by the intended arrangement of the very important aspect of the food programmes, as stated in Chapter 3 of the document. This is of the utmost help in building up the capacity of the organizations which provide assistance and those of the recipient countries in the preparation of a sound policy, food programming and budgeting for fruitful field programmes. This endeavour should be given high priority and genuine application so that it can be realized and to make certain that such planning and budgeting preparation will not appear only on paper, as have some other efforts we have seen. We must see to it that they are actually put into operation.

In the documents, sectoral and sub-sectoral policy and planning support for field programmes are given high priority. In this connection we would like to add some new dimension in order to activate the real achievements of the field projects and programmes. It is our view that multi-sectoral perspectives and policy, planning, programming and budgeting as an integrated approach should be added to the originally stated conceptual framework of sectoral and sub-sectoral planning. This is because in the actual implementation of field programmes we usually have found that if not enough attention is given to multi-sectoral aspects some projects or programmes are vulnerable and do not give satisfactory outputs and inputs, as intended.

Various sectors usually come into important close linkages and integration and they mostly engulf agriculture, education, health, agro-industry, public utilities employment and social sector aspects. Therefore, in designing and preparing the poverty area programmes for identifying poverty-stricken areas, we have embodied such multi-sectoral approaches with satisfactory results in co-attainment after we found out that certain sub-sectoral methods had not sufficiently facilitated sound implementation of field programmes. We would therefore recommend that a multi-sectoral approach be part of the policy planning and budgeting endeavour for field programmes.

ZHU PEIRONG (China) (original language Chinese): First allow me to express my gratitude to the Secretariat for the preparation of such a well covered document, C 87/4. I should like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks on the contents of the document. First, the field programme is a very important means for realizing the objective of FAO in promoting the development of the world economy and ensuring freedom from hunger. The steady growth of field programmes is very significant for FAO in assisting member countries to develop their food production and for world food security through increased production. We are pleased to note that the resources used for field programmes have been growing in the past few years. With US\$ 315 million in 1986, expenditures in 1986 were up by 8 percent over 1985. Though that did not reach the record level set in 1981 that was a considerable increase after continuous decline for several years. It is gratifying that in 1986 the UNDP's share in FAO's field programme expenditure increased for the first time since 1981. As the United Nations system is a major supporting agency, and UNDP is the channel for a cycle with an improved financial status, the total delivery for FAO/UNDP projects is expected to go up in the coming biennium. All this is significant in favour of the developing countries facing serious food shortages and agricultural problems, particularly those whose economies and technical developments rely on external assistance to a certain extent.

I should like to refer to the FAO Trust Funds. We are happy to note its continuing growth for years on end. In 1986 it reached US\$ 151 million, which accounted for about 54 percent of the expenditures of field projects funded by extra-budgetary resources. This clearly shows the confidence of both the donors and the recipients of FAO's ability to apply its expertise to the execution of the high priority technical assistance and cooperation projects. We hope that FAO will make further efforts in this respect.

Secondly, we have noted that FAO, bearing in mind the geographical distribution of field projects and resources, is focused on Africa. While identifying project coverage and components, it has laid stress on the production of food crops. Meanwhile the funds for the role of development have increased significantly both in terms of absolute value and its share. Allocations for programmes in natural resources, forestry and fisheries have also increased. We support all these initiatives. Furthermore, we very much appreciate the fact that in FAO/UNDP field projects the expenditure for the personnel component was reduced to 55 percent in 1986 from 63 percent in 1984: that was the share of equipment purchased restored to 24 percent from 18 percent in 1984.

At the two previous Conferences, the Chinese delegation drew the Secretariat's attention to the share of equipment in the total fund delivery. In fact the equipment assistance has proved to be practical to those developing countries which are short of funds and lagging behind in technology. Due to the great efforts made by FAO, the continuing decline of the equipment share has been brought under control and has now begun to increase. We hope that such a trend will continue and be consolidated.

Thirdly, with appreciation we have noted the viewpoint repeatedly mentioned in the report that the ultimate goal of the technical cooperation between FAO and developing countries is to help the recipient countries to realize self-reliance in their process of development. Our Government has always held that development of agricultural production is a fundamental way for eliminating poverty and food deficits, and adhered to the policy that external assistance should be accompanied by national efforts for self-reliance. In this connection, a number of measures have been taken by FAO, such as (1) paying more attention to intelligence development, particularly women's training, in order to improve the developing countries' ability of self-reliance. As a result, some 6 000 to 7 000 people are being trained annually through various kinds of training activities, totaling 500 000 people since 1980: (2) making every possible use of national experts and agencies to manage the implementation of field projects, for which 45% of field project experts are from developing countries, and agencies of developing countries cover 57% of the total number of executing agencies: (3) promoting TCDC and ECDC activities. We commend FAO for its efforts and we hope that such efforts will be strengthened in the future.

Fourthly, the unsatisfactory aspects of field projects execution mentioned in paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 have aroused our great concern. We hope that FAO will make further efforts to improve assistance planning and coordination. In planning the activities of field programmes, consideration should be given both to the consistency of its direction, key points and strategic objectives and to the characteristics and specific conditions of recipient countries.

Coordination at Headquarters level, such as between FAO and UNDP, FAO and other UN agencies, and coordination at the national level should also be strengthened so that all kinds of assistance activities can supplement one another.

Expenditure for field projects should be open to the greatest extent possible in order to help member countries know more details about the field projects and enable them to make their proposals in this regard. We believe that the ideas mentioned above will be helpful in raising the efficiency of field projects.

China is a developing country with a large population and agriculture is a dominating factor in its economy. In the past few years, China has received active support from FAO in getting assistance from the Organization and other international agencies and in providing assistance to other countries. Most of the direct and indirect assistance projects of FAO to China have achieved tangible results and have to some extent helped to promote the development of our rural economy, food and agriculture production. All these achievements are inseparable from FAO's assistance and the hard work of all the foreign experts invited to China.

Here I would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the agencies concerned and wish to maintain the fine and close cooperation with FAO.

Pedro OYARCE YURASZECK (Chile): Permítame, en primer término, agradecer a la Secretaría por la preparación del documento C 87/4 en el cual se analiza y evalúa los niveles, tendencias y los resultados de las actividades operacionales de la FAO. Deseamos también expresar nuestro reconocimiento al Sr. Lignon por su completa presentación.

Los programas de campo constituyen un instrumento esencial de la cooperación multilateral en la búsqueda de mecanismos que contribuyan a resolver las dificultades complejas que deben enfrentar los países en desarrollo en el ámbito de la alimentación, la agricultura y la pesca. Estos programas consolidan las instituciones locales, ayudan a la investigación, capacitación y desarrollo y exponen nuevas tecnologías.

Mi delegación en su intervención en relación al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1988/89 tuvo oportunidad de referirse detalladamente a los esfuerzos de la Organización en orden a destinar mayores recursos a la cooperación, al objeto de contribuir a erradicar el hambre, la desnutrición y a favorecer la seguridad alimentaria como un concepto amplio a través de las prioridades fijadas por los propios Estados Miembros dentro del marco del programa ordinario. La filosofía del programa regular, de carácter general y de perspectiva más a largo plazo, en términos de doctrinas y práctica es diferente a los programas de campo. Estos últimos responden a necesidades puntuales de impacto directo. Sin perjuicio de los programas de campo, no deben en modo alguno desvincularse de las funciones de apoyo técnico de la Organización.

Ai respecto, conviene tener presente que la FAO es una agencia técnica que dispone de una larga y valiosa experiencia, la cual debe utilizarse en beneficio de fórmulas que estimulen la autosuficiencia del sector agropecuario en los países en desarrollo.

La estructura de los programas de campo ha evolucionado considerablemente en cuatro decenios. La asistencia técnica de la FAO es valiosa. Sin perjuicio de la diversidad de necesidades de los beneficiarios se percibe que un número importante de países han alcanzado ya una etapa de desarrollo en la que sólo se requiere de la Organización, principalmente, insumos a corto plazo y altamente especializados.

La diversificación de los fondos destinados a proyectos de campo ha aumentado la capacidad de la FAO para responder a las necesidades de los países en desarrollo aplicando un método flexible de manejo de proyectos.

Respecto al Capítulo I, párrafo 12, Tendencias actuales y perspectivas, vemos con satisfacción que los recursos del PNUD muestran un aumento considerable de fondos para el cuarto ciclo quinquenal 1987/91.

Esto refleja la prioridad que los gobiernos conceden al sector agrícola, en el marco de las cifras indicadas de planificación. Por ello, sería apropiado que la Conferencia recomiende la necesidad de dar prioridad a este sector a nivel gubernamental.

En cuanto al párrafo 1.29 y 1.30 del mismo capítulo, en relación al PCT, nuestra Delegación desea expresar su satisfacción con este mecanismo que ha mostrado eficacia en la atención rápida y cobertura dinámica de las necesidades de los Países Miembros en áreas puntuales de acción.

Hemos tomado nota con agrado que el 15 por ciento de estos recursos han sido asignados a proyectos de la región latinoamericana y del Caribe. Confiamos que a pesar de las limitaciones financieras, esa tendencia pueda mantenerse e incluso aumentarse.

En el punto 1.30 se observa que el costo de los proyectos PCT es aproximadamente de 75 000 dólares. Nuestra Delegación estima que en vista de los costos administrativos involucrados en el manejo de estos proyectos, convendría cuando sea apropiado reflexionar sobre la posibilidad de que este valor medio sea incrementado.

Hemos tomado nota con satisfacción de la aprobación reciente de dos proyectos que benefician a mi país. Uno sobre el control integrado de la mosca del mediterráneo, utilizando la técnica del insecto estéril, y otro de capacitación en métodos y técnicas modernas de esquila.

Con respecto a los párrafos 1.37, 1.38 y 1.39 de este Capítulo, referente a la distribución geográfica de las asignaciones a los proyectos de campo, lo que incluye diversas fuentes de financiamiento, lamentamos observar en los Cuadros 1.3 y 1.4, que la tendencia de los gastos destinados a estos proyectos en la región latinoamericana y del Caribe, continúa su tendencia decreciente. Sin embargo, es interesante recordar que en numerosos casos los proyectos son ejecutados por expertos y consultores locales. Al respecto esperamos que la tendencia del 45 por ciento que refleja el cuadro del Documento, sea incrementada. Este hecho hace disminuir la asignación global de los proyectos para la región. Tal situación no debería en ningún caso prejuzgar la atención de la Organización a los recursos y requerimientos que se destinen a la zona latinoamericana y del Caribe.

En cuanto al Capítulo segundo punto 2.1, mi Delegación considera positiva las funciones realizadas por el Servicio de Evaluación, dentro de los parámetros de los mecanismos de cooperación del Sistema de Naciones Unidas, donde se percibe una clara tendencia a incluir el componente evaluativo como un instrumento básico para una adecuada implementación y seguimiento de proyectos.

Este instrumento reviste particular relevancia en las actividades de campo en la búsqueda de una mayor eficacia en la aplicación de los programas de campo.

En cuanto al Capítulo tercero, mi Delegación ve con interés la acción de la Organización y estima apropiadas las conclusiones de la Sección E. Nos parece necesario, sin embargo puntualizar los siguientes aspectos: Primero: la asesoría en la formulación de políticas agrícolas orientándose hacia las fuerzas del mercado, procurando evitar caer en subsidios a la producción y/o exportación, así como buscar una mayor liberalización. Segundo: promover políticas de fomento a la inversión sectorial. Tercero: estimular políticas que garanticen la descentralización y regionalización. Cuarto: Fortalecimiento de la Asesoría Técnica en la fase de elaboración y evaluación de proyectos, y Quinto: apoyo técnico en el mejoramiento del proceso de comercialización hacia mecanismos más transparentes.

En relación al capítulo cuarto, mi Delegación sólo desea limitarse a compartir el enfoque de esa Sección, en especial las ideas contenidas en los párrafos 4.11 y 4.12 y en los aspectos vinculados a la evolución de la administración y operaciones de los proyectos. Nos parece importante enfatizar las actividades gubernamentales en la fase de ejecución de proyectos, así como la capacitación y las redes nacionales de transferencia de tecnología. En el caso de Latinoamérica y el Caribe, se percibe con claridad el componente de gestión nacional.

Por otra parte, es interesante destacar el rol de la mujer en este marco, ello refleja un nivel de implementación valioso a las preocupaciones contempladas en la Estrategia fijada en la Conferencia de Nairobi.

Por otra parte, las labores de apoyo a los programas de campo proporcionada por el Centro de Inversiones, en materia de preparación de proyectos de desarrollo que puedan contar con recursos de inversiones de las agencias internacionales de financiamiento, constituyen un aporte real a la solución de los problemas agropecuarios en America Latina y el Caribe.

En este contexto, creemos sería valioso poder ampliar esta acción en nuestra región a través de la reanudación de la cooperación entre Centros de Inversiones y el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID).

Los programas de campo constituyen una actividad importante en la acción de la FAO estrechamente vinculados en algunos aspectos, al Programa ordinario. Confiamos que, también, por el conducto de ese Programa, la Organización continúe contribuyendo a la evaluación global del sector agrícola, forestal y pesquero, como una manera de responder a las necesidades crecientes y diversas de los países en desarrollo que aspiran a un orden económico y social mas equitativo.

Temei Iskit, Vice-Chairman of Commission II, took the Chair.

Temei Iskit, Vice-Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence.

Ocupa la presidencia Temei Iskit, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II.

CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate from Chile and before I give the floor to the delegate from Australia who is the next speaker, I want to express my gratitude to the General Committee of this Conference who kindly nominated me as one of the Vice-Chairmen of this Commission. I want, of course, also to express my thanks to all the delegates of this Commission and of the Conference who were good enough to accept me as one of the Vice-Chairmen and I want also to say that it is a pleasure for me to second as Vice-Chairman the Chairman of our Commission, Mr Eckert. I would also like to welcome Mr Lignon among us, the Assistant Director-General of the Development Department, whose presence no doubt will be of great assistance in our work. With these few words I want to give the floor to the delegate of Australia.

Angus Edward MACDONALO (Australia): May I be one of the first to congratulate you on your appointment to the Chair.

In many ways the Field Programme activities are the external face which FAO offers in developing countries. In total value each year the Programme represents expenditures one half as large again as the Regular Programme. To this extent the efficiency and effectiveness of the various activities discharged under the Programme can play a decisive role in promoting agricultural development and alleviating hunger in recipient countries. To this end we consider that greater external evaluation of the Field Programme activities would be to the benefit of FAO. Most other publicly funded agencies have periodic external or peer review, and FAO's Field Programmes should do the same on a regular basis. Having said this we commend the range of external reviews conducted and support the strengthening of the evaluation service within FAO to conduct better monitoring and evaluation.

The Australian delegation notes the concentration of FAO projects in Africa, 44 percent versus Asia and the Pacific 23 percent. The report, however, says little about the South Pacific or Papua New Guinea. In reference to planning for assistance in fisheries development. On page 92 of the document, no mention is made of the South Pacific, yet this is a most important activity for the region.

The summary of project assessments by FAO representatives indicated that there was a high correlation between successful projects and good management. At the same time concern was expressed about the ability of extension services to extend benefits to the wider community. These observations, to our mind, reinforce the need for ongoing and external evaluations and in the second case for more training and extension in certain agricultural projects. We would note that experience with our own bilateral aid activities have revealed similar trends.

The report advises that in the last two or three years recipient governments have experienced considerable problems in allocating resources, both financial and expertise, to development projects, mainly in Africa. This is often due to changed economic situations and the need for revision of project budget durations and project rates of return. The Australian delegation appreciates the problems experienced by recipient countries in allocating sufficient resources for development projects but points out that often this can be interpreted as an indication of the priorities those governments apply to the particular projects. We consider that some of the problems which the report draws to our attention would be overcome, or at least eased, by the introduction of the Swiss proposal to establish a Field Programme Committee to oversight proposed activities. This would better ensure that Field Programme activities are coordinated with overall national development strategies while enhancing the confidence of donors, both existing and new, to provide trust funds.

Finally, Australia supports FAO's general policy framework as described in the document.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKÍ (Egypt) (original language Arabic): Having studied this subject my country wishes to recommend caution in studying the operational activities of the Organization in order to guarantee the efficacy of the Field Programmes, whatever the problem of the Organization may come up against when preparing these programmes. We would like to pay homage to the Organization for its activities in order to improve this study.

Paragraphs 1.1 to 1.3 highlight the very serious problems faced by developing countries within this framework and we should like to compliment the Organization for its efforts in this context, as explained in paragraphs 1.4. Having studied paragraphs 1.12 to 1.15 and on the UNDP-supported programmes, we notice that these programmes have fluctuated as registered in Table 1.2.

We note in paragraph 1.12 that the means and scope for these programmes have improved. We would request the Organization to play its role in the most complete manner and as regards the programmes supported by the UNDP Board, we want to ensure that these programmes are efficaciously implemented. It has been stressed that these programmes have 54 percent of the resources from trust funds in this respect. We should like to express our approval in the terms of paragraph 1.14.

Now turning to 1.21 and 1.28, the Organization's efforts in this respect have increased. As regards granting loans to various countries, my country thinks the Technical Cooperation Programme is extremely important. It has a very positive impact on agricultural programmes. That is why we would point out that we were particularly pleased to see that the allocations to this Programme, referred to in 1.29 have increased. We appreciated the fact that 24 percent of these allocations went to Africa and we note with pleasure that priority was given, in paragraph 1.34, to harvesting and crop problems. We also notice that developing countries are receiving more and more inputs within this same framework, enabling them to better administer the programmes in these countries.

We are also pleased to note what we see in 1.27 to 1.30. Appraisal and evaluation should cover all projects and concentrate on those which are faced with certain difficulties. We should not forget that we should praise the evaluation carried out by the Organization in 1987-88 enabling us to know what are the weak points in the implementation of these programmes. This enables us to plan better working methods for the years to come. Proper evaluation and analysis of the various policies, along with training, are the keystones of the effective technical assistance, of great value to the recipient countries. We would like to stress the important role played by the Organization in providing this assistance, shown in paragraphs 3.19 to 3.121. Chapter Four refers to evaluations in field activities. We are particularly appreciative of the work done in Africa in order to satisfy the various requirements of the countries concerned here. Paragraphs 4.2 to 4.7 show that there is improved coordination and cooperation between the countries concerned. Also in 4.9 and 4.13 we also note the stress given to training, as we see in 4.15 and 4.19. We are particularly interested in the new dimensions approved by various United Nations agencies as we see in paragraph 4.28. It is proposed that we use local experts for the limitation of field programmes and we should also ask the governments to get involved in the management, as we see in 4.31, 4.32 and 4.33.

We also support everything that is said in this document as regards expanding economic ECDC. This is a very important subject for my country. My country, which has already in the past expressed its support for this Programme, a very important Programme, a Programme which serves the interests of the developing countries. We would welcome all countries within the framework of this Programme.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Je voudrais tout d'abord vous dire combien nous sommes heureux de vous voir présider cette réunion. Je voudrais également dire l'intention du Président de la Commission II que si je n'étais pas présent au moment où mon pays fut appelé ce matin en deuxième ou troisième place, c'est parce que nous nous trouvons en Commission III à discuter de la reconstitution du compte de réserve spécial. Et je voudrais quand même attirer votre attention sur le fait qu'il est parfois difficile pour les petites délégations d'être à la fois présentes en Commission première et dans les travaux des différentes Commissions.

Nous tenions à intervenir sur les programmes de terrain parce que mon pays a ces programmes particulièrement à coeur, et que nous apportons notre appui à ce programme qui est un programme dynamique et en expansion.

Nous avons eu l'occasion à plusieurs reprises de souligner que les programmes de terrain doivent être considérés, comme les compléments indispensables au niveau opérationnel du Programme ordinaire. Il y a une articulation étroite entre le Programme ordinaire et le Programme de terrain; et le Programme de terrain est d'une importance toute particulière. Il revêt bien sûr des facettes diverses.

Nous ne négligeons certainement pas les études sectorielles et sous-sectorielles entreprises par la FAO, ni le rôle indispensable de conseiller de la FAO concernant les politiques auprès des gouvernements. Nous croyons également que la FAO doit avoir sa place - avec une participation active - dans les différentes tables rondes du PNUD et des groupes consultatifs de la Banque mondiale. Cette présence est non seulement souhaitable mais elle nous paraît indispensable.

Il est clair que le rôle de conseiller auprès des gouvernements ne peut être efficacement joué que par une présence active et de très bon niveau de la FAO dans les pays eux-mêmes. Nous avons approuvé la création de quatre nouveaux postes de représentants et nous insistons bien sûr sur la nécessité d'une bonne représentation, d'une représentation qualifiée de la FAO, dans l'ensemble des pays en voie de développement.

Je voudrais également dire, car nous avons une participation active dans ce domaine, que nous sommes satisfaits du déroulement des programmes des fonds fiduciaires avec la FAO que non seulement nous désirons les maintenir mais que nous désirons les voir se développer à l'avenir. Nous avons avec la FAO des réunions annuelles sur ces points. Les programmes doivent être appliqués avec souplesse et sans rigidité excessive. Et je crois que nos programmes de fonds fiduciaires peuvent parfaitement s'intégrer et épouser les grandes orientations des politiques et les grands programmes d'actions prioritaires dégagés par les organes directeurs de la FAO.

Un seul point me paraît peut-être quelque peu faible pour le moment, c'est l'aspect comptabilité - l'aspect comptes - des fonds fiduciaires. Je me suis laissé dire qu'un bureau de consultants s'occupait actuellement de la mise au point du service informatique. C'est incontestablement une des réformes, et peut-être une des bonnes réformes, à entreprendre dans l'organisation de la FAO que de veiller à ce qu'on puisse obtenir plus de renseignements sur ce plan de manière plus efficace; on a souvent parlé de transparence mais la transparence se réalise en réalité au niveau des budgets, au niveau de la comptabilité, au niveau de l'ordonnancement. Et je note là une certaine faiblesse des services administratifs.

Je crois que depuis de nombreux mois un bureau d'étude, que je ne citerai pas, s'occupe de ces problèmes. Je voudrais qu'il puisse très rapidement permettre aux organismes responsables de pouvoir fournir régulièrement les renseignements concernant non seulement les fonds fiduciaires mais l'ensemble des opérations de la FAO.

Je voudrais également citer - en disant que nous l'appuyons - le programme d'experts associés. Nous avons un nombre respectable d'experts associés belges, et nous sommes très satisfaits de la façon dont ce programme se déroule à l'heure actuelle. Je ne puis que féliciter et remercier les services administratifs de la façon très humaine, très souple et très opérationnelle avec laquelle on travaille dans ce secteur.

Je ne dirai pas grand chose du PCT ayant déjà eu l'occasion d'intervenir en ce qui concerne le Programme de coopération technique. Ce programme reçoit notre appui. Je crois que les critères du PCT sont clairs, précis, et que l'impact de tout ce programme est nettement plus important que le montant des ressources dont il dispose puisqu'il a un effet catalyseur et qui permet d'assurer le

financement d'un certain nombre de projets mis au point qui ne verraient pas le jour sans le PCT. Et je crois que ce serait au grand dam des pays en voie de développement.

Je crois que souligner cet aspect n'est pas nécessaire pour la bonne raison que la plupart, pour ne pas dire tous les pays qui ont bénéficié du programme du PCT, ont déclaré, redéclaré et assuré la FAO que ce programme était vraiment un succès. Je crois que ce sont ces pays qui sont le mieux à même d'apprécier la qualité du Programme de coopération technique.

On s'est parfois préoccupé du fait que les fonds en dépôt d'un certain nombre de pays étaient ou avaient dépassé les ressources du PNUD dans le Programme de terrain de la FAO. Il est clair que la part de la FAO, dans les dépenses de terrain du PNUD, qui avait chuté de 31 pour cent en 1972, à 19 pour cent en 1986, était particulièrement inquiétante. On peut actuellement noter une reprise et un progrès, mais il faut souhaiter que cette part remonte, à l'occasion du 4^{ème} cycle 1987-91, par une plus grande priorité donnée à l'agriculture et surtout en modérant la tendance du PNUD, par le biais du Bureau d'exécution des projets, à devenir lui-même organe d'exécution, en concurrence directe avec les agences spécialisées.

Il me paraît normal que les programmes d'agriculture du PNUD - et Dieu sait s'ils sont importants -soient assurés avec la FAO. C'est un problème qui doit être réglé et pour lequel nous avons tous une part de responsabilité car il se règle au niveau du Conseil d'administration du PNUD à New-York. Et je crois que tous les pays qui ont plaidé au Conseil d'administration du PNUD à New-York pour une meilleure action du PNUD et une meilleure intégration des activités du PNUD et de la FAO, doivent redire ce qu'ils avaient déclaré. Et je suis convaincu qu'on ne peut arriver qu'à un succès si les membres du Conseil d'administration du PNUD insistent pour que le PNUD n'exécute-pas lui-même ces projets mais qu'il travaille en collaboration avec la FAO dans le domaine de l'agriculture, car c'est en définitive le Conseil d'administration du PNUD qui doit tracer les grandes lignes d'orientation des activités - et Dieu sait si le PNUD dispose de moyens financiers dans ce domaines.

Telles sont les quelques réflexions que je voulais faire.

Je voudrais également dire aux fonctionnaires responsables de la FAO qu'ils ont une tâche - et ils le savent - particulièrement importante; et que nous avons toujours reçu chez eux un accueil très ouvert et très positif. Si je me suis permis cette remarque qui me paraît importante, non pas au sujet de la gestion des fonds mais de l'information et de la comptabilité, c'est parce que je note un point de faiblesse et que je suis convaincu qu'il pourra y être porté remède dans un très proche avenir. Je crois que c'est important.

Et je crois que les programmes de terrain, les fonds fiduciaires et les différentes facettes d'activité continueront à recevoir le soutien d'un bon nombre de pays, et .vous pouvez être assurés que mon pays, le Royaume de Belgique, en sera.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie beaucoup le distingué représentant, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de Belgique. Je remarque que le Représentant du Gabon est dans la salle et je lui donne volontiers la parole.

Bartélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): La délégation gabonaise voudrait féliciter le Secrétariat pour l'excellence des documents relatifs à l'Examen des programmes de terrain soumis à notre appréciation Elle se joint à d'autres délégations pour féliciter M. Lignon de la clarté et de la concision de l'exposé qui a été fait.

Ma délégation se félicite de l'accent qui a été mis sur le Programme de relèvement, de la production alimentaire et encourage la FAO à poursuivre son action d'aide d'urgence en faveur des pays sinistrés. Dans le chapitre premier, nous notons avec satisfaction la récente amélioration des ressources financières du PNUD et l'augmentation des fonds fiduciaires. Nous sommes en droit d'espérer que les activités de terrain pourront augmenter au cours du prochain biennium et nous profitons de l'occasion pour remercier les pays donateurs des efforts qu'ils réalisent malgré la crise.

En ce qui concerne les grandes catégories des programmes de terrain, la délégation gabonaise observe avec satisfaction que notre Organisation a mis un accent particulier sur l'amélioration des cultures, mais regrette toutefois que le secteur de l'élevage ait subi une importante réduction des fonds au cours du dernier biennium. Nous espérons, comme le disaient les délégations de l'Inde et du Pakistan lors des débats sur le Programme ordinaire, que le secteur de l'élevage sera considéré dans les années à venir comme un programme spécial au même titre que le Programme Agriculture.

Abordant les activités de notre Organisation à l'appui de l'investissement, ma délégation souhaiterait que dans ce domaine, la FAO, qui a déjà aidé l'UDEAC à formuler le projet de multiplication et de diffusion de bovins trypanotolérants de Moukalaba, continue à assister cette jeune organisation régionale et sous-régionale dans la recherche des financements auprès des bailleurs de fonds et dans l'organisation des rencontres de ces derniers avec l'UDEAC.

Ma délégation se félicite des mesures spécifiques destinées à promouvoir l'autosuffisance et l'information, cette dernière étant entendue non seulement comme perfectionnement du personnel d'encadrement, mais également comme devant permettre aux agriculteurs et petits exploitants, une meilleure réceptivité aux innovations; formation des cadres à évaluer et à planifier, à formuler et à gérer des projets sur le terrain.

Ma délégation est satisfaite des évaluations qui ont été faites par les consultants ou les représentants de la FAO.

Comme on peut le voir, beaucoup de projets ont connu des échecs, comme le montre le document à travers le constat de diminution de 60 à 40 pour cent de bons projets entre le biennium précédent et celui-ci. Ces échecs ont pour cause l'insuffisance dans les domaines évoqués plus haut. Malgré cette détérioration, nous notons avec satisfaction que 44 pour cent des activités de la FAO sont réalisées en Afrique. Cette charge devrait avoir pour corollaire la mise à disposition du Bureau régional de l'Afrique, des moyens lui permettant de faire face à ces suppléments de charge.

Dans ce chapitre, d'évaluation et de suivi des projets, ma délégation estime que la double évaluation donne une idée exacte de l'évolution des projets. Elle sert à mieux élaborer le document des nouveaux projets.

Toutefois, nous pensons que la planification et la conception de l'évaluation, si elles ont connu un certain intérêt, restent faibles car elles ne vont pas jusqu'à insister pour que les gouvernements mettent en place les infrastructures, les cadres et les crédits voulus en vue de continuer les différentes activités du projet à la cessation de l'assistance technique et financière.

Par ailleurs, nous avons noté une amélioration dans les rapports et la coopération interagences; et ma délégation recommanderait à la FAO de privilégier la coopération technique entre pays en développement.

Pour ce qui est de l'évaluation sectorielle, le projet de mécanisation agricole en Afrique a retenu notre attention. En effet, l'augmentation de la production agricole dans nos pays passe par une modernisation des exploitations agricoles. A notre avis, la mécanisation agricole devrait occuper une place de choix dans le processus de production et c'est pourquoi nous souhaiterions que la FAO nous aide à identifier et à formuler le projet de création d'un centre national de machinisme agricole.

Ma délégation est consciente de la crise financière qui secoue notre Organisation. C'est pourquoi elle remercie les pays membres donateurs des fonds fiduciaires dont nous apprécions l'importance dans la réalisation de nos programmes de développement agricole.

Les donateurs, de leur côté, ont la possibilité de vérifier l'utilisation des fonds mis à notre disposition par des missions sur le terrain par l'intermédiaire de consultants de haut niveau.

Avant de terminer, nous voudrions dire que nous sommes d'accord pour que l'on fasse davantage appel aux experts et institutions nationaux dans l'élaboration des projets. Nous appuyons tout ce qui est contenu dans le document C 87/4 et notamment les grandes lignes directrices des programmes de terrain.

René LONCAN (Brazil): During discussions on document C 87/4 on the occasion of the Ninety-second Session of the Council, my Delegation already expressed its approval of the Review of Field Programme 1986-87, even though remarking that notwithstanding a moderate increase achieved in the biennium, the field programmes are still much beyond desirable levels, especially considering the magnitude and complexity of the problems faced by developing countries. We much regret the small share of resources allocated to Latin America and the Caribbean from budgetary as well as from extra-budgetary funds, even though it is also noted that our region benefits from a range of TCDC activities under the TCP. In this line my Delegation wishes to support the statement contained in the report that TCDC and ECDC programmes both have an important multiplying effect in the expansion of the plan for technical assistance and cooperation among developing countries. We attentively followed the Information on the evolution of FAO Field Activities in view of the changing nature of the necessities of recipient countries and in that connection we would like at the same time to support and express our wish that the tendency be maintained towards an increasing number of national project professions. We also appreciated seeing a growing number of projects under direct government execution and we look forward to having this practice transformed in a permanent trend.

My Delegation cannot avoid making a special reference to the fact that a growing number of women are taking part in training programme, since this has been repeatedly remarked by many delegates in various fora in this Organization as desirable and important. Their participation in training activities is due to ensure the full achievement of the goals targeted in training and should continue to deserve attention in the future.

We wish also to reiterate our appreciation of the presentation, in Chapter 2 of the document, of the careful and detailed analysis and evaluation of 6 project examples. We recognize the efforts undertaken by FAO to improve the performance and efficiency of its field programmes through the strengthening of the evaluation service and we extend our support to further initiatives in this same line.

Concluding with the above remarks offered in the best spirit of collaboration and with the aim of suggesting some points which could enrich the effectiveness of the field programme in the next biennium, my Delegation conveys its support and approval of the Review of Field Programmes 1986-87.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): A l'instar des autres délégations, nous voudrions dire combien nous sommes heureux de vous voir présider la suite de nos travaux au sein de la Commission II.

Nous voudrions rappeler que nous sommes coprésentateur du mémoire présenté par les pays en développement qui va être examiné au titre du point 12, mémoire qui consacre une bonne place à la manière dont nous - avec les autres pays en développement - voulons voir l'avenir de l'Organisation, et plus particulièrement les programmes de terrain, ce qui va me permettre d'économiser un peu de temps. Je serai donc assez bref dans cette intervention, étant entendu que nous aurons l'occasion de nous déployer au titre du point 12.

C'est avec un vif intérêt que la délégation congolaise a procédé à l'examen minutieux du document traitant de cet important point de notre ordre du jour, à savoir l'Examen des programmes de terrain de la FAO. Nous estimons qu'en abordant cet examen, nous touchons par là même à l'un des maillons les plus importants qui contribuent au rayonnement de l'action de notre Organisation auprès du grand public des paysans, de ceux qui, à travers le monde, procurent à chacun son pain quotidien.

Notre délégation se félicite du récent redressement des allocations financières du PNUD aux programmes de terrain de la FAO, redressement qui va ainsi succéder à la légère baisse de ces derniers temps. Nous souhaitons vivement que cette tendance se maintienne et s'accroisse aussi longtemps que possible. Nous voulons d'ailleurs saisir cette occasion pour dire que nous faisons nôtres les considérations et avis émis tout à l'heure par la délégation de la Belgique concernant la nécessité d'intégrer la FAO dans le cadre des activités du programme et des bureaux d'exécution des projets du PNUD. Nous voulons également réitérer l'appel qu'elle a lancé pour que ce que nous disons ici au sujet de cette intégration soit répété au sein du Conseil d'administration du PNUD.

Bien que notre délégation ait une préférence plus marquée pour la coopération multilatérale, nous ne voyons pas pour autant d'un mauvais oeil l'existence de la coopération dite multi-bilatérale qui lie la FAO à certains gouvernements donateurs.

Notre délégation aimerait aussi saisir l'occasion qui lui est offerte par cette intervention pour dire combien elle apprécie l'ampleur et la qualité du travail auquel se livre le Centre d'investissement de la FAO, qui entretient par ailleurs une excellente coopération avec nombre d'agents de financement, dont le FIDA, les banques régionales de développement et la Banque mondiale.

Dans ce même ordre d'idées, nous nous félicitons du rôle joué par les représentations de la FAO dans les activités de préévaluation des requêtes destinées à l'évaluation par les gouvernements des Etats Membres. Nous avons pris note avec satisfaction des deux évaluations sectorielles dont l'une concerne la mécanisation avec le Gouvernement donateur de l'Italie et l'autre est consacrée au Programme Engrais avec le Gouvernement donateur des Pays-Bas. Nous appuyons la FAO dans ses efforts de réalisation des principales activités de ces différents programmes.

Notre délégation a enregistré avec satisfaction les récents changements opérés par la FAO pour tenir compte de l'évolution de la situation spécifique des pays en développement en vue du déploiement de programmes d'assistance techniques plus pragmatiques. Aussi, notre délégation apprécie-t-elle l'orientation des projets vers le développement des capacités nationales des pays bénéficiaires; et nous mettons l'accent également sur la CEPD et la CTPD. Nous incitons la FAO à poursuivre son action sans perdre de vue l'action de la Conférence des Nations Unies sur la réforme agraire et le développement rural, du Plan forestier tropical et de la Conférence mondiale sur les pêches.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): A mon tour, j'associe ma voix à celle des délégations qui m'ont précédé pour vous dire que ma délégation est heureuse de vous voir présider cette session très importante pour la vie de notre Organisation. Je tiens encore une fois à vous adresser toutes mes félicitations et à vous souhaiter plein succès.

Je me permets également d'adresser mes vives félicitations à M. Lignon pour sa brillante présentation du document C 87/4, "Examen des programmes de terrain", et au Secrétariat pour la préparation de cet important document.

Nous sommes satisfaits de constater une reprise dans les programmes de terrain de la FAO financés par le PNUD et nous espérons que les programmes soutenus par les fonds fiduciaires, qui nous intéressent particulièrement, continueront leur croissance. Nous voyons là le résultat des efforts constants que mène le Département du développement de la FAO pour répondre à nos requêtes et chercher activement à mobiliser les financements nécessaires.

A ce propos, je voudrais souligner le rôle essentiel que joue le représentant de la FAO pour faciliter la formulation, l'approbation et l'exécution des projets. Je tiens ici à m'associer à ce qu'a dit l'Ambassadeur de Belgique car pour nous, au Cap-Vert, le bureau de la FAO constitue un excellent conseiller du Gouvernement dans le domaine de la planification nationale de projets.

Plusieurs délégations ont parlé de la coordination des projets. Je voudrais, à ce propos, faire deux remarques que nous estimons très importantes. Tout en reconnaissant le rôle utile joué par le Coordonnateur Résident du PNUD, il me faut rappeler que la responsabilité de la coordination des projets et des diverses sources d'assistance au niveau national relève d'abord et avant tout de la souveraineté des gouvernements respectifs. Que cela soit clairement entendu dans cette salle. C'est aux gouvernements de juger des avantages comparatifs de telle ou telle agence d'assistance technique et d'associer leurs diverses contributions d'une manière optimale dans le cadre de leur politique et de leurs plans de développement, car chaque gouvernement a ses propres plans nationaux de développement.

C'est aussi à chaque gouvernement de décider des priorités de l'assistance technique qu'il reçoit. Il nous semble illusoire et même malsain d'imposer des priorités communes à l'ensemble des programmes de terrain de la FAO. Certes, il y a certains besoins qui sont semblables mais on ne peut pas réduire les activités de terrain de la FAO au plus petit dénominateur commun de ces besoins. On ne peut pas comparer les besoins et les priorités du Cap-Vert avec ceux de l'Inde ou du Brésil. Les programmes de terrain doivent donc rester flexibles et adaptables pour être réellement utiles à chaque pays. C'est justement à cause de sa flexibilité que le Programme de coopération technique jouit du soutien unanime des pays en voie de développement.

L'assistance à la planification nationale joue un rôle essentiel dans la détermination des priorités et des besoins d'assistance technique et d'aide à l'investissement. Le Cap-Vert est l'un des pays

qui en a bénéficié pour la préparation de la Table Ronde des donateurs, et ceci grâce au PCT. La FAO apporte ainsi une contribution unique dans le domaine agricole, non seulement par sa compétence, mais aussi par l'indépendance et l'objectivité de ses avis et conseils désintéressés pour orienter et mobiliser avec succès le soutien apporté par la communauté des donateurs aux priorités et aux plans de développement du pays, tel qu'indiqué au paragraphe 3.25 du document. Nous souhaitons d'ailleurs voir cette action se prolonger au niveau du renforcement des structures et du personnel de planification de façon à accroître les capacités nationales de planification et de coordination de l'aide internationale.

Dans le même esprit, la FAO apporte une aide, avec le soutien de l'Italie, à la coordination des divers types d'assistance à la vulgarisation agricole et à sa décentralisation. Grâce à ses compétences dans de multiples domaines, elle assure également une approche intégrée à la mise en oeuvre d'un plan de reboisement, de conservation des terres et des eaux et de développement des ressources fourragères. Ce projet, financé par un fonds fiduciaire de la Belgique, est pour nous un modèle d'intégration multidisciplinaire répondant aux besoins spécifiques du pays. Et je tiens aussi à remercier le Gouvernement belge de ce financement.

Je ne peux pas laisser passer cette occasion sans remercier le représentant des Pays-Bas pour le financement récent d'un important programme national de production et de multiplication des semences de pomme de terre, qui constitue pour le Gouvernement cap-verdien un atout important pour son autosuffisance et sa sécurité alimentaires.

J'espère, par ces quelques exemples, avoir montré qu'en ce qui nous concerne, les programmes de terrain de la FAO jouent un rôle stratégique dans l'identification de nos priorités et dans la formulation et la coordination de nos plans de développement, tout en répondant avec flexibilité à des besoins spécifiques.

Pour terminer, j'aimerais relever, dans l'Examen des programmes de terrain, un point particulièrement important pour le Cap-Vert. Il s'agit de l'assistance à la planification pour le développement des pêches - paragraphe 3.77 - et surtout des efforts déployés par l'Organisation pour aider les Etats cotiers à mieux exploiter leurs ressources halieutiques dans le cadre de leurs zones économiques, exclusives. Nous voudrions également souligner l'importance que revêt la valorisation des ressources humaines par la formation en cours d'emploi et tous autres programmes de formation de la FAO. Nous encourageons la FAO à recruter, comme cela figure au paragraphe 1.68, les experts des pays en développement, car nous pensons que cela va promouvoir la coopération technique et économique entre les pays en développement et la coopération régionale et sous-régionale.

Rodolphe de POURTALES (Suisse): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de vous féliciter pour votre élection et pour avoir accepté cette charge au pied levé.

Ma délégation aimerait remercier M. Llgnon de sa présentation très claire ainsi que pour la préparation du document C 87/4 qui présente le Programme de terrain dans sa complexité et son éventail très large - peut-être trop large - d'activités.

Tout comme d'autres délégations, et notamment celle de la Colombie, ma délégation s'inquiète de la diminution de la participation de la FAO au Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement. Les explications données dans le document au paragraphe 1.14 - à savoir que le PNUD utilise des organismes financiers comme la Banque mondiale et les banques régionales comme agences d'exécution - renforcent notre inquiétude.

En effet, si des institutions financières, dont la vocation primaire n'est pas l'exécution de projets mais leur financement, sont préférées à la FAO pour l'exécution de projets, ma délégation estime que l'esprit de coopération, à l'intérieur du système, atteint un niveau inquiétant et demande au Secrétariat quelles initiatives il compte prendre pour améliorer la collaboration avec les institutions financières dont la FAO devrait, en définitive, être le partenaire privilégié pour les secteurs qui sont de son ressort.

En ce qui concerne l'éventail des activités de terrain, ma délégation se demande si certaines d'entre elles ne sortent pas du cadre du mandat de notre Organisation, et si elles ne devraient pas être laissées à d'autres organismes. Je pense, entre autres, aux recherches sur le biogaz, l'énergie solaire et éolienne.

Le rapport C 87/4 fait état des difficultés pour mobiliser les homologues nationaux pour les projets, mais souligne en même temps l'augmentation du recrutement des experts dans les pays en développement.

Sans mettre en doute la qualification de ces experts, ma délégation se pose la question de savoir s'il n'y a pas là une contradiction; en effet, le recrutement par la FAO peut contribuer, peut-être, à affaiblir les structures nationales.

Par contre, ma délégation est très en faveur d'une participation plus active des experts nationaux à l'élaboration, la planification et l'exécution de projets au niveau de chaque pays.

En ce qui concerne le rôle des représentants de la FAO dans les pays, ma délégation estime qu'ils ont à jouer un rôle de premier plan, non seulement pour le suivi des projets mais surtout en qualité de principal interlocuteur du gouvernement en matière de politique agricole et de développement rural.

En matière d'évaluation, ce rôle, si important soit-il, nous semble devoir être limité vu son-implication dans la formulation des propositions de projets, notamment du PCT dont l'effet catalytique est certainement l'indicateur principal.

Finalement, ma délégation a noté avec Intérêt la situation d'un représentant de la FAO, telle que présentée au paragraphe 2.32, et mettant en évidence la difficulté qu'il y a à combiner la notion de projet - en tant que produit fini - et celle de processus de développement. A cet égard, ma délégation se félicite des activités de la Campagne mondiale contre la faim, activités essentiellement axées sur la promotion du processus de développement ancrée dans les populations intéressées. Il nous semble que cette approche devrait être encore mieux combinée avec les apports techniques des différents Départements de l'Organisation.

Pour terminer, je dirai que le peu de temps que notre Commission peut dédier à l'examen du Programme de terrain renforce la conviction de la délégation suisse quant à la nécessité d'étudier l'établissement d'un comité, ce qui permettrait un examen plus sérieux de ce programme extrêmement important. Cette étude pourrait être incluse dans le mandat d'un groupe ad hoc d'experts, tel que cela a été évoqué par la délégation canadienne et appuyé par la délégation australienne.

Bernardo PALESTINI (Italy): Given the importance and scope of FAO's operational activities, the view of field programmes carried out over the past biennium would certainly lend itself to more in-depth attention than the allotted time can allow. However, considering that many of the issues involved are also dealt with under other items of the Conference agenda, the statement of the Italian delegation will be focused on some general considerations. In the main we have found document C 87/4 balanced and comprehensive. We believe it represents a significant effort on the part of FAO to provide the contents with a qualitative outlook on FAO's achievements and difficulties. Considering the close links between activities carried out under the regular programmes and the various projects being implemented in the field, perhaps it would have been useful to have more details 'on the way this relationship is being carried out.

Coming to the main points raised in the document, we have been pleased to note FAO's readiness to take measures to meet challenges of an emergency nature and the positive role the Organization has continued to play in the coordination of international assistance, as in the case of locust and grasshopper control in Africa.

We also acknowledge the importance of promoting the role of women. We would like to say that in our experience every useful action can be carried out, including women's activities, as a component of larger projects wherever possible. We have noted with satisfaction the emphasis placed on planning not merely at the policy level but also as a tool to adjust project design to local social and economic circumstances. With regard to the development of human resources, the Italian delegation is in favour of a practical approach focused on training at field level. We are pleased to see that the need to reinforce the evaluation and monitoring of field activities is being stressed both by means of internal assessment and by independent exercises. In our view this is very important to ensure close links among projects in the same technical circle, implemented in different countries' regions.

We also consider very important the flow of information on field projects in terms of frequency and quality. Let me now touch briefly on Italy's involvement in FAO's field activities. Italy has become the first trust fund donor in support of FAO's field activities in developing communities in developing countries. The overall volume of the Italian Trust Fund which has pledged contributions since the early 1980s, has reached the level of over US\$200 million. Annual expenditure in 1986 alone amounted to over US\$30 million. By the end of 1986 ongoing FAO-executed projects financed by the Italian Trust Fund exceeded, the figure of 50, for a total contribution of over US\$170 million. The collaboration between Italy and FAO has been constructive and has led to the joint development and adoption of innovative arrangements and mechanisms with a view to achieving a better implementation of projects and programmes. The list of projects under the FAO/Italy Cooperative Programme includes activities being carried out in different regions and covering a variety of sectors ranging from integrated rural development, agriculture mechanization, animal health, aquaculture, forest industries, planning and development of human resources.

Italy's contribution to these projects is not merely of a financial nature, but it also involves the provision of Italian expertise in terms of human resources and techniques which have been developed to meet specific requirements of Italian conditions but which can also be applied to developing countries. There is, for instance, remote sensing for which the prime issue of agriculture has gained considerable experience. For a better understanding of the above matter you have to consider that Italian activities in this field began in 1979 with the continuation of satellite-derived data for the solution of agricultural problems such as provisional studies of production, yields and Irrigation. In 1985 the Italian Ministry of Agriculture started the "Agrit" Programme, which in two years has extended acquired methodology to the whole Italian territory. It was also possible to implement a programme for the use of data derived from the meteo-satellites from the NOAA series to obtain a pre-alarm system on the weather conditions for ongoing crops. Agrit-2 and Agrit-3 extended the possibility of the system, which now enables us to carry out the inventory and the provisions for a certain number of crops with sufficient accuracy and up to a month ahead of the date expected for harvest.

Although no explicit mention is made in the document, allow me to recall the large integrated rural programmes financed by Italy in West Africa. Given their complexity, dimensions and enormity of nature, these projects presented at the start particular difficulties in terms of management and technical requirements. However, positive results have been achieved and the role of small farmer groups at village and sectoral level is being enhanced. With a view to improving the performance and efficiency of the Italy/FAO Cooperative Programmes an innovative mechanism has now been developed by FAO and Italy which has proved instrumental in rationalizing the different phases of the project cycle.

Arrangements have been made to develop a systematic methodology for the evaluation of Italian-funded projects, both ongoing and completed. The findings of the first exercise of this type, which was focussed on agricultural mechanization projects in seven African countries, are briefly discussed in the Review of Field Programmes, 1986-87. A second thematic evaluation has just been completed on Italian-funded projects aimed at the prevention of food losses. Apart from these major exercises, continuous efforts have been made to upgrade the following-up of project activities through adequate monitoring systems. We believe that the lessons learned so far with FAO/Italy Cooperative Programmes can also benefit other FAO field projects. We are pleased to note that some solutions developed in connection with Italian-funded projects are now being introduced on a wider scale.

Satoshi WAKUNO (Japan): First I would like to commend the Secretariat for the very informative introduction of document C 87/4 which is before us.

Before touching upon some specific remarks regarding the document, I would like to express a general opinion on the FAO field activity as a whole. First, my delegation fully appreciates the important role of the FAO field projects in promoting food and agricultural development in developing countries.

Secondly, my delegation feels that in order to bring about a greater effect and impact of the field projects, it is of the utmost importance to formulate projects which will be cost effective and respond properly to the actual needs of the recipient countries, and furthermore due consideration should be given to the relationship between the field projects and the activities which are implemented under the Regular Programme in the course of the formulation of the projects.

I should now like briefly to express my delegation's specific comments on the Review of Field Programmes 1986-87. First, my delegation welcomes follow-up reviews on the Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme for Africa (ARPA) which we can see in document C 87/4, and hopes that a similar follow-up will be carried out in future and reported to the Conference, also on the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, the Strategy and Programmes of Action approved by the World Conference on Fisheries Management and Development, the Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, etc.

Secondly, my delegation believes that the modality of Review of Field Projects could be improved by strengthening independent evaluation, through third parties, but mostly through self-evaluation by FAO representatives.

Thirdly, my delegation considers that it is useful for all member countries to share the results of experience on field projects, including TCP, and hopes that the rest of the projects carried out by FAO will be duly submitted to the Conference or Council.

Lastly, my delegation welcomes the fact that distribution and expenditure on field projects for the African region were increased to 44 percent in 1986-87 from 39 percent in the previous biennium, mainly reflecting the food crisis that the region has experienced in recent years. At the same time my delegation recognizes that the other regions also have their own various programmes in food and agriculture to resolve urgently and therefore hopes that the regional distribution of field programmes be decided carefully so as not to overlook the requirements of the other regions.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Quba): Debo expresar con toda sinceridad que nos complace mucho verlo presidir aquí nuestros debates durante la tarde de hoy. Sabemos que quizá este Usted un poco agotado por la sesión dominical de trabajo que tuvo ayer; pero estamos seguros de que con su presidencia vamos a tener un pleno éxito en nuestros trabajos.

Mi delegación saluda el valioso documento C 87/4 presentado por la Secretaría; el mismo resulta muy completo y nos permite con suficiente facilidad evaluar los resultados de la gestión de la FAO en su Programa de Campo. Constatamos así que en cada bienio que transcurre se introducen nuevas mejoras en este documento. Al mismo tiempo, deseamos felicitar al Señor Lignon por la amplia y completa presentación del tema.

Los crecimientos experimentados en el programa de Campo durante el bienio 1986-87, si bien han sido discretos, ello puede constituir un indicador de una mayor recuperación de este Programa, sobre todo si tenemos en cuenta la sustancial mejora ocurrida en los fondos del PNUD. Otro factor importante en las mejoras previsibles del Programa de Campo, es sin duda las decisiones de los países al dar una mayor prioridad al sector de la agricultura dentro de la asignación de fondos provenientes del PNUD. En este sentido, una cooperación más estrecha entre la FAO y el PNUD sería deseable.

Mi Delegación considera que deben analizarse las posibles alternativas para invertir o modificar en sentido positivo las asignaciones de fondos procedentes del PNUD para que el Programa de Campo, en lugar de tener una estabilización, pueda experimentar una mejoría aún mayor.

Consideramos que la FAO debería asistir un tanto más a los países con recomendaciones ilustrativas de las posibilidades y ventajas para la implementación de proyectos en materia de agricultura con los fondos provenientes del PNUD. Esto contribuiría de manera importante a mejorar y aumentar las actividades de campo.

En el Programa de ayuda a la inversión merece también que se destaque la función realizada por la FAO a través de su Centro de Inversiones, a pesar del bajo nivel de reposición de los fondos del FIDA. Esto ha limitado una porción importante de las actividades de dicho Centro. Abrigamos la esperanza de que el FIDA mejore su situación financiera y pueda aumentar su benéfica gestión en favor de los países en desarrollo.

Las representaciones de la FAO en los países están jugando un papel muy importante, a juzgar por las actividades de evaluación continua de los proyectos que se llevan a cabo en los países. De igual manera, merece destacarse la asistencia que vienen prestando a los países para identificar posibilidades y áreas de actividad para la implementación de proyectos con fondos de diferentes fuentes.

En consecuencia, mi Delegación reitera lo expresado durante el debate del tema 13, para que el Director General adopte las medidas necesarias para la apertura de cuatro nuevas oficinas de representantes en igual número de países.

En el sentido de mejorar las actividades de campo, la Delegación de Cuba apoya plenamente lo expresado en cuanto al reforzamiento del Sistema de Evaluación de Proyectos que ha sido propuesto por la Secretaría.

La cooperación técnica entre países en desarrollo ha tenido un gran impulso en la región de América Latina y el Caribe, con la introducción de manera dinámica del sistema de redes de cooperación técnica, por ello la Oficina Regional merece nuestro apoyo y reconocimiento. Continuando con esta materia de CTPD, diremos que resulta alentador que ya muchos países en desarrollo cuenten con instituciones de investigación y desarrollo en agricultura y con especialistas capaces de brindar una valiosa contribución. Por esta razón, desearíamos que la Secretaría nos indicara qué medidas se están tomando para incorporar progresivamente a técnicos y especialistas e instituciones de los países en desarrollo, no sólo al interior de los propios países, sino para que con un sentido amplio dichos técnicos y estas instituciones que mencionamos desplieguen una mayor actividad en la transmisión de experiencias hacia otros países en desarrollo.

En el mismo sentido, apoyamos las acciones que se llevan a cabo para promover la autosuficiencia de los países en la implementación de los proyectos que les son otorgados.

Como hemos expresado en ocasiones anteriores, el PCT merece todo nuestro apoyo porque es un instrumento dinámico en cuanto a responder a situaciones de urgencia, así como por constituir un valioso elemento catalizador. En nuestra opinión, el PCT es un pequeño motor impulsor que rompe la inercia del desarrollo, y una vez que se pone en marcha, actúa sobre los recursos humanos y materiales de los países beneficiarios, y al mismo tiempo, este motor estimula y mueve los fondos externos en apoyo al desarrollo.

Son muchos los ejemplos que pudiéramos citar de importantes proyectos que han comenzado con un pequeño proyecto de cooperación técnica, y luego, a partir de los resultados alcanzados, han encontrado ecos que permiten una ampliación de sus recursos financieros de su horizonte de acción y de su impacto.

CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to Ghana, who is the next speaker, I would like to appeal to the speakers who will take the floor afterwards to be as concise as possible. As we know, time is running, and we will have a night session, most probably on another item. Just to set things straight, we have six more speakers on the list, then afterwards the Secretariat will reply to certain questions and hopefully we will finish this in at most twenty minutes or half an hour, so that we can take up the following item during our night session.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): The Ghana delegation would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the preparation of this Report now before us. The Ghana delegation would like to comment briefly on Chapter Three of the document - that is, The Key Role of Planning Assistance. We would wish that FAO continues its assistance in certain vital areas within its competence, Physical and area development planning, that is management of soil and water resources.

The Ghana delegation has noted with pleasure in paragraph 3.71, FAO's assistance to some West African countries, especially the master plan for the integrated development of the Niger River Basin, which cuts across the boundaries of nine countries. This kind of programme is very essential for most of the countries in the West African sub-region, in view of the expansion of the Sahara Desert and the recent unpredictable rainfall pattern in the region which has been the cause of crop failures in recent years. Such projects resulting in the provision of facilities and infrastructures for irrigation will surely be one of the means for alleviating food shortages.

On the Planning Assistance for Fisheries Development, the Ghana delegation would like to stress that the programme of assistance for the development and management of fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zones for developing coastal states as approved by the FAO Conference in 1979 should be intensified.

In this regard we are grateful to the Government of Norway for providing funds for the EEZ programme and wish that more funds be provided for the expansion of this programme.

For the forestry development planning the report has emphasised its increasing complexity, mainly due to the growing demand for agricultural land, forest products, mainly timber, resulting in deforestation and environmental degradation. In this regard Ghana hails the Tropical Forestry Action Plan prepared by the FAO and wish for FAO assistance for support for projects already identified in Ghana.

Finally, Ghana's delegation would like to urge FAO to intensify its support for human resources development through training in order to upgrade the knowledge and efficiencies of professional and technical personnel in the developing countries since lack of such personnel has been identified as one of the important constraints on rapid development in the field of agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

Ghana has some more comments to make on Chapter 3 but in view of the limited time that we have we would like with your permission to submit the manuscript for inclusion in the verbatim report.

CHAIRMAN: I thank you for your spirit of cooperation. Of course, your manuscript will be included in the verbatim.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): Thank you for granting us opportunity to make some observations on this subject, but like colleagues who have spoken before me, allow me also to congratulate you on your election to the Vice-Chairmanship of this Commission and to express appreciation on seeing you preside over the deliberations of our Commission. We wish you success and hope we shall be having fruitful discussions under your guidance.

We would wish to compliment the Secretariat for the document prepared and submitted for these discussions. Mr Lignon introduced this subject with clarity and we congratulate him for his pleasant presentation of the subject.

Our delegation considers the Review of FAO Field Programmes as important, as an important reflection that should mirror performance of the programme in relation to the set goals. We therefore welcome document C 87/4 as a good tabulation of the programmes, their costs, their geographic distribution. However, the document does not seem to contain much comment on the impact of the programme against set goals. We consider critical analysis of programme impact on set goals, especially the cumulative benefits flowing to the target population as important and essential to improvement in formulating, preparing and implementing any subsequent programmes.

Paragraph 2.32 notes that achievement of output does not necessarily guarantee significant project effect on development. We would also have liked to see more comments on coordination and integration of FAO field programmes with national development programmes and planning activities, particularly to ensure that the revenue base of recipients can successfully sustain financing recurrent costs which accrue consequential to problem capital expenditure. Many donor finance programmes which appear to be running well during the capital financing period have often collapsed soon after termination of donor funding, primarily because the projects did not result in generating enough revenue to suffice the current costs and this deficiency is mainly caused by lack of forecasting recurrent cost responsibility during the project planning stages.

The Kenya delegation wishes to associate with the observations made earlier by the delegate of Colombia that the review should have given detailed breakdown of programmes where FAO has used recipient governments for implementation. We would also have preferred comments on comparative

performance between FAO executed or implemented projects and projects implemented by recipient governments. We, however, commend FAO for increasingly encouraging TCDC by the use of experts in developing countries in preparing and implementing field programmes. FAO training programmes have assisted the developing countries towards attaining self-reliance in servicing their development programmes.

CHAIRMAN: I want to announce that the delegate of Zimbabwe has kindly asked for their intervention to be included in the verbatim and they have given the text to the Chair.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): I should like to start by congratulating you on your election as Vice-Chairman of our Committee. I wish you every success.

Document C.87/4 sets out a general and precise review of the field programmes and we are very grateful to the Secretariat for presenting it and to Mr Lignon. The Director-General mentioned in his statement on this, at the end of paragraph 2 in Arabic, that these programmes are still below the level required because of the scale of the agricultural and food problems which are very complicated problems faced by all developing countries, and especially in Africa. Although all other regions do not necessarily lack these problems we appreciate the approach given to the problems in Africa because of specific problems faced in this area because at the same time we believe that it is the duty of FAO to prevent atrophy in the other regions as regards these problems, other regions which do not yet run the risk of becoming anything like Africa. We believe it is necessary to concentrate more on the appraisal of field programmes in a more efficient manner and ought to pay special attention to the planning of these projects in order to guarantee their success.

This document indicates that the drop in evaluation carried out by national representatives of FAO is due to budgetary problems in the recipient countries. We believe that it is necessary that there be respect for the priorities of these programmes and national representatives should be encouraged to follow up these projects and prevent them from suffering serious losses and make it impossible, for them to be properly implemented.

As regards planning we would support this as regards the importance of agriculture if we are to guarantee the success of these projects which are a key priority in the sector which we have suggested. Here again we support the need to concentrate more on extension of the concept of food security. We are particularly pleased to note that half a million people did receive training under the field programme in the course of the last ten years. The document also mentions that the quality of assistance required by developing countries has changed and therefore we ask FAO to take the necessary measures which will enable it to provide this form of assistance, bearing in mind the above-mentioned priorities. As regards the locust campaign, the setting up of an office in FAO headquarters and its emergency activities represent development which we trust will be supported and maintained in years to come.

As regards TCP, paragraph 1.29 mentions that a considerable increase in the applications for assistance has been registered moving from 218 in 1980 to 650 this year. That is why we wonder about the FAO's capacity within this programme to satisfy this increase in applications for assistance during coming years in the light of the serious financial problems which we are all acquainted with.

Finally, we have to express our interest in those projects for technical modernization for the production of traditional foods in such sectors as agro-food industries, marketing extension, fisheries and forestry. We also believe that member countries should also count on their own efforts in order to help FAO in the implementation of these programmes, in the establishing of priorities requirements basing our efforts on FAO's experience and its data bank. This would enable us to get round a whole series of marginal problems which might otherwise hamper the progress of these projects.

HAN DEA SUNG (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Like other previous speakers, I am delighted to see you sharing this Commission's afternoon session after your election to the post of one of the Vice-Chairmen of this Commission this morning in the Plenary meeting. I wish you every success.

First I would like to express my deep appreciation to Mr Lignon, the Assistant Director-General of the Development Department, for his brief presentation of the field programme and also my deep appreciation goes to the Secretariat for its preparation of the documents C 87/4, the Review of the Field Programme which provided us with a concise and comprehensive analysis of FAO's wide range of field programmes which my delegation fully supports.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to join previous speakers in understanding the importance of the field programme which we think played a great role in and contributed to the development of agriculture and the increasing of food production. It is the view of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that the field programme should be increased in the forthcoming biennium and to promote further the field programme to contribute more effectively to the development of agriculture and increasing of food production, the South-South cooperation which is the general form of TCDC and ECDC should be emphasized.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is sure it will be successful if developing countries which already have the pertinent technical capacities would keep the South-South cooperation continuing. The necessity and importance of South-South cooperation was also highlighted at the extraordinary Ministerial Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries on South-South Cooperation held in June. The Conference emphasized the need to develop South-South cooperation in agriculture so that reserves of food can be obtained. A large number of developing countries are not yet free of hunger and poverty and certain developed countries are trying to subordinate these countries economically, and dominate them politically, by using food as a weapon. Therefore, the developing countries must improve their agriculture and solve the problem of food. This is important in delivering their people from hunger and poverty, and in order to defend their independence. The developing countries must set inspiring objectives of achieving complete self-sufficiency in food as soon as possible and achieve it by undertaking joint ventures in agriculture in various forms and means, and cooperating with each other closely in the construction of irrigation systems, in the improvement of farming techniques, in research on agricultural science, and in the production of farm machinery. This is the most suitable type of cooperation for them.

For the successful realization of South-South cooperation the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will, as we have in the past, willingly provide our experts and specialists in the field of food and agriculture and also offer training facilities in our country for experts from Member States. My delegation also thinks that due attention should be paid by Member States to at follow-up of the Pyongyang Declaration and Plan of Action on South-South cooperation, particularly in the field of agriculture and food.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): The United States has reviewed the FAO document presenting a picture of Field Programmes over the last biennium with interest. We understand that expenditures have increased somewhat and the share of activities in funding various agricultural sub-sectors remains relatively unchanged and that FAO hopes for increased funding under the UNDP Fourth Programming Cycle. The facts presented give us a useful impression of the variety of FAO's country-level and regional projects. We appreciate the clarity of the presentation. We agree that nearly half of the programme allocation should go to Africa. However, we still have questions about how priorities are determined. The Field Programme Review indicates that the priorities among sub-sectors have changed little from two years ago. What the Report describes is a result. Like Finland, we would have liked to see the Field Programme Review reviewed more analytically in a broader context against a background of FAO's views, as the leading UN agency responsible for agricultural development, of what are the critical agricultural development problems, and what are the gaps in efforts to solve them. As others, we think that FAO should have a firm view as to what its programme priorities should be which guides the selection of projects for funding.

We have a number of questions concerning the field activities which we would like to raise here and which we would like to see explored in detail in the report to the 1989 Conference. First, problems in project design persist, as the document states inter-alia page 42, paragraph 2.30. This is consistent with our own findings and with the findings of UNDP. We would encourage FAO to continue to improve its project design process and to report on the steps taken and the results of these

efforts at the next conference. In this context we would encourage FAO to make maximum use of its technical expertise to ensure that projects have clear objectives, clearly linked to broader development goals such as those mentioned a while ago by the representative of Kenya, and to make sure that project design explores a variety of technical alternatives and policy options.

We also believe that projects should make adequate arrangements to ensure project sustainability once external assistance is phased out. This is what I believe FAO calls "follow-on activities" which have suffered due to resource constraints in recipient countries. However, to our mind they are much more related to finding and planning for repayment of current costs.

Secondly, project backstopping from Headquarters continues to have weaknesses and is not of a consistent, dependable quality. A report prepared by the UN Director-General for Development in International Economic Cooperation on UN Operational Activities for Development and based on specific country case studies is now under consideration by the Second Committee of the General Assembly. This Report highlights the problem of project backstopping. Part of the difficulty seems to be that often there is no single focal point for project backstopping. We know that FAO and UNDP have re-instituted consultations on this and other implementation issues and would appreciate having in greater detail how FAO manages project backstopping, namely, what is the set-up for UNDP projects, trust funded projects and TCP projects. We would also appreciate an exploration of this issue in the Report prepared for the 1989 Conference.

FAO and some delegations have expressed concern at FAO's declining "share" of UNDP's resources. I do not need to remind delegations that this share of UNDP's resources for which FAO serves as implementing agent is as a result of decisions made by sovereign governments. It involves a number of factors including the amount of their programmes governments dedicate to agriculture which, as the Secretariat pointed out, is happily increasing. It also involves government decisions about which executing agencies to select. Those decisions include choices about whether a government should execute projects themselves and/or which UN institution is most appropriate, reliable and effective. I think FAO is aware of some quite important cases in which these issues have affected recipient countries' willingness to allocate UNDP resources to projects to be executed by FAO. To put it candidly, some countries have decided to reduce the project funding levels allocated to FAO because of unsatisfactory past experience with FAO.

The third implementation question concerns the continuing problem with the quality of experts provided and their willingness and ability to transfer skills to host country government counterparts who can then pursue full responsibility and continue to pass on skills in countries once the experts have left. Colombia mentioned the number of related questions earlier this morning. My Government has been pleased to see the growing flexibility across the UN system, including FAO, to choose the type of expert - long or short term, international or national or volunteers - most appropriate to each project. There is no one standard or best way. We are concerned though that skills be transferred and experts go home. Even though the relative share of the programme allocated to training has more than doubled, from 5 percent in 1980 to 11 percent in 1986, my delegation would ask whether 55 percent of funding for experts and 11 percent for training is the kind of allocation which is most likely to build the capacity of developing countries' governments. Obviously, it is a project-by-project decision, but we would like to know more about TAO's review process and how these choices are made.

We congratulate the Secretariat on FAO's increased involvement in preparation for consultative groups and UNDP round tables. In the debate on other agenda items my delegation has stressed the role that we feel FAO can play in coordination at the sector level. At all levels, FAO's working relationship with UNDP, which organizes round tables and represents the UN system at consultative groups, is an essential factor. As the report I have just mentioned points out coordination is still considerably less than adequate and agencies have still not, in most cases, accepted a substantive and operational leadership role by the resident coordinator. However, there are some constructive models singled out in the report such as joint programming among several UN agencies. FAO has participated in such activities. As Poland, we would like FAO to deal in greater depth with coordination issues in a future report discussing FAO's experience with coordination in different settings. Before leaving this topic my delegation would like to note that some trust fund donors have established new procedures to ensure that the trust funded projects are coordinated through the resident representative or resident coordinator. We congratulate these donors and urge others to consider similar steps.

The same report of case studies highlights problems caused by the differing procedures of different UN agencies. We hope FAO will follow and be a full participant in discussions on how procedures might be harmonized to reduce the burden on recipient countries. The United States has been one of those members which has insisted on substantial improvements in project budgeting. Too often project budgets are over-estimated tying up funds which could be used for other activities. We were glad to take note of the training FAO is giving in this and other aspects of project design and implementation. We would urge this Conference to stress the importance of FAO working closely with UNDP to assure the most accurate budgeting possible and the most effective use of resources.

These issues of programme and project design and implementation, of quality and impact, are some of the reasons underlying my Government's support for the idea of an external, independent and objective review of FAO's programme management.

Like others, we appreciate the Secretariat's efforts to do a professional job of assessing programme impact and then report the results to this body. FAO continues to make progress in integrating evaluation into this programme. Also like others, we would have liked - and will in future look for - more information on, and analysis of, actual programme impact. This goes for TCP projects as well as UNDP and trust funded projects. Paragraph 2.20 on page 40 hardly presents an adequate assessment of TCP projects. The size of the projects raises questions of impact and value. We should like to see more analysis and join those who have called for periodic external evaluations. For my Government, evaluation is not only a tool to assess impact, but it is also a mechanism to make mid-course correction. Therefore, we should like to know the relationship between information provided by the resident representatives concerning assessment of projects and the tripartite project reviews. Were the findings consistent? We should like in future for FAO to draw on the results of the tripartite reviews for reports to the Conference. We appreciate the detailed description of FAO's activities in planning. As in the past, we should like to stress that FAO in its project design, should keep in mind that like women and environmental concerns, consideration of policy issues should be integrated into all project design because most projects at least make some assessment about policy. It would seem to be more desirable to explore explicitly what the policy impact might be for example in the design of seed production and distribution, credit or mechanization, than to make assumptions.

Finally, the United States of America was pleased during this biennium to have joined in partnership with FAO in a new way - through the Associate Professional Programme. While our participation is small, we are nevertheless glad to be able to participate.

Alex Louis TANIS (Haïti): Je ne redirai pas ce qu'ont dit avant moi d'autres orateurs et je me bornerai à formuler des commentaires généraux et brefs sur des points précis du Programme. En ce qui concerne le Programme, il me semble excellent car il couvre les différents domaines de la production agricole. mais il me paraît extrêmement ambitieux compte tenu des conditions économiques très précaires auxquelles la FAO est appelée à faire face. La répartition de ces fonds sur l'ensemble des projets à exécuter doit se faire de façon précise afin d'éviter tout gaspillage de fonds, de temps et de compétence technique.

Pour excellents que soient la plupart des projets contenus dans ce programme, ma délégation pense qu'ils ne sont pas intégrés dans un plan général de planification nationale. A notre avis, il n'y a pas véritablement de phénomène socio-économique qui se nomme le développement de l'agriculture, mais plutôt un phénomène psycho-politico-socio-économique qui se nomme le développement rural, et tant que l'on n'envisagera pas le problème dans sa globalité, il nous semble que l'impact des projets sera limité car on ne peut pas travailler avec des gens qui, technologiquement, ne peuvent accumuler les connaissances nouvelles, on ne peut pas travailler avec des gens malades, des gens qui n'ont aucune sécurité en ce qui concerne la tenure de leurs terres et qui ne peuvent conserver, par des mesures appropriées, les substratum physiques sur lesquels se fera le développement de l'agriculture.

Toujours dans ce programme général, nous pensons qu'il devrait y avoir une collaboration et une planification plus étroites entre la FAO et les différents gouvernements, car les projets qui sont patronnés conjointement par la FAO et les gouvernements respectifs ont pour objectif

principal de renforcer les structures permanentes de nos différents ministères afin d'assurer la relève et la continuation de ces projets et la cessation de l'assistance technique et financière. Mais il semble, le plus souvent, qu'aucune mesure appropriée n'ait été prise et l'exécution de ces projets contribue à l'affaiblissement des structures permanentes et du ministère; et il en résulte parfois une régression de la productivité nationale dans les différents domaines, car aucune mesure n'a été prise par la FAO ni par le Gouvernement qui doit assurer le suivi desdits projets en vue de la cessation de l'assistance technique et financière.

S'agissant du développement de la pêche, qu'il me soit permis de faire deux considérations. En attendant le développement de l'aquaculture, la plupart des pays font un effort gigantesque pour compenser leurs carences en protéines animales; il faudrait organiser la pêche artisanale. Mais pour ce faire, on se heurte à deux obstacles principaux. En effet, le plus souvent, la pêche artisanale est organisée uniquement dans la zone côtière qui est surexploitée étant donné que les petites embarcations dont disposent les pêcheurs sont trop fragiles pour leur permettre d'aller en haute mer; également du fait du manque de matériel, ils ne sont pas organisés pour des captures de poisson en haute mer. Il en résulte que la zone de haute mer est sous-exploitée alors que la zone côtière est surexploitée.

S'agissant du PCT, il est absolument nécessaire non seulement de maintenir le budget à son niveau actuel, mais de le renforcer étant donné qu'il, est appelé à libérer des fonds pour la conduite de projets ponctuels; il est là également pour des interventions destinées à relever les conditions de vie des petits exploitants et pour assurer une transition entre deux financements.

Ma dernière remarque s'applique au programme du PNUD. Nous avons remarqué avec beaucoup de satisfaction que les fonds du PNUD ont été augmentés, mais cette augmentation ne se reflète pas toujours dans nos pays nationaux au niveau des budgets des ministères de l'agriculture et du développement rural; en effet, le PNUD finance un certain nombre de projets qui ne sont pas exécutés dans le domaine agricole alors que l'agriculture est considérée comme prioritaire dans la plupart de nos pays en développement.

D'autre part, le PNUD, le plus souvent, s'entend avec le Ministère de la planification ou du Plan pour arriver à une redistribution entre les différents ministères, redistribution se rapprochant du chiffre prévu à l'origine pour le pays. Il en résulte que, malgré la priorité accordée à l'agriculture, ce secteur bénéficie de très peu de fonds accordés à l'origine comme prioritaires.

Face à ces problèmes graves et préoccupants, nous continuons à faire confiance à la FAO car c'est la seule organisation à caractère universel possédant une expérience aussi vaste et une compétence aussi variée dans les domaines ayant trait à l'agriculture; c'est pourquoi nous continuons à appuyer le Programme de terrain, tel que prévu au document C 87/4.

CHAIRMAN: If there are no requests for the floor after Haiti I will give the floor to the Representative of the UNDP as Observer.

Evlogui BONEV (UNDP): UNDP studied with particular interest document C 87/4 entitled "Review of Field Programmes 1986-87." We commend the FAO Secretariat for the excellent presentation of the field activities Organization, during the period under review, particularly with respect to the evolution of UNDP/FAO cooperation. I would like to congratulate the Assistant Director-General, Mr Lignon, for the very informative introduction of the item.

I have listened very carefully to the enriching debate that has taken place on this important matter and should like to assure the distinguished members of FAO that all their comments regarding UNDP and its cooperation with FAO, as well as with member countries, both donors and recipients, were duly noted and would be transferred to Headquarters for their careful attention.

At Plenary of this Conference, I read a statement on behalf of UNDP, reflected in document C 87/PV/13 which contains information regarding matters which are also the subject of this item. Therefore I will not repeat what I already said, but will limit myself to some particular comments made with reference to my Organization attempting thereby to clarify some points.

Regarding UNDP's resource situation, we are all pleased here to note that the results of the recent Pledging Conference marked a third consecutive year of record pledging, with amounts over and above the targets established by the Governing Council. The Governing Council has envisaged to carry out a mid-cycle review of the resource situation of UNDP during its 1989 session. A preliminary review, however, is being planned to take place during the June 1988 session in Geneva. We very much hope that the healthy trend in the stabilization of UNDP's resource situation will continue during the rest of the present Programming Cycle, thus assuring that the developing countries will implement their own programmes as they themselves designed them, and that the priorities they themselves established will not have to be changed due to lack of sufficient resources.

I was pleased to note during this debate that delegations are already well aware that the share of agriculture, and of FAO respectively in UNDP resources, depends entirely on the importance the recipient governments themselves attach and attribute to this sector.

As far as FAO's share in UNDP resources for the present cycle is concerned, we, in UNDP, agree with FAO's conclusion that a stabilization of its share is perhaps a realistic expectation. The reasons for this prudent conclusion stem from several recent developments in the evolution of technical co-operation activities in the UN system as well as in the recipient countries. These developments are well reflected in the document under consideration but I should like to underline some of them:

Many developing countries which used to give high priority to agriculture have reached, in some sub-sectors, a stage of self-reliance, thus shifting their priorities to other sectors of socioeconomic development. We have several examples in Asia and the Pacific and in the Latin American regions, where some countries have given higher priority to industry, allocating around 50% of their IPFs to this sector. This tendency may, though slowly, develop in other countries as well.

Many developing countries, having reached a higher level of development of their agriculture, prefer short-term consultants, thus replacing long-term experts who consume bigger allocations of resources. Some of them have reached the stage of being able to provide their own local expertise and managers for the projects.

Government execution has slowly but steadily been established as an important and permanent feature of UNDP delivery of technical co-operation projects. It is no longer an exception even in the field of agriculture.

All these developments, which are by no means exhaustive, lead to the conclusion that executing agencies should accordingly re-adjust their methods to facilitate this process, whereby the developing countries may achieve the ultimate goal of self-reliance, the common endeavour of governments, partner-agencies and UNDP.

Achievement of this goal, though still not quite within our grasp, is what we are actually aiming at. Once attained, this will be a source of pride for all parties concerned, including UNDP and FAO, which are trying their utmost to put to the best use their modest contributions in this direction.

In UNDP's opinion, it is not necessarily the higher share of FAO in UNDP's resources that will make so much difference. It is rather professionalism, quality and efficiency which have a much heavier weight in the job we are doing. We are very pleased that FAO is continuously readjusting to the changing needs and new challenges of the developing countries, and we are pledging our full partnership in this process.

Many delegations referred to the LDC roundtables. We fully subscribe to paragraph 3.115 on page 103 of document C87/4 regarding FAO's participation in the UNDP-sponsored roundtable process and wish to state that we highly value its important contribution in the various stages of this process. We look forward to continued FAO co-operation in this important issue.

Concerning the UNDP Office for Projects Execution, to which some delegations referred, I wish to point out that the 1970 Consensus does not foresee the automatic designations of a specialized agency as an executing agency merely by virtue of that organization's "area of competence". The choice of executing agency is a matter of consultation between the Administrator and the recipient government, taking into account specific project requirements. Often governments express a wish to obtain sources of experience outside the UN system. A large part of the projects executed through OPE provide this additional source of experience which complements existing sources of technical expertise. It needs pointing out that the percentage of OPE-executed projects funded from UNDP's central resources has remained constant under 7.0% over the past five years and that the great majority of the projects are in fact government-executed, while the role of OPE is reduced to assisting the recipient governments only if needed and requested.

It should also be pointed out that in so-called "umbrella" projects of multi-sectoral character executed by OPE, large components have been sub-contracted to executing agencies, including FAO, according to the competence required.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, UNDP/FAO recent review meetings at various levels have strengthened the dialogue between the secretariats of the two organizations and we are confident that the conclusions and recommendations which were drawn up at these meetings will give a new impetus to our cooperation at both headquarters and field levels, for the benefit of the developing countries.

CHAIRMAN: We have received a written statement by Mexico and of course it will be duly included in the verbatim. We thank the delegation of Mexico for facilitating our work.

Raymond S. LIGNON (Sous-Directeur général, Département du développement): Je voudrais tout d'abord par votre intermédiaire, Monsieur le Président, remercier les honorables délégués qui ont participé à ce débat, et surtout, qui ont apporté un certain nombre de commentaires et de remarques que nous avons notés, et qui nous permettront d'améliorer nos efforts pour rendre le Programme de terrain le plus efficace possible.

Je voudrais tout d'abord m'arrêter sur quelques questions d'ordre général qui ont été posées par plusieurs délégations et qui méritent une réflexion plus approfondie.

Le premier point que je voudrais aborder est celui du problème de la programmation de nos Programmes de terrain. Il ne faut pas oublier que les projets que l'on nomme "FAO" sont en fait des projets des gouvernements, supportés par la FAO; par conséquent, lorsque l'on parle des relations entre les projets et les plans gouvernementaux, il appartient aux gouvernements de vérifier si les projets qu'ils nous soumettent ou qu'ils soumettent au PNUD ou à des donateurs, pour être exécutés, s'inscrivent bien dans leur plan de développement, et notamment du développement rural.

Il est évident que cette préoccupation sectorielle n'est pas toujours facile et c'est la raison pour laquelle la FAO essaie d'appuyer le plus possible les gouvernements pour que les ministères responsables du développement puissent faire entendre leur voix dans le Conseil gouvernemental, au niveau des ministères de la planification, des finances et de l'économie; chacun sait d'ailleurs qu'il n'est pas toujours facile à un ministère sectoriel de défendre son point de vue. C'est la raison pour laquelle nous insistons sur ce point.

D'autre part, se pose le problème de la coordination des aides; il est vrai que c'est un problème lancinant mais très difficile à résoudre dans la mesure où les différents partenaires de l'aide au développement sont de plus en plus nombreux et ont des règles de plus en plus strictes, soit pour donner une aide, soit pour la recevoir; par conséquent, il faut une très grande maîtrise du système pour arriver à une véritable coordination; et il me semble que la coordination globale n'est pas toujours la meilleure si l'on veut rester sur un plan concret; je veux dire par là

qu'il est peut-être plus important de coordonner dans des cadres macro-économiques la politique générale, des politiques sectorielles ou sous-sectorielles permettant aux donateurs de participer à un programme semences, ou à un programme irrigation, ou viande plutôt que de rechercher s'il est véritablement de la souveraineté du gouvernement de trop intervenir dans la coordination globale de l'aide.

Le problème est aussi compliqué par le fait que plusieurs mécanismes veulent contribuer à cette coordination. Je veux parler des tables rondes ou des groupes consultatifs qui sont pour leur part des systèmes de mécanismes de coordination beaucoup plus d'investissement que d'assistance technique. Et le rôle de la FAO dans ces systèmes est peut-être essentiellement d'intervenir pour rendre d'abord peut-être plus étroits les liens entre l'aide en capital - y compris tout ce que cela représente de conditionalité - et l'aide en assistance technique pour que cette aide en capital soit plus efficace et ait un impact plus grand sur les groupes qui nous préoccupent le plus à la FAO, c'est-à-dire les groupes les plus démunis.

Tout ceci montre que ces problèmes de coordination, qui sont encore une fois de la responsabilité du gouvernement; ne peuvent être réellement résolus que si les ministères intéressés peuvent jouer un rôle, d'où l'effort que nous faisons porter sur les conseils au niveau sectoriel, sur les renforcements des cellules de planification dans les ministères techniques et dans toutes les institutions et administrations qui sont chargées de la faire.

Le deuxième point sur lequel je voudrais revenir concerne le problème des ressources. Je voudrais dire premièrement que la FAO n'est pas une agence financière; c'est une agence spécialisée et leader dans le système des Nations unies en ce qui concerne le développement rural.

Deuxièmement les problèmes d'affectation des ressources sont soumis à un certain nombre de contraintes sur lesquelles nous n'avons pas toujours un grand pouvoir d'intervention. Et lorsqu'on dit que les activités de la FAO en Amérique latine et aux Caraïbes ne sont pas aussi importantes qu'on le voudrait, c'est tout simplement parce que la FAO ne trouve pas, soit du côté du PNUD, soit du côté des donateurs bilatéraux, les moyens de financement que nous souhaiterions trouver pour pouvoir aider les gouvernements des pays d'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes dans leur programme de développement. L'assistance que nous pouvons leur porter est certainement inférieure à celle que nous voudrions leur donner.

Pour ce qui concerne la part de la FAO dans les programmes du PNUD, je crois qu'il faut d'abord distinguer entre la part de la FAO, la part de l'agriculture et du développement rural dans les programmes du PNUD, et la part en elle-même de la FAO. Sans avoir les chiffres que nous pourrions vous donner si vous le souhaitez, il est clair que les problèmes se posent en termes différents suivant que l'on est en Afrique, en Amérique latine ou en Asie. Les chiffres que vous avez dans le rapport (qui seraient plus intéressants en plus grand nombre) montrent une décroissance en pourcentage de la part de la FAO dans les financements du PNUD. Ceci est d'abord dû au fait qu'apparaissent depuis quelques temps de nouvelles institutions dans le système des Nations Unies qui participent à l'exécution de projets dans lesquels le développement rural occupe une place importante.

Le caractère multidimensionnel du développement rural conduit bien sûr à ne pas très bien savoir finalement où il s'arrête et où il commence, certains disant même que le développement rural trouvera sa solution hors de l'agriculture. On ne peut donc pas évidemment analyser précisément la part de la FAO dans les programmes de financement du PNUD si l'on ne tient pas compte du fait que la Banque mondiale est aussi un agent d'exécution du PNUD comme le PNUD est aussi lui-même un agent d'exécution de la Banque mondiale à la suite d'arrangements passés entre ces deux institutions financières.

Il y a aussi le fait du Bureau des opérations du PNUD dont vient de parler le Représentant du PNUD et dont la part commence à s'accroître pour de nombreuses raisons qu'il n'est peut-être pas nécessaire d'analyser jusqu'au fond, mais qui peut-être ne respecte pas toujours le consensus parce qu'il est plus facile de garder la maîtrise de l'exécution quand on finance l'opération que de la confier à des tiers qui sont quelquefois gênants par les contraintes techniques qu'ils apportent dans les projets.

Il y a également le fait - et c'est là le point le plus important - de l'exécution des projets par les gouvernements et ceci va dans le bon sens, mais avec un certain nombre de précautions; et c'est la raison pour laquelle il ne faut pas imaginer que l'exécution des projets par les gouvernements annule la tâche de la FAO. Nous avons d'ailleurs dans un certain nombre de pays, des projets qui, étalés sur quatre ou cinq ans, ont un démarrage qui se fait en double commande, si je puis dire, pour essayer de se terminer comme des projets exécutés par le Gouvernement. Ce n'est pas toujours très facile à réaliser, mais nous avons des exemples à vous montrer.

Au point de vue de la gestion de ce programme qui devenait de plus en plus complexe, on m'a demandé des informations très précises sur ce qu'est le Comité de Programmes de terrain de la FAO. Je ne veux pas entrer dans le détail, mais je peux dire à Monsieur le délégué du Canada, que s'il le souhaite, je pourrai lui donner les termes de référence et les bulletins qui définissent les activités du Comité Interne de Programmes de terrain.

En ce qui concerne l'évaluation qui a donné lieu à de nombreuses questions, je ne voudrais pas répondre à toutes les questions qui ont été évoquées. Je voudrais quelques commentaires rapides. Par exemple, il a été demandé que la FAO fasse davantage d'évaluations de projets; je voudrais vous dire qu'entre 1981 et 1982, 80 missions d'évaluation ont eu lieu; entre 1983 et 1984, 103 missions d'évaluation, et entre 1985 et 1986, 130 missions d'évaluation. Vous voyez la cadence avec laquelle le Service d'évaluation multiplie ces missions. Cela représente une augmentation considérable, mais tout ceci crée des difficultés très importantes pour organiser de si nombreuses missions chaque année, et encore, les chiffres que je vous ai donnés n'incluent pas les missions thématiques et les missions de programmes.

Une question très importante à laquelle je voudrais répondre rapidement concerne l'évaluation de l'impact. Celle-ci est surtout faite dans le cadre des missions d'évaluation thématique et de programme, par exemple l'aquaculture, les projets de fertilisation ou de mécanisation agricole. Je crois que là encore il faut se rendre compte que l'évaluation de l'impact aboutit finalement à une évaluation ex-postes du projet; que ces évaluations ex-postes coûtent cher, sont difficiles à faire et qu'on essaie par conséquent avec le PNUD de voir dans quelle mesure on peut progresser, relativement lentement d'ailleurs, sur ce chemin.

Il y a encore un commentaire que je voudrais faire sur les missions d'évaluation, peut-être parce qu'il s'agit là encore d'un point important. Certaines délégations ont demandé que les missions d'évaluation soient elles-mêmes améliorées. Mais là encore l'augmentation que je vous ai signalée tout à l'heure du nombre des missions montre que ce n'est pas quelque chose qui peut être résolu d'un coup de baguette magique et que nous essayons d'améliorer le système tous les ans. Le système d'information global des cycles des projets nous permettra sans doute d'apporter quelques améliorations supplémentaires.

Je crois qu'il y aurait beaucoup d'autres questions auxquelles je devrais répondre encore dans le détail, mais vous m'avez dit qu'il ne fallait pas dépasser les heures limites qu'on nous a données. Je n'ai certainement pas répondu à l'ensemble des questions posées par les délégués, mais mes collègues et moi-même sommes tout à fait disposés à leur donner des réponses beaucoup plus précises que celle que je viens de vous donner brièvement, s'ils le souhaitent.

LE PRESIDENT: Je vous remercie beaucoup M. Lignon. En effet, malheureusement, la contrainte du temps nous limite.

I recognize the delegate of the United States, who asked for the floor, but I am told that we do not have even one more minute so far as the interpretation assistance is concerned. So may I ask the indulgence of the delegate of the United States, and also your indulgence, Mr Lignon, because I guess it will be a supplementary question, and the United States will be the first speaker when we reconvene at 20.30 hours as I said, and then we can continue our discussion on the Field Programme.

Panama kindly gave their written statement to be included in the verbatim report: it will be done.

Frank Mensa DENYOH (Ghana): As my delegation has already said, the FAO Secretariat is to be commended for the thoughtful and comprehensive manner in which the Review of Field Programme in C 87/4 has been presented. The varieties of the issues raised and the topics covered in the document are of particular interest to countries of Africa.

My brief intervention, however, would cover Chapter 3, sections 3.1 to 3.52. These sections have immediate relevance for the on-going national and international actions aimed at rehabilitating the economics of sub-Saharan Africa. For Planning, Policy Analysis and Training in planning are areas which require most emphasis. We therefore applaud the FAO for putting in place programmes to help African countries in these areas. Our gratitude also goes to the contributors to the UNDP and the Trust Fund for making it possible for the FAO to continue implementing its planning assistance programme. But there is a lot more to be done. This calls for an increased flow of resources, more replenishment, more sympathy and greater identification with our most important development need which can best be handled at the multi-lateral level.

Planning and Policy do complement each other. They are best handled when relevant data are made available. Those three interrelated activities give us a sense of direction even as we tend to find ourselves perched on roller-skates not knowing which direction to go. Some of us are mindful of the old Asian proverb: "No one goes so far as he who does not know where he is going to". The FAO's choice of emphasis on planning assistance is a step in the right direction and has to be encouraged, not discouraged.

My delegation notes with satisfaction the multi-faceted assistance that FAO continues to render to developing countries. The assistance given - the type, scope and size - tends to be country-specific and there is an implicit suggestion that the initiative has always come from a particular developing country. However, it seems to my delegation that for purposes of cost-effectiveness, we need a minimum of interrelated planning related activities in place at a country level. These are: 1) sector studies and sector analysis; 2) policy formulation and implementation; 3) project identification, formulation, monitoring and evaluation; 4) statistics - information gathering, analysis, storage and retrieval.

It does not require much effort to realise that if all the above-mentioned planning-related activities are not taken up simultaneously at each individual country level, the overall FAO planning assistance programme may fail to achieve the needed impact.

Planning in developing countries cannot take place in an "undeveloped" institutional environment where the necessary trained manpower and logistics should be present.

The euphoria which accompanied "development planning" in the fifties (or perhaps going back to the twenties if you want to give Ghana the credit for being the first country in the world to come out with a Development Plan in 1927) has given way to a sense of disillusionment. For many reasons which can be attributed to political, technical, institutional and budgetary factors, many development plans have ended up in cold storage. Nor have the credentials of planners assumed any better posture. Our assessment of the situation has clearly revealed that the most single factor that has been the cause of lack of implementation of development plans so far is the structure of the national budgets. It was for this reason that African Ministers of Agriculture at the FAO Regional Conference for Africa in Arusha in 1978 charged the FAO with the responsibility of assisting all African countries to institutionalise programme budgeting. Three features of the traditional budget which frustrated efforts to implement development plans are: 1) there is absolutely no harmony between the recurrent budget and the capital budget. Consequently, even if adequate provisions are made in the recurrent budget, inadequate provisions are made in the capital budget. 2) The input-orientation of the budget as against the output-orientation of the programme budgeting makes it almost impossible to monitor and evaluate projects in the budgets. 3) Lack of harmony between the budget and the Plan.

Therefore, Mr Chairman, whilst my delegation congratulates the FAO for the many planning assistance projects it is currently implementing, we say action is badly needed in the area of budget reform

at each individual country level to interface with the on-going structural adjustment programmes. Unless this is done we shall continue to have difficulties and the pay-off from the planning assistance projects may be negligible. 1/

E.T. CHENCU (Zimbabwe): First of all my delegation would like to congratulate you on your election to the Chair and also we would like to compliment the Secretariat for producing the excellent document C 87/LÎM/20 now under discussion.

My delegation has studied the document very carefully and would like to point out that my delegation is in broad agreement with and supports the programmes of FAO as proposed here.

We feel that FAO should continue its catalytic role to agricultural development in developing countries. In Zimbabwe we see FAO playing four important functions, namely: (a) Assistance in project planning, especially in new activities such as horticulture and fisheries. (b) Planning for major investment projects through the FAO Investment Centre. (c) Acting as a focus for obtaining donor aid through the production bankable documents. (d) Training of counterpart personnel. To this end we have found the various Trust Fund programmes and the Technical Cooperation Programme very useful and we feel these should be suggested and where possible increased.

Where FAO has acted within the priorities of the recipient country and in close liaison with local personnel there has been maximum benefit and transfer of technologies to our country.

We feel that FAO should place greater emphasis on planning for sustainability and self-sufficiency by the recipient country.

All efforts should be made to continue to reduce, wherever possible, the programme delivery costs so that maximum funds can become available to actual project implementation.

There should also be a focus on assisting to increase the aid-absorption capacity of the recipient countries. We also find that we derive maximum benefit in these projects where we are able to provide Zimbabwe counterpart staff who can continue the work after the consultants have left.

We particularly appreciate the Special Trust Fund Activities that deal with emergencies such as locust, army worm and other disease control. The ability of FAO to react quickly to such emergencies has always been appreciated.

FAO has also assisted us in arranging for marketing of export products through triangular arrangements and in future we look forward to receiving more such assistance.-

Srta. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): Mi delegación agradece al Sr.Lignon por su brillante y esclarecedora introducción del tema; mi delegación apoya entusiastamente el trabajo que realiza el Departamento de Desarrollo a su cargo.

Seremos muy breves en áreas de contribuir a que completemos nuestro programa de trabajo, sin embargo, deseamos hacer algunos comentarios que consideramos fundamentales dado que los programas de campo es un elemento esencial de las labores que FAO realiza en apoyo de nuestros países.

1/Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request.

La Delegación mexicana se complace del papel potenciador de la FAO en lo que respecta al uso de fondos externos en la asistencia técnica a nuestros países y la inducción de proyectos de inversión.

De la misma manera, esperamos que la FAO pueda recibir el apoyo prioritario del Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD), que constituye la fuente de financiamiento mas importante para los proyectos de campo que la FAO haya recibido en 1986 fondos por mas de 1 000 millones de dólares, cifra que jamas se había registrado; asimismo, nos vemos en la necesidad de insistir en que debe prevalecer ademas de la prioridad ya establecida, el equilibrio regional en las asignaciones de los recursos y por ende en la de los programas de campo, ya que en lo que respecta a la región latinoamericana el número de programas ha descendido considerablemente: mientras que para el bienio representa únicamente el 7% del conjunto para programas en operación, en un momento en que la región está sufriendo el embate de una crisis por el peso de la deuda externa en detrimento de la seguridad alimentaria y el desarrollo.

Por otro lacio, en lo que respecta a los Programas de Fondos Fiduciarios, reiteramos que éstos deberán realizarse bajo la coordinación y asesoramiento de la Organización en estrecho contacto con los gobiernos, asegurando con ello que dichos programas lleguen a los países beneficiarios en forma multilateral y no multibilateral, como muchos países han venido manejando a través del programa de cooperación con ios gobiernos, con lo que se podrá evitar toda posible condicionaiidad en los programas. Reconocemos, sin embargo, que existen honorosas diferencias.

Asimismo, insistimos en que la aplicación de los programas deberá aprovechar ios recursos materiales y humanos del país beneficiario de tales programas. Una formula para alcanzar ese propósito es reclutar, preferentemente, personal nacional radicado en el país beneficiario, en lugar de contratar personal extranjero, dentro de los marcos autorizados de presupuesto. Del mismo modo se podría favorecer la creación de cuerpos técnicos de los países en desarrollo a través del uso de equipo y capacitadores nacionales que podrían multiplicar el impulso que se deriva de la aplicación de los programas y asimismo, bajar costos y aprovechar mejor los recursos disponibles.

Finalmente, considerarnos que un elemento que podría contribuir a elevar el nivel de eficiencia y reforzamiento de los programas de campo, es utilizar mejor el papel que desempeñan las representaciones permanentes de la FAO establecidas en ios países como un fuerte punto de apoyo técnico entre los gobiernos, la Secretaría y los otros organismos internacionales representados en los países.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá): Deseamos iniciar esta intervención felicitando al Sr. Lignon por la excelente presentación del tema en examen.

Para nuestro país, Panamá, los programas de campo de la FAO han sido siempre motivo de particular atención. Nosotros no sólo hemos centrado nuestra atención en el alcance de las actividades operacionales de esta Organización, sino que nos interesamos también, de forma especial, en su contenido, siguiendo con interés sus tendencias y prioridades. Como en ios bienios anteriores el contenido del examen de los programas de campo que hoy efectuamos, representa, en nuestra opinión, un análisis abierto y constructivo de las características, tendencias y perspectivas de dichos programas, al igual que una evaluación franca y objetiva de los mismos.

Dentro de este contexto la Delegación de Panamá, al manifestar en forma general, su apoyo a dicho examen, desea expresar su complacencia de que, a pesar de las dificultades por las que atraviesa la Organización, se continúe registrando un aumento, aunque modesto, de los programas de campo de la FAO. Lamentamos, sin embargo, y de ello llamamos la atención, que el nivel de los programas en cuestión no esté en consonancia con las realidades de los arduos y complicados problemas que confrontamos en la actualidad la mayoría de los países en desarrollo y a los cuales debemos hacer frente en un ambiente económico y político internacional sumamente adverso.

1/ Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa

A este respecto nuestra Delegación desea manifestar su esperanza y su optimismo de que en vista de la gran cantidad de recursos prometidos al Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD), los programas de campo puedan aumentar considerablemente durante el próximo bienio, ya que ello significaría un alivio para, y subrayo, usar una palabra que ha querido ser utilizada por otra delegación como un elemento de provocación, nuestras frustraciones. Frustraciones que sin embargo, y lo resaltamos, no son sinónimos de impotencia.

La Delegación de Panamá, reitera su apoyo pleno a la prioridad concedida al África por cuanto se refiere a las actividades operacionales. Ello no sólo nos parece justo sino necesario. En efecto, conocemos que en muchas zonas de dicho continente subsisten y basta empeoran, problemas alimentarios y agrícolas sumamente graves. Manifestamos, en este marco de referencias, nuestra solidaridad y apoyo al Programa de Rehabilitación Agrícola para África.

Nuestra Delegación desea sin embargo, manifestar su preocupación por la situación de nuestra región, América Latina y El Caribe, en lo que se refiere a la distribución de las asignaciones para los proyectos de campo. En efecto, se nota a este propósito una disminución progresiva de dichas asignaciones para nuestra región. Estimamos, por lo tanto, conveniente que para alcanzar el justo equilibrio regional se continúe concediendo a nuestra región la asistencia que tanto necesita en materia de actividades de campo.

Por lo que se refiere al PCT ya hemos hecho referencia al mismo en forma amplia en nuestras intervenciones anteriores. En esta ocasión nos limitaremos a evidenciar que a pesar de sus limitados recursos, en nuestra opinión, el PCT desempeña una función de suma importancia en los programas de campo de esta Organización y que por lo tanto le reiteramos nuestro apoyo.

En general manifestamos nuestra complacencia y especial interés por el considerable aumento del componente de capacitación que se imparte actualmente a través de las actividades de campo, y es que mientras para algunos el conocimiento significa la clave del poder, para nosotros la capacitación representa la clave del desarrollo, razón por la cual la anhelamos.

Dentro de este contexto no podemos dejar pasar la ocasión sin destacar un hecho que consideramos de una importancia sustantiva, a saber la utilización cada vez mayor de los recursos de los propios países en desarrollo para la ejecución de sus proyectos de campo.

Para nuestra delegación el examen objetivo y sistemático de las actividades operacionales de la FAO es esencial para la eficacia de los programas que se ejecutan. Nos complace, pues, el fortalecimiento del servicio de Evaluación operado en la FAO y que se aprecia en el capítulo 2 del presente examen. A este respecto deseamos observar sin embargo que, aun reconociendo y aprobando todas las acciones de análisis que sirvan para mejorar la calidad y el impacto de los programas, debemos tener cuidado en no caer en la obsesión casi patológica de medir la efectividad de los programas con el patrón único del costo/beneficio. En efecto, en nuestros países en desarrollo, ello no es siempre posible y en algunas ocasiones la evaluación debe efectuarse a través de otras consideraciones de carácter socio-político o cualitativas, difícilmente mensurables en un cálculo económico-financiero.

La delegación de Panamá, estima, asimismo, oportuno manifestar su complacencia y su respaldo a la labor del Centro de Inversiones de la FAO. A tal propósito es para nosotros motivo de particular satisfacción observar que, a pesar de que los fondos disponibles en condiciones de favor para el desarrollo de los sistemas de crédito para la alimentación y la agricultura siguen siendo insuficientes las actividades de dicho centro se han mantenido en un nivel alto.

De la misma manera, nos complace la importancia que se otorga a las múltiples actividades de la FAO que suministra a los gobiernos miembros asistencia en sus actividades de planificación tal como se destaca en el capítulo tres. Estimamos que dicha función es esencial para mejorar la programación y la coordinación de la ayuda para el desarrollo y se justifica con creces, dada las precarias situaciones económicas en que se encuentran en la actualidad gran parte de los países en desarrollo.

Igualmente nuestra delegación desea apoyar, en forma general, lo contemplado en el capítulo 4 y que se relaciona con la evolución de las actividades de campo de la FAO. Nos complace de manera especial que esta Organización haga esfuerzos para reforzar la capacidad de los países y para

aumentar el rendimiento de los proyectos utilizando cada vez más un mayor número de Directores de Proyectos y de personal profesional de los distintos países. Consideramos así respecto que tal práctica no sólo crea mejores oportunidades de labor a nuestros técnicos, sino que también, y sobre todo, constituye un aliento y estimula el espíritu de superación del personal nacional.

De la misma manera expresamos nuestra complacencia por el creciente número de mujeres que están siendo capacitadas y las cuales, estamos seguros, representan un importante pilar en los planes de desarrollo rural de los países en desarrollo.

La delegación panameña desea expresar también su satisfacción por la importancia que se les concede a la cooperación técnica y económica entre países en desarrollo, la que consideramos como elemento básico para el establecimiento de un nuevo orden económico internacional. Estimamos que este es un objetivo que debe perseguirse activamente.

Para terminar, la Delegación de Panamá desea expresar, una vez más, seria preocupación por las tendencias cada vez más generalizadas, de reducir los recursos internacionales para el sector agrícola. Nos preocupan sus efectos sobre el multilateralismo. Nos preocupa, que tal tendencia esté dirigida contra los organismos que lo practican. Nos preocupan los fines que con ellos se persiguen y finalmente nos preocupan cuáles podrían ser sus consecuencias.

The meeting rose at 18.30 hours

La séance est levée à 18 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 18.30 horas

1/ Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/19

Twenty-fourth Session

COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session

COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones

COMISION II

NINETEENTH MEETING
DIX-NEUVIEME SEANCE
19ª SESION

(23 November 1987)

The Nineteenth Meeting was opened at 21.00 hours
Temei Iskit, Vice-Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La dix-neuvième séance est ouverte à 21 heures, sous la
présidence de Temei Iskit, Vice-Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 19ª sesión a las 21.00 horas, bajo la presidencia
de Temei Iskit, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

16. Review of Field Programmes (continued)

16. Examen des programmes de terrain (suite)

16. Examen de los programas de campo (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished delegates. First of all, of course, want to thank you for coming at this hour and I am full of hope that we can start now and, as you will remember, when we adjourned, we were still on the item concerning the Review of Field Programmes. The Secretariat had already responded to some queries, but the distinguished delegate of the United States of America had asked for the floor for a second time, presumably for another intervention or a question and I am glad to give her the floor.

Ms Joan DUDIK-CAYQSO (United States of America) : I just wanted to come briefly back to the coordination question for a moment because I detected a note of resignation in Mr Lignon's reply to some of the remarks my delegation made in their intervention. He said the coordination issue is difficult. We agree. That makes it all the more important for us all, including FAO, to try to do something about it. Of course Mr Lignon is right to remind us that the role of the government is primarily in coordination, but what donors, bilateral and multilateral do can make it easier or harder by how we do our business. Mr Lignon mentioned the question of coordination of technical assistance. That is exactly the point. The UNDP resident representative or the resident coordinator has this function.

My delegation must launch an appeal to FAO to see itself as part of this process and part of the solution to coordination problems. It is correct to say that round-tables and consultative groups deal with resource flows and investments but it is also correct, as Mr Lignon himself pointed out, that technical assistance and capital assistance resources need to be looked at in an integrated way. More and more technical assistance needs, in connection with other assistance, is a subject of review in consultative groups and round-tables.

I have listened to FAO respond to issues of coordination in this Body and in others. Sometimes I have the feeling that there is an attitude of "tout va bien". "Tout ne va pas bien". And we really seriously call on FAO to see these problems and work with the governments and other agencies and bilateral donors to try to solve them not to act as if "tout va bien".

Raymond S. LIGNON (Sous-Directeur general, Département du développement): Tout d'abord, je voudrais m'excuser parce que, compte tenu de l'heure tardive, j'ai répondu très rapidement.

Je voudrais rassurer tout de suite Madame la Déléguée des Etats-Unis et lui dire que nous sommes très favorables à une coordination. Les représentants de la FAO reçoivent des instructions très précises leur demandant d'assister et de participer aux réunions organisées par le Coordonnateur Résident avec la participation des donateurs bilatéraux. Et si j'ai dit que c'était très difficile, c'est parce que les évaluations faites - et Madame la Déléguée des Etats-Unis a pu s'en rendre compte si elle en a été informée - montrent que ces réunions ne sont pas toujours efficaces; et pourquoi ne le sont-elles pas? Je pense personnellement que la raison en est que l'on aborde le problème de la coordination sur un plan très global c'est-à-dire sur le plan de la coordination de l'ensemble des activités d'aides en capital et d'aide technique dans le pays. C'est évalué soit en capital, soit à travers des Tables Rondes et des Groupes consultatifs, soit en assistance technique par le biais du chiffre indicatif par pays.

Je disais qu'il me semblait qu'une coordination plus concrète et plus pragmatique pouvait se faire avec des donateurs et notamment les donateurs bilatéraux au niveau de secteurs beaucoup plus qu'au niveau global.

C'est ce que j'ai voulu indiquer et je m'excuse d'avoir été trop bref dans ma déclaration tout à l'heure.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Lignon. I hope this satisfies the distinguished delegate of the United States of America. And as you offered in your intervention before our adjournment, I think that the ways of dialogue are open within each delegation and the Secretariat on any subject.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La delegación de Colombia desea apoyar plenamente la declaración reciente que ha hecho nuestra colega y amiga la Sra. Gayoso, de los Estados Unidos. Consideramos que una de las partes más optimistas de este documento fue la referencia a que todo iba bien en materia de coordinación. Quienes tenemos contacto con nuestros países sabemos que esta afirmación no corresponde completamente a la verdad y pensamos que esa coordinación puede aún mejorarse para mayor beneficio de todos los países beneficiarios, los donantes y multilaterales.

Quisiera preguntar al Sr. Lignon si la FAO considera que ha llegado ya el tiempo, después de tantos años, de revisar y actualizar el famoso consenso.

Hemos intervenido también, porque al final del debate, en la magnífica declaración que hizo el Representante del PNUD, el Representante de ese Programa dijo que estaba de acuerdo con la FAO, espero no interpretarlo mal, en el sentido de que había posibilidades de que se estabilizara, que es uno de los términos usados en el documento, el nivel de participación de la FAO en la ejecución de proyectos financiados por el PNUD. Dijimos en nuestra declaración, a esto no se respondió, que si acaso la FAO y el propio PNUD cuando hablan de estabilizar el nivel, están anclándose, están refiriéndose al 19 por ciento de 1986, o es que esperan superar ese nivel. ¿Qué se entiende por estabilización? Lamento prolongar el debate, pero son cosas importantes.

CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished delegate of Colombia. I have Canada on my speakers list but I think to proceed in an orderly fashion, since there was a specific question on the part of Colombia, I beg the indulgence of Canada if I give the floor to Mr Lignon to reply to this specific request if you agree.

Raymond S. LIGNON (Sous-Directeur général, Département du développement): Je crois que le problème de la stabilisation de la part de la FAO dans les programmes PNUD se pose de la façon suivante:

D'abord je ne crois pas que le critère financier soit le seul critère d'évaluation de nos relations avec le PNUD et qu'il y a des aspects qualitatifs qui sont peut-être beaucoup plus importants que les aspects financiers; je crois que ce n'est pas nécessairement en termes de projets que nous pouvons apprécier notre relation avec le PNUD par exemple, et quand on parle de stabilisation, je pense qu'il faut se référer à ce qui est dit dans la revue du Programme de terrain, à savoir qu'il y a un point très important qui est à long terme, la tendance à l'exécution des projets par les gouvernements et compte tenu de l'action que mène l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies en matière de formation, il serait normal que les pays aient de plus en plus la possibilité d'exécuter leurs propres projets. D'ailleurs, c'est ainsi qu'il est intéressant de noter que ce sont parmi les pays les plus avancés que se situent les cas les plus nombreux d'exécution par les gouvernements.

Il faut prendre des précautions là encore pour ne pas tomber dans le travers de l'aide financière plutôt que de l'aide technique, à la fin; lorsqu'un pays peut lui-même exécuter ses propres projets, cela veut dire concrètement qu'il n'a pas besoin d'assistance technique puisqu'il demande simplement d'avoir un moyen de financement pour exécuter les projets que son administration propre lui fera.

C'est pourquoi je vous disais qu'il y a peut-être des modalités qui permettraient d'apporter une assistance technique tout en favorisant l'exécution par les gouvernements. Je pense d'ailleurs que l'exécution par les gouvernements a un très gros avantage; elle assure un meilleur suivi du projet. Je pense que lorsque le gouvernement exécute lui-même un projet, il est plus à même de le suivre, de le poursuivre que lorsqu'il reçoit une aide pour le faire fonctionner.

Cela veut donc dire que quand on parle de stabilisation de la part de la FAO cela signifie qu'en termes financiers on peut parler de stabilisation, mais qu'il y aura certainement un changement de nature et c'est le point le plus important, savoir quelle est l'aide que la FAO peut le plus efficacement apporter tout en favorisant les changements dans la nature de l'aide en général. Et je pense que si l'on réussit cette opération sans démagogie - parce que je crois qu'il faut éviter la démagogie dans ce domaine -, avec des précautions ensuite, même si notre part dans les programmes PNUD n'augmentent pas, nous pourrions, soit par le nombre des projets, soit par la nature de nos interventions, continuer à rendre d'éminents services dans des projets financés par le PNUD.

Voilà ce que je voulais dire à propos de la stabilisation.

En ce qui concerne le consensus auquel le représentant de la Colombie fait allusion, je crois que ce qui est un peu préoccupant, y compris dans ces problèmes de coordination, c'est que plus le PNUD devient une agence d'exécution; de plus, le Coordonateur Résident a une position ambiguë puisqu'il porte une fois la casquette de coordonateur et une autre fois la casquette de coordonné, si je puis dire, et que cette position un peu délicate le met en mauvaise posture, non seulement vis-à-vis des autres agences du système des Nations Unies, mais dans de nombreux cas, vis-à-vis des organisations d'aide bilatérale. J'ajoute que la preuve que ce problème n'est pas posé en l'air, c'est que le rapport Jansson auquel la déléguée des Etats-Unis faisait référence soulève cette question et suggère que peut-être le résident coordonateur devrait avoir un autre statut, un autre financement, un autre moyen de recrutement et beaucoup d'autres choses encore. C'est pour toutes ces raisons que je considère que le problème n'est pas simple et ne doit pas être vu au niveau des concepts seulement.

En ce qui concerne les relations entre la FAO et le résident coordonateur, compte tenu des enquêtes que nous avons menées, que le PNUD a menées, que le rapport Jansson évoque, on peut dire que les cas où il y a des difficultés dans la coordination relèvent beaucoup plus de relations personnelles entre les différents représentants des agences que de problèmes de déontologie ou de mauvaises relations entre les agences. En réalité les cas de difficultés sont fort peu nombreux non seulement de notre part à nous - et M. Régnier ou moi nous rencontrons pratiquement tous les représentants résidents et coordonateurs qui viennent à Rome -, mais de la part des coordonateurs eux-mêmes qui dans de nombreux cas nous font des compliments sur l'aide que le représentant de la FAO leur apporte.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your extensive reply. I hope that at least for this stage that is satisfactory to the delegation of Colombia.

R. MACINTOSH (Canada): We appreciate Mr Lignon's offer to answer specific questions that we posed during our intervention on FAO's internal Field Programme Committee as well as the development of a project cycle approach to its programmes. We introduced these questions because we thought that answers to them may be of sufficient general interest to the entire Commission, and we felt they would benefit from a discussion of how FAO was taking charge of the management issues it faces in running the Field Programme. However, Mr Lignon has kindly offered to provide my delegation with some material, and we accept that offer.

With reference to the point made earlier by my colleague from the United States, may I say that our delegation takes these questions very seriously also. We were a little bit troubled by the complacency shown in the document and in this question as well as from the tone of the remarks by Mr Lignon and some other delegates, I must say. We think it is really a change of attitude that is required, not only from FAO but from all of us, bilateral donors and multilateral organizations. We have to work together on this. We thought the complacency was evident in the document at one point where whoever wrote the document seemed to pass off any remaining problems simply as personality difficulties between the resident coordinator and the FAO representative, or something like that.

Good intentions, as were evident from Mr Lignon's statement, are encouraging. However, concise strategies are a little more attractive. Only firm results can be considered as proof of the pudding. We hope there might be continued progress towards achieving a concerted approach to food security and agricultural development. We are going to face a period of constrained resources and increased demand in the next decade and we must work together to resolve this problem, hopefully once and for all.

CHAIRMAN: I think your remarks are very well taken note of, and since coordination is a matter which cannot be too perfect I am sure that all parties concerned will strive to improve, as you have put it, this coordination and that we will be able to eat more of this pudding you have alluded to. If there are no other countries wishing to take the floor I would conclude that we have finished this item and can now proceed to item 19. This item is concluded.

19. United Nations/FAO World Food Programme

19. Programme alimentaire mondiale Nations Unies/FAO

19. Programa Mundial de Alimentos Naciones Unidas/FAO

CHAIRMAN: This item refers to the United Nations World Food Programme and the related document is C 87/LIM/5. The item also includes a draft resolution for the Conference which should be discussed by our Commission for eventual reference to the Plenary of the Conference. As distinguished delegates are all aware, this item has been the subject of many meetings in FAO and especially also in the CFA, which is the Committee on Food Aid Programmes and Policies. Since the gist of the item concerns the pledging target for the regular resources of WFP for the 1989-90 biennium and since during the discussions which took place in other instances, including the CFA and the Council of FAO, this target fixed at 1 400 million dollars was approved by these institutions I am referring to.

Another element is that since we are at this late hour perhaps I might venture to suggest that we approve the resolution included in the document without further discussion, on the understanding of course that the floor is open to any delegation wishing to make comments. However, I repeat that we want to expedite our work. We have discussed and rediscussed and approved and re-approved our target several times; so perhaps I am not too bold in proposing to the audience this approval, I will not say by acclamation but perhaps by consensus. That is my proposal.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Je ne peux que soutenir la proposition très constructive que vous venez de faire. Je crois que les problèmes du Programme alimentaire mondial ont été largement débattus au cours des deux comités des politiques et programmes d'aide alimentaire qui ont été tenus, cette année, et qui ont été particulièrement positifs.

Je soutiens la proposition que vous faites. Je crois que le projet de résolution qui nous est soumis peut obtenir le consensus de tous les membres.

Je me pose simplement la question - et je demanderai peut-être au Directeur exécutif adjoint ce qu'il en pense - de savoir si, dans l'avenir, il ne serait pas souhaitable de tenir la Conférence des annonces de contributions en collaboration entre le Programme alimentaire mondial et la FAO ici, à Rome, au lieu de demander au Secrétaire général des Nations Unies de convoquer spécialement une conférence des annonces de contributions au siège de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, à New-York, pour le début 88. Il est clair que l'annonce des contributions pourrait se faire sans aucune difficulté par l'ensemble des pays ici à Rome. Cela simplifierait peut-être les choses et éviterait des frais qui me paraissent inutiles.

Je ne demande pas qu'on le retire de la résolution qui nous est soumise car cela provoquerait certaines difficultés; mais je me demande si, à l'avenir pour simplifier les choses, on ne pourrait pas annoncer les contributions à Rome.

Nous avons quand même une série d'instances responsables des activités du Programme alimentaire mondial et je crois que l'annonce de contributions pourrait aussi bien se faire par les représentations permanentes ici à Rome, au lieu d'envoyer un télex à nos représentations permanentes à New York pour faire la déclaration que nous aurions pu faire ici. Cela simplifierait les choses.

Je désirais simplement soulever très brièvement ce point en vous signalant, une fois de plus, que je me rends totalement à l'avis que vous venez d'émettre.

CHAIRMAN: I am certain that your very interesting proposal has been noted. Of course I will give the floor to the Deputy Executive Director to comment on it, but before doing so I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Cuba.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Un comentario muy breve. Pensamos que, como ha dicho el distinguido Embajador Saintraint recientemente, las actividades del PMA han sido sometidas a un examen cuidadoso. La conclusión de este CPA es que el programa marcha satisfactoriamente, goza de excelente salud, a pesar de las dificultades por las cuales estamos atravesando y nos parece muy sensato y muy práctico que aprobemos esta Resolución de inmediato. Quisiera también sumarme al criterio de buscar mecanismos mas ágiles. Algunos países en desarrollo a veces tenemos dificultades para asistir a estas reuniones del Comité de Colocación de Productos, y nos parece que en Roma hay una representación suficientemente amplia como para poder hacer esta reunión sobre contribuciones aquí en Roma.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Cuba, especially for your support for the acceptance of the resolution by consensus.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Estamos de acuerdo, Sr. Presidente, con usted en que es muy tarde y que este tema se ha discutido en otros foros, pero estamos esperando que por lo menos se produjera una declaración por parte del Director Ejecutivo Alterno, el Dr. Ahmed, quien ha venido a representar al Director Ejecutivo Sr. Ingram, bajo la furia del vendaval de la naturaleza esta noche. No vamos a prolongar el debate, pero intervenimos después de que nos ha estimulado la primera declaración del Embajador Saintraint quien acaba de presidir con gran competencia el CPA en este año 1987, y también la declaración de nuestro colega Nieto, de Cuba, porque pensamos que la Conferencia como máximo organismo de la FAO no debería limitarse simplemente a adoptar este proyecto de resolución, sino que conviene que en la parte de nuestro informe sobre este tema se consignen por lo menos algunas consideraciones fundamentales.

Nosotros pensamos que no obstante apoyar la meta invariable de 1 400 millones para el bienio 89/90 lamentamos que esa meta no haya sido más elevada, de manera tal que correspondiera a la eficacia con que trabaja el Programa y al hecho de que el PMA es el único organismo del sistema de las Naciones Unidas que no ha sido víctima de la crisis que afecta el multilateralismo. Sin embargo, tomamos nota de que el Director Ejecutivo dice haber sido realista al hacer esta propuesta y asegura que con ella podrá mantener su nivel actual de compromisos o aumentarlo a la luz de la posible variación de los precios.

También pensamos que en nuestro informe debe constar la actitud positiva del PMA que frente a la situación de liquidez, situación que es sólida, ha decidido absorber gastos de descarga de barcos fletados en países beneficiarios. Creemos que esto es importante, porque sabemos que muchos países beneficiarios han tenido dificultades en el descargo de los productos por la carencia de infraestructuras adecuadas.

También pensamos que en nuestro informe debemos reiterar una vez más el apoyo a la compra de productos en los países en desarrollo. Particularmente las transacciones triangulares cuyos beneficios todos conocemos. Somos conscientes de que ya el Consejo apoyó unánimemente este objetivo de promesas 1989/90 y debemos insistir tal como se dice ya en el informe del Consejo y también en el texto mismo de la resolución en la necesidad de que los donantes hagan esfuerzos para que se alcance el objetivo en su totalidad.

En toda la historia del PMA, en sus 24 años de existencia, nunca ese objetivo se ha alcanzado completamente, de manera que pensamos que esto también convendría que se incluyera en el informe; pero la propuesta de Bélgica, que apoyó Cuba, naturalmente también estaríamos en favor de agilizar el mecanismo siempre que la Secretaría del PMA considere que esta innovación pueda representar beneficios y no cause dificultades en la celebración de la Conferencia de Promesas que tradicionalmente se ha celebrado en la Sede de las Naciones Unidas de Nueva York.

Finalmente, acogemos complacidos su propuesta de que la Conferencia aprueba por unanimidad este proyecto de resolución como el mejor voto de confianza a la forma dinámica, eficaz y competente como trabaja el Programa Mundial de Alimentos.

CHAIRMAN: Please do not think that I wanted to deprive Mr Ahmed of his right to introduce the item, but I thought I had his tacit consent to open the debate in the fashion I did. of course I would not wish at all to prevent any delegate from expressing appreciation of the World Food Programme, an appreciation which was expressed so many times that I think the message is already there. But now I want to give the floor to the delegate of Canada.

R. MACINTOSH (Canada): I was going to reserve my remarks until we heard from Mr Ahmed. In fact I was very much looking forward to hearing from him. I am prepared to join any consensus that you may propose in order to handle this discussion, but I feel compelled to point out to our colleague from Belgium that any discussion of the locale of the Pledging Conference surely is something which should be developed within the appropriate governing body of the World Food Programme, the CFA. So, Mr Chairman, I would propose that you turn over the mantle to Mr Ahmed and he can introduce the topic very capably, as we expect him to do, and then if there are comments we can deal with them at that time.

CHAIRMAN: But I take it that you are ready to join the consensus. Of course I will turn the floor over to Mr Ahmed, but perhaps we can wait for a prologue instead of an epilogue, since many countries have asked for the floor. So may I give the floor to Ethiopia.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): Mr Chairman this is the first time that we have taken the floor since you started chairing this Commission and we would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your election.

Since we were members of the CFA and also we have discussed this matter in the Council, we have the same opinion as you, Mr Chairman, that we will have no difficulty endorsing the recommendations and resolutions contained in document C 87/LIM/5. We felt that this is a matter upon which there will be no difficulty as far as the question as placed by you is concerned. But then, like the Ambassador of Colombia and also later the delegate of Canada, we also felt that the presence of the Deputy Executive Director amongst us would give us some enlightenment on some recent developments and we thought that he should be given a chance to present some of the latest things that developed since the last Council meeting. We want to air this view of providing a chance for Mr Ahmed to present whatever he has to present for us today and then would be reserving our right to comment on his presentations.

CHAIRMAN: That was indeed my intention. There are four other speakers on my list and then I will give the floor to Mr Ahmed and of course every country has the right to comment after the statement of Mr Ahmed.

James Samson KAIRD(Kenya):We too would like to add our voice to the other speakers who have spoken before us on this issue. Looking at the resolution as it is, we also had the same view, that with the presence of the Deputy Executive Director, Mr Ahmed, probably we would like the introduction as it is always the routine, so that we may as well come in and comment. We are very grateful, particularly to this Programme, but before we hear from Mr. Ahmed we would probably just say we endorse the resolution as it is.

A.K.M. Fazley RABBI (Bangladesh): We too support the proposal from the Chair, but I raised the flag being that we were being deprived of the lucid presentation by the Deputy Executive Director, so at this point we join others and say that the target which is realistic and pragmatic received unanimous support of all the Member Nations, both in the CFA as well as in the Council. So we take this chance to reiterate our full support to the target and also to the adoption of the Draft Resolution.

CHAIRMAN: I see that everyone is anxious to listen to Mr Ahmed, but again I beg your indulgence. I have only two speakers left.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): A cette heure tardive de la nuit, notre délégation limitera son intervention en déclarant que le Gouvernement malgache apprécie vivement l'aide précieuse que le PAM nous apporte et celle qu'il prodigue en général aux pays en développement.

L'assistance du PAM correspond aux besoins prioritaires de notre économie. Elle tient compte de notre programme de développement. Le PAM a toujours su soutenir nos efforts de programmes et nos efforts d'ajustements structurels.

La délégation malgache encourage le PAM dans son effort de dynamisation de ses activités dans son souci permanent de s'adapter aux besoins particuliers de chaque pays tout en veillant à ce que ses opérations profitent en priorité aux groupes cibles, ceux pour lesquels il a été créé.

Notre délégation félicite le Secrétariat pour la clarté de ce document et accorde son appui sans réserve au projet de résolution qui figure en annexe.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I have the pleasure of giving Mr Ahmed the floor.

Salahuddin AHMED (WFP): I thought I had escaped the honour of making a statement before this Commission under your Chairmanship considering the late hour and your convenience.

I am happy and I feel honoured that I am here at this Commission to speak on behalf of the Programme, on the pledging target of the Programme for the next biennium, that is, 1989-90.

Mr Chairman, the CFA, as you have rightly mentioned in your introduction, has recommended the target which the FAO Council has commended to you for the Conference's approval. In a parallel action, the United Nations General Assembly's Second Committee has supported the target on the basis of an ECOSOC Resolution. In doing so it also expressed the hope that resources would be augmented by substantial additional contributions from other sources. There is not much that I can add to the appreciative deliberations of those bodies, but I take this opportunity, as I have been asked to do, to apprise the Conference of some of the activities of WFP to put the target in perspective.

Thanks to the confidence placed in it by donors and recipients alike, WFP now handles about a quarter of the world's food aid and has emerged as the largest provider of aid, among all UN agencies, that directly reaches the world's poor - landless peasants in Bangladesh, malnourished children in Latin America, homeless refugees in Somalia. If there is a problem we are facing now it is one of growth - growth in expectation, growth in the complexity of operations, and growth in excellence.

It has been our direct focus on the poor that has set the course for us as we seek to enhance the design and implementation of our food aid projects, strengthen our logistics capability and improve our management structure. In the crucible of the African crisis, the Programme met its toughest challenge and faced it with courage and commitment. In the wake of that crisis, the scope of the Programme's operations has continued to expand. Last year, WFP shipments climbed to an all-time high of 2.25 million tons of food drawn from our own resources, the International Emergency Food Reserve and bilateral donors.

Our food purchases also achieved a new record of 567 000 tons in 1986 - 3 out of 4 tons of it from the developing world and 2 out of 5 from Africa. So far in 1987, we have exceeded even that record and purchased 585 000 tons. Of this total, 410 000 tons are from developing countries.

Understandably, there are attendant difficulties with such purchases, but they have decided developmental advantages, particularly in promoting South-South cooperation. Unfortunately, the deteriorating food situation we are beginning to see now in some of Africa's stronger producers - most notably Malawi and Zimbabwe - will likely prevent us from repeating these large purchases next year. It is, however, our firm commitment to buy in Africa for Africans whenever possible, and we plan to increase our funding for food purchases from the Third World in the next biennium.

The overall character and direction of our food aid projects have not varied significantly in recent years. In 1986, for example, 84 percent of the 1.8 million tons of food we committed to development projects, largely of the food-for-work variety, went to low-income, food deficit nations. Fifty-six percent went to the least developed countries - a high figure given the LDC's share of the developing country population. We continue to have a very high proportion of our commitments to development projects in Africa, roughly 38 percent last year.

As in the past, agriculture and rural development accounted for the lion's share of the \$629 million we committed to development projects in 1986, receiving 81 percent of the total. The remaining 19 percent went to human resource projects such as education and health with a strong emphasis on mother and child health programmes.

I realize that all of these percentages are a bit abstract. To give you an idea of the "real world" effects of what WFP does: in the Ethiopian highlands, for example, there are now millions of saplings and trees growing on thousands of kilometres of terraced hillside, planted through the largest food-for-work project in Africa. This represents a massive contribution to that country's struggle to contain erosion and revive farming.

To combat food emergencies, accentuated by seemingly inexorable rise in refugees and displaced people, we committed \$183 million last year. The need for emergency food aid is again rising and rising rapidly, largely because of the deteriorating conditions in Africa. It already appears that we will barely be able to meet the demands for 1987 for emergency food aid requirements. At the present rate of new emergencies we certainly will not have a carryover into 1988, in spite of the good response from donors for extra allocations.

Strengthening our ability to deliver food quickly and efficiently has been the Programme's highest priority in this area. When it comes to logistics, Africa is a harsh teacher and we learned a great deal from the African famine. We continue to make progress the hard way, prompted by the difficulties and dangers inherent in emergency operations, like our ongoing drive to bring food to victims of civil strife and drought in Ethiopia, Mozambique and the south of Sudan.

Despite worsening conditions in much of sub-Saharan Africa, we have had a measure of success. In the food pipeline to southern Sudan, WFP's newly formed logistics branch is organizing truck convoys, though with serious interruptions from time to time, and great risks not only to carry our own food, but also to deliver the relief goods of several NGO's. In Mozambique, the Programme is providing crucial coastal transport in the overall relief effort. We have, at the moment, stationed logistics coordinators in various parts of the country to provide essential information feedback and coordinate logistics for what has become a massive operation.

Operating conditions in Ethiopia are not just difficult; I am sorry to say they are dangerous even. I am sure many of you read the newspaper accounts of how WFP trucks were attacked and burned while attempting to deliver food to Eritrea last month. Despite this setback, we have persisted in our food deliveries and trucks are now moving into the north, though the situation remains precarious. Just three months ago, we issued a warning about the deteriorating conditions in Ethiopia. If we are to avoid another catastrophe there, we must be absolutely sure that we have the resources forthcoming and the ability to deliver them. The WFP Transport Operation in Ethiopia (WTOE) has therefore been extended into 1988 to cope with the situation. Donors have been approached for funds to procure additional transport, spare parts and workshop facilities. We are in constant touch with them.

In a separate effort to increase our global food aid information capability - vital to planning of shipments - the Programme is currently working on an International Food Aid Information System. This will be a computerized international data-sharing system designed to distribute information on food aid commitments and movements. It builds upon our operating system during the African crisis. It should be able to quickly provide both donors and recipients with detailed information that will improve food aid management. The distance we have travelled in strengthening our logistics and information capability is considerable indeed. It is highly gratifying that this capability of the Programme has received the appreciation of the international community and the UN system.

The Programme has taken some steps to strengthen its internal management following the first independent review in about two decades. We have begun to implement measures on an interim basis, including a new, more field-oriented organizational structure. Our long-term goals in this exercise, as I indicated earlier, are to develop and implement projects more effectively, sharpen our logistics ability and improve our emergency preparedness.

May I also take this opportunity to mention a most welcome initiative by the Italian Government which has a direct bearing on our budget and working conditions. It has formally committed itself to providing WFP with a new headquarters here in Rome for which a headquarters agreement will have to be signed. I am pleased to report that the Director-General of FAO and the Secretary-General of the United Nations are moving swiftly to negotiate such an agreement. We are grateful to them for this.

You are also undoubtedly aware, Mr Chairman, that in the last few years, the World Food Programme and the FAO have worked to forge a new, more effective partnership. Our collaboration is progressing smoothly. Our resources position remains fundamentally sound. So far for this biennium, donors have pledged \$1,069 million which is about 76 percent of the target. The prospects are good and the final result for 1987-88 should surpass the \$1,100 million pledged for 1985-86. With these encouraging figures, we are looking forward to the next pledging conference set for February 9th in New York.

If I may here respond to only one point that was made by the distinguished Ambassador of Belgium, and our past Chairman, actually the Pledging Conference is convened by mutual consultation between the Secretary-General and the Director-General and it has traditionally been held in New York but we take note of the point and then we shall see.

Now coming back to the resource position of the pledging target, I am coming to the end of my statement which I initially intended not to deliver; you have before you a recommended pledging target of \$1,400 million for the 1989-90 biennium. This target level, we believe, is realistic under present circumstances. It is the same as for the current biennium. The CFA chose this level because it considered it prudent to set a target that is attainable. It also felt confident that this will provide a stimulus to donors to achieve it and that with another attempt, \$1,400 million could be reached.

Finally, the challenges facing WFP are likely to intensify rather than diminish in the next few years. In Africa alone, 40 percent of cereal imports are now in the form of food aid and that figure will not decline soon. Political conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America have added millions to the ranks of refugees in the last few years, further building the demand for food aid. All these pressures give added meaning and significance to the WFP Pledging Target before you. They make the continued support of your governments that much more crucial for the World Food Programme and the poor and hungry of the developing world. We are hopeful that such support will be forthcoming in the next pledging conference.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Ahmed, for the very extensive intervention which I have assumed will satisfy many delegations but I see many flags going up and that would mean that we will continue our discussion.

Mme Anna Teresa FRITTELLI ANNIBALDI (Italy): In the course of the World Food Programme Review undertaken by the Committee on Food Aid Policies and programmes at its 21st session the Italian delegation shared many delegations' concern that the pledging targets in the past had not been reached, so it was in full agreement with the Executive Director's realistic approach of setting a target based on the position of the current biennium so that it could be attained in full and facilitate the programming project planning and management.

In response to the request made to donors to increase their pledges for the current biennium and aware of the importance that the World Food Programme should intensify its efforts to buy more food from developing countries out of the Programme's own resources, the Italian Government has increased its cash contribution for 1987 of Lit 3 billions, more specifically destined to World Food Programme management triangular action reaching to the 30 percent of cash contribution allocated for this purpose.

The Italian delegation also announced its intention to double its voluntary contribution to the World Food Programme for 1988 and to increase the 1988 contribution to the European operation from Lit. 5 to 7 billion.

As you may be aware, at the time of the convening of the Pledging Conference in early 1988, the Italian Parliament will not yet have ratified the formal commitment to the World Food Programme for the biennium 1989-90. The intensified effort presently made by the Italian Government is a recommendation of the value of multilateral food aid as implemented by the World Food Programme since its inception and a demonstration of our confidence in this performance of the Programme whose services are called for by the Italian cooperation also to carry out bilateral actions of a particular complexity.

The Italian delegation is therefore pleased to give full support to the Conference Resolution on the target of world food pledges for the biennium 1989-90.

Angus Edward MACDONALD (Australia): I take the floor because I simply did not want to be deprived of an opportunity where I could actually say "yes" to a budgetary proposal during the Conference. As delegates may be aware, Australia has supported, at the Committee on Food Aid and at the FAO Council, the pledging target for 1989-90 of US \$1 400 million. We would certainly like to commend the Executive Director for proposing this realistic and, we believe, achievable figure. It is set at the same level as the current biennium, 1987-88, and we feel it is set with full recognition of the need for restraint in agencies programme budget, while still attempting to meet needs of food deficit developing countries. I think the Deputy Executive Director Mr Ahmed can assume that the brevity of my statement is positively correlated to the satisfaction we hold for the World Food Programme.

Goran ANKARBERG (Sweden): I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Deputy Executive Director for his lucid introduction to this point of the agenda. The active support of Sweden in favour of the World Food Programme is well known and I do not need to repeat it here. The fact that the estimated budget for the year 1988-89 could be accepted by broad consensus was, in our view, a further expression of the confidence member countries have in the World Food Programme, its management and staff. We are confident that the decision to implement the major part of the recommendations of the Consultants Organizational Review will even further improve the effectiveness of the operation of the World Food Programme.

My delegation was pleased to note that the CFA unanimously approved the pledging target for the regular resources of the World Food Programme for the year 1989-90 at US \$1 400 million. We regard this target as realistic and urge all donors to fully meet this target. With these words I commend the adoption of the resolution before us. Finally, Sweden feels strongly that the Pledging Conference should continue to be held in New York.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Por favor Señor Presidente discúlpeme por hacer uso de la palabra por segunda vez. Quiero ser realmente muy breve. Voy a reiterar nuestro sí a la Resolución categórica, apoyando plenamente esta Resolución. Quisiera saludar al Sr. Ahmed por la presentación que nos ha hecho. Hubiese sido muy triste que no hubiéramos podido contar con su exposición sobre lo que está ocurriendo en el Programa para que la Conferencia pueda recogerlo en su informe.

Mi Delegación desea destacar sinceramente el valioso trabajo que viene realizando el Programa Mundial de Alimentos, la dinámica que ha desarrollado en la gestión y su capacidad para adaptarse a las diferentes circunstancias de urgencia, que, como sabemos se han venido produciendo en los tiempos recientes.

También queremos señalar nuestro acuerdo en la dirección que ha venido manifestando el PMA para orientar los recursos cada vez más hacia el desarrollo, sin desatender las necesidades de urgencia en cuanto a la ayuda alimentaria.

La meta que ha sido propuesta de 1 400 millones nos parece realista, pero estamos convencidos y abri-gamos la esperanza de que la capacidad ejecutoria del Programa Mundial de Alimentos pueda promover nuevas aportaciones y estimular a los donantes para seguir en su beneficiosa labor.

ZHANG YESUI (China) (original language Chinese): First of all, I should like to thank Mr Ahmed, the Deputy Executive Director of the World Food Programme for his introduction of this agenda item. The delegation of China very much appreciates the contribution made by the World Food Programme to agricultural development in low-income developing countries. Experience has shown that food aid is an important instrument to combat hunger and malnutrition. Since 1979 China has been receiving assistance from the World Food Programme and we have been working on the basis of food against work. Food aid is a very important catalyst that has allowed the Government of my country at various levels to invest sizeable amounts of funds, labour and materials in agricultural development, fisheries, livestock breeding, water management and the building of roads in rural areas. All this has given very positive results which may serve as examples.

Food aid not only creates jobs in rural areas but also increases the incomes of farmers who obtain good economic results and modifies the entire situation in rural areas improving the environment. However, hunger and malnutrition still exist in the world while at the same time some countries have food surpluses. It is essential to strengthen the work of the World Food Programme. We strongly support Mr Ingram's proposal and the target for pledges at US \$ 1 400 million for 1989-90 and we hope that governments will support this programme. Our Government will be supporting the programme. As other countries, we hope that the target of the World Food Programme for 1989-90 will be approved by consensus.

Ms. Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): I should like to thank the Deputy Executive Director of the World Food Programme for his very interesting introductory statement. Food aid is playing an increasingly important role in the development process. Today food aid constitutes approximately 10 percent of aid development assistance. In sub-Saharan Africa the share is nearly 25 percent. Apart from the quantity also the quality of food aid has significantly improved. Food aid is regarded as an integral part and complementary resource to enhance development, particularly in rural and agricultural sectors. This development approach has created new and innovative ways to use food aid to alleviate poverty and malnutrition without disturbing normal patterns of production and marketing in recipient countries.

The pledging target of the World Food Programme's biennium 1989-90 was approved by the CFA during its 23rd Session. The target of US \$ 1.4 billion was recently supported also by the United Nations General Assembly. In our opinion, this realistic pledging target will facilitate planning and management of WFP's activity over the next two-year period. Therefore, Finland is pleased to join in a unanimous adoption of the pledging target by this Conference as presented in document C 87/LIM/5.

Finland's contribution to WFP's regular resources and to the International Emergency Food Reserve has steadily increased. In fact, we have trebled our food aid to WFP during the six-year period 1982-87. Nearly all Finnish food aid assistance is channelled through WFP. We intend to continue with this policy in the future.

During 1986 WFP committed US\$629 million to development projects representing 1.8 million tonnes of food and approximately US\$ 183 million to provide 550,976 tonnes of food to emergency operations. If this annual commitment of more than US\$ 800 million is compared to, for example, FAO's budget for 1988-89 it gives an idea of the magnitude and scope of WFP's current operations. Growing resources need to be planned and managed in an efficient way.

Finland has noted with great satisfaction that initiatives and efforts made by the Executive Director of WFP to strengthen the management and administrative capacity of the Programme. In the 24th Session of CFA the issue of CFA's working methods was widely debated. We hope that the next CFA meeting will be able to find a solution and agree on the most appropriate option as to new working methods which we find necessary mainly to improve project consideration and also to make the committee's work on policy issues more efficient.

Finally, a few observations regarding the Emergency operations of WFP. We have taken note that WFP jointly with other relevant UN agencies, is actively engaged in efforts to combat the new crisis developing in eastern Africa. We appreciate the coordinating role which WFP has exercised as regards food aid in emergency situations. As refugees are the largest continuing beneficiary group of WFP emergency assistance, we welcome the increased cooperation and coordination between WFP and UNHCR. We are convinced that the recent agreement between the two agencies will lead to more efficient utilization of food supplies to the refugees. More resources are needed for refugees and other victims of emergency situations in different parts of the developing world. We hope that these resources are planned and utilized in such a way that they also contribute to the smooth transition of longer-term development. In this effort FAO should actively cooperate with WFP.

Finally, as Sweden, Finland considers that the Pledging Conference should be held in New York.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): As I tried to indicate in the earlier part of my intervention and as members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes, we have gone through the process of discussion on the pledging target and the proposed US\$ 1 400 million target for the 1989-1990 period. As this has been no surprise and has been well supported in the CFA and by my delegation, also in the Council that was held recently, we would again voice our support and endorsement of the Resolution contained in the document C 87/LIM/5. We also support the idea expressed in paragraph 166 regarding the increased purchases of food from developing countries out of the Programme's own cash resources. Even so, the food shortage situation in the developing countries has increased and in spite of commodity price rises and lower exchange rates of the US dollar, the target for the period 1989-90 stayed at the same level as that of the previous biennium and accounting for the prevailing international economic situations and also the concern expressed in connection with the achievable target setting, the present proposal could be considered as an acceptable level.

As one of the beneficiary countries from Food Aid for Development, Ethiopia has effectively used the contributions to support natural resources conservation activities such as soil and water conservation, as well as afforestation programmes. And these programmes will eventually contribute to our increased food production of the future. We would continue to support and encourage the continuity of the present directions of development and priorities of the World Food Programme. We also would commend the success in the utilization of food aid for development for others in our country's programme.

In response to the Ethiopian emergency. Ethiopian food shortage emergency was due to the drought in 1987-88 and that was reported by the Deputy Executive Director. We are still short of the actual requirement. Firm commitment is still at about one third of the requirement which was conservatively estimated some time back - about six months back. We would like to thank all those Member Nations who responded to the situation prevailing, while at the same time indicating the need of further response in order to face up to and challenge the existing food shortage problem.

While listening to the report, and also having gone through the document presented for our consideration we felt that this emergency, which was not at all related to the document and which was not at all presented in any form in the document being considered, we felt that it would not appear in this part of the discussion. I would like to get a clarification on how this could be related with the document which is presented for our consideration.

Dangers which have been and are being encountered will in no way become a blockage to us reaching the needy. We will continue to reach the needy in all parts of the country but we will, however, want to indicate our strong objections to the exaggerated reports such as the one that was presented by the Deputy Executive-Director.

Moses Mike MUKOLWE (Kenya): We did speak earlier in support of the proposed resolution and after hearing Mr Ahmed, we note a variety of problems that the Organization may face in relation to the operation in Africa but this is no doubt not discouraging.

You rightly stated that Africa is a harsh teacher and this has spurred you to sharpen your design and strategy and this should be the spirit of our cooperation programmes such as this. However it is a two-way system learning process.

I note with appreciation that at least soil conservation works and afforestation programmes are on the ground in Ethiopia and could be in other areas of your operation - this is very encouraging.

I am not very sure if the Organization keeps monitoring the situation - maybe with nutrition interventions regarding the state of the target groups so that the momentum can be kept not only by the WFP but also by the recipient governments. I have in mind the maintenance of the works established under the programme.

I would like also to compliment your organization for the assistance given to us in Kenya, particularly with regard to triangular transaction arrangements which has enabled the country to dispose of their temporary surpluses last season. We hope in other places where there are surpluses within assisted Africa this definitely would be the programme to foster.

We support the cash element of the programme to facilitate getting the food commodity to the target groups and it is our hope this will continue to form one third of the total pledge and even more.

Kenya has realized that without proper organization - that is, a task force within the country and infrastructures that will relate to movement of food, then the programme is impaired and this should not be overlooked in the programmes that we are undertaking under the WFP because this will instead go over or surmount the wastage and then save the very life that we are after. We endorse the resolution as it stands.

Jan DOORENBOS (Netherlands): The target level has been already extensively dealt with during the CFA meeting. We shared at that time the view of the Executive Director of WFP that preference should be given to set a goal that can be met rather than a target very likely not to be attained. We made however an appeal then, and I would like to repeat it here, to not only the traditional donors but also to those countries which did not donate to WFP so far, to pledge contributions so that the target really can be met. The Netherlands knows its responsibility and is known to accept its share fully. This also applies to triangular actions. The WFP is now almost 25 years young and over the years WFP has grown considerably. Also with the coming of age, wisdom has been accumulated. We are happy to note that the parent organization acknowledges this fact. We therefore wish to express our appreciation that relations have improved to a stage like there should be between two relatives respecting each other so that each can fulfil their responsibilities which are imposed by their respective mandates, and this in closest harmony.

Mr Ahmed, we applaud your speech and hasten to voice our support and endorsement of the resolution before us.

Satoshi WAKUNO (Japan): I shall be very brief. The Japanese delegation is pleased to join many of the previous speakers in supporting the draft resolution on the realistic pledging target for 1989-90 of 1.4 billion US dollars formulated at the 23rd Session of the CFA and endorsed at the 91st Council of FAO. Given that the gaps between the targets and actual pledges have gradually been increasing over recent years and considering also that the existing donor countries share the burden in making the contributions under their present financial constraints, we hope that efforts will also be made by WFP to seek out new possible donors in order to mobilize the additional resources.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to commend WFP for its successful achievements, including the change of the Headquarters' organizational structure and the efficient management in the field of development food aid as well as emergency assistance, particularly in Africa, and so would like to express our continuous support to the programme.

Wolfram M. RAINER (Germany Federal Republic of): First of all my delegation would like to thank Mr Ahmed for the extensive and informative statement he has given us. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany already expressed its views at the Twenty-third Session of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes and also at ECOSOC and at the General Assembly of the United Nations, and in those various fora we have expressed the view that the target of US\$ 1 400 million as the expected target for 1989-90 was acceptable and we have expressed our support for it.

We have also noted with satisfaction the action on the part of the Executive Director to take ever greater account of the needs and requirements of the beneficiary countries. For this reason the Federal Republic of Germany supports the resolution included in document C 87/LIM/5. We are in favour of this resolution and the Federal Republic of Germany, as in the past, will also in the future go on supporting the World Food Programme in its struggle against hunger and malnutrition to the best of our ability.

Almir F. DE SÁ BARBUDA (Brazil): I shall be very brief. I just want to join all previous speakers in praising the WFP as a highly efficient organization and also the work done by Mr Ingram and Mr Ahmed. The CFA is as well in our view a very effective forum that accomplishes in a proper manner its functions and reaches the targets for which it has been created. Proposals for changes in CFA's methods of work should therefore, in our view, be very carefully examined and accepted only if all member countries are convinced that they will improve our already effective work.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr Ahmed for his very useful and comprehensive statement and to give the full support of my delegation to the resolution presented to us.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Gracias, Sr. Presidente, por permitirme esta segunda dosis, muy comprimida.

Queremos referirnos al problema de la situación en Etiopía, tal como lo hicimos en el CPA que concluyó sus labores a fines de octubre pasado, e igualmente insistimos en la Comisión I en la discusión del primer tema de fondo sobre la situación de la agricultura y la alimentación en el mundo. Pensamos que ante los hechos que empiezan a conocerse en relación con la situación en Etiopía convendrá que esta Conferencia haga un llamado para que una acción conjunta de la FAO, del PMA, del organismo especial de Naciones Unidas para la situación africana y sobre todo de los donantes pueda permitir una intervención oportuna y con la anticipación necesaria a fin de evitar que debamos asistir a otra crisis tan dramática como la del año 1985. Pensamos que esto debe constar en nuestro informe.

Y finalmente, queremos agradecer al Sr. Ahmed su declaración elocuente y fundada como siempre y pedirle al Director Ejecutivo Adjunto que transmita al Sr. Ingram, Director Ejecutivo del PMA, la reiteración del respeto, del pleno apoyo, de la simpatía del Gobierno de Colombia por la forma inteligente y eficaz como el Sr. Ingram viene cumpliendo sus funciones con tan alta responsabilidad.

R. MACINTOSH (Canada): Mr Ahmed's introduction was certainly worth waiting for. The Canadian delegation is fully satisfied with the proposed pledging target established by the Committee on Food Aid, CFA, at its 23rd Session. The target of US\$ 1 400 million appears to our delegation as realistic and achievable, and we urge other delegations and Member States to reach fully this target and to do so as early as possible within each calendar year of the biennium.

We believe that setting a target which is realistic will facilitate the work of the Programme when establishing the resources available for the different projects in the planning process. We consider that the new arrangements adopted by WFP, bringing together responsibilities for emergency operations and development projects under the new administrative structure of regional bureaux and headquarters will contribute to the operational effectiveness of the Programme. The creation of an integrated and rotational professional staff should help WFP to produce better projects and to improve cohesion in the field.

We are convinced that with well designed and targeted projects available and effective implementation assured, larger effective commitments of resources will be made, and that this will benefit the poorest populations in developing countries. Canadian authorities are also quite pleased with the solid progress made in the last two years on FAO/WFP relations. We congratulate both parties on the productive working relationship now established, and attach great importance to the stability of these new arrangements. Like the delegate of Finland, we have an interest in continuing and completing discussions in the CFA designed to streamline and improve the project approval mechanism.

Eduardo Tomás MIRANO (Angola): Monsieur le Président, nous pensons qu'il est quand même nécessaire de vous dire que nous sommes ravis de vous voir présider, ce soir, les travaux de notre Commission. Encore une fois, nous voulons nous joindre aux délégués qui nous ont précédés pour féliciter M. Ahmed, Directeur général adjoint du PAM, et le Secrétariat pour l'élaboration du document soumis à notre appréciation.

Ma délégation se déclare satisfaite de la présentation claire et nette du document et apprécie avec intérêt les résultats escomptés par l'Organisation.

Le problème de l'alimentation est une priorité des priorités auxquelles toutes les nations du monde doivent accorder toute leur attention pour faire face à ce fléau toujours grandissant. La faim nous préoccupe tous et la nécessité de trouver des solutions urgentes pour libérer le monde de la faim est impérieuse.

Nous insistons pour qu'un accent particulier soit mis sur ce problème dans les pays en développement, et surtout ceux de certaines de nos régions du globe troublées par des guerres d'invasion.

C'est pourquoi ma délégation souscrit au vœu du Directeur exécutif exprimé au paragraphe 165 du document C 87/LIM/5, à savoir celui de permettre au Programme de maintenir ses engagements au niveau actuel et même de les accroître sensiblement si les prix restent stables.

Par la même occasion, nous appuyons l'objectif des contributions au PAM recommandé au Comité des politiques et programmes d'aide alimentaire pour 1989-90. pour lui permettre une meilleure planification et une meilleure gestion des projets.

Le rôle du PAM est immense et réputé dans nos pays pour ses résultats combien louables et déjà escomptés dans la réalisation de ses projets au niveau de chacun des pays. Nous savons que c'est une tâche importante mais difficile dont se charge le PAM afin de venir à bout de ces calamités naturelles qui surgissent dans certaines régions des pays sinistrés. Mais nous croyons qu'avec un programme d'action fondé sur l'engagement mutuel de tous les pays membres et de tous les contribuables dans l'esprit manifesté au paragraphe 166 du document soumis à notre appréciation, nous saurons surmonter le problème de la faim qui sévit dans le monde.

Avant de terminer, nous tenons à manifester notre grande satisfaction relativement aux dispositions du Conseil qui figurent aux paragraphes 166 et 167 ainsi qu'à celles prises par la Direction générale de la FAO et par les Nations Unies.

Nous restons favorables au projet de résolution soumis à la Conférence et relatif à l'objectif des contributions au PAM pour 1989-90 et nous l'appuyons sans réserve.

Par conséquent, nous lançons un appel à tous les contribuables pour qu'ils fassent preuve de bonne volonté et permettent au PAM d'exécuter ses programmes.

Nous nous rallions à la position de la Belgique, de Cuba et bien d'autres qui sont intervenus avant nous pour appuyer sincèrement le projet qui sera adopté par consensus afin de clore nos débats.

Ronald DEARE (United Kingdom): I had not intended to intervene in this non-debate but I did not want the absence of a United Kingdom intervention to be misunderstood, so let me just say very briefly that of course we support the resolution before us. While I have the floor, I have to say that I have doubts about the suggestion of moving the Pledging Conference from New York to Rome. I do not know, but I suspect that one of the reasons for siting it in New York in the first place was that it made it easier for all the members of the World Food Programme actually to attend, because I suspect that rather more countries have representation permanently in New York than they have in Rome. I would be interested, on the assumption that Mr Ahmed is going to respond to this debate, to have his comments on the origin of this proposed siting.

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): I will be very very brief. Denmark supports the resolution and thus the unchanged pledging target for 1989-90 at the level of US\$ 1 400 million. We see the target as realistic and would like to see it met, also through contributions from new donors. Finally, we urge donors to provide one-third of their contributions in cash in order to ensure the continued efficiency of the Programme.

Salim SARRAF (Liban) (langue originale arabe): La délégation du Liban est heureuse de se joindre à tous ceux qui ont appuyé le projet de résolution relatif à l'objectif des contributions au PAM pour l'exercice 1989-90.

Je voudrais féliciter M. Ahmed pour l'excellent exposé qu'il vient de faire. Mes félicitations s'adressent au PAM pour l'aide qu'il a fournie au Liban au cours des années de crise.

Srta. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): La delegación de México agradece al Sr. Ahmed por la brillante introducción del tema. El Gobierno de México aprecia mucho la labor del Programa Mundial de Alimentos de la cual se ha visto beneficiado.

Asimismo se felicita por el éxito que se ha logrado con el objetivo de promesas que asegura la continuidad de las operaciones.

Esperamos, al igual que lo han manifestado otras delegaciones, que los contribuyentes cumplan de igual manera con la regla del porcentaje establecido de su contribución en dinero que permite aumentar las operaciones triangulares, el uso de medios de transporte de los países en desarrollo como un medio que coadyuve a lograr los objetivos de apoyar a nuestros países a incentivar la producción y uso de servicios y reducir los costos que conllevan el incremento de los resultados.

Nuestra delegación ha seguido con gran interés y aprecio todas las mejoras en la administración del PMA. Esperamos que ello permita la movilización de mayores recursos en favor del número creciente de los afectados por el hambre en el mundo, por lo que nosotros no compartimos la satisfacción por el crecimiento cero que tiene el objetivo de promesas. Esperamos que la satisfacción justamente compartida con la eficiencia del PMA permita que se lleven mayores recursos; por todo ello y por la confianza que tenemos en esa Organización y en su dirección, la delegación de México pondrá todo su apoyo a la resolución que se nos presenta.

Nils Ragnar KAMSVAG (Norway): We would just like to join in with others in expressing full support for the draft resolution.

CHAIRMAN: That brings us to the end of our list of speakers for this item. In the meantime we have received a text from Egypt, to be included in the verbatim records of this item. It will be duly recorded.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt): The Egyptian delegation would like to support the proposed pledging target for 1989-1990 at US \$1 400 million. We do hope that this target will be met soon in order to achieve better project planning and managing. We urge donor countries as well as other countries to fully meet this target. The Egyptian delegation adopts the draft resolution No. 1/91 related to this subject. 1/

Salahuddin AHMED (WFP): It has been a very interesting evening for me and very heart warming: no doubt about it. The spirit has been so warm, and right at the beginning I tried to remove a misunderstanding that might have occurred with regard to part of my statement regarding Ethiopia.

My very distinguished friend, I think he misunderstood me and therefore he reacted the way he did. If I failed to communicate that is my failing. But I must say our intention has been all through to draw attention to the very grave situation in Ethiopia and to call attention to the need for very urgent help in order to alleviate the suffering of the people over there, and also to be in a position not only to get aid into the country but to make possible very speedy movement to the areas where it is needed. There are difficulties indeed, but if I had not been brief, if I had been a little more elaborate, I think my very distinguished friend would not only have taken courage but would even have been happy that I mentioned this. The unfortunate incident that all of us know of, where we lost our trucks and also our life, which happened on 23 October, following that about 2 000 tons of food have been moved into Tigré and Eritrea and there are trucks of the WFP's transport operations fleet operating there. But the finest thing about it is that the coordinating body of that truck operation of the WFP is headed by the RRC Commissioner, the Relief Commissioner of Ethiopia himself. Therefore if food is moving into those difficult areas it is moving by a joint effort of both of us and we are working together as we have always done. So that is the happy part of it, where we are together and I hope that will remove any misunderstanding he might have had as a result of my failure to communicate fully to him our concern about the situation and the need for assistance.

Second, there was a small observation made by one of our very distinguished friends here with regard to the fulfilment of the target in the past, whether we achieved the target we had set for ourselves any time in the past. I have records in front of me which indicate that on at least three occasions in the past the target was exceeded; once in 1969-70 it was 160 percent of the target which was achieved; in 1973-74 it was 106 percent; in 1975-76 luckily 149 percent over a target of 440 million. So with all the goodwill that is around and with all the commitment that is there in retaining the target level for the next biennium at the current level, we do hope that it will be possible for the international community to achieve and even to excel the target.

I have only one more point, which is a task that was given to me by the delegate of the United Kingdom, who referred to the basis, if there is one, for holding the Pledging Conference in New York.

Looking at the Basic Text I find that in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution of 1961 there is a particular requirement which reads thus: "Requests the Secretary-General in cooperation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization to convene such a Conference (that is, a Pledging Conference) at United Nations Headquarters as soon as feasible after the Conference Sessions of Economic and Social Council and the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization". That was a Resolution of 1961 when the Programme was just established.

^{1/} Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request

Then in 1965, when the Programme was established on a continuing basis, as a multilateral food aid: "On a continuing basis for as long as multinational food aid is found feasible and desirable".

At that stage in 1965, the Resolution of the General Assembly again: "Requests the Secretary-General in cooperation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization to convene a Pledging Conference at United Nations Headquarters as soon as feasible".

Thereafter there is no such Resolution where there is any reference to the Pledging Conference venue, because the 1975 Resolution concerns itself only to the Constitution of the CFA as the new Governing Body of the World Food Programme. But in the General Regulations derived from all these previous Resolutions of the General Assembly and also of the FAO Conference, in those Regulations there is a very clear reference related to contributions which simply refers to the fact that contributions to the Programme shall be on a voluntary basis, and then: "There shall generally be pledged at Conferences convened jointly by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization approximately one year before the commencement of the pledging period ... etc., etc.". Since there is no other reference anywhere to the contrary one would presume it is a continuation of the same thought and the same trend. As a result of that we feel that traditionally the Pledging Conference has been- held in New York. This is all the knowledge I have at this moment.

Finally, I do feel very heartened on behalf of the Programme by all the words of encouragement, support and understanding, and you can be assured that we will continue to make our modest contribution in the troubled world today.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Ahmed. I think that the debate, or the exchange of views, was indeed heartening for the WFP and the views were expressed that WFP will deserve these heartening comments.

I would not attempt at this late time of the evening to sum up the debate on this item. I will just repeat that there was unanimous appreciation of the WFP's work, constructive comments were made on the operations of the WFP, comments were made also on the operation of the work of the CFA, and other general comments were heard.

But there is one point which concerns our work now, and I can gather from the discussion that there is a consensus to approve the Draft Resolution for the Conference concerning the target for WFP pledges for the period 1989-90, which figures on page 2 of C 87/LIM/5. If I am correct in this assumption I would consider this Draft Resolution as approved by our Commission. I do not see any objection. The Resolution is approved.

It was so decided

Il en est ainsi décidé

Se acuerda así

CHAIRMAN: I believe this concludes discussion of this item, and with your permission I will thank Mr Ahmed for his presence and I think he may have a very good sleep tonight after all the appreciation the Commission has expressed for the Programme.

Now it is five minutes to eleven. We still have some time left until the interpreters will stop assisting us. I think we can use this time, which is around half an hour, to introduce at least the following item on our agenda.

20. Relations and Consultations with International Organizations

20. Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales

20. Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales

20.1. Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa

20.1. Préparation de la session extraordinaire de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies consacrée à l'Afrique et actions consécutives

20.1. Preparación y medidas complementarias del período extraordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas dedicado a África

CHAIRMAN: This item concerns Relations and Consultations with International Organizations. As you are all aware, item 20 has three sub-items, 20.1, 20.2 and 20.3, and I suggest we take these points separately. With your permission I will ask Mr Regnier to take his place on my right to introduce the first sub-point, 20.1, which is Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa. The document relating to this sub-item is C 87/26.

A. REGNIER (Director, Office for Inter-Agency Affairs): It is my pleasure to introduce the agenda item entitled "Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa". Document C 87/26 has been submitted under this item. I have noted the numerous interventions, particularly under item 13 on the Programme of Work and Budget 1988-89 and medium-term objectives, which have referred to the situation in Africa.

As you may recall, the Conference adopted resolution 4/85 at its last session which, among other things, encouraged the efforts being made at that time at the Fortieth Session of the United Nations General Assembly to convene a Special Session on the critical economic situation in Africa. The call for convening the Special Session had come from the OAU Summit held in July 1985, which adopted a strategy on "Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery 1986-1990" (APPER) and a declaration on the critical economic situation in Africa.

Subsequently, the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990 was adopted by the Thirteenth Special Session of the General Assembly. It has two central elements: (a) the determination and commitment of the African countries to launch both national and regional programmes of economic development, and (b) the positive response and commitment of the international community to support and complement African development efforts.

The most important implication of UN/PAAERD for FAO derives from its recognition of agricultural development as the main engine for the recovery and long-term development in Africa. The priority given to agriculture is evident from the fact that 47.5 percent of overall resources for the implementation of the Programme of Action has been allocated to agriculture, with a further 46.9 percent to agro-based sectors.

FAO's close involvement with the Programme of Action goes back to the preparatory stages of the Special Session of the General Assembly when FAO made substantive inputs to the documentation. FAO played an active role in the preparation of the so-called "New York Paper" and the African Submission for the Special Session. The Director-General himself led the FAO delegation to the Special Session.

The adoption of the FAO Programme of Action for African Agriculture, by the Fourteenth Regional Conference for Africa, in September 1986 constituted the first step in FAO follow-up to the Special Session. FAO continues to reorient its regular and field programmes so as to sharpen the focus on Africa and to reflect the priorities of UN/PAAERD, as well as Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery and the Lagos Plan of Action. This appears clearly in document C 87/LIM/24 entitled "FAO's Focus on Africa in Relation to the United Nations Programme of Action". At the same time, the Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme for Africa (ARPA) from 1985 to May 1987 focussed on medium-term efforts to prevent food shortages and to help relaunch agricultural production on a sustainable basis.

A review of achievements and developments during the first year of the UN Programme of Action, from the perspective of FAO work on the stage of agriculture in 1987, is contained in another document before you (C 87/2, paragraphs 54-75). The document under consideration here. However, (C 87/26), outlines the inter-agency dimensions of follow-up to UN/PAAERD.

In September 1986, the United Nations Secretary-General established a high-level Steering Committee of UN/PAAERD under the chairmanship of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Cooperation, Mr Ripert. FAO and other United Nations entities were invited to participate in the work of this Committee. FAO has actively participated in all meetings of the Steering Committee and has submitted a comprehensive report on its approach on the priority measures in the Programme of Action.

In October 1986, the UN Steering Committee established, under the chairmanship of the Executive Secretary of ECA, an Inter-Agency Task Force on the Programme at the regional level, in order to assist the Committee and to act as its technical and operational arm. As a core member of the Task Force, FAO has participated fully in its work. FAO has also contributed considerably, as a member of the drafting group (along with ECA, World Bank and UNCTAD) in the preparation of the Secretary-General's report to the Forty-second Session of the General Assembly. FAO also provided personnel for an FAO/ECA/UNICEF mission in early 1987 to study information flows on the follow-up process on African recovery and development.

In order to oversee the implementation of the agricultural provisions of the UN Programme of Action and to ensure the full commitment to it of the Organization as a whole, the Director-General established in February 1987, an FAO Steering Committee for the follow-up to the Programme chaired by the Deputy Director-General. The other functions of the FAO Steering Committee are to develop specific inputs for implementation of the Programme of Action; to monitor progress and achievements in relation to these objectives and to coordinate arrangements for the reporting of progress to the United Nations and FAO bodies; also to coordinate FAO's participation in the work of the United Nations Steering Committee and the Inter-Agency Task Force; and to formulate policy advice accordingly.

Mr Chairman, up to this point, I have been speaking about formal participation, may I now draw to your attention once again the substantive programmes of FAO pursuant to the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development which are summarized in document C 87/LIM/24.

In accordance with the follow-up mechanism of the UN Programme of Action, the Secretary-General is to monitor the process of implementation of the Programme and to report thereon to the Assembly at its Forty-second and Forty-third Sessions. Accordingly, the Secretary-General has submitted a report (A/42/560) for the consideration of the current session of the General Assembly. As I said earlier, FAO made a considerable contribution to the preparation of this report at the regional level. The Secretary-General has stated in his report that a most important and assuring trend has become discernible in the implementation of the Programme of Action - the growing number of African countries which have embarked on significant policy reforms and structural adjustment measures aimed at bringing about accelerated economic recovery and setting new foundations for more sustainable development. The report affirmed that some of these policy measures have been pushed through in the face of formidable political difficulties and risks. It detailed the unfortunate situation where the external environment that was already so adverse when the Programme of Action was adopted has become even more aggravated. Increased agricultural production often yielded reduced earnings as the prices of the commodities collapsed to their lowest levels for several decades, and the receipts from exports dropped sharply. At the same time, the price of imported manufactured goods has continued to rise, resulting in a deterioration in terms of trade.

The Secretary-General's report also gave considerable attention to the African debt crisis and indicated that the overall African debt is in the region of US \$ 150 bn to US \$ 200 bn, accounting for about half its Gross Domestic Product and approximately three to four times its annual export income. Debt service ratios on average exceed 50 percent.

The current session of the General Assembly has another document before it on this subject, entitled "Africa's Preliminary Assessment of the Implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990". This document was originally presented at the Tenth Ordinary Session of the Permanent Steering Committee of the Organization of African Unity, held in New York in September. The Council will be kept informed on the outcome of the General Assembly deliberation at its next session.

With these preliminary remarks, may I present document C 87/26 for your consideration. I shall be happy to provide any additional information or clarification.

CHAIRMAN: I said in the beginning that we have before us the document C 87/26 but as you have drawn our attention, we have for information purposes only another document on the item which is C 87/LIM/24 for information only. I underline that.

Jean-Pierre POLY (France): Ma délégation voudrait brièvement commenter la présentation par le Secrétariat du document C 87/26 et des paragraphes 8 et 41 du document C 87/9 qui en reprennent les termes et qui font bien le point sur la contribution apportée par la FAO au Programme d'action des Nations Unies pour le redressement économique et le développement de l'Afrique. On peut créditer l'Organisation d'avoir su, depuis quelques années, manifester de manière active sa participation aux efforts de redressement du continent à travers des programmes comme le Système mondial d'information et d'alerte rapide, la lutte contre les criquets et les sauteriaux et un projet comme l'Etude de faisabilité sur l'aide en nature sous forme d'intrants agricoles.

Ma délégation, pour sa part, ne peut que se féliciter de cet engagement total de la FAO vis-à-vis d'un continent particulièrement défavorisé et qui bénéficie de la plus grande part de l'aide que nous apportons aux pays en développement.

Le Ministre des affaires étrangères a d'ailleurs déclaré dans son allocution prononcée le 23 septembre à New York, devant la 42ème Assemblée générale que "les Etats africains doivent bénéficier tout particulièrement du soutien de la communauté internationale, et il ne faut pas que les conclusions de la Session extraordinaire de l'Assemblée générale consacrée au continent africain restent lettre morte".

Permettez-moi, à cette occasion, de vous rappeler le rôle déterminant de notre pays - d'ailleurs avec d'autres pays européens - dans les initiatives suivantes qui ont toutes pour but d'apporter des flux de ressources supplémentaires au développement de l'Afrique. Je pense notamment au Fonds spécial Afrique, au Programme spécial du FIDA pour l'Afrique subsaharienne, à la facilité d'ajustement structurel du FMI, dont mon pays encourage le triplement. La France, en outre, a accru sa part dans la huitième reconstitution de l'AID. Elle appuie une augmentation substantielle de la BIRD et soutient une reconstitution du Fonds africain de développement.

Dans le cas de ce dernier fonds, le secteur prioritaire devra être le développement rural.

Pour compléter ce panorama, au plan bilatéral, le Gouvernement français a montré son attachement au développement du continent africain puisque le Ministère de la coopération connaîtra en 1988 une augmentation budgétaire de plus de 13,5 pour cent, soit l'une des plus importantes pour les ministères français. Une part croissante des fonds sera consacrée à l'aide hors projets et en particulier à des plans de réhabilitation sectoriels.

Toutefois, pour que ces efforts ne soient pas vains, il faut qu'au niveau de chaque pays des solutions soient explorées afin de mettre en oeuvre des actions coordonnées à la fois entre donateurs et pays bénéficiaires. A cet égard, nous pensons que la FAO a un rôle à jouer et nous ne pouvons qu'encourager son Directeur général à prendre des initiatives complémentaires dans ce domaine et l'assurer de notre complet soutien.

Mi lutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): I would like to congratulate you on your election as a Vice-Chairman and also to express our satisfaction to see you in the Chair.

At the same time the Yugoslav delegation wishes to congratulate the Secretariat for its efforts in preparing the document before us for consideration and thank Mr Regnier for his very substantive presentation of the item.

Bearing in mind the facts for the United Nations Programme of Action for the Economic Recovery of the Development of Africa in 1987 is being implemented under conditions of further aggravation of the economic position of the developed countries we should like to point out that such a situation acts as a factor limiting the political action and the possibilities for the African countries to

implement more resolute steps to undertaking the key economic problems of Africa. The further exacerbation of the debt problem and the absence of a global solution to this make the solution to the developing countries of Africa even more difficult and the prospects of recovery and the development of Africa even more remote.

We have seen the reality that in spite of the global improvement in the field of food and agriculture in Africa the position of a number of African countries is still difficult. Therefore, our delegation fully supports the FAO's efforts to focus its programmes of activities on Africa with a view to implementing the United Nations Programme of Action. We consider these to be a positive approach on the part of FAO in assisting the African countries to overcome the immediate medium and long-term problems that this continent is confronted with.

The Yugoslav delegation supports the further implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action and points to the need for greater participation in and contribution of the United Nations Specialized Agencies, including FAO, aimed at more consistently implementing the decisions of the Conference of African Unity Organization pertaining to the critical economic situation in Africa.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): Etant un adepte de la non-violence, j'ai souhaité souligner visuellement simplement, comme c'est je crois la norme aux Etats-Unis, un point d'ordre. Je tiens à faire malheureusement référence au règlement XIII, point 5, c'est-à-dire que nous n'avons pas de quorum en ce moment pour arrêter cette séance, non pas par désir de faire obstruction au débat, mais parce que les pays principalement concernés ne sont pas ici. Je pense qu'il serait sage d'avoir l'Afrique présente et participant au débat quand on parle de l'Afrique et il me semble qu'on pourrait peut-être repartir demain matin quand ces pays seront présents.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Srta. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): Punto de orden: Yo también con el espíritu de mayor comprensión, que creo que debe tratar de ayudarnos a avanzar en el trabajo de nuestras deliberaciones. No sólo en qué situación estamos, porque realmente no ha variado la situación desde hace más de hora y media. Somos los mismos protagonistas los que estamos aquí, solamente lo que ha cambiado es el tema. Me parece que si hemos tenido la comprensión para tratar el tema anterior en el mismo estado de cosas, podemos seguir trabajando, porque yo creo que si la voluntad de algunos países hubiera sido de estar aquí, tal vez las posibilidades se lo impidieron, pero yo creo que si se pudiera hacer abstención de esta situación, en espíritu de compromiso, podríamos seguir trabajando. Se lo pedimos así a los colegas que han levantado el primer punto de orden, a ver si podemos seguir avanzando.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ronald DEARE (United Kingdom): It is the same point of order. I very much agree with what the distinguished delegate of Canada has said. The item we have just been discussing was totally different from the one now before us. It seems to me that it would be appropriate that we should have rather more of the countries represented to whom this is of the greatest concern, than we have here tonight. I would support the motion by the distinguished delegate of Canada.

CHAIRMAN: I think the point made by Canada is well taken and indeed there are two considerations. First, we do not have a quorum but that has not prejudiced our discussions up to now because it has only just been pointed out. Secondly, as far as concerns the substance of the discussion we should like to have seen more African countries present when we discussed this item. To respond to the query raised by Mexico I should like to point out that we have, in fact, only ten minutes before the interpreters leave us. We would not lose much time if we were to stop now. Therefore, if the distinguished delegate of Mexico agrees we could abide by the Canadian proposal, which was supported by the United Kingdom, and adjourn now. We will continue the discussion of this item tomorrow morning. For my part I think we have made some progress this evening. I thank all the delegates present for their attendance

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Estamos de acuerdo, Sr. Presidente, en que se levante ahora la sesión pero a condición de que usted siga presidiendo esta Comisión por lo menos durante todo el día de mañana.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your remark but the matter is not in my hands. We have a chairman and I think we will decide that matter tomorrow. If there are no further comments I will adjourn now.

The meeting rose at 23.30 hours

La séance est levée à 23 h.30

Se levanta la sesión a las 23.30 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/20

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

TWENTIETH MEETING

VINGTIEME SEANCE

20ª SESION

(24 November 1987)

The Twentieth Meeting was opened at 11.45 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La vingtième séance est ouverte à 11 h 45, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 20ª sesión a las 11.45 horas, bajo la
presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary advises the Chair that we have a quorum. The Chair would point out that we have a quorum two hours and eleven minutes after we were supposed to start our proceedings today. We understand we are late because of the Plenary's necessity of conducting an uncontested election. We must caution that time is running out and everyone would do everyone else a favour if we tried to produce a quorum and commence business at some point in time reasonably close to the time when we are supposed to.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

20. Relations and Consultations with International Organizations (continued)

20. Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales (suite)

20. Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales (continuación)

20.1. Preparation and Follow-up of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Africa (continued)

20.1. Préparation de la session extraordinaire de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies consacrée à l'Afrique et actions consécutives (suite)

20.1. Preparación y medidas complementarias del período extraordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas dedicado a África (continuación)

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): This is a topic which continues to touch very deeply the hearts and minds of the Canadian people. I say the hearts and minds because indeed, as the ancient wisdom of China has taught us, the need for balance between the Ying and the Yang, this is an issue which requires the Cartesian intellectual rigour of the economist as well as the sensibility of the artist.

This agenda item is intended to review the implementation of FAO Conference Resolution 85/4, but it is also an opportunity for us all to comment on the prospects for economic growth and renewed development in Africa. On the former point I will say only that in view of the central place of agriculture in the UN Programme of Action we urge FAO to do its utmost to ensure maximum effectiveness in its programme delivery and maximum cooperation with UN coordination efforts in this context.

Concerning the latter point, Canada believes that the current situation in Africa requires that this FAO Conference recognizes the following four needs on an urgent basis. First, acknowledgement of the efforts Africans have made themselves to improve their economic management and effectively implement the UN Programme of Action. Secondly, recognition of the unexpected deterioration of the world economic environment.. Thirdly, general acceptance of the need to do more in terms of providing additional resources. Fourthly, innovative action to alleviate the debt-burden at least for poor African countries.

The United Nations General Assembly completed its debate on the progress of the implementation of the UN PAAERD in October. The Canadian Minister for External Relations, who is also the Minister responsible for CIDA, (Canadian International Development Agency) delivered the Canadian statement from which I will now liberally quote. In Africa some 28 countries have undertaken significant and effective structural adjustment programmes. These countries have made great and far-reaching sacrifices in the hope of improving their prospects for long-term benefits and success. We must here recognize that the courage, energy and determination demonstrated by those African governments are making a difference and deserve our full unrelenting support.

On the part of the international community there has also been some movement. I will not rehearse in detail what has happened for instance at the IMF, or the Paris Club, or the ideas generated by UNICEF, but in current circumstances it is only too evident that the response is not adequate. We, in unison, must accomplish what may now appear impossible, that is, more and better assistance more quickly given. We in Canada have accepted our responsibilities. I do not wish here to join what has often become a beauty contest in this room. I will simply mention in passing that in 1984 and 1985 we responded to the immediate problem of famine, as well as contributed to the long-term resolution of the problem which caused it in the first place. For instance, early last year Canada set in place the Africa 2000 Programme and we declared a moratorium on outstanding aid debt for sub-Saharan Africa, as well as converted our Development Assistance Programme throughout the world to an all-grant basis.

This year Canada has gone further, for example, at the Francophone Summit and at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, both hosted by Canada, we undertook to forgive the remaining outstanding Canadian overseas Development Assistance debts of 13 countries in sub-Saharan Africa - a measure worth US\$ 672 million. In addition the Canadian Government has taken steps to orient our development assistance more directly toward the more pressing needs of the poorest countries, in particular, in the area of human resource developments and in respect of the role of women.

In line with our concern for Africa we have taken the decision to increase the percentage of our bilateral development assistance channelled to African countries to 457%. We have taken the additional decision to untie that assistance up to 50% so that it can be more quickly and effectively used, and better adapted to local circumstances. I will not elaborate further, I simply wish to underline the need for all of us - beyond the beauty contest to which I had to refer earlier - to put our resources where our mouth is. We are determined to do not only our part but more, and we invite others to join us urgently in this endeavour.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): First of all the United States would like to compliment the Director for his able presentation last night. Within the context of assistance to Africa the implementation of the UN Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development (PAAERD) is of great importance to the United States. The development priorities outlined in the UN Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development for adoption by the African States and assistant donors closely parallels those of the United States Agency for International Development (AID). We have consistently stressed the need for active follow-up by all concerned to the measures outlined in the Plan of Action since it was adopted by the General Assembly in June 1986. The Secretary-General's Report makes for sober reading, recounting as it does the magnitude of the continuing economic crisis facing Africa. Yet the Report provides confirmation that the development priorities and goals adopted by the UN General Assembly last year, and spelled out in the Plan of Action, remain valid and hold the key to Africa's economic recovery. For its part the United States reaffirms its support for the United Nations Programme of Action for Africa's Economic Recovery and Development and its commitment to work in partnership with the African States in the implementation of their programmes of reform, rehabilitation and development.

ZHU PEIRONG (China) (original language Chinese): In document C 87/26 prepared by the Secretariat for this Conference, we find a summary of the preparations for the Thirteenth Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and of the follow-up given to that Session within the UN System as a whole. We are very happy to see that the FAO has played an important role in many of these activities, for example, the supply of information, the preparation of documentation, attendance at meetings, providing help to Africa in drought control and locust control and a feasibility study of in-kind assistance to the continent. This demonstrates the firm commitment of the FAO to the efforts which are aimed at solving the problems of the African Continent both in the immediate future and in the long-term. It is indicated in paragraph 14 of document C 87/26 that there would be a Conference in Africa at the beginning of 1988 on the follow-up to the Action Programme by the United Nations. It is said that this will concentrate upon the human dimensions of the development and of the economic rehabilitation of Africa. We should like to express our appreciation and our support for this. We hope that the FAO will be an active participant in the work of that Conference. We also hope that the FAO will bring its support to the efforts which are being deployed by the Member States in all these areas.

I should like to recall the commitment undertaken by our Minister of Agriculture, Mr He Kang, on behalf of the Chinese Government at the Thirteenth Ministerial Session of the World Food Council which was held at Beijing in June. That Commitment was to help the African countries to enhance their intellectual resources. The Chinese Government will set up an international centre for agricultural training, the main task of which will be to train agricultural technicians and administrators for the African countries. I should like to state to this body that the training centre will be set up on the campus of the Agricultural University of South China. The construction work of the centre has already begun with the help of the relevant Chinese authorities and of the FAO. The work of procurement of plant and equipment and the drafting of text books and manuals is underway. We will do our very best to see that this centre is inaugurated on 1st September 1988. We hope that at that time when we open the doors of the centre the African countries will send us trainees. We hope very sincerely that the African countries, the FAO and other countries and international organizations which are interested in the economic development of Africa will provide support and cooperation for this centre so that it can improve its work, train competent persons for African countries and play the role which it should be able to play in the promotion of agricultural development in Africa.

Satoshi VAKUNO (Japan): I should like to make a brief comment on this agenda item. My delegation much appreciates the leadership displayed by FAO in preparing for the 13th Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa in May 1986, and the follow-up to the United Nations Programme of Action for Africa's Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990, adopted at the Special Session. We recognize the importance of the work of the Global Information and Early Warning System for Food and Agriculture; the locust control campaign and the feasibility study on aid in kind on agricultural inputs illustrated in paragraph 16 of the Secretariat's document C 87/26, as FAO's activities in accordance with UN/PAAERD. I am pleased to communicate that the Government of Japan is continuing to give positive assistance to them. In this connection my delegation strongly expects FAO to continue to play a very important role from the medium- and long-term point of view in the follow-up to UN/PAAERD in cooperation with other organizations within the UN System.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): Ma délégation sera extrêmement brève vu la clarté du document; nous sommes tout à fait conscients du rôle important joué par la FAO concernant le Programme d'Action des Nations Unies pour le Redressement Economique et le Développement de l'Afrique dans le cadre de la préparation de la treizième Conférence régionale pour l'Afrique, et du suivi des actions concrètes entamées, ainsi que cela figure au document C 87/LIM/24.

Je vais rapidement passer en revue certains points de ce document qui nous paraissent d'une importance cruciale pour notre pays. Je voudrais parler tout d'abord de l'étude faite par la FAO suite aux recommandations de la Déclaration de Harare en juin 1984 intitulée "L'Agriculture africaine: les 25 prochaines années". Cette étude est d'une importance capitale et présente des réflexions à moyen et long termes aux niveaux régional et sous régional, et nous tenons tout particulièrement à féliciter à nouveau le Secrétariat de la FAO. Il y est précisé qu'il faut une mobilisation totale des ressources potentielles et leur utilisation rationnelle dans le cadre de ce programme. Il est certain que nos gouvernements africains ont la volonté politique d'aller dans ce sens mais une volonté politique à elle seule sans les moyens ne suffit pas. Des réflexions très pertinentes quant à l'importance de ces études ont été faites à la Conférence régionale qui s'est tenue à Yamoussoukro en septembre 1986.

Nous sommes également conscients du rôle joué par la FAO en liaison avec l'OUA, notre organisation régionale et le Comité économique pour l'Afrique pour que cette réflexion se concrétise dans la pratique.

Nous voulons attirer l'attention de cette assemblée sur l'importance du Programme d'alerte rapide tant au niveau national qu'au niveau régional; en effet, des actions très concrètes ont été menées par le PASA dans le cadre de dispositifs sur la sécurité alimentaire en Afrique; ce programme a été bien mené dans notre région où l'on a envoyé des missions de formation; le financement du Programme, tel que mentionné dans notre document, a atteint une valeur totale de 28,5 millions de dollars E.-U.; c'est là pour nous une action très concrète.

Nous adressons nos félicitations à la FAO pour la mise en place efficace d'institutions en vue de la plantation de cultures, et pour l'aide apportée à nos pays pour le renforcement de nos propres institutions nationales en ce qui concerne les végétaux et la coopération sous-régionale dans le cadre du CILSS. Je dirai pour terminer que nous voulons signaler l'importance que revêt pour nous le point 9: la coopération Sud/Sud entre les pays africains.

K. N. ARDHANAREESWARAN (India): We in India are deeply influenced by the developments in Africa. We would like to associate ourselves closely with the United Nations Programme of Action for the Development of Africa and also the efforts of FAO in stepping up development activities in Africa. We note with interest that the development efforts will be confined, by and large, to the agriculture and allied sectors. The focus will be on food and providing food security to the African countries.

We also fully endorse the action taken by FAO in fighting drought and in managing problems of desertification in Africa. In this connection, we would like to emphasize the need for proper management of natural resources for the continent. These resources are in the form of soil and water and it is necessary to prepare a plan for proper management of soil and water resources for the African countries.

Side by side we have to take action for the development of human resources. It is necessary to train experts, to train agriculture scientists in the proper management of soil and water resources.

We note with interest that an allocation of 47.5 percent of the resources are already provided for agriculture and forestry programmes. We also fully endorse the efforts of FAO to maintain close cooperation with OAU and ECA.

We also fully support the global information system which is being set up, and also the early warning for pests. We feel that frequent attention is required in the field of agriculture research and extension. We have to provide for transfer of technology from the research stations and agriculture universities to the farmers. It is also necessary to provide Inputs in the form of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides. It is also necessary to provide for diversified farming systems based on horticulture, animal husbandry and other allied sectors.

We in India fully support the Programme of Action. We are willing to share our experiences and our knowledge in agriculture research and other activities. We are also willing to provide training facilities to agriculture scientists and experts from Africa. For your information, we have provided training facilities to 66 agricultural experts and scientists from the African countries in the last two years in the field of agronomy, animal husbandry, fisheries, dairy and a number of other sectors.

I would also like to mention that the World Food Council sponsored an Asia/Africa workshop on the exchange of food policy experiences in May last year. We hosted this conference in which twenty African delegates from fourteen countries participated. We were immensely profited by this exchange of experiences and we hope there will be more such workshops for exchange of experiences.

We have also provided food assistance to the extent of 155 000 tons in the last three years to the needy African countries. India has also pledged US\$40 million to the African Fund set up by the non-aligned movement. We hope that with assistance from the Africa Fund it will be possible to take up a large number of activities relating to agriculture and forestry and other allied sectors.

I would like again to reiterate that India is willing to share its experiences with the African countries. We are willing to provide training facilities. We are willing to arrange for study tours for African experts and agriculture scientists. We are also willing to depute our own experts to work in African countries. We are willing to share our experiences with regard to production of quality seeds. We are willing to share the germ plasm - whatever we have - with the African countries.

I would like to reiterate our full support for the efforts of the United Nations and FAO in promoting development of agriculture and the allied sector in the African countries.

We would like to fully associate ourselves with the present Programme of Action.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): The role of agriculture in both the economic and social development of Africa does not need further reiteration. That agriculture is the lifeline of development in Africa is obvious. Discussions in many international fora have acknowledged and reaffirmed this in as many resolutions as the conferences themselves. The UN Special Conference on the Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development was one in the series of conferences that continue to grow while there was persistent decline in the economy of many African countries. In fact paragraph 74 of document C 87/2 reads: "The capacity of most African countries to mobilize financial resources domestically is also questionable, unless (a) economic growth picks up, depending largely on agricultural performance; and (b) there is a shift in focus of domestic policy towards actively mobilizing domestic savings" and further, paragraph 75 of the same document says: "Another threat to the success of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development arises from the continuing weakness in primary commodity markets." This therefore indicates that regardless of whatever conferences and resolutions we make, the future of African economic recovery depends on the price of primary commodities which constitute the bulk of African export commodities. Unless there is change which would influence the balance of trade, whatever resolutions conferences may make will not have any meaningful impact on African economic recovery.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Sr. Presidente, mi delegación desea saludar al Sr. Régnier por la calidad y concreción de la presentación que nos hizo en la noche de ayer. Al mismo tiempo, saludamos a la Secretaría por las actividades de seguimiento que está llevando a cabo en cuanto al Programa de Acción para la recuperación económica de África y el desarrollo.

Mi delegación desea apoyar estas acciones, que han sido emprendidas por esfuerzos de las Naciones Unidas y los esfuerzos de la FAO, para poner en práctica acciones que permitan una mejoría de la situación económica del continente africano.

Mi país, Sr. Presidente, durante varios años ha venido prestando una ayuda solidaria a los países africanos, no solamente con el envío de asistencia técnica en materia de agronomía, veterinaria, protección de cultivos, intercambio de material genético, intercambio de genofondos también con este continente, y ha sido nuestra contribución en esta dirección acogida favorablemente y continúa esta disposición de mi país de seguir apoyando, como lo hemos hecho hasta el presente.

Al mismo tiempo, muchos técnicos y especialistas de hermanos países africanos también han recibido capacitación en Cuba, y nosotros queremos reiterar la disposición de continuar contribuyendo con este Programa de Acción para la recuperación económica en África.

Bedda KATANI (Tanzania): The Tanzania delegation has gone through documents C 87/26 and C 87/LIM/24. We are satisfied with the information so contained and more so the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990.

African agriculture in the next 25 years was unanimously accepted by the 14th FAO Regional Conference for Africa at Yamoussoukro, Côte d'Ivoire. Indeed we all agree that the report was comprehensive, of high quality and included all the facts which were required to rehabilitate agricultural production in Africa. I am convinced that if resources would flow in the areas which had been identified in the report, Africa would be able to make headway in agricultural production. Therefore my delegation supports the efforts of the FAO Director-General and we hope that he will do all he can to ensure that that report is put into action.

The Tanzania Government, having realized that agricultural production was continuing to decline, in 1985 we prepared a three-year Economic Recovery Programme which centred on the provision of the necessary inputs - transport, improved rural communication, storage, pest control, soil conservation, irrigation development and rehabilitation of processing plants.

Since then we have managed to get donor support and there has been an increased national budgetary allocation in the agriculture sector. As a consequence we have managed to increase the production of maize which is the main staple food, and also managed to double our cotton production, and likewise there has been increased production in other cash crops.

If more assistance were forthcoming, then we would be able to improve agricultural once again the Tanzania delegation supports the efforts of the Director-General to ensure that the African Economic Recovery and Development Programme is implemented.

Joash R. KAHAGIRWE (Uganda): The Ugandan delegation has studied document C 87/26 and the accompanying document C 87/LIM/24 with much interest. The African governments and peoples are struggling against odds produced by the trade system, the great burden incurred by the unstable currency situation and all the other issues with which the meeting is familiar. With these and many other difficulties, especially changing climatic conditions and desertification, the task is enormous and requires the combined efforts and actions of the international community.

This delegation appreciates the response to the OAU appeal by the General Assembly, other United Nations agencies and the international community as a whole. However, it has taken years of loss of life due to famine and other calamities and the immense suffering of the peoples of Africa to convince the international community that the African crisis has gone beyond the abilities of the individual countries to contain. We should not have to wait as long as this, especially with the FAO warning on time. Europe after the second world war was saved by the Marshall Plan. In Africa, after devastation ion by drought and desertification combined with diminishing bilateral and multi lateral assistance, together with the prevailing economic and financial crisis, we need such a plan no less.

The United Nations Programme for Action for African Economic Recovery and Development offers Africa and the international community a chance to tackle Africa's problems in a concerted and coordinated fashion. We appreciate FAO's invitation to accommodate this plan and we appeal to all the United Nations agencies, the multilateral agencies and bilateral aid donors to give aid to emulate this orientation in favour of Africa. We recognize Canada's practical approach to African economic recovery which has just been announced. We in Africa are doing everything possible to support the international effort so that the continent can emerge victorious from the vicious circle of poverty, underdevelopment and malnutrition.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair has a statement from the Egyptian delegation which they ask to be included in the verbatim record of this debate. With no objection, we will do so.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt): The Egyptian delegation would like to appreciate the efforts of the FAO in respect the agricultural sector in Africa. We are pleased to see the FAO stands ready to meet renewed calls of the African countries within a coordinated United Nations effort and in close cooperation with African countries and bilateral and international aid agencies (paras 4 and 5).

In the meantime we appreciate the positive attitude of FAO through its active participation in the various initiatives aiming to Africa's economic recovery and development 1/.

Eduardo Tomas MIRANO (Angola): Le souci grandissant du continent africain vis-à-vis de la crise économique qui l'opprime a été largement manifesté par les Chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement africains au cours de la réunion réalisée en juillet 1985 et à l'issue de laquelle un "Programme prioritaire de redressement économique 1986-1990" a été établi.

De tout ce qui a été fait jusqu'à présent par les organisations internationales pour se pencher sur la situation de la crise économique du continent africain, bien des résolutions intéressantes ont été prises à cet effet, mais nous croyons que tout ceci est resté sur le papier car l'Afrique a besoin de grandes solutions urgentes et concrètes.

Nous appuyons toutes les structures déjà créées et le chemin parcouru jusqu'à ce jour pour une étroite collaboration avec l'OUA, la CEA et bien d'autres institutions économique-financières africaines, en vue de sortir l'Afrique de cette crise.

Beaucoup d'actions ont déjà été enregistrées et si les résultats obtenus n'ont pas été consistants c'est parce que les ressources allouées à cet effet sont insuffisantes.

C'est pourquoi, Monsieur le Président, aux grands maux, il faut de grandes solutions car l'Afrique est très malade.

Pour la guérir, il faudra nécessairement:

- un ajustement des prix des produits de base;
- l'assouplissement des conditions de sa dette extérieure;
- la suppression de la charge de la dette.

1/ Text inserted in the verbatim records on request.

Ainsi, on arrivera à alléger le poids qui pèse sur les pays africains.

S'agissant de la prévision d'une autre conférence internationale en Afrique, au début 1988, nous pensons que ce serait un gaspillage des fonds qui pourraient servir à financer un projet quelconque au bénéfice de ce continent; car ce qui a été dit et préconisé à cet égard dans les instances internationales, pensons-nous, est assez suffisant. Suspendons le verbiage et passons au concret pour nous permettre dans un bref avenir d'évaluer l'impact résiduel de la crise économique et les mesures d'ajustement structurel sur les aspects humains de développement.

Monsieur le Président, la délégation de mon pays tient à féliciter sincèrement la FAO pour son rôle, de plaque tournante et appuie toutes les résolutions favorables tendant à tirer le continent africain de la crise qui sévit et qui ressemble à un projectile jeté dans un précipice sans fond.

Nous nous réjouissons de l'apport positif de la FAO avec l'appui des organisations internationales qui se dépensent pour le développement socio-économique de notre continent. Je voudrais également présenter au Secrétariat nos vives félicitations pour le rapport qui nous a été présenté.^{1/}

20.2. Other Recent Developments in the UN System of Interest to FAO

20.2. Autres faits nouveaux survenus dans le système des Nations Unies et intéressant la FAO

20.2. Otras novedades recientes en el sistema de Las Naciones Unidas de interés para la FAO

Á. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): C'est pour moi un plaisir d'introduire le point de l'ordre du jour intitulé "Autres faits nouveaux survenus dans le système des Nations Unies et intéressant la FAO". Nous avons noté que de nombreuses interventions ont été faites durant cette même conférence quant à l'importance des questions interagences, et ceci m'encourage à vous présenter ce point avec peut-être plus de détails qu'à l'ordinaire.

La Commission a devant elle deux documents: le premier, C 87/9, déjà présenté au Conseil en juin dernier, et le document C 87/9 sup.I, qui constitue une mise à jour incluant les faits survenus jusqu'à la fin du mois de septembre. Ma présentation se bornera donc à en souligner les aspects essentiels et à fournir des éléments d'information complémentaires et plus récents.

Bien que les documents soumis à votre considération couvrent une vaste gamme de sujets traités par le système des Nations Unies, ils ne prétendent évidemment pas être exhaustifs. Les Nations Unies abordent tous les aspects ou presque de l'activité humaine, et nous devons donc par nécessité être sélectifs.

Le Secrétariat espère néanmoins que les documents permettront à la Commission d'avoir un aperçu de l'étendue de la coopération tissée par la FAO au sein du système des Nations Unies, et des diverses formes que cette collaboration peut revêtir. La FAO coopère en effet de manière étroite avec les organisations sœurs du système des Nations Unies. Et cette coopération se déroule tant par le biais de relations directes entre la FAO et d'autres organisations qu'au travers des mécanismes intersecrétariat, en particulier le Comité administratif de coordination, présidé par le Secrétaire général des Nations Unies, et où siègent tous les chefs d'agences.

A titre d'exemple de relations directes, laissez-moi signaler la participation active de la FAO aux travaux de l'ECOSOC. C'est ainsi que la FAO a présenté à l'ECOSOC en juillet dernier les commentaires et les vues du Conseil de la FAO concernant les activités opérationnelles, ainsi que l'ECOSOC le lui avait demandé dans la résolution 1986/74. C'est ainsi également que la FAO a présenté à l'ECOSOC un rapport d'ensemble sur la campagne de lutte contre le fléau des acridiens en Afrique, décrivant l'action entreprise et les perspectives pour 87. L'ECOSOC a d'ailleurs réaffirmé le rôle central de coordination de la FAO dans ce domaine, dans le cadre du système des Nations Unies.

^{1/} Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.

Autre exemple de relations directes bilatérales: coparrainage par la FAO de consultations avec l'ONUDI dans des secteurs spécifiques. La FAO a ainsi coparrainé avec l'ONUDI la première consultation sur le bois et les produits dérivés du bois qui s'est tenue en Finlande et la première consultation sur l'industrie de la pêche qui s'est tenue en Pologne en juin dernier, comme l'a rappelé l'autre jour le distingué représentant de ce pays. De même, la FAO a été invitée à prendre part à d'autres consultations futures de l'ONUDI, notamment sur les industries de transformation des produits alimentaires ainsi que sur les engrais et les pesticides. De même, un programme de formation sur le contrôle de la qualité des pesticides, organisé conjointement par la FAO, la Banque Mondiale et l'ONUDI est déjà en cours pour la région Asie/ Pacifique.

Dans le domaine de la nutrition, je voudrais mentionner les relations étroites entretenues avec l'OMS, non seulement pour le Codex Alimentarius, ce qui est peut-être le plus connu, mais plus généralement. La FAO et l'OMS ont tenu en juillet dernier une réunion pour considérer les voies et moyens d'un renforcement de leur coopération inter-secrétariat. Il a été décidé qu'une réunion technique entre les deux secrétariats se tiendrait à Rome avant la fin de cette année pour examiner les politiques alimentaires et de nutrition des deux organisations, les implications de la nutrition en matière de politiques agricoles et sanitaires, et envisager la création d'un groupe consultatif conjoint sur les politiques alimentaires et nutritionnelles. Le Conseil en sera bien entendu tenu informé.

D'autres exemples pourraient être donnés comme la coopération de la FAO avec l'UNESCO et l'OIT dans le secteur de la formation, avec l'OMM pour l'agro-météorologie ou l'AIEA pour l'utilisation de l'énergie atomique appliquée à l'agriculture. Mais la liste deviendrait vite fastidieuse, et je m'arrêterai donc là.

En ce qui concerne la coopération inter-secrétariat, je citerai la participation active et personnelle du Directeur général au Comité administratif de coordination pour examiner régulièrement et coordonner les questions d'intérêt commun pour le système, ainsi que celles des services techniques de la FAO aux organes subsidiaires du CAC. C'est ainsi, par exemple, que la FAO joue un rôle déterminant au sein du système des Nations Unies dans l'équipe spéciale du CAC sur le développement rural dont la FAO assure la présidence et le secrétariat et joue également un rôle primordial dans le sous-comité du CAC sur la nutrition dont le secrétariat est assuré par la FAO ici même au siège à Rome.

Les résultats de la quatorzième session de l'équipe spéciale sur le développement rural sont résumés aux paragraphes 47 à 56 du Supplément 1. Il importe de noter que durant ses débats sur la coordination et la collaboration inter-agences en matière de développement rural et de réforme agraire, l'Equipe spéciale a examiné les projets de programmes actuellement préparés par les organisations membres pour l'exercice 1988-89, l'objectif étant d'harmoniser les activités entre les institutions et d'éviter les doubles emplois au niveau des régions et des pays.

En ce qui concerne le Sous-comité sur la nutrition, puis-je insister, en particulier, sur la décision de renforcer la surveillance nutritionnelle. La FAO, l'UNICEF et l'OMS ont, en effet, décidé de développer un programme de surveillance nutritionnelle qui devait contribuer à ce que les décisions de politique, tant au niveau national que régional, prennent en compte leur impact et leurs effets nutritionnels.

Permettez-moi maintenant d'en venir à quelques grandes conférences et événements intervenus récemment dans le système des Nations Unies et dont les documents sous revue vous donnent l'essentiel des résultats.

Tout d'abord, il y a la septième session de la Conférence des Nations Unies sur le commerce et le développement, tenue à Genève en juillet dernier. Je me bornerai, à cet égard, à noter que les perspectives d'entrée en vigueur du Fonds commun des produits de base se sont nettement améliorées à la suite de nouvelles signatures et ratifications. La FAO, en tout cas, est prête à coopérer pleinement aux efforts de la CNUCED dans le domaine des produits de base, et notamment à la mise en oeuvre éventuelle de projets et de programmes de développement au titre du deuxième Guichet du Fonds commun.

En ce qui concerne les négociations commerciales multilatérales dites "Uruguay Round", je souhaite souligner la satisfaction de la FAO de la décision du GATT de l'inviter, à titre d'observateur, aux travaux du Groupe de négociations sur l'agriculture et de celui sur les produits tropicaux.

Le Conseil mondial de l'alimentation a tenu sa treizième session ministérielle à Beijing, en juin 1987, et a adopté une Déclaration sur l'éradication de la faim. Le Président du Conseil mondial de l'alimentation, le Ministre mexicain de l'agriculture, a réuni ici même, à Rome, durant cette conférence, les agences et organisations du système des Nations Unies actives dans le secteur agricole afin de promouvoir une action concertée de leur part pour la mise en oeuvre de cette déclaration de Beijing.

En ce qui concerne le PNUD, on en a parlé longuement au titre du point 16 de l'ordre du jour, "Examen des programmes de terrain". Je crois donc pouvoir me dispenser d'y revenir dans cette introduction.

Il n'y a plus à insister sur l'importance attachée au sein du système des Nations Unies aux activités opérationnelles pour le développement et aux efforts entrepris de toutes parts pour en assurer la meilleure harmonisation possible.

Ainsi que je l'ai déjà signalé, la 91ème session du Conseil de la FAO a d'ailleurs examiné, à la demande de l'ECOSOC, diverses questions spécifiques y ayant trait, en particulier le rôle des coordonnateurs résidents, l'utilisation de la programmation par pays du PNUD comme cadre pour les activités opérationnelles, la question des locaux communs pour les bureaux de terrain et la poursuite de l'harmonisation des procédures opérationnelles.

Dans le cadre de ce qu'il est déjà convenu d'appeler au sein du système des Nations Unies le dialogue et l'interaction entre les organes directeurs des différentes institutions, les vues et commentaires du Conseil de la FAO (paragraphe 4 à 27 du document C 87/9), de même que ceux des autres organes du système des Nations Unies, ont été soumis à l'ECOSOC en juillet 1987. Le dossier est maintenant sur la table de la deuxième Commission de l'Assemblée Générale qui examine actuellement des projets de résolutions du Groupe des 77 et du Canada, ainsi que le rapport du Directeur général à la coopération économique internationale et au développement. L'Assemblée Générale aura également à connaître d'un autre rapport soumis par le Secrétaire général, à la demande de l'ECOSOC, présentant les résultats d'un certain nombre d'études de cas sur le fonctionnement et la coordination des activités opérationnelles au niveau local.

La discussion est en cours à New York. Je ne peux donc rien vous dire, sinon que le Conseil sera tenu informé à sa prochaine session.

Une autre conférence à laquelle je voudrais me référer est celle tenue à Vienne, en juin dernier, sur l'abus et le trafic illicite de drogues, à la préparation et à la participation de laquelle la FAO a contribué activement.

Des conclusions intéressant directement la FAO, je voudrais signaler que le Secrétaire général des Nations Unies a été prié de convoquer un groupe d'experts pour étudier les méthodes d'éradication des cultures illicites, qui soient sans danger pour le milieu. Le PNUD, l'OMS et la FAO ont été invités à participer à ce groupe. D'autre part, la Conférence de Vienne a demandé à la FAO de rassembler des données sur les programmes de développement rural intégré et de substitution des cultures et d'en analyser les résultats, en vue d'élaborer de meilleures méthodes de remplacement des cultures. Dans les deux cas, la capacité de la FAO en matière de télédétection pourrait se révéler fort utile.

La question des femmes a été largement débattue à la Commission I. Je n'y reviendrai pas, sinon pour dire que, comme le Conseil l'avait demandé, une section du document traite de ce problème.

Les documents C 87/9 et C 87/9-Sup.I se réfèrent également aux prises de position et propositions visant à harmoniser le développement et la conservation des ressources, contenues dans le rapport de la Commission mondiale de l'environnement et du développement: le rapport Bruntland.

La thèse principale de ce rapport est qu'un développement durable à long terme doit être réconcilié avec les efforts de conservation des ressources naturelles et les mesures appropriées pour la préservation de l'environnement et du milieu naturel.

Les organisations du système des Nations Unies, y compris la FAO, ont soumis leurs commentaires sur ce rapport dans le courant de l'année. Le document sera examiné par la présente session de l'Assemblée Générale et l'on s'attend à ce que cette dernière adopte une résolution donnant à l'ensemble des organisations du système des Nations Unies des directives pour promouvoir un développement écologiquement rationnel et durable.

En outre, le Conseil d'administration du PNUÉ a récemment demandé aux organes directeurs du système des Nations Unies de tenir compte de ce rapport, ainsi que de son propre rapport sur les perspectives en matière d'environnement jusqu'à l'an 2000 et au-delà, dans l'élaboration de leurs politiques et de leurs programmes et de rendre périodiquement compte à l'Assemblée Générale des progrès réalisés dans ce domaine.

La FAO, qui souscrit à l'analyse et aux conclusions générales du rapport Bruntland, participera activement à l'examen interagences des implications de ce dernier et en tiendra compte dans l'examen et l'orientation de ses programmes et activités.

Finalement, je voudrais attirer votre attention sur la dernière section du document C 87/9 - Sup. 1 qui, aux paragraphes 106 à 131, traite pour la première fois d'un sujet nouveau, mais d'importance pour l'avenir: la biotechnologie. Cette section a été conçue afin d'informer la Conférence des travaux qui sont en cours au sein du système des Nations Unies, y incluant cependant des références directes aux programmes de la FAO dans la mesure où cela est nécessaire à la compréhension du sujet. Etant donné l'importance de ce dernier, nous serions heureux de connaître les commentaires et vues de la Conférence à cet égard.

Avant de terminer, permettez-moi de vous donner un dernier élément d'information concernant les Nations Unies. Comme vous le savez, un examen de l'efficacité du fonctionnement administratif et financier des organes des Nations Unies a été entrepris en 1986. Le document C 87/9 y fait référence aux paragraphes 28 à 37. Mais, ce que je souhaite ajouter à cet égard, c'est qu'au cours des derniers mois, une Commission spéciale du Conseil économique et social, présidée par l'Ambassadeur Badawi d'Egypte, a été établie pour examiner la structure intergouvernementale et le fonctionnement des Nations Unies dans le secteur économique et social. Elle s'est réunie quatre fois en 1987 et se réunira à nouveau l'année prochaine, avant de soumettre son rapport à la deuxième session régulière de l'ECOSOC en juillet. La Commission a, jusqu'à présent, examiné les activités des Commissions économiques régionales, la composition et le fonctionnement de l'ECOSOC et les mandats des différents organes subsidiaires. Le Directeur Général de la FAO a rencontré personnellement le Président Badawi et les membres du Bureau de la Commission spéciale pour s'entretenir avec eux des problèmes de coordination au sein du système des Nations Unies. La FAO s'est engagée à coopérer pleinement avec ladite Commission.

D'autre part, le Secrétaire Général, dans son Rapport annuel à l'Assemblée Générale sur les travaux des Nations Unies, a souligné la nécessité d'une réforme du Conseil économique et social et de ses méthodes de travail; il s'est référé en particulier au niveau de représentation des délégations, à la sélection des sujets à discuter et à l'interaction souhaitable avec les organes directeurs des autres organisations du système.

Le Conseil sera tenu informé des conclusions de la Commission Badawi et des décisions que l'Assemblée Générale pourrait prendre à cet égard.

Comme je vous le disais en débutant, les documents devant vous et cette introduction n'ont pas pour intention de dresser un catalogue exhaustif de toutes les activités menées dans le système des Nations Unies, ni de toutes les actions coopératives interagences. Il s'agissait plutôt de procéder à un large tour d'horizon des questions d'intérêt commun dans le système, de montrer la complexité des dossiers traités et de donner un aperçu de l'étendue des relations entretenues par la FAO et l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies.

Je suis, bien entendu, à votre disposition pour toute information complémentaire.

Marc-Andre FREDETTE (Canada): My intervention under this Agenda Item will be in two distinct parts. First I will talk about environmental matters as they relate to the United Nations system, including FAO, and then I will address more specifically the documents before us and the issue of the United Nations coordination.

The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development was presented on 19 October of this year to the Plenary of the United Nations General Assembly by its Chairperson, Prime Minister Brundtland of Norway. This was followed by a very full debate with five heads of government and several ministers, including the Canadian Minister of the Environment, speaking on the subject and indicating broad endorsement for the report and especially for its principal theme of sustainable development.

The Second Committee of the Forty-second Session of the United Nations General Assembly is now considering a draft resolution on the Commission's report which inter alia calls upon the governing bodies of the organs, organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to review their policies, programmes, budgets and activities, aimed at contributing to sustainable development. This is of course particularly relevant to FAO.

In that context Canada, Netherlands and Norway have jointly introduced at this FAO Conference a resolution which has now been made available to all member country representatives as part of document C 87/LIM/44. I am pleased to indicate that in addition to Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Saudi Arabia, Philippines, Bangladesh, Ghana, Switzerland and the United Kingdom the list of original co-sponsors should also include Finland, India and Italy. I will leave to other delegations the tasks of elaborating on the substantive context of that resolution.

I now turn to the second part of my intervention. First I wish to put on record Canada's sincere appreciation for Mr Regnier's efforts in listening to and responding to the numerous comments we have offered over the years with a view to improving the coverage of issues, events, and institutions in the documents submitted by the Secretariat under this Agenda Item. He has proven himself to be a uniquely genuine listener to the sovereign wishes of member countries and for that he deserves praise and recognition.

That being said, I now wish to put on record once again our views regarding FAO's role in the multilateral system. To organize our thoughts the format of the United Nations resolution came to mind. I might say in passing that this is a tool little used in this Organization to articulate consensus and to convey instructions from the membership to the Secretariat. I underline that what follows is not a formal resolution: it is a purely Canadian view, more like our coordination credo, in fact.

1.. Recognizing that the benefits of improved coordination go primarily to the resident countries in the form of increased programme delivery for a given cost. This is especially crucial in these days of budgetary restraint and more than ever relevant to FAO now in light of its financial crisis

2. Emphasizing that this is an objective that Canada has consistently pursued not only at FAO but throughout the United Nations system in other multilateral fora and among bilateral donors, FAO has not been singled out for this so-called coordination crucifix, but its response does stand out.

3. Recalling indeed more than a decade of frustrating appeals and growing disillusionment as regards FAO's response to United Nations coordination efforts.

4. Reminding this governing body that strengthened United Nations coordination is not Canada's lonely pursuit but reflects the clearly and occasionally strongly worded decisions of the United Nations' central organs. Of course, FAO is not legally bound to respond to ECOSOC and the United Nations General Assembly, but we should be consistent with ourselves. I will quote for illustrative purposes the consensus of 1970 as set out in resolution 26/88 XXV of the United Nations General Assembly, United Nations General Assembly resolution 32/197, General Assembly resolution 40/177, ECOSOC resolution 1986/74 adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 41/71. All these decisions were made by consensus and were accepted by the same countries represented in this governing body.

5. Noting that the past eighteen months period has been extremely fertile in terms of the number of reports on important subjects relating to United Nations operational activities on the

development, including the extremely challenging Jansson Report, many of the concerns we have raised here and many of our proposals for improved efficiency and effectiveness, including through strengthened coordination, have been met with a positive response within the context of current discussions regarding United Nations reform,

6. (And on a lighter note perhaps) agreeing with the observation made by French President De Gaulle twenty years ago that "le mot chien n'a jamais mordu personne". Keen to practise what we preach, Canada has always expressed its views on coordination in a very transparent manner. We believe that FAO's response to United Nations coordination efforts has too often been and continues to be hindered by an attitude problem. Although there should be nothing to fear but fear itself FAO's approach is excessively territorial, defensive, protective, apologetic and evasive. I will cite as examples some of the discussions in this room earlier in the Conference where systematically the response to proposals or requests for improvements ranging from strengthened coordination to evaluation and so on, the response was systematically that it was too difficult, too costly, too complex and so on.

More recently we have seen signs of cooperation and we recognize them for what they are. When we criticize FAO it is because we support it, because we want to ensure that it is everything it can be, that the impact of its programmes is commensurate with its resources.

I will conclude by saying that there is no crisis of multilateralism in Canada; indeed, Canada is the fourth largest contributor to the United Nations system, by far most of it through voluntary contributions, but there is a crisis of confidence in this Organization and we will look very carefully at the outcome of the reform debate at this Conference. I must say the debate on coordination which was initiated earlier in this Commission did nothing to reassure us. We make one last appeal for the FAO Secretariat to welcome a truly independent review of its performance, of its working methods of its relationship with the rest of the United Nations system, as well as with member countries.

CHAIRMAN: We have now exhausted the time available to us this morning. We will commence our proceedings this afternoon at 2.30, and when we do, for your benefit, the countries next in line are Netherlands, Norway, Haiti, Czechoslovakia, Bangladesh and Dominica. Anyone else who wishes to be added please indicate so to the Chair. The Chair would make one last appeal, please try to be here reasonably close to 2.30. We will have to have a long session today to make up for the fact that we did not work other days.

The meeting rose at 12.50 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 50

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.50 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/21

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING
VINGT ET UNIEME SEANCE
21^a SESION

(24 November 1987)

The Twenty-first Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La vingt et unième séance est ouverte à 15 h 00, sous la
présidence de Fred J.Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 21^a sesión a las 15.00 horas, bajo la
presidencia de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS (continuación)

20 Relations and Consultations with International Organizations

20. Relations et consultations avec les organisations internationales

20. Relaciones y consultas con organizaciones internacionales

20.2 Other Recent Developments in the UN System of Interest to FAO (continued)

20.2 Autres faits nouveaux survenus dans le système des Nations Unies et intéressant la FAO (suite)

20.2. Otras novedades recientes en el sistema de las Naciones Unidas de interés para la FAO (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat informs me that we now have a quorum. However, the record of never starting anything remotely on time remains unbroken and we are 35 minutes late.

J. DOORENBOS (Netherlands): Reading FAO's constitution already in the introductory lines it becomes clear that the essence of FAO's mandate: "The improvement of agriculture and the condition of rural populations" forms an integrated part with the whole system of natural and physical resources which can enable us to ensure humanity's freedom from hunger. This may seem a little bit of a high-sounding introduction to an item which deals with recent developments in the United Nations system. But as our Canadian colleague has stated, the recommendations and activities of the World Commission on Environment and Development are of main importance for the whole UN system. My delegation wants to promote the idea that these recommendations are followed world-wide and my Government will support activities mentioned in the so-called Brundtland Report.

Why? In the Netherlands, for example, we have experienced for a long time that the relationship between development of agriculture and the countryside on the one hand, and on the other hand, the protection of the natural environment is a fragile but a crucial one. In taking actions and measures for the one, you have to be aware of consequences for the other. This has become very clear in cases such as the lowering of water levels or the manipulation of water resources in general: there are also limits we have to respect in the use of herbicides and pesticides and in the reduction of the surface of land covered with trees, and so on. When the population is growing and the agricultural use of land is getting more intensive, the need for planning of the countryside is more obvious. This is the case now in many parts of the world. It is clear that within the responsibilities of national governments to design development policies, the environmental issue has to be included.

As was agreed in the ministerial meeting of the OECD last May in Paris, environmental concerns have to be given a high priority in government policies in order to safeguard and improve the quality of life as well as to preserve the resource base needed for sustainable global economic, and thus also and specifically agricultural, development. In the field of physical planning this means in particular the way and means of how agricultural activities are related to other functions of the rural areas.

My delegation wants to make it clear that a careful tuning-in of the different consequences of changes in rural areas which result from exploitation and reclamation of natural areas should also take into account the environmental perspective. An old saying, which we surely all know from the recent past, says that there is "only one earth". Relating this to the above-mentioned Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, Our Common Future, my delegation - together with the delegations of Norway and Canada but also, as we have heard, together with a large number of delegations in this meeting - believes strongly in the specific tasks of FAO in this regard. The possibilities of agricultural development to contribute to our common goals - that is to say, the raising of levels of nutrition and standards of living of the global population - depend on the essential ecological integrity of the production systems. My delegation is completely aware of the complexity of the problems concerned. Therefore only international action within multilateral frame-works can make a successful approach.

In this respect FAO is amongst, and together with other international organizations, the foremost bodies to deal with the relationship between agriculture and the environment. It is the opinion of several delegations in this hall that in the middle of so many difficult problems with which this Conference is dealing, this issue surely will get the support of a great majority. Trusting in this, the Netherlands calls upon a broad support, which in good FAO tradition means consensus, to adopt the resolution on Item 20.2.

Nils Ragnar KAMSVAC (Norway): Since our Prime Minister, Ms Gro Harlem Brundtland, chaired the World Commission on Environment and Development, it is with particular pleasure that the Norwegian delegation has noted the wide support the Report and its conclusions has received during the discussions on many of the agenda items of this Conference. This support clearly illustrates the Report's relevance for the work of FAO.

The ecological crisis that threatens not only human well-being but even the life support systems of the earth, challenges governments and people everywhere to create new approaches to the process of economic development. The World Commission introduces the concept of sustainable growth. The application of the concept to the effort to ensure food security requires systematic attention to the renewal of natural resources. It requires a holistic approach focused on ecosystems at national, regional and global levels, with coordinated land use and careful planning of water usage and forest exploitation. The world's agricultural systems were built for a smaller, more fragmented world. In the future new realities will require systems that focus as much on people as they do on technology, as much on resources as on production and as much on the long term as on the short term.

The questions raised in the Report are thus touching upon central goals in FAO's activity. In that connection we would like to commend the work FAO has already carried out in this field so far. We note that FAO in general concurs with the main thrust of the Report and the analysis it contains.

The Report of the World Commission is now being discussed in the United Nations General Assembly. The outcome of those deliberations will serve as guidelines for the further work within the Report in the United Nations specialized agencies. The proposed resolution you now have before you could thus be seen as a prologue for the further work with the Commission's Report within FAO. The wording is therefore general and is meant as an expression of the wide support the Report has received during the Conference. If we are to be able to build a world without hunger, as is FAO's noble goal, we have to be able to establish the sustainable growth the Commission is advocating. We therefore hope that the resolution will meet with unanimous support, thus giving environmental questions an even more prominent place in the work of the FAO.

Václav DOBES (Czechoslovakia) It falls to me to give an appreciation of the excellent introduction on this item by Mr Regnier. According to the view of my delegation, document C 87/9 and Sup.I which have been worked out by the Secretariat gave a good survey of the important facts in the work of the United Nations in relation to FAO. However, these documents were published already seven and two months ago. They have missed some events to which FAO should pay extraordinary attention. I propose therefore that the Report on the Twenty-fourth Conference should include information on the United Nations International Conference on the Problems of the Relation Between Development and Disarmament and the conclusions of this Conference.

My delegation believes that all the FAO member countries, and especially developing countries, share the view that the discussions and the outcomes of that Conference confirmed the realistic possibility of releasing enormous economic resources for the development programmes, if the governments of all countries solve the problems of their relationships thoroughly through peaceful cooperation and understanding. The above-mentioned international Conference was certainly one of the most important events of the year within the United Nations system, and it deserves mentioning in the Report on our Conference.

Let me now add some partial comments on some parts of the text of the present document. In the chapter Operational Activities for Development, in paragraphs 6 and 95, the words "efforts through field activities to promote the role of women" are included among the important subjects. Although the document mentions some sessions concerning this problem, it would undoubtedly be interesting for the Conference and the Council to know the number and extent of the projects associated with this problem within the Fourth Programme Cycle of the UNDP for the 1987-91 period, so far as the programmes executed by FAO are concerned.

As for the role of the United Nations resident coordinators, I would like to draw attention to the fact that with respect to the unification of the Regional Bureau for Arab states and the European Programme in UNDP headquarters, it would be very useful to make efforts to strengthen the European coordinator role and the European UNDP office in Geneva, especially where the regional European programmes are concerned. As far as we know, there is a danger that, unlike as in other agencies, there will be no European regional programme operated by the FAO after 1988. The number of agricultural projects in the European IPF countries is also close to a minimum.

As to the data contained in 8.16, we should like to express concern about the slow course of the programming: sixty UNDP Country Programmes for 1987 (some of them still in a preparatory stage) is too small a number to record at the end of the first current programme year. We would also appreciate information on the projected proportions of FAO involvement in the Country Programmes of the Fourth cycle, i.e., information on the tendency: are the number of agricultural development projects, and the money allocated to them, expected to increase for the FAO, or decline?

Our delegation believes that FAO will use the findings from the Review of the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations, from the joint consultations of the Executive Heads of the main agencies with the UN Secretary General, and from the suggestions submitted at the sessions of the supreme bodies of other agencies and contained in the many proposals, including those aimed at the improvement of the administrative structure of the FAO.

I would also like to point out Czechoslovakia's interest and wish that FAO's relationship with UNIDO, the newly converted specialized agency, should develop effectively especially in cooperation in the field of biotechnologies which are expected in the last decade of this century to play an important role in the world agricultural production. The complementarity of both agencies in the development of the foodstuff industry, in the production of commercial fertilizers and pesticides, in the wood-working industry and other segments is also deemed necessary.

In conclusion, our delegation would like to appreciate FAO's interest in the problems of the environment and to point out, in this context, the new initiatives of the Czechoslovak delegation at the UNO General Assembly which is now holding its session. We believe that this year's session of the General Assembly will bring about new ideas concerning environmental problems and that the FAO will be able to implement these ideas in its work programme.

A.K.M. Fazley RABBI (Bangladesh): We also thank Mr Regnier for the presentation of the agenda item.

We know that developments in the United Nations System as a whole have both a direct and indirect bearing on each of the international organizations. FAO cannot but maintain close links with other sister organizations. In this regard, we believe that FAO had been doing its job faithfully and efficiently. The documents on the subject prepared since before the Ninetieth Council Session in November 1986 have been excellent presentations of the developments in the UN and other international agencies. The Director-General and the Secretariat deserve our commendation for this.

Although the document C 87/9 was considered in the Ninety-second Session of the Council, I would like to dwell upon some of the items contained in it as well as in the supplementary paper. First of all, we must express our full satisfaction for the existing good and cordial relationship between FAO and other international organizations. We notice that FAO maintains close liaison with and extends cooperation and assistance to multi-disciplinary activities of the world community, be it UNGA, ECOSOC, GATT, UNCTAD, UNIDO, UNDP, Conference on Drug Abuse, disaster relief assistance, women and development, science and technology development, Environment Programme, etc., etc.

I would like to comment on some of the items/activities as contained in the documents on the agenda item. These are: (a) From document C 87/9 it appears that there is room for further improvement in the coordination between UNDP Resident Coordinators and FAO Representatives; (b) Regarding the relationship with UNIDO, we would like to know the present position of the draft FAO/UNIDO formal relationship agreement; (c) We appreciate the Director-General's personal initiatives in attending the UNCTAD VII Conference and hope that FAO would continue its endeavours in the implementation of the Integrated Programme for Commodities and in the successful negotiations in the Uruguay Round, particularly on agriculture and tropical products; (d) We are appreciative of the FAO activities concerning women in development and promotion of TCDC and ECDC. We hope that FAO will continue to cooperate with the High-Level Committee on TCDC as well as the UNDP Special Unit for TCDC; (e) Lastly, I would like to refer to the subject of biotechnology which has emerged as a potential input for increased agricultural and forestry production, food and non-food processing, as well as animal and human health. Genetic engineering and biotechnology may open up new methods of eradication of hunger and malnutrition from the world, for which FAO has been working for more than 40 years. The FAO, we think, should actively associate itself for collaboration with concerned sister UN organizations and other inter-governmental and expert groups to examine the policy and technical issues of biotechnology.

McDonald Phillip BENJAMIN (Dominica): I will limit my intervention to the aspect of relations with international financial institutions. As we are all aware, the World Bank is the largest lender for agriculture. We note with concern the dramatic drop in lending for agriculture in the period of this last fiscal year, 1987, which accounts for 17 percent of total bank lending in contrast to 29 percent in the fiscal year 1986. Traditionally the bankers lend roughly slightly over 30 percent for agriculture.

Mr Chairman, I would like to invite your attention to the fact that it is not only the volume of resource flows that is significant but equally significant is the question of targeting of these flows, for example towards food crops and towards small farmers.

As is well known, the World Bank has just gone through this big organizational reform, and this is pointed out in this document. One of the consequences of this is a temporary drop in the levels of lending, levels of appraisals in this current fiscal year.

As far as I am aware, also with regard to the Asian Development Bank, the lending for agriculture decreased because irrigation as a main field of lending suffered reverses because countries in the region would not borrow because of the concerns about the prices of rice.

I would like to make one reference to the question of the possible role of FAO in the consortia meetings in Paris. These meetings provide a very fertile ground where FAO could make a very significant contribution on aspects of the agricultural sector, and this sector always looms very large in the Paris discussions.

I happen to have been present in Bangkok when the United States introduced a very bold, and proposed a very bold, initiative for the Asian Development Bank to lend directly to the private sector without government guarantees. My delegation is very pleased to see that this initiative is bearing fruit and that this method of lending has been introduced on a modest scale. Now that this door has been opened for the industry sector, is it too ambitious for us to hope that this door can also be opened to the agriculture sector for lending to agriculture-based groups, such as producer associations, fertilizer distribution agencies, marketing agencies and so on, and peasant associations. As a matter of fact this could well provide a very great stimulant to larger private sector involvement in agricultural development in these countries.

Lastly, we are very pleased to see that the Director-General of FAO has signed a cooperation agreement with the President of the Caribbean Development Bank. We consider this a very positive step forward for the region.

A. SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Je serai très bref, bien qu'il s'agisse d'un domaine particulièrement vaste dont il est difficile de déterminer les contours. Aussi, suite à l'intervention d'un de mes collègues, me limiterai-je à l'examen du rôle de la FAO sur le plan opérationnel dans le système des Nations Unies et je parlerai quelque peu d'un problème dont on pourrait parler à l'infini (dont on parle depuis des années et dont on parlera encore pendant des années) celui de la coordination.

J'ai lu avec beaucoup d'intérêt le rapport de Monsieur Kurt Jansson au sujet des activités opérationnelles des Nations Unies. Il fait le point de la situation avec beaucoup de réalisme et de compétence, et après une lecture approfondie de ce document, on se pose la question de savoir si le problème se situe du côté de la FAO. Compte tenu des remarques faites par M. Jansson, il ne me semble pas que la FAO ait fondamentalement à modifier ses approches opérationnelles, qui ne font guère l'objet de critiques. Et l'on peut se demander si le problème ne se situe pas ailleurs. Les conclusions de ce rapport mettent le doigt sur un certain nombre de vices du système, qui ne se situent pas dans cette enceinte; en effet, comme on a déjà eu l'occasion de le dire, un certain nombre de choses ont été déclarées lors de cette Conférence qui pourraient utilement être déclarées dans d'autres enceintes, dans d'autres Conseils, notamment à New York.

Le problème de la coordination est vaste et complexe et pose un certain nombre de questions de relations humaines, de relations entre agences, et je me demande si la première chose à faire ne serait pas d'essayer à court terme, de manière très pratique et opérationnelle, sous l'égide de la FAO (conformément à ses statuts et aux buts de l'Organisation tels que soulignés par notre collègue des Pays-Bas) je me demande donc s'il ne serait pas opportun d'essayer de regrouper l'ensemble des problèmes agricoles au sein desquels s'insèrent les programmes d'aide alimentaire.

Il serait anormal de parler de coordination de manière tout à fait générale sans s'occuper de problèmes pratiques et concrets de coordination au niveau de Rome. Rome, en effet, est le siège de trois organisations que vous connaissez tous: la FAO, le Programme Mondial et le FIDA. Ne pourrait-on pas, dans un premier stade et avec le concours de la FAO, arriver à une bonne articulation entre ces trois organisations qui poursuivent le même but, celui de l'amélioration du sort des pauvres et des démunis dans le Tiers Monde.

C'est, me semble-t-il, un bon exemple de coordination car on peut parler à l'infini de la coordination d'une manière générale dans le système des Nations Unies, on peut parler de coordination dans la FAO, l'ONUDI, l'Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique, mais ici, sur place, à Rome, se posent peut-être un certain nombre de problèmes. Notre Conseil, nos instances pourraient peut-être faire un certain nombre de suggestions pratiques et opérationnelles; et quand on parle de réformes, ce sont plutôt de petites réformes, pratiques, concrètes dont il devrait s'agir. Plutôt que de vouloir réformer tout un système, essayons de rendre notre Organisation plus opérationnelle et commençons peut-être par l'Organisation qui s'occupe de l'ensemble des problèmes agricoles. Il a été dit à d'innombrables reprises - et tout le monde en est d'accord - que l'aide alimentaire doit s'insérer dans une perspective de développement. Il est clair que les organismes qui ont ces missions en charge doivent se coordonner entre eux.

Telles sont les quelques réflexions que je me permets de faire dans le cadre de ce débat. Je n'ai abordé qu'une toute petite partie des problèmes. Mais s'agissant des problèmes de la coordination, j'ai souvent entendu dire que la FAO ne les affrontait pas alors qu'elle devrait s'en préoccuper. Il me semble qu'au niveau romain, nous pourrions peut-être, sur des problèmes précis et concrets, régler certaines questions de coordination. Ainsi aurions-nous fait un pas en avant.

Gerhard DIETERLE (Germany, Fed. Rep. of) (original language German): My delegation thanks the Secretariat for the documents C 87/9 and C 87/9/Sup. 1, the content of which we fully agree with. We are particularly pleased that issues that have not been dealt with before are being discussed here, in particular the improvement of coordination especially at a time when there are problems arising. In addition we are grateful that the role of the resident coordinators as in decision 32.1.97 and 74, which was approved by the General Assembly are fully supported here. As has been shown previously, the cooperation and the division of work between the resident coordinator, on the one hand, and the FAO representative, on the other side, is working satisfactorily, as is the valuation of reports from the various FAO member countries and the reports of the resident

coordinators and the contacts between the representatives of UNDP and FAO which are strongly emphasized. We assume that this cooperation will be extended, that it will be possible for the FAO and the UNDP representatives to work together and that the relationship will not be just satisfactory but good. We are particularly pleased that attempts are being made that the work of the FAO country representative should be coordinated with that of the resident coordinators in order to achieve further harmonization and we feel that this is an ongoing process which should be strengthened.

In paragraph 25 of document C 87/9/Sup. 1 UNDP funding is mentioned. In the original text of the resolution 87/10, paragraph 27 refers to, it talks of the United Nations system of funding which emphasizes the role of the resident coordinator.

In paragraph 28 of document C 87/9 about the efficiency of the United Nations system, we feel that this is positive. We believe that it is important that the whole system of the United Nations should be made more effective in order to free budgetary resources for operational purposes.

We are pleased that the Consultative Committee on Substantive Issues in document A/41/49 has reported favourably on the proposal for the annual meeting of the Director-General with the other organizations under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General and of the special agencies is something that we think should be encouraged.

Thirteen years ago at the World Food Conference in 1974 we suggested something analogous. We emphasized the execution in C 87/9, the call for a special session of the United Nations on the critical economic situation in Africa. At the beginning of the 11th legislative period Federal Chancellor Kohl on the 18th March this year made a similar statement. Africa is a very important area for our development policy. They need our support in order to be able to solve their political and economic problems themselves. The Federal Republic will continue to support them.

The activities relating to the misuse of drugs received our full support.

We think that the activities within the United Nations system in trade under UNCTAD VII to be particularly important, in particular paragraphs 66 - 71, and in the Uruguay Round on multilateral trade negotiations in paragraphs 62 - 69, we would emphasize the proposals of the United Nations for the Early Warning System in the case of a nuclear accident and for international agreement on aid to be provided in such a case.

We also think that the activities of the United Nations in environmental protection are very important.

We think that the United Nations is a vital forum for international politics which we continue to support.

Angus Edward MACDONALD (Australia): I would like to stress at the outset Australia's full commitment to coordinated operation of the United Nations system for development and we urge FAO to apply sufficient resources and priorities to this issue to effect genuine and constructive changes in policy and practice in the United Nations system.

FAO's stated commitment to and involvement in the United Nations system activities to achieve improved coordination in operational activities for development is encouraging. It reflects a clear perception, particularly at field level with key development issues and hence effect projects that often rely on cross-section analysis and implementation.

Some key issues on coordination have been raised by the recent review undertaken by the United Nations Director-General for international economic cooperation, and some of these are discussed in the document before us. C 87/9. I would like now to refer to a number of these issues.

On the value of the United Nations system, the UN DIEC Review shows that recipients do not measure the terms of United Nations system aid solely in terms of volume of funds but appreciate advisory planning and coordination functions.

On the role of the resident coordinator, we do disagree with FAO's assertion in paragraph 10 that problems of UNDP-FAO cooperation in the field are generally the result of personal factors and do not reflect institutional problems. To our mind the situation is the reverse. Personality is important because there are no institutional obligations for coordination. We agree that coordination relies on goodwill and the personalities involved and this point has been emphasized by the UNDP's Conference on Coordination that was held in Stockholm in 1985 but we see a key problem arising when the rank of the UNDP resident representative, who is the resident coordinator, is lower than that of other agency representatives. The UN DIEC report urges an inter-agency agreement on the role and authority of the resident coordinator which Australia fully supports. We have previously stated our support that the proposal of the position of the resident coordinator be rotated around agency heads provided competence and merit are fully taken into account. We are interested in the UN DIEC proposal that a separate resident coordinator office with staff be seconded from the field missions of agencies. The main reservation here is that UNDP field staff in some posts are overloaded with operational responsibilities which inhibit their capacity to undertake their mandated coordination role.

On the United Nations system programming, we believe broader United Nations programming would result in greater coherence and effectiveness of projects selection, design and implementation, as well as simpler and improved recipient country coordination. Specialist agencies, including FAO, have extensive technical operational and analytical skills which should be offered in this process. We consider the joint programming should be undertaken in selected countries on an experimental basis with a view to developing replicable programming models or arrangements for a range of circumstances. The key mechanism in the process is a constructive involvement of all relevant donors, including agencies in coordination meetings, particularly the UNDP roundtable conference and the World Bank's consultative groups.

On the issue of co-location of field officers as far as practicable, United Nations system field officers should be located to facilitate coordination. We believe informal and frequent contacts facilitate relationships.

Due regard should be given to recipient country views of course, although as far as possible minimizing bureaucratic competition for development funds and maximizing internal governmental coordination of a coherent maximum development plan. The issue which is of some concern is that of agency salesmanship or the promotion of sectoral projects within the relevant ministries which disregard national priorities rather than provide objective advice. Recipient countries frequently complain of the complexity of aid coordination because of the diverse procedures, approval criterion, and programming cycles of the multiplicity of donors with which they deal. We believe that it is essential that continuing efforts be made towards simplification and harmonization of operational procedures. We believe it would be useful for the UN System to develop joint mechanisms to feed back on evaluation and other implementation issues in this context.

As regards nutrition, Australia strongly supports efforts to focus coordinated attention on nutrition as outlined in paragraphs 43, 45 and 46 of document C 87/9.

Finally, Australia supports requests that FAO strengthen its coordination mechanism for assistance in disaster situations. We recognize that special programmes of economic assistance for a country should be of limited duration, established and reviewed through the field offices of the UN System. We recognize UNDRO's vital role as a focal point in the UN System of disaster reporting and disaster relief coordination, but affirm that this role should be confined to emergency phase with a smooth transition to other UN agencies for the rehabilitation and reconstruction phase.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has asked the Chair to announce that Commission III, now meeting in the Plenary Hall needs a quorum to adopt a Resolution by a vote. We would ask that those countries represented here which have an extra representative, to please ask one of your members to assist them in meeting their quorum.

Ms Anna Liise KORHONEN (Finland): The Finnish delegation has studied the background documents to the agenda item 20.2, namely, C 87/9-Sup.I with interest. This statement deals only with those documents. Both documents give an excellent summary of international conferences which have taken place recently. For those delegations which have not been able to receive reports from their national delegation to those conferences, the two documents may be useful. On the other hand, to delegations who are familiar with the results of the said conferences, these documents are of less importance.

The main problem my delegation has with the two papers is the lack of analysis ascertained in them when the result of most of these international conferences are described. In order that the FAO Conference would benefit from the reports, they should include a better assessment of action required by the FAO. Also, more important international inter-governmental meetings are reported with the same style as smaller governmental and inter-secretariat meetings. No recommendations to this Conference emerge from these descriptive reports. Therefore, my delegation wonders what is the usefulness of having them in their present format. However, Finland considers it important that major international events of interest to the FAO are reported to this Conference. Next time the report should be more analytical, not descriptive. It should point out the important results for the consideration of this Organization, or proposals made by the Secretariat on how to proceed in these matters. It is equally important that the reports better explain what line the FAO has supported in the international meetings. Often a problem-oriented presentation would be useful instead of a descriptive factual account of activities.

As regards the present document, my delegation would like to comment on the part which deals with the operational activities for development which my delegation finds useful. The information on the cooperation between the Resident Coordinator and the FAO Representative are reported to be satisfactory. This is something my delegation welcomes.

The ad hoc survey of FAO Representatives pointed out that periodic coordination meetings at the country level are not held on a regular basis in all countries. The report also states that by bilateral donors and other multilateral institutions, such as the World Bank and Regional Development Banks, should participate in these meetings if the governments so wish. For her part, Finland has often expressed the view that exchange of information with the Resident Coordinator is useful and has provided information on Finnish bilateral aid to these representatives. Likewise, Finland has called for closer coordination between the UN operational system, agencies and the international financing institutions at the country level. The FAO Representative should also actively promote the further use of this mechanism.

This point in the report before us can also be pursued further in the context of the functioning of the UN System in the field of economic and social sectors, and this is something my delegation intends to do.

My delegation has noted with satisfaction that in the future FAO intends to continue to explore thoroughly with governments the most suitable location for FAO field offices and that UNDP premises are given priority in this regard. Likewise, the simplification and harmonization of procedures, and the standardization of evaluation and related reporting procedures of the agencies is a positive development and should also be pursued vigorously in the future. In this context I should like to mention that my delegation fully agreed with the statements made by the Canadian and Australian delegations with regard to coordination issues.

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): The delegation of the United Kingdom intervened on the substance of this agenda item at the Ninety-second Session of the Council and we are content that our views remain in the verbatim records of that meeting. I have now asked for the floor merely to say that my delegation would like to be wholly associated with the thought-provoking intervention made by the delegation of Canada.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): My delegation appreciates the reports the Secretariat has provided under this agenda item. They give us all an idea of how the various activities of the UN System fit together. They also give members an idea of what developments FAO

consider important. On the other hand, my delegation agrees with the comments made by Finland to the effect that unimportant (or less important) meetings are given similar attention to the more important ones, and to the fact that there is a lack of analysis in the document.

I will address my remarks to two issues. First, programme quality and effectiveness and secondly, coordination. For my Government concern about programme quality and effectiveness has been a major issue across the multilateral system for some years now. We are struck by the fact that, despite detailed information on the financing situation of many organizations and the UN System reform effort, this concern that the quality of multilateral programmes leaves something to be desired. It does not quite show through. It touches the smallest programmes such as UNFPA which has just undergone an extensive assessment, and UN Volunteers where a major assessment of the Programme's effectiveness is underway. This gets only a passing mention in paragraph 34, document C 87/9/Sup.I. It touches also some of the largest programmes, for example, the Asian Development Bank where a high-level group will conduct an assessment; the African Bank where improved country programming was the key issue in the last replenishment; the inter-American Development Bank where programme quality was also a fundamental issue in the replenishment discussions, and the World Food Programme which has had a major review on its management, programme and project review process. Basically, what we are seeing is a questioning by many of whether these programmes, or the programmes of FAO for that matter, are achieving their potential and effectively responding to the critical needs. We are also finding that while some feel it is wrong, offensive event to pose such questions, others find the questions a challenge to see how much has been learned through past experience and how operation can be improved. The jury is still out in the Malaysia Room considering how this Conference should respond to this challenge.

As regards coordination, FAO has been diligent, if not comprehensive in reporting the issue as dealt with in ECOSOC and FAO Council. The report neglected to point out that ECOSOC had requested the Director-General, for development in international economic cooperation in 1986, to undertake some in-country field visits and prepare some case studies. That report referred to as the "Jansson Report" mentioned in this morning's introduction, is now out and under consideration in the General Assembly Second Committee. It makes very interesting reading (as others have noted) and contains a number of recommendations which my Government believe merit serious consideration by members and agencies, for example, the increased use of joint programming by UN agencies; the signing of inter-agency agreements at the country level; the role of resident coordinators with greater emphasis on programming on a sectorial basis, as opposed to a project-by-project basis. No doubt there are recommendations that FAO, or we for that matter, might not favour. On the other hand, we should not use these as grounds to dismiss a report that lays out country level problems with such clarity that we are only fooling ourselves if we continue to ignore them. My delegation also found interesting how little mention FAO made of the discussions in the UNDP Governing Council's Working Group in which FAO has participated for about three years, or of the discouragingly accurate coordination paper considered and praised by the UNDP Governing Council. FAO has had ample opportunity to hear the real problems of coordination and programme implementation and to take initiatives to respond in more than just the statements that we hear in New York. We urge FAO to become a constructive participant in these discussions joining in efforts to find solutions to tough, but not intractable problems. My delegation appreciates the report of instructions given to FAO Res. Reps. cited in paragraph 9 of document C 87/9. We noted these publicly at the UNDP Governing Council as an indication of FAO's increased commitment to cooperation and coordination. However, it takes action and steps to show the way, or to set an example, sometimes just in small ways. The Jansson Report stated that a major agency headquarters instructed its field representatives not to provide case study missions with information on the cost of field representation.

My delegation would like to be reassured that this major agency was not FAO and we would like to receive the information that was provided to that mission. Along the same lines, while we agree that personal relationships are key to cooperation in the field, my delegation, like others who have spoken before me, believes that chalking all problems up to imponderable personality differences is taking the easy way out by admitting defeat *ex ante*. My delegation also wishes that the FAO report had taken note of the guidelines on coordination issued last year by the OECD TAC High-level Meeting of aid agency heads on coordination. More importantly, we hope FAO will call them to the attention of its Resident Representatives, as has the UNDP. These guidelines see the recipient government at the centre of coordination, highlight the need for a clear set of investment priorities, including investment in human resources and institutional development through technical assistance programmes like FAO's, and stress the importance of developing host government capacity. The guidelines have been received with great appreciation by developing country officials responsible for coordinating and planning the use of external assistance.

Ahmed S. HARIRI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): A number of delegations have levelled quite clear criticisms against this and have said there is a lack of coordination between FAO and other UN agencies. They have really upbraided the organization of my country here. Now this is somewhat confusing and it is not at all justified regarding the lack of coordination between FAO and other agencies. We feel that this can not be done unilaterally. There has to be a number of parties involved in this.

Ugo SESSI (Italie): Je voudrais remercier avant tout le Directeur du Bureau pour les affaires interagences, de la présentation des deux documents qu'il nous a faite ce matin; nous les avons trouvés intéressants. Et bien que certaines critiques aient été faites par quelques délégationés sur d'autres informations qu'on pouvait y insérer, surtout dans la partie analyse, nous croyons qu'ils constituent une bonne base de discussion. Ils peuvent bien sûr être améliorés, mais ils sont quand même très valables en ce qui concerne la concision des informations fournies et l'ampleur des problèmes.

Je ne vais pas examiner le problème de la coordination, plusieurs délégations y ont fait allusion. Mais je dois dire que nous partageons bien sûr plusieurs des soucis qui y ont été exprimés. Je partage entièrement ce qui vient d'être déclaré il y a quelques instants par l'Ambassadeur de la Belgique en ce qui concerne la coordination ici, dans le pays hôte. Mais il faut quand même reconnaître qu'il y a sûrement eu une amélioration de la coordination au sein des Nations Unies.

Je crois qu'il faut reconnaître le rôle positif que la FAO a joué, tel que les informations qui nous sont fournies le montrent, notamment dans la coordination en ce qui concerne les rapports avec les représentants résidents du PNUD qui restent le vrai moteur de toute l'action des Nations Unies dans les pays bénéficiaires.

Un effort a été fait, et bien qu'il reste encore beaucoup de choses à faire pour améliorer la situation, je crois que l'apport que la FAO a fourni dans cette oeuvre n'est pas négligeable.

Je me limiterai à mentionner quelques secteurs ou parties de ces rapports qui méritent selon nous une attention particulière.

En ce qui concerne les informations qui nous sont fournies sur la CNUCED, nous encourageons la FAO à poursuivre les travaux qui sont en cours à la CNUCED sur les produits de base, et je crois que la FAO peut apporter des informations valables et très importantes, surtout dans le secteur des produits tropicaux, des fibres dures, des bananes, des bois tropicaux.

Nous avons noté le rôle positif de la FAO dans les négociations commerciales multilatérales d'Uruguay. Nous encourageons le Secrétariat de la FAO à participer à ces travaux.

Nous avons pris note avec intérêt qu'elle a obtenu le statut d'observateur dans deux des groupes qui s'occupent des négociations dans le secteur agricole; et nous voudrions que le Secrétariat nous dise si elle a aussi obtenu le statut d'observateur dans le 3ème groupe, c'est-à-dire celui des produits de base des ressources naturelles, à propos desquels on nous dit qu'une décision devait être prise en octobre 1987.

Comme je l'ai déclaré lors de l'intervention que j'ai faite sur le budget, nous approuvons l'effort qui a été fait par la FAO dans le secteur des investissements. Nous avons pris bonne note des informations qui nous sont fournies dans les paragraphes 101 à 105 du document, sur l'effort fait par la FAO dans le secteur des investissements. Nous croyons que c'est un secteur dans lequel beaucoup pourrait être encore fait, surtout concernant la collaboration avec le PNUD, et en particulier avec les fonds d'équipement des Nations Unies, ainsi bien sûr qu'avec le FIDA.

En ce qui concerne enfin le PNUD, nous avons noté le rapport qui nous est présenté sur la session du Conseil d'administration. Ayant moi-même participé à ces travaux, je voulais signaler que parmi les décisions qui ont été prises et qui sont mentionnées ici, il y en a une qui n'est cependant pas mentionnée et qui est celle du renforcement du groupe consultatif entre agences pour les achats; ce qu'on appelle en jargon onusien - inter-agency procurement service unit - qui va également faire l'objet l'année prochaine d'une étude très poussée de restructuration. Nous croyons que ces groupes effectuent un travail considérable à l'intérieur du système des Nations Unies. Et nous serions très désireux de savoir si la FAO bénéficie des travaux de ces groupes, et dans quel secteur.

Nous croyons que les travaux que le groupe consultatif effectue dans le secteur des achats des marchés internationaux de biens et services, en faveur des agences des Nations Unies, sont très importants; de même qu'ils sont très importants concernant la dissémination des informations au bénéfice des pays qui peuvent participer. Vous savez que c'est un secteur très délicat auquel plusieurs délégations sont très sensibles.

Et je crois que la FAO aurait tout à gagner d'une participation accrue aux travaux du groupe consultatif, et de l'usage des informations qui sont fournies.

K. N. ARDHANAREESWARAN (India): My delegation would like to compliment the Secretariat on the excellent presentation, and also the very valuable documents they have circulated. In particular my delegation is interested in the recommendations of the World Commission on the Environment. This Commission has made far-reaching recommendations. The Commission has introduced the concept of sustainable growth. The Commission has also highlighted the need for protecting the environment. We are concerned with the indiscriminate use of pesticides. We are worried about the fall in ground water levels. We are seriously concerned with the over-exploitation of land and water resources, so we fully share the anxiety of the Commission with regard to the environment, and we strongly hope that FAO will accept the recommendations of the Commission and will frame the future strategy for agricultural development keeping in view the recommendations of this Commission. We hope it will be possible to introduce land and water use planning, in particular for ecologically fragile zones.

My delegation is fully in agreement with the recommendations of the World Commission on the Environment. We appreciate the initiative taken by FAO in pursuing the recommendations of the World Commission on the Environment. My delegation sincerely hopes that FAO will frame future programmes keeping in view the recommendations of the Commission.

My delegation fully supports the initiative of FAO in the field of nutrition. My delegation hopes that it will be possible for FAO to pay coordinated attention to problems relating to nutrition.

We also appreciate the action taken by FAO in the Seventh Session of UNCTAD and also in the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. In the developing countries agreement on commodity trade is of vital importance. We strongly support the initiative taken by FAO in securing a fair deal for the developing countries in the matter of commodity trade.

We fully support the initiative of FAO in improving the role of women in development.

My delegation notes with appreciation the action of FAO in accepting the role of Programme Resident Coordinators. We hope this will improve the coordination and also the cooperation among UN agencies and it will also improve the delivery of services and development programmes to various countries. In particular, we would like to emphasize close coordinations between FAO and the UNDP. My delegation hopes that the cooperation and coordination between the two agencies will improve.

With regard to location of field offices, we support the recommendation made in the document. We hope that the host countries will be consulted before a final decision is taken.

We commend the efforts of FAO in the simplification and harmonization of operational procedures. We hope these efforts will go a long way in bringing about effective coordination and improving the delivery of services. We also commend the efforts of FAO in standardizing evaluation procedures. In conclusion, we support the initiative of the FAO in bringing about the effective coordination between the various United Nations agencies.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): My delegation has looked at this document and we would like to commend what has been done by the Organization within UNCTAD and also regarding its cooperation with other United Nations agencies. I should also like to congratulate the FAO for its participation in a number of United Nations meetings. I think we should commend the efforts undertaken by FAO, because these have been quite considerable.

My country is interested in the environment, and we would praise what has been done by the Organization in that area. Similarly, we would approve what it has done by showing its desire to involve women in development. Also we should like to congratulate the FAO for what is stated in paragraph 41 relating to the setting up of a high-level committee to monitor agricultural development in Africa. We think we should give full weight to supporting the African countries so that it should be possible for agriculture to be developed in that continent. We also give full support to the efforts undertaken in respect of coordination between organizations and agencies. We would like to thank you for having submitted to us this excellent document.

CHAIRMAN: Now being distributed to member countries is the draft Report of Commission IT, Part 2. Before proceeding with that we will take a break so that member countries can have some time to read the contents and reflect on them before we proceed to discuss them. We have three more countries to speak on this topic and then the Secretariat will respond.

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): The Danish delegation did not intend to intervene on this subject. We found the paper submitted very descriptive and not really useful for discussion. However, I should like to reiterate Denmark's support of the draft resolution on FAO activities related to the World Commission on Environment and Development. We agree that this is an area to which FAO should pay increasing attention in coming years, as the debate at this Conference has indicated.

While I have the floor, the Danish delegation would like to support what was said by Canada, Australia, Finland and the United States on FAO's efforts in the area of coordination. We would also like FAO to more profoundly fulfill the recommendations concerning the coordination of operational activities within the United Nations system as spelt out in numerous resolutions, especially the UN General Assembly resolution 41/171 and ECOSOC resolution 87/11.

Ababacar Waly NDIAYE (Senegal): Permettez-moi tout d'abord de remercier M. Régnier de la présentation très claire qu'il a faite du document C 87/9.

Beaucoup de pays africains, parmi lesquels le Sénégal, ont initié des politiques d'autosuffisance alimentaire. Pour ce qui concerne le Sénégal, après trois années d'expérience de cette politique, il est apparu que l'un des obstacles fondamentaux à la réalisation de l'objectif d'autosuffisance alimentaire à terme se situe à l'aval de la production. Il s'agit de la transformation industrielle et semi-industrielle des produits céréaliers pour choisir des produits finis qui peuvent être livrés à la consommation à des prix acceptables.

C'est dans ce contexte que la délégation sénégalaise tient à encourager une meilleure coopération entre la FAO et l'ONUDI afin d'aider les pays africains à lever cet obstacle majeur à une sécurité alimentaire.

La délégation sénégalaise tient aussi à suggérer que la coopération entre la FAO et l'OMM soit renforcée pour que la FAO soit davantage impliquée dans l'exécution du projet AGLINET, particulièrement durant la phase opérationnelle de ce projet.

Angel BARBERO MARTIN (España): La delegación española se congratula al observar en el documento presentado que ha avanzado de una forma efectiva la coordinación entre la FAO y otros organismos internacionales.

Queríamos hacer especial mención de los aspectos medio ambientales en los cuales para nosotros esta coordinación es fundamental y al mismo tiempo también quisiéramos hacer algunas apreciaciones sobre esta área.

Quizá entendemos que además de esta coordinación en materia de medio ambiente es necesario que los organismos o los países que están encargados de las operaciones y de los trabajos que de alguna manera inciden en este medio ambiente introduzcan los conceptos medio ambientales en su sistema operacional y, por tanto, entendemos que por un lado será necesario elevar la importancia de los sistemas coordinadores, muy en especial de la figura del Coordinador, pero también ir introduciendo el aspecto medio ambiental en todos los proyectos y programas que se realizan, y muy principalmente en la FAO.

Los recursos que hasta ahora se están destinando a los aspectos específicamente medio ambientales son escasos y probablemente lo van a seguir siendo en un futuro próximo. Esto no debería ser pretexto para evadir este aspecto medio ambiental; sin embargo, y en todo caso, queríamos recordar que cuando realmente se presentan estos problemas financieros para el medio ambiente existe también la cooperación. El medio ambiente no tiene fronteras, no conoce fronteras administrativas o políticas y los efectos de un deterioro medio ambiental se pueden hacer visibles en cualquier país, en cualquier parte de nuestro planeta.

También querríamos destacar que dentro de los aspectos medio ambientales nos congratula observar cómo se ha dado importancia a la silvicultura y tratamiento de los bosques, especialmente de los bosques tropicales; sin embargo, nos gustaría que este aspecto fuera todavía más remarcado en los programas de la FAO; no solamente en la silvicultura de los bosques que ya existen, sino en la creación de nuevas masas boscosas y también en la restauración de aquellas zonas, especialmente de las cuencas, que sufren erosión y que deberían ser objeto de mucha más atención, porque no solamente el aspecto silvícola tiene una vertiente económica, sino muy importante medio ambiental y por eso dentro de este aspecto creemos que la FAO tiene todavía un papel muy importante por cubrir y debería de ejercer ese papel coordinador, pero también debería de introducir en sus programas y trabajos este aspecto medio ambiental, muy especial en lo que se refiere a los casos de catástrofes y sobre todo las catástrofes naturales derivadas de inundaciones, incendios forestales, plagas, etc.

Creemos que toda estrategia que lleve a mejorar la pronta asistencia de un organismo internacional como la FAO allá donde se haya producido la catástrofe debe ser subrayada constantemente y con más intensidad; también aunque la catástrofe no sea tan visible en algunos momentos, la pérdida de germoplasma en el mundo viene a ser una catástrofe a veces solapadas, a veces ignorada o desconocida por los países. Apoyamos, por lo tanto, las iniciativas que se han realizado en este aspecto y muy en especial de la que ha hablado México, aunque sabemos que más adelante se va a tratar con más detalle.

René LONCAN (Brésil): Ma délégation voudrait tout d'abord remercier le Secrétariat de la préparation du document C 87/9 et de son Supplément 1 ainsi que M. Régnier de l'excellente présentation du sujet

La septième session, de la CNUCED fut un événement de la plus grande importance pour la coopération multilatérale. Le Brésil a participé activement à ses discussions et a accordé son appui inconditionnel à son Document final.

A ce sujet, nous voudrions relever quelques domaines qui font l'objet de ce document auquel nous attribuons une importance spéciale, dont la recommandation concernant le Programme intégré pour les produits de base et la crise de la dette extérieure. Nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec l'affirmation dans ce document, selon laquelle la crise de la dette est complexe, et une solution équitable, durable et mutuellement acceptable ne sera atteinte que si l'on traite le problème dans le cadre d'une stratégie orientée vers la croissance intégrée et coopérative tenant compte des circonstances particulières de chaque pays.

Nous nous réjouissons également des possibilités encourageantes d'entrée en vigueur du Fonds commun. D'autre part, nous croyons fermement que les négociations dites "Uruguay Round" offrent une opportunité d'amélioration des termes du commerce international.

A notre avis, quelques principes fondamentaux doivent toutefois être préservés: les principes d'un traitement différentiel plus favorable aux pays en développement, la non remise en question du soutien agricole fondé sur les critères sociaux, le gradualisme devant être observé dans le processus d'élimination des politiques de soutien à l'agriculture et le rapport étroit que ce processus doit garder avec le niveau des subventions accordées par chaque pays; car une élimination

automatique et générale des mécanismes de soutien pourrait entraîner de désastreuses conséquences économiques pour certains pays en développement. Les propositions en ce sens devront donc être opposées.

Nous réitérons notre appui à la participation de la FAO aux négociations du GATT, et accueillons avec plaisir l'invitation faite à notre Organisation d'assister aux travaux des groupes de négociation sur l'agriculture, les produits tropicaux, les produits de base et les ressources naturelles. La treizième session ministérielle du Conseil mondial de l'alimentation a offert l'occasion d'évaluer la situation économique mondiale et ses conséquences sur les conditions de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation des pays en développement.

Le Brésil a participé à la réunion et soutient les recommandations et conclusions de la Déclaration de Pékin dont celles sur l'effet néfaste de certains programmes d'ajustement sur la situation agro-alimentaire des couches les plus pauvres des pays en développement.

Avant de terminer, nous voudrions faire référence à la quatorzième session du Conseil d'administration du Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement concernant l'adoption des rapports sur notre avenir commun et la perspective écologique jusqu'à l'an 2000 et au-delà.

Ces deux rapports reconnaissent que la pauvreté augmente dans les pays en développement du fait des prix des produits de base, des politiques de protectionnisme, du fardeau de la dette extérieure et de la tendance au déclin des flux de financement pour le développement.

Ma délégation a signalé, lors de la discussion du point 17 de l'ordre du jour, que tant que l'on n'aura pas pris de mesures effectives en vue d'un nouvel ordre économique international plus juste, les problèmes de l'environnement ne trouveront pas de solution.

CHAIRMAN: At this point, if there is no objection, we can now by consensus approve the resolution submitted for Item 20.2 and refer it to Plenary. The resolution is approved.

It was so decided

Il en est ainsi décidé

Así se acuerda

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): Je voudrais tout d'abord, à l'issue de ce débat, remercier les délégations qui ont pris la peine de s'exprimer et je voudrais ajouter que j'ai essayé dans mon introduction à ces documents - tout comme le Secrétariat l'avait fait - de donner les faits en matière d'événements dans le système des Nations Unies.

Un certain nombre de délégations ont donné leurs opinions sur la coordination et ce thème a dominé et les opinions ont été variées et nombreuses.

Le distingué représentant du Canada a dit que la question de la coordination devait être appréhendée dans l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies. IL est vrai que le mandat et les compétences de la FAO sont très vastes et touchent à l'agriculture, à la pêche, à la nutrition, et nous pourrions citer de nombreux exemples où d'autres organisations du système des Nations Unies - soit centrales soit périphériques - sont tentées d'intervenir dans ce secteur; par conséquent la coordination n'est pas aisée.

On a dit que c'était une question d'attitude; je voudrais répéter au nom du Directeur général que la FAO a pour attitude d'être très positive en matière de coordination mais, en réalité, la coordination est une pierre de Sisyphe: plus vous la montez, et plus on en demande et plus on en a besoin autrement dit, il ne faut pas en faire une fin en elle-même. La coordination doit aussi avoir ses limites du point de vue strictement financier.

Je voudrais revenir, en matière de coordination et de coopération, sur l'exemple du PNUD et de la 4ème cible puisque la question a été soulevée. Le distingué représentant de la Tchécoslovaquie nous a demandé de taire le point sur la programmation indicative et sur la part de la FAO dans les res-sources du PNUD. Sans revenir sur le débat d'hier, sur les questions opérationnelles, je voudrais dire un certain nombre de choses: il a cité le paragraphe 16 du document C 87/9 où l'on dit que 60 programmes par pays ont été définis. Mais nous étions en mai de l'année dernière lorsque ce document a été finalisé; depuis lors, le Conseil d'administration du PNUD de juin a également approuvé un grand nombre de programmes par pays; il en reste une vingtaine, je pense, à approuver, et par conséquent, des progrès ont été fait en ce sens.

Est-ce que la part de la FAO va remonter? D'une part, au cours du troisième cycle le programme était relativement faible: 19 pour cent, pour 1986 mais bien entendu, Il y a eu des variations de région à région. Par exemple la part de la FAO était de 25 pour cent en Afrique; elle n'était que de 14 pour cent en Europe et à l'intérieur des régions il y avait un certain nombre de programmes indicatifs pour le troisième cycle FAO/PNUD qui dépassaient 50 pour cent. Nous avons raison de penser qu'il en sera de même pour le quatrième cycle; pour un certain nombre de pays, nos indications montrent déjà au moins 50 pour cent; ce chiffre est inférieur pour d'autres pays. Mais il faut tenir compte d'un double fait. D'une part, la part de l'agriculture est décidée souverainement par chaque Etat dans les programmes indicatifs qu'il souhaite voir approuver. D'autre part, lorsque ces programmes sont approuvés et que la part de l'agriculture est définie, il faut décider la part qui reviendra à la FAO pour exécution. Mais nous pensons que pour le quatrième cycle, cette part sera légèrement supérieure à celle du troisième cycle.

Quoiqu'il en soit, la collaboration avec le PNUD pour la préparation du quatrième cycle a été intense à tous les niveaux. Cette collaboration intervient sur la participation à des missions de programmation et sur l'examen, par la FAO pour la partie agricole, de toutes les notes que les Représentants résidents préparent pour le programme indicatif, tout au moins lorsque ces derniers nous consultent, ce qui est la majorité des cas. Notre collaboration intervient également pour l'identification et la formulation de projets qui, ensuite, peuvent être inclus dans le programme indicatif du pays.

Il me faut ajouter que dans un certain nombre de cas des projets, préparés par la FAO, sont exclus, par le mécanisme d'approbation soit au niveau du pays, soit au niveau du PNUD, tout simplement parce que les ressources n'étaient pas disponibles, ou parce que les réserves de programmation devaient être plus importantes que prévu. Néanmoins, ces projets sont disponibles et nous avons heureusement pour ces cas des recours possibles à des donateurs en fonds fiduciaires, car nous voulons éviter de perdre des projets qui à l'époque où ils ont été préparés et soumis, sont une priorité. Et je vais prendre un exemple dans la région Asie Pacifique où la FAO a participé, pour la préparation de ce cycle, à dix programmations de revue par pays. En coopération avec la division technique, elle a organisé 124 missions de formulation de projets et dans 3 pays, le PNUD souhaite demander à la FAO une étude de l'évaluation de la situation de l'agriculture: ceci est en fait très proche des conseils que de nombreuses délégations ont souhaité ici voir se développer au sein de la FAO.

J'ai cité la région Asie mais je pourrais le faire pour l'AFrique, ou pays par pays si nous avons le temps. Comment ce travail se fait-il? Il se fait d'abord au niveau des représentants de la FAO ainsi que des Représentants résidents qui, en particulier, s'agissant du quatrième cycle ont été chargés de collaborer ensemble à la définition du Programme indicatif du pays. Des revues globales entre le PNUD et la FAO ont eu lieu à Bangkok et à New York. Pour l'Asie, on a revu pays par pays le programme indicatif en cours d'élaboration. Des revues ont également eu lieu ici à Rome en juillet dernier; les responsables régionaux du PNUD pour l'Afrique de l'Est, l'Afrique de l'Ouest et l'Afrique centrale sont venus ici à Rome discuter de la programmation du programme indicatif pays par pays. Ils se sont largement basés sur les "print-out" de l'ordinateur de la FAO pour les cycles de projets et il a semblé aux représentants régionaux du PNUD que c'était un élément d'information très utile.

Je voudrais dire que, rien que cette année, la FAO a reçu à Rome pour consultation 44 représentants résidents avec lesquels nous avons entretenu une discussion technique avec toutes les divisions intéressées à ces différents projets.

Cela c'est de la coordination au ras des projets, la coordination la plus évidente qui puisse se faire puisque ces représentants résidents retournaient ensuite dans les pays et après une discussion technique nous décidions éventuellement de ce qui restait à faire pour la préparation des projets

leur contenu et le délai dans lequel il fallait le faire. Je ne parle pas bien entendu des discussions plus techniques qui peuvent avoir lieu avec le PNUD sur des questions de principes ou sur des questions plus générales. Là encore, je citerai deux exemples: l'examen du format des projets du PNUD qui seront mis en application au premier janvier de l'année prochaine; nous en avons discuté ici avec le représentant du PNUD concernant les modalités d'exécution par les gouvernements des projets du PNUD. Nous pouvons donc affirmer que si consultation il y a, en tout cas avec le PNUD, elle est intense et journalière, que cela soit au siège, à New York ou ici. Et si vous regardez les documents préparés par les Représentants résidents eux-mêmes, dans leurs rapports, envoyés à New York, si vous examinez le rapport de M. Ripert sur les relations opérationnelles, ils s'accordent tous à dire que les relations FAO/PNUD sont en général excellentes; bien entendu il peut y avoir des difficultés et il y en a, au niveau des individus; il peut y avoir des difficultés et j'en ai signalé tout à l'heure concernant des projets qui brusquement sont retirés simplement parce que les ressources ne sont pas disponibles; que cela puisse créer des petites tensions, des petits problèmes, personne ne le nie, mais cela relève des questions de personnes et, je ne pense pas, comme l'a dit le représentant de l'Australie tout à l'heure qu'il n'y ait pas d'instructions encourageant la collaboration.

Le document C 87/9 au paragraphe 9 donne un extrait des instructions communiquées à tous les représentants de la FAO lorsqu'ils partent en mission. Ils ont pour instruction de reconnaître le PNUD comme le primus inter pares en matière de coordination. Ils ont pour instruction de mettre à la disposition du PNUD toute la capacité technique dont ils peuvent disposer; en revanche, on présume que le PNUD fera appel à cette capacité technique et à cette connaissance, telles qu'elles sont accumulées à travers la FAO dans les domaines agricoles et alimentaires. On a également parlé des bureaux du PNUD, et éventuellement de la collaboration et de la mise en commun des bureaux des différents agents. Le Directeur général adjoint de la FAO a déjà dit en pleineière l'autre jour que c'est une optique que nous considérons toujours. J'ajouterai que dans certains cas les bâtiments du PNUD sont trop étroits ne serait-ce que pour contenir les services des Nations Unies proprement dits, a fortiori ceux des agences indépendantes des Nations Unies et dans certains autres cas les ministères de l'agriculture avec lesquels la FAO collabore jour après jour. Et ils préfèrent parfois avoir la représentation de la FAO dans leur bâtiment car il ne faut pas oublier que le rôle des représentants de la FAO n'est pas strictement opérationnel de l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies; ces représentants ont également des tâches très précises qui relèvent du Programme régulier de la FAO et par conséquent il y a un contact journalier avec le Ministère de l'agriculture ou du développement rural qui est très important.

Concernant le rapport Jansson, la question a été soulevée à plusieurs reprises. Je dirai tout d'abord que le document soumis au Conseil, au moment où le principe de ces études de cas a été décidé, mentionnait très spécifiquement la résolution de l'ECOSOC demandant cette revue. Je ne peux pas vous la citer car je ne l'ai pas devant moi, mais il faut que la distinguée représentante des Etats-Unis sache que nous avons mentionné l'existence de cette requête de l'ECOSOC. Nous avons collaboré aux différentes études de cas menées à travers cet exercice et nous avons donné des instructions à nos représentants dans les sept ou huit pays qui faisaient l'objet de cette étude de cas pour qu'ils fournissent toute l'assistance désirée aux différentes missions; nous leur avons demandé notamment qu'ils fournissent toute l'information nécessaire pour l'évaluation des programmes opérationnels menés par la FAO dans ces pays.

Nos représentants nous ont indiqué le sérieux avec lequel les missions ont été entreprises et l'intérêt qu'ils ont pris avec nos propres représentants.

Le distingué représentant de la Belgique nous a demandé si nous étions d'accord avec ce rapport; dans l'ensemble, le rapport Jansson ne nous pose pas de problème; c'est un document très complet qui n'est peut-être pas très représentatif de l'ensemble des opérations des Nations Unies puisqu'il ne touche que sept pays. Mais dans l'ensemble, nous sommes dans une large mesure en accord avec ses conclusions et, à l'intérieur du système des Nations Unies, ce n'est pas la FAO qui fait des critiques sur ce rapport.

Une autre question a été soulevée concernant la coordination, par le distingué représentant de la Belgique, qui nous dit: "mais ne faudrait-il pas commencer concrètement, d'abord au niveau de Rome, où il y a plusieurs agences". Comme je l'ai dit dans mon introduction, le Ministre de l'agriculture du Mexique présidant le Conseil alimentaire mondial a, durant cette session du Conseil et de la Conférence, réuni toutes les agences des Nations Unies actives dans le secteur agricole.

CHAIRMAN: What we are supposed to be doing at this time is to reply to questions asked by members. Please try to state a question that somebody raised directly to the Secretariat and respond to that question rather than do an additional report or fill in the report. I think the function here is to respond to the questions of member countries. Please try to stick to that.

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des affaires interinstitutions): Oui, Monsieur le Président, la question était: pourrait-on commencer par la coordination au niveau des agences à Rome? Et la réponse que je voulais donner était que le Conseil alimentaire mondial, à l'occasion de la réunion dont je viens de parler, a décidé de préparer un document pour sa prochaine session, sur la convergence des différentes organisations à Rome traitant de l'agriculture.

Une autre question soulevée concerne l'ONUDI: on a demandé où en était l'accord formel de relation avec l'ONUDI. Le texte final de ce projet d'accord est à Vienne, auprès de l'Organisation; il sera probablement adopté début 1988, puis soumis au Conseil de la FAO en 1988 et à la Conférence en 1989.

Une autre question concernait la participation de la FAO au troisième groupe du GATT. Nous avons nous-mêmes exprimé le souhait d'être invités en tant qu'observateurs; nous attendons la réponse et espérons qu'elle viendra sous peu.

La participation à l'IAPSU, le Comité interagences pour les questions d'achat, a été soulevée. Nous y participons; c'est un sujet important et je pense que ce Comité peut faire un travail utile.

Je voudrais pour terminer ajouter deux choses: en premier lieu, nous souhaitons effectivement participer autant que faire se peut aux réunions du Conseil d'administration du PNUD et de ses organes lorsque nous y sommes invités. Je réponds ici au distingué représentant des Etats-Unis; c'est un moyen pour les agences de faire entendre leur point de vue et de mieux comprendre le point de vue du Conseil d'administration du PNUD.

Enfin, il a été dit que les deux documents étaient peut-être informatifs mais peu analytiques; je répondrai que nous sommes forcés d'être sélectifs. Les Nations Unies touchent un nombre considérable de points et de secteurs et nous devons résumer les points de vue; mais, dans la mesure du possible et sur des sujets particuliers, nous nous efforcerons à l'avenir d'être aussi analytiques que possible mais dans des limites car l'objet de ces rapports est d'informer le Conseil et la Conférence sur les événements qui ont lieu au sein du système des Nations Unies.

CHAIRMAN: Before going to have a brief introduction on item 20.3 are there any other comments on item 20.2.

Ms Joan DUDIK GAYOSO (United States of America): My delegation may have missed it but we are still waiting for an answer to the question of what the field costs are, the costs of field representation, and are waiting to hear FAO's assurances that they were not the agencies that instructed their field representatives not to provide this information to the missions that were doing the case studies.

CHAIRMAN: With the indulgence of the United States and in the interests of time the Chair would suggest you try to figure out the answer to that question while we go on to the next question and we will come back to that. Canada, you are next in line with a question and after yours has been responded to we will go back to the United States question, if we have an answer to the United States question.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): I will not comment on what I think was the response of the Secretariat, which was not in the form of a reply to some of our comments but quite frankly more in the nature of a lecture.

I would like to introduce two specific questions, however, along the same lines as the American colleague. I will introduce a brief quotation and then lead to the specific question which has to do with numbers and we do have some indulgence if the Secretariat does not have these numbers at hand always, but the quote is as follows: "There is an excess of field establishments. It is sometimes doubtful whether all country representatives are fully occupied in the field and the overall pattern of representation does not make complete sense." I am sure nobody in this room would be stunned if I told you that this was from a Canadian statement, but it is not. This is a quote from a JIU report, a report of the Joint Inspection Unit in document A/41/424.

There is a further comment in paragraph 421 of that same report which says that FAO began setting up country offices in 1977 and at the time the report was written there are now at least 70 of them. At the end of 1983 country offices had total staff, and we presume there is an increase since then, of 117 international professionals and 513 general service staff. During the corresponding period the number of FAO experts, the heart of FAO, declined from 1,964 to 1,719. I would like to have the most recent figures in those two cases, that is the number of international professionals and general service staff in the country offices and regional offices on the one hand, and on the other hand the corresponding figure in terms of FAO experts. The reason I raise this here is that one of the objections that has been raised to increased coordination is that it is going to be costly. Well, I think there is an interesting point made here, not by a Canadian but by the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations.

CHAIRMAN: Secretariat, please respond to whichever question you have an answer for, the American or the Canadian.

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): Je m'excuse d'avoir eu à consulter pour répondre à la question de la distinguée représentante des Etats-Unis. Nous avons effectivement indiqué à nos représentants dans les pays, la où les études de cas devaient se passer, qu'ils devaient fournir toute l'information nécessaire, y compris l'information chiffrée, sur les opérations de terrain. Et la raison, claire, en est que les représentants de la FAO ont des activités bien plus nombreuses relevant du Programme ordinaire et qui étaient elles-mêmes forcément en dehors des termes de référence des études de cas entreprises à la suite de la résolution de l'ECOSOC.

En ce qui concerne la question soulevée par le distingué représentant du Canada, je voudrais dire d'une part...

CHAIRMAN: Just let us finish one question at a time. Did that answer the question of the United States delegate?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I do not know. I did not understand the answer. It sounded to me that instructions were given to the field staff but that some activities that the resident representatives or the field officers were doing did not have anything to do with what the case studies were doing. That would raise for me another question, if I understood correctly, but I still do not know whether the resident representatives were given instructions to provide information on the field representation costs to the Jansson case study teams.

CHAIRMAN: That is the question, were they or were they not?

A. REGNIER (Director, Office of Inter-Agency Affairs): I think I answered- in saying we gave instructions to the FAO representative to give all those figures related to the field activities, which was the terms of reference to the Jansson report missions.

CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Maybe I am just being very dense today but the numbers of field activities to me refers to the amounts of money spent for field programmes and my understanding is that what was not provided, and I do not know if it was FAO, I hope it was not, what was not provided was the costs of the field representation. So if what you are saying is that resident representatives were given instructions to provide information on the numbers, the amounts of money for field activities, that would make sense because the case studies would not have amounted to anything if the missions did not know what the value of the programmes in the countries were, but the question has to do with the cost of field representation. Nowhere in the report was there a complaint about the lack of information on the size of the field programme. The issue has to do with the cost of field representation. I think in FAO it is called the office of the FAOR.

CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to elaborate? The Chair in such exchanges here, in trying to be an intermediary between the question asked and the answer given, can do a limited amount of interpretation of it, but the Chair has to leave to the judgement of the member country as to whether or not their questions were answered. That is why I repeat that. Was your question answered? Are you satisfied with the answer?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): No, I will not press the point further because I think it has already got embarrassing enough, but I would state for the record that my delegation does not feel that the FAO has indicated whether it provided to the case study missions done for the Director-General the costs of field representation in those seven or eight countries.

CHAIRMAN: There is some confusion up here. Can you state your question in a way that can have a yes or no answer, and then we can move on to Canada.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): What I would like to do is to look for a quote, so if you go on to Canada I will look for the quote.

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): En ce qui concerne la question du Canada, je voudrais tout d'abord dire que pour ce qui est des représentations de la FAO, nous n'avons absolument pas l'impression qu'elles doivent être assimilées à la citation qu'il vient de faire. Toutes nos représentations ont vraiment un full time job, et nous en sommes vraiment persuadés au travers du système reporting auquel nous soumettons ces représentants, et qui font bien entendu l'objet d'un examen sérieux ici au siège. S'il m'avait demandé hier les chiffres précis, lorsque nous discutons du Programme de terrain, j'aurais pu les lui donner; je les lui ferai parvenir ou je les communiquerai à la Commission dès que possible. Je les avais hier, je ne les ai plus aujourd'hui, ne sachant pas que ce genre de question aurait pu être posée.

CHAIRMAN: The answer is that you will have the specifics tomorrow.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): On page 24 of the Jansson Report the following statement occurs: "The missions attempted to obtain information on the cost of UN field representation. This turned out to be difficult. One major agency declined to give information to the

missions upon instruction from headquarters." My question presented in my statement to the Secretariat is, was this agency FAO? My statement said that I wished to be assured that it was not the FAO and I requested that the information FAO provided on the cost of field representation would be provided to my delegation.

CHAIRMAN: The question concerns the agency referred to in that quote - is that FAO or is it not FAO?

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires Interinstitutions): Nous n'avons pas donné cette information parce qu'on ne nous l'a pas demandée. Nous avons donné à nos représentants l'instruction de communiquer tous les chiffres disponibles concernant les opérations de terrain. Et comme nous avons des opérations qui ne sont pas de terrain mais qui relèvent du Programme ordinaire, il n'est bien entendu pas possible d'indiquer la totalité du coût de la représentation qui doit être attribuée aux opérations de terrain. Et nous avons dit que le siège pouvait donner des instructions et des indications plus précises sur demande si la question nous était spécifiquement posée, avec le détail. Ces chiffres sont disponibles mais ils ne peuvent être que misunderstood.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? There being no further questions we will proceed to the next item.

20.3. Relations with Intergovernmental and International Non-governmental Organizations

20.3. Relations avec les organisations intergouvernementales et les organisations internationales non gouvernementales

20.3. Relaciones con organizaciones intergubernamentales y organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales internacionales no gubernamentales

CHAIRMAN: There will be a brief introduction of that item.

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): Pour ce point de l'ordre du jour, la Conférence dispose du document C87/17 sur les relations avec les organisations inter-gouvernementales et les organisations internationales non gouvernementales. Ce document expose, dans ses grandes lignes, les principaux faits nouveaux survenus au cours du biennium, en ce qui concerne la coopération avec ces organisations. J'aimerais également attirer votre attention sur le document C 87/INF/1 qui fait rapport sur la réunion officieuse des organisations inter-nationales non gouvernementales qui s'est tenue le 10 novembre dernier.

Le principal document qui vous est soumis n'a pas la prétention de faire rapport sur l'ensemble et dans le détail de la coopération avec les organisations internationales intergouvernementales et non gouvernementales. Cela aurait représenté une tâche presque impossible. Le document fait état des principaux développements qui caractérisent le biennium en cours. Comme dans le passé, ce document est surtout destiné à l'information de la Conférence et ne soulève aucune question appelant une décision.

Avec votre permission, je souhaiterais, cependant, faire quelques commentaires sur le contenu du document. Je dois, en premier lieu, souligner l'importance que l'organisation attache aux relations avec les organisations intergouvernementales. Comme vous le savez, les textes fondamentaux prévoient les arrangements qui peuvent être arrêtés avec ces organisations. A ce jour, 103 organisations intergouvernementales ont établi des rapports officiels avec la FAO à la suite d'un échange de lettres ou d'autres instruments appropriés. Par ailleurs, 175 organisations internationales non gouvernementales ont également des rapports officiels avec la FAO. Un répertoire des organisations internationales ayant des rapports officiels avec la FAO est publié régulièrement

et rais à jour. Il est distribue, entre autres, aux missions permanentes à Rome et aux bureaux des représentants de la FAO. Les rapports officiels entre la FAO et les organisations intergouvernementales peuvent prendre la forme d'un échange de lettres ou d'un accord formel. Ces accords fournissent un cadre pour la coopération et prévoient, en général, un échange de documentation et d'information, la participation à des réunions, des consultations réciproques sur la programmation et l'exécution de programmes techniques d'intérêt commun.

Le document C 87/17 reflète l'étendue des rapports de coopération avec les organisations intergouvernementales. A cet égard, je souhaiterais souligner l'étroite collaboration qui existe avec un grand nombre d'organisations régionales et sous-régionales, particulièrement, mais non exclusivement, en Afrique. A titre d'exemple, il me suffira d'indiquer l'excellente collaboration avec l'Organisation de l'Unité Africaine (OUA), notamment à l'occasion des préparatifs de la session spéciale de l'Assemblée générale sur l'Afrique. Le document qui vous est soumis fournit de nombreux autres exemples de collaboration avec les groupements économiques/régionaux.

J'en viens maintenant à la coopération avec les organisations internationales non gouvernementales. Ces organisations peuvent avoir des rapports officiels sous la forme d'un statut consultatif, consultatif spécial ou de liaison. Ces rapports officiels permettent à ces organisations de participer à certaines réunions, à recevoir de la documentation, etc. Ces organisations peuvent également, sous la responsabilité de leur organe directeur, soumettre des exposés écrits sur des questions concernant le programme.

Les contacts et la coopération avec ces organisations ont un caractère continu. A titre d'exemple, je mentionnerai la réunion officielle organisée à la FAO en septembre dernier entre la Division des produits et du commerce international et la Fédération internationale des producteurs agricoles (FIPA).

D'importants développements doivent être mentionnés concernant la coopération avec les organisations non gouvernementales. En premier lieu, sur le plan interne, un groupe de travail, rassemblant l'ensemble des divisions et bureaux concernés, a examiné dans le détail, en 1986 et 1987, les arrangements et la pratique actuelle concernant la coopération avec les ONG, y compris au plan opérationnel. Ainsi, par exemple, en juin 1986, le département des pêches a organisé une réunion informelle avec les ONG concernées sur la collaboration dans le domaine du développement des pêches artisanales. Dans le domaine des forêts, dans le cadre du plan d'action pour la forêt tropicale, un renforcement du rôle des ONG aux niveaux international et national est prévu. A la suite de la Conférence mondiale sur la réforme agraire et le développement rural, la collaboration s'est intensifiée, en particulier en ce qui concerne la participation populaire.

La Journée mondiale de l'alimentation offre un autre exemple d'excellente coopération avec les ONG. La première réunion internationale sur la Journée mondiale organisée en juin dernier à Milan a rassemblé des représentants d'ONG et des comités nationaux de quinze pays.

Enfin, la Campagne mondiale contre la faim|Action pour le développement constitue également un instrument pour la coopération avec les ONG. Il convient de signaler qu'en 1987, 99 projets dans quarante pays, pour une valeur totale de 7 millions de dollars, ont pu être mis sur pied grâce à l'aide des ONG. 160 projets représentant une contribution des ONG de 4 millions de dollars sont en cours de préparation.

Dans ses activités, la Campagne mondiale contre la faim|Action pour le développement met l'accent, notamment en Afrique, sur l'identification d'organisations de paysans qui ne bénéficient d'aucun appui extérieur. L'objectif est de les aider à formuler et gérer leurs propres projets avec l'assistance financière d'ONG des pays industrialisés. Cette assistance s'est élevée pour l'Afrique à 2,6 millions de dollars au cours du présent biennium.

En Asie, le bureau de la Campagne mondiale organise depuis de nombreuses années des activités de formation et d'échanges pour des participants, en particulier les femmes, engagés dans des tâches de développement. Du matériel de formation a été préparé dans les langues locales. En Amérique latine, la Campagne mondiale s'appuie sur un important mouvement d'ONG. En 1987, les activités qui y ont été conduites l'ont été surtout dans le domaine de la formation. 35 projets, qui mettent l'accent sur l'utilisation des ressources locales, sont en cours de préparation.

La FAO est pleinement consciente de l'importance des organisations non gouvernementales, à la fois internationales et nationales. J'espère que les documents qui vous sont soumis et cette présentation reflètent suffisamment cette importance et faciliteront votre discussion.

Raul LOPEZ LIRA (México): Mi delegación desea comunicar la presentación de un proyecto de resolución tendiente a brindar apoyo y coordinación entre esta Organización y el recientemente creado Comité de Acción sobre Cooperación y Concertación Latinoamericana en materia de germoplasma vegetal a la luz de las enormes pérdidas de germoplasma vegetal que atenta contra un gran número de variedades útiles para el ser humano. En él se destaca el entendimiento establecido entre el Director General de la FAO y el Secretario Permanente del SELA, en el cual se dan las directrices de colaboración entre ambos organismos y en su parte de resolución se expresa la satisfacción por la constitución de este nuevo organismo, y la decisión de prestar apoyo al CARFIT;

Se pide al Director General identificar medidas tendientes a respaldar sus actividades y se solicita de la Secretaría establezca los contactos necesarios con la Secretaría del CARFIT para coordinar sus esferas de acción conjunta. Todo esto en base a la resolución 8/83 sobre compromisos internacionales sobre recursos fitogenéticos.

CHAIRMAN: We do not have a list of speakers but we have a statement on behalf of a group of Non-governmental Organizations and there being no objection that will be inserted in the record at this time.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): First of all, we want to thank Mr Régnier for his introduction of this item. As Mr Régnier stated in his introduction FAO is undertaking several programmes in the field of improvement in collaboration with NGO's in the field and local level. However, we want to add something. As regards document C 87/17, and C 87/INF/1, my delegation wishes to state the following: first, we want to express our satisfaction with the organization of the informal meeting of international non-governmental organizations on 10 November last. In his keynote address to COAG last April, our Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister Braks, stated that cooperation between farmers which influenced government policy and market development had been one of the major corner-stones of Dutch agricultural development. To have a policy establishing favourable conditions for agriculture, it is the opinion of the Netherlands Government that the creation of effective mechanisms for participation of and cooperation with farmers' organizations is the prerequisite.

Since FAO's mandate is to act as a policy advisor to governments and to assist them in food and agricultural programmes, the Organization has increasingly taken to recount the value of the contribution of relevant NGOs in these areas. It is our opinion that FAO should systematically include those NGO's such as farmers' organizations, rural workers' organizations and other types of local NGOs in the design and implementation of policies and programmes for social economic development at country level. The capacity of the above-mentioned NGOs to represent the interests of farmers' communities and other rural poor groups and to assist FAO and governments in technical field activities will benefit those target groups.

In this way those groups can be offered improved access to production factors, income and employment opportunities, training and extension, credit facilities and also effective participation in decisionmaking processes at governmental level. In this set of cooperation, promotional donor NGOs based on social, maybe religious and community involvement, are able to play a complementary role.

The observations my delegation want to put forward concern the recommendations of document C 87/INF/1. In paragraphs 26 and 27 we endorse the recommendation for - in the first place - the organization of regular joint consultations between technical FAO divisions and relevant NGOs and secondly for having a focal point within FAO divisions for the collaboration between FAO and NGOs.

Flexible but clear guidelines within the FAO organization based upon a coherent policy framework would facilitate the realization of this goal.

Perhaps I may draw your attention to a recent development within UNDP where a division for the collaboration with both local and promotional NGOs has been established, working on such a base of flexible guidelines and combined with appropriate resources.

As regards what is mentioned in paragraph 29 of the document on involvement of NGOs in field activities by FAO representatives, my delegation wants to stress the importance of partnership-relations with NGOs, carrying on responsibilities in spin-off activities as the result of FAO field programmes.

We want to endorse the idea presented in paragraph 30 on the provision of small-scale technical assistance to NGOs to be contained in the Regular Programme budget of relevant technical divisions of FAO.

My delegation wants to refer to what has been stated by the delegation of Switzerland and what my delegation wholeheartedly endorsed in Commission I on item 9 of WCARRD concerning the establishment of a FAO committee of farmers' organizations.

Speaking of NGOs in this respect we would consider the idea to include not only farmers but also agricultural workers, rural women and cooperatives. And it is our opinion that the next COAG could provide the momentum for a follow-up discussion on the above mentioned issues.

Vaclav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): Referring to document C 87/17, I would like to say that, with respect to the facts described in the report on the progress of conclusions from the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, the contacts with the trade unions and cooperative unions are assuming increasing importance for the FAO. They provide an occasion to encourage peasants, landless people and farm workers to unify and organize. In this respect the trade unions and cooperative societies can do much good work and we deem it useful for these organizations to know the intentions and objectives of the FAO.

The document says that FAO is maintaining regular contacts with 178 organizations. Although this is only a fraction of the high number of organizations active in the field of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, we believe that the Secretariat will establish further relations at the level of Liaison Status. However, according to the view of my delegation, an excessively high number of international non-governmental organizations with this consultative status might be too large a burden to the FAO administrative system.

Sami SUNAA (Jordan) (original language Arabic): I must express my gratitude for the interest which the Organization has shown and the efforts that it has deployed for the development of cooperation with inter-governmental organizations and the support that it gives to the international non-governmental organizations. We feel that these organizations could be a major tool in the development of agriculture if the necessary assistance is provided to them and if their Action Programmes enjoy coordination with our Organization. For many years FAO has undertaken measures for establishing rural organizations in various regions of the world - Africa, Asia, the Caribbean region. I would like to mention some of these unions: the National Union of Agricultural Credit which brings together more than 30 agricultural organizations in this region and which enjoys assistance not just in terms of training hundreds of leaders who work within the context of these organizations in different areas of specialisation but also for the translation of a number of documents which are used for training. They hold symposia on the major problems which arise for these institutions and the solutions to these problems, based on the current situation and the experiences acquired. These organizations may receive financial assistance from IFAD. Technical assistance is also available for meetings which are organized by regional and international organizations. I wanted to give an example of this to the meeting because it is an example of what can be achieved within the context of the assistance available to such organizations, thanks to the initiatives undertaken by the Organization and by the sort of assistance which could enjoy priority, both technically and financially.

On this occasion I should also like to emphasise the current cooperation being set up between nongovernmental organizations and governmental and intergovernmental organizations, which is a reflection of the consultations which are going on within the Organization, and we feel that it should be possible to develop this type of cooperation within a broader context by inviting such unions or federations to put forward their viewpoints on the various issues within their field of interest, and these

viewpoints ought to be taken into account when action programmes are being developed by the Organization. We want to emphasise the importance of following up assistance and of the cooperation of our Organization with these inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, in view of the importance of these for carrying out development programmes. This cooperation could avoid duplication and achieve the joint objectives of our organizations and these organizations.

CHAIRMAN: We had a statement by Mexico and in their statement they introduced their resolution.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): Very briefly, I would like to ask the Secretariat to explain to us what might be the cost implications of this Resolution if adopted, and what precedent, if any, it might create in terms of relationship between the Organization and such a body.

A. REGNIER (Directeur, Bureau des Affaires interinstitutions): A ce stade, il est difficile d'évaluer le coût éventuel. Tout dépendra bien entendu, du volume des activités qui se développeraient en liaison avec ce comité d'action. Il est certain que, selon la progression du volume de ces activités, les coûts augmenteront. On pourrait peut-être parler de 10 000 dollars ou plus. Tout dépend, avec le temps, de l'importance des activités qui se développeront. Il y aura certainement un coût financier, mais il est trop tôt pour l'évaluer.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Lamentamos que por razones ajenas a su voluntad el delegado de México haya tenido que ausentarse de la sala. Como bien se expresa en esta resolución, está siendo promovida por los países latinoamericanos, me permitiré explicar brevemente en qué consiste este Comité de Acción.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would point out to you that the representative of Mexico is in fact here.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Agradezco que sea el representante de México quien presente este proyecto de resolución.

CHAIRMAN: The representative of Mexico already did present this Resolution.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

MAPELA NGA-MA (Zaire): Monsieur le Président, je vous suis en français et je crois que nous sommes toujours sur le point 20.3. C'est sur ce point que je voulais demander la parole. J'avais peur que vous ne parliez d'autre chose.

CHAIRMAN: We have you down listed to speak on item 20.3. The Chair thinks it might be easiest just to cover this Resolution. Maybe it would be worth having a couple of moments here to ask the delegate of Mexico briefly to summarize his Resolution and then we would take the other speakers who have caught our attention and will take them in order.

Raul LOPEZ LIRA (Mexico): No voy a repetir lo que ya dije en la presentación, sino que voy a explicar un poco en muy breves palabras lo que es el organismo al que estamos haciendo referencia. Es un organismo creado por el SELA con el propósito de crear bancos de germoplasma regionales a partir de los cuales se conserve y se investigue, se evalúe y se aprovechen, y se usen los recursos fitogenéticos de la región para beneficio de los agricultores y de la seguridad alimentaria en general. Eso es todo lo que podría yo agregar a mi presentación.

HAPELA NGA-MA (Zaïre): Je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter M. Régnier et à travers lui tous les membres du Secrétariat pour la qualité et la présentation du document que nous examinons.

Ma délégation tient à remercier la FAO pour la contribution très appréciable qu'elle apporte dans le cadre des relations qu'elle entretient avec les organisations intergouvernementales et avec les organisations internationales non gouvernementales. Nous encourageons la FAO à continuer à collaborer et à assister toutes les organisations africaines, notamment l'OUA, la CEA, le Centre régional africain des technologies, l'Organisation africaine du bois, le Centre de développement rural intégré pour l'Afrique, la Communauté économique des pays de grands lacs, etc..

C'est effectivement de par son rôle de chef de file en matière d'alimentation et d'agriculture que la FAO doit tout mettre en oeuvre pour renforcer ses relations avec ces organisations.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Mi Delegación Señor Presidente, pidió la palabra simplemente para preguntar el número del documento que estábamos considerando, pero ya lo tenemos.

E.V. WADE BROWN (United Kingdom): Like Canada, we are somewhat worried about the cost implications of this and we would like to propose an amendment to the resolution which would include something like "implementation would be within existing resources".

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of the sponsor of the resolution to the amendment being accepted?

Raul LOPEZ LIRA (México): Sí Señor Presidente, para mí no sería un obstáculo.

CHAIRMAN: Could the United Kingdom clarify the wording and could you tell us where you think the amendment ought to be placed?

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): Yes, we would propose at the end of the paragraph 3 to delete the full stop and to continue the sentence with the words: "The cost of implementation to be within existing resources".

CHAIRMAN: Does Mexico accept that language?

Raúl LOPEZ LIRA (Mexico): Asiente.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Yo no me adelantaría mucho. Quisiera opinar sobre este aspecto que se acaba de discutir. Quisiera explicar que este Comité de Acción en el marco del SELA es un Comité de Acción autosustentado, tiene una Secretaría protémpore que se sustenta por los propios países. Por consiguiente, no creemos que los factores financieros puedan tener un peso significativo si esto constituye una preocupación para algunas otras Delegaciones.

Quisiera hacer una introducción, una ligera modificación en el párrafo romanito cuatro, en el tercer renglón donde dice: "en materia de recursos fitogenéticos, inclusive el estudio; la prospección." Esta sería nuestra adición: Estudio, la prospección, la identificación. Todo lo demás seguiría igual.

Respecto del párrafo 3, quizá la nota pudiera, si la distinguida Delegación del Reino Unido lo considera pertinente, después de nuestra explicación, tal vez se pudiera suprimir esta nota. No creemos que sea determinante dentro del marco de la Resolución.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): Regarding the resolution proposed by Mexico calling for the FAO to provide support to the Action Committee on Latin American Cooperation and Consultation on Plant Genetic Resources, we support the amendments proposed by Canada and the United Kingdom. We are encouraged that FAO is arranging its PGR activities to complement those of the International Board on Plant Genetic Resources and we are pleased that the relationship between FAO and the IBPGR has improved since February 1987 at the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two organizations. We note that existing FAO mechanisms such as those in place for quarantinable plant materials represent an area where FAO involvement is valuable. However, the United States does not support proposals that would establish an international network of base collections: nor are we in favour of FAO establishing an international fund for international plant genetic resources. Both these activities would appear to be unnecessary initiatives that infringe the work being accomplished by the IBPGR and other international research centres. To the extent to which the proposed resolution does not envision these activities and with the amendment proposed by the delegate of the United Kingdom, the United States could support this resolution.

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): I must admit we are a little puzzled about the sudden appearance of this resolution. We have no documentation and so far as we remember it has not been discussed in the proper forum, which is the Commission for Plant Genetic Resources. We would therefore like to have more information. Could the Secretariat perhaps explain what "back-stopping" means? I should like to come back to this later because if we are going to support the resolution we think we may add some amendments to it.

Temel Iskit, Vice-Chairman Commission II, took the Chair.

Temel Iskit, Vice-Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence.

Ocupa la presidencia Temei Iskit, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II.

Sra. Monica DEREGBUS (Argentina): Mi Delegación entiende de la lectura de este proyecto de resolución, Señor Presidente, que lo que se pide a la FAO en este caso es que realice una función más que nada coordinadora de esfuerzos del CTPD que están emprendiendo los países de América Latina y el Caribe.

En ese sentido, entendemos que está dentro de las funciones básicas de la FAO, prestar tales asesoramientos y no creemos que este tipo de reforzamiento de sus tareas de CTPD esté fuera de lo que está previsto en el presupuesto para el bienio próximo, como apoyo a actividades de cooperación técnica entre países en desarrollo.

En consecuencia, no entendemos de ninguna manera la enmienda que acaba de ser propuesta por varias Delegaciones en el sentido de introducir la frase de que esto debería ser hecho con los recursos existentes.

Obviamente, la FAO como no tiene todavía la posibilidad de contraer prestamos de ningún lado, no va a realizar absolutamente nada fuera de los recursos existentes. De manera que para la Delegación argentina la frase no tiene sentido y no debería ser introducida.

Ms Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): Like Denmark, my delegation is also a little surprised to see this text in front of us without specific documentation, with other delegations who are not very familiar with Latin American scenery, it is difficult for us to know what the objectives and activities of this new institution are which we are, according to this resolution, to support fully. My delegation has no references, for example, to find out where to learn about the objects and activities of this institution. So I think that we need to have more specific references to the background of this institution so that we can decide with additional information how to formulate this resolution.

CHAIRMAN: I see no other speakers, but Denmark and Finland have directed questions to the Secretariat and I think Mexico is also concerned in this reply. With the indulgence of the United Kingdom, I will revert to their proposal, to be commented on by Argentina and Mexico later.

L. BRADER (Director, Plant Production and Protection Division): I think in principle it is more appropriate that the delegations who have submitted this resolution should reply to certain detailed questions, but I can at least answer the questions of Denmark and Finland. For the Secretariat, back-stop" means to provide technical support for activities. With respect to Finland's question of what this institution stands for, this is a network of collaborating institutions working on plant genetic resources in Latin America. They have decided to collaborate more closely in future for the benefit of further development of plant genetic resources work in Central and South America. In that sense the activities proposed by this network are in line with the activities undertaken by FAO in relation to the International Board for Plant Genetic Resources and guided by the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources. I hope I have answered the questions

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): In addition to what Mr Brader has said, we would like to have further information. My delegation would like to know what are the additional activities to be undertaken to answer the requests in the operative paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the resolution. My delegation is convinced that the wide range of activities of FAO already being undertaken will benefit from what the resolution is considering. We would propose that the Latin American group at this stage could perhaps put the contents of the resolution in the report of Commission II. It is also our opinion that the resolution is in general following the lines of what FAO is already doing. In our opinion, that is one of the most important fields of activities of FAO.

For my delegation, it is difficult to recognize where the quotations come from. It is important to know that, because the context in which they are used could make it clearer as to how we should read the resolution. My delegation has no major objection to the resolution. As a matter of fact, FAO is the foremost international organization to deal with these activities. However, we should like more information because without it we wonder what would be the use of the resolution.

Ms Susan ULBAEK (Denmark): I do not think I have an answer. I ask the same question. I want more information on what are the activities that FAO is going to backstop.

Ms Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): I think the reply from the Secretariat was most helpful but I would still like to know the name of the document where I could find exactly the information that was just referred to.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Finland. Can the Secretariat reply immediately?

L. BRADER (Director, Plant Production and Protection Division): I can reply immediately. There is no conference document in which this matter is clarified. So far as I know, the matter was not discussed in the conference, so we cannot refer to a specific document.

CHAIRMAN: A number of questions were asked and I think perhaps more than the Secretariat the sponsor or sponsors of the resolution can give explanations, and since Cuba has asked for the floor, I give him the floor with this expectation.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Como ha expresado la Secretaría, Señor Presidente, no hay un documento en debate en la Conferencia que explique esta Resolución; sin embargo nosotros quisiéramos brindar algunas informaciones adicionales.

Un conjunto de países de América Latina y del Caribe en el marco del SELA promovieron un proyecto regional para la prospección, conservación y estudio de los recursos fitogenéticos. Este proyecto está poniéndose en marcha en el marco del SELA y con financiamiento del SELA y de los países.

En el marco de este proyecto se creó un Comité de Acción. Este Comité de Acción a que se hace referencia en la Resolución, y celebró su primera reunión en los primeros meses del año 1987 en la ciudad de México, acordando tener una Secretaría *pro tempore*; es decir que el país sede que acoge la reunión regional se haría cargo de la Secretaría y correría con los gastos que implique la gestión de la Secretaría. La asistencia a esta reunión del Comité de Acción también es financiada por los propios países. Por consiguiente, no vemos las implicaciones que del punto de vista presupuestario de la FAO pueda tener el que se establezca una mayor coordinación entre este Comité de Acción en el marco del SELA y la FAO, toda vez que la FAO ha creado, ha convocado una Comisión de Recursos Fitogenéticos. En todo caso, nos parece que fue muy clara la expresión de la distinguida delegada de Argentina cuando se refirió a que lo que aquí se pide es que la FAO actúe también en esta acción de coordinación para evitar duplicación de acciones, evitar duplicación de gastos para ciertas acciones, y poder facilitar dentro del marco de América Latina un intercambio mayor de información. Esto es el principio que anima a esta Resolución, y que anima a los países patrocinadores, teniendo en cuenta la importancia que reviste para la Región los Recursos Fitogenéticos.

Por consiguiente quisiera reiterar nuestra solicitud a las distinguidas Delegaciones que han pedido una enmienda en el párrafo 3, porque esta idea que se lanza aquí, esta petición al Director General, está encaminada en el sentido de fomentar las actividades de coordinación entre los países, la Oficina Regional, el SELA y el Comité de Acción sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos.

Sra. María Isabel CASELLAS (Venezuela): Solamente quería apoyar lo dicho por la Delegación de Cuba y por la Delegación de Argentina en cuanto a la Resolución presentada por México.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, but I would like to ask a question of Cuba and other Latin American countries, sponsors of this resolution. The suggestion was made by the delegation of the Netherlands whether the group sponsor of this resolution, would be content with including the whole resolution in the report. So first I want to hear the reply of the Latin American group to this and on this reply we can continue to deal with the resolution.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (México): Perdone, Sr. Presidente, pero no comprendí muy bien su pregunta.

CHAIRMAN: It is not a suggestion of the Chair. I have just repeated a suggestion by the delegation of the Netherlands based on certain hesitations for lack of information of many delegations. The suggestions was whether the sponsors of this resolution would be happy to see the resolutions text not as a resolution but as an insertion in the report of Commission II. I wanted to have your reaction to that before continuing. Is that clear?

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Está claro, Sr. Presidente, que desde el punto de vista de la voluntad de los países patrocinadores de esta Resolución y desde el punto de vista de la conveniencia y necesidades de una mayor y estrecha cooperación entre la FAO y el SELA, teniendo en cuenta los recientes contactos entre el Director General de la FAO y el Secretario General del SELA, teniendo en cuenta estos últimos contactos, la Resolución podría establecer un punto de reforzamiento a estas actividades de coordinación. Consideramos que esto pudiera otorgarle un mayor peso desde el punto de vista de la acción que van a tomar los países en el ámbito de la región latinoamericana.

CHAIRMAN: Do I infer from that, Cuba, that you want to maintain the resolution in its present form and you appeal to the delegations who expressed certain - I would not say reservations, but hesitations, about the content of the resolution to reconsider joining the consensus, if there is one? I recognize Mexico for further comments on this point.

Raúl LOPEZ LIRA (México): Mi delegación desea hacer algunas observaciones, a ver si con esto se puede aclarar un poco la duda que tienen algunas delegaciones. Este organismo es un organismo de reciente creación, que se ha creado a la sombra del SELA, con apoyo de la FAO. La FAO, tengo entendido, que en ocasiones, en una ocasión anterior ha prestado su apoyo a este organismo. Lo único que se pretende con este Proyecto de Resolución es darle un poco de fuerza y apoyo a un organismo de reciente creación en Latinoamérica, que tiene como interés hacer un esfuerzo en materia de biotecnología, de bancos de germoplasmas y que el propio Comité Fitogenético de la FAO ha expresado que desearía se reprodujera en otras regiones. Entonces, no veo yo cuál es el problema que ven las otras delegaciones para apoyar una cosa de esta naturaleza. Yo apelaría a ellas, a ver si pueden acceder.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Notre délégation joint naturellement son intervention aux déclarations de l'Argentine, de Cuba et du Mexique pour lancer un appel aux délégations qui ont soulevé le problème de l'incidence financière. Nous ne comprenons pas l'insistance sur cet aspect de la question dans la mesure où il a bien été expliqué par la délégation de l'Argentine que de telles activités de la FAO rentrent bien dans le cadre du CTPD. Et nous savons tous que dans le budget ordinaire (dans le PCT), des montants et des crédits sont prévus dans ce cadre CTPÜ et du CEPD, et que nous avons tous encouragé le développement des activités du CTPD et du CEPD.

Aussi nous voudrions lancer un appel aux délégations pour ne pas insister davantage sur cet amendement et que l'on puisse aller de l'avant dans l'adoption de cette résolution.

CHAIRMAN: I turn to the delegations who have expressed hesitations, and in particular to the United Kingdom first, who made a proposal for amendment on the basis of avoiding any misunderstanding on the cost implications. Would the United Kingdom respond on the basis of explanations given by Mexico, Argentina, Cuba and others, that there are no financial implications?

Ronald DEARE (United Kingdom): Of course I will respond but before I do so I would just like to make one observation, my delegation has not in fact seen this resolution until today and we really do not believe it is helpful to the efficient conduct of our business to ask the delegations to deal with something like this at least without some background information and certainly without giving time to consult our responsible authorities if this is necessary.

We assume from reading this resolution, as I say for the first time today, that it was intended to be a call for support from FAO in practical terms. This is certainly how we read operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. Given the financial situation of the Organization, which has taken so much of our time over the past two or three weeks, we in this delegation at least are reluctant to impose additional burdens on the Organization's finances and therefore we were seeking assurance that this in fact was not what was intended. This is the purpose of our amendment. Now of course, if either paragraphs 3 and 4 were to be redrafted in a way which made it quite clear that there was no question of any audit Joua 1 expenditure being incurred by FAO over and above what is already provided in the approved budget, or if the Secretariat can now give us a categorical assurance that the approval of this resolution will not in fact involve the Secretariat in additional expenditure over and above what is already provided in the Programme of Work and Budget we shall be ready to withdraw our amendment. Otherwise we wish to maintain it.

CHAIRMAN: I think the intents are the same but some delegations want a clearer assurance, if I understand it correctly. So may I ask the Secretariat whether the Secretariat can give the assurance asked by the United Kingdom.

L. BRADER (Director, Plant Production and Protection Division): After having heard the various views on the matter I can definitely assure the Commission that it will not lead to additional expenditures on our budget. On the contrary, after having heard the various arguments, it might even alleviate our costs because as it is certainly our intention to cooperate with various countries on the matter of Plant Genetic Resources and as the Latin-American region is a very important region for plant genetic resources we will probably take advantage of this mechanism and in that sense our costs may be reduced. I certainly do not see any reason why the costs would be increased.

Ronald DEARE (United Kingdom): In the light of that assurance from the Secretariat we will withdraw our amendment.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your very helpful attitude.

Ms Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): The concern of my delegation has not been so much related to the extra financial costs of this resolution, but I am also happy to hear the assurances of the Secretariat on this point. But my question relates much more to the background of this agreement or the objectives of this new organization and I think that it is a question of clarity: if a reference can be made in this resolution to a document, if it is not an FAO Conference document, but anyhow to a document where the objectives and activities of the CARFIT can be located.

Roger P. LEVIS (United States): We remain somewhat concerned about the financial implications of the proposed resolution, notwithstanding the assurances of the Secretariat. We also share the concerns expressed by our colleagues from the United Kingdom and Finland and elsewhere that there has been an inadequate amount of time provided to study this question. We are particularly concerned with the proposed scope of activity envisaged by the proposed resolution and would like to know some more of the specifics in that regard. We think the resolution frankly is ill timed.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Apparently the comment we have just heard from the Secretariat about the possible implications on the budget of FAO on this resolution may assist in bringing this matter to finality fairly quickly but given the facts, given the nature, the issues which have been raised in the debate in Council and otherwise with regard to this matter of plant genetic resources, perhaps at this point in time it is reasonable, if this is in fact so, that the Secretariat would indicate no implication but given the importance of this matter to agricultural

development world wide, given the comments we have just heard from the Secretariat, the importance to the region for plant genetic resources, I think it is a bit unwise to tie down this matter so finitely and we trust that this is not a projection for all time so that if and when it becomes necessary that we will recognize the importance of this issue, the importance of the region and that there will be some flexibility with regard to financing of any related activity on this matter.

CHAIRMAN: I think your remarks are well noted.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Mi delegación agradece mucho la última intervención que ha hecho nuestro distinguido colega de Trinidad y Tabago. En efecto, se trata aquí de un reconocimiento a un trabajo que se realiza en la región latinoamericana y que ha sido concertado dentro del sistema económico latinoamericano con un grupo especial, que es este Comité de Acción sobre cooperación y concertación latinoamericana en materia de germoplasma vegetal. Como bien dijo el Dr. Brader, la región le da una gran importancia a este aspecto, y ha habido reuniones especiales que han concertado justamente esta iniciativa para reforzar a nivel regional y subregional esta asistencia y apoyo a la formación de bancos de germoplasma y otras acciones, dirigidas justamente a la conservación y a la utilización óptima de estos recursos. En ese sentido y después de que el Dr. Brader ha dado la explicación sobre que no hay una implicación de recursos financieros, que se trata de un apoyo, de una colaboración que ya ha sido suscrita en una causa de entendimiento, como aquí se especifica, en el romanito iii del Considerando. Nosotros creemos que la Conferencia no tendría inconveniente, por lo menos así lo esperamos, a que las distinguidas delegaciones que han tenido alguna duda al respecto... Se trata de una cuestión de carácter regional, subregional que quiere vincularse al sistema internacional como una forma lógica y que no vemos nosotros cuál sería la consecuencia para otras regiones y otros países, de apoyar esta iniciativa de nuestra región. En ese sentido pedimos que se nos apoye y, vista la aclaración dada por el Dr Brader.

Angel BARBERO MARTIN (España): Nuestra delegación sólo vuelve a tomar la palabra para reafirmar lo que dijo refiriéndose al punto anterior de este orden del día, simplemente en apoyo de esta iniciativa de los países latinoamericanos porque nos parece que no puede traer más que beneficios, teniendo en cuenta el acervo de especies vegetales que se dan en este continente y la utilidad de este intercambio con otros países y otras organizaciones que de alguna manera tienen alguna iniciativa en este sentido, y una vez que se ha aclarado la implicación económica que esto puede tener, repito que mi delegación se ratifica en este apoyo a esta iniciativa.

Humberto CARRION McDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Deseamos adherirnos al apoyo de este proyecto de resolución. Ya se ha aclarado suficientemente su objetivo, sus antecedentes, sus implicaciones financieras las cuales no existen como tales por parte de la FAO.

Quiero también reconocer que hay delegaciones que tienen razón cuando solicitan alguna cita o referencia a un documento que especifique qué cosa es el CARFIT. Hay delegaciones que les podemos asegurar que no tendremos problemas en introducir incluso en el texto de esta resolución el documento de referencia en cuestión; estamos precisamente tratando de localizar el título exacto y su procedencia para poderlo incluir; en el caso de que no lo podamos hacer en este momento será cuestión de tiempo y lo podemos hacer para cuando aprobemos esta resolución en la Plenaria.

Ton A. J. M. OOMEN (Netherlands): Of course, we accept gratefully the explanation of Cuba, Mexico and the Secretariat and several other delegates but it does not help my delegation to the extent that we can base our opinion on appropriate documentation and discussion and there is no shadow of doubt in my delegation but that it is a very important issue of plant genetic resources. We think that this item also deserves proper preparation. It is therefore that my delegation appeals to the sponsor and the co-sponsor to reconsider the drafting of the resolution and provide us with the do-

cumentation before they decide to insist to have it proposed in Plenary. Also without this information that several delegations have asked for it seems to us that a decision has too many unconsidered aspects and it is the opinion of my delegation that the best effect of the objectives of the resolution will be that the objectives of the resolution will be adopted, can be the insert of the content of the resolution with the indication of the support inserted by the Drafting Committee on adoption in this Commission in the official report of the Conference.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): Knowing the role of FAO in the implementation of agricultural development, though some point of clarification and additional information was sought, my delegation would like to support the resolution presented.

Roberto PONCE (Ecuador): La delegación ecuatoriana quisiera, aparte de apoyar el proyecto de resolución presentado, llamar la atención hacia el hecho de que si bien las delegaciones de algunos países han expresado sus dudas en relación a las implicaciones de carácter financiero o quizá operacional que podría traer la colaboración que pretende establecer el Comité de Acción del SELA en materia de germoplasma vegetal con la FAO, nos parece que lo que se está poniendo en duda es el principio de la cooperación internacional. No vemos la razón por la cual algunas delegaciones pretenden que se someta este proyecto de resolución a un período mayor de maduración cuando en realidad los objetivos que persigue son muy claros, no tiene ninguna implicación financiera y, conforme lo han expresado algunas delegaciones como la honorable delegación de España, tal vez lo único que va a traer como resultado inmediato son beneficios.

América Latina es un continente rico en materia de recursos fitogenéticos, en tanto que hay otros continentes por razones que solamente podrían explicarlas los técnicos y científicos, que no tienen esa misma riqueza y el establecer una colaboración entre una entidad, un organismo latinoamericano que posee los recursos y la FAO no podría servir sino exclusivamente para que todos los avances que en esta materia se hagan estén difundidos a nivel universal, de tal forma que no vemos las preocupaciones de algunas delegaciones en el sentido de pretender que se demore el estudio de una resolución que lo único que pretende es establecer un vínculo de cooperación y nada más, es una expresión más de cooperación a nivel internacional y nos parece realmente que eso es lo que se está poniendo en duda.

Rodolphe de POÛRTALES (Suisse): J'ai écouté avec beaucoup d'intérêt le débat relatif à ce projet de résolution et je dois dire que je ne comprends pas mieux qu'au début le sens de la résolution. Il me semble que les paragraphes de son dispositif n'apportent rien de nouveau. Comme l'a précisé le Secrétariat, il s'agit d'activités qui existaient déjà et, s'il fallait adopter une résolution pour entériner chaque activité de la FAO, la Conférence ne se terminerait jamais.

Je voudrais appuyer, en ce sens, la délégation des Pays-Bas pour introduire l'énoncé de la résolution dans le rapport final.

Talaat DADA (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Nous voudrions appuyer vigoureusement le projet de résolution présenté par le Mexique. Nous lançons un appel à tous les participants pour que ce projet soit adopté à l'unanimité car il s'agit d'une question très importante pour les pays d'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes. Par ailleurs, nous savons que ce projet de résolution n'aura pas d'incidence financière.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): It is unfortunate that we do not have background information on this Resolution. In any case, we have been advocating that FAO should cooperate and coordinate any work concerning agriculture. We are under the impression that the work going on in Latin America is scientific work and the Secretariat has already explained that it is not going to involve FAO in

any extra funding. We believe that Africa would benefit if this kind of scientific work is carried out because Africa and Latin America share species of plants, crops and animals and therefore we would encourage such scientific work to go on for the benefit of the African region. Therefore, Ghana will support this Resolution so long as it does not have an adverse effect on FAO or any member country.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): We would like to associate ourselves with the statement of the Netherlands.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): Since we began this meeting and this Conference, people have asked for and encouraged technical cooperation between member countries and different organizations. That is the first point. Secondly, those who presented this Resolution belong to the Third World, to the developing countries, who are trying to accede to development. They are trying to benefit from the spin-off of this Organization. Thirdly, the Secretariat told us very clearly that there were no financial implications involved in this Resolution. Fourthly, this is an integral part of the work done by FAO which is so experienced in this field. Fifthly, this Resolution would be of benefit to all countries and to all areas. Those countries who presented this Resolution have pledged to give all possible and imaginable references. That is why we support this Resolution.

CHAIRMAN: On my list of speakers I have three more countries, now four with Algeria. After those four countries I beg your indulgence. I think we have reached a point where I can try at least to reach some conclusions because if every country speaks on the Resolution perhaps we will stay here for another half an hour. We have to come to a decision on the Resolution.

Ahmed S. HARIRI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): We are very much surprised to see the hesitation shown by certain delegations in supporting this Resolution because just an hour ago when we were discussing agenda item 20.1 and 20.2, the same delegations were unhappy and dissatisfied about the coordination and cooperation between FAO and other institutions. Now, when we are calling for further cooperation and coordination for this Resolution, it is being criticized. We appeal for general support for this Resolution.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): We wish to ask one or two questions. Lack of resources is limited not only to Latin America, but spread particularly in Africa. The work which could be done in the Latin American Centre would be useful to give the information which Africa needs. We would have preferred this Resolution to call for an enhancement of this kind of activity which was not limited to Latin America alone. It should have been spread to all the areas concerned, particularly in Africa, or in the case of Ethiopia with coffee and Kenya with grass - that would have encouraged us more. The question I would have wished to ask concerns sub-paragraph 3 of the proposed Resolution, namely: the fact that there is already a memorandum of understanding signed between the Organization and SELA. However, at paragraphs 3 and 4 (page B.2), we are asking for back-stopping on specific problems. It is here that we think detailed documentation would be useful as to what the memorandum of understanding covers and the deficiencies that should now be topped up by back-stopping, or specific problems. It would enable us to come to a conclusion as to really what it is that we are supporting. I do not know whether the Secretariat has an answer to that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Kenya, we will come back to your question.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): Ma délégation souhaite intervenir à propos du projet de résolution présenté par le Mexique.

Compte tenu du rôle reconnu à la FAO dans le domaine de la coopération en matière de ressources phytogénétiques et vu l'intérêt considérable que la région concernée accorde à la question et les efforts que les pays de cette région déploient dans ce domaine, nous pensons qu'il est opportun que notre Commission adopte ladite résolution. Nous pensons également que, dans le cadre de la coopération technique entre pays en développement, notre région pourrait valablement profiter des travaux de ce Comité.

La délégation guinéenne appuie donc le projet de résolution du Mexique.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Nous intervenons très brièvement sur ce point de l'ordre du jour pour exprimer notre soutien à ce projet de résolution. Notre appui découle de l'intérêt que nous portons à ce genre de question, à savoir celle des ressources phytogénétiques.

Nous pensons également que les résultats des travaux de cette Commission pourraient être utiles à l'ensemble de la communauté internationale.

Eduardo Tomás MIRANO (Angola): Mon intervention ne sera pas longue puisque, comme le Président l'a dit, l'Algérie devait être le dernier orateur.

Je voudrais simplement exprimer l'appui de mon pays à ce projet de résolution. Ce débat a pris un temps convenable et nous ne voyons pas pourquoi nous devons continuer à discuter sur cela puisque ce projet n'entraîne aucune incidence financière.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Angola, Kenya has asked a specific question. Is the Secretariat in a position to answer?

A. REGNIER (Director, Office for Inter-Agency Affairs): In fact the Director-General of FAO and the Permanent Secretary of SELA have signed not a Memorandum of Agreement, but what is called an Exchange of Letters, in March 1985, and the content is rather broad in scope. It foresees the possibility of cooperation through exchange of documentation and information; through invitations to meetings; through undertaking possible joint studies and may be even programmes and any other activities agreed between the parties. It is because it has been framed in such a way it is broad in scope. This is the technical information that I can give on the matter.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr Régnier. Does that satisfy Kenya?

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): We would stop there for the time being but with the declaration that a memorandum of agreement has been signed which is misleading so far as this paragraph is concerned.

CHAIRMAN: Just to solve the latest difficulties - start with the latest difficulty ... from the declaration of the Secretariat I understood that paragraph (iii) is not a question of a memorandum of agreement but is an exchange of letters. So may I suggest myself that we change the second line, or we change this paragraph as follows. At the end of the line after "have" we continue by saying "had an exchange of letters." I repeat, instead of "signed a memorandum of agreement" we delete this

part and we say "have had an exchange of letters" and then continue as it stands. If there is no objection on the part of the sponsors then perhaps we can adopt this amendment, just to concur with the facts. I see no objection. This is amended as I said.

Now I will try at this stage to sum up, or try to sum up the situation a little bit. We have this Resolution before us. Some countries at first expressed some hesitations about the financial implications. I gather that these hesitations are overcome on the basis of the explanations of the countries concerned - that is the sponsors - and on the basis of the explanations of the Secretariat. But still some hesitations remain on the following points. First, the general comment was made that countries have only had the opportunity to study this Resolution at very short notice; that such Resolutions should be based on the documentation which should be circulated beforehand. These general comments I think do not concern only this Resolution but are valid for any Resolution to be discussed by our Commission or by the Conference in general. So I think this general comment is well noted.

Secondly, hesitation was specifically expressed concerning the operations etc. of the organizations of which this Resolution speaks. I think this is also a valid point but perhaps the delegations concerned can pursue the matter afterwards, and I will say in what way.

A third point was also made - that since this Resolution does not bring any new element into the cooperation between FAO and the organizations mentioned, perhaps we should not need a Resolution at all, but we may serve the same purpose by inserting the same wording in the report of our Commission.

However, all these hesitations having been noted I think I have felt a strong feeling on the part of many countries that they want this Resolution to be adopted as a Resolution and not to be included in the report because of the wish of these countries to give a special emphasis to the cooperation between FAO and the organizations concerned. So on this basis may I appeal to the delegations who have expressed some hesitations whether they can go along with the general consensus, however having of course the right to enter general reservations or make declarations reiterating in full or in part the hesitations to which I have referred already. So again may I appeal to these delegations first, and then we will see what will happen. If there is no objection to that we can take it for granted that the hesitations expressed as to the form and the content of the Resolution will of course be included in our report. But may I gather that, with this proviso, the Resolution is adopted by consensus?

Ronald DEARE (United Kingdom): I was with you until you used the words: "this Resolution is adopted by consensus." I explained earlier that certainly for my delegation I needed a little more time to consult. I still need that time. I certainly do not want to stand in the way of this Commission sending the Resolution forward to the Plenary, but my position is totally reserved, as I made clear in my statement, until I have instructions.

CHAIRMAN: Of course I recognize your position. Of course it is not, let us say, a nice thing to invite a delegation to enter specific reservations, but can you go along with what you have just said, that this reservation on the part of the United Kingdom, is on the grounds that they did not have time to study the Resolution?

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): In the absence of a clear statement within the Resolution requiring the proposed plant genetic research activity to be carried out within existing budget resources, and lacking adequate information concerning the scope of work envisaged by the proposed Resolution and an inadequate amount of time to study the implications of the Resolution, the United States would like to ask that the record reflect that it reserves with respect to the Resolution.

CHAIRMAN: There is no doubt about that.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Como usted mismo trato de expresarlo hace poco, no es éste el primer proyecto de resolución que se presenta a una Comisión sin una antelación considerable. Se han aclarado las repercusiones financieras, que no existen, se ha explicado muy adecuadamente que se trata de actividades de coordinación. De manera que, sinceramente, no vemos que dificultades puedan existir para dejar reservas sobre este Proyecto de Resolución. Sin embargo, naturalmente respetamos la posición de los dos distinguidos países: Reino Unido y Estados Unidos y entendemos que ambos, por lo menos el último, aceptó que sus reservas consten en las actas; si ésta fuera también el caso del Reino Unido, muy lamentablemente y muy a nuestro pesar, tendríamos que proceder así; pero consideramos que será necesario adoptar ya este Proyecto de Resolución.

CHAIRMAN: That is in fact what I am trying to do.

Michael Joseph RYAN (Australia): I am afraid the Ambassador from Colombia will have to respect the Australian position as well. We have exactly the same problems as have been expressed by the United Kingdom and the United States. We do need more time to study this Resolution before we decide one way or the other, and they have said all that needs to be said on this. We reserve on this as well.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAIXHD (Mexico): Lamentamos que por problemas internos de nuestra Delegación no contábamos con las citas y los documentos solicitados aquí por algunas de las Delegaciones. Ahora nos han llegado las citas de estos documentos. Uno es el Programa Latinoamericano de Recursos Fitogenéticos, Reunión de Mexico, y el otro es el Programa Regional de Recursos Fitogenéticos para América Latina, la tercera, un documento sobre la creación de una Comisión CARFIT que es apoyo para lo que está mencionado aquí como título del Comité.

Estos documentos podrán estar libres mañana si logramos hacer algunas fotocopias, pero los documentos existen y, como les digo, desafortunadamente no pudimos traerlos.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is helpful, especially for the intention of delegations who have asked for further information. But at this point I think - again I say I think and I hope - that the Resolution can be considered as adopted by consensus with of course the reservations expressed by the delegations concerned, and certainly the report will reflect these reservations. It is so decided.

Shigeki YAMAMOTO (Japan): Japan has the same problem as the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. This Draft Resolution has been submitted quite suddenly and unexpectedly. That is why, before we give a final decision, we need instructions from the government. That is why we reserve.

Ms. Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): On this occasion I am speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries. Like the previous speakers, United Kingdom, United States, Australia and Japan, our delegations feel that we had very little time to study this issue and therefore we would like to register our reservation on this Resolution.

CHAIRMAN: Canada, you want to enter another reservation?

J LYNCH (Canada): We will enter a reservation.

CHAIRMAN: Germany - the same point?

Wolfgang A.F. GRAMSCH (Germany, Fed. Rep. of:) (original language German): For reasons just put forward by the distinguished delegate of Japan and also of Finland, and already by other delegations, we too must enter a reservation to this Resolution. I would like to remind you of the Netherlands idea that was put forward. Would it not be useful to include the main objectives contained in this Draft Resolution as well as the essence of the discussions into the report of our Commission. That would be the new balance which would then probably carry the reservations which other delegations and we are now compelled to make.

CHAIRMAN: I want to reiterate that the suggestion of the Netherlands was put to the floor and there was a strong feeling on the part of the sponsors to keep it as a Resolution so I do not want to reopen this debate.

Rodolphe de POURTALES (Suisse): Je dois me joindre aux delegations qui ont parlé avant moi pour exprimer certaines réserves concernant cette résolution dont le contenu n'est ni clair ni précis et dont les conséquences ne sont pas mesurables à l'heure actuelle. Je tiens à préciser que la délégation suisse ne veut pas du tout faire d'obstruction à une collaboration ou à une coordi-nation de la FAO dans le domaine des ressources phytogénétiques; bien au contraire nous pensons qu'il s'agit d'une partie de son mandat, mais nous ne pouvons pas nous déclarer satisfaits de cette résolution.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): I think what we are experiencing - that countries are requesting their democratic rights to be clearly expressed - is reasonable. I only hope that the report of this Commission on this particular matter will be well-written and balanced. It should emphasize the major issues as indicated in the resolution. For the record, they are: cooperation and consultation among the group of countries and an initiative on establishing collaboration between SELA and FAO. Finally, this is an initiative designed to establish or strengthen the abilities of the developing countries in this matter.

CHAIRMAN: That concludes the review of this resolution. I repeat that the resolution was adopted by consensus, with the reservations expressed by the following delegations: United Kingdom, United States of America, Australia, Japan, all the Nordic countries, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland - with the hope that many of the reservations will disappear when the subject comes to the Plenary. That is an addition on my part. Therefore that concludes matters concerning the resolution but of course we have not yet concluded Item 20.3.

It was so decided

Il en est ainsi décidé

Así se acuerda

Cedric FERNANDO (Observer for the International Confederation of Catholic Organizations for Charitable and Social Action): As Chairman of the Informal Meeting of International Non-Governmental Organizations held on 10 November, I should like to make a few comments on the document C 87/INF/1 which is the Report on the meeting.

The theme under discussion concerned the contribution - actual and potential - of NGOs to the identification and implementation of rural development programmes in collaboration with FAO and Member Governments.

The meeting, and the report on it, in effect, represent concrete examples to hand of FAO-INCO collaboration: the document presents, in synthetic form, specific information on initiatives under way which involve collaboration by NGOs, Member Governments and FAO - initiatives which cover a range of activities already wide and which, in recent years, have become more numerous.

It is hoped that the trend towards greater involvement of NGOs in rural development programmes and projects will continue: NGOs are often in a position to be able to involve and motivate rural populations and thus to contribute in a definitive manner to the success of the operations. Moreover, in recent years, NGOs have shown the capacity to be able to mobilise and effectively to utilise an increasing quantity of development funds. It appears highly desirable that a substantial proportion of these funds be directed to the rural sector.

For these reasons, representatives of INGOs welcomed the increasing interest shown by FAO in the contribution of NGOs to rural development. This, amongst other things, has been evidenced by the favourable consideration hitherto given to the proposal of the Ad Hoc Group of INGO representatives in Rome to include an item on the agenda of the next COAG regarding people's participation in agricultural and rural development.

Specific proposals have, moreover, been put forward by Member Governments (and are still under discussion) for intensifying the involvement of representative organizations of groups of rural people (particularly women) in the planning and execution of development projects.

If NGOs are to be involved in a more intensive manner, however, it seems essential that further efforts be made to improve channels of communication between FAO and NGOs. The present difficulties in this respect are specified in the Report and proposals for overcoming them are put forward.

It also appears to be very important - as is underlined in the document - to recognize the great diversity in character amongst NGOs as a group. This diversity must be taken into consideration in suggesting lines of action.

In conclusion, therefore, it seems important to emphasize, on the one hand, the progress already made in involving NGOs in rural development programmes; on the other hand, it is necessary to recommend a thorough, unprejudiced and well-documented consideration of the as yet unexploited potential of NGO action. 1/

Almir F. DE SA BARBUDA (Brazil): I wish to have a clarification from you, in relation to the resolution on the environment. I have been informed by the Secretariat that the resolution has been approved by consensus. My delegation did not notice that it was approved by consensus. I have consulted with other delegations in this room which also did not know that the resolution had been approved. Could you tell me what is going on?

CHAIRMAN: That puts me in a little difficulty because I was not in the Chair at the time but I am told that these resolutions were indeed approved by consensus. I hope that at that time there was a quorum in this room. I do not think I can give any other reply on this.

Almir F. DE SÁ BARBUDA (Brazil): In that case, I just want to let this Commission know that we are going to present a reservation on this resolution when it is taken to Plenary.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La información que usted nos acaba de dar hace que la Delegación argentina quiera dejar en actas su reserva formal con relación a la Resolución, al Proyecto de Resolución que figura en el Documento C 87/LIM/44, Apéndice A, que se dice que fue aprobada por consenso

1/ Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request.

en esta sala y en esta tarde. Mi Delegación, no obstante, quiere dejar aclarado qué tiene reservas de fondo con relación a la terminología y a los conceptos utilizados en esta Resolución, y que expresará, si es posible reabrir el asunto en este momento, dichas reservas, y si no lo hará en Plenaria.

CHAIRMAN: I want to underline that it is not in my power to reopen the discussion. It was adopted and finished; but of course there are other instances where any delegation who wishes to do so may enter reservations - but not here. I am sorry.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Colombia se suma a las reservas de Brasil y Argentina.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): Kenya is rather baffled at the way in which we are going about discussions on resolutions on the environment. We do not really understand how matters discussed here and properly concluded, with decisions made, can be reopened several hours later and we start entering reservations. If we start doing that to matters which have been concluded, for example, three days ago, it could be that we might have received instructions which are different from the positions that we took, and then open discussions to enter reservations. In Kenya's view, those delegations which might not have voted either for reasons which were beyond their control or because they were absent from the discussion should feel free to raise these matters in the Plenary. It is my wish that we do not enter into matters that are finished and concluded and long gone.

CHAIRMAN: I think I made this point when replying to Argentina. I repeat those words.

Washington ZUÑIGA TRELLES (Peru): Des pués de que el Proyecto de Presupuesto B ya se había aprobado, usted aceptó que otros países hicieran sus reservas. Entonces, con el mismo criterio de equidad, los países que han presentado sus reservas al Inciso A, están con todo el derecho de hacerlo, y yo también quisiera sumarme a Colombia, Argentina y Brasil y formular mis reservas oportunamente.

CHAIRMAN: I will try once again to clarify matters. There is a big difference between entering reservations to a resolution after the resolution is adopted, but under an item that is being discussed, and trying to enter reservations on a resolution concerning an item on which the discussions are finished. The resolution under Item 20.2 was discussed and this item was concluded. Item 20.2 is concluded. So it is not possible, according to the rules, to reopen the item about the resolution. We cannot reopen Item 20.2. However, to reply again to your comments, the reservations to the resolution we are discussing were entered when the item was under discussion. I tried to make this difference clear and I appeal to the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Peru - this is a suggestion on my part - that they should enter their reservations in the Plenary. I can tell distinguished delegates that we have now concluded our consideration of Item 20, with all its sub-points. It is almost seven o'clock and in the work of our Commission there remains part of the discussion on Item 15. On the list of speakers the item was introduced - the discussion had already begun - but it was deferred until after the discussion of Item 20. With your permission, we will continue because I have ten speakers ready on my list and we hope we can listen to them within a reasonable limit of time, and then conclude the item with replies from the Secretariat. I see that Saudi Arabia has a point of order.

Ahmed S. HARIRI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): It is not really a point of order but just a question for the Secretariat. Are we going to proceed to Item 12 after finishing this one?

CHAIRMAN: I think your question is not directed to the Secretariat, but to ourselves. I would remind the distinguished delegate that this Commission has established a contact group to facilitate the discussion of Item 12. So far as my personal inclination is concerned, the Contact Group is pursuing its work.

I assume it will come back to this question at the Commission level when this Contact Group hopefully arrives at a positive outcome. I hope that answers your question, but in any case I do not see any possibility for us to come back to this item today.

15. Impact of Financial Problems on Regular Programme Activities in 1986-87 (continued)

15. Effets des problèmes financiers sur les activités du Programme ordinaire 1986-87 (suite)

15. Repercusiones de los problemas financieros sobre las actividades del Programa Ordinario de 1986-87 (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: I will first read the list of speakers so that everyone knows when they will take the floor. The first country will be Swaziland, followed by Egypt, Guyana, Philippines, Mexico, Bangladesh, France, Cuba, Chile and Argentina. Also I see Germany. For the moment let us leave matters like this.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Moción de orden. Sr. Presidente, como usted sabe, ésta es una etapa muy movida, muy agitada de la Conferencia. Quisiéramos saber, Sr. Presidente, antes de volver a este tema, cuáles son sus planes.

¿Hasta qué hora va a trabajar esta Comisión? Habrá interrupción, o no? Porque todos necesitamos organizarnos.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colombia. I think I have made my intentions clear when I said that I had ten countries and I have expressed the hope that these ten countries will speak within a reasonable time limit, and then we will hear the Secretariat's replies and we will stop at that. Also I had replied to the delegate of Saudi Arabia that I do not see any possibility of proceeding further on Item 12 and Item 12 is in fact the only Item left. So let us hope that we finish Item 15 in one hour's time. Perhaps I am too optimistic. So I give the floor to Egypt.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): The Egyptian delegation has studied this document in great depth and we welcome the measures taken by the Director-General in order to cope with the negative impact of paragraph 3, liquidity problems.

Paragraphs 5 through 7 deal with the extent of financial problems and we fully agree that non-payment of contributions is the basic reason for this Treasury crisis. My Government has paid all its dues convinced, as it is, of the programmes and targets pursued by FAO and also in order to promote international cooperation. We take this opportunity to urge all countries despite all their financial difficulties to pay their contributions and thus make it possible for FAO to fulfil its task.

After having studied the summing up of action taken, paragraph 12 onwards, and having taken note of the reactions on the part of Council and subsidiary bodies, paragraphs 22 through 28, we fully support paragraph 28, describing the tackling of the situation.

Neil o. PIERRE (Guyana): My delegation feels obliged to be brief on its comments on this agenda item. The three main factors responsible for the Organization's budgetary shortfalls are very clearly stated.

My delegation especially understands the need for meeting the constitutional obligations for the payment of contributions, particularly since my own country now finds itself in the situation of arrears. We note however a significant distinction between the willingness to pay and the inability to meet that obligation directly and effectively as a result of extenuating conditions beyond the control of our own national authorities. Notwithstanding, my delegation fully shares the difficulties and underlying causes contributing to a state of delinquency on the part of some Member States.

There have been several suggestions in earlier debates aimed at addressing or overcoming the crisis. Among these I note, firstly, the suggestion of denominating the budget in two or more currencies, secondly the consideration of the use of basket of currencies, including the SDR, thirdly a selective approach to savings according to properly defined priorities, and fourthly the examination of possible income generating activities. My delegation recognizes that particular difficulties may exist in each of these suggestions. It is our view however that they may each be worthy of some further consideration.

My delegation would like to register its concern for the priority attached to selective programme reductions under the current budget. We note especially the impact of the crisis on the forestry programme, as stated in the document before us. This particular programme we consider of major importance.

Finally, we highly commend the actions adopted by the management of the Organization in meeting the shortfalls. We fully endorse the course of action proposed in paragraph 28 for dealing with anticipated abnormalities, bearing in mind of course the necessity for proper accountability.

It is our hope that the Conference will adopt these proposals.

M.M. SIDDIQUE ULLAH (Bangladesh): An analysis of this financial problem and its impact on the Regular Programme activities during the 1986-1987 biennium presented in document C 87/23 is very informative. Some of the figures are not up-to-date but up-dated figures would not change the position substantially. The document shows that the total shortfall in the estimated income was of the order of US\$ 136 million. Three factors contributed to it and they are as follows: shortfall in miscellaneous income, US\$ 12 million; shortfall in contributions US\$ 94.4 million; loss due to depreciation of exchange rate, US\$ 29.8 million. However, the impact of the shortfall on Regular Programme activities has been limited to just about US\$ 25 million. This has been achieved through skilful management action and we believe that the Director-General deserves our congratulations for facing this situation with wisdom and foresight.

But the measures taken show that FAO's activities had been protected for the current biennium only if the financial problems persist. The activities will have to be curtailed drastically during the next biennium. There would be no Special Reserve Fund next biennium to fall back on in case of further depreciation of the exchange rates. There would not be enough elbow room in the Working Capital Fund to provide a cushion for diminishing cash flow. Generous Member Nations who agreed to relinquish or defer their claims to cash surplus could not be expected to do so again and again. Therefore corrective measures to restore the shattered financial position of the Organization are urgently called for.

I supposed Commission III would have discussed these problems and found solutions to them by now. But one or two observations bearing on these problems in this Commission would be relevant.

An analysis of the factors which contributed to the present financial situation of FAO would show that delay in payment of contributions by certain member countries not only meant a shortfall in cash flow to the extent of the amount of those contributions, it also indirectly produced a shortfall in miscellaneous income by reducing the size of short-term investible fund. This we urge be taken note of by the Member Nations while considering the timing of the payment of their contributions in future.

We believe that freezing the growth of FAO's activities is one thing and delaying payment of agreed contributions required to finance an agreed programme is another thing. In the first case one can plan for adjustments according to priorities, in the latter case you are taken unaware and by surprise. More importantly, in the latter case you not only suffer by curtailment of specific activities, but also by rendering other activities infructuous. Because many of these activities are complementary and inter-dependent I think this has been focused in the concluding part of the document under consideration.

We therefore urge that Member Nations concerned appreciate these implications in depth while deciding upon the timing of payment of their contributions.

Delay in payment of contributions in certain cases had been explained in terms of foreign exchange difficulties. In this connection I wish to invite the attention of the Commission to document C 87/LIM/38, which presents a statement of the payment position of each member country. A close look at the list lends one to wonder in the case of how many countries' delay in payment is explained fully by foreign exchange difficulties. We should like to leave it to the members concerned to find an answer.

There is a reference in paragraph 8 of the document that the national need for meeting budget deficit posed a problem in payment in certain cases. There is nothing unusual about meeting a budget deficit by retrenchment of allocations. The right principle to follow in such cases is to go by priority. From that point of view contribution to an organization dealing with the problems of food and hunger of the world does not appear to be the most suitable case for retrenchment of expenditure. If we agree upon this approach we all should try to adopt this priority.

We are aware that the question of delayed contributions is a very sensitive question, yet we have decided to offer some comment only to show this forum how countries like Bangladesh look at this problem. We have no intention, in this intervention, of ignoring the problem faced by several countries in finding the resources to pay up their contribution. We have also no intention to question decisions taken by sovereign national parliaments in their best interest. In this intervention we are entirely inspired by our anxious consideration of this need for making a joint undertaking of all nations effective and fruitful.

I have taken a little time of the Commission but we have not made too many long interventions.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): This is not the first time that member countries look at this issue - "The Impact of Financial Problems on Regular Programme Activities of 1986-87". Hence many delegations have already voiced their views on this issue. This is perhaps the reason why the debate on the item started the other day hesitatingly, haltingly.

This, notwithstanding, the Philippine delegation wishes to offer the following comments:

I. First of all, the Philippine delegation commends the Secretariat's efforts to safeguard the most essential aspects of FAO's programme, taking into account the absolute priority attached by member nations to the technical and economic programme. The countries' priorities after all are not unknown to the Secretariat since these have been aired on various occasions not only in the technical bodies but in the Council and Conference as well.

In this connection, the Philippine delegation agrees to give the necessary authority and flexibility to the Director-General for the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget the Conference would eventually approve for 1988-89 along the lines of the authorization given to the Director-General by the Council in the 90th Session, to take actions as appropriate in the current biennium. Also connected with this is a resolution that is still to be passed in Commission III regarding the transfer of authority to the Council to make adjustments on the current budget.

II. Regarding the factors at the origin of the income shortfalls, I should like to express the view that perhaps these may not have the same effect on the Programme of Work and Budget of the forthcoming biennium as on that of the present biennium.

The first factor noted by document C 87/23, the overestimate of the miscellaneous income, may not perhaps recur in the forthcoming biennium.

This time the estimate of the miscellaneous income is more prudent and modest in line with the guidance by the FAO governing bodies and governing Council. As you know, the income of the miscellaneous income was very much less than the estimated income in the current biennium.

The third factor, that is the arrears of Member Nations apart from the largest contributor, are in the same level as in the previous biennia, as noted by other delegations who spoke before me. FAO has been able to handle these arrears in the past and I do not see why FAO should not be able to handle them now or in the future.

Now, regarding the depreciation of the dollar, as we all know this has had at least three results: number one, it has increased the proposed budget level by many millions, about US\$40 million; number two, it has cost the complete depletion of the Special Reserve Account amounting to US\$22 million; third, it has cost an additional loss of US\$7.8 million, which has to be met from the regular budget. In this connection the Philippine delegation wishes to reiterate its view which it has already expressed during the debate on item 13, which is as follows: the depreciation of the US\$ dollar *vis-à-vis* the Italian lira has had adverse effects on the implementation of the budget. It has also caused an increase in the assessments of member countries in dollar terms.

Some member countries, however, whose currencies have revaluated in relation to the dollar are going to pay much less in terms of their national currencies for the 1988-89 biennium than they paid for the present biennium. The Philippine delegation would therefore like to request the Director-General to approach the Member Nations, to encourage them to continue paying at the same rate in their national currencies as they paid in 1986-87. In this way this would lessen the pressure on the assessment of the Special Reserve Account and also on the budget. I should also like to suggest that the Finance Committee study alternative possibilities of having burdens of payments more equitably distributed in the future, taking into account the so-called currency factor. The objective of this request is not to subsidize those who have not yet paid their contributions but to achieve a more equitable distribution of the burden.

Furthermore, in order to avoid the possible adverse effects of currency fluctuations the Organization could perhaps hedge by keeping its liquid funds in SDRs or ECUs. IFAD, for example, has been able to maintain the value of its investments by keeping a high portion of its funds in SDRs. I believe the Finance Committee should look into this at its next session or as soon as possible.

Then in spite of the care taken by the Secretariat to safeguard the essential aspect of FAO's programme, we notice an overall reduction of FAO's technical programme. It has affected important programmes such as the programme for advice for trypanosomiasis control, improvement of management of agriculture, fisheries resources assessment and development planning, as noted in the document C 87/23.

An observation has been made that representation expenses did not seem to have been cut. Well, during the previous biennium those who came to the intergovernmental groups must have noticed there were receptions given on the first evenings on intergovernmental meetings. This served the useful purpose of allowing delegates to get to know each other, especially those who came from the capitals and the representatives from business. These receptions have been abolished in this biennium. Also, for example, the members from the contact group or the drafting group worked all evening from 6 o'clock sometimes up to 3 o'clock a.m. We are not even given any food. We have to work all these hours without even being given coffee or sandwiches. I think it is part of the austerity. So I believe that cuts have been made and I believe they have been made with seriousness and system but there is a limit to an orderly process of programme and budgetary adjustments.

The estimate of the present biennium shortfall is between US\$40 million to US\$80 million. I do not know how much it will be for the next biennium. The financial crisis of the Organization apparently will continue unabated unless appropriate actions are taken. It is within the power of Member Nations to take appropriate action to solve these problems of arrears. We hope this action will be taken so that FAO may be able efficiently to continue its mandate.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Mi delegación ha leído con atención el documento C 87/23 relativo a este tema de nuestra agenda que expone sucintamente a la Conferencia los motivos y el alcance de los problemas financieros que afronta la Organización.

En adición a lo que manifestáramos en ocasión de la consideración del tema 14, que no repetiremos en honor de la brevedad, quisiera hacer unos cortos comentarios.

En primer lugar, el documento no tiene la precisión que hubiéramos deseado, lo que se aplica no sólo a su formato y conclusiones, sino también a algunos de sus párrafos entre ellos el 6, el 8 y varios otros. Estimamos que las razones de economía invocadas en el párrafo 20 no justifican la falta de presentación a la Conferencia de un detalle completo de las actividades no cumplidas y que fuera encomendadas por ésta a la Secretaría en noviembre de 1985.

Del párrafo 16 y siguientes y de los informes del Consejo surge que éste concordó con lo actuado por el Director General. Mi delegación ya expresó su acuerdo en términos generales con lo actuado por el Director General en ocasión de la consideración del tema 14. Mi delegación estima, no obstante, que es de competencia de la Conferencia entender en estas cuestiones y ratificar cuales quiera medidas adoptadas debido a circunstancias imprevisibles por otro órgano de esta Organización.

En consecuencia, quisiera dejar constancia que si bien respaldamos el criterio general con que la Secretaría procedió a los ajustes en los programas, mi delegación siente que haya algunas actividades que revisten prioridad y debieran haber sido mantenidas y que la región de América Latina y el Caribe ha sido tal vez desproporcionadamente afectada por aquellos ajustes en los programas. En particular nos referimos a las actividades relativas a la CEPD, a las mujeres, a la sanidad animal, otras que involucran actividades de extensión y capacitación en beneficio de pequeños agricultores y las que tienen que ver con intervenciones nutricionales en zonas urbanas de América Latina mencionadas en los documentos CL 92/3 y CL 90/23.

Respecto de los ajustes introducidos quisiéramos que la Secretaría nos informara cuál es el porcentaje de reuniones, publicaciones y actividades de campo canceladas que han sido incluidas en el nuevo proyecto de labores y presupuesto, qué prioridad se le ha otorgado.

Finalmente, quisiera dejar constancia que mi delegación expresa su disconformidad con la manera en que quedó reflejada en el informe de esta Conferencia relativo al tema 14, la falta de pago de una parte sustancial de la cuota del mayor contribuyente. Mi delegación entiende que dicha falta de pago lejos de ser una consecuencia necesaria de problemas financieros o económicos o de factores relativos al proceso de presupuestación nacional tiene su raíz y razón de ser en las consideraciones que originaron la llamada enmienda Kaselbaun, teniendo a modificar los procesos de adopción de decisión a los organismos internacionales a que se hace referencia en el párrafo 8 del documento C 87/23.

La delegación Argentina une su voz a las otras delegaciones que han lamentado los efectos perjudiciales sobre las organizaciones internacionales de esta legislación.

Por último, quisiéramos hacer nuestras las reflexiones de la delegación de Filipinas en lo que respecta a las medidas futuras para aliviar a los países en desarrollo de las consecuencias de la fluctuación de los tipos de cambio.

Raúl LOPEZ LIRA (México): Se tienen claros los problemas que enfrenta la Organización (atraso en el pago de las contribuciones de los países miembros; devaluación del dólar, moneda en la que basa el presupuesto; y reducción de los ingresos derivados del pago de interés sobre los fondos de la Organización). Factores todos que están fuera del posible control de la Secretaría a la que, junto con los Comités de Programa y de Finanzas, agradecemos por la diligencia con que se ha dedicado a estudiar y analizar posibles formas de enfrentar la crisis de liquidez y hacer las propuestas por los canales adecuados para que los países o el Director General cuando esa autoridad le es delegada por el Consejo o la Conferencia, tomáramos, la decisión final respecto a las medidas que tendríamos que tomar.

En estos momentos existe un déficit por ingreso de cuotas de alrededor de 100 millones de dólares, que representa más del 26 por ciento de las cuotas asignadas para el presente bienio, por lo cual se han realizado ciertos ajustes y economías al Programa Ordinario por un total de 25 millones de dólares, viéndose afectados con ello los Programas de Cooperación Técnica en un 7 por ciento.

Ante esta situación, lamentamos divergencias en los puntos de vista de cómo abordarlos; algunos países desarrollados, desean que estos ajustes sean el marco que posibilite la aplicación del concepto de Crecimiento cero" o bien se dejen inconclusos diversos programas que estos países no consideren prioritarios.

Los países en vías de desarrollo reaccionamos distintamente porque, además de los efectos sobre nuestras contribuciones (por efecto de la devaluación de nuestras monedas frente al dólar y el peso de la deuda), nos afecta en la disminución del apoyo en nuestros esfuerzos en busca de nuestra seguridad alimentaria y desarrollo de nuestra agricultura. Nuestra delegación y muchas delegaciones nos hemos ya referido a estos aspectos en los temas 13 y 14. Sin embargo, queremos enfatizar respecto al impacto financiero en la ejecución de los Programas de Cooperación Técnica, pedimos a la Conferencia el cumplimiento de los ya emprendidos y que se introduzcan otras medidas de racionalización, que, lejos de afectar negativamente a los mismos, eleve la eficiencia de sus operaciones.

Deseamos volver a precisar que es indispensable distinguir con toda claridad que la razón por la cual los países miembros con menores recursos hemos debido retrasar el pago de nuestras contribuciones, obedece estrictamente a los graves problemas financieros y la situación económica interna por la que atravesamos. Ello debe separarse de la tendencia del mayor contribuyente a limitar y condicionar con sus contribuciones para presionar por cambios en las políticas de los organismos internacionales del sistema de Naciones Unidas, a fin de que estén más acordes con sus posiciones que son ampliamente conocidas entre ellas, particularmente a través de la enmienda Kaselbaun, y que tienen una franca vinculación del pago con el voto ponderado y otros aspectos que lesionan las prácticas democráticas del sistema de Naciones Unidas.

Por ello volvemos también a exhortar a tal contribuyente a que reconfirme la voluntad política y busque mecanismos para pagar en su totalidad y a la brevedad posible, sus contribuciones.

Ese es el principal problema financiero que enfrenta la FAO y que, por tanto, está totalmente fuera de su control.

Por otra parte, recordamos aquí la preocupación y en cierta medida la inconformidad de los Estados Miembros, que con motivo de la crisis monetaria han visto devaluar sus monedas y, por tanto, sus contribuciones en dólares se han incrementado. Al respecto, volvemos a plantear, como lo hemos ya planteado junto con otras delegaciones durante los temas financieros, nuestra solicitud al Director General, de que entre en contacto con aquellos Estados Miembros que han visto reducir sus contribuciones en moneda local, para que hagan un mayor esfuerzo de solidaridad aportando sus pagos a la misma tasa que en el bienio 86/87.

Asimismo, insistimos a que el Comité de Finanzas estudie las alternativas para hacer una distribución de las cargas entre los diversos países tomando en consideración los movimientos monetarios, de tal suerte que se logre una mayor equidad en las cargas en el futuro.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Quisiéramos Señor Presidente, en primer lugar saludar al Sr. Shah por la clara presentación del Tema que nos ha hecho y a la Secretaría por el documento presentado que con suficiente precisión nos presenta uno de los momentos presupuestarios más difíciles por los que ha tenido que atravesar la Organización.

Señor Presidente, los párrafos 6 al 9 del Documento 87/23, explican claramente las causas que motivan el déficit para el presupuesto del bienio 1986-87. Sin embargo, deseáramos que la Secretaría nos aclarara si el orden en que han sido expuestos los factores causales responden en ese mismo orden a la magnitud de la afectación por cada uno de ellos. Está claro que el párrafo 9 del mismo documento podría ser mucho más extenso y explícito sobre las causas que determinan la escasez de divisas en los países en desarrollo, tales como la devaluación del dólar estadounidense, la abultada deuda externa, y el pago de sus servicios y las persistentes condiciones de intercambio desigual en el mercado internacional de productos agrícolas y de materias primas producidas en los países en desarrollo.

Es lamentable asimismo, que el presupuesto ordinario tenga que verse afectado en casi ocho millones de dólares de Estados Unidos aun después de haberse agotado la cuenta especial de reservas con afectación directa de actividades ya aprobadas por la Organización. Como consecuencia de estas afectaciones el Director General adoptó medidas atinadas y racionales tratando de no afectar rubros prioritarios y máximas necesidades para los países; y me refiero entre otros al Programa de Cooperación Técnica.

Permítame pues, felicitar al Director General por estas decisiones. En consecuencia, mi Delegación desea respaldar la decisión del Consejo en el sentido de conceder al Director General la autoridad y flexibilidad necesarias para la ejecución del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto que ya fue aprobado para el bienio 88-89.

Rainer PRESTI EN (Germany, Fed. Rep. of) (original language German): I prefer to speak on this item on the agenda tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN: Distinguished delegate of Germany it was my intention to conclude this item now, so perhaps you would reconsider?

Rainer PRESTIEN (Germany, Fed. Rep. of) (original language German): Having put my name on the list of speakers I now withdraw.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your cooperation. Only Swaziland remains on my list of speakers and this delegation is absent. I think they will reserve their right, if they wish to submit a written statement. I have also a written statement from Chile and this will be duly inserted in the records. As I do not see any other members wishing to speak, I think Mr Shah would like to make the epilogue.

Pedro OYARCE YURASZECK (Chile): Permítame expresar nuestro agradecimiento a la Secretaría por la preparación del documento C 87/8 y sus suplementos. Deseamos igualmente felicitar al Sr. Shah por su completa presentación.

Mi delegación desea sumarse a las numerosas declaraciones que han expresado su preocupación por las consecuencias que la crisis de liquidez genera en la Organización. Sobre el particular, consideramos apropiada la forma que la Secretaría ha procurado preservar con elementos limitados, la acción de la FAO concretamente en relación con los programas de campo en intereses de los países en desarrollo. A este respecto mi delegación formulará algunas observaciones al abordarse el tema 16.

El Programa de cooperación técnica (PCT) continua siendo uno de los mecanismos vitales de la FAO en el marco de la cooperación para el desarrollo. Si se mide el impacto de este Programa en los países receptores, en terminos de movilización de recursos humanos, materiales, de capacitación y transferencia de tecnología, es fácil comprender la tendencia percibida en esta Comisión en el sentido de alentar un incremento en sus fondos.

En este contexto, como ya se ha planteado, advertimos la necesidad de que la FAO juegue un rol sustantivo en el intercambio científico y tecnológico entre países en desarrollo, explorando fórmulas que faciliten la investigación y capacitación en el marco de la cooperación Sur-Sur. En ese proceso es indispensable utilizar la capacidad disponible en áreas puntuales. En el caso de mi país, contamos con una infraestructura técnica y recursos humanos suficientes en el sector forestal y pesquero.

Otro aspecto de carácter general que deseamos comentar es el referente a la limitación del comercio por efecto de barreras sanitarias. Nos parece indispensable que la FAO promueva en las negociaciones internacionales la uniformidad de políticas relativas al control sanitario, ello facilitará el acceso a los mercados. Lo anterior, como complemento a la asistencia técnica específica que la Organización ha realizado y ejecute en esta esfera.

Señor Presidente, mi delegación desea brevemente referirse a dos puntos concretos: en primer lugar, a la importancia de analizar el programa relativo a la reducción de pérdidas posteriores a la cosecha. Sobre el particular, nuestro país está implementando, en los últimos cuatro años, un proyecto con la FAO para disminuir las pérdidas post-cosecha en granos, producto básico de consumo nacional.

En segundo lugar, on cuanto el documento C 87/8 Suplemento 3 "Evaluación del PASA", consideramos que este constituye un instrumento adecuado en la búsqueda de la seguridad alimentaria, como un concepto amplio que cubra la producción, estabilidad y acceso. Nos parece importante reforzar sus actividades para lo cual es valioso contar con un apoyo renovado de los donantes.

Por último, mi delegación desea compartir la inquietud de algunas delegaciones en el sentido de solicitar al Director General que explore fórmulas apropiadas para que los países desarrollados, cuyas monedas se han reevaluado, consideren este efecto en sus aportes a objeto de facilitar el reestablecimiento del equilibrio financiero de la Organización.

Paralelamente creemos útil requerir al Comité de Finanzas que estudie las posibles alternativas para lograr una mejor repartición de las cargas financieras en el próximo bienio. Ello en atención a la devaluación monetaria que sufren los países en desarrollo, especialmente afectados por aquellas variables macro-económicas, en los cuales no tienen posibilidades de influir. 1/

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): I hope that my answers will be such that they do constitute the epilogue to this discussion. I will certainly try to respond to the questions which have been raised, and at the same time out of respect for your injunction that the members of the Commission be brief, I will also do my best to be brief.

The first question raised in the debate on 18th November when we discussed this item was a question from the distinguished representative of the USA, about the countries who are in arrears with their payment. He requested that the names of these countries be read. We certainly have this information, but in the interest of time I wonder whether it may not be enough to state that the situation of arrears is given in the document which has been referred to by the distinguished delegate of Bangladesh. The document is C 87/LIM/38 which gives the name of every country and indicates the outstanding contributions as at 17 November relating to the 1987 assessments and relating to the arrears.

The distinguished delegate of Canada raised the question about a workshop with respect to forestry, which was one of the activities affected under the programme adjustments and he expressed surprise considering the fact that the Tropical Forestry Action Plan is one of the priorities for the coming biennium. I can only respond by saying that while The Tropical Forestry Action Plan is a priority for the coming biennium, and in fact, a great deal of work has been done in this biennium as well, where we have found that there was certain finite activities that could be postponed or cancelled depending on the timing of that particular activity and the state of preparations which had already been undertaken, we have to review everything. Therefore, it was a question of considered judgement. Just because a Tropical Forestry Action Plan, as a major programme priority, is certainly one which has to be shielded as much as possible from programme adjustments did not mean that everything was untouched. I think the same comment can be applied to our examination of all the programme activities in the priority areas.

The distinguished delegate of India asked a question about what the income shortfall would be because the document at the time of its preparation referred to income shortfall in the range of US\$ 40 to 80 million. I well understand the remark of the distinguished delegate of Argentina who said that this is the kind of imprecision she would not like to see in such a document. My explanation for that is that I hope the Commission will understand and appreciate that when it comes to making forecasts of this nature, we are so very much in an evolving situation. When this particular document (C 87/23) was prepared we had to make certain major assumptions, for example, about what would be the possible payment, an important payment. At the time of its preparation we still held out a hope that an amount of US\$ 40 million might be hoped for. At the time of the preparation of another document which was submitted to the Conference in Commission III yesterday, a document which was, in fact, prepared only two days before that, we were able to come out with a more precise figure. The more precise figure that we gave in that document is an income shortfall of US\$ 73.4 million.

There was a related question by the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom about whether there would be a cash deficit at the end of this biennium. I believe that the distinguished delegate has already been satisfied by the discussion in Commission III so I will not go into details of that matter.

1/ Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

Another related question was raised by the distinguished delegate of Cuba about how financial factors which created difficulties could be ranked in terms of magnitude. I wish to avoid making any kind of value judgements, so let me just give the figures as they are in the last estimates. I think to understand this one needs to look both at the income situation and at the expenditure situation. Let me explain. On the income side there are three factors; the contributions for the current assessments for the current biennium, here the shortfall according to our latest forecast is US\$ 90.3 million because, according to the approved budget we expected assessed contributions being paid of US\$ 396 million. We expect to receive US\$ 305.7 million. SO, there is a current assessment deficit of US\$ 90.3 million. Then there is the payment of arrears for the previous biennia of US\$ 20.7 million which reduces by that amount the current contribution deficit. Then the miscellaneous income shortfall which, at the time of preparation of the earlier document was estimated at some US\$ 12 million, in the final analysis we estimate at US\$ 3.8 million. So the total income shortfall is US\$ 73.4 million all on the income side. The problem created for the Special Reserve Account is on the expenditure side because of the depreciation of the dollar. Due to additional costs which we had to cover we used up the full amount of the Special Reserve Account - just under US\$ 22 million - and expect to use another US\$ 7.5 million by the end of the year.

Then there were some non-financial questions raised - a question raised by the distinguished delegate of Australia about the possible scope for revenue-raising or income-earning side of FAO's activities and he gave two examples - commercially oriented publications and the use of the Organization's staff on a consultancy basis for which we would be reimbursed. My reply would be in three parts: firstly, that it is true that certain organizations in the UN system - the UN itself has two big examples of revenue-raising activities. It has a postal administration and it has quite a noticeable revenue from visitor service - guided tours, etc. We are not in that business. The UNICEF programme, as we all know, also has revenue-raising activities for its own needs. On our side certainly there are revenues from publications and those are explained and indicated in the Programme of Work and Budget document where there is a table giving the revenues of the publications' revolving fund and the use of that revenue.

As for the use of staff as consultants, for which the Organization would be reimbursed, I must say we consider ourselves an inter-governmental organization, given a mandate to carry out a particular task with funds appropriated by Member Governments and through extra-budgetary resources. So I have personally not heard it suggested before that FAO turns itself into a consultancy outfit or a consultancy firm which would use staff to raise revenue.

Then there were questions from the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom about posts, and his comments suggested that perhaps posts were frozen indiscriminately - that there was no judgment as to their freezing and that there was no judgment exercised in how to deploy staff or how to unfreeze posts that are needed for priority activities. I hope I can correct that misconception because in fact in considering the posts which could be frozen, even when we started out this exercise with the initial package of US\$ 16.4 million at the end of last year - we examined 248 posts, of which 159 were professional and 89 general-service. Not all these posts could be frozen, for obvious reasons. There were priority activities going on - ongoing work which heeded to be continued, and therefore both in the initial examination and with every post as it fell vacant since that time, there has been a very careful examination of the size of the unit, the post involved, what work would be affected if that post was not filled. There were full programme aspects which were taken into consideration.

The distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom then asked a specific question about the distribution of these posts and the split between professional and general service. Out of the 170 posts, 121 are professional and 49 general service. The distribution - and if I may give it by department -in the Agriculture Department 28; the Economic and Social Department 46; Fisheries 4; Forestry 14; Regional Liaison Offices 6; Development Department 14; the Department of General Affairs and Information 33; Administration and Finance 13; and the units which form part of the broad Office of the Director-General like the Office of the Legal Counsel, Internal Audit, my own office, 12.

I believe these were the main questions raised. There was a question also by the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom about TCP spending but as I tried to respond and I gave fairly full responses in Commission III, I hope I do not need to repeat them now and I am glad to see that the distinguished delegate considers that satisfactory.

A question was raised about entertainment, and the distinguished delegate of the Philippines referred to how he has personally been affected by this. There were no written directives given but I can tell you that the department heads were requested in a formal meeting - a management meeting - to exercise restraint. So the large part of any effort to reduce on hospitality is a question of personal responsibility and oral injunction and not the subject of any administrative memorandum. But as requested let me give you the figures comparing 1986 and 1987. The budgetary provision for hospitality for the biennium was US\$ 293 000. Now one would expect that to be spent roughly evenly or perhaps slightly less in the first year and slightly more in the second because of the number of meetings and the nature of meetings in the second year of the biennium. In the first year of the biennium 1986, the allotments issued were 145 000 at the beginning of the biennium but the actual expenditure was US\$ 100 000. This year, despite the different nature of the year as I said, the second year of the biennium - meetings like more sessions of the Council, Conference itself, I estimate expenditure for this year to be US\$ 90 000.

I hope I have not neglected any other questions which were raised. I am sorry, there was one more raised by the distinguished delegate of Argentina, about the proportion of cancelled activities.

As far as posts I have been able to give you some quantification. As regards meetings - the Programme of Work and Budget for this biennium and Supplement 2 gives a list of meetings - had 366 meetings. So just under one third - about 27 percent - have been affected and in terms of publications the total number listed in Supplement 1 to the Programme of Work and Budget of this biennium was 386. But those are 386 of the main publications main documents - so when I say that about 200 publications have been affected you cannot compare 200 as a proportion of the 386. But that brings me again to the comment which is the concluding one in the document before you - that it is only after the biennium is completed and when we do our review of the implementation for this biennium that we will be able to be much more specific and undertake to provide this specific information in the next review of the Regular Programme.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr Shah for your analysis. I see three delegations, perhaps having more questions - or even more delegations.

John COOK (United States of America): The United States can understand Mr Shah's concern for brevity and his preference for not responding to the United States request for a reading of the list of countries with contributions in arrears, but the desire for brevity in these proceedings has not prevented lengthy references to the major contributor being in arrears in contributions. Therefore I am under instructions to request the Secretariat please to read for the record the names of all Member Countries in arrears with their contributions.

CHAIRMAN: We have a document on that so do I understand correctly that Mr Shah reads out the whole document? Can you reply please because we have the document before us which was distributed about a month ago. Can you repeat your request?

John COOK (United States of America): It is not necessary to read the entire document. It is not necessary to read any figures. The request is simply to read the names of the countries in arrears with their contributions.

CHAIRMAN: All right. If these are your instructions. Can you please read them?

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The list of countries with arrears For 1986 and prior assessments as given in the Appendix to document C 87/LIM/38 is as follows: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Islamic Republic of Iran, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, St. Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname, Syria, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda. Then there is a list of countries for whom the Conference had authorized arrears to be paid in instalments or in arrears: Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Kampuchea, Nicaragua, Paraguay. And continuing then with the list of other countries, that is to say without instalment payments: United Arab Emirates, and United States of America.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): I should like to welcome the response of Mr Shah to our questions. It is extremely helpful. I am afraid I find myself rather in the position of Oliver Twist. Having been given some gruel, I come back for more. I was very interested when he gave us the figure for expenditure on entertainment in the current biennium of US\$ 293 000. I should like him to identify this. I must confess I do not have the budget document with me at present but I would be very interested to know what the comparative figure is for the next biennium, 1988-89. Could we identify that figure within the budget? I should also be interested in clarification as to whether that figure includes representational allowances which are, of course, personally granted with emoluments. I see from document C 87/LIM/35 that, depending on the decision of the Conference, we could be adding another US\$ 8 000 to the bill for entertainment for the coming biennium. I must confess that I feel, given the nature of our discussions and the strength of feeling within the Organization about the problems posed by income shortfall in terms of operational programmes, surprised that there has been no statement in writing to staff generally, asking them to exercise restraint over entertainment. Finally, may I ask the Secretariat if they have any plans to issue such a statement?

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The first question was about the comparable figure for 1988-89, and where this can be found in the Programme of Work and Budget document. We do not give a figure for hospitality separately in that document. It is part of the operating expenses figure and I must say I did not come prepared for this detailed question, so I do not have the figure with me.

The second question, if I understood it correctly, was whether the representation allowance of the Director-General is included in the figure for hospitality. No, I believe not. The hospitality element is one which is distributed throughout the Organization, whereas the representation allowance is more of a position-related expense which comes under the costs covered under salaries and common costs.

Thirdly, may I clarify that although there was no administrative memorandum - I believe I said there was no administrative instruction - issued in relation to hospitality, there certainly was an injunction or advice given to departmental heads at a formal management meeting, and so it was equivalent to an injunction to exercise restraint. On the last question as to whether it is envisaged that we shall issue a written instruction, I do not know whether it is envisaged. Certainly the same restraint will be urged for the foreseeable future.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Yo no sé, tal vez haya sido un problema con la interpretación. Agradezco que el Sr. Shah nos ha aclarado que se aceptó el 27 por ciento de las reuniones previstas. La pregunta nuestra fue específicamente dirigida a saber si, de las actividades que fueron canceladas en el bienio 86/87 ¿Cuál fue el porcentaje de estas actividades que fue incorporado en la previsión de gastos para el bienio 88/89? Mi pregunta tiende a saber por ejemplo, si las reuniones que no fueron efectuadas están previstas, o si han sido sustituidas por alguna otra reunión a la cual se le ha dado mayor prioridad.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): As is stated in the Programme of Work and Budget document, the Director-General made a conscious decision that whatever had to be cut during this present biennium would not be automatically incorporated in the Programme of Work and Budget of the next biennium. I think that members would not find it very satisfactory to look at specific programme activities and try to rediscover them, because in the process of formulating the present Programme of Work and Budget we went through all the proposals. Very often it is not the programme objective that changes but the elements and the groups of activities and their constituents. For example, you may have the same programme objective for training in a particular field and in one biennium you may have activities consisting of workshops or study tours, and in another biennium these may be in a different form. For example, there is the preparation and publication of a training manual. Because of that process, I would find it hard to assure the representative of Argentina, or any other representative, that there has been a reprogramming in exactly the same way.

J. LYNCH (Canada): I have three questions. First, in responding in his introduction to questions, Mr Shah responded to a specific part of a general question we had asked. Our general question was intended to get an idea of the policy to be pursued with respect to programme adjustments during the coming biennium. In document C 87/23, paragraph 24, there is a statement saying that on the whole across-the-board cuts have been avoided and measures have been based on a re-examination of programme validity and the possibilities actually available for saving. In his statement to the Conference Mr Walton indicated that the basic approach of the Secretariat would be linear cuts with priorities providing preservation for particular items of great interest to the Organization. It strikes me that between that paragraph in the document describing the policy followed in the past biennium and Mr Walton's statement for the coming biennium there is a significant difference, and one that I should like to have explained. This is not an attempt to point out differences between Mr Walton and Mr Shah: it is not an attempt to be smart in any way.

My second question concerns a small point which has been passed to me by my colleague, the permanent representative, Mr Musgrove. He noted that substantial money is earned by the Investment Centre and cost-recoverable money is expended on feasibility studies for projects which are subsequently financed by the World Bank or other donors. He noticed that similar feasibility expenditures are carried out under the Technical Cooperation Programme. But why are they not likewise cost-recoverable in those cases where no donor is found? The third question has already been asked: it concerns the cost per hour of meetings. I believe that someone may be in the process of estimating that, but I would guess that it is about US\$ 5 000. It is well known that a great deal of time has been lost just waiting for a quorum to be found. I myself believe that in the last few days I have spent three hours waiting for quorums, and I would expect that the cost of interpretation would be US\$ 15 000. That was in one Commission alone and I would suspect that in the other Commissions we could have lost in the last few days US\$ 45 000 - that would, I would expect, run one person for one year. I believe there is a general feeling at this Conference that the way the meetings have been organized was a mistake and that significant savings could be made by reorganizing the way the Conference is held. Has any work been done on finding out the cost per hour, and are there plans for future savings?

Finally, the last comment would be to say that we echo the United Kingdom's comments about entertainment costs. I believe there is a request for an increase in the entertainment allowance for the Director-General. Although he is of course well entitled to that, I wonder whether, in a time of such financial austerity, it might not be appropriate to cut allowances. I know that in our own service the first thing to go is all the representational and entertainment allowances. What they always do is to balance approval for that type of thing very high up, so that in our own department assistant deputy ministers have to approve entertainment even by directors general. So those are the four points: three are questions and one is just a comment which need not be answered.

CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to Australia. These are comments which may well concur with Australia's.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I am beginning to feel like a player in an orchestra performing Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony. Fairly soon we could be down to the quartet part - and you know the last to leave is the conductor. But seriously, if I could just respond to Mr Shah's comments on my intervention, of course I was aware of the revenue-raising activities of the publications area. That was partly why I was thinking that it could perhaps become even more commercially oriented. Can this be extended?

Secondly, regarding the thought of a super consultancy, of course that is not the idea I had in mind: not were the examples that I gave examples of that. Our universities and the Commonwealth scientific and cultural research organizations have very small units organizing this. At any one time it would only involve a very small number of people but it is a means of earning revenue and also indicates the type of stimulation which people can get from outside involvement. I appreciate this is an intergovernmental organization, but we need to be careful not to close our eyes to any new possibilities. I would certainly encourage all delegations to come forward with ideas, because we are in a situation where innovations and a readiness to change and adapt are needed if our Organization is to be strengthened and to prosper.

CHAIRMAN: Although your intervention was not in the form of a question, I am sure that your thoughts will be well noted.

James AITKEN (United Kingdom): I shall be brief. My Australian colleague made a musical reference to Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony. I keep on being reminded of the Rolling Stones' hit for those of you who are old enough to remember it "I Can't Get No Satisfaction". I have just two simple points. I take it from Mr Shah's answer that at present there are no plans to issue an administrative memorandum. I would leave that question hanging, and perhaps direct the Secretariat to feel the temper of the meetings.

The second point is more specific. Mr Shah also said, and I quite understand, that he could not give us the comparable figure for 1988-89 for the entertainment allowance within the budget. We would be quite happy if we could have this information some time later on during the Commission's meetings.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Maybe I could start with one or two of the questions and then pass the microphone to Mr Shah. Perhaps the most appropriate musical comparison for this evening might be Eine Kleine Nachtmusik.

On the question of programming which was raised by the delegate of Canada, I think I should expand a little to make clear the difference between the current biennium and the next as we see it. For the next biennium we are going to have to take a view of the range of resources available to the Organization, and I think the events of the last few days have confirmed what I said earlier in this Commission, I think when we were on this item before, that there are a number of factors of uncertainty which make it very difficult before the Conference is over to put all the facts together and make a reasonably reliable forecast of what resources we can solidly count on for the next biennium. This should then be followed, I suggested, by a process of orderly reprogramming, and I repeat that you cannot avoid starting with the concept of a linear cut. Perhaps that is not the most felicitous phrase. Perhaps what I should have said was an average target reduction, that is what I mean, that is what we are talking about. We have to see how much the Organization has to cut expenditure, if indeed it does have to cut expenditure at all. Given that figure you can then work out the areas of protection as I said, areas of priority, and perhaps areas of negative priority, areas where you have to make deeper cuts than the average. What happened inevitably in this biennium was a much higher degree of improvisation where we had to freeze posts as they became available. We would hope that for the next biennium if there has to be a reduction in the level of the programme, departments and divisions will be able to programme it deliberately and not have to become, I do not say victims, but at any rate have to be seriously affected by the random factor of which staff are going to retire and so forth. Therefore I do not think that there is any difference between Mr Shah and myself. I think we were just talking about two separate biennia, the approach that had to be taken in this one and that which we envisage taking in the next.

On the question of entertainment or hospitality or representation, this is administered by senior members of the staff, and an oral injunction by the Director-General to these staff members to exercise responsibility and restraint seems to me a perfectly adequate thing to do and I do not see why there should be any issue of whether oral or written directives are issued: the effect is exactly the same.

As for the representation allowance of the Director-General in the next biennium, this was a recommendation from the General Committee and not from the Director-General. Perhaps Mr Shah could take over.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): The delegate of Canada referred to the Investment Centre activities of DDC and whether there was any parallel between those and the revenues which were earned by the DDC and assistance in investment promotion carried out under TCP projects. I think there is a very basic difference. In the case of the Investment Centre there are really two types of arrangements, on the one hand the arrangement with the World Bank, which is that of a set cooperative programme with a fixed proportion of contributions from the World Bank and FAO, and on the other hand arrangements with funding institutions, regional development banks, IFAD, where we have agreements for reimbursement of costs in varying proportions depending on the nature of the activity, whether it is a project identification or a project appraisal or project formulation. These are very substantial feasibility exercises, whereas in the case of TCP projects, although investment is one of the categories in which TCP provides assistance, the average TCP project is still under US\$ 80 000 and at this level of operation it cannot undertake an entire feasibility study leading to investment in the immediate or in the relatively near future in the same way as a -proper investment feasibility study carried out by teams of people jointly from FAO and a funding institution. That is one big distinction which I would make.

If the question was to say if there are investment promotion projects under the TCP why do they not raise revenue, again I would say that the assistance given under the TCP is not for the purpose of raising revenue but is one category of assistance under that programme.

I believe there is little more I can say on this subject.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Since I do not see any other flag up I accept that of Australia.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I feel very diffident about entering into the hospitality, but when you spoke you gave some figures and a large amount seems to be missing. Maybe you forgot to mention it. You said that in 1986-87 the appropriation was 293 000, you said that 145 000 had been allocated to 1986 but that actual expenditure was 100 000. You then said that the estimate for 1987 was 90 000. If you add the 100 000 actual plus the 90 000 estimate it gives you the 190 000 against an appropriation of 293 000. Is the 103 000 savings? I think it might be useful to have that on the record to save further questions.

CHAIRMAN: It was not me who gave these figures. I guess you were addressing Mr Shah.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): I am sorry, I gave the figures, but the delegate of Australia draws the proper conclusion, that in fact this is part of the savings, the economies that were made.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Shah. I really hope now that there are no other delegations wishing to speak and that we may conclude this item of our agenda, which is item 15. I said a while ago that we were hopeful of finishing within a reasonable time limit. I think it is still reasonable although we have this "Nachtmusik" already in our ears, and at this hour I will not attempt, any summing up. There was a lively discussion, a good dialogue between the Secretariat and the Member Countries, and since this item was for information the Commission may consider itself satisfied at least to some degree. So with these words I declare discussion on item 15 concluded.

That also brings us to the end of our work today. Tomorrow we will resume our work at 9.30 as usual to take up the second part of our report, which is contained in document C 87/II/REP/2 and with the hope that, we may have some other reps. So we will consider the discussion of the reports.

Mile Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Après votre proposition de réunion pour demain matin à 9h 30, comme vous le savez peut-être nous avons des problèmes de quorum un peu partout, dans toutes les commissions parce que bien souvent nos délégations sont très minces et doivent assumer plusieurs charges à la fois. Ne pourrions-nous pas examiner la possibilité de retarder l'examen de l'adoption du rapport? Notre délégation, particulièrement, doit être également, par exemple, à la Commission III et à la Commission I.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: it is not planned tomorrow to run more than two parallel meetings of Commissions. That is in recognition both of the difficulties facing many delegations and also of our rapidly diminishing number of interpreters. I would add that tomorrow may well be a very long day, so I would urge delegations to bring picnic baskets with them. I would also point out that there is a general strike tomorrow which is expected to affect transportation in the city of Rome so I would warn those who are not aware of it to take precautions in advance to arrange some form of transportation.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Walton, for this not very heartening information.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Yo comparto la preocupación de nuestra colega Faouzia de Argelia, y tal vez sería dificultad de interpretación, pero no entendí bien si las tres comisiones han sido convocadas para mañana a las 09.30, como tenía yo entendido, o no se convocaran las tres para la misma hora.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: The arrangement is that Commission II will start its work at 9.30 and will just carry on until it completes its work. Separately Commission I will complete the adoption of its report and will be followed, in the same room probably, by Commission III which has both to complete its substantive discussion and also to complete its report. So Commission II will have the whole day to itself and Commissions I and III will have to split tomorrow, I am afraid.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for this good news for our Commission. We have the whole day as you have heard, for ourselves, and may I repeat on the basis of this information that we meet tomorrow at 9.30 in this room to continue our work. If there are no further comments, the meeting is adjourned

The meeting rose at 20.30 hours

La séance est levée à 20 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 20.30 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/22

FIRST DRAFT

PREMIER PROJET

PRIMER BORRADOR

25 November 1987

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24º período de sesiones
COMISION II

TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

VINGT-DEUXIEME SEANCE

22ª SESION

(25 November 1987)

The Twenty-second Meeting was opened at 10.15 hours,
Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La vingt-deuxième séance est ouverte à 10 h 15, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 22 sesión a las 10.15 horas, bajo la presidencia
de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)

ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)

APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The first item today will be the adoption of the Draft Report of Commission II, Part 2.

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 2

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - DEUXIEME PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 2

PARAGRAPHS 1 to 30

PARAGRAPHEs 1 à 30

PÁRRAFOS 1 a 30

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): With respect to paragraph 2, line number 5 in the original text, which says "However, a few member countries called for efforts to make the Review more evaluative", and in the last sentence also "A few Member Nations", we would like the word "few" to be changed to "a number of member countries", in the absence of which the United States would ask for the specific countries to be named.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection? The United States of America on paragraph 5?

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): Our point is the same, with respect to line 4 in paragraph 5. We would like the word "few" to be changed to reflect "a number of Member Nations".

CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): Turkey is a member of the Drafting Committee so I do not want to intervene on the substance of the United States proposal but may I suggest at this point that whenever such questions arise perhaps the Chairman of the Drafting Committee may help you, but I do not see him. On such questions we need his advice.

CHAIRMAN: We would like to have him but unfortunately he is faced with a scheduling problem, a need to be in two places at once and he is participating in the Contact Group which is meeting at this very moment, and it was felt on the order of needs it was more important for him to be at that meeting than at this meeting but this body is fully capable of making those decisions. Any objection to the change in paragraph 5? It has been approved. Any comments on the paragraphs 6-15? Approved. Paragraph 16?

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Nous intervenons au titre du paragraphe 16. A la neuvième ligne de ce paragraphe, nous lisons la phrase suivante: "La Conférence a toutefois souligné la nécessité d'une formation ultérieure et a demandé instamment qu'une aide extérieure supplémentaire soit fournie à l'Ecole de lutte anti-tsé-tsé (ELAT) ..."

Nous pensons que le mot "supplémentaire" n'a pas sa place parce que, lorsque nous regardons la structure actuelle de l'ELAT, nous constatons que les donateurs initiaux, qui étaient la France et la République fédérale d'Allemagne, ont considérablement réduit leur apport au point qu'ils ont presque cessé de fournir des fonds. Donc, au lieu de mettre "supplémentaire", nous souhaiterions que l'on mette "substantielle" parce que, à ce moment-là, cela s'adresserait non seulement aux donateurs initiaux, mais aussi aux donateurs qui seraient intéressés par la formation de l'ELAT.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to Gabon's proposal that the word "further" be changed to "substantial"?

Rainer PRESTIEN (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): I think that I am directly addressed and I have no problems with the suggestion but at the present time I am not informed to what extent my country has reduced its contribution; I can neither confirm or deny. I am not able to say anything about the situation at this stage.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair sees no objection to the proposed change by Gabon. Argentina, do you wish to speak on paragraph 16?

Sra Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Lamentablemente, nosotros pudimos llegar a la banca en un momento en que usted daba por aprobado el párrafo 15. Mi Delegación quisiera, si usted lo permite, y dado que no ha pasado mucho tiempo, proponer una pequeña enmienda con relación al párrafo 15. ¿Puedo formularla?

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 15 has been adopted, but with unanimous consent we can return to it. Is there any objection? There being no objection, paragraph 15 is re-opened.

Sra Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La segunda frase del párrafo 15, nosotros preferiríamos que, en lugar de decir "La Conferencia animó al Director General a continuar las evaluaciones externas", dijera "Las evaluaciones externas podrían continuarse", y después continuar la frase como está redactada. Es decir, querríamos que se eliminara "La Conferencia animó al Director General a continuar las evaluaciones externas" y que se reemplazara por "Las evaluaciones externas podrían continuarse."

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the change proposed by Argentina? United States of America you have the floor.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): The United States of America questions the wisdom of such a change. We would object to it.

Sra Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Tal vez, Señor Presidente, interesaría que yo explicara por qué quisiera ver este cambio. Por lo menos dos delegaciones, que yo recuerde, objetaron el costo de las evaluaciones externas y dijeron que preferían verlas en un numero limitado de casos,

a fin de no cargar con demasiados gastos a esta Organización. No obstante, el sentido de la frase es el mismo; es decir, la Conferencia da su aquiescencia a que se pueda continuar la práctica cuando sea necesario y conveniente; pero lo que no queremos es que la Conferencia diga que entusiásticamente animó al Director General a continuarla, puesto que nosotros en nuestra intervención, y México también en la suya, lo objetamos.

Yo creo que este cambio no es tan sustancial; es un cambio, digamos, de énfasis. Es una manera de recoger también otras opiniones que han sido formuladas en esta Sala.

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): We should like to say we prefer the original language because we believe there were a large number of Member Nations who said that they supported external evaluations.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): As members of the Drafting Committee, we are rather surprised at this objection by Argentina because the cost implications are mentioned in the last part of the sentence. As a matter of fact, to our recollection the Food Security Assistance Scheme of Evaluation was financed by external resources and not from the regular budget.

CHAIRMAN: Argentina, you may wish to respond. The Netherlands has called your attention to the fact that the concern you have just expressed is in their judgement addressed later on in the sentence about bearing in mind the size of the programme and the cost implications.

Sra Monica DERECHIBUS (Argentina): Es cierto, Señor Presidente, que se hace una mención a los gastos a que diera lugar la evaluación. No obstante, me parece a mí que la manera en que está redactada la frase es demasiado enfática como para que la salvedad de los gastos a que diera lugar la evaluación sea tenida en cuenta, digamos, primordialmente. Creo que si nosotros quitáramos el énfasis de la primera frase que al inicio de la frase estamos diciendo que la "Conferencia animó al Director General" es cierto que muchos Miembros animaron al Director General, pero no fue la Conferencia, ya que al menos dos Delegaciones opusieron ciertas reservas a la continuación de este procedimiento. Yo creo que una buena fórmula de compromiso es la que acabo de sugerir. No creo que los Miembros que han animado al Director General no reconozcan que por lo menos dos delegaciones, no sólo no lo animaron, sino que pusieron ciertos límites a que esta práctica se siguiera efectuando en la Organización.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): We could agree to replace "It" by "the majority encouraged the Director General" because that is what happened. As my Argentina colleague stated only two Member Nations have some doubts, particularly relating to the costs of the evaluation. If "the majority" could be accepted by Argentina we could adopt it.

CHAIRMAN: Argentina you are nodding your head, but for the Verbatim Record, can you please state your concurrence?

Sra Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Si, Señor Presidente, podemos aceptar esa formulación.

CHAIRMAN: The language will say "A majority of member countries encouraged" rather than "It". Is there any objection to that? There being no objection paragraph 15 is adopted as amended with the Netherlands language. Paragraph 16 has been adopted. Any objections to paragraph 17? The Chair sees, none - 17 is adopted. Paragraphs 18 and 19 - Australia is your objection on paragraph 18 or on paragraph 19?

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I am not speaking on substance as a member of the Drafting Committee, but just to point out that in the second last sentence of paragraph 19 in the English language, there is a conjunction which is wrong. It should be "on" not "and". I think it should read "further dependence on external inputs". If you use the word "and" as we have here, it does not make sense.

CHAIRMAN: Is there an objection to that?

Ibrahima KABA (Guinee): Je voudrais revenir au paragraphe 17 concernant le problème de la trypanosomiase.

CHAIRMAN: Just a second, we are not on paragraph 17. We have already had a considerable discussion on 17 and closed it. We would be glad to do what we did with Argentina, namely, with unanimous consent re-open. You can only re-open with unanimous consent I will ask that, but let us now finish the business we are on and deal with paragraph 19. Does anyone object to the English language correction by Australia? There being no objection to the language change the paragraph is adopted. If there is unanimous consent we will go back and re-open paragraph 17 at the request of Guinea.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): Excusez-moi mais c'est une question que je voudrais poser concernant la dernière phrase du paragraphe 17 qui commence par "Quelques Etats Membres ont déclaré qu'une sélection excessive pouvait avoir des conséquences négatives". C'est une question que je pose car j'ai déjà, au cours de ce débat (je ne sais pas quelle était la délégation qui a déclaré cela) étant donné qu'on a surtout dit dans le document de travail que des croisements de trypanotolérants pourraient aboutir à l'élimination de la race, de l'espèce trypanotolérante. Mais dire qu'une sélection excessive pouvait..., alors là j'aimerais avoir des éclaircissements, c'est une question qui m'intéresse de très près.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to take up that point?

Nils Ragnar KAMSVAG (Norway): Questions were raised about that matter in the Drafting Committee and the French delegation explained that they had brought it forward in their intervention.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone here from the French delegation to speak on the point that France apparently made? The Chair observes there is no one here to respond to that?

Ibrahima KABA (Guinee): C'est une question technique très importante pour la Guinée étant donné que la race DAMA se caractérise par son aptitude de trypanotolérance. Dans mon pays, actuellement, se déroule un projet d'amélioration et de sélection de la race DAMA, sous la conduite de la FAO. C'est pourquoi cette question qui est posée dans ce paragraphe revêt une importance certaine pour mon pays.

Si la délégation française n'est pas présente pour soutenir cette déclaration qui figure ici, je ne vois pas comment on pourra la résoudre.

CHAIRMAN: We can solve it very simply. The Chair has authority under the rules to suspend discussion and will exercise it and we can take up para.17 later when we can have a more fruitful discussion on it, and when we observe the French delegation is able to assume its seat. We will return then to item 17 and you can have an exchange on that matter.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): Paragraph 22, the first sentence reads "The Conference noted that the Director-General had accepted almost all the recommendations of the evaluation team". We would like to replace "almost all" with "many of the recommendations of the evaluation team".

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Yo creo que la propuesta de Estados Unidos'es aceptable, si concuerda con la realidad. Esta es una cuestión que es fácilmente constatable. Creo que la Secretaría misma podría responder si las recomendaciones contenidas en el documento han sido aplicadas en cerca de su totalidad, casi todas las recomendaciones han sido aplicadas, o si muchas de ellas. Es una cuestión meramente de número, pero podríamos acercarnos más a la realidad con una explicación por parte de la Secretaría, en este caso.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat is in an unfortunate position of having to pass judgement on the Secretariat's superiors, and this is a Body where the Member Countries have to make these decisions not the Secretariat. I do not think it would be prudent to ask someone who works under the Director-General to pass judgement on whether the Director-General has or has not done something.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): No.-

CHAIRMAN: Do you accept the amendment or not? I am sorry; I was not clear. No? Let us have a discussion on the amendment. But for a point of clarification, Nicaragua, let me state, so you do not misunderstand the Chair's interpretation, the Chair is not attempting to squelch any debate of that, but the language here is about what the Conference noted. To ask that an Assistant Director-General report to us on whether the Director-General had done an excellent job, a good job, or a fair job is to put anybody under the Director-General in a bit of an unfair situation. It is also, if you look at it on the other hand, likely to invite a highly biased response. What we are dealing with here is what the Conference noted, the Conference being the Member Countries. So it is really up to the Member Countries to pass judgment on what the Member Countries did or did not do. That was the sole point.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Esta es su opinión. En todo caso, la respetamos y nos sometemos al debate tal y como se llevó a cabo, y me parece que la opinión de los que hablaron sobre este tema en relación con las recomendaciones específicas era sobre la casi totalidad de la aplicación de las recomendaciones, por lo tanto, en este caso no es que haré un debate al respecto. Usted ya tiene su opinión sobre el particular, es obvio. Sin embargo, si hay otras delegaciones que están de acuerdo con nuestra exposición, obviamente defenderemos entonces la propuesta nuestra de que quede el texto como esta.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): As a Member Country of this Organization I would like just to mention that we have before us the suggestion, the draft report from the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee was composed also from the Member Countries. As my country was not a member of the Drafting Committee, I have also the right to ask the Secretariat for an explanation not just because I would like to have support or not support from him; I would just like explanation as a Member Country because I have before the suggestion from the Drafting Committee whose Member Countries are suggesting such a Draft Report to us.

CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, what the Chair would normally do is to ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to respond to these many questions but, as has been explained earlier, because of the press of business the Chairman of the Drafting Committee has elected to be at the Contact Group Meeting this morning because in his judgement there are some critical matters going on there, and he wants to be an active participant. But it would be his role normally to clarify that. It would be the Drafting Committee's role to clear that.

Are there any further discussions on this paragraph?

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): I suggest postponing the decision on this paragraph until the Chairman of the Drafting Committee will come back to give us an explanation.

CHAIRMAN: That is a good suggestion. It is so ordered.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Párrafo 25, Primera oración, segunda línea. Entre paréntesis dice: "producción, estabilidad y acceso" relacionado con el concepto ampliado de seguridad alimentaria. Ahí debemos agregar: "y acceso a los alimentos", "producción, estabilidad y acceso a los alimentos".

CHAIRMAN: Nicaragua says that we should say "access to food," the two words "to food" added there. Does anyone have any objections to that? There being no objections it is so ordered.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Como miembro del Comité de Redacción, no tenemos una cuestión de fondo que plantear en este párrafo, simplemente nos remitiremos a la tercera frase, donde dice: "los dos factores limitadores habían sido ..." Esta palabra limitadores en el texto español no suena muy bien. Habría que decir: "los dos factores limitantes". Sería más correcto.

CHAIRMAN: That objection on 25 is reopened and so amended and adopted. The Chair sees no objection to paragraphs 26 and 27, so they are adopted. Paragraphs 28-30. Adopted.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Era sobre el párrafo 29. Usted disculpe, porque Usted toma rápido la decisión de aprobarlo. En todo caso, es una aclaración. Desgraciadamente, como Usted lo ha manifestado anteriormente, hoy no está con nosotros el Presidente del Comité de Redacción, pero el texto en español del párrafo es confuso. En la cuarta oración, por ejemplo, en la línea 6, se comienza diciendo: "En cambio, pidieron a la FAO," etcétera, haciendo relación, imagino yo que, o a la Conferencia, o a la mayoría de los miembros, o a algunos miembros, no se sabe. En la línea décima es lo mismo, él menciona: "pidieron también a la Secretaría", etcétera y en la línea trece aparece "los Estados Unidos", como país específicamente, pero realmente no logro entender la

secuencia de ese párrafo, incluso el párrafo comienza con: "la Conferencia", después se habla de "muchos miembros" y después dice "otros formularon" y, por último, "En cambio, pidieron" después "pidieron también..."

CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent 29 is returned to reopen.

Humberto CARRIO MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Quisiera de jar constancia de que no lo mencionaba porque en el texto en español se menciona a los Estados Unidos. Es solamente una secuencia completa, que no tiene lógica en el texto en español. No es solamente porque aparece un país mencionado al final. Es toda la secuencia.

CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that there is a mistake in the Spanish language. There is no reference to the United States of America in the English language version, by the way. That is a mistake in the Spanish language, and your points are well taken. We will suspend paragraph 29 until we do have the Chairman of the Drafting Committee back here and we can take it up. We will suspend that and return to it.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): In paragraph 30, we just have a point which we thought is missing in one of the suggestions we made. We had a point which has not been included in this section in any one of the paragraphs. So if I am allowed, I want to raise that point.

CHAIRMAN: You can go and make any suggestion you want.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): In our intervention we indicated that a review of programmes and budgets of the current biennium should be discussed before the discussion of the budget and the programme of the coming biennium so that we can have the benefit of the programmes and budgets which have been ongoing. In fact, in many of the discussions on the impact or the implications of the devaluation of the dollar, at many points there has been a question raised as to whether this effect has been reflected in the coming biennium programme and the budget. So for the benefit of the discussion in the future, we propose a review of the current programme and budget, to the effect that any of the matters should be reviewed before discussion on the coming biennium. That has not been reflected in any of the paragraphs.

CHAIRMAN: I think you are talking, really, about item 12. Also, we are dealing here with the adoption of the language. We can have suggestions for inclusion of sentences that are not there, deletions of sentences that are there, changes, but this is not a point for just a general discussion. If you have a specific language change that you wish to propose, we can take that up, but I did not really hear one.

Sra Monica DEREGBUS (Argentina): La idea que acaba de ser expuesta por el distinguido delegado de Etiopía resulta bienvenida por nosotros. Nosotros creemos que es muy útil que el examen se realice en el futuro de esta manera, pero pensamos que tal vez bastaría con agregar una frase en el párrafo dos, que es el que se refiere a la iniciación del examen del Programa Ordinario. También podríamos dejar tiempo a la Delegación de Etiopía para pensar una frase para agregar allí y volver sobre el tema un poquito más tarde.

CHAIRMAN: That is a good suggestion. Ethiopia, we will return when we get toward the end here or at the end, to paragraph 30. At that time, if you have a sentence that you suggest, we will take it up. We will be flexible about taking things up. We are trying to go for speed, but we will reopen any automatically if we just happen to miss somebody's sign.

Paragraphs 1 - 30 not concluded

Les paragraphes 1 - 30 sont en suspens

Los párrafos 1-30 quedan pendientes

PARAGRAPHS 31 to 48

PARAGRAPHERS 31 à 48

PÁRRAFOS 31 a 48

Marcos INIETO LARA (Cuba): Voy a referirme al párrafo 37 y quisiéramos hacer una observación de carácter general. El texto en español comienza diciendo "tras tomar nota de la función" etc. Esta expresión de "tras tomar nota" no nos parece en español una expresión muy correcta. Esto aparece en diferentes párrafos de otros informes que vamos a ver y pediríamos, por favor, a la Secretaría que buscara una fórmula, como pudiera ser "tomando nota" y aplicar esa fórmula para todos los demás párrafos donde aparezca esta expresión porque en español no nos parece la más apropiada.

CHAIRMAN: It is so ordered.

Frank Mensa K. DENYOH (Ghana): The African Group is very much concerned with the African Regional Aquaculture Centre. At least two African countries, Zambia and Ghana, mentioned this in their statement. We would like this to be highlighted in the report and therefore, in the fourth sentence of paragraph 39 we would add "In that context, the African Regional Aquaculture Centre and the Eastern Central Atlantic were mentioned." That is a slight modification.

CHAIRMAN: There is no objection.

Paragraphs 31 to 48 as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 31 à 48 ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 31 a 48 así enmendados, son aprobados

PARAGRAPHS 49 to 57

PARAGRAPHERS 49 à 57

PÁRRAFOS 49 a 57

Alrair F. DE SA BARBUDA (Brazil): I have an amendment to propose in the last sentence of this paragraph 49. Reference has been made to the UNEP Report by some delegations, as my delegation has done several times. We would like the sentence to read, "I noted the conclusions of the recent reports of the UN EP (Environmental Perspective to the Year 2000 and Beyond) and of the World Commission on the Environment and Development (Our Common Future) as they pertained to the conservation of tropical forest".

CHAIRMAN: No objection.

Almir F. DE SÂ BARBUDA (Brazil): I have two proposals. The first one is in paragraph 51 to change the first sentence. The first sentence says "... keep the international community informed". I propose to change that wording to "member countries" because this report is for member countries.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone have any problems in changing the words "international community" to "member countries" in paragraph 51? The amendment is approved.

Almir F. DE SÂ BARBUDA (Brazil): In paragraph 52, in the sentence after "Conference" I propose to change the words so they read, "The Conference, noting the adverse affects on the environment of the serious economic difficulties in developing countries and as well the need to reverse present trends in tropical deforestation, urged that..." - and then it would be the same language.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Paragraph 52 as amended is adopted.

Paragraphs 49 to 57, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 49 à 57, ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 49 a 57, así enmendados, son aprobados

Paragraphs 1 to 30 (continued)

Paragraphes 1 à 30 (suite)

Párrafos 1 a 30 (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: That brings us to the last paragraph so we can go back and try to pick up the details. Have you prepared the sentence you wish to put in paragraph 30, delegation of Ethiopia?

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): I hope I may be assisted by people who can draft the English language better than I can, but I have put my idea into a sentence. "In the future preparation of the agenda it will be more useful to discuss the review of the Programme and Budget of the current biennium before the budget and the programme of the coming biennium is discussed and approved".

CHAIRMAN: Will you please state where you propose to put that sentence.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): I do not know where it should go.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any problem with that? This is paragraph 30. Where in paragraph 30 do you wish to place that amendment?

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): In close cooperation with my Ethiopian colleague, I think the end of paragraph 1 in effect is probably the best place because this has to do with the organization of work and does not have to do with the substance, so it would probably fit best at the end of paragraph 1. May I ask my Ethiopian colleague to repeat it slowly so we can write it in longhand?

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to reopening paragraph 1 for the purpose of including at the end of that paragraph the amendment put forward by the delegate of Ethiopia? There being no objection, paragraph 1 is reopened. Can you please read your sentence slowly, delegate of Ethiopia?

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): "In the future preparation of the agenda it will be morti useful to discuss the review of the Programme and Budget of the current biennium" - this wording can be improved if someone can suggest a better one - "before the budget and programme of the coming biennium is discussed and approved."

CHAIRMAN: Mr Shah advises the Chair that there is a point of clarification and I will ask him to state it.

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): In order to help the Commission, I think the suggestion that this addition go at the end of paragraph 1, as made by the distinguished delegate of Canada, is very appropriate, but may I suggest that the sentence begins, "The view was expressed that in the future preparation of the agenda it would be more useful to consider discussing the review of the Regular Programme before the Programme of Work and Budget or the coming biennium is discussed and approved."

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): I appreciate Mr Shah's mastery of the language, but there is a significant change in what he has proposed in the preambular portion. Unless there is actual opposition in this room - and I invite it now - I would much prefer the sentence begin as the delegate of Ethiopia suggested and we simply say, "In the future preparation of the agenda it would be more useful ...".

Sra. Monica DEREGBUS (Argentina): La delegación Argentina también preferiría que se mantuviera la redacción originariamente propuesta por el delegado de Etiopía.

CHAIRMAN: Another country has suggested otherwise.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Nuestra contribución es más bien un problema de forma, no queremos abordar el fondo de la cuestión. Quizá sería más conveniente para la estructura del texto que esto se expresara en un párrafo aparte, entre el uno y el dos. Sería más conveniente, quizás.

Ton A.J.M. OOMKN (Netherlands): As a matter of fact we were considering asking you or our Ethiopian colleague for a reference by whom it was stated or whatever was the divided opinion between the members of the Commission, and therefore we are very grateful for the help of the Secretariat that formulated the beginning of the sentence "the view was expressed that".

On the other hand I think that our Ethiopian colleague has the right and has the opportunity to formulate his proposal in the way he did.

But I should like to ask the Secretariat - the Chairman anyway - that perhaps the formulation "It was stated that" is of a more general nature and is perhaps more acceptable to both the Ethiopian and perhaps also the other view.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair will leave that for the country that proposed the amendment to decide what it wishes to do.

Now on the proposal of Ethiopia to have its sentence approved at the end of paragraph 1, is there any objection at this point? The Chair sees none. It is adopted. Paragraph 1 is now readopted as amended by Ethiopia. We should now go back to para. 30 and because the language was changed I believe we will now have no other areas open on para 30.

Temei ISK.IT (Turkey): I am sorry, Mr Chairman, you have stated that the Ethiopian amendment or addition was adopted, but was it adopted with the addition of the Netherlands - that is where the sentence starts with "It was stated that", or was it adopted in the general version as stated by Ethiopia? I am confused.

CHAIRMAN: There should be no confusion. The Chair very clearly stated that it would be to Ethiopia to make any changes in Ethiopia's language. The Chair did not hear any. It is up to Ethiopia to state the Ethiopian resolution; it is not up to the Chair. It seemed clear, and while there have been different suggestions made it was then the role of Ethiopia at that point to state any changes if any.

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): Sorry Mr Chairman, it is not about the substance, but I agree with Netherlands that the sentence should start with something saying who stated this view. Of course it is Ethiopia's right, but any other country has the right to bring amendments to any proposals by any country. So I support the amendment of Netherlands.

CHAIRMAN: It was never stated as an amendment. There were a number of casual suggestions made along the way, but none stated as an amendment.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): I formulated as a proposal, as an amendment to the Ethiopian text, and I invited also via the Chair to Ethiopia to agree or not agree upon it.

CHAIRMAN: There being no objection, let us reopen para 1 and complete the business.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Señor Presidente, tal vez sea útil, a esta altura, explicar las razones por las cuales nos parece a nosotros que sería enormemente más útil realizar el examen del Programa ordinario del bienio que termina, antes de considerar las actividades del nuevo bienio.

Hay dos órdenes de cosas, hay dos órdenes de razones, que impondrían ésta como la solución más racional. La primera categoría estaría dada por una cuestión conceptual: es mucho mejor saber qué se ha hecho, qué se ha obtenido y qué queda por hacer, antes de decidir lo que se va a hacer en el siguiente bienio. Y, en segundo término, está siempre pendiente la cuestión de la falta de liquidez que eventualmente pueda tener esta Organización. Es una oportunidad para que los Estados Miembros piensen seriamente en términos de prioridades y en términos programáticos. Yo creo que las Delegaciones aquí presuntos no pueden tener objeciones de fondo a que sea la propia Conferencia la que decida sobre esta cuestión.

Creo que la idea es enormemente útil, que mejoraría nuestros trabajos en un gran porcentaje. No creo que deberíamos dejar pasar tan buena idea como la idea de una sola Delegación; creo que debería ser la Conferencia la que tomara esta idea como propia, porque no va a ser más que en beneficio de todos nosotros y de la FAO.

Salim SARRAF (Liban): Je fais partie du Comité de rédaction, donc je n'aurai pas à prendre la parole pour cette question qui n'a pas été discutée au cours du Comité de rédaction. C'est pourquoi je me permets de donner mon avis et je suis d'avis d'appuyer la proposition des Pays-Bas qui ont exprimé l'avis comme l'a proposé M. Shah et comme l'a proposé la Turquie.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): I frankly dare anyone to challenge the Cartesian logic which was put forward by Argentina just a few moments ago. Surely, in this Organization, if nothing else, we can agree to a good idea being absorbed, as she put it, by the Conference, and in the Drafting Committee I made the same point as Lebanon has made just now. I was a member of that Committee I was there when this item was discussed. This particular idea was not discussed which is why I take the liberty of intervening, but many times - and I will not name any countries - many times suggestions came up in the Drafting Committee and in the past have come up in the Commission here which were "the good idea of one country", and were indeed generously absorbed by the Conference. I invite you all to show the same generosity to a colleague who has chosen with great wisdom not to intervene too often in our deliberations, and who now comes forward with a very useful and practical suggestion.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): I think that we have nothing to do with the opening of the discussion. I would just like to say that I agree with the idea proposed by Ethiopia, but I support the amendment from the Netherlands.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Como han manifestado otras Delegaciones, esto no se examinó en el Comité de Redacción, y en el debate tampoco fue puesto de manifiesto o, mejor dicho, no fue debatido, aun cuando la Delegación de Etiopía lo expresó. Nosotros consideramos que podría adoptarse la propuesta de Países Bajos. Esto recoge la opinión de Etiopía y, además, recoge también un criterio de la Conferencia, toda vez que el primer párrafo al que se va a agregar esto tiene un horizonte general.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): We share the views of others, that this is a good addition. We do not feel strongly either way. Our preference though, we are persuaded by our colleagues from Canada that there is some benefit in adopting it as the spirit of the Conference.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Nous n'avons, en fait, aucune objection de fond sur ce que la délégation de l'Ethiopie souhaite ajouter à ce rapport, notamment la proposition qui a été faite tout à l'heure; mais après avoir également suivi le débat nous nous rendons compte, en fait, qu'il y a quelques difficultés à attribuer cette proposition à toute la Conférence, et pour notre part nous pensons que l'on pourrait utiliser la forme impersonnelle ou la formulation proposée par le délégué de la Turquie. Mais si nous avons demandé la parole, c'est surtout pour attirer l'attention sur le fait que peut-être la place que nous voulons donner à cet ajout n'est sûrement pas le paragraphe 1, parce qu'il est introductif. Il est suivi d'autres paragraphes qui expriment dans le détail, les différentes déclarations et positions qui ont été formulées et d'ailleurs lorsque nous étions déjà plus avant, c'est dans le rapport que l'Ethiopie avait suggéré cette proposition; nous avions à l'époque dit que nous considérerions cette proposition au paragraphe 2. Nous pensons que le paragraphe 1 devrait rester en l'état et mettre la proposition que nous fait la délégation de l'Ethiopie, reformulée par la Turquie et les autres orateurs, et non pas au paragraphe 1. C'est une question de logique.

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): Just to clarify our position in -response to the interventions from Argentina and Canada. We do not have any difficulty at all with the substance of the proposal. Indeed we like the idea, we support the idea. Our only concern was to give a subject to the idea, and by supporting the Dutch proposal we thought that an impersonal subject would perhaps be more convenient, but my delegation has no difficulty whatsoever in accepting any other formulation which gives a subject such as: "The Conference agreed that" or "The Conference felt that". If there are no other delegations objecting to this I want to make this clarification. Also we do not have any difficulty with the latest proposal of Congo to change the place of the sentence.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would venture that possibly just simply saying "Many Member Countries felt that". It seems clear, sitting here, that many Member Countries do concur with the view of Ethiopia. Would that phrase rather than "It" solve the problem?

Ethiopia has asked the Chair's attention, and if it is on your amendment we will grant you the floor at this time in case there are any changes that would affect the discussion.

Getachew TEKLEMEDEHIN (Ethiopia): I just wanted to intervene. As far as the substantive matter in the sentence, I have no objection to the amendment as well as the placing of the sentence in any paragraph.

CHAIRMAN: At this point then, is there anybody who has any objection with the Ethiopian proposal as amended by the Netherlands being included at the last sentence of para 1.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): La Delegación argentina se resiste a creer que la Delegación de Países Bajos no quiera realmente que la Conferencia adopte esta recomendación. Nos gustaría saber cuál es el argumento de la Delegación de Países Bajos para que nosotros, que estamos aquí como Conferencia, como Comisión en pleno, no podamos adoptar esta decisión, que yo creo que es útil - que muchas Delegaciones creen que es útil - y no creo que haya ninguna otra Delegación que se haya opuesto hasta este momento.

CHAIRMAN: Netherlands, would you wish to respond to that very direct question?

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): Sure Mr Chairman. There is no shadow of a doubt that one delegation has the right to propose an amendment. As a matter of fact it seems to my delegation a fruitful

addition to the report as a whole. On the other hand if the Commission should decide to make the Conference as the body to what is referred, that is democracy and good FAO tradition. We have no point about that. Once again, the Ethiopian member is indeed showing a very good understanding of what is of importance for FAO. So for my delegation there is no point that also "The Conference felt that" is perfectly acceptable for our delegation if the Commission decides upon that.

CHAIRMAN: Well that is a change.

Mme Anna Teresa FRITELLI-ANNIBALDI (Italie): Je ne m'opposais pas à ce que vous aviez dit.

E.V.WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): We have no problem whatsoever with this amendment but it occurs to our delegation that it might be better to include it as a new paragraph 31. After all, this is a report of what has happened and this paragraph is suggesting what ought to happen in the future.

CHAIRMAN : We have had some changes proposed and some views expressed. The Chair would recommend that we should consider the United Kingdom proposal and the Ethiopian proposal, which is a matter which comes after, so that there would be a new paragraph following what is now paragraph 30. Is there any objection?

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): We have no particular difficulty with the substance of the Ethiopian proposal, and whether it should be added to the existing paragraph or appear as a new paragraph is more or less a matter of editorial opinion. We are prepared to go along with the consensus on that point; but permit me to say that wherever it is placed, as it is an observation of a general nature, I should like to add one sentence to it. I have one formulation before me, and before placing it ready for the consideration of the Commission I wish to say that during the few interventions we made on certain tables attached to certain documents, discussed in the last few sessions of the Commission, we pointed out that the regional shares of expenditures do not bring out the shares of the poorest countries of "the world, If you are vitally concerned with the problems of food and hunger, which are more prevalent in the least developed countries than any others, it is of vital importance for policy guidance and the fixing of programme priorities that the shares of the least developed countries, within their own regional groups should be brought out. With that end in view, I would suggest that along with the Ethiopian amendment a second sentence should be added, which may be as follows...

CHAIRMAN: That is not really an amendment to Ethiopia's amendment. It is a different topic. We will be glad to take up your proposal but we shall get into a very confused area if we do not stick to the topic at hand. We will come back to this and recognize your proposal and discuss it, but let us first dispose of this item. I am advised by the Secretariat that the proper place for the Ethiopian proposal would be a paragraph following what is now paragraph 30. Is there any objection to that? - Let us deal with the placement of it.

Michel MOMBCULI (Congo): Je constate qu'il y a un progrès puisqu'au départ vous vouliez le mettre au paragraphe 1. J'étais, et je suis toujours convaincu, que le paragraphe 1 n'est pas le meilleur endroit puisque c'est un paragraphe qui introduit le sujet. J'avais proposé tout à l'heure que la proposition de l'Ethiopie soit intégrée dans le paragraphe 2, et je voudrais expliquer le pourquoi de la chose.

Je pars du principe que notre Rapport a une certaine structure au sein duquel le paragraphe 1 est un paragraphe général introductif; le paragraphe 2 donne certaines idées d'ordre général, expose certaines positions; et il nous semblait que c'est à l'intérieur de ce paragraphe 2 que l'on pouvait glisser, parmi les considérations d'ordre général, cette proposition de l'Ethiopie.

Vous nous proposez maintenant de mettre cette proposition au paragraphe 31, c'est-à-dire qu'on la trouverait dans la section Examen du Programme ordinaire 1986-87. C'est une façon de faire, mais notre préférence irait à ce que cette phrase soit plutôt dans le paragraphe 2 qu'ailleurs, et en tout cas pas au paragraphe 1.

CHAIRMAN: In the interests of time, the Chair would like to get the feeling of the membership on the basics first. Let us try to dispose of this in an orderly fashion. By a show of hands will you indicate your preference of the following three suggested placements; first, at the end of paragraph 1; following as a separate paragraph; and following paragraph 30. Will those countries who feel that it should be at the end of paragraph 1 please so indicate.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I thought that many delegations considered it ought to go in paragraph 2, and I do not think you have mentioned that.

CHAIRMAN: Then we can have four options: at the end of paragraph 1; a separate paragraph following paragraph 1; at the end of paragraph 2; or after paragraph 30. Are there any other suggestions? Then let us solve the placement problem first. In our discussion of the proposals we keep coming back to suggestions of different movements. We have not yet reached clarity as to where we wish to place it.

Sra. Monica DEREGBUS (Argentina): Para la Delegación Argentina, el mejor lugar para poner la enmienda de la Delegación de Etiopía sería a continuación de la segunda frase del párrafo 2, o sea como tercera oración del párrafo 2.

CHAIRMAN: We have four different options: as a new last sentence of paragraph 1 or, as Argentina has just suggested, in paragraph 2; as a separate paragraph, as someone suggested earlier, between paragraphs 1 and 2; or following paragraph 30 as a separate paragraph. Let us see if we can achieve a consensus view on that. Will those countries who feel that it ought to be at the end of paragraph 1 please so indicate.

Vote by show of hands
Vote à main levée
Votación a mano alzada

CHAIRMAN: Nobody feels it ought to be there. Will those who feel that it ought to be a separate paragraph between what is now paragraphs 1 and 2 please so indicate.

Vote by show of hands
Vote à main levée
Votación a mano alzada

CHAIRMAN: Nobody feels that should be done. Will those countries who agree with Argentina's proposal that it be placed in paragraph 2 please so indicate.

Vote by show of hands
Vote à main levée
Votación a mano alzada

CHAIRMAN: It seems obvious that there is a strong consensus and that it ought to be placed there. The issue of placement is now closed.

That is where it will go. The item is closed and cannot be reopened unless there is unanimous consent. We will now proceed to the substance.

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Nous n'étions pas beaucoup intervenus sur cette question et nous pensions même ne pas pouvoir continuer à en débattre dans la mesure où, sur le fond, presque toutes les délégations qui sont intervenues n'ont pas jugé utile de revenir là-dessus puisque la proposition éthiopienne recevait en principe l'accord de tous ceux qui sont intervenus. Il était seulement question de savoir où placer cet amendement, et il nous semble, en fait, que la question que vous soulevez n'a pas sa raison d'être.

CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately what occurred was not as you have stated it. There was in fact an amendment by the Netherlands, now concurred in by Ethiopia. Can we now take up a vote on the Ethiopian proposal as amended?

Mile Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): J'ai, suivi le débat et il me semblait que notre ami des Pays-Bas avait retiré son amendement.

CHAIRMAN: You are right. I stand corrected. On the Ethiopian amendment, does anybody object? Then the Commission accepts that should be the language. There being no objections, it is hereby adopted. Netherlands, the Chair has to apologize. I misunderstood your statement: I misinterpreted you as pressing your point.

Before proceeding with any new business, let us go back to deal with paragraph 30. Originally that is where this item came up. Let us take paragraph 30: does anyone wish to speak on that?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): It was just a point of order, because I got an assurance on an earlier intervention from the Chair that I would be allowed to take the floor after the Commission had finalized its decision on Ethiopia.

CHAIRMAN: You will. This is just a housecleaning task. We did not want inadvertently to forget that paragraph 30 has not been closed. The only question raised in that paragraph was Ethiopia's, and that was then shifted to another point, so that technically we have not closed out paragraph 30. We will conclude that in two seconds and then we will come to you far your point. Are there any objections to paragraph 30 as it is? Paragraph 30 is adopted.

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): As I said, I want my proposal to be added to the Ethiopian amendment because it is also of a general nature. I am referring to my earlier interventions on this subject, that the regional shares of expenditure either of the programme budget or of extra-budgetary resources do not really show how much of those expenditures have gone for the poorest countries of the world, and this is very important for policy formulation in FAO and also for adopting programme priorities. So in view of that in my interventions on two occasions I had suggested that whenever the regional shares in expenditures are shown a separate presentation of the shares of the poorest countries of those regions should also be shown. With a view to achieving this objective I have the following formulation to table before the House: "It was also stated that in future documentations relating to any agenda item where regional shares in expenditure either of the Regular Programme budget or of the extra-budgetary resources are shown, a separate table to show the shares of the least developed countries should be added."

CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on the amendment by Bangladesh?

Roger PÌ LEWIS (United States of America): Could I ask the Secretary to read the sentence in its entirety one more time.

CHAIRMAN: I think I will pass on that because I did specifically ask Bangladesh to read it slowly and state where he envisaged it being placed. We have already read it twice. It is difficult enough. Does anyone else wish to speak?

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): If there is any difficulty with my pronunciation I can give this to you, Mr Chairman, to read it out to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: No, there was no difficulty. It would be quicker to read it than talk about the time we would save by not reading it. Read it, please.

Michel SAVINI (Assistant Secretary, Commission II): "It was also stated that in future documentation relating to any agenda item where regional share of expenditure either in the Regular Programme budget or the extra-budgetary resources are shown, a separate table to show the share of the least-developed countries within those regions should be added".

CHAIRMAN: On the Bangladesh proposal, any discussion, any objections?

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): I have no difficulty with the substance of the Bangladesh proposal but I do wonder whether we are developing paragraph 2 into too much of a basket of ideas. I wonder whether the Bangladesh proposal might stand quite nicely as a separate single-sentence paragraph, a new paragraph 3. I just offer that suggestion.

CHAIRMAN: Bangladesh, can you respond to that, please.

M.M. SIDDIQUE-ULLAH (Bangladesh): I have no objections, Sir,

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else have any objections? There being no objections, the Bangladesh proposal is adopted as a separate paragraph.

We have a few items to dispense with. The Chair has asked the Secretary to ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to come here for a while to clear up points on which member countries had questions for him to clarify. We also had a question earlier when France was absent that we held in abeyance - I am sorry, I thought I saw France a few minutes ago.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinee): Concernant la question posée sur le paragraphe 17, la délégation française a préféré se référer à M. Poly qui est un fonctionnaire de la FAO, et qui pourrait certainement répondre à la question posée par la délégation guinéenne.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr Poly is a member of the French delegation, he is not a member of the Secretariat. I think we had better suspend that so that we are not with hearsay. We will save that for France to come back to. The Chairman of the Drafting Committee can also clarify some of those points.

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Après que cette phrase, qui avait soulevé l'indignation de la délégation guinéenne, ait été à nouveau abordée, nous avons consulté le procès-verbal de la Commission pour essayer de voir si la délégation française avait effectivement fait ressortir cette idée. Nous nous sommes rendu compte que cela n'avait pas été le cas. Mais nous avons eu en plus des contacts avec la délégation française qui ne trouve pas d'objection à ce qu'on l'enlève dans la mesure où c'est pratiquement une vérité de La Palice qui ressort dans le document, d'autant qu'on la trouve dans le document d'évaluation. Mais on peut attendre que la délégation française revienne pour confirmer elle-même mes propos.

CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed on that basis and take a decision on paragraph 17 rather than have other member countries speaking on behalf of France. If France wishes to speak, France can deal with this.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): En complément d'information, je me suis entretenu avec la délégation française qui est malheureusement retenue dans une autre Commission. Nous sommes tombés d'accord pour dire que cette phrase est inutile parce que, s'il s'agit de la règle générale de la génétique, nous savons tous ici que la sélection excessive dans toutes les espèces est négative. Cette phrase est donc inutile et ne nous apprend rien.

Mais concernant le cas spécifique de la trypanosomiase, et plus particulièrement la race trypanotolérante, il y a eu des problèmes dans le cadre des croisements qui constituent une méthode de sélection - spécifiquement dans le cadre des croisements. Nous avons eu à constater ces problèmes dans mon pays.

S'il s'agissait donc de problèmes de croisement comme cela a été évoqué dans le document de travail, la phrase aurait donc un sens. Mais nous étions bien tombés d'accord au contraire, dans le cadre de la sélection générale, sur le fait que la phrase était inutile et qu'on pouvait la supprimer.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Je crois que même si nous avançons vite, les jours passent et nous n'avons plus tellement de temps. Aussi je ne crois pas qu'il soit raisonnable de laisser ouverts plusieurs paragraphes des rapports qu'on est en train d'adopter. La phrase est là et elle pousse à une certaine curiosité. Nous nous sommes seulement pressés pour traiter les paragraphes, mais c'est aussi à notre avis une occasion pour savoir exactement de quoi retourne ce dont nous parlons. Notre ami de la Guinée nous a fait comprendre qu'il y avait dans cette salle un expert en la matière qui pourrait donner des explications. Je n'ai pas de position arrêtée sur le fait qu'il faut ou pas barrer cette phrase. Mais je crois qu'on peut donner la parole, si on le peut, à un expert qui pourrait nous clarifier la situation, nous dire ce qu'il en est, et nous donner des explications; et nous pourrions décider ensuite de supprimer ou de maintenir la phrase. Il est quand même bon de savoir ce qu'il en est exactement de la réalité sur le terrain. Y-a-t-il eu effectivement des preuves selon lesquelles la sélection excessive pourrait avoir des conséquences négatives et dans quel sens? Nous pourrions ensuite nous décider sur ce point sans attendre le retour de la délégation française par manque de temps.

CHAIRMAN: By the way, the Chair has asked the Secretariat if there is anyone nearby who is an expert. on this and the Chair is advised that there is no one handy.

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): Two very quick points, of grammar and of principle. Continued in French

Je pense que le français de la Guinée et du Gabon était très clair; il était impeccable, il était transparent. Le message du Gabon est très clair: on a vérifié, cela n'a pas été dit en Commission de la part de la Guinée. On nous apprend que c'est la France elle-même qui, au Comité de rédaction, a eu la créativité d'introduire ce point, mais cela n'avait pas été dit à la Commission et on peut se débarrasser de la phrase. Tout le monde est d'accord. Continue en anglais

As a consequence, if we do delete that sentence we have to take out the word 'other' from the next sentence: we have to say 'Some Member Nations', as a purely grammatical consequence. By the same token, but I am in your hands, Mr Chairman, as to when you want to return to that, there is another grammatical change in paragraph 2.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair was just going to ask Guinea whether your suggestion just made to them is acceptable.

What Canada simply did was to say to you that it needed a grammatical change in the next sentence,

Which is right. Let us get their response to that first. Is Guinea in accord with that?

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Guinée): Je suis entièrement d'accord avec le Canada.

CHAIRMAN: On that point does anybody object to proceeding?

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Monsieur le Président, je vous ai dit, dans ma dernière intervention, que je n'avais pas de position arrêtée. Si la Conférence convient du fait que, pour gagner du temps, on barre cette phrase, ce n'est pas moi qui ferai des difficultés. Mais j'ai cru comprendre qu'il y avait quelqu'un, à côté de vous, qui pourrait quand même nous dire ce qu'il en est de cette question.

CHAIRMAN: I had asked the Secretariat that very question and the answer was in the negative. If you do not believe me - Mr Shah, did I not just ask you if there was anybody expert on this subject up here?

V.J. SHAH (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): You did, Sir, and I said there was nobody at the time. There is now, if you wish.

CHAIRMAN: I also asked to find one. Where is he? Get him up here. We now have a certifiable expert. Are you aware of the discussion under way? Will you please make a statement that will expedite our work.

P. FINELLE (FAO Staff): Je crois que cette question pourrait facilement être réglée si l'on ajoutait quelques mots à la phrase proposée. Voici le texte que je propose: "Quelques Etats Membres ont déclaré qu'une sélection excessive basée uniquement sur des critères zootechniques pouvait avoir des conséquences négatives sur la résistance à la maladie".

Marc-André FREDETTE (Canada): I am all for creativity but that simply was not said. We cannot put in our record something that was not said. The opinion is undoubtedly valid; "we respect it; we take it into account. The Secretariat has heard the debate. Surely we can move along. It is costing us, in interpreters alone, not to mention the cost of our patience, far more than the issue. We are all agreed it was not said. Let us take it out of the record. The parties principally concerned are already agreed so let us move along and deal with the grammar adjustments that follow.

CHAIRMAN: Your point is very well taken. However, we did have a request from a member country for clarification and expert opinion which was available, not immediately present, but we were able to get it and it is a reasonable request and ought to be accommodated. Guinea, do you wish to move your point? It seems to be clear that we are ploughing the same ground. Your point was that something was not discussed, by report that it was. Let us delete the sentence. Is that point and why don't we vote on it?

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Guinée): C'est justement ce que je voulais dire. Il ne s'agit pas d'arranger des phrases; il s'agit de refléter ce qui a été effectivement dit. Cela n'a pas été dit; pourquoi cela figure-t-il dans le rapport? Éliminons-le, étant donné que cela ne nous apprend rien.

CHAIRMAN: Guinea's point is clearly stated, that in their judgement this was not said, the report should report what was said, it should not report what was not said and does anybody object to the motion by Guinea simply to solve this simply by deletion? Does anybody object to that? The Chair sees no objection. It is deleted. That paragraph is adopted with that change. We have now the Chairman of the Drafting Committee here and there were some items his presence was needed on and I would ask the Secretariat to check your notes and let us start taking those up in order.

On paragraph 22 we have a discussion or lack or agreement on the first sentence, the phrase "almost all" the amendment moves to substitute the words "almost all" for the word "many". Let us take that point and plough through. Would the Chairman of the Drafting Committee care to respond on paragraph 22? That particular paragraph was not discussed by the Drafting Committee.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): Le paragraphe 22 a été examiné, comme l'ensemble du rapport d'ailleurs, et je dois dire qu'il n'a posé aucun problème au niveau du Comité de rédaction. C'est pour cette raison que je voudrais inviter la Commission à accepter la proposition qui est faite ici. En tout cas, aucun membre du Comité de rédaction ne s'est opposé à la rédaction du paragraphe que vous avez devant vous. Nous pensions donc, par conséquent, qu'il ne poserait aucun problème ici non plus.

Bien entendu, la Commission reste souveraine, mais je ne peux que l'inviter à faire preuve de beaucoup de pragmatisme. Je dois dire qu'il s'agit là d'un rapport qui a été étudié avec beaucoup de minutie et que nous avons souhaité qu'il soit adopté non pas en bloc mais, en tout cas, sans difficulté.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Agradezco en esta ocasión al Representante del Congo por su explicación como Presidente del Comité de Redacción lo que en su oportunidad mencioné en relación a la propuesta de los Estados Unidos y, por lo tanto, podemos de nuevo apoyar el párrafo 22 tal y como fue discutido y propuesto por el Comité de Redacción.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): The intervention of the Chairman of the Drafting Group is understood and his comments could apply to any suggestions for changes which have been made earlier today. As a matter of fact our country was not a member of the Drafting Committee and we would like to reserve our right as a sovereign nation to comment upon the Report which is submitted to us. We think that the wording "almost all" gives a prejudicial bias to the context of this sentence, it is a judgement that is difficult to quantify. That is the reason for our suggestion that the Director-General had accepted many of the recommendations of the Evaluation team. It is our belief that there were other countries who also had reservations about the extent to which the Director-General had implemented recommendations with respect to evaluation, hence our suggestion that the wording be changed from "almost all" to "many of".

CHAIRMAN: Any other member wish to speak on this point? Let us resolve it.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): After hearing the explanation from the Chairman of the Drafting Committee our delegation supports the wording as originally presented in the text of the Drafting Committee.

Ms. Mery Cecilia HURTADO SALAMANCA (Colombia): La Delegación de Colombia está de acuerdo con el párrafo, para que éste no se modifique y nos atengamos a lo expresado en este momento por el Presidente del Comité de Redacción.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Notre délégation en tant que membre du Comité de rédaction souhaite vivement que le libellé du rapport reste en état. Je voudrais attirer l'attention sur le fait qu'en français, il y a le mot "presque" qui atténue; on n'a pas dit que la Conférence a accepté toutes les recommandations: il y a le mot "presque" qui atténue. Il y a quand même une nuance et le petit mot qui existe certainement dans les autres langues établit la balance nécessaire pour tenir compte du fait que certains autres délégués ont certainement dit, et qui ont constaté qu'il émet peut-être des doutes. On a mis le mot "presque" pour équilibrer. J'attire l'attention sur ce mot. Ceci étant j'invite tout le monde à en tenir compte et à accepter que la rédaction proposée puisse rester en état.

Sami SUNAA (Jordan) (original language Arabic): I think most of the recommendations were adopted earlier. I wished to propose using the word "most" but I think that I will withdraw this proposal and uphold the initial form of the sentence.

CHAIRMAN: We now have a third proposal.

Pedro Agostinho KANGA (Angola): Nous associons nos voix à celles qui nous ont précédés. Nous sommes en accord avec notre collègue du Congo. Je crois que le mot "presque" apporte une certaine atténuation. Je ne vois donc pas la raison pour laquelle on veut le changer par un autre mot qui serait la même chose. Le mot "presque" en français dit déjà que l'histoire est un peu atténuée. De ce fait, ma délégation insiste afin que cette phrase soit maintenue ainsi que cela nous a été présenté par le Comité de rédaction.

Roger P. LEWIS (United States of America): In the spirit of compromise, the United States withdraws its requests to change the wording "many of" and replaces it with the wording "most of".

CHAIRMAN: Any objection to "most of" ? The Chair sees none, the paragraph is adopted as amended.

We now have a point raised by Nicaragua on paragraph 29. The Secretariat advises me that your concern is about the fact that "Member Nations" in the Spanish text appears as "United States". My understanding was that you had more than a language problem with that paragraph, did you not?

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Sr. Presidente, no; no va más allá de la redacción: es en relación con la redacción, porque el párrafo comienza con "La Conferencia tomó nota", etcétera. Eso es correcto, en la primera oración. La segunda comienza diciendo "Otros formularon", refiriéndose a otros miembros, y a continuación se dice: "En cambio, pidieron a la FAO que preparara un nuevo mandato para el PASA". En la siguiente frase dice: "Pidieron también a la Secretaría que presentara", etcétera, y la última frase comienza con "La Conferencia recibió seguridades", etcétera. Hay una incongruencia de redacción meramente, porque no sabemos, en los párrafos intermedios, si nos referimos a la Conferencia, a algunos miembros, a la mayoría, a unos pocos, etcétera, al menos en el texto español. Se dice "En cambio, pidieron", y no se refiere a quiénes, y la siguiente frase dice "Pidieron también", pero no sabemos quiénes pidieron esto.

CHAIRMAN: Would the Chairman of the Drafting Committee clarify the points raised by the representative of Nicaragua?

Joseph TCHICAYA (Président, Comité de rédaction): J'ai le texte en français. Je crois que dans un premier temps on a parlé de la Conférence. La seconde phrase commence par "de nombreux pays membres ont jugé"... La troisième phrase commence par les mots "d'autres ont exprimé des réserves concernant la validité de cette structure" (ce sont les membres bien sûr). Ensuite, "ils ont demandé par contre à la FAO de préparer un nouveau mandat pour la PASA". Ce sont les mêmes pays qui ont invité le Secrétariat à soumettre cette proposition à l'examen du Comité de la Sécurité alimentaire mondiale. Je ne sais pas s'il y a des problèmes au niveau du texte en espagnol. Je croyais que le texte français était clair. C'est peut-être un problème de traduction.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Ahora tengo claras las ideas. El texto en español es el que tiene un problema, meramente de traducción. Porque cuando dice "En cambio, pidieron" refiriéndose a otros miembros, no se entiende; no se ve la relación con el párrafo anterior. Entonces, ese párrafo, en vez de "En cambio, pidieron", debería comenzar diciendo "Estos miembros pidieron"; es decir, los otros miembros de los que se habla en la frase anterior.

De modo que la tercera frase comenzaría diciendo: "Otros formularon reservas acerca de la idoneidad de la misma, especialmente las dimensiones de su personal". Punto y seguido. "Estos miembros pidieron", etcétera. Tal vez eso resolvería la contradicción del texto en español.

CHAIRMAN: No objection - approved. Does that complete the difficulties with paragraph 29?

Amador VELASQUEZ GARCIA-MONTERROSO (Perú): Sr. Presidente, había pedido la palabra antes de que usted aprobara el párrafo 29, y ya que este párrafo estaba en revisión, solicitar la inclusión de una frase, porque es algo que se dijo en el Tema 14, en esta Comisión, y también lo dijo Perú en la Plenaria, quien solamente desea que quede registrado.

En la quinta línea, comenzando desde abajo, después de "para que lo examinara", viene un punto y seguido, donde el Perú solicita que se incluya la siguiente frase: "Se sugirió también que la Secretaría estudiara la viabilidad para la creación de los Fondos Regionales de Seguridad Alimentaria."

Yo estoy seguro de que todos recordarán lo que se dijo en la Plenaria y lo que el Perú resumió en esta Comisión en el Tema 14. No pretende el Perú, obviamente, que se reproduzca lo que considera como objetivos, ni mecánica, ni estrategia de lo que serían los Fondos Regionales de Seguridad Alimentaria; sino, sencillamente, la sugerencia que se hizo, que es lo que pide que se incluya.

CHAIRMAN: Any objections to the adoption of paragraph 29? There being no objection-so ordered.

Marc-André FREÜETTE (Canada): A quick grammatical suggestion-with all the various manipulations that paragraph 2 underwent earlier, in the English text, what used to be the fifth line in the sentence started with the word "however". The word "however" has now lost its sense grammatically because it has nothing to do with the Ethiopian proposal which now precedes it in the text. I suggest we start the paragraph "A few member countries called for".

CHAIRMAN: You are correct. The Chair would presume there would be no objection to using correct English - so ordered. The report is adopted.

Paragraphs 1 to 30, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 1 à 30, ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 1 a 30, así enmendados, son aprobados

Draft Report of Commission II, Part 2, as amended, was adopted

Projet de rapport de la Commission II, 2ème partie, ainsi amendée, est adoptée

El proyecto de informe de la Comisión II, parte 2, así enmendado, es aprobado

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 3

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - 3ème PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 3

CHAIRMAN: We are now on Part 3. The Secretariat has a couple of announcements to make on it.

Michel SAVINI (Assistant Secretary, Commission II): There were just a couple of printing mistakes in REP/3 in several languages. For the English version on paragraph 9, on the fifth line, the two words "in particular" should come after "referred to", so the line should read "was also referred to, in particular, in relation to the environmental effects of projects."

In the Spanish version on paragraph 6, on the sixth line, one word is missing. At the end of the sixth line the sentence reading "Sin embargo, la Conferencia tomó nota" the word "complacida" is missing.

Dans la version française, à la page 4, le paragraphe 9 doit commencer par les mots suivants:

"Concernant le suivi des projets et notant les difficultés croissantes ...". Le reste sans changement. Les mots à ajouter sont: "Concernant le suivi des projets".

De même, à la page 6, les trois dernières lignes du paragraphe 16 - et cela uniquement pour la version française car les autres versions sont correctes - doivent constituer un nouveau paragraphe, le paragraphe 17.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair will go through the paragraphs and see where there is unanimity and declare those paragraphs approved. Where there is substantial discussion we will defer that to a later point.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ms Joan DUDIK-CAYOSO (United States of America): This is a point of order. The re is a document being circulated at the moment, and I would like to know its status and whether it has been through the Resolutions Committee before it gets distributed any further.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat does not know. The rules provide that it must go to the Resolutions Committee, and the rules also have a 24-hour hold on it. So there will be no discussion on this. It will have to be referred to the Resolutions Committee.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Then I would request that this not be distributed until it has suitably gone through the Resolutions Committee.

CHAIRMAN: Hold the distribution of that. We have got enough confusion without inviting something new. The point is well taken.

PARAGRAPHS 1 to 17

PARAGRAPHERS 1 à 17

PARRAFOS 1 a 17

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 1, has any country any objections to paragraph 1? It is adopted.

Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 - the USA and Belgium have an objection. Paragraph 5 - no objections approved. Paragraph 6 - no objections, approved. Paragraph 7 - objection. Paragraph 8 - there is objection. Paragraph 9 - there is objection. Paragraph 10 has an objection. Paragraph 11, are there any objections?

Paragraph 11 is adopted. Paragraph 12 - objection; paragraph 13 - objections. Paragraph 14 is adopted. Paragraph 15 - .any objections?: Paragraph 15 adopted. Paragraph 16 - are there any objections? There are objections. Paragraph 17 - no objections, adopted.

Paragraphs 1-17 not concluded

Les paragraphes 1-17 sont en suspens

Los párrafos 1 - 17 quedan pendientes

PARAGRAPHS 18 to 28

PARAGRAPHERS 18 à 28

PARRAFOS 18 a 28

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 18, any objections on 18? Adopted. 19? Objection. 20? I see no objection. 20 is adopted. 21? Objection. 22? Adopted. 23? Adopted. 24? No objection; adopted. 25? Objection. 26? No objection; adopted. Objection. 27? No objection; adopted. 28? Adopted.

Paragraphs 18 - 28 not concluded

Les paragraphes 18 - 28 sont en suspens

Los párrafos 18 - 28 quedan pendientes

CHAIRMAN: The time for discussion for this morning has expired. Once again, we would admonish you that we should try to be here at 2:30 to commence business. We are adjourned until 2:30.

The meeting rose at 12.30 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.30 horas

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACIÓN DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/23

Twenty-seventh Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

TWENTY-THIRD MEETING
VINGT-TROISIEME SEANCE
23ª SESIÓN

(25 November 1987)

The Twenty-third Meeting was opened at 15.15 hours
Fred J. Eckert , Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La vingt-troisième séance est ouverte à 15 h 15, sous la
présidence de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

Se abre la 23 sesión a las 15.15 horas, bajo la presidencia
de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)

ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)

APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART 3 (continued)

PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PARTIE 3 (suite)

PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE 3 (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary advises me that we now have a quorum. The Chair will observe that, true to form, we are forty minutes late. Time is running out and we have to deal with serious business. We are going to pursue the Draft Report of Commission II - Part 3, where we left off and we will continue until four o'clock. There will then be a recess because the report of the Contact Group is expected to be ready by then. We presume that it will be ready and can be distributed and read. At 4.30 p.m. we will reconvene and take up that issue, which is probably the most important one in the deliberations we have had over the last two weeks or so. Also it is clearly the most important pressing issue to be dealt with in the remaining few hours.

PARAGRAPHS 1-17 (continued)

PARAGRAPHEs 1-17 (suite)

PARRAFOS 1-17 (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: At this point we have on Part 3 a number of paragraphs to be discussed. If objections are raised we will return to them in order. When we went through paragraph 2 this morning there was an objection raised in regard to it and we now return to it in order to discuss the objection.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): My problem with paragraph 2 was that my delegation is not particularly concerned about the decline in FAO's share of UNDP programmes. There is not a fixed share, and so I should like to propose an amendment to this text that says: "in noting the decline in the FAO share of the UNDP-funded programmes".

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections?

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Nous avons eu l'occasion de souligner, lors de nos diverses interventions, la nécessité pour le PNUD de recourir, pour les projets dans les domaines de l'agriculture et du développement rural, par priorité à la FAO. Or nous sommes très préoccupés parce que le PNUD aurait trop tendance à exécuter lui-même un certain nombre de projets, alors que ce n'est pas sa fonction principale. Nous avons eu l'occasion d'insister sur la nécessité de recourir aux organismes des Nations Unies opérationnels, et notamment à la FAO, pour l'exécution des projets agricoles, ce qui me paraît tout à fait normal.

En ce qui nous concerne, et c'est le cas d'un certain nombre de délégations, - en tout cas c'est vrai pour le Royaume de Belgique - nous sommes préoccupés de la situation.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): If I recall allright, during the discussions the observations made by the UNDP was that the decline of the FAO share in UNDP is mainly a reflection of the priority of the recipient governments - that it is the recipient governments which decide how much the UNDP should put into the agricultural sectors of the various countries. This is the position we would wish: that both FAO and UNDP should not dictate to recipient countries how much of the aid resources should go to one particular sector. Therefore we would concur that it be noted that there is a decline in UNDP input and that we should express concern that we should be allowed to say where the resources should go.

Carlos Moyses ANDREOTTI (Brésil): La delegation du Brésil voudrait soutenir la proposition de la délégation de la Belgique.

Milutin TAPAVICKI (Yugoslavia): I would like also to support the expressed view of the delegate of Belgium and I would like to retain the text presented by the Drafting Committee.

Gerald Phirinyane KHOJANE (Lesotho): We would also like to associate ourselves with the sentiments expressed by the delegation of Belgium.

Ibrahim KABA (Guinée): Monsieur le Président, notre délégation exprime son soutien à la déclaration faite par l'honorable délégué du Royaume de Belgique.

CHAIRMAN: The United States again has the Chair's attention, but before we recognize the United States if there is any member country who has not yet spoken we will give the priority.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I am aware that the issue of UNDP's Office of Project Execution has been a continuing issue in this body. The United States could accept language that noted the activities of the UNDP's Office of Project Execution. Since the Office of Project Execution is described in UNDP documents very much like FAO's TCP programme in terms of its quick response time, we could not accept that we note with concern the activities of a small office of UNDP which implements less than six percent of the resources of the UNDP.

CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else? I am trying to arrive at some sort of consensus here but we have a clearly conflicting view. The Chair will have to ask for a division by a show of hands in that circumstance.

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): As you have said, there are conflicting views here, but may I venture to make a proposal, and it will be as follows: that after "expressing" we put "generally", "In expressing generally its concern about the decline in the FAO share", and I suppose here "generally" will take care of the US concern; they are not included in the "generally". This is just a try.

CHAIRMAN: I understand, United States, is that acceptable?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): No, Mr Chairman, because we do not have a general concern. I could make an alternative proposal, that we just add a sentence that says something like what Kenya said, that some members pointed out that sovereign governments decide what agencies should implement UNDP projects according to what is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone object to the United States position as just stated, which was in support of what Kenya said?

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): On. constato qu'on a constaté, mais je crois que l'on constate que l'on ne constate point, et qu'il ne s'agit pas ici en l'occurrence ici ni de CTPD ni de PCT. Il s'agit du Programme ordinaire du PNUD. Beaucoup de pays ont insisté pour que le PNUD continue à servir dans le rôle et les fonctions qui lui sont attribués, c'est-à-dire de ne pas être sa propre agence d'exécution, et dans le domaine des projets agricoles de s'adresser aux organisations spécialisées des Nations Unies. Or, incontestablement, dans le domaine de l'agriculture, la FAO est l'Organisation privilégiée des Nations Unies. Il me paraît normal que l'on puisse être préoccupé du fait que le PNUD exécute lui-même une partie de ce programme.

Quant à l'option faite que c'est au pays à le déterminer, nous sommes d'accord que c'est aux pays à le déterminer. Encore faut-il dans les discussions que le PNUD s'efforce de faire participer la FAO à ses discussions. La FAO a incontestablement la capacité de réponse dans le cadre des cycles de programmation pour exécuter les projets financés par le PNUD.

CHAIRMAN: Belgium has made it clear that it supports the text as it is. The United States has an alternative proposal

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): I would just like to say that I support the amendment as proposed by the United States and, in fact, by the delegation of Kenya. It reflects very much what I have heard the UNDP representative say in this forum.

CHAIRMAN: At this time could the United States state its suggestion, the statement in support of what Kenya said? Then we will ask for a decision by a show of hands.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): What the text would be, we would not change the "in expressing its concern", that would stay. Then there would be at the end of the paragraph a sentence that reads as follows: "Some members pointed out that sovereign governments decide what agencies should implement UNDP projects according to which is appropriate."

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? Belgium objects to that.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): On utilise l'expression "certains membres". Or c'est tous les membres qui sont d'accord sur le fait que les pays souverains organisent eux-mêmes leurs programmes de développement. Il n'y a pas de pays qui déclarent le contraire, et qu'il faille mettre des pays sous tutelle. Ce que nous voudrions c'est que dans le cadre de l'élaboration des cycles de programmation et dans l'exécution des programmes du PNUD, la FAO soit l'organisme privilégié pour exécuter les projets dans le domaine agricole. Aucun pays ne viendra dire que la souveraineté des pays pourrait être atteinte de la moindre façon en ce qui concerne leur pouvoir de décision. Leur dire que certains pays ont soulevé le principe de la souveraineté des pays me paraît un texte inacceptable pour l'ensemble des pays.

CHAIRMAN: Are you proposing to change it to "all countries"?

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Tout à fait d'accord: "tous les pays".

CHAIRMAN: Would the United States accept that? Is there any objection to the United States proposal as amended by Belgium? There being no objection, it is adopted. Without further objection paragraph 2 is adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 was also contested.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I take responsibility for contesting this paragraph and the reason is the words "with satisfaction". My government believes that the funding for UN System technical assistance should go through the UNDP, so we are not particularly in favour or satisfied with the idea of trust funds. So we would like to drop those two words.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Il y a parmi les membres de la FAO un certain nombre de pays qui travaillent depuis des années à l'aide de fonds fiduciaires et qui sont très satisfaits de la formule. Si on veut supprimer les termes "la Conférence", on peut dire "une large majorité de pays a noté avec satisfaction...", ce qui veut dire qu'une petite minorité se dissocie de cette majorité.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone object to saying "some countries noted with satisfaction" - "A majority of countries noted with satisfaction"? Is there any objection to that? There being no objection, that is adopted. Are there any other points on paragraph 3?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Many countries also praised the allocation of the share of the programme to Africa and I would like to add at the bottom of the paragraph "and to the proportion of the programme allocated to Africa".

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered. Are there any further points on paragraph 3? There being none, paragraph 3 is adopted as amended.

There is an objection raised to paragraph 4. The Chair did not note who objected at different points. On some there were more than one. So when we come to a paragraph under dispute please indicate.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Nous avons eu l'occasion, lors de la discussion du Programme du PCT et à diverses reprises, de souligner le rôle du programme de coopération technique.

Je proposerais d'ajouter à la 4ème ligne: "le PCT aide à réaliser de petits projets catalytiques qui permettent la formulation et la mise au point de projets importants et qui engendrent souvent une expansion à plus long terme..."

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I do not object. I just wonder if it could be read one more time.

CHAIRMAN: Belgium, could you please repeat your proposal slowly?

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Voici la rédaction que je propose: "le Programme de coopération technique aide à réaliser de petits projets catalytiques, qui permettent la formulation et la mise au point de projets importants qui engendrent..."

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? That language is adopted. Are there any further points on paragraph 4?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I would like to propose the addition of the following sentence at the end of paragraph 4: "Some delegations called for more thorough assessment of TCP projects."

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections? If there are no objections, it is adopted.

Any further points on paragraph 4? No, so it is adopted. The Chair's record shows that the next paragraph in context is paragraph 7.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I would like to insert the word "more" before "candid and balanced", so the first sentence would read "The Conference noted with appreciation that Chapter Two, covering the assessment of field project performance, provided a more candid and balanced account".

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Si entendí bien la enmienda que está proponiendo la distinguida Delegada de Estados Unidos, se diría en la primera frase "La Conferencia tomó nota con agrado de que en el Capítulo Dos, relativo a la evaluación de los proyectos de campo, se describían de forma más objetiva y equilibrada". Yo creo que esto implicaría que en algún momento no se hizo de forma suficientemente objetiva, de manera que me parece que estamos haciendo un juicio de valor si incluimos la palabra "más". Yo preferiría que no se incluyera.

CHAIRMAN: Argentina, in the English language at least that is a problem, you could have potential interpretation either way because if you say it is a more candid and balanced account, yes, it could be taken to connote as you have just stated. If you say it is a candid and balanced account, the very fact that you are saying that it is a candid and balanced account implies that previously it was not.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS(Colombia): Sr. Presidente, muy respetuosamente le pregunto: ¿Puedo referirme al párrafo seis?

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 6 was adopted earlier today; your country was represented at the time that it was. We are going to have to go on with our work. We are not going to open closed doors. Paragraph 7, any more work on paragraph 7?

Mme Anna Teresa FRITTELLI ANNIBALDI (Italie): Je veux tout simplement me rallier à ce que vient de dire la déléguée de l'Argentine en ce sens que je suis pour la conservation du texte. tel que le Comité de rédaction l'a approuvé, étant donné que la majorité des membres de la Commission n'ont pas mis en cause la question de la franchise. Or, si nous ajoutons le mot "plus", cela pourrait faire penser qu'un jugement de valeur est effectivement porté, ce qui ne me semble pas le cas.

K.N. ARDHANAREESWARAN (India): My delegation feels that there is no need to add the word "more". We can leave the text as it is.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Au Comité de rédaction, cette phrase a fait l'objet d'une très longue négociation et si l'on est arrivé à accepter ce texte, c'est pour plusieurs raisons. Nous souhaiterions que l'on apprécie le consensus qui a été obtenu au sein du Comité de rédaction et que l'on laisse cette phrase telle quelle.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): On this point my delegation was among those who indicated in the debate that we felt that the evaluations and assessments section of this Report was progress over previous such Reports, and that is part of the reason why the "more" inserted there. We also indicated that we would have wished for a greater attention to certain aspects of the assessment process, so my delegation had problems with the word "balanced" and I chose to propose the addition of the word "more" because it seemed to be the simplest way of "dealing with our problem. I think the Chairman is right, that if you just say "candid and balanced" one wonders what came before and I think that Argentina is also right, that if you say "more candid and balanced", well that obviously means last year or two years ago the Report was less. I can propose a language which is more complicated and says that "the Conference recognised progress in assessing field projects" but frankly it would facilitate our work if this Group could accept the addition of "more".

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, United States but we do seem to have a dispute on the addition of "more" and I presume that that remains, no one has indicated a withdrawal of that. In the interests of time, the Chair will suggest that anyone could interpret the language presently there as an implied statement that there were previously problems of the lack of candour or a lack of balance and the chair would also observe that the very fact that the phrase "with appreciation" is in the sentence indicates that it is greeted favourably as a change. One would know that candour and balance would be expected as opposed to being appreciated and the very phrase "with appreciation" adds to that weight but we can spend as much time or as little time as you wish on this.

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Mi delegación no se opone a que la Conferencia o algunos Estados Miembros expresen que encuentran un progreso o encuentran un avance en la manera en que se describen las dificultades con que se había tropezado. Lo que no quisiera es que se calificara ese avance mediante la adopción de la palabra "más" previa a "objetiva", que aparentemente en inglés está escrita como candida o algo así. O sea, que si existe otra formulación que la distinguida delegada de Estados Unidos pueda ofrecernos, sin que ello implique un juicio de valor con relación a la objetividad o al balance de estos análisis o de estos estudios, estamos dispuestos a escucharla.

K.N. ARDHANAREESWARAN (India): I would suggest a compromise formulation; in the place of the words "candid and balanced" can we have the expression "useful account", "a useful account of the difficulties faced in programming formulation".

CHAIRMAN: The Chair might suggest that you could say "the Conference noted". I think that the United States and Argentina would seem to be the ones disputing this, they seem to have some kind of an agreement on the word "progress" as an acceptable middle ground and perhaps that might be a way out of this particular linguistic impasse. Do the United States have any alterations?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Well I always admire the ability of the representative of India in those kinds of meetings to come up with useful words and in this case I could accept "useful" but. the formulation I had made that had "progress" was something like this, "the Conference noted with appreciation progress indicated in Chapter 2 in assessing the field project performance and noting the difficulties," so either one would be acceptable to my delegation.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN-GOMEZ (Venezuela): Yo estaría perfectamente de acuerdo si la palabra no fuera "useful". Continues in English:

"Useful" means nothing because "useful" is everything that you can do in any moment which is useful.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it is the opposite of useless!

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN-GOMEZ (Venezuela): Entonces voy a hablarle en español para que me entienda. Quando hablamos en forma objetiva estamos calificando de una manera específica lo que es realmente objetivo. Pero, entre "objetivo" y "useful" hay una distancia tan grande porque "útil", que es útil. Entonces, yo creo que la atinada e inteligente intervención de la India para mediar, en este caso no está siendo muy favorable para quienes defienden la objetividad de los informes.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair might suggest that an alternative would be to say that "the Conference noted with appreciation" - or without it, it doesn't matter - "certain progress, in that Chapter 2" and then leave the rest exactly as it is which seems to inject the word "progress" that Argentina wished as an alternative and that the United States from what I understood, accepted. Could we reach agreement on that? The Chair was just suggesting that on the basis of what people had stated. Possibly an alternative would be simply to say that "the Conference noted with appreciation that certain progress, in that" and the rest. exactly as it is.

Sra.Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): En lugar de decir "algún adelanto", yo preferiría decir: "tomó nota con agrado del adelanto logrado en el Capítulo Dos, en que se describían de forma objetiva y equilibrada". Porque "algún adelanto" es casi despectivo en español.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection to that?

Barthélémy BOUASSA-MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Pour éviter de discuter longuement sur ce qu'il y a à mettre avant "franche et utile", ne serait-il pas possible de remplacer les mots "franche et équilibrée" par le mot "objective" - qui relève de l'objectivité, bien sur?

Selon ma proposition, ma phrase se lirait donc comme suit:

"La Conférence a noté avec satisfaction que le chapitre DEUX, qui porte sur l'évaluation des résultats des projets de terrain, donne une analyse objective des difficultés rencontrées dans la programmation...". Le reste sans changement.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Not to object, just to clarify that we would be talking about "an objective account". If the language is "an objective account" I would note with appreciation the suggestion and accept it.

CHAIRMAN: Gabon, the question the Chair put to you was do you concur with that, the word "account" added? Could you indicate yes or no.

Barthélémy BOUASSA MOUSSADJI (Gabon): A la place d'analyse? Je n'ai pas bien compris.

CHAIRMAN: Okay United States, could you...? Thank God we are not writing the Ten Commandments here:

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I was listening in translation and I do not know the translation I got or the interpretation was first the word "analysis", "an objective analysis", and then it was substituted, an objective account. My delegation could accept "an objective account" but since some of us complain that there was not an analysis in this paper, the word "analysis" would be hard to accept.

CHAIRMAN: Gabon, is that satisfactory with you, the word "account", "an objective account"?

Barthélémy BOUASSA MOUSSADJI (Gabon): Pour ce qui est de la version française, "analyse" existe et je pense, pour ma part, qu'il ne sert à rien de changer cela.

CHAIRMAN: Why do you not leave the French as it is so long as you do not object to the word "account" in English. Have you any objection to that suggestion by the United States?

Sra. MÓNICA DEREGIBUS (Argentina): ¿Podría hacer creer por la Secretaría la formulación última que se está tratando de acordar?

CHAIRMAN: That is a good suggestion. Secretary, will you please read.

Michel SAVINI (Assistant Secretary, Commission II): The text will now read: "The Conference noted with appreciation the progress made in the assessment of field project performance, providing an objective account of the difficulties faced in the programming" and the rest without change.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any problem with that? The Chair sees no objection. Netherlands, you have an objection?

Ton A.J.M- OOMEN (Netherlands): One word in the third line from the bottom of the paragraph, the word "were". We felt yesterday during the Drafting Committee that the word "were" should be "are" but I am just asking if that is in the right tense?

CHAIRMAN: You are right. It should be the present tense. Is there any problem with that? No problem, is there any other point of paragraph 7? There being no objection, paragraph 7 is adopted.

Paragraph 8 was in dispute. Who had objections to paragraph 8?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I should like to add the following language to the end of paragraph 8. After the word "studies" I would add: "while still others stressed the importance of external evaluations".

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? There being no objection it is adopted. Are there any further points on paragraph 8? There being none, paragraph 8 is adopted.

The next paragraph to which there was objection - paragraph 9.

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): It may be known to some that most members of the United Kingdom delegation are from our Overseas Development and Administration. For this reason we are well aware of the burden placed upon developing countries in meeting the local costs on development projects, as well as the difficulties faced by such countries in finding resources to continue such projects once external assistance is phased out. For this reason we should like to propose an addition to paragraph 9 which we believe reflects the views of some member nations which spoke on this Agenda Item. The proposal we should like to make is that after the word "for" in line 3 we should like to add the following: "project design to include consideration of recurrent costs and for projects to promote".

Sra. MÓNICA DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Lamentablemente no entiendo la inclusión que está pidiendo el Reino Unido. Pediría yo, si es posible, que se me aclarara qué tiene que ver poner delante de "promover un desarrollo autosostenido y el examen de los costos". Me parece que son dos cosas absolutamente diferentes.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I am glad to answer that question. I think it was actually the delegate of Kenya who, in our debate, raised the problem that in the reports there is discussion of the problem of follow-on. The problem of follow-on is what happens after external assistance ceases. Many times projects cannot be maintained and the delegation of Kenya called attention to this. It is of concern also to my delegation, as indeed it is to the United Kingdom, that in the very beginning project design should consider how much it will cost to maintain a project after external assistance ceases, otherwise the development is not self-sustained and is in fact continually dependent on external resources that are not always available.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): ¿Podría la Secretaría leernos cómo y dónde sería insertada la propuesta del Reino Unido?

CHAIRMAN: It is not up to the Secretariat to make recommendations of what to insert. It is up to the member country which proposes it and the Chair would have to yield to the member country to clarify. I believe they stated it at the end. However, would you please state where the United Kingdom proposed to insert that language.

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): Certainly, at line 3 of paragraph 9, it would read as follows after the comma: "The Conference emphasized the need for project design to include consideration of recurrent costs and for projects to promote self-sustained development".

CHAIRMAN: Is there still objection to that?

McDonald Phillip BENJAMIN (Dominica): As a person involved with projects I have a lot of sympathy with the United Kingdom proposal on this matter and I think it is an area on which the Government has to focus much more and this has to be done at the stage of project design.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): We are agreeable to the United Kingdom proposal except that we would wish to leave out the "consideration" and to say "to include an accurate forecast of post project recurrent costs", the rest would continue as it is.

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): That is excellent and we fully accept it.

CHAIRMAN: Any objection to that?

Jaime GARCIA BADIAS (España): Si nuestra delegación ha entendido bien la propuesta del distinguido representante del Reino Unido, él proponía hacer un cambio de la palabra "promover" por "mejorar". En español el sentido de estas dos palabras significa cosas muy diferentes y yo propondría, nuestra delegación desearía que se mantuviera la palabra "promover" porque eso quiere decir cosas nuevas, iniciativas nuevas; sin embargo, "mejorar" en castellano, en español significa continuar con cosas ya iniciadas.

En este sentido creo que es mucho más rico de cara al futuro el sentido de la palabra "promover" que es el que había originariamente en el párrafo 9.

CHAIRMAN: I think that is what the United Kingdom has settled on. Is there a problem?

E.V. WADE-BROWN (United Kingdom): No, that was understood.

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 9 is adopted. The next contested paragraph is paragraph 10.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I should like to add a sentence to this paragraph. It would be the second sentence from the bottom. I will read the preceding sentence in the middle of the paragraph and then the addition: "however, a few member nations emphasized the need to undertake a more global review of the management of field programmes, as part of a wider package of reforms which they were proposing". Then comes the addition "some also highlighted continuing problems in several areas, for example, project back-stopping, quality of experts and their ability to transfer skills".

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Antes de hacer una propuesta que tenemos sobre el párrafo 10 quisiéramos que la Secretaría o el Presidente del Comité de Redacción nos informara si lo que ha propuesto ahora la delegada de Estados Unidos fue planteado aquí en la Comisión cuando se discutió este tema.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry we have already adopted that, but if you want we would be glad to ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to respond to your question. Was that discussed?

Joseph TCHICAYA (President, Comité de Rédaction): Ce paragraphe a fait l'objet de discussion au sein du Comité de rédaction. Il a été amendé et nous pensons que toutes les idées sont relevées dans le texte qui vous est présenté. Donc, les idées que l'on propose ici sont nouvelles et nous n'en avons pas débattu au niveau du Comité de rédaction.

CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question Colombia? Of course, it is for the whole Body to write this report.

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): I was about to speak on the same lines as the distinguished representative of Colombia, as clarified by the distinguished Chairman of the Drafting Group. Almost all the amendments which have been introduced to paragraph 4, 7, 8, 9 and now 10 are focussing continually on criticism of whatever has taken place. It looks as though it is adding something which has not found its way at the time of the Drafting Committee Meetings. We accept with you that when the Conference meets we reserve the right to add something more to these additions. In the interest of work we do not wish to make comments on all these additions now.

CHAIRMAN: Anymore comments on that paragraph? There are no other points? Paragraph 10 as amended is adopted. Colombia, can you please state your objections at the time? We are trying to move along expeditiously. If you could raise your flag, or signal it would help. We will re-open 10 -do you have a point on 10?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Gracias por su lección, Sr. Presidente. Siempre aprende uno, por muy viejo que sea en esta Organización. En primer lugar, la distinguida colega de los Estados Unidos presentó una propuesta, sobre la cual yo pedí una aclaración; fue suministrada por el Presidente del Comité de Redacción. Otro colega aclaró también la situación, y usted decidió que se adoptara esa propuesta. Nosotros creemos que no se debe adoptar. Y, después de que usted resuelva esto, le pedimos que nos dé la palabra, porque tenemos una propuesta para el párrafo 10.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair assures you, and had you been present and participating earlier, you would have heard me clearly state that in the interest of time we will go through this in as 'expeditious a manner as possible. We went through to try to identify those paragraphs which were non-controversial. We rapidly adopted them. We then singled out all those paragraphs in which there was some conflict. We said that we would return here in an orderly fashion and go through them. We on more than one occasion explained that we would try to move fast, but any time that we inadvertently close things and somebody wanted to come in a couple of minutes later, we would always go back and reopen. And that is what we are doing. All the Chair was pointing out was that while the Chair is saying "without objection" or "is there any objection?", at that time say there is an objection. That was the point. Please state your proposal. Paragraph 10 is wide open.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Cuando usted hizo un dictamen semejante sobre el párrafo 6, nosotros lo acogimos y no intervenimos en el párrafo 6. Si vamos a intervenir sobre el párrafo 10, es porque usted lo ha citado entre los párrafos que están pendientes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Did you wish us to ask the Chairman to clarify whether that was discussed at the Drafting Committee or not?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Proponemos que al final del párrafo 10 se agregue la siguiente frase: "Las Delegaciones de América Latina y el Caribe pidieron que se incrementaran las actividades de campo en los países de esa región". Gracias.

CHAIRMAN: There is a proposal by Colombia. Is there any objection to it? The Chair sees no objection. Colombia's proposal is adopted. The Chair now recognizes Libya.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): In the same sense, I would like to say what was said by Colombia with regard to the United States' proposal. Therefore, we would like some clarification. We think that this sentence now being proposed is not within the purview or competence of this Committee because it was not discussed. I think that we should not accept the sentence which the United States delegate has proposed be added.

CHAIRMAN: For a point of clarification, the report is not what we discussed. It is not a report on what the Drafting Committee discussed or did not discuss. It is a report on the whole procedure. For example, Colombia just moved an amendment here. It has every right to do so. It was concurred in. There was no objection to it. Colombia would not have been out of order, as you seem to be suggesting, if the Drafting Committee did not happen to discuss whether the Latin American group did that. What Colombia said is that, as a point of fact, in the discussions the Latin American group did say that particular statement that Colombia said. Now if the Drafting Committee did not happen to think about that while they were discussing, that does not mean that we are out of order in discussing it. It is perfectly in order; perfectly.

Sarai SUNAA (Jordan): I am sorry; I have to agree with my colleague from Libya that the role of the Drafting Committee really is to collect all the information, put it together and come up with something that has been discussed, really, here. It is not up to one delegation or two just to change the whole subject and make it look as if many countries or fewer countries - if there is any system that one country does not approve or goes with the majority - you cannot say one country, for example, or two countries decided that and that and that. Just let us be more clear because the interpretation of such reports is very important later on. I do not agree with what has been proposed by the United States.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I agree with Libya and Jordan. This report should reflect what took place in the debate. Frankly, I find that this report is basically not a fair, balanced report of what took place in the debate. As the delegate of India noted, the kind of things we are adding in are things that we felt were important, that were not included in the report. Frankly, the Drafting Committee worked very hard under tremendous time pressure, so I really think they did the very best job they could and I welcome the chance to have a second look at it. My delegation - and we were not the only ones - specifically highlighted particular problems in project management. The sentence that I proposed does not say that everyone agreed; it said that some also highlighted particular problems. Those problems are even highlighted in the document itself in the section on evaluation, page 42, paragraph 2.30. I would like it to be reflected in this report because I think otherwise the report will not reflect the debate.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Je voudrais intervenir plutôt sur la proposition de la délégation de la Colombie.

CHAIRMAN: " Excuse me, but we are going to have to have some order. The Chair has ruled that the Colombian proposal has been adopted. Now we have got to have a certain flexibility in being able to go back when somebody did not hear us say that the debate was closed, and reopen and be flexible on that. But Colombia's proposal is clearly adopted. We cannot go back and resurrect it because Colombia would be perfectly in order to object to it, which would block that. We cannot resurrect that.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Je voulais intervenir plus tôt sur la proposition de la délégation de la Colombie. Cette proposition a sa place dans le paragraphe 6.

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 6 was adopted previously.

Excuse me, but Madagascar has raised a very pertinent point that in the language in paragraph 6 it does say that regret was expressed at the low share of field projects in Latin America and the Caribbean, which was the point of Colombia's. The point seems to be that we have already plowed that ground.

Sra. Mónica DEREGBUS (Argentina): La Delegación argentina también ha dicho cosas, durante el debate de todos los temas que hemos tratado en esta Comisión, y, no obstante, no está tratando de que en cada párrafo se incluya su punto de vista. Creo que las Delegaciones aquí tenemos que tener, en ese sentido, un poco de responsabilidad y no intentar modificar todos los párrafos con cosas que hemos dicho durante el debate. Porque, de todas maneras, el Comité de Redacción ha hecho lo que ha podido con el conjunto del debate; y si cada uno de los Estados Miembros quiere poner su párrafo particular en cada párrafo particular del informe, no vamos a terminar.

Ms Anna-Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): As Finland was not a part. of the Drafting group, I think that from that point of view I may raise some additional points here just for the benefit of the Commission. I think that the proposal by the United States is just a factual statement, and my delegation would like to support it just because of the fact that this is a common problem. We all know that in our bilateral programmes and in programmes with the other multilateral agencies the same problem occurs. So this is not something which is specifically problematic to FAO. I also believe that this is in the very nature of the changing requirements of technical cooperation when we face these kinds of problems. I do not see that this is any kind of a negative statement, but just a kind of factual statement of the processes, where all the countries are when we deal with technical cooperation issues. So I hope that we will keep this fact in mind when we discuss the United States amendment.

CHAIRMAN: If there is any country which has not spoken, we always try to give preference.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Espero que, al referirme solamente a mi propuesta, pueda ayudarle para que usted pase luego a Estados Unidos. El colega de Madagascar ha señalado que en el párrafo 6 hay y? una referencia a la posición de las Delegaciones latinoamericanas, y recordará usted que yo no pude referirme a ese párrafo por acogerme a su dictamen. Pero en el párrafo 6 solamente aparece la mitad de la posición nuestra; ahí lamentamos la escasa participación. Con la adición que proponemos al párrafo 10, pedimos que se incremente la participación. Son dos conceptos distintos. Indudablemente, desde el punto de vista estético, habría sido todo mejor en el párrafo 6; pero, como no fue posible, lo hemos propuesto en el párrafo 10, que termina hablando del incremento de las actividades de campo en los países.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other points?

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): En fait ma proposition était d'inclure cette phrase de la délégation de Colombie au paragraphe 6. Je n'avais pas dit qu'elle était déjà incluse. Ma proposition était donc sur le paragraphe 6 et d'inclure cette proposition à sa place dans ce paragraphe.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone have an objection to reopening paragraph 6 and putting Colombia's statement in paragraph 6? Nobody? So ordered.

The Chairman must caution that we have to agree not to keep going back and reopening closed territory or we will never know when we have concluded. If we close down a paragraph we should try within reason to keep it closed so nobody at any time can jump back and forth all over the place or we will not finish any work. We still have paragraph 10 to finish. At this point, to clarify the debate, it would facilitate things if the United States of America would restate its proposal, because that is the remaining point of contention on this paragraph as the Chair understands it.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): The addition would be to the second to the last sentence. It would read, "some delegations also highlighted continuing problems in several areas, for example project back-stopping, quality of experts and their ability to transfer skills".

CHAIRMAN: On the proposal moved by the United States of America and seconded by Finland, is there on this point any objection?

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): This reference in this paragraph, in order to facilitate our work we agree on condition that we say, "a few members of delegations" or "few delegations" highlighted. If the delegation of the United States feels it has referred to this in its statement during the discussion, we have to say, "a few delegations have highlighted".

CHAIRMAN: I believe the word put forward by the United States was the word "some", or was it "a few"? There is a different meaning between "few" and "some", but there is not a different meaning between "some" and "a few", but if you do not have the "of" there it has a different meaning. I suggest the United States would not agree to "only a few".

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I would only say that I am very surprised at the desire of some of us to try to gloss over problems that are problems we all deal with. I can live with "a few". I am surprised that in this body it seems to be unacceptable to say things which are said out loud with no embarrassment in United Nations bodies. These kinds of things are in UNEP documents, and FAO has participated in discussion of these problems, but for some reason in Rome it is an embarrassment to discuss them. I am willing to end up and live with "a few".

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you mean "too few".

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I would be happy to say "too few".

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Señor Presidente, apruebo la propuesta de compromiso presentada por Libia.

Marcos I. NIETO LARA (Cuba): Señor Presidente, modificación introducida en el sentido de que se diga unas pocas Delegaciones, estaríamos dispuestos a aceptarla; pero una vez más hacemos un llamado a esta Comisión para significar que el Comité de Redacción trabajó con mucho equilibrio, tuvo una composición muy bien equilibrada, trabajó intensamente con una excelente voluntad para recoger lo que se dijo en el debate, y nos parece que estamos deteniendo nuestras labores quizá examinando puntos que ya fueron debidamente discutidos.

Ahora, dicutíamos si se ponía unos pocos, algunos, muchos, etc.. Estos aspectos fueron previamente discutidos en el Comité de Redacción, incluso llegaron a señalarse específicamente las Delegaciones que habían hecho referencia a tal o cual tema. Pudiéramos, llegado el caso hablar de cantidades respecto a tal o cual planteamiento, porque así fue examinado cuidadosamente en el Comité de Redacción.

Hacemos, Señor Presidente, un llamado nuevamente para tratar de avanzar mucho más en nuestro trabajo y ofrecer, y otorgar un tanto más de confianza al Comité de Redacción que hasta ahora ha contado con la confianza de esta Comisión.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair cannot deny member countries the opportunity to speak on these additions. The Chair sympathizes with your admonishing us to get on with the work and for that reason the Chair has opened each meeting and pointed out that nobody turns up for work. We need to get on with it, true, but it is not within my power to keep people from debating an "as" or "but" or "how", or "when" or any of these sorts of things. Does the United States wish to amend this to "too few".

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): If that is a serious question and this body will accept this language, I will be happy to accept it.

CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to "too few"? No objection. Paragraph 10 is hereby closed, As previously announced, we have the Contact Group completing its business and there will be a report to us shortly. This will be given to the translators to try and make it as easy as possible to work with. As I indicated earlier we will recess for a while. We will suspend this item and try to return in a short while. We will come back as quickly as we can.

Paragraphs 1 to 17 not concluded

Les paragraphes 1 à 17 sont en suspend

Los párrafos 1 a 17 quedan pendientes

The meeting was suspended from 16.20 to 18.30 hours

La séance est suspendue de 16 h 20 à 18 h30

Se suspende la sesión de las 16.20 a las 18.30 horas

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process (continued)

12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme (suite)

12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO, especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas (continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat now has for distribution to the member countries the document C 87/LIM/50 being submitted by the Contact Group, and to try to facilitate matters for everybody here we would be scribbling this right now but we will not start the introduction for a few more moments so that member countries have the documents.

Secretariat, would you please distribute to the member countries the report of the Contact Group?

The Chair will now ask Mr Jurecky, who is the man who presided over the Contact Group meetings, to make some introductory comments and report to us on the activities of the Contact Group.

John JURECKY (Chairman, Contact Group): The Contact Group met in an extremely extensive series of sessions that began on 18 November and continued on a daily and oftentimes nightly basis, Saturday and Sunday included, until today, 25 November. The actual amount of time devoted to our discussion and negotiation was in excess of 32 hours. Those countries which participated - and all of them did so very actively - were the countries that I shall now name: the Cameroon, Congo, Costa Rica, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Japan, Libya, Mexico, Norway, the Philippines, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. According to the procedures we all agreed to, the draft resolutions of the United States, C 87/LIM/28, the one presented by the delegations of the Latin American and Caribbean Group and the Near East Group, C 87/LIM/29-Rev.1, and the Nordic proposal, C 87/LIM/27, were taken up. The procedure that was followed was that there should be an oral explanation of the respective resolutions by the sponsors, followed by a round of subsequent questions and answers. It was agreed by those present that we would first take up the so-called Nordic Resolution -this following the initial presentation - and that there would be a question and answer period on each of the three draft resolutions. It was then agreed that the so-called Nordic Resolution would be taken up in the next round and that it was to be used as a basis for the detailed negotiation of language. As part of this agreement, we decided to begin with paragraph 2 of C 87/LIM/27, deleting for the purposes of our discussion references to the "Committee", which occur throughout the resolution, wherever it appeared in the Nordic text. The document which has just been distributed to you should be read with this understanding.

We continued from paragraph 2 and got as far as paragraph 5, where only limited discussion was possible due to the exhaustion of our available time, and of our bodies as well, I am afraid. Therefore the Contact Group agreed that paragraphs 2-4 of C 87/LIM/27 were to be replaced by the language in the document that you should now have before you. I would note that these revisions reflect inputs from C 87/LIM/29-Rev.1 and from all other members of the Contact Group who worked very diligently and cooperatively together in a spirit that does great credit to all those involved. I thank all of them for the tremendous effort and sense of responsibility they all amply demonstrated in this task. That is all I would wish to say at this point.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am sure the Chair speaks for all member countries when we observe that we appreciate the extra work on the part of each of the representatives of the member countries you have named in devoting those 32 extra hours to a difficult task. In the report of the Contact Group that we have before us changes are recommended and in the Nordic Resolution introduced by Norway on behalf of all the Nordic countries. The Chair would feel that it would be in order, to facilitate matters and to help our discussion, if we were to ask Norway whether it concurs in the language used. The Chair has been asked by the Secretary to announce that there is an error in the Spanish language text. Could the Secretary please deal with that now, as it may save time later.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Secretary, Commission II): In the Spanish version of C 87/LIM/50 certain words in square brackets at the end of paragraph 2 have been omitted. They are in the English and French texts. I will therefore say them in Spanish:

Al fin del párrafo, después de la palabras "Resolución 3/75", habría que poner, entre paréntesis, las palabras "tal como ha sido adoptada".

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): Mr Chairman, you asked me a straight question but before I answer it may I, somewhat irregularly, do a favour for a friend in the Secretariat, who has just come to me and asked me to announce that Commission I is meeting now.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary wishes to correct that, but at this point the Chair would discourage other people from going to other meetings, and would encourage them to stay and listen to hear Norway speak about the Nordic Resolution. I would ask the Deputy Director-General to say a few words here.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Commission I is not able to meet now. Commission I will meet at 9.30 punctually tomorrow morning for a maximum of half an hour.

CHAIRMAN: If anybody would like to place bets on whether anything starts punctually here or not, I will take them.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): Permit me first to extend my thanks to the Chairman of our Contact Group, who was extremely accommodating and extremely fair and who probably worked harder than anyone else. I would give my personal thanks to him and also to my colleagues in that Group. They all seemed to be acting out of a spirit of goodwill and cooperation, wanting to come to a result. I appreciated that very much.

It is my great pleasure to say on behalf of the Nordic Group that these amendments that were agreed in the Contact Group and are presented before us in C 87/LIM/50 are fully acceptable to the Nordic Group in its draft resolution and can be considered to be a replacement for paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. Paragraph 7 will not be replaced but is being incorporated into another paragraph in the document which has just been distributed. The Nordic Group accepts this, provided that these amendments meet with the consensus of the Commission. Unless it is so accepted, we will have to reserve our right to revert to our original draft.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Norway: we will come back to you. The Chair understands that changes have also been recommended by the Contact Group which included drafts by Mexico, introduced on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group and the Near East Group. We would wish to give Mexico the opportunity at this point to respond and make observations about its concurrence or non-concurrence.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): Quisiera, primero que nada, aclarar un poco la situación. La región latinoamericana y del Caribe se encontró representada por su Presidente y por la Delegación de México. Nuestro grupo, apoyado por el del Cercano Oriente, presentó una resolución contenida en el LIM/29/Rev. 1 y asistimos todos a este Grupo de Contacto que como mencionó su Chairman, ha elaborado numerosas horas y con el mayor espíritu de comprensión, tratando de buscar un texto negociado que fuera aceptable por consenso. Con ese espíritu, tratamos de abordar los elementos para que fuera posible llegar a ese entendimiento y, como lo explicó el Presidente, eludimos aquellos aspectos, o mejor dicho, dejamos para el final aquellos aspectos en donde sentimos que las posiciones no estaban muy cercanas y, proseguimos a ponernos de acuerdo sobre lo que sería el mandato y la forma de entrega del producto del estudio o revisión que estábamos revisando.

Quiero dejar sentado que la Delegación de México encontró el ambiente de trabajo sumamente fructífero, que todos los colegas hicieron el mayor esfuerzo para un entendimiento y mi agradecimiento particular va al Grupo Nórdico por representación del Sr. Hostmark, con quienes pudimos tratar de conciliar aquellos aspectos de la Resolución de ellos, con parte de nuestra resolución que podría traer los elementos contenidos en el documento que aquí tenemos.

Como ya se ha expresado antes, los aspectos relativos al mecanismo no se pudieron analizar. El tiempo nos faltó, tal vez porque empezamos algo tarde, pero en concreto puedo decir que el texto que tenemos en nuestras manos, es un texto que negociamos y pudimos llegar a un entendimiento que está reflejado aquí.

Bernard LEDUN (France): A l'instar de mes collègues de la Norvège et du Mexique, je voudrais bien entendu adresser toutes mes félicitations et mes remerciements, d'une part, au Président de notre Groupe de contact et, d'autre part, à tous ses membres, qui ont effectivement accompli un très gros travail. Comme l'a dit tout à l'heure le président de notre groupe, nous avons en effet beaucoup travaillé même si, aux yeux de certaines délégations ici présentes, le résultat peut paraître relativement mince. C'est que chaque article du document C 87/LIM/50 qui vous est soumis a fait l'objet de nombreuses interventions souvent pertinentes et que le temps nous aura finalement manqué pour conclure et boucler un projet de résolution complet.

En ce qui concerne ma délégation, si nous souhaitons intervenir ici, ce ne sera pas pour gloser à nouveau sur un document dont les propositions qui concernent le mandat de la Conférence à un groupe d'experts reçoivent globalement notre adhésion, en tenant dûment compte toutefois des points qui restent encore provisoirement en suspens et qui sont mis entre crochets ou qui n'y figurent pas en raison des réserves qu'ils ont suscitées. C'est le cas, notamment, pour le paragraphe 5 du projet de résolution nordique, sous la cote C 87/LIM/27, qui, à notre avis, n'a pas sa place ici s'agissant, d'une part, d'études qui sont déjà prévues dans le mandat général du groupe d'experts ainsi qu'il est indiqué à l'alinéa b) du document C 87/LIM/50 et, d'autre part, d'une orientation spécifique et davantage du ressort ou du domaine de compétence d'un organe de vérification ou d'un cabinet d'auditeurs en management que d'un groupe de consultants généralistes.

Cette étude approfondie, en effet, sur la gestion de l'Organisation, ne pourrait être entreprise, à notre avis, qu'à l'initiative du Directeur général et par l'entremise d'un cabinet spécialisé de consultants, comme ce fut le cas, par exemple, au Programme alimentaire mondial, l'année dernière.

Non, si nous intervenons, c'est en fait pour traiter de la question qui n'a pu être débattue au sein du Groupe de contact, à savoir la définition du mécanisme auquel serait confiée l'exécution du mandat indiqué dans le document de référence.

Le projet de résolution nordique propose un tel mécanisme dénommé Comité ad hoc d'experts de haut niveau qui n'a pu, faute de temps, faire l'objet d'un examen approfondi au sein du Groupe de contact. Toutefois, le texte du projet de résolution nordique nous éclaire sur le mode de composition et de sélection de ce comité et suscite de notre part et de la part d'autres délégations certaines réserves que nous espérons surmonter, pour notre part, en retenant l'idée de base - le principe de base - c'est-à-dire l'appel à des consultants techniques extérieurs, mais en faisant l'émanation des comités techniques du Programme et des finances, de façon à bien articuler le travail de ces experts avec celui des organes techniques et du Secrétariat de la FAO.

Nous pensons, en effet, qu'une superstructure du type de celle proposée par le groupe des pays nordiques présente l'inconvénient de court-circuiter les mécanismes établis et, ce faisant, de s'ériger en une espèce de comité des juges ou de commission de contrôle dont nous ne voyons pas bien la vocation en dehors d'une situation d'urgence ou de crise grave, ou encore de flagrante mauvaise gestion.

Nous n'en sommes pas là. Aussi proposons-nous, sous forme de complément au document du Groupe de contact, ou d'amendement au projet de résolution norvégien, le paragraphe suivant que je vais vous lire, d'abord rapidement, et ensuite à vitesse de dictée. Il est relativement bref et ne comporte que quelques lignes. Je lis d'abord rapidement.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): Could I ask for a point of clarification? May I ask if I misunderstood? I thought you opened for a discussion in the first instance of the, if I may term it so, consensus text from the Consulting Group and afterwards we come back to the other parts of the resolution, because of course we Nordics have a few things to say about that too. But I limited myself specifically to what I thought you asked for. If I was wrong, please inform me.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair was about to point out that we did indicate that we were going to discuss the document submitted by the Contact Group and see if we had a consensus agreement on this. But France was speaking until that point in general terms, and the Chair is trying to be flexible and have a general discussion, but a specific amendment on that would not be in order at this point. I indicated earlier when Norway finished that we would be coming back to Norway, and then went to Mexico, because changes had been recommended, and we asked Mexico if they wished to address that and they did and they spoke on that. We will come back to Norway, taking up their amendment as soon as we got through some of the introductory remarks here.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Dois-je comprendre qu'il me faudra intervenir une nouvelle fois, ultérieurement, au cours du débat pour présenter mon amendement, ou que faisant d'une pierre deux coups, je peux profiter du débat général pour présenter l'amendement, ce qui nous ferait gagner du temps, je pense?

CHAIRMAN: The Chair is perfectly willing to be flexible on that and to allow you in your remarks to talk about your amendment, so long as it is understood by everyone that we will not be proceeding to a vote on your amendment. We would then ask you to come back at the appropriate time and formally move it. But with that understanding, please proceed. You are right, it might facilitate matters but so long as there is an understanding on both parts, and there was not on the part of the sponsor, and for that reason we clarify this. But feel free to state it so long as it is understood that there will not be a vote whenever you wish to press it later.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Si vous le souhaitez, je m'apprête non pas à lire maintenant ou présenter formellement l'amendement que je voulais à l'instant présenter. Simplement, à la différence du mécanisme prévu par le Groupe des pays nordiques, notre proposition vise A la création d'un groupe, je dis bien, d'un groupe d'experts en petit nombre qui serait choisi conjointement par le Comité technique du Programme et des Finances.

Je reviendrai plus longuement sur cette proposition et je m'apprête à en faire une lecture plus approfondie ultérieurement. Qu'il soit bien clair néanmoins, à ce stade, que les experts que nous souhaitons mettre en place, en ce qui nous concerne, nous les souhaitons aussi qualifiés et aussi indépendants d'esprit que possible. Comme ils ne feront pas partie statutairement de l'Organisation, il n'y a pas de raison qu'il n'en soit pas ainsi.

Enfin, cette proposition a pour nous le mérite de contribuer à renforcer la capacité d'analyse et d'action du Comité du Programme et du Comité des Finances, renforcement que nous avons appelé de nos vœux durant cette Conférence. Elle présente aussi l'avantage d'être une formule finalement apolitique car des experts désignés par des Etats Membres ou groupes régionaux seront investis, quoi qu'ils en aient, d'une mission de caractère quasiment politique ou institutionnel. Quel pas de plus aurons-nous fait alors vis-à-vis des structures actuelles de l'Organisation? Au lieu que les experts désignés par les comités du Programme et des Finances, le seront és qualité, c'est-à-dire en fonction seulement de leur compétence professionnel le et de leur éminence internationalement reconnue. Je me réserve le droit d'intervenir ultérieurement pour présenter mon amendement.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sr. Presidente, en el Grupo de Contacto hemos hecho el máximo esfuerzo de conciliación. Agradezco a los demás miembros del Grupo de Contacto porque estimo que ellos también hicieron todo el esfuerzo posible de conciliación.

En nombre del grupo latinoamericano apruebo todo el texto que ha sido convenido en el Grupo de Contacto excepto las palabras entre corchetes. Las palabras entre corchetes son las contenidas en el párrafo 2. subpárrafo b y son "y procedimientos".

Mi grupo no puede estar de acuerdo en eso porque estima que el mecanismo que vamos a poner en marcha no debería ocuparse de la manera con la que se logren los acuerdos entre gobiernos.

A estas alturas me permito apoyar y agradecer a Francia por haber presentado, por ahora en términos genéricos y en lo sucesivo lo hará en términos más específicos, una propuesta que nos permita llevar a la práctica el mandato establecido en el Grupo de Contacto.

En el Grupo de Contacto hemos logrado únicamente un acuerdo sobre un mandato. La tarea que tenemos esta noche es llegar a establecer un acuerdo sobre quién lleva a cabo este mandato. Creo que la propuesta de la cual Francia ha empezado a definir las grandes líneas que van a ser formuladas en su propuesta formal puede ayudarnos muchísimo. Le agradezco y le apoyo de antemano.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): We have also participated in the Contact Group and as soon as we had the opportunity this afternoon I had the honour of calling together the meeting of the Asia Group. It had before it the results of the work of the Contact Group in LIM 50, as well as the other documents that were presented to the Contact Group, including the so-called French proposal. I should like to confirm that the Asia Group is in conformity with the agreements that have been reached in the Contact Group as indicated in LIM 50. The Asia Group has also looked at the so-called "French proposal" in paragraph 3, which is not really an amendment but an additional paragraph, which could possibly be a paragraph 1 of this LIM 50 and they have also indicated their agreement with the same paragraph to be an amendment to the agreement which has been admitted in LIM 50 but would form a new paragraph in the LIM 50, and therefore would find mechanism for the review, whose terms of reference have been more or less spelled out in paragraphs 2 to 4 in the LIM that is now before us.

The problems that are in paragraph 2 of the text before us, we have a small bracket. That is still, I believe, in brackets up to now because this, if you will permit me to explain the origin of these brackets was placed because our delegation requested the inclusion of this because of possible reservations that had been adopted during the Resolution that is reflected in this paragraph 2, but precisely for that reason the paragraph which has been adopted without any reservation, that some people thought this should be into brackets, but that is a different matter altogether, I would just like to confirm the agreement of the Asia Group to this and I hope that we could, as soon as possible, go to the other matters that are pending related to the mandate of this Group proposal, which is precisely the mechanism which is going to the review or to do the review, the mandate of which is already defined in this document before us.

Atif Y. BUKARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): I think that we feel a bit better now. We are more satisfied with the outcome achieved by the Contact Group and also we are very grateful for all the efforts made by the Contact Group and we hope that our satisfaction will further prevail until we have wound up the scrutiny of all the matters before us. We greatly appreciate the Contact Group's work and efforts and we want to address all our thanks to this Group.

Actually we studied the revised version, paras 2, 3 and 4 as before us now and I think that I am now able, as Chairman of the Group of 77 to say that we do not object. We certainly have no problems in accepting this revised version and I would like to add that we listened very carefully and keenly to the statement made by the delegate of France. We want to confirm that we thought that it was very interesting and very important, what the delegate of France said, and I want to thank France for this effort, these very praiseworthy efforts that were made by France and also for the help that this really implies for all of us, and I would also like to know from the delegate of France if what he is proposing by way of text is going to be added to the text or whether it is a mere amendment. There is, of course, a difference between something which is added or just an amendment and we support the declaration of France and we hope that everybody will take this into account and give it the necessary importance.

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): Having participated quite frequently in the Contact Group, I would like first to express our appreciation to the painstaking work of the Chairman, to the extremely restrained and positive attitude to the delegate of Norway, representing the Nordic countries; we know their position and therefore deeply appreciate the efforts they made to reconcile the positions. We also have to thank the delegates of Mexico and Costa Rica and of course Congo, Cameroons, all of whom had rather strong views on the subject.

Within the Group of 77 I would be less than frank if I did not say that within the Group of 77 there are a number of countries who have basic reservations on the need of reform or review, in the sense proposed by some countries. That is why we did submit certain other papers which were not considered but in the spirit of compromise and recognizing that there are genuine concerns of a number of important and friendly countries, we agreed to discuss the basic issue of reform or review and therefore the Nordic proposal, which became the basis of the Contact Group's discussion, was considered as the primary paper. It could have been some other paper. Despite 30-odd hours of discussion it was almost impossible to take off so far as the mechanism was concerned. So far as the preamble is concerned, the preamble is not that important, I think one could get to it later, and therefore when the delegate from France suggested at the Contact Group a certain formulation, it was not with a view to pre-empting the discussion of the Nordic proposal but the fact is that even in the Contact Group it was almost impossible to start the discussion on that ad hoc high level Committee and there was no time to discuss the proposal from France and hence this proposal was made. There are also some reservations within the Contact Group on the bracketed portions, which also need to be considered. I think generally those of us who were in the Contact Group, we are not in a position to speak on this. Therefore I do not think I should lengthen my talk any further, except to say that the points between the brackets should be considered, we reserve the right to speak there, and so far as the French proposal is concerned we might consider it an early stage whether a formulation from them would help this committee to get on faster with the work.

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Gracias, Sr. Presidente. Mi Delegación desea también, en primer término expresar nuestro sincero reconocimiento a todos los miembros del Grupo de Contacto, por el esfuerzo que han realizado y por presentarnos en la tarde de hoy algunos párrafos sobre los que, a nivel de Grupo de Contacto, se ha llegado a cierto consenso.

Mi Delegación, sin embargo, no está todavía en condiciones de unirse a este consenso, que parece ser mayoritario, porque tiene algunas dudas. En primer término, resulta difícil estudiar el mandato sin conocer el sujeto a quien se le da el mandato. Pero, de todas maneras, tratando de hacer abstracción del sujeto y limitándonos exclusivamente a la cuestión del mandato - es decir, a los párrafos 2, 3 y 4, tal cual nos los presenta el Grupo de Contacto-, quiero traer a la atención de toda la Comisión las dudas - sinceras y constructivas dudas - de mi Delegación.

En el párrafo 2, por ejemplo, entre las primeras palabras, se establece como primer mandato del comité - o no sé cómo se llamará - que estudiará "la función". No sé qué diferencia habrá en otros idiomas; en español se habla solamente de una (singular) función: una función, mientras que cuando se habla de prioridades, objetivos y estrategias, se habla en plural. Mi Delegación - insisto: sinceramente - pregunto cuál es la función que se va a estudiar de la FAO.

Fíjese que en el subpárrafo b) del mismo párrafo 2 comienza la oración diciendo: "Sin perjuicio del compromiso de los Estados Miembros de respetar la Constitución de la Organización"; es decir, que no vamos a cambiar la Constitución de la Organización. Sin embargo, como primer mandato que se le da al comité - o como se le vaya a denominar -, se le da el de estudiar la función. Las funciones están determinadas precisamente por la Constitución de esta Organización, y se llaman, en el artículo primero, "funciones de la Organización". Insisto en que lo que hago no son objeciones, sino, simplemente, preguntas al Presidente del Grupo de Contacto, para que nos aclare estos aspectos, a fin de podernos unir al consenso que se va creando en esta sala.

Por ultimo, Sr. Presidente - siempre en el subpárrafo b), dentro del párrafo 2 -, después de señalar que "sin perjuicio del compromiso de los Estados Miembros de respetar la Constitución de la Organización", dice "examinar si es necesario introducir cambios en las estructuras internas". Me refiero a antes del corchete. ¿Estructuras internas de la Organización - una vez más, y con toda sinceridad, con toda calidez lo pregunto -, estructuras internas de la Organización, de la Secretaría, de los Comités que forman la Organización? No lo tengo claro. Quisiera, si es posible, Sr. Presidente, por su intermedio, tener aclaraciones sobre estos puntos, antes de poder, esporo, unirme al consenso de esta sala con respecto a estos párrafos, sin perjuicio de que después estudiemos la resolución en su conjunto.

CHAIRMAN: Before we get to the next speaker, Argentina, the Chairman has been taking notes while you were speaking, I noticed, and I will ask him to come back later to your question but we must take the other countries in order.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Comme d'autres avant moi ici, j'ai fait partie du groupe de 'contact, et à cet égard je voudrais rendre hommage à notre Président pour les efforts qu'il a su déployer 32 heures durant pour nous amener à faire le travail qui vous est présenté ici.

J'étais dans ce groupe de contact pour représenter une région de l'Afrique, en compagnie de mon frère du Cameroun, et nous avons, avant que ne débute cette réunion, rendu compte des résultats de notre travail au sein du groupe de contact au groupe africain. Nous devons dire qu'au niveau du groupe africain ce n'est pas la satisfaction générale qui a prévalu. Nous pensons - et le groupe pense avec nous - que nous avons certainement accompli des efforts pour arriver aux résultats qui nous sont présentés dans le LIM/50. Mais l'Afrique aurait voulu que nous allions certainement plus avant. Nous devons dire que cela n'a pas été possible, les positions au départ étant si éloignées les unes des autres.

Mais nous espérons, comme d'autres ici, que l'Organisation ne souffrira pas de ce travail que nous venons d'accomplir. Au contraire, nous pensons que nous venons de faire là un pas qui doit constituer une base sur laquelle devraient se développer d'autres concertations futures.

Nous aurions certainement voulu que le mécanisme ait été précisé, le mécanisme qui pourrait contribuer à aller de l'avant. Mais je crois que cela mérite encore un examen approfondi, et je crois que tous nous nous sommes rendus compte que le travail qui a été fait là, tout en ne nous donnant pas entièrement satisfaction, constitue une base pour le consensus, et nous espérons que ce consensus sera obtenu dans cette salle.

Nous voudrions à cet égard remercier notamment les auteurs des résolutions ou des projets de résolution qui ont constitué la base de nos discussions au sein du groupe de contact. Je songe à la Norvège, mais je songe aussi aux pays latino-américains, et du Proche-Orient. Notamment, je veux parler de la déléguée du Mexique qui a eu à défendre avec talent le projet de résolution autant que notre ami de Norvège.

Nous pensons que cela ne s'arrêtera pas là, et nous sommes certains que les uns et les autres ont mis toute leur bonne volonté durant tous ces travaux et nous pensons que nous réussirons peut-être dans le futur à continuer ce dialogue fructueux que nous avons entamé.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I am sorry if at present the members of the Contact Group are monopolising the discussion. If I intervene now it is of course only on the text which has been distributed, and I wanted to say something about the two passages in square brackets. However, before that I should be less than true to my own feelings if I did not echo warmly what the distinguished Ambassador for the Congo has said about both the spirit in which the exercise was conducted, and the way in which the results were arrived at. I felt, and perhaps I should put on record one small complaint, that we could have achieved much more if we had been given greater priority in the allocation of resources available to the Conference over all. However, I do appreciate the difficulties that the Secretariat has over this matter. I think that is largely due to the fact that we are not able to present something which is a complete text.

As regards the two passages in square brackets in the first passage (which is "as adopted") as I understood it those words were to be included if there had been statements of reservation made during the discussion of Resolution 375. My own personal checks with the Secretariat did, I think, confirm that at least our country made such a statement of reservation. I am not in a position to speak for others and therefore I consider that it ought to be possible to delete those square brackets and include the two words, thus dropping one potential problem for a consensus.

The other two words in square brackets are, frankly, of a rather different nature. We had a very long discussion about this in the Friends of the President Group. I know this is perfectly clear and fair, with one delegation on behalf of a number of countries was not able, without further consideration, to agree to the inclusion of those two words. My country, and I believe some others (but they must speak for themselves) did say that unless those two words were included we were not able to agree to the formulation in the little paragraph (b), as it stood.

I would like to place on record that our agreement to the formula, which we were very happy to accept in a spirit of compromise, (although it went far beyond instructions which we had received) depended on accepting the inclusion of those two words. I do not want to add to the difficulties, on the contrary, I think that we overcame very many, but that problem is certainly still one which we have left.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): My country has also taken part in the Contact Group, and I should like to extend my thanks to all the other members for their cooperation in this work. We have been able to narrow our positions and our understanding on the terms of reference. I think we achieved good work there, with the exception, however, of paragraph 5 as I think Mr Hostmark has already pointed out.

My country can fully support the work presented in document LIM/50 as it has been distributed. We still have differences on the mechanism and I should like to explain the position of my country with respect to this matter. First, why do we believe that the review is necessary? We believe it because of a reason well spelt out in paragraph 2(a) - how FAO can make, the most effective contribution to the efforts of member countries and people to eliminate hunger, malnutrition and poverty. The world is sick of under development, of malnutrition and poverty. It is because of that that we believe we have constantly to look at how FAO can, with its comparative advantage, make the best contribution to help. It is clear that these questions which we would like to have looked at in the review, must be looked at from a very independent point of view. The mechanism itself should not add to questions, but reduce them. This is the reason why my country supports an independent mechanism as proposed in the Nordic resolutions.

Waliur RAHMAN (Bangladesh): I should like to join the previous speakers in paying tribute on behalf of my delegation to the members of the Contact Group, particularly the Chairman of the Group for the very laborious and successful work which they have been able to accomplish. The thirty-two hour period that they had at their disposal was a very short time, but the amount that they accomplished is tremendous. We have the experience in one case when we sat for one year and still could not come to a decision about the terms of reference of a particular issue. They achieved a lot in thirty-two hours.

The agreed text on the terms of reference is entirely acceptable to my delegation. When I said this, I am not very sure about the clarification that has been given by the distinguished delegate of the U.K. Perhaps at the end of this discussion the Chairman of the Contact Group will be in a position to give further clarification concerning the square brackets.

As has been said by one of the speakers, obviously, we have a difference of views as to whether or not to have the review. Seen in that context the paragraphs in the amendment presented by the distinguished delegate of France, particularly with reference to the question of mechanism, deserve our serious consideration. This accords well with the statement made by the leader of my delegation in the Plenary of the Conference (page 6, document C 87/PV/9). We have the experience of the

Committee of Eighteen and its report at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. Indeed, it is true that the Group of experts in New York sat over a number of months and finally came to an agreement which was not acceptable, or not palatable, to everyone. However, we accepted that for the sake of better international cooperation and understanding and above all, for helping the United Nations charter principles and purposes to be revindicated - if indeed they needed any revindication.

In the case of FAO, I believe that we are not far from that situation, although certain aspects of the priorities which FAO is considering are rather different from other organizations. Having said that I would appeal to the Commission that we should proceed to the amendment of the French paper as soon as possible.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): Je m'associerai également à tout ce qui vient d'être dit par nos collègues qui ont participé au Groupe de contact. Peut-être estimerez-vous utile d'écouter la première réaction de quelqu'un qui n'a pas participé au Groupe de contact, qui vient de lire la version révisée, le document LIM/50, et qui vient rapidement de relire également le préambule de l'Acte constitutif et l'Article Ier des Textes fondamentaux de l'Organisation dont nous avons la responsabilité.

Il est clair qu'il faudra pouvoir déterminer de façon précise les mécanismes et le fonctionnement de ceux qui seront chargés de reconstruire le monde dans le secteur de l'alimentation et de l'agriculture. C'est incontestablement un secteur extrêmement vaste et extrêmement important. Ce type d'approche recouvre des domaines gigantesques et extrêmement différents touchant à la fois à l'environnement, à la pêche, à la forêt, à une série de problèmes d'ordre technique, à une série de problèmes humains d'une complexité folle.

J'ai quand même une certaine expérience dans le domaine des réformes ayant été chef d'administration pendant de nombreuses années et je sais combien tout cela est complexe pour un groupe d'experts dit indépendants. Je ne crois d'ailleurs pas à l'indépendance, on dépend tous de quelqu'un, on dépend tous de sa formation, de ses approches et, dans un certain nombre de cas, des instructions qu'on reçoit; donc parler d'experts indépendants est peut-être un leurre, ce qu'il faut ce sont des gens de bonne volonté, décidés à travailler en collaboration avec les responsables FAO, les responsables sur le plan de l'administration, ceux qui connaissent les rouages, ceux qui ont la pratique des mécanismes. Je vous avoue qu'après un an de représentation de mon pays auprès de la FAO, je n'ai pas encore fait le tour de tout le dédale, de toute la complexité de l'ensemble de l'Organisation. Alors je suis convaincu que si on parle d'experts indépendants et s'il n'y a pas une interrelation extrêmement étroite, extrêmement opérationnelle avec l'ensemble des responsables et des fonctionnaires compétents de la FAO, nous courrons à un document qui sera peut-être indépendant sur le plan de la lecture mais qui n'aura rien d'opérationnel.

Je crois que si l'on veut être opérationnel, le Groupe d'experts doit être un groupe d'experts qualifiés mais collaborant et désireux de travailler avec les responsables de la FAO, tant les responsables ici à Rome qu'également les pays intéressés, les pays concernés, qui sont représentés, qui ont leur mot à dire. Je crois que cette tâche, extrêmement ambitieuse, est une tâche qui, dans les années qui viennent, doit être qualifiée de permanente, car je crois que, toujours, nous devons essayer d'améliorer le fonctionnement de l'Organisation, nous devons essayer de répondre aux interpellations d'un monde en perpétuelle mutation, d'un monde qui évolue rapidement, qui présente quand même certains aspects angoissants. Si l'on veut régler des problèmes aussi fondamentaux, aussi difficiles que les problèmes de la faim et du développement, je crois que c'est dans une collaboration, et non en restant avec un bureau d'études d'experts indépendants qui n'aura pas le lien nécessaire avec ceux qui ont quand même travaillé sur le terrain et qui connaissent un certain nombre de réalités.

Ce sont des réflexions de quelqu'un qui n'a pas participé aux trente-deux heures. Je me rends compte que ces trente-deux heures sont importantes, mais elles seront suivies de nombreuses autres heures si l'on veut réellement apporter un certain nombre d'améliorations. Je crois que tous ceux qui portent des responsabilités au sein de cet organisme sont conscients de la nécessité d'un renouvellement, d'une adaptation et d'une adéquation permanente de l'Organisation aux nécessités du monde de demain.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): Were it not for the fact that we are focusing on LIM/50, I would be thoroughly tempted to make some comments on my preceding speaker, the delegate from Belgium because, to say the least, we have a completely differing understanding about what independent experts mean or can do. But I will focus, as you have suggested, on the document that we are discussing at this time, and we will talk about mechanisms later on.

My delegation was also in the Contact Group, and it was a good experience in terms of harmony and the cooperation, a very fair Chairman, very constructive work. It was my delegation who suggested the language as adopted following Resolution 375 in paragraph 2. In doing so, we followed what is absolutely the long-standing standard practice in the United Nations for many reasons that resolution was adopted 12 years ago. My experience, which is not unique, is that sometimes reservations have a way of disappearing. I will never forget the Plan of Action of WCAARD in which the reservations were printed on a single sheet of paper, not in the body of the report. If you go to my office, I have 6 copies of the report, which I like very much. I have a long time ago lost the single sheet with the reservations. Quite frankly - and I did say this clearly in the Contact Group - as adopted, it protects us all against forgetfulness and does not change an iota the spirit of the paragraph or the quotation of the Resolution 375.

For my country I said there that it is very important to have it as adopted. Maybe we do not have long memories as others do.

With respect to 2(b), we also felt that this bracketed word was and remains very important to us. One needs to examine the fact that we spent several hours on that paragraph. That is a very important paragraph. Some sought assurance that we were not trying with the review to change the Council, the Conference and basic constitutional arrangements. It was the selection of those three words, "internal structures and procedures," that provided that guarantee, a guarantee that otherwise is reassured in the first sentence of that sub-paragraph, when it says, "subject to the commitment of Member Nations to the constitution of the Organization."

So we started paragraph 7 precisely on the basis that we are going to work fully in the ambit of the constitution and with no aim for a review to seek changes in the constitution. Looking at procedures, it is important in terms of what our Swiss delegate colleague was saying a few minutes ago. The FAO is an organization that was created to deliver a product or a set of products. The proof of the pudding is in the tasting, they say in English. Countries in which the FAO has programmes or who are affected by these programmes - including my own - see these effects delivered through procedures. Effective delivery depends on effective procedures. Inadequate delivery depends on inadequate procedures. So without making any judgements, a review of whether the FAO is delivering the best value for money - and that is not a criticism of the FAO - we must necessarily look at procedures.

My delegation feels very strongly about that word and feels that it is very necessary, and we just cannot understand why it may seem a threat to anyone, given that we provided the guarantees that we have requested in terms of the inviolability of the Constitution.

Leo HERTOOG (Netherlands): My delegation is fully aware of the tremendous efforts the Contact Group has made in reaching a consensus in the Group on the revised draft paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Nordic Document C 87/LIM/27. My delegation wants to thank the Chairman and the members of this group for their work and the time spent on it. I would remind this Commission that the background for the whole exercise was to contribute to the strengthening of our Organization in relation to major economic and agricultural developments and trends which are taking place in our world. Having said this and having read the text of LIM/50, my delegation wants to put forward that this paper does not reflect in a sufficient way in what manner FAO should adopt measures to realize its necessary reorientation. As I said, surely we appreciate very much the work of the Contact Group, and we are aware of the difficult tasks it carried out.

Now looking to paragraph 2(b), I was reminded of a very nice and fine product of the Italian culinary art, and it is composing a nice minestrone. For the minestrone you need quite a few ingredients which are necessary to give it its proper taste. Now what I miss in this minestrone, paragraph 2(b), is that one ingredient has a tendency, as it stands here, to be left out and the other left in which should not be there with as much emphasis as is stated here. What I am aiming at is that the attention of my delegation was drawn to the brackets in 2(b) in the third line, "changes are necessary in the internal structures and procedures," between brackets. In the opinion of my delegation, looking into internal structures is a way of self-reflection, which is perhaps not as much necessary as looking into the procedures in which the Organization, FAO, operates or should operate. Speaking about procedures, I think this word is a little bit too neutral. I think what is lacking - and I think this Conference will maybe approve of what I am going to say - what FAO is lacking is a proper way of decision making. So one of the ingredients in the minestrone which I mentioned should, in the first place, be that there should be changes in the decision-making procedures. We feel very strongly about that point, and it would be very difficult for our delegation to accept this paragraph if, first of all, the words between brackets would be left out. That is one point. If that would not be acceptable to the Commission, we could, we might, we

could be willing to, we would be willing to accept the words simply "and procedures." We would strongly insist on having the words "structures and decision making procedures."

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brawil): I will try to be brief by associating myself with statements made by one or more delegations that preceded me in this debate. May I first associate our delegation with all the expressions of thanks to the extremely effective work of the Contact Group. May I also associate myself with the doubts raised by the Argentina delegation as with regards the words "role" in paragraph 2 and "internal structures" in paragraph 4.

May I also associate myself with the pertinent remarks made by the delegate of Belgium as regards the Contact Group.

Finally, I wish to state that my delegation believes that the paragraphs agreed by the Contact Group, together with the proposals for the Constitution and the Ad Hoc Committee which will be entrusted with the task of reviewing our Organization as contained in the document in the French draft, are a good beginning. May I only say we should first look at the composition in this manner before adopting this mandate.

George Henry MUSGROVE (Canada): We were not part of the Contact Group, therefore, until only just a few minutes ago I have not had an opportunity to be privy to the discussions and the results of those discussions of its meetings. Therefore, I would join others in welcoming the report we have received from the Director of that Group. I have been looking through the draft he has put in front of us. We are quite impressed, but I guess not as organized as our colleagues in the Group of 77 in Africa and Asia where it appears they have had time for consultations on this particular document as well as on other documents which we have not seen. There have been references to the French draft, for example, which to my knowledge has never been made available to my delegation.

It will come as no surprise to those who have listened with some monotony to our interventions over the last few years that we were one of those countries quite interested in seeing a review exercise with the prospect of coming up with recommendations on reform. In this sense, we would very much like to associate ourselves with the remarks made by the delegations of Switzerland and the Netherlands in the last few minutes, that our objective was and is to see a strengthening and improvement of the Organization. In our comments over the last year or two we have spread our net rather widely. We have at times been somewhat harsh and critical in the tone of our remarks and we quite appreciate that the views we hold would not be shared by other members in their entirety.

But having said that, we find the paper which has been put in front of us is rather modest (perhaps somewhat too modest) in its aspirations. In this paper, and in the comments that delegates have been making, we detect a hesitancy, a hesitancy for the process of review itself, a hesitancy as to what such a review might do in terms of its mandate and a hesitancy with respect to the process by which such a review might be carried out.

The document is replete with very thinly veiled wording which seeks to contain the scope or inhibit the width of what a review might be. It suggests rather defensively that it should be within the context of the Constitution of the Organization, within its Basic Texts and should not discuss FAO procedures - it may be should not discuss roles someone said. We are disappointed that there is this kind of hesitancy because we feel that the power of the membership is firmly in control at every stage of such a review exercise.

The review, should it be held, of course will report to the various governing bodies of this Organization, perhaps through the Council to the Conference, and recommendations, should they be forthcoming, will be there for discussion by the membership, each and every one of us, for acceptance, consideration or rejection. I think there is no need for fear or hesitancy on the part of any member here as to the ultimate outcome.

What, then, is the source of the hesitancy? In our view, the review is an attempt to seek new ideas. It is often said that people who are closely involved with things cannot see the forest for the trees. We have thought that such a review would bring in a breath of fresh air, new ideas, observations and recommendations which would make this Organization more effective. We had thought that by definition such a review should have independent people on it. In our view, we think they should be completely divorced from the Organization, but should have an eminence and expertise and a distinguished background which would permit them to look at this Organization and, indeed, other organizations in the multilateral system, to look at global agriculture and its problems, to have a knowledge of developmental issues that they could bring to bear, a freshness of advice and suggestion to this Organization.

It is in that concept that it is our view that such a review should be independent and divorced from the membership, from the Permanent Representatives such as myself who sit in Rome and who sometimes lose sight in our day-to-day discussions and debate of the larger issues of what this Organization should do and perhaps how it should be doing it. It has been suggested that the process should be operated with the hands-on management of the Secretariat itself.

Well, we appreciate the" virtues of the Secretariat, but again we feel they have some encumbrance in either justifying current practice or in seeing the problems that change in the day-to-day management of the Organization. We do feel the participation of the Secretariat in such a review is crucial to its success, but the independence of the reviewers should be somewhat divorced from either the membership or the Secretariat. We indicated a minute ago that the membership will have ample time to study the review locally or accept any such report. We feel from past experience that likewise the Secretariat will have the same sort of options.

Mr Chairman, in conclusion we are somewhat disappointed in the modesty of the report, but would like to join with the consensus that we proceed with such a review exercise and that we do so with independent expertise.

Ernest Sylvester BENJAMIN (Antigua and Barbuda): Antigua and Barbuda would like to congratulate the Contact Group in trying to grapple with what appeared to be a difficult problem. However, we are not at all convinced in the first place that every view is contemplated in the documents or that the documents are necessary, in that reviews have been taking place in FAO since 1976 and before, with beneficial results. That is not to say we are not in favour of renewal, adjustment and change. In any event, Mr Chairman, in our view this review will not necessarily be a panacea for the problems facing developing countries. We say that against the background of document C 87/LIM/50 which says something about "and the need to implement and promote the establishment of a new international economic order within the ambit of FAO". Since 1975 we have heard of a NIEO. We can strive and dream - at least we should have visions; but this review would never push us on to the goal of the new international economic order. In fact, what is pressing us away from a new international economic order has nothing to do with FAO. It has to do with factors external to FAO so we -cannot follow the logic that this review might lead to a new international economic order within the ambit of FAO. Let us not be dreamers. We might be visionaries!

Then again, we cannot see what has prompted this review, this ad hoc committee. We cannot see anywhere in the documents that there is mismanagement in their election, in the orientation of FAO programmes, in carrying out this mandate, so what has prompted the review? We cannot understand it.

Further, we have considerable problems with the language. It has a lot of polemics. First of all, in one place it talks about international structures and intergovernmental decisions. Then in document C 87/LIM/50 we had a watering down of the structures and procedures. Listening to another delegation, it was suggested that it is watered down and this confirmed our greatest fear, that there seems to be an expression of wanting to have a change in the decision-making.

We have read the document and it seems that some countries would like to have vetoing powers which would be tantamount to the dismantling of the whole concept of multilateralism, that is, the equality and the sovereignty of nations which cannot vote. We cannot accept a decision where a country or countries, because of their vote, will be controlling the Organization. We also need to know what precisely this ad hoc committee is going to do in examining the role. Is something wrong with the role as laid down in Article i of the Constitution? If it is wrong, then change it. We submit we do not see anything is wrong with it. As a matter of fact, from the papers we get the impression from the developing countries that all countries agreed that the mandates are as valid today as they were forty years ago.

So we do not see the need for the appointment or the establishment of any ad hoc high-level committee. They do not have roots. They cannot emphasise with the various roles which FAO is asked to perform. In all sincerity we want to feel that within FAO itself there is the capability through its intergovernmental bodies. Those bodies represent governments and their loyalty and allegiance would be first to the governments and not to the management of this Organization.

In conclusion we support the view that any organization must be subject to renewal and change, but we do not see the need at this stage for the review of our Organization to be as far-reaching as contemplated. Moreover, we do not see the need for a high-level group of experts.

Finally we think, we suspect that there seem to be attempts at wanting to dismantle the whole principle of consensus and multilateral cooperation. We thank you Mr Chairman.

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Queremos, en primer lugar, felicitar a los Miembros del Grupo de Contacto los ingentes esfuerzos que han hecho para presentarnos esta proposición.

Nuestra delegación quiere adelantar, independientemente de los análisis que creo que se están haciendo en estos momentos, en esta Comisión en forma mesurada, civilizada y tranquila, que espero que podamos seguir así para intercambiar los criterios, para poder ayudarnos, para poder oír y poder hablar lo que realmente representa un intercambio de criterios.

Nosotros tenemos el criterio, y lo puedo expresar, de que este documento que se nos presenta es un buen documento que podemos aprobar. Creo que se ha hecho un análisis bastante inteligente y se ha reflejado todo aquello que puede ayudar a que se haga el análisis, si se quiere. La necesidad del análisis en el Consejo pasado se puso en posibilidad.

De todas maneras, no podemos negar que la obra humana hay que analizarla. La forma de analizarla y el tiempo para analizarla es el que la misma obra humana debe escoger.

Tenemos el dilema de que hemos de aprobar un documento, con un mecanismo. Nosotros quisiéramos solamente hacer dos observaciones, después de haber dicho que estamos de acuerdo con este documento, como dijo la distinguida Representación de México y la distinguida Representación de Costa Rica. Sin embargo, aquí se han expresado algunas cuestiones que nosotros quisiéramos expresar también.

Hay una sola de las intervenciones que nos parece que no se ajusta a la idea de que podamos discutir e intercambiar criterios. Es la de aquella Delegación que se presenta condicionando su aprobación a su criterio solamente, y de esa forma no nos ayuda. Esa Delegación es una Delegación que tiene un aval de siglos en la investigación, en la cultura, en las letras, y creo que podría ayudarnos dándonos criterios de lo que opina y no paralizando la discusión diciendo sencillamente que todo está supeditado a que se oiga su criterio solamente.

Independientemente de este pequeño lunar, creo que estamos discutiendo bien. Nosotros queremos asociarnos a lo que ha expresado la Delegación de Bélgica acerca de la palabra "independiente". Creo que la Delegación de Francia hizo un análisis en el sentido de que podríamos entrar a analizar consuleros externos, pero para coordinar con la Secretaría de la FAO y los organismos técnicos. Creo que así respetamos la representatividad gubernamental que tenemos. Estas dos cosas se unen, Sr. Presidente. La palabra "independiente" no la entendemos, a no ser que escojamos un alto técnico que en estos momentos no esté trabajando, que no tenga ningún nexo con ningún organismo. Entonces sí puede ser independiente; pero en este mundo, todo el que tiene un nexo ya tiene dependencia, Sr. Presidente. Un cesante, un hombre que no esté trabajando, sí tiene todos esos méritos, lo podemos traer.

De todas maneras, esto tiene relación con lo que ha expresado ahora la distinguida Delegación de Antigua y Barbuda, en cuanto a que hay que tratar de garantizar que no se rompa el carácter intergubernamental, que es lo que le da sostén a esta Organización, es lo que le da el sostén al multilateralismo. La adopción de sus decisiones debe ser la adopción del voto que cada país tiene, igualitario. Esta es una situación que ya se ha ganado en la historia de la civilización. Entonces, no creo que podamos entrar a querer hacer valer un voto más que otro.

En lo que sí debemos ganar es en forma de discutir y en forma de hacernos entender. Yo no sé si tendré suficiente capacidad para hacerme entender. Sin embargo, hago el esfuerzo de expresar que si discutimos los procedimientos estamos poniendo ya en duda nuestra representatividad gubernamental. Primero.

Segundo. Creo que sé nos puede hacer alguna observación, si no se está de acuerdo, de cómo podemos obviar esto. Estamos dispuestos a oír; a oír todos los criterios que haya sobre esta materia.

Nosotros creemos que el esfuerzo que se ha hecho no debemos dejarlo resbalar hacia atrás. Vamos a seguir discutiendo como estamos, sobre la base de aprobar el documento y aislar los dos o tres virus que hay en ellos, para ver cómo podemos resolverlos, después de un intercambio amplio, paciente, de discusión, sin negar el documento, de momento. Creo que si son realmente dos cuestiones entre corchetes, esas dos cuestiones entre corchetes no deben nublar nuestra vista, en cuanto a que ya hay un esfuerzo grande, que es todo el documento. Y esos dos puntos, discutirlos.

Nuestro criterio, sencillamente, lo damos ahora. Repito que estamos dispuestos a oír todos los criterios. Nosotros creemos que si entramos a condicionar o a negar, a cuestionar la adopción de las

medidas, de las decisiones, estamos cuestionando nuestro carácter intergubernamental. Y, si no aceptamos, podemos aceptar un asesor, un consultor, un técnico externo, pero calificándolo de externo normalmente, para trabajar en comunión estrecha con la estructura actual intergubernamental, representativa, legal, que tiene la Organización, que es la estructura de la FAO. En esos términos creo que podemos conciliar la situación. Se puede pensar que es un capricho el que para nosotros la palabra "externo" no sea igual que "independiente". No; creo que "externo" ya indica que no tiene nexos con FAO. Pero la palabra "independiente" puede crearnos alguna situación de liberación que nadie quiere. Croo quo aquf nadie quiere ser independiente en oso sentido, sino discutir los problemas por los que atraviesa la FAO, que pueden ser fáciles, pueden ser difíciles, pero son problemas a estudiar.

Repito, Sr. Presidente: aceptamos el párrafo en todas sus partes y también creemos que debe eliminarse lo que está entre corchetes, por lo que hemos explicado. Muchas gracias.

CHAIRMAN: At this point the Chair would like to observe that we have a few remaining speakers on this topic. We have also taken notes of questions asked by certain Member Countries and we will try, when we finish with those remaining speakers on the list, to go back to the questions and we will try to have as best possible, as close to the source as possible, answers to the questions.

The Chair would like to make an observation about procedure and a suggestion. We have, everyone would agree, a degree of a consensus but there has been an awful lot of wasted time. We are into something that is very important. It would be highly risky to break for eating because we would suffer from the absence of a quorum, and the Chair recognises however that even as we discuss at length here the problems of the hungry of the world, some of them are going to be right here and they may wish to send out for sandwiches. We would ask that Member Countries would not press points of quorum or that; if we can continue with a certain understanding that people can send out for food or sandwiches or coffee or whatever, and just go to the adjoining room and eat it or eat it at the desk or whatever you want to do, but I would highly recommend against breaking for that purpose or we will have serious problems.

We are also aware that we have a Drafting Group that must meet after our proceedings, and we will try to call things to a halt at some reasonable hour this evening. We do not believe that grown men and women ought to be conducting business under unnecessarily adverse circumstances in the best parts of the world, and that could be focussed much after 10:00, with no reflection of what the Drafting Committee may do after that!

It is best to be prudent and not get into those sorts of problems!

The Chair would also like to suggest that while it may be a little bit unorthodox it might be more prudent, as we carry on here and complete this and go back to the questions, to proceed and recognise that we do "have obviously a large consensus but not a complete one, and that we have considerable discussion as focussed on the mechanism, and may be for the whole package we ought to consider it in toto - at least the discussion that is - and at some point go into a discussion of the mechanism. The two topics which have been crossed are inter-related, and it might be fruitful, as soon as we complete here, to get into a discussion in the same manner as it has gone on and just let countries speak as they are recognized. But in a few minutes when we complete the next five or six speakers that are here, try to get into a discussion of the mechanism and then carry that on for a while.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): My delegation would wish to express appreciation and thanks to the Contact Group for working, as I understand, fairly odd hours - 32 hours - to come up with a document which looks small but the number of hours indicate the complexity.

Mr Chairman, it could be useful before we even start really wondering how much or how good this document is, to remember that this Commission did set up the Contact Group, and it did set up the Contact Group arising from the difficulties which the Commission did realise then. If we were to

start opening the discussions which made us establish the Contact Group we might be here I do not know until when. So it is with that in mind that we do appreciate very much the report of the Contact Group, and we are to a large extent agreeable with it. In fact we see no difficulties in accepting it including the words which at the moment happen to be in square brackets. All we suggest is that the square brackets be taken out and the words remain in.

Mr Chairman, we would also wish to comment, if I were not to limit myself to LIM/50 but arising from your observations that various countries or various delegations have made their recommendations for discussions of the mechanism, we have a statement which deals with the mechanism and perhaps I will reserve the right to come back to that when we are discussing the mechanism, and restrict myself exclusively to LIM/50.

There is one addition perhaps Mr Chairman that we would wish to make, and if it were to meet with the consensus it would be very useful. It is a small addition to 'a'. In the course of discussions here, Mr Chairman, there were several expressions that it is high time FAO took into consideration the capabilities and the resources that some of the developed countries have cultivated and accumulated. So for that reason, Mr Chairman, 'a' which is asking FAO "to make the most effective contribution to the efforts of Member Countries and people to eliminate hunger, malnutrition and poverty, taking into account the resources available to the Organization", Mr Chairman our delegation would prefer to add these three words "and Member Countries" "... resources available to the Organization and Member Countries".

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): Thank you Mr Chairman. Especially since I intervened after your proposals on procedure I can be quite brief I hope. First, of course, I join the chorus of thanks and appreciation for the Contact Group and its President.

Mr Chairman, I want to address myself to the outcome of the Contact Group. My first remark is that my delegation has always maintained the necessity of keeping the dialogue and arriving at a compromise.

I consider this work of the Contact Group to be a real work of compromise and I hail this result. That means we are 'inclined to join a consensus, if there is one, on the text before us, but since we understand that the portions between brackets will be discussed later, we reserve the right to deal with these points at that time.

I said we were inclined, because I want to make clear a point already made by Brazil, I cannot escape the impression that we are putting the cart before the horse." We have the cart, which is Document C 87/LIM/50, but we do not have the horse. Who will carry out this mandate? I think it is inevitable that we should consider also the Group or Committee, whatever it is called, which will have this mandate. When I make this comparison about cart and horse it may be that the cart is too big, or perhaps too small for the horse.

Turning to the horse now, since you have said that the discussion is also open on the Group or Committee...

CHAIRMAN: I said we would be coming to that next, and I asked that we would get these speakers on the topic and then we would come back to that. If that is done, you will certainly be recognized at that time, but I am afraid that if you do, then all the others who have confined themselves to the topic at hand might have been done a little disservice. We will come back in time to that.

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): May I continue? Perhaps I am allowed to make general comments on that, as Belgium did, because it was my intention to support entirely the declaration of Belgium on this point, and since other delegations have already found the opportunity to make general comments I think I am entitled to at least support their statements. I repeat that I support the Belgium declaration on the horse.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Turkey. I am sorry if I was unclear but I was just cautioning against getting into detail on this.

Ibrahim KABA (Guinée): Pour notre part, nous nous bornerons à des observations d'ordre général. Pour celui qui a participé à la 90ème Session du Conseil en juin 1987, il est aisé de comprendre et surtout de mesurer les progrès considérables accomplis dans le rapprochement des points de vue. Le temps, la concertation, les événements ont considérablement contribué à l'efficacité du travail du Groupe du Contact. Toutefois, les efforts louables du Groupe méritent toute notre admiration. Ainsi, le document C 87/LIM/4 retient fortement notre attention. Quant à la proposition constructive avancée par la France, nous pensons qu'elle pourra contribuer à la recherche de la solution aux problèmes de mécanismes efficaces. En définitive, nous, pays membre, restons les auteurs et les bénéficiaires de cette Organisation qu'est la FAO. Et la Conférence est souveraine. C'est pourquoi nous pensons et croyons fortement que nous ne ferons rien qui puisse nuire au fonctionnement de la FAO. Ainsi, tout en prenant en compte les propositions qui nous sont faites et que nous avons déjà évoquées, nous nous associons à la déclaration de l'Ambassadeur du Congo. A notre avis, l'importance et la délicatesse de la question exigent de nous beaucoup de sagesse. Dans ce cas, le temps est un facteur positif car il a été atteint à ce jour est de loin plus important que ce qui reste à faire. Nous pensons que la Conférence pourrait en prendre note et fixer une date pour la reprise du dialogue.

Antonio R. PIRES (Cap-Vert): Nous apprécions l'effet fort louable qu'a fait notre Groupe de contact et nous tenons à le féliciter et à le remercier.

Les tâches dont nous avons investi ce Groupe n'étaient certainement pas faciles. Nous le constatons maintenant. L'honorable délégué d'Antigua-et-Barbuda a présenté une analyse très claire. La délégation du Cap-Vert tient à soutenir tout ce qu'il a dit au sein de cette Assemblée.

Nous pensons également qu'il faut souligner l'importance cruciale et le caractère intergouvernemental de notre Organisation. Comme l'a dit l'honorable délégué de Cuba, c'est un aspect fondamental que nous devons respecter et suivre.

Nous aussi, nous voulons dire: "indépendant"; oui, mais avec le Secrétariat. Parce que nous ne voyons pas un Groupe indépendant sans le Secrétariat, surtout si nous voulons atteindre les objectifs que nous nous sommes fixés ici. Nous sommes aussi pour une solution de compromis: oui, mais nous soutenons ce qu'ont dit les délégations de la Belgique et du Kenya, surtout l'adoption sans les crochets.

Joachim WINKEL (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): I was a little reluctant to ask to speak today out of feelings of modesty because I was a member of the Contact Group, and that Group has been praised so enormously. However, I think that a Contact Group such as this one is only as good as the Committee that has elected it. That is why we can return the compliments. I have heard so many well-weighted views that I am convinced that what we are hoping for will certainly be achieved. I think those who believe that the mandate for the Contact Group is too far-reaching as well as those who are in favour of it can learn from that argumentation. I think that Argentina's thoughts would be very useful as regards the role of the Organization and its internal structure. I especially welcome the declaration of the delegate of Cuba and I regret that he is not listening now - because I am talking about you, Sir, and about what you said in regard to this document which is before us here. That indicates the way I take it. I see this as dough which, with the yeast of the Contact Group, is going to be a nice loaf of bread with which we will be able to keep the Organization well-fed and as healthy as it has been up to now and as it may continue to be.

Now I come to another point. Our distinguished colleague from Turkey said that we were putting the cart before the horse. I think we are deciding about the load before we know about the horse. We are no great horsemen planning what we are going to do. We are going to carry a heavy load over a long, arduous road, and I am one of those who is lucky enough to be a farmer. You have to be very careful. You look at the load and at the roads you have to cover. When you know all this you can

go back to the stable and you look at your cart and, depending on how fast you have to go and on how heavy the load is, you take your fiery Arab steed or one of those nice tough Belgian animals. In any case I think what we have chosen here - first the load and then the horse - is the right approach. I will speak about this again later on.

CHAIRMAN: Moving further along on the carts and horses - and you always watch where you step when there are horses - I will call on Barbados.

Clifton E. MAYNARD (Barbados): As you know, my delegation stated its position on this issue when the matter was being discussed earlier. I too would like to thank the Contact Group for the important contribution they have made in the short time available. I must say that they have done well in the number of hours available to them, when I recall some time ago that it took a committee thirteen years to define "aggression". My delegation would not wish to repeat the comments made when we spoke earlier on this issue, but I cannot help but again emphasize two points that were made: that the proposals for any group external to the Organization could not be supported because I did not see a crisis and I do not believe the financial problem to be the sort of crisis that would require external examination. Therefore, while we could go along with some aspects of the draft from the high-level group, I must again ask the question as to why FAO, which a few years ago was held to be an Organization that other intergovernmental organizations should emulate because of management and because of the fact that its programmes responded to the needs of member countries, should need a review or reform. Therefore I still have a suspicion as to the real reason for this review or reform, or whatever you term it.

However, common sense demands that one should be prepared at all times to review, to reflect and to ensure that the goals which motivated the foundation of this Organization and all international organizations are constantly being followed and policies adopted in concert with these goals.

I would have been happier if the important contribution made by the French delegation was reflected in LIM/20 in greater detail because it corresponds with precisely what our views were on this whole question and with the mechanism that should be used in order to carry out this review.

I should like to add that it is vitally important that we understand here that eventually we have to respect the fact that this is an intergovernmental organization and in the long run, governments, through their representatives, will decide what happens to it, including the possibility that they might not wish it to exist any longer. But that is for governments to decide and therefore they should be responsible for ensuring that it continues to work to the benefit of Member States.

I would just like to add that the decisions taken on the report of the High level Group in New York reflect the fact that the international organization is intergovernmental in nature and that the governing bodies will always make the choices. I am sure that the Secretary General is going to be guided in his implementation of the work of the High Level Group by the comments made by the fifth committee in the resolution that they put to the Plenary which was adopted, after ensuring that two principles were respected. These same principles must be respected here, that is the principle that the chief executive or administrative officer has responsibility under the basic documents for certain matters and his role must be respected. The other one is the equality of all Member States.

If we can get the body which we believe would reflect those concerns into this piece of paper, we would have no difficulty in accepting it. I would hope that you would not insist on people reflecting what the horse should be because I do not care, provided it reflects the intergovernmental nature of this Organization.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr. Presidente, gracias por el intenso trabajo realizado por el Presidente y los miembros del Grupo de Contacto. Al principio del debate tuvimos la impresión de que podría lograrse el consenso, al menos sobre esta primera parte, pero en la medida en que hemos ido avanzando, y no obstante la declaración conciliante y serena que ha hecho nuestro amigo el Dr. Winkel de la República Federal de Alemania, tenemos la impresión de que nos estamos alejando del

consenso. Sin embargo, seguiremos acompañándole a Usted en su optimismo, Sr. Presidente, con las pocas fuerzas que nos quedan, sin comer, a estas horas.

En esta primera intervención, nos acogemos al dictamen suyo para referirnos solamente al LIM/50, y, concretamente al apartado B del párrafo dos, al cual hizo referencia adecuada el Embajador Di Mottola de Costa Rica, Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y del Caribe. Tenemos la impresión, Sr. Presidente, de que el término "procedimientos" que aparece entre corchetes es la nueva versión de lo que ya aparecía en el apartado B del párrafo dos del LIM/27. Decía "procesos intergubernamentales de adopción de decisiones". Además de que esto es inaceptable por principios a los que nos referiremos más adelante, incluir "procedimientos" en este párrafo resulta inadecuado y fuera de contexto. Porque resulta fácil observar en el resto de la redacción del apartado B del párrafo dos que ese texto se refiere a las funciones que corresponden exclusivamente a la Secretaría de la FAO y que nada tienen que ver con los procedimientos sobre cómo los representantes de gobiernos tomamos las decisiones.

Es fácil observar que el apartado B se refiere a asesoramiento, función catalítica, asistencia, etcétera, es decir, la función de la FAO. Si eso es así, como parece evidente, Sr. Presidente, lo máximo que podríamos aceptar es una referencia a la introducción de algunos cambios en la estructura interna y los métodos de trabajo de la Secretaría de la FAO. Esto sería coherente con el resto del apartado B del párrafo dos. Está es una propuesta que hacemos, Sr. Presidente, después de consultar a algunos colegas y que creemos tiene algún apoyo.

Finalmente, Sr. Presidente, queremos apoyar firmemente las declaraciones de Antigua y Barbuda, que fue excelente, la de Cuba y otros colegas, en el sentido de que será inútil todo empeño por desvirtuar el principio democrático de la igualdad de todos los estados, cualesquiera que sean sus condiciones económicas, cualesquiera que sean sus contribuciones financieras, su extensión, su población o cualquier otro factor discriminatorio.

El Gobierno de Colombia jamás aceptará que en esta Organización, se altere el principio de que cada estado tiene los mismos derechos y la participación y el voto de cada país es soberanamente igual.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Notre délégation se limitera, Monsieur le Président, pour suivre vos injonctions, à donner son avis préliminaire sur le texte contenu au LIM/50.

Nous n'avons pas de problème particulier sur ce texte. Pour l'instant, nous pouvons être d'accord sur sa formulation actuelle.

Toutefois, nous avons quand même l'impression, comme l'ont dit les Représentants de la Turquie, du Brésil et de la RFA, que parler du mandat avant même de savoir qui sera chargé de l'exécuter, c'est peut-être aller trop vite, et nous risquons de discuter le fond de la question sans savoir quel est l'organe qui va être chargé de l'exécuter. Nous risquons peut-être également de buter sur la composition de cet organe et de revenir finalement sur tout le travail que nous sommes en train d'effectuer.

La délégation algérienne souhaiterait qu'au b) du paragraphe 2. on supprime le membre de phrase qui dit: "sous réserve de l'adhésion des Etats Membres à l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation". Il y a déjà une délégation qui l'a indiqué, il me semble qu'il s'agit de la délégation de l'Argentine, et nous pensons également que tous les Etats Membres qui sont ici présents ont déjà adhéré à l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation, et qu'il ne s'agit pas de remettre en cause cet Acte constitutif. Donc cette phrase n'a pas lieu d'être.

German CARRASCO DOMINGUEZ (Chile): Señor Presidente antes que nada debo expresar, como país latinoamericano, el agradecimiento que tenemos todos para los que formaron el Grupo de Contacto. Los países latinoamericanos concurrimos a este Grupo de Contacto y hubo esperanzas de que se iba a alcanzar un consenso, un consenso, Señor Presidente, que reflejaba en gran medida el sentimiento general de los países que concurren a esta Conferencia de la FAO. Este sentimiento era ya bien conocido de todos. Nosotros abrigábamos la esperanza, y creo que allí los países del Grupo de los 77 hicieron sus grandes esfuerzos para que hubiera comprensión para nuestras posiciones. Sin embargo. Señor Presidente, los documentos resultantes no nos han dejado del todo contentos.

Otras delegaciones ya han expresado las dudas, los temores, que ven detrás de cada una de las frases que contienen los documentos que tenemos delante de nosotros.

Señor Presidente, Chile, al igual que otros países, ya dijo en su oportunidad lo que estimaba y lo que pensaba frente a estos proyectos de resolución para reestructurar la FAO. Nosotros siempre hemos creído que la FAO no necesita una reestructuración que pueda afectar su marco legal y su rol fundamental, que está bien conocido por todos y que durante muchos años ha funcionado sin tropiezos.

Es evidente, Señor Presidente, que la FAO necesita algunos pequeños ajustes. Estos pequeños ajustes y los problemas que ahora se suscitan, a juicio de mi delegación son un reflejo de la crisis económica internacional; es un problema presupuestario acentuado por una contracción en el cumplimiento de las obligaciones como contribuyentes que tienen muchos estados miembros, sea porque tienen una gran deuda exterior, sea porque tienen un gran déficit en sus presupuestos, sea por diversas razones, muchos estados miembros no están en condiciones de pagar totalmente sus deudas y en efecto no lo han hecho. Esto, a juicio nuestro ha movido a que se crea que por el establecimiento de un grupo de cualquier naturaleza de personas ajenas a la FAO puede mejorar el funcionamiento de la Organización, en un aspecto que básicamente es financiero.

Señor Presidente, la FAO es una organización, como ya muchos lo han dicho aquí, intergubernamental, que forma parte del esquema de las Naciones Unidas. Chile es uno de los países miembros fundadores de la FAO y de las Naciones Unidas; nosotros entramos a las Naciones Unidas, a esta Organización, y a las otras que forman el sistema general de las Naciones Unidas con dos compromisos básicos, Señor Presidente. Uno, que se respetara la igualdad jurídica de los estados y otro que se respetara la soberanía de cada uno de ellos. Ningún estado puede aceptar que personas externas a su Organización vengán a dictarle las normas sobre las cuales tiene que regirse su funcionamiento futuro. Yo me pregunto, Señor Presidente, si alguno de los países que tiene graves problemas económicos y financieros internos estaría dispuesto a que una Comisión de alto nivel venida de fuera, formada por gente ilustre, por cierto, como dice aquí en el proyecto LIM/27 "personas elegidas por su eminencia y competencia especial en los campos de la agricultura, el desarrollo, las finanzas, y la administración", estaría dispuesto, repito, a que vinieran a dictarle normas de lo que tiene que hacer. A muchos de los países subdesarrollados no les parecería bien y yo creo que incluso al suyo Señor Presidente, que hubiera una Comisión de alto nivel que viniera de fuera y les dijera cómo superar el problema de la deuda externa y de la deuda interna. Creo que usted no lo aceptaría.

Por esta misma razón mi delegación se opone firmemente a que nosotros aceptemos una comisión externa que venga a dictar normas a los estados soberanos que conforman la FAO para que les indique cómo debe cambiarse. Estamos sí, Señor Presidente, dispuestos a que se constituya un grupo de expertos nombrado por los países miembros, escogido por nosotros mismos y que venga de los sectores que nosotros estimamos que son los útiles, y para eso tenemos un comité que está en condiciones de elegirlo y un grupo regional que lo pueda designar.

Señor Presidente, me adhiero a muchas de las expresiones valiosas que se han vertido aquí por otros países anteriormente con respecto a lo que no debe ser este grupo de alto nivel, este sistema de reforma de la FAO y esta Resolución.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Chile. I will not respond to your question, but, believe me, you tempt me dearly when you ask a former Member of the Congress of the United States whether we need a high-level group.

We will now take up some questions that were directed, and try to get a response. In the course of the discussions earlier, Argentina had raised some questions for which it asked clarification. It was given assurance by this Chair that we would return to them for clarification. We would suggest that, since the questions were dealing with the points on the draft by Norway, rather than the Chairman of the group responding by discussion with him and with note to you and to Norway, it would be in order for Norway to respond. The Chair would suggest that it might be a little different, but perhaps we could engage in a colloquy between the Chair and you: if you pose the question, I will try, as directly as we can, to get a direct response. Please state your question and I shall ask Norway to respond.

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Durante el curso del debate me temo que alguna delegación no ha comprendido el contenido de las preguntas, o por lo menos de sus interpretaciones, pero de todas maneras las formularé para que, como usted bien ha dicho, quiénes redactaron el LIM/27 nos den su propia interpretación.

Las dos preguntas concretamente se referían en el párrafo 2 en la primera línea a qué se entiende por la función de la FAO particularmente, y quizás haya sido malinterpretado por otras delegaciones cuando hice uso de la palabra, repito, pregunté qué se entendía por la función de la FAO a la luz de que en el apartado b) del mismo párrafo se ratificaba el respeto a la constitución de la Organización. Digo esto porque las funciones de la FAO están perfectamente establecidas en el artículo 1 de la Constitución de la FAO.

La segunda pregunta mucho me temo que ya ha tenido una respuesta y se refiere a qué se entiende por estructuras internas de la FAO. Mi interpretación es que se trataba de la Secretaría de la FAO, pero quizás la distinguida representación de Noruega, a través suyo, pueda tener la gentileza de aclarar ese tema.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): FAO's role - by the way, that word, as far as I can recall, is not used in the Constitution; its objectives are set out there, but I have not referred to the Basic Texts in the last few minutes - FAO's role, it is a word that is perceived in different ways. How does it fulfil the function? How is it perceived? It can also of course be perceived from the other side. What is its place in the system? That is a different perception. That is not what is meant here. I am not the only one who has been using the word "role" in this sense. As we have seen in another LIM document which has been placed before us, drafted by a group of Latin American countries, they have also been talking about strengthening the role of FAO. If you strengthen the role, I think you must mean it in the sense that I meant it, otherwise they would also, in using the first sense of the term, be going against the Constitution as set forth.

Mr Chairman, did you want me only to respond to that particular point?

CHAIRMAN: Argentina stated, any other question or follow-up, if you chose.

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Agradezco la oportunidad que usted me da, Señor Presidente de hacer le repregunta. Comprendo la explicación que nos da nuestro distinguido colega y amigo de Noruega; lamentablemente no puedo compartir su interpretación y como ha hecho mención a un proyecto de resolución en el cual soy parte, por contar con el patrocinio latinoamericano y del Caribe, quiero asegurarle que la visión nuestra, el enfoque nuestro, me da la impresión de que es distinto. Nosotros efectivamente nos referimos al fortalecimiento de la Organización a través del fortalecimiento de sus funciones. Quizás sea un problema de idioma no estamos en momento alguno solicitando la modificación del artículo 1 de la Constitución de la FAO. Por lo menos no es esa la intención de mi delegación.

CHAIRMAN: Are your questions answered?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I will not ask for any changes in the Constitution's Article 1 either. I was pointing out that, in the same way as the sponsors of other resolutions had used that word, I will use that word, I think I meant that word in the same way. Whether you spell out that you strengthen or not, the point is that you use that word in the same sense. I think that was self-explanatory in that case.

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Señor Presidente, entrar en este diálogo no lo ayuda a usted, por lo tanto doy por terminada la primera pregunta y rogaría pasar a una explicación sobre mi segunda preocupación que es que se defina más claramente que quiere decir "estructuras internas de la FAO".

CHAIRMAN: Libya has a point or order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya)(original language Arabic): I do not think this form of discussion is of any use to the Commission. I believe that the discussion should be managed or arranged in a different manner. I object to this procedure, giving the word to Argentina, then to Norway and so on and so forth. We could go on like this until tomorrow morning. I believe that we should have a constructive discussion, but arranged in a different manner.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would respectfully have to disagree with that and point out that it is very important, because what you are establishing here is a legislative intent. The questions asked by Argentina earlier in the course of the discussion could not be responded to at that time out of courtesy to everyone. We clearly said that we would like to provide them with the opportunity to do that. It is an extremely important and constructive contribution to the dialogue here because what Argentina is raising are precise points of interpretation and clarity. If you had to go back later and decide what was meant - presumably when it was adopted - by these given phrases and it was open to possible interpretation, then the final arbiter must be the intent of the sponsor, and he is clearly establishing here legislative intent. It is a very constructive proposal, and the Chair is certainly not trying to give extra time to Argentina, but it is trying to expedite the matter. We did have countries which asked questions, and each of them was assured that they would be given an opportunity. The Chair views this as informative for all countries and could not conceive of how it could be considered otherwise.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): When we look at that word, I think it has to be understood in the context of a discussion that was held in the Contact Group. You can ask the Chairman of the Group to confirm that, if he so desires. A large number of concepts was discussed and we tried to define those concepts which would deal with - I am trying to find synonyms - the tools for arriving at certain conclusions, which were to be examined without actually touching upon the specific processes that were otherwise established in the Constitution. We did not want to include what the Member Countries themselves had as processes in their own capitals in their own aims of coming to the points of view and the conclusions to which they would come. We want to limit this to what went on allied directly and pertaining to the Organization. As a result of that we came to those words to describe those activities that we thought could usefully be examined. In other words, it is activities that take place directly in connection with the Organization and in the Organization that we have tried to describe.

CHAIRMAN: I believe that concludes that colloquy, does it not?

Guillermo GONZALEZ (Argentina): Creame que no tengo ninguna intención de demorar esta sesión y mucho menos de crearle a Usted un problema adicional. La explicación que me da el distinguido representante de Noruega, señor Presidente, no es a nuestro juicio totalmente clara pero, de todas maneras, dejo constancia - porque así lo había señalado al principio - de que la delegación Argentina no puede aceptar la interpretación del apartado b) del párrafo 2º si no se interpreta en la forma en que lo hizo el señor Embajador de Colombia al hacer un proyecto de enmienda a este párrafo.

CHAIRMAN: We have just a couple more quick questions that were raised on which we need to get answers. Canada raised a specific question about the presence of a French draft. The Chair is not aware of one. Could the Secretariat advise Canada if there is a draft of a French resolution that was referred to, and has it been distributed?

Ms Kay KILLINCSWORTH (Secretary Commission II): No. A draft submitted by the delegation of France was presented to the Contact Group.

CHAIRMAN: Bangladesh had a question on the United Kingdom interpretation. I believe it was subsequently answered.

I have inadvertently overlooked Italy.

Mme Anna Teresa FRITTELLI ANNIBALDI (Italie): Monsieur le Président, vous ne devez pas vous excuser puisque vous m'avez donné la parole. Je regrette simplement qu'on doive revenir ' en arrière.

Je voulais avant tout féliciter et remercier le Groupe de contact pour le travail qu'il a accompli. Ma délégation estime que la critique constructive de son propre travail par rapport aux objectifs voulus est toujours la meilleure façon d'avancer. Nous pensons qu'il ressort des travaux et des conclusions de la Conférence que la FAO a fait preuve de sa capacité de progrès, d'évaluation et d'amendement, . suivant les suggestions en ce sens de ses organes directeurs.

Cela étant dit, mon pays serait prêt, par esprit de conciliation, à se rallier à un consensus sur le document C 87/LIM/50, pour laisser la porte ouverte à tout ce qui pourrait aider - et nous attendons la preuve - à faire mieux."

Poursuivant dans des considérations d'ordre général, je dirai que nous partageons ce que la délégation de la Belgique a souligné. Nous sommes convaincus que tout exercice de ce genre ne peut être fait sans l'apport du Secrétariat de la FAO.

Je ne vais pas insister maintenant sur ce sujet car je me réserve la possibilité, le cas échéant, d'intervenir à nouveau, mais il faudrait se mettre d'accord à l'avance sur cet aspect de la question: par qui et en fonction de quoi les experts indépendants - et je souligne indépendants - devraient-ils être choisis? Je crois que n'importe quelle étude conduite sans l'apport et l'expérience du Secrétariat de la FAO et sans l'appui constructif de l'Organisation risquerait d'être une étude belle et compétente mais pas basée sur l'expérience.

Voulons-nous quelque chose qui puisse être laissé en l'air? Je ne le crois pas.

Enfin, j'ai entendu une suggestion qui me semble bonne. Pourquoi ne pas parler d'experts externes plutôt qu'Indépendants, si ce mot nous pose des problèmes? Pour conclure, si l'on considère que des yeux externes pourraient aider à accomplir la tâche, nous estimons que la proposition de la France pourrait être prise en considération afin d'arriver à une solution.

CHAIRMAN: We have indicated earlier that we would proceed into a discussion of the mechanism, and the Chair feels that it is important to clarify a couple of points. The Chair feels that in order to discuss the mechanism of the proposed High Level Committee of Experts, if we are going to suggest alternative suggestions for that and how to do it, it would be in order and appropriate for the sponsor of the Resolution to explain what it meant by paragraph 1. We will do that in a moment.

The Chair would further observe that there has also been considerable discussion about the Secretariat's participation in any outside group. Therefore, it might be a fruitful discussion of the issue if at some point we would clarify from Norway what it means in paragraph 6 by "small Secretariat", and also ask the Deputy Director-General on behalf of the Director-General if he would respond to some of the concern raised here so that the body would know if the Deputy Director-General feels that the Director-General could work with such a group along the provisions in paragraph 6, because we have many countries represented and the Director-General might have difficulty with that.

Perhaps it would be more appropriate at this time if we asked the Secretariat to respond to the question of whether or not the Secretariat has that problem, so that we can establish that.

Turkey has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Temei ISKIT (Turkey): It is on the procedure. You interrupted my statement saying that I could not speak on the mechanism. Is the mechanism question open for discussion now?

CHAIRMAN: I said that we are going to try to get into proceeding with a discussion on that, and I thought the Chair made it clear that we were just cautioning against a detailed discussion, certainly not the general sort of remarks you made earlier. We will be proceeding into a more detailed discussion of that.

The Chair would have to observe that we have two options before us. We have tried to be flexible in having a flow of discussion on a number of things and to try to come back later, or we could follow a more strict interpretation of the rules under which the Norwegian Resolution as originally drafted takes precedence and would have to be voted on, which clearly no one wishes to do at this point. We are trying to avoid those sorts of confrontational votes and procedures, and be more flexible. The Chair can do it either way.

Congo has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je ne comprends pas très bien qu'à ce stade de nos débats vous puissiez demander au Secrétariat de nous donner un point de vue sur on ne sait quoi.

Le Groupe de contact a abordé cette question et il faut avouer qu'après un échange de points de vue les avis étaient très divergents. Par conséquent, nous ne pensons pas pour notre part qu'un débat dans cette salle puisse aboutir à des conclusions acceptables par tous.

Il serait de bon ton, en tant que Président, que vous puissiez examiner cette question avec le Président du Groupe de contact pour mesurer les difficultés à discuter, à ouvrir le débat sur ce point ici.

C'est pour cette raison que pour ma part je ne pense pas que nous soyons ici pour écouter le Secrétariat sur on ne sait quoi, il faut d'abord que nous puissions, nous Etats Membres, discuter de la question et proposer des solutions avant d'écouter le Secrétariat.

Voilà ce que je pense de cette question.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlo DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Tengo un punto de orden. Durante las sesiones largas de días y de horas del Grupo de Contacto se pasaron muchas horas y nos dimos cuenta que no hay ninguna forma de acuerdo posible sobre el párrafo 1 de la proposición de Noruega.

La Delegación francesa ha sometido, sea al Grupo de Contacto, sea oficiosamente a muchas delegaciones miembros de la Conferencia, un texto de propuesta. Yo le pido atenta pero firmemente que Usted tenga la amabilidad de permitir a Francia que presente su propuesta.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry but we cannot take France out of order. We are trying to follow a more orderly procedure. The Chair simply observed that many member countries during the course of the discussion speculated, speculated, on whether or not the Secretariat would have difficulty in working with such a group. The Chair simply observed that that is an opinion that could come from the Secretariat. If the Secretariat wishes to respond, I certainly think that it would be in order. If it doesn't wish to respond, so be it.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Leo HERTOOG (Netherlands): I would like to suggest that we proceed with the debate in the way you just had in mind to do.

CHAIRMAN: That is the best suggestion I have heard in two weeks. The Chairman would just caution, as mentioned before, that the rules and things that you are handed at the time also include references to suggestions that at some point you should intervene and make such observations. It is up to the body to decide those, but we do have an attempt here to try and get facts and information from which member countries can make sound judgments. It certainly seems obvious to the Chair that if that particular issue is in dispute, it is easily rectified.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL: The Commission is discussing the text contained in C 87/LIM/50 emerging from the Contact Group. The relevant paragraph of that text is paragraph 4, and I do not believe that the Director-General will have any difficulty in carrying out his functions in line with paragraph 4. In any event, the Director-General is, of course, at the service of the Organization

and it is up Governments to take the final decisions. As far as the Secretariat is concerned, there should be no problems with paragraph 4 of C 87/LIM/50.

CHAIRMAN: Canada, are you raising a Point of Order or seeking to be recognized?

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

George Henry MUSGROVE (Canada): I hope am not out of order. I do find an increasing propensity for people who want to seek the floor to use the route of Point of Order. I won't answer that question too directly whether I raise a Point of Order, Mr Chairman, but my point is simply this: that we did begin a discussion which was introduced by the delegate of Norway on the Nordic Resolution that went on to discuss the Contact Group Report as contained in C 87/LIM/50, but I thought I heard at the inception of the discussion that we would confine ourselves during the discussion to see whether a consensus did exist. In his introduction, the delegate of Norway said in relation to the Nordic Resolution that the Nordic countries would consider replacing the irrelevant parts of their Resolution with this work of the Contact Group if this consensus did exist; and before we move on and leave this subject, which I think is being proposed now....

CHAIRMAN: No...

George Henry MUSGROVE (Canada): ... whether consensus could be ...

CHAIRMAN: We are not proposing to leave that subject. What the Chair observed some time ago was that we appeared to have a consensus, but certainly not total unanimity here, that there were a great number of countries which clearly wished to have an extended discussion in more detail of the mechanism. The Chair has also just announced that we are going to proceed onto a discussion of the mechanism; but, in order to properly introduce that and in following the proper order, clearly the sponsor of the Resolution had to explain what was meant in his relevant section, paragraph 1. We would introduce the discussion on the mechanism if the delegate of Norway would be so kind as to explain what he means by his paragraph 1.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): The preamble of paragraph 1, or the operative part of paragraph 1?

CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 1? No, the High-Level Group, so we can establish some kind of frame as we begin to discuss the mechanism. Could you please make some introductory comments on your proposal, so that those who are discussing it will have some idea of your intentions.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I shall try to do so, Mr Chairman. I am sure I shall have to come back on this many times, as will other members of the Nordic Group, because I have had certain experiences during the last 33 hours that this sort of discussion is not completed at one sitting - or at two either, for that matter!

We have put in the phrase "ad hoc" to make it quite clear that we do not here have in mind the institution of any sort of permanent structure. We have used the expression "High-Level", because we believe that this would be a group that should have this sort of overall view, this sort of understanding, this sort of ability and experience that would enable them to deal with these matters on a broad basis. The phrase "a committee of experts" is one on which we can hear the opinions of others. The child has many names: you may call it "a group of experts", "a group of eminent people", "an eminent persons group", etc., but we are trying to indicate a concept here - that is all we are trying to do with this phrase...

CHAIRMAN: Would Member Nations, if you are going to conduct discussions that can be heard, conduct them outside so that Norway can be heard?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): We are trying to give an indication of the type of persons we are looking for, working together in a group, in a body. We also considered that, if this group was to work reasonably efficiently its numbers should be as small as possible. By that, we really meant to indicate that, after dialogue with members here, all of you could accept it, and we all know that discussion always takes place on numbers. But from an efficiency point of view a smaller group is preferable to a larger one.

We have also brought in the concept of "designated by Member Nations", because we want to make it clear that our Organization as belonging to the Member Nations - to all Member Nations who have an interest in doing so - should in part at least, through their specific groupings, have some say in the selection of its members so as to ensure that they are in some way connected with the process, because quite clearly it is impossible that every Member Nation should have a participant in this Group, - at least, it is quite clear to me, and I hope I don't have to come back and explain that point!

We have here introduced a concept of an independent Chairman. When this was briefly discussed in the Contact Group, I believe - but I may stand corrected by the Chairman of the Contact Group - one of its members suggested the name of Mr Swaminathan who was formerly our Chairman of the Council, as an independent chairman. We believe that the Chairman should be selected independently on the selection process of the other members, in order to facilitate discussion in the most objective manner possible. I believe in some way the same thinking and philosophy lies behind the creation of the institution of an independent chairman of the Council.

The main point and basic element of our thinking is that we believe that this Group should be mainly composed of members outside the actual Organization itself - outside its working, so that it can look at it with fresh eyes, with a broader view and not, as one of the members of the Contact Group termed it when the discussion again briefly touched upon it, as suffering from "Betriebsblindheit".

CHAIRMAN: The Chair recommends that we proceed with the discussion of the mechanism, and it seems clear to most of us that it would facilitate matters if the Chair recognizes first France and then holds a discussion. We will not be voting on anything at this point, and Norway had the right to come back on their Resolution before any amendments are moved; but on the discussion of the mechanism, the Chair would like to recognize France and to request anyone who wishes to speak on that issue to please indicate so to the Secretariat.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vice Chairman of Commission II took the Chair
Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vice Président de la Commission II assume la Présidence
Ocupa la presidencia Bashir El Mabrouk SAID, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

Bernard LEDUN (France): Monsieur le Président, la proposition de la délégation française doit être comprise comme un complément, une adjonction au document du Groupe de contact C 87/LIM/50. Nous n'avons malheureusement pas eu le temps d'en débattre au sein du Groupe de contact, aussi je le livre ici, en Commission II, à votre appréciation, en espérant qu'elle recueillera l'agrément le plus large possible.

Il va sans dire qu'il s'agit ici d'une proposition de compromis, qui s'efforce de retenir des uns et des autres points de vue en présence des éléments en commun. Je tiens surtout à redire une nouvelle fois que la formule que nous proposons présente l'avantage de faire un pas de plus sur la voie de la technicité, d'être une formule en quelque sorte non politique, car des experts désignés par les Etats Membres ou les régions seront - ou se sentiront - investis d'une mission de caractère quasiment politique ou institutionnel, au lieu que des experts désignés par le Comité du Programme et des Finances le seront encore une fois, és qualité, c'est-à-dire en fonction - et en fonction seulement - de leurs compétences professionnelles, de leur audience, au-delà des limites qu'imposent les frontières ou les idéologies. C'est là, à notre avis, un avantage décisif sur des experts désignés par les Etats Membres. Désignés par nos Etats, nous le sommes tous ici, Monsieur le Président; ce que nous voulons maintenant, c'est donc une plus-value en termes de compétence mais aussi en termes de bonne volonté, comme l'a déclaré tout à l'heure l'honorable représentant de la Belgique.

Nous pensons que le mécanisme que nous introduisons est en mesure de nous rapprocher de cet objectif. Nous faisons confiance à des experts réellement indépendants, qui en définitive ne représenteront qu'eux-mêmes. C'est là l'essentiel, Monsieur le Président.

Je vous lis à présent, à vitesse réduite, le texte de notre proposition à inclure dans le document que vous avez sous les yeux:

"Aux fins de cet examen (quand je dis "examen", il s'agit bien entendu de l'examen qui est mentionné au paragraphe 2 du document C 87/LIM/50), le Comité du Programme et le Comité financier travaillant conjointement seront assistés d'un petit nombre d'experts. Ils seront choisis en fonction de leur compétence dans les domaines de l'agriculture, du développement, des finances et de l'administration, par les Comités du Programme et des finances en consultation avec le Directeur général, en tenant compte d'une répartition géographique équilibrée."

Je tiens également à vous signaler que je peux mettre à la disposition de notre assemblée le texte d'un préambule qui viendrait coiffer l'ensemble du document et que je suis prêt soit à lire, mais soit plutôt à communiquer ultérieurement au Secrétariat qui pourrait le faire circuler, sous forme de document écrit par exemple.

J'espère que tout le monde a pu prendre note de la proposition que j'ai faite. Il est bien évident que si des questions doivent être posées, je suis prêt à y répondre.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Thank you, France, I would also like to welcome you.

Clearly, you have all heard the proposal put forward by France on the different mechanisms relating to the study of certain aspects of the Organization.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): When the basic document C 87/30 was circulated my delegation tried to go through it with due regard within the time limits available. We have tried to understand it from the angle of a neutral position, also placing ourselves as part of the whole process so as to gather a balanced view. From both of these angles we were able to witness that the suggestions and recommendations concerned in all those papers were far-reaching and useful. Even though there were some areas which required further study and analysis in order to form our own conclusive evaluations of the whole process, which it tabled for discussion during the 24th Conference, there was one area to which all members of the delegations agreed without ideas contained in the document, so that this would contribute towards strengthening the Organization for which we all have a responsibility.

With this as a background, the establishment of the Contact Group was welcomed by our delegation in its entirety. To our satisfaction, the contact Group was established, and it worked long hours and came up with ideas that were both conciliatory and "also of a high quality.

Our delegation would like to join others in expressing its gratitude and due regard for the outstanding service that was provided to the Commission by the Contact Group and its Chairman.

We were also satisfied that the Norwegian proposal was used as a basic document, to which the ideas contained in the other papers and recommendations were directed and focused.

It was unfortunate that the papers were processed by our delegation late in the evening, so we could not express our views on it as much as we would have liked and at length. However, we feel that the paper placed before us for consideration, after long hours of work and concentration, deserves our support.

We would also like to say that the ideas contained in document C 87/LIM/50 should be taken as acceptable and that we should proceed to other areas which were not dealt with by the Contact Group. If we do that, we might come up with the mechanism that needs to be worked out, which at present seems to be within reachable dimensions when we consider the French proposal. We would therefore like to indicate our acceptance of a consensus, and will not adhere to any position that will block programmes and support to the proposal thus placed before us.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Now I think it would be preferable for delegations when they take the floor to focus on the machinery proposed by Norway and by France. Let us focus on this in order to try and make progress.

Humberto CARRION MCDONOUGH (Nicaragua): Sr. Presidente, muchas gracias. Queremos, en primer lugar, manifestar nuestra complacencia por verlo a usted presidiendo esta sesión. Voy a limitarme a lo que usted ha mencionado, que es precisamente nuestra principal responsabilidad en esta fase del debate: el procedimiento. Además, Nicaragua ha suscrito un documento, que ha sido el C 87/30. No nos hemos separado de esas posiciones, y también ya el Presidente del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe ha hecho una exposición inicial, en la primera fase del debate, sobre el resultado del Grupo de Contacto y los proyectos que tenemos ante nosotros para consideración.

Dicho esto, quiero también hacer un reconocimiento específico de parte de mi Delegación a los países nórdicos, en el sentido de que entendemos que sus posiciones en relación a la FAO han sido y son de apoyo a los trabajos de la Organización y han sido también de apoyo a los países miembros necesitados de la cooperación financiera de la FAO. En ese entendido, también deseamos hacer un reconocimiento a todos los miembros del grupo de Contacto, por el espíritu de cooperación que se demostró, y en ese espíritu deseamos apoyar la propuesta de compromiso que ha hecho la Representación de Francia sobre los mecanismos que podríamos adoptar para la posible revisión de los trabajos de la Organización, según están redactados en el documento C 87/LIM/50, con la salvedad de la posición de reserva que presentó en su oportunidad el Embajador de Costa Rica. Creo que puede llegarse a una fórmula de compromiso en el espíritu de cooperación, en el entendido, insisto, de que todos los miembros de la Organización aquí presentes deseamos que la FAO continúe sus labores en beneficio de los más necesitados y en su lucha en contra del hambre, la desnutrición y el subdesarrollo.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): It seems to me that at this stage it would be desirable for the Secretariat to distribute the proposal submitted by the French delegation. This should be in writing and you should have it as soon as possible so that we can carry on with our work. In order to facilitate our debate on this, I propose that the Secretariat should distribute as quickly as possible to all delegations the proposal made by the French delegation.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): We would support the proposal that the Secretariat should distribute this text in all languages as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN(original language Arabic): The Secretariat have noted this, and they assure me they are going to distribute this text in all languages as quickly as possible.

In order not to waste any more time, I propose that in the meantime we should continue our debate.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): First, we have one small question before I go into the substance of the matter. Earlier on, with the work with C 87/LIM/50 as a basis of compromise submitted by the Contact Group, Norway, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, if I understood them correctly, gave us the impression that if there was substantial amendment to C 87/LIM/50 they would be making revisions reverting to the document they have. I do not know whether this is their stance in relation to the French submission. Perhaps we could have some clarification later, because that would affect what we want to say.

Having said that, we think we should support the proposals that have been made. We agree with the proposal by the delegate of France, but we suggest a small revision of that, that is, to say "For the purposes of this review, a group of experts, working in consultation with the Finance and Programme Committees and the Director-General ...", and then the rest continues as they put it.

We appreciate the view that the Programme and Finance Committees could carry this out, but we see this as really tied with responsibility if we were to assign them the responsibility, the way it is put here, because, the way we get the French proposal, it is they that will be doing this review, but in the process will be assisted. The onus of carrying out the revision is with the Finance and Programme Committees, but they will be assisted with it. We wish that the onus of carrying out the revision be with the group of experts. They should be assisted, or their work should be facilitated, by the Committees. I think that will give us something good.

We should also wish to say something to the effect that the institution, in our view, should try to borrow from the daily human behaviour of all of us sitting here. I know that this morning before we left wherever we came from about 99 percent of us went to the mirror. Everyday we go to the mirror and look at it. It has become a routine. We do it without really checking. If you were to ask yourself why it is that we all go to the mirror, it is simple, it is almost obvious. A mirror is a very neutral object. It assists us to improve. The view of the Kenyan delegation is that we should submit ourselves to the neutrality of the mirror. In so far as we look at this, let us submit ourselves to the neutrality of the mirror.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): First of all, I want to thank Mr Høstmark from Norway for the very clear presentation of the mechanism of review as it is to be found in paragraph 1 of the Nordic resolution. He has underlined that, in order to make such a review, you need to have fresh eyes, looking at FAO in the world of under-development, in the world of hunger and malnutrition. It should look into the future, beyond the year 2000, give suggestions and some guidance for further discussions on this issue. I would also like to point to the fact that, when one speaks of an independent group of experts, we should also look at the same time at paragraph 6 where it clearly says that the group of eminent persons should be provided - I guess by FAO - with a small secretariat, so this link with the Organization which is necessary is provided for in the resolution we have before us.

I would also like to thank the delegate of France for the presentation of their idea. However, I have some difficulty in seeing in the French proposal a compromise. We are suggesting these kinds of fresh eyes. There is some suggestion to have experts selected for their competence in the field of agriculture, development, finance or administration. But it is not so much technical questions which should be looked at. We have confidence in the technical abilities of FAO. There is a suggestion in the French proposal that the review should be carried out by the Programme and Finance Committees. The Programme Committee has in its task today to look at the biennium, to look at everything, to see if all the requests from member countries are brought together correctly. Let me remind you, FAO may be a little bit like a truck. It is good for 20 tons, but what we are putting on FAO may already be 30 or 40 tons. It is overloaded, so it may be quite difficult for FAO to fulfil its work. The Finance Committee should look to see that it is not overloaded, but I do not know if this can always be fulfilled.

Let me underline again the fact that we should have fresh eyes when we come to the last example brought forward by the delegate of Kenya. When we looked into a mirror when we were young we looked one way. When we are older, we are grey, from one day to the other we may not see the difference but somebody from outside may tell us that we are different when years pass by.

Sr^a. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): Nuestra delegación se ha expresado ya en numerosas ocasiones en relación con la posible revisión de ciertos aspectos de nuestra Organización, pues aunque creemos que todo es perfectible, pensamos que este examen se daba en condiciones y en un momento muy particulares. Hemos, sin embargo, reiterado también nuestra posición abierta al diálogo, y en ese sentido nos hemos sentado a la Mesa de Discusiones para escuchar en términos igualitarios con los representantes de las diferentes posturas en relación con estos aspectos.

Quiero expresar nuestro gran reconocimiento y respeto a la postura de los países nórdicos y a su portavoz, el Sr. Høstmark.. Creemos en la buena fe y en todas las condiciones que han acompañado a su propuesta, pero creemos también y agradecemos mucho a la delegación francesa, porque creo que nos ha traído a la Mesa una solución de compromiso que realmente, en la resolución presentada por nuestros grupos, habíamos propuesto el mecanismo intergubernamental establecido en nuestra Constitución, y en donde estamos representados legítimamente los gobiernos miembros, con una representación de carácter equilibrado y regional.

Es por esto que la propuesta francesa la consideramos muy válida porque justamente tomamos lo constructivo de la propuesta nórdica, que es la unión de expertos de alta capacidad para venirse a adicionar, apoyar, el trabajo de los Comités de Programas y de Finanzas, que en forma usual han encargado evaluaciones y estudios que han servido para dirimir aspectos que el Consejo ha encargado a estos Comités, y es por ello que nosotros consideramos que esta propuesta francesa es muy valiosa y que, unida al mandato que hemos concordado todos los países que tenemos diferentes posturas, podría ser una buena solución de compromiso, por lo que nuestro país le da todo su apoyo.

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): I should like to be a little briefer than perhaps I shall be, but I should like to put the proposal of France in the context of the time available and the work that has been done. Before doing so, I should again like to thank the representative of Canada for his extremely persuasive and well thought out plea for reform and for acceptance of the idea. As he is aware, many of us would not believe that there was need for wholesale reform or establishment of any major structural changes in the functioning of FAO, but as a compromise we have gone along with a number of countries to do our best to improve, if possible, our own working and the working of the Organization in which we are represented, which is FAO. Let us not imagine that just because FAO has improved the problems of world food and agriculture, it has solved them. Let us have some sense of modesty. No given organization can solve the world's problems, no matter what we do. Since this Organization has served a very notable purpose for many years, we should be a little cautious in working for wholesale changes.

I go along with the simile or parable of needing to look at the mirror, but, before one looks in the mirror, the person who is going to look in the mirror should be there, otherwise the mirror itself reflects all types of passing objects. To that extent, therefore, the idea of having a group of experts which consists not only of experts selected by the Finance and Programme Committees but includes the Finance and Programme Committee members themselves should be acceptable. After all, the Programme and Finance Committees do represent a very important aspect - almost all important in total aspects - of the working of FAO. It would be much more conducive to good work if there were inter-action between this group of independent-minded experts and the Organization itself it seeks to benefit. Therefore, to cut things short, I think that it is a very happy complement to the Nordic proposal to accept the French proposal in total. There are some small lacunae which I think can be filled in later as to the number of experts. It will be important to go into detail in due course. After all, one is thinking of extremely far-reaching changes, and therefore it would not do just to have a small number. At some point in the Conference one will have to think of the number, how the Chairman will be selected and other things.

But as things stand, I think it would be reflecting the sense of the house and a large number of small countries, as was very eloquently expressed by Antigua and Barbuda and Barbados, have expressed the same view.

Finally, as a matter of procedure, may I suggest that while the complementary proposal is being translated and circulated it would be useful if as soon as possible we all consider the preamble which has been prepared. That also may save time and perhaps it can be circulated soon.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): We are now considering as a principal document before us C 87/LIM/50. If we look into this document we see that there is no paragraph 1 and also in the second paragraph there is an empty bracket, as well as one in paragraph 3. The reason for this is that we have before us really two documents, one presented by the Latin American Group, LIM/29 Rev. 1 and the Nordic proposal which was LIM/27. The Contact Group could not agree on either of these proposals, regarding the mechanism of the review, the Nordic proposal was not acceptable to the sponsors of LIM/29, the delegations of Latin America and the Near-East Group, nor to the other members of the Contact Group. Neither was the Latin American proposal entirely acceptable to the proponents or sponsors of the Nordic proposal.

Since there was no agreement, therefore the Contact Group had to report to the Commission a non-agreement by giving it LIM/50 without paragraph 1 which was precisely supposed to deal with the mechanism and also the blanks in paragraphs 2 and 3. It was not possible to arrive at an agreement because according to members of the Contact Group its terms of reference were that the Group had to take into account not only the views of the sponsors but also the views which had been expressed in Commission II as well. This being the case, it is clear that neither the proposal of the Nordic Group nor the proposals of the Latin American and the Near-East Groups had received unanimous support.

Therefore, we now have a proposal from the French delegation which is supposed to marry these two proposals. To start with, we have the Programme and Finance Committees from the proposal of the Latin American and Near-East Group and the High Level Committee from the Nordic Group. In a sense, therefore, we can call the French proposal a compromise proposal. As I indicated to you, Mr Chairman, the Asian Group had a chance to look at this proposal of the French delegation and I should like to indicate to you that the Group had given its blessing to this proposal inasmuch as they believed it would be a workable solution. Of course, the members of the Asian Group can later confirm the view which I am now expressing that indeed the Asian Group stands behind the French proposal as a compromise which could be a fitting and appropriate mechanism to carry out the review.

After all, the Programme and Finance Committees are composed of countries which we have elected. We have chosen them to represent us in these two important committees. If we need the help of external independent experts, then the Programme and Finance Committees are free to engage the services of these experts in the numbers they wish.

With this I should like to indicate not only my own personal but my country's support for this proposal and also the support of other members of the Asian Group for the French proposal, as indicated to you earlier.

CHAIRMAN (original language Arabic): Time is very limited because the third part of the report of Commission II is not yet finished. The Drafting Committee also has to meet this evening in order to finish its work and therefore I hope that your remarks will be as brief as possible.

Salim SARRAF (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Monsieur le Président, je vous souhaite la bienvenue à la présidence de cette séance de la Commission.

Je serai plus que bref, à cette heure fort tardive de la journée. J'ai suivi avec beaucoup d'intérêt ce qu'a dit le représentant de la France et je peux vous assurer que le Liban appuie la proposition française qui représente une solution transactionnelle.

Je dois dire qu'il s'agit d'une question que nous envisageons partiellement. Nous ne pouvons pas approuver le projet de résolution du document C 87/LIM/50 avant d'en avoir examiné tous les éléments. Après ce qu'a dit le délégué des Philippines, nous avons besoin d'une solution de compromis. Cela est très important.

W.A.F. GRABISCH (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): My delegation is very grateful to the delegates of Norway and France for their proposals and the explanations they have given us about the machinery or mechanism which we have been discussing. Both proposals have obviously been brought forward with the intention of contributing towards a consensus.

As things now stand in our debate, I should like to state my delegation's position which is that we would give preference to the Norwegian proposal. The main reasons for this are very briefly the following. First, we can well imagine that it would be easier to proceed on the basis of the Norwegian proposal and to get highly qualified experts to perform this very important task.

Secondly, we assume that the Director-General, whatever the Group that may be involved, will cooperate with those experts or whatever you call them and will support them in their endeavours. We are grateful to the Deputy Director-General for his explanations just now given in relation to paragraph 4.

Thirdly, we do not believe that this group - whatever they call it - should be working in isolation from Member Nations and from the Secretariat. It would not operate in isolation, as some speaker has already pointed out; quite the contrary. In our view such an ad hoc group cannot operate without the valuable support of the Secretariat.

Fourthly, we believe that what the delegate of Kenya proposed - or rather mentioned or stated - a little while ago is well worth having a further look at. As I understood him, he was stating that he was very much in favour of consultation between the ad hoc group and the Finance and Programme Committees of the Organization, but that he was not in favour of the idea that the Members of that group should be selected by the Chairman of those two Committees of the Organization.

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, took the chair.

Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence.

Ocupa la presidencia Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II.

Temel ISKIT (Turkey): We have made known our views as far as the mechanism is concerned, when we had a limited opportunity to support another delegation, which was Belgium. We have two proposals before us, the Norwegian proposal and the French compromise proposal. I insist on compromise.

As far as the Norwegian proposal is concerned, I must say that I very much appreciated the sound logic in the presentation of Mr Høstmark. His ideas were very consequential and he defended his case perfectly. However, I see a difference between these two proposals. There is a difference of philosophy which we cannot escape. In the Norwegian proposal, what we see - and we do not agree, although I underline that it was consequent - is that the member countries should accept some kind of authority about themselves to decide or to pass judgement on the work of our Organization, which is an inter-governmental organization. This point was underlined by many delegations, and I should like to emphasize especially the intervention of the Barbados delegation with which I agree completely.

Therefore, this difference of philosophy means that we do not agree with the Norwegian proposal. We think that in an inter-governmental organization, the Member Nations are the last instance. There are no instances beyond the member countries. We have the responsibility and we have to take it. He has made a point about "Retriebs blindheit", which can be translated in French as 'déformation professionnelle' or in English as 'professional deformation', but, as somebody else has already pointed out, to be away from the things you have discussed may induce you to errors, too. I have been in this Organization for two years. I have learned a lot and if I were to comment on FAO two years ago I am sure I would have made many fundamental mistakes. Therefore we should involve ourselves and the Secretariat, and we should take advantage of the accumulation of experience and knowledge over 42 years.

Coming back to the question of philosophy, which brings me to the French proposal, my delegation can accept the French proposal as a compromise, because I think it inclines towards the philosophy which we share, which is that in the end it will be the member countries which will decide on the changes or on the improvement. I like the word "improvement" rather than the word "reform".

To be brief, my delegation can support the French proposal as a compromise, but I have some comments to make on the form of this proposal. Whilst, waiting for the distribution of the text of the French proposal, I think I managed to take it down, and we should make some changes in the form, first, to integrate it in LIM 50, because LIM 50 starts with "a body", but the French proposal starts with "to make the study the Programme and Finance Committee", so we need some changes in the form.

The second point I want to make on the form and the procedure related to the French proposal is that we stop at a certain point with the French proposal. If I understood it correctly, the Programme and Finance Committee assisted - I underline the word "assisted" - by a small group of experts would study, etc., but we do not see the follow-up. Perhaps it is understood that the report of the Programme and Finance Committee will be referred to the Council and then to the Conference. In the light of my comment, perhaps some additions may be made to complete the whole procedure. As I said, there are comments on the form, but I repeat that on the substance my delegation supports the French proposal as a compromise.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Nous avons siégé au Groupe de contact et à ce niveau nous avons abordé les problèmes des mécanismes, disons que nous les avons survolés, les uns et les autres ayant exprimé ce qu'il croient être le bon choix.

Nous avons notre idée nous-mêmes sur la question, nous l'avons exposée au cours de la réunion et enfin, nous n'avons pas pu aboutir à un accord général. C'est pour cette raison que nous avons dû abandonner cette question de mécanismes et que nous nous sommes attelés à définir le mandat du mécanisme qui pourrait être mis en place.

On a dit ici que l'on a mis la charrue avant les boeufs. Je crois que cela est exact, nous pouvons accepter cette critique. Mais nous l'avons fait parce que nous avons senti que nous avons beaucoup de difficultés à avancer et je crois que la suite nous a donné raison. Nous avons pu définir le mandat, tout au moins une grande partie de ce mandat, alors maintenant nous devons nous prononcer sur les mécanismes.

Pour notre part, nous avons pensé dès le départ que deux choix étaient à faire: le premier choix était de faire confiance au Directeur général qui aurait pu désigner un groupe d'experts travaillant sur la base du mandat que nous aurions défini et qui aurait présenté un rapport donnant ses avis et ses commentaires, il l'aurait acheminé par les voies habituelles jusqu'à la Conférence.

Cette solution a été jugée partisane et par conséquent n'étant pas susceptible d'être retenue.

L'autre choix était de dire que les Etats Membres par région devaient désigner des experts qui se rassembleraient, feraient le rapport et l'enverraient par l'intermédiaire des mécanismes habituels.

Je dois dire ici que l'une et l'autre solutions n'ont pas, semble-t-il recueilli l'assentiment de tous.

Nous pensions qu'il fallait effectivement opter pour une solution qui puisse rallier certainement les deux possibilités, c'est-à-dire où les Etats Membres et le Secrétariat travailleraient ensemble pour mener à bien ce travail qui nous est cher à tous. Oui, Monsieur le Président, nous avons pensé que ce travail nous est cher à tous et je crois que le consensus s'est réalisé ici pour que certains aspects des activités de l'Organisation puissent être revus afin d'apporter le nouveau souffle nécessaire pour en améliorer l'impact. Personne n'a été contre de telles améliorations, le débat actuel le prouve amplement.

Nous avons lu avec beaucoup d'attention la proposition norvégienne, disons nordique, sur les mécanismes et nous avons écouté avec beaucoup d'attention l'intervention de la France nous exposant un mécanisme pour pouvoir mener à bien le travail, tout au moins le travail prescrit dans le cadre du mandat défini au sein du Groupe de contact.

Je dois dire qu'entre ces deux propositions, pour notre part et après mûre réflexion, nous avons opté pour la proposition de la France. Nous voyons là une synthèse entre les partisans d'associer complètement le Secrétariat et uniquement lui au niveau de la production ou de l'élaboration du rapport et ceux qui pensaient qu'il fallait laisser ce choix exclusivement aux Etats Membres. Cette solution française a donc l'avantage d'associer les deux idées même si les Etats Membres restent disons les principaux contributeurs de cette solution. Il est bon que nous puissions associer cette proposition française au mandat que nous avons défini au niveau du Groupe de contact. Evidemment nous supposons pour notre part que les crochets qui avaient élagué les travaux de notre groupe devront disparaître, soit en enlevant les mots entre crochets - et pour ma part je pencherais pour cette solution - soit en supprimant simplement les crochets.

Notre travail ne se limitait pas seulement à cela puisqu'il s'agit d'une résolution, nous avons des dispositifs qui sont le mécanisme, il y a le mandat, nous n'avons pas suffisamment abordé cette question mais je crois pour ma part que la proposition française que j'ai devant moi, puisque j'ai eu la chance de l'avoir au niveau du Groupe de contact, cette proposition française du préambule mérite que tout le monde puisse s'en imprégner pour que nous puissions en faire l'étude. Pour notre part, nous pensons que cela est une bonne base pour pouvoir compléter notre projet de résolution.

Voilà ce que nous tenions à dire. Nous espérons que grâce à cela nous pourrions aller de l'avant et permettre aux experts, au Comité de programme et au Comité financier d'accomplir leur travail. Peut-être qu'au niveau de la proposition française quelques aménagements peuvent être apportés mais la base devrait être retenue.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Congo. On the point you raised about the preamble, the Secretariat advised the Chair that it is being translated and is in process of being distributed in the various languages.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Estoy muy agradecido al colega y amigo Sr. Høstmark y a los países nórdicos por el carácter pragmático y el espíritu constructivo de sus propuestas. Desafortunadamente, con realismo político, la única alternativa posible ahora parece ser la propuesta de Francia. Pensamos, señor Presidente, que la propuesta de Francia tiende a lograr, en buena parte, el objetivo que todos perseguimos, pero pensamos igualmente, con mucha franqueza, que esta propuesta deja abierto el problema de la especificidad del número de miembros del Consejo y también de la manera adecuada para seleccionarlos. Doce miembros del Grupo de Contacto, presididos ejemplarmente por John Jurecky de los Estados Unidos, emplearon 33 horas que equivalen a más de cinco días de reuniones de los miembros del Programa de Finanzas, y no se pusieron de acuerdo sobre el mecanismo, ni siquiera llegaron a considerar la posibilidad del mecanismo. El Comité del Programa de Finanzas suma 21 miembros además de las consultas con el Director General; semejante cosa, casi el doble de los miembros del Grupo de Contacto necesitan un espejo mucho más grande y una lámpara de Diógenes muy luminosa para escoger acertadamente los miembros del grupo. Tendrían varios problemas: el primero sería cuántos expertos y el segundo sería la proveniencia, sus características, etc.

Hay otras cosas importantes, y ello recientemente se comprueba, y es que los aspectos técnicos no se pueden separar de la representación política. Si se integran en un grupo de expertos - y esto lo dijo en cierta medida el distinguido Sr. Iskit de Turquía - divorciados apoyo político que puedan tener las recomendaciones de esos expertos, la suerte de esas recomendaciones de antemano está condenada a la adversidad. Por eso señor Presidente con realismo y tratando de complementar el esfuerzo de Francia - aunque sé muy bien por la información que poseo que no es muy popular la propuesta que vamos a hacer, y ya el colega del Congo la planteó como una de las hipótesis - pensamos que realmente contribuiríamos a avanzar en estos propósitos, si dijéramos que el grupo de expertos debe ser de siete miembros como lo fue en 1976, siete miembros, uno por cada región, elegidos por sus respectivas regiones y en función de todos los temas, su competencia, dominio agrícola, del desarrollo, de finanzas y de administración. Esta es la única manera práctica de avanzar realmente porque, de lo contrario, seguimos pensando que el problema queda completamente abierto y a lo mejor, 21 personas más el Director General necesitarán de un bienio de trabajo para ponerse de acuerdo.

Mohammed ABDELHADI (Tunisie): Monsieur le Président, vous nous avez demandé de concentrer nos commentaires sur le problème du mécanisme ou de l'organisme qui serait chargé d'examiner les améliorations ou les réformes qui pourraient être introduites dans les méthodes de travail de la FAO. Je m'en vais donc limiter mon intervention sur cet aspect de la question, et je serai bref, puisque d'autres délégations avant moi, telles l'Inde, la Turquie, le Congo, la Colombie, ont déjà fait part de points de vue sur ce sujet que je partage entièrement.

A notre avis, le mécanisme en question ne saurait être qu'un organe institutionnel déjà existant de la FAO. C'est plus efficace et c'est plus opérationnel, comme l'a dit l'Ambassadeur de Belgique tout à l'heure. La proposition de la délégation française, que j'appuie, constitue à notre avis la formule de compromis, par excellence, en ce sens qu'elle a l'avantage de lier le mécanisme en question aux structures existantes de la FAO, c'est-à-dire le Comité de Programme et le Comité financier, qui seront assistés par des experts dans différents domaines, à titre personnel, comme donneurs d'avis, comme donneurs d'avis autorisés compte tenu de leur compétence et de leur expérience.

La proposition de la France associe également le Directeur Général, qui est nécessairement consulté, et c'est tout à fait normal.

Les experts seront choisis également compte tenu de leur origine géographique. Donc, la proposition française, sur ce plan là, nous la considérons comme étant une proposition équilibrée, sur le plan de la représentation géographique puisque, à notre avis et tel que nous le comprenons, les différentes régions seront représentées par des experts, comme l'a déjà proposé également le délégué de la Colombie. Monsieur le Président, ma délégation appuie la proposition française en tant que formule de compromis.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): The French proposal is a logical and acceptable one in its form and substance, and we believe that it represents a sound basis for the establishment of a balanced mechanism to undertake this review referred to in the second paragraph of the amended draft resolution. We had thought C 87/LIM/50 represented the sum total of all the work of the Contact Group, which worked for several days, and that it also represented a compromise between the proposals of the Scandinavian countries and those submitted by the Latin American and Near East countries.

The document before us is being examined and reviewed now with a view to reaching a consensus on its contents. We have in fact agreed to this document: I have heard several members state this. We are duty bound to adopt and approve any proposal deemed appropriate on the matter.

As you know, Mr Chairman, we have spent a very long time discussing matters, and in my country's opinion it is difficult to see where they are leading to, or how long it will take us to reach a conclusion. Time is moving on - and frankly, Sir, we consider that you should take whatever decision you deem appropriate to reach a solution to this question now. As you may have noted, Sir, the delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia - the delegation of a developing country - has not yet dined, no matter how simply or how modestly - and I would like to assure you, Sir, that all developing countries here have not yet had their dinner. We all know that developing countries are not unfamiliar with that situation, but ...! Sir, you, as Chairman of this Committee, must adopt a quick, clear cut solution, and inform us precisely how long our work will continue tonight.

CHAIRMAN: That is a legitimate question. The Chair has been eyeing the clock as well - but we have eight speakers. Part of this question will be determined by what emerges from the discussion - but the Chair would like to wrap up the discussion as soon as we can.

However, this is up to the member countries as well. We have tried to provide an opportunity for every member country who wishes to speak on the subject to address relevant points, to try and cover the whole ground. However, since you, Saudi Arabia, have specifically recommended to me that I wrap this up quickly because time is running out, I must tell you that I asked you recently, as representative of G 77, to produce a list of member countries and it took one week to produce it. I know this is not solely your fault, but it took one week to agree on the membership. Having taken one week's time, I cannot in all conscience complain that in a few hours we have not resolved this whole question. I cannot do that.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): I believe you are mistaken, Sir, the Group of 77 did not take that time, and we decided from the very first day on the names of the members of the Contact Group. As you know personally, the delay was due to the OECD and not to the Group of 77.

CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair would observe that it would probably take another week to decide that issue, and best leave it alone and proceed on other matters. But, Saudi Arabia, the point whether it took one day or seven days, the record is clear, from the time the Chair first made reference to that and the time...

... I have not finished responding to him, please. I am talking in response to his point of order. You will be recognized.

...That we will not get into that, but the record will say: The Chair calls your attention to -check the verbatim - when there was first reference to it and when the membership was first agreed on. We realize the hour is getting late. We will try to adjourn as close to eleven o'clock as we possibly can. Part of that must depend on the comments of the member countries.

Ernest Sylvester BENJAMIN (Antigua and Barbuda): Mr Chairman, you finally did what is right in that you answered the question. So we shall hope to adjourn at eleven o'clock.

CHAIRMAN: On your point of information, the Chair indicated that it would attempt to adjourn as close to eleven o'clock as possible, and we pointed out the number of speakers left, and that much will depend on that. The Chair is no more anxious to be here than you are, but I feel that we have a lot of work left to do and we have some speakers here who wish to speak this evening. The countries who wished to speak have listened to other speakers; they wish their turn. I am sure they would have preferred an earlier time, but this is how the lot falls. We would like to proceed and wrap it up. Believe me, I would just as soon adjourn as get on to other things. I call your attention to the fact that under the Rules the Chair has the power to adjourn at any time the Chair chooses. My feeling has been that most of the member countries wished us to get through as much as we possibly could this evening. If I am wrong in that, so indicate, and I will adjourn the meeting in two seconds.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): This is the fourth time that I have spoken in this Committee, and unfortunately every time I have asked for the floor the discussion preceding my taking the floor dwelt on the question of saving time.

CHAIRMAN: You have not been a consumer of a great deal of time of this body, and please do not be inhibited by that accident, so say whatever you want to say.

Yacoub Y. AL-YOUSUFI (Kuwait) (original language Arabic): To sum up and to be very brief, a group of countries has commented on the French proposal and another group has commented on the Scandinavian proposal. I shall not, in fact, deprive myself of making a proposal I drafted at the beginning of this evening's meeting. In fact, I have amended and re-amended my proposal on the basis of what I heard. My proposal is in eight very short points.

The first point is the name of the Committee to fill the empty brackets of paragraph 2 of C 87/LIM/50. I shall not refer to the name of the group now.

My second point deals with the mandate of the Committee. Both technical and material matters have to be determined, and they have to be clearly determined and defined.

My third point is that the proposals and recommendations of the above mentioned Committee are to be submitted to the general Conference of the Organization for approval and adoption.

My fourth point - an important one - is that the Committee should be composed of 75% of the following: (a) experts from various fields from within the Organization known for their competence and experience in their various fields of specialization; (b) the heads of committees or their alternates - I mean by this the Finance and Programme Committees; (c) a representative of the Director-General. The remaining 25% will be independent and neutral experts from outside the Organization who will be very carefully selected. In so doing, we will have represented the experts in the Organization in points (a) and (b), the Director-General in (c) and the outside experts in (d).

The fifth point: the Committee will be set up by the joint Programme and Finance Committees.

The sixth point: a specific time span or period will be determined for the Committee to undertake its tasks and mandate.

The seventh point: the first and last purpose of this Committee is to seek to establish the ultimate goals for this Organization, namely to improve the food and agricultural processes in the world and to achieve development in the world. This should not aim ultimately at reducing or impeding the work of the Organization, or reduce its budget.

The eighth point: the Secretariat should provide the necessary information for the undertaking of such a study and facilitate the work of the Committee.

I believe that what I have stated in these eight points could represent a compromise solution, or may be represented as an amendment to certain proposals made so far.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I would begin by observing that unfortunately, during the intervention of the delegate of Kuwait, which I was very anxious to hear, there was rather a lot of noise in the hall. I do not think that that was very respectful to him, and I very much regret that.

For my own part, I should like to address myself to the question you have put to us of the mechanism. I begin by stating that, as the delegate of the Congo indicated, the Contact Group did have a chance to take some part in the discussion of the French ideas. Indeed, therefore my delegation had the chance to take part in that discussion. Unfortunately, some of us there found those ideas rather lacking - sadly, even lacking in logic. I am not sure that they look any more satisfactory now, and certainly they do not appear to my delegation to be a satisfactory basis for a compromise. On the contrary, several of us turned thumbs down on them before. Therefore, as far as my delegation is concerned I must do so again. Why?

Let us go through the logic. First of all, let us get one point absolutely clear. It is central, it is important, and I think it is worrying a good number of the delegates in this room. No-one is arguing against a cooperation between the study - I give it a neutral word - and the management of the Organization. On the contrary, this is written into the various texts which we have already considered. It is in the Nordic text and, as the Deputy Director-General underlined, it is well provided for in paragraph 4 of LIM/50 which the Contact Group agreed on.

There is of course - and this is the next point, which was mentioned by the distinguished representative of Turkey - a difference of philosophy. I think our Turkish colleague put forward the idea that somehow under the Nordic text someone was going to be put above the Member States in some way to take some overall view or range of decisions to which they would be subordinate. That is absolutely not so. If there are any misapprehensions on our part, or if I have misunderstood what my colleague said, I apologise to him in advance. It is nevertheless clear that the essence of the idea in the Nordic text is a strict division between the phase of study, which would be quite wide-ranging, and the phase of taking decisions on the outcome of that study. Indeed, this distinction was insisted upon in the earlier debates by several delegations in this Commission and, I believe, in the Plenary. I have the text before me but I will not, because of time, refer to it. It is an absolutely critical point, and, as the distinguished delegate of Turkey did, I think, say, decisions on improvements are for the Member States to make, not for any group of experts. But it is our view, and it is the view behind this text, that the Member States should not be committed by, or involved in, the study. The study is only of real value if it is independent, and that, I think, was a point also made by France: independent of the Member States, independent of the management, independent of the political decision-making bodies within the Organization. My delegation very much supports the views of Kenya on this point, and, as the German delegation did, we found them a very convincing interpretation.

As the distinguished representative of the Philippines said - and I think I quote his exact words - the Programme and Finance Committees are composed of countries we have elected. In other words, those Committees are part of the decision-making machinery which represents the governments within the Organization and they are not, therefore, appropriate bodies to carry out the study. Their role is surely to take part in the phase of decision-making.

I would remark that these Committees are in any case going to be very heavily charged with work over the next biennium as a result of the various decisions and points which will be put to them, which are already being discussed within this Conference.

Here is the question which I think underlies the French proposal: how can individuals designated by a panel of countries, as in the Nordic resolution, still be independent? How can they give independent advice? The answer is very clear to my delegation. It is because the people who are designated by groups of Member States, would not and should not in any way be their representatives. On the contrary, they would, and should, be chosen precisely for their individual qualities and their individual eminence. This arrangement is working very well in other institutions which are having similar reviews.

As to the number and the geographical composition, I thought the distinguished delegate of Colombia made a proposal which was precise and pretty well reflected the ideas of my own delegation, with the exception that, as I continue to stipulate, the individuals who would be designated would not be representatives of their governments in any way. We therefore do not find the French proposal, which mixed up the different phases, which mixes up the competence of the Organization, which mixes up the studying element and the decision-making element, philosophically or practically satisfactory. We believe strongly that the Nordic proposal, and in particular its proposal for a truly independent body, is the only one to which our delegation can give support.

Fotis G. POULIDES (Cyprus): First of all, I wish to say that the Cyprus delegation associates itself with the Belgian declaration. Secondly, we were indeed very glad to hear the delegate of France making a compromise proposal. As we shall very shortly have the full text in front of us, we shall be able to judge the pros and cons and reach our conclusions without losing further precious time. I wish, therefore, fully to support the compromise proposal of France, which I think is well balanced and logical, covering to a great extent the concept and mechanism of reforms, and safeguarding the principles of this Organization. I wish, however, to say that the Norwegian proposal also contains very wise thoughts and should be well considered to a certain extent. I avail myself of this opportunity to stress the importance of the fact that we must be very cautious and try by all means to take the best out of both proposals, because I am sure that those who contribute to promoting further the aims of FAO, to which we are all committed.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): I was trying to figure out how I could approach this issue of the mechanism, because my country is one which has in its own deposition to the assembly, C 87/30, fully supported the idea of appointing an independent high-level group. Perhaps the best way to approach this, following the eloquence of the UK delegate, is to look at what the factors are that we must consider in buying this horse that so many people have talked about. We need a group that will have knowledge of FAO, some people have said. We need a group that will have knowledge of agriculture and development. We need close working contacts during the review with the FAO Secretariat. We need the involvement of the Director-General in the process. We need objectivity in the review to ensure that the results will be credible. We need a tied group that can be operationally effective. We need members, through the Conference, to make final decisions on recommendations of this group. We need regional representation so that everyone is satisfied, although in the sense that the UK stressed. This group needs time to do the job.

Basically, if you take that criteria, incomplete as it is, in assessing which of these two horses we are going to choose, it is quite obvious that the Nordic proposed mechanism answers all the questions in the affirmative. It does not compromise the credibility of the group because they

will be independent, they will be eminent, they have too much to lose to be otherwise, because there will be a small group with time, because they will make a commitment, because they will be from outside the Organization, so that they can be detached, detached from the daily responsibilities of work in the Organization, detached from the daily responsibilities of overseeing the Organization that exists in the Programme and Finance Committees.

I am afraid that when I look at the French alternative it really does not answer many of the questions, and those which it tries to answer it does not answer very well.

I cannot imagine a group of 21 people plus 7 or 8 experts attempting a cogent, a coherent and independent revue of anything. One would need to have a DC-10 to go around. Can you imagine all these people flying to countries to take a look at how field programmes operate? It is just impractical, totally lacking in logic, totally lacking in operational sense.

I would like, for a minute, therefore, to focus again on the Nordic proposal. It says, and it is short: "Establish an ad hoc high-level committee of experts consisting of individuals chosen for their special eminence and competence in the fields of agriculture, development, finance and administration."

Gentlemen, ladies: just look at that wall, a number of eminent people who know the FAO, who could be independent. Some of them work too close to the FAO right now and I could eliminate them from the list, not because they lack credibility, but because it would put too much of a burden on them.

Jokes aside, it is serious. You have a Bukar Shaib who has extensive experience, you have a Swami-nathan who fits the bill, you have an Enrique Iglesias, and there are a large number of people who we all know from all of our regions who can provide that detachment, that independence and that credibility.

So basically I know that many people do not like this and I know that many people are accepting or supporting the French alternative which, as many have said, is not really operationally complete. So even if we decide tonight on it it would not work. So I would like to appeal to the members, particularly those who want to go home early, to look at the practical effectivity of the mechanism proposed that answers all the questions, all the qualities required to do a review.

In closing I would like to express my appreciation for the very interesting presentation of the delegate of Kenya, very interesting from a philosophical standpoint and in the end very interesting from a practical standpoint.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I ask to come back again on the list on a proposal of the resolution that is the basic text in front of us. I thought I should respond to some of those interventions, some of those proposals that have been made to my original proposal.

When we were working in the Contact Group it was observed by one of the members from one of the developing nations that he had the impression that some developed nations considered development only in relation to what happened within the national boundaries, and he rejected that view. I agree with him. I subscribe to that same philosophy. That is precisely one of the major points that will live in a world of interdependence. So do we. So do FAO. FAO is a complex organism, having a complex set of relationships, it does not exist in a vacuum. That is one of the major reasons why we need people that also have a view of other factors of the other parts of the relationships which are needed to help us with the work which we propose for the betterment of our Organization.

There are basically two points of view that have been propounded here, be that in that draft resolution that Mexico so ably proposed and used in the Contact Group, or be that in the French proposal which, as I see it, is more or less a variation upon the same theme which holds an internal review.

We in Nordic believe very strongly in the external review, partly for the reason. I have just described and partly for reasons that I gave in my first intervention, namely the need to look at this from the outside, divorced from the daily work of those who are engaged in the operations of our daily activities.

The point was made earlier that some propose, some dispose, and that is exactly what we had in mind here. The group that we have suggested should be set up is a group that proposes, and proposes only, and I cannot underline that strongly enough. It is for the member countries only to dispose. They make the decisions. They take advice, they reject it, they apply it, they modify it, but they decide fully what to do with it. That is also why I want a separation. It was my friend the delegate of Colombia who suggested that we might lose something, might lose political support, if these members were not direct representatives of the member countries. Yes, exactly so, and we want that support lost. We want the member countries when they get together to accept or reject that advice, not to feel bound at the outset by what has been proposed by their representatives. There have been many references, indeed in the French variation it has been stated explicitly, as it was in the Mexican, to the Finance and Programme Committees. I believe the delegate of the Philippines used the term that we had elected them, they are important, so we should use them. Exactly so. But if I may use a slightly old-fashioned term, I elected my wife, nobody is more important to me, but I would not propose her as a member of the eminent body that we are talking about here. But I do believe we can use the Programme and Finance Committees. We can submit the findings of this group, this review that we have proposed, to those Committees, maybe in joint session, before that is passed on to the Council, to review and attach recommendations to it. That is certainly a modification that we should consider, to get the best advice on that score. But if they should do that, then they must not be a part of constructing those proposals, then they would not any longer be free to give

their views upon it. Otherwise, if that would not meet with the pleasure of the House I also found that the Kenyan suggestion could contain a real compromise, a first attempt at a real compromise that I have heard in this House and, believe me, I am as fully cognizant as anybody else of the difficulty at finding a compromise between being pregnant and not being pregnant.

CHAIRMAN: If you can find a compromise between being pregnant and not being pregnant you will be in the high-level group!

Michael Joseph RYAN (Australia): I come in at this stage of the discussion, I find that the ground has been pretty well run-over but I would like to make a couple of points. Firstly, we would like to put on record our support for the Nordic proposal. As we see it, it points the way clearly to a comprehensive, wide-ranging, thorough-going review of this Organization.

When I was collecting my thoughts I had in fact harked back to the views put forward by the Swiss delegation which I thought were excellent, but the United Kingdom, United States and a number of other delegations have come over the top since then. Suffice it to say though that we find the French proposal - well, it's not a compromise in our view; it does leave key decisions, particularly the one dealing with how the members of this Study Group are to be chosen within the Organization as it stands right now, as it stands today. As has been already pointed out, these Committees work within a set framework, they deal with a lot of detail, they only have a very limited view down the road for a couple of years and we do not see them as being the appropriate body to make these sorts of decisions.

The French proposal concentrated very much on technical matters. We have no great truck with the Organization on their competence in such things as CODEX, I could list them off. We think they do excellent work there. We do not have any trouble with that. That is not the thing that we are talking about. We want to review the internal Organization structure of the mechanisms by which policy-making decisions, or policy decisions are made, the mode and the way these things flow through and become a reality, become tangible. We feel that it is necessary to bring in outside views to further guide the membership of FAO as to the future orientation and evolution of the Organization of the years ahead. We have already had one view on that and that is the view that comes forward each biennium in the work of the Programme of Work and Budget. We believe there could be another view to that. It is worth looking at. The time is ripe and we believe it should take place along the lines of the Nordic proposal.

One final comment., if it does take place at the end of the day when the delegates gathered here review that study, as Canada pointed out, we should not be afraid of it, we in the end do make the decisions on where we go. I would suggest it would make this place a lot stronger and there would be a lot greater confidence on the part of members in the Organization.

CHAIRMAN: We are past 11 o'clock and we have a number of speakers, a number of member countries who have indicated a desire to speak. We also have a number of member countries who have indicated a desire to wrap things up and they are fundamentally in conflict. The Chair would suggest that it may be prudent to try to come to some resolution this evening. We have before us a proposal introduced by Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries. We earlier established that Norway concurred in the suggested changes of the Contact Group. We also had one other, Kenya had some specific other alternatives also suggested and the Chair would suggest if we have any hope of coming to resolution this evening that we had best start on an orderly procedure. It certainly has been a wide diverse discussion on virtually every aspect that we perhaps would be best advised to try to move things along by having some votes and coming to some decisions. At the rate we are going, I must caution you, please bear in mind that there is a fundamental conflict between being urged to let everyone speak and say what he wants to say and simultaneously complain that we are not coming to a resolution. They are fundamentally in conflict. You cannot do both. We must come to a decision on the closure of the debate and proceed to start to come to reach a decision. The Chair would highly recommend that we do that. Just by the time, and the number of speakers that are remaining and what is likely to occur. Every country which is on the list to speak yet has spoken at least two or three times this evening. We would suggest that we suspend further discussion and spend the rest of our energy on a decision and try to take it in the best possible order, the proper order. The proper order is this; we have before this body, as we have had for some time now, a resolution advanced by Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries. We have had earlier this evening their concurrence in changing the language, their acceptance to modify an amendment proposed by a great number of countries acting in concert. The Chair would point out that before we can move, even on Norway's acceptance of the language, we need to have a clarification on the issue of the brackets. That decision on whether to have language included or excluded is a decision that is in the hands of Norway as the prime sponsor of this motion and their concurrence must be stated as a concurrence with or without and at that point we can then take up the amendment.

Norway, the Chair's understanding is that you have concurred in the language. Is it Norway's intent to accept? How is it your intent to accept? Could you clarify?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): When I first moved that on behalf of the Nordic group I accepted a proposal, I accepted a proposal fully as it was with the brackets removed. I would suggest, as a suggestion that those countries who cannot accept the words that are in the brackets get a chance to list that in a footnote to those brackets, with those removed. That was my understanding then.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): I would like to ask for the right of reply.

CHAIRMAN: The right of reply is a procedure for a country to respond to a criticism of its government's policies and you would certainly, if you have a wish to respond to a criticism of the policies of the government of the Philippines made today we provide under the Rules for an orderly time for that at the end of the proceedings of the day and it would certainly be granted as requested.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): We have advanced certain arguments and there has been reference to our arguments. I think it is correct procedure that we be allowed to answer those arguments which have been advanced against our arguments.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry that is not a right of reply. What you are saying is that you wish the discussion to be continued. Let me clarify, I am not playing with language but under the rules of this Organization the phrase "right of reply" is a specific phrase that provides member countries an opportunity to respond when the policies of that member country have been criticised and there is a procedure for doing that. I do not believe that that is really what you are saying here. What you are saying, as I understand it, is that you wish the debate to continue - is that correct? We have here a suggestion of the Chair that we close debate and come to a decision. We have an objection to that from the Philippines which is perfectly in order. The body can decide whether or not it wishes to continue. That is a decision that must be taken by Member Countries - the Chair cannot make that decision.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Bernard LEDÜN (France): En effet, s'il y a un droit de réponse, il ne peut pas s'exercer pour un seul pays. La Norvège a eu tout à l'heure l'occasion de répondre aux critiques qui ont été formulées à l'égard de sa proposition. J'estime donc, étant l'auteur du deuxième projet de résolution, qu'en ce qui me concerne, j'ai également le droit de répondre aux critiques et aux remarques qui ont été faites au sujet de la proposition française.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair must correct you, you were wrong. That is not a right of reply issue. We have just explained that to the Philippines. The right of reply deals with the criticism of the policies of a Government. Under the rules there is a right of reply procedure. We have just had two countries evoke the right of reply, but we are not dealing with the right of reply. What you are saying is what the Philippines have just said and what we have just discussed. What you are saying is that you do not wish to close the debate. That is not a right of reply, that is an objection to closing the debate. The procedure under the rules for a point of order - we do not want to be strict about this, but sometimes it is confusing when you are trying to signal whether you want to talk, or whether you have a point of order. They are very different. Under the rules you should stand and hold your country's sign. But if you can stand and make a sign something which differentiates between the two.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Waliur RAHMAN (Bangladesh): I have no quarrel with your interpretation of the rules of procedure. You are right in interpreting the right to reply. It relates to a country's policy, but when we are debating two divergent views, perhaps before the Committee, that also may be in a modified form, you can interpret that as a right of reply, not to a country's policy but a response to certain criticisms which have been levelled at certain proposals. In that respect the French and the Philippine requests for further clarification of their points can be termed as a right of reply.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would point out that the Chair cannot determine whether we close, that is up to the member countries. All the Chair was trying to do was to point out that in the past hour we have had a number of countries express a desire to bring the debate to a close and proceed with the decision making, Saudi Arabia did so and Antigua and Barbuda and other have made similar statements. We have tried to caution that we cannot do both, we cannot come to a decision tonight and continue with a further long discussion which the Chair has made the observation that we have already been over this ground. It is up to the body. The Chair is perfectly willing to sit here

and listen to further discussion. However, it made it perfectly clear earlier this evening that it is simply not sound decision making policy to waste so much time at other times, and then when people are tired and not thinking properly to press the more pressing decisions. We will invoke the right to adjourn so that we can take it up tomorrow. We have a feeling that a lot of people want to proceed to a decision and some people also want to keep talking. We cannot do both. We are going to have a decision.

Wolfgang A.F. GRABISCH (Germany, Federal Republic of) (Original language German): We can abide by both solutions. We are ready to carry on with the debate or to adjourn until tomorrow. What we do not think would be right would be for us now to force a decision at a time when we all feel that there is still a possibility to reach a consensus if we debate further. We propose that we must first exhaust the possibility of achieving a consensus either this evening or tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the membership the Chair would like to read from the rules a point that some Member Countries may wish to consider at this time. "During discussion of any matter a delegate or representative may move adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion two delegates or two representatives may speak for, and two against the motion after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The Chairman may limit the time allowed to these speakers". We just caution you that under these rules at any moment any country can move to cease the discussion. If that occurs then certain steps must occur automatically under the rules, and the Chairman is empowered to limit the time allowed to those speakers and would limit it to three minutes.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Temel ISKIT (Turkey): I have a point of order on three counts. First, I abide by your ruling and on behalf of my delegation I support the view that we should continue the discussion. As regards the second point of order I support the interpretation of Bangladesh. The third point of order I support the interpretation of Germany. That is all - I have not surpassed three minutes.

CHAIRMAN: If we get that motion I hope that you are one of the speakers.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Je serai très brève. J'appuie la Turquie. Je ne parie pas sur le fond des mécanismes. Je parle de la question de savoir si nous devons continuer nos travaux ou non.

Il me semble que le délégué de la Turquie vient de résumer tout à fait la question et nous nous joignons à son idée de poursuivre le débat parce que nous pensons que nous ne sommes pas trop loin d'une solution.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ernest Sylvester BENJAMIN (Antigua and Barbuda): My point of order is very simple. By consensus, as I understand it and the house understood it, the debate was closed. The Chair was proceeding, before it took a vote, with asking Norway for a clarification. Norway gave that clarification, and then there were some interruptions. Antigua and Barbuda submit that there is no point for a vote to close the debate. The debate was closed. We were now in the process of voting.

CHAIRMAN: It certainly would facilitate the workings of the Chair, but the Chair must point out in good conscience that we have applied a certain flexibility to reopening things. We must be consistent on that. With the Philippines we may disagree with the language, but the point is well taken and the chair has to respect the rights of Member Countries to speak. State your point of order.

Ernest Sylvester BENJAMIN (Antigua and Barbuda): It is with the greatest difference. My point of order is that the debate is closed. I like your flexibility, but it is a point of order that we cannot enter into any more discussions. We are now in the process of voting.

CHAIRMAN: On your point of order, the Chair recommended - your point of order is not well taken. The Chair recommended to the body a certain consideration. The Chair expressed a view on how it would, in the Chair's judgement, be best to proceed. The Chair gave advice. For the past fifteen minutes or so we have had a discussion of why member countries disagree with my suggestion. Now, the Chair cannot then turn around and state that it heard no such objections because the Chair heard several objections. It heard the Philippines object, it heard Turkey object, it heard Bangladesh object. And I cannot turn around and rule that they were in concurrence with that closure. I cannot do that. The Chair agrees with you that it would be a more expeditious manner of getting to decision making, and that was the reason the Chair suggested it. There was not a concurrence of this body in that. The Chair then proceeded to point out how a member country which wished to make that point might do so, if it did wish to do so, by opening the Basic Text at page 40 paragraph 22, and making such a motion. The Chair stated were such an event to occur we would be into races. That is one possibility that would close things down. The other is getting to a decision. The Chair strongly feels that we ought to move to a decision making, but that is not the view that is prevailing here.

Wolfgang A.F. GRABISCH (Germany, Federal Republic of) (original language German): In 1974 at the World Food Conference, shortly before midnight in Rome the distinguished representative of a very large state said, "Hungry people are angry people. Let us stop the discussion. Otherwise, we might become even more angry". Having quoted this saying, I propose formally that we stop the debate now and carry on tomorrow. In other word I am moving for an adjournment of the debate to tomorrow. Tomorrow we can carry on with it.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that under Rule XXII, following the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany, two delegates may speak for and two delegates may speak against the motion. When the two have spoken for and two have spoken against, it will be immediately put to a vote. The Chairman, under the rules is empowered to set a limit of time allowed to the speakers. The Chair rules that there will be three minutes for each pro; three minutes for each con. The Chair will recognize one pro, then one con, in the order handed by the Secretary. Secretary, please see who wishes to

speak on it. Federal Republic of Germany, you are absolutely right under the Rules. That is what the Rules provide. They must be carried out. We must under the Rules of this Organization proceed to a vote on that after two countries have spoken for and two against. Please indicate to the Chair whether you wish to speak for or against to the Secretary. If there is a point of order, it must be specifically on the issue of the vote.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I wish to be clear what we are supposed to be deciding. As I understand it, the proposal is for adjournment of the debate of the item until tomorrow. Is that right? I am most grateful.

CHAIRMAN: That is correct. That is what the Federal Republic of Germany stated. There may be two speakers for, two speakers against. Please signal the Secretary. The Chair will ask her to give me one for, one against, one for, one against. Who wishes to speak for this motion? Colombia? The Chair presumes that you are now well. Or the Chair could just as easily rule that that is evidence that you are not so well. But Colombia, if you have a point of order, your point of order must be on the issue of the vote. It is almost twenty minutes to midnight. We are going to have to enforce the rules strictly. State your point of order. If it is on the vote, it will be listened to; if it is not it will be out of order. State it.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr. Presidente. Yo sé que soy muy pequeño de estatura, pero esperaba que usted, por lo menos, a través del espejo de Kenya, viera el reflejo de mi fotografía sobre la pared. Colombia es uno de los países que está a favor de la propuesta de Alemania. Basta.

CHAIRMAN: You have three minutes to speak. The clock is ticking. Start speaking in favour. You were recognized for the purpose of speaking in favour of the motion to adjourn until tomorrow. You have the floor. Speak.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Me quedan dos minutos, pero el texto del discurso lo dejé en mi casa. .

CHAIRMAN: I must, complement you, Colombia, - that is the finest speech you have given. I will recognize one speaker for and one speaker against the motion. They may speak for three minutes

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I do not approve of the proposal of the Federal Republic of Germany and I suggest that we continue the debate and then vote on one of the draft resolutions.

CHAIRMAN: It is not a proposal from the Chair, it is a motion from the Federal Republic of Germany which has been clearly explained by the Chair. We have had one opportunity. Who wishes to speak in favour of adjournment? Does anyone else wish to speak in favour?

Ton A.J.M. Oomen (Netherlands): If you will allow me a point of clarification, can you indicate,

Mr Chairman, how many speakers are on your list?

CHAIRMAN: There are eight at this time. That could go on longer. But it is the intention of the Chair to adjourn at midnight anyhow. We have had plenty of time to discuss this issue. This is not a responsible time to carry on these discussions. A point of order must be on the vote, not on a side issue.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): This is not a point of order but one of clarification. If we adjourn now, can we through you, Mr Chairman, have knowledge of the practical possibilities of continuing the debate tomorrow?

CHAIRMAN: Absolutely, that is exactly what the motion is. It is to start tomorrow at 9.30 if people show up. Is anyone speaking in favour of the motion?

John GLISTRUP (Denmark): We are all very tired now. It is the view of my delegation we should continue our debate in the most orderly way and for that reason, I strongly support the motion moved by the Federal Republic of Germany.

CHAIRMAN: Does any country wish to speak against? Philippines, you had our attention earlier.

Horacio CARANOANG (Philippines): I am speaking against the order to close the debate for the following reasons. First, tomorrow is the last day of the Conference. I believe we have worked for 36 hours in the Contact Group. We deserve a full debate on the result of this Contact Group and at this late hour, we will not be able to come to a conclusion of our debate.

Secondly, the Contact Group has reached an agreement on the terms of reference of the review. This is not the only result we have come to. There is another problem - that of the mechanism of the Review. We must have some time to debate this issue.

Third, I have heard arguments put against arguments that I have put forward. I have a right to reply to those arguments put against my own. For these reasons I do not agree with the motion to close the debate at this stage.

CHAIRMAN: There have now been two speeches for and two speeches against the proposition. The Rules state that the motion shall be immediately put to a vote. We shall now have a vote on the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany. We will conduct the vote and we can have a show of hands. Those countries who wish to support the motion of the Federal Republic of Germany will now indicate by raising the sign of their country. Those opposed to the motion? That is carried. We will all adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9.30.

The meeting rose at 23.45 hours

La séance est levée à 23 h. 45

Se levant a la sesión a las 23.45 hors

conference

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conférence

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

conferencia

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

C

C 87/II/PV/24

Twenty-fourth Session
COMMISSION II

Vingt-quatrième session
COMMISSION II

24° período de sesiones
COMISION II

TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING
VINGT-QUATRIEME SEANCE
24ª SESION

(26 November 1987)

The Twenty-fourth Meeting was opened at 10.50 hours

Fred J. Eckert, Chairman of Commission II, presiding

La vingt-quatrième séance est ouverte à 10 h. 50, sous la présidence
de Fred J. Eckert, Président de la Commission II

a Se abre la 24ª sesión a las 10.50 horas, bajo la presidencia
de Fred J. Eckert, Presidente de la Comisión II

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN (continuación)

12. Consideration of Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations

including the Need for Reform in the Programme Budget Process

(continued)

12. Examen éventuel de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO,

y compris la nécessité d'une réforme de la procédure du budget-programme

(suite)

12. Posible examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO,

especialmente la necesidad de reformar el proceso de presupuestación por programas

(continuación)

CHAIRMAN: The Secretary advises the Chair that we now have a quorum. Continuing where we left off last night in our discussion, we have some speakers yet to speak on the topic and others wishing to make comments. We have seven countries left on our list: Belgium, Netherlands, Barbados, Philippines, Antigua and Barbuda, France and Norway. The Chair would observe that we are past our deadline and we should be wrapping up business. We would like to bring the proceedings to a close. We will not break for lunch: we will proceed until 4.00. p.m., at which time we may or may not have reached a conclusion, but we will have reached a finish. The closure at 4.00 p.m. will be rigidly enforced. The Chair would request member countries to bear in mind that a great deal of discussion took place yesterday and would also request that as far as possible it would be useful for everyone if we could avoid ploughing the same ground over and over and that countries which have said what they need to have said would say no more. We need to start proceeding to conclusions, but we will finish with or without a conclusion.

Antoine SAINTRAINT (Belgique): J'ai suivi avec beaucoup d'attention le débat d'hier et j'aimerais quand même obtenir de notre collègue norvégien une précision qui me paraît extrêmement importante. On a parlé d'experts objectifs, d'experts impartiaux, d'experts se situant en dehors de l'Organisation et devant émettre un jugement objectif. Je voudrais savoir, en posant une question précise, à charge de quel budget et comment sera effectué le financement de cette expertise? Je poserai également la même question, et j'espère que le délégué de la France aura l'occasion d'y répondre. C'est un aspect important et clair que celui qui reçoit une rémunération a un certain lien de dépendance. Il paraît important que ce point soit soulevé et que la question posée ici reçoive une réponse claire.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would ask the Norwegian delegation to be cognisant of the question and to try, in the interests of facilitating discussion, to respond to it when their turn comes.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I think that after our very lengthy debates of last night it would be right to make a proposal. I would propose that you close the debate on this item. After having heard the delegates of Norway and France answering their requests for elucidation that were raised yesterday, we could move on to the vote, on the basis of the two draft resolutions moved by France and Norway; and that would be all.

CHAIRMAN: On a point of clarification - and perhaps as there was a translation difficulty we could ask the translators to keep this in mind - in the translation from Arabic to English the words were used "to close the debate". That could be a closure motion. However, following that in the translation we also heard a request on your part that we should hear the response as indicated from these other countries which are on the list. We cannot do both. We cannot close the debate and also continue to hear countries speak on this subject. Did you wish to put a closure motion or not? Would you please respond.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Yes, I did indeed propose that you close the debate on this item and that you proceed to the vote on the two motions for resolutions submitted by France and Norway.

CHAIRMAN: The delegate of Libya has made a closure motion. Let me read you the Rule: "A delegate or representative may at any time move the closure of the debate on the item under discussion whether or not any delegate or representative has signified his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the closure debate shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. If the Conference or Council is in favour of the closure the Chairman should declare the closure of the debate. The Chairman may limit the time allowed to speakers under this paragraph".

The Chair hereby limits the time to three minutes. We have the floor available to two speakers in opposition, only in opposition. Would the two countries who wish to oppose the closure please seek the attention of the Chair?

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): I want to draw your attention to the fact that last night when you adjourned the meeting the Commission voted on continuing the debate and I think it cannot happen that after a motion to continue the debate a motion to stop the debate can be put forward.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): On a point of order, I wish to demand a role call vote on that motion if and when it is put.

CHAIRMAN: The motion has already been put and we are in the process of taking it. Denmark, you have the floor for the purpose of opposing. Yes, there was a motion to adjourn to 9.30 this morning. However, there has been a closure motion this morning and we must deal with it.

John GLISTRUP (Denmark): I would also like to recall that the last thing we did last night was that the Committee voted on the proposal of the Federal Republic of Germany to postpone the debate but to continue the debate today. At that time I supported that motion because we were all tired. This morning we have listened to two interventions, one by Belgium posing questions and one by Libya for a motion to stop the debate. I think the happenings between last night and these two statements should not have changed the view of this Commission that we wanted in full to discuss this issue. Therefore I oppose the motion.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): When the delegate of Libya made his motion you said that you did not understand it very clearly. The problem was that he was making a motion of closure after, I understood, the list of speakers that you have on your table, precisely after Norway, because Norway is the last speaker on your table. If that is correct, I would support that motion: if not, I will be opposing that motion.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but the Chair did seek clarification on that. The Chair asked specifically, are you now moving a closure motion, and the answer was yes. As the United Kingdom has requested a roll call vote, there must be a roll call vote. Proceed on the vote.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (COLOMBIA): El colega de Países Bajos tiene razón, Señor Presidente. El colega de Países Bajos tiene razón. Anoche resolvimos que hoy continuaríamos el debate.

El párrafo 25 del Artículo 12 del Reglamento dice lo siguiente: "Cuando una propuesta haya sido aceptada (y ese fue el caso de anoche) o rechazada, no podrá discutirse de nuevo en el mismo Período de Sesiones. En el mismo Período de Sesiones, repito Señor Presidente, y este es el mismo Período de Sesiones de nuestra Comisión.

CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. It is wrong. We are not in the same session. We adjourned last night. We are in a new day of business. Libya has made a motion.

Commence the vote. Can I clarify what the vote is? A vote Yes is a vote to cease discussion: a vote NO is to enable countries who wish to speak to have the opportunity to speak - Yes if you want to cease discussion, No if you want countries to be able to continue to discuss.

Vote
Vote
Votación



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

Vote on
1st Vote sur Closure of Debate
.....Votación para

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	3
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	50
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	30
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	72

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	53
--	----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	27
--	----

REJECTED
REPOUSSEE
RECHAZADA

Date 26.11.87 Elections Officer B. Linley
Fecha Fonctionnaire électoral.....
El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) GRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

Session of the Conference

Session de la Conférence

Período de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT

APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN

VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Vote on

Vote sur

1st Vote sur CLOSURE OF DEBATE

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan				X	Gambia				X	Pakistan				X
Albania				X	Germany (Fed. Rep. of)		X			Panama		X		
Algeria			X		Ghana				X	Papua New Guinea				X
Angola			X		Greece		X			Peru		X		
Antigua and Barbuda			X		Grenada				X	Philippines		X		
Argentina		X			Guatemala				X	Poland			X	
Australia		X			Guinea			X		Portugal			X	
Austria		X			Guinea-Bissau				X	Qatar				X
Bahamas				X	Guyana				X	Rwanda				X
Bahrain			X		Haiti		X			St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Bangladesh		X			Honduras		X			Saint Lucia				X
Barbados				X	Hungary			X		St. Vincent & the Grenadines				X
Belgium		X			Iceland				X	Samoa				X
Belize				X	India		X			Sao Tome and Principe				X
Benin			X		Indonesia				X	Saudi Arabia				X
Bhutan				X	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)		X			Senegal				X
Bolivia		X			Iraq				X	Seychelles				X
Botswana				X	Ireland				X	Sierra Leone				X
Brazil		X			Israel				X	Solomon Islands				X
Bulgaria				X	Italy		X			Somalia				X
Burkina Faso				X	Jamaica				X	Spain		X		
Burma				X	Japan		X			Sri Lanka				X
Burundi				X	Jordan			X		Sudan			X	
Cameroon		X			Kenya		X			Suriname				X
Canada		X			Korea (Rep. of)				X	Swaziland				X
Cape Verde		X			Kuwait				X	Sweden		X		
Central African Rep.				X	Laos				X	Switzerland		X		
Chad				X	Lebanon				X	Syria				X
Chile		X			Lesotho		X			Tanzania		X		
China		X			Liberia				X	Thailand		X		
Colombia		X			Libya		X			Togo				X
Comoros				X	Luxembourg				X	Tonga				X
Congo		X			Madagascar			X		Trinidad and Tobago				X
Cook Islands				X	Malawi				X	Tunisia			X	
Costa Rica		X			Malaysia		X			Turkey			X	
Côte d'Ivoire			X		Maldives				X	Uganda			X	
Cuba		X			Malta				X	United Arab Emirates				X
Cyprus		X			Malta				X	United Kingdom		X		
Czechoslovakia				X	Mauritania				X	U.S.A.		X		
D.P. Rep. of Korea				X	Mauritius				X	Uruguay				X
Denmark		X			Mexico			X		Vanuatu				X
Djibouti		X			Mongolia				X	Venezuela		X		
Dominica				X	Morocco			X		Viet Nam			X	
Dominican Rep.				X	Mozambique				X	Yemen Arab Republic				X
Ecuador		X			Namibia				X	Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)				X
Egypt			X		Nepal				X	Yugoslavia		X		
El Salvador		X			Netherlands		X			Zaire				X
Equatorial Guinea				X	New Zealand		X			Zambia		X		
Ethiopia		X			Nicaragua				X	Zimbabwe				X
Fiji				X	Niger				X					
Finland		X			Nigeria				X					
France		X			Norway		X							
Gabon		X			Oman				X					
	0	25	9	19		3	12	10	28		0	13	11	25

CHAIRMAN: The motion has been rejected. We shall now proceed but in the interests of time the Chair will make an observation; the highest number of this is no reply, no reply! That ought to say something about how we are proceeding with serious business. We have consumed a long period of time on a motion that had the support "of three member countries; almost 25 times as many people were not here as cared to vote for it. That should tell us something of significance.

The Chair would suggest that we bear in mind a 4 o'clock deadline. It is beyond my power to suspend rules. I must enforce them. When motions are made the rules will be carried out. Any country has the right at any time to make closure motions or to do such things but the Chair would suggest that out of concern for orderly process there ought to be a sense of what the support is here and it seems obvious that at this late hour the member countries do wish, for those member countries which last night did not have the opportunity to speak, be given that opportunity this morning. The member countries do wish clearly to proceed to a vote on the issues before us following the respectful opportunity of the other member countries to speak their piece. We cannot continue to interrupt ourselves and to waste time like this but the clock is ticking and we would highly recommend that if we are going to have quorum problems and that, we would get some assistance in getting those 72 people here when we are dealing with the most important business we have dealt with in the past three weeks.

Ton A.J.N. OOMEN (Netherlands.) : My delegation feels very encouraged by the great majority of delegations here that voted in favour of continuation of the debate and I am not sure if it was only for the opportunity to listen to the Netherlands opinion but I agree with you that it is significant how many delegations are not present during the debate of this very important item.

After so many interesting statements of philosophies yesterday in a constructive way from both supporters and opponents of the different proposals related to the reform and in particular to the group of experts, it is quite a job for my delegation to add very much to that but nevertheless I have to try to add something which can put a new light on the subject. The Netherlands delegation wants to express, however, a different light on the ideas of the mechanisms and ideas proposed and discussed up to now. For my delegation there is no shadow of doubt that our Organization needs a new orientation in the direction it should exercise its mandate as stated in the revised para. 2, the main parameters that are relevant in this process lay outside the Organization, namely the evolution and trends related to world food and agricultural situation. This evolution has its origin in the first place in the world market and other international developments and secondly in the international bodies which are dealing with the negotiations and decisions in the global economic area. In this very process FAO has played thus far an additional role. It is from this point of view that FAO in our opinion needs an independent analysis, how to come to play a protagonistic role in the international decision-making process on agricultural development.

Therefore it is necessary to have experts from outside who are of outstanding quality and experience in the field of agriculture. However, it is more important to recognise ability and analyse the political and economic possibilities in order to give FAO more influence in this international process. In the first place this would be to assert the interest of the developing countries. Therefore, we fully associate with the views expressed by our Norwegian colleague. In our opinion the composition of a group of experts should be based on regional representation, chosen by the regions. The role that the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee should play is of eminent importance, that is to say, to give their comments on the results of the group of experts.

CHAIRMAN: Barbados. Barbados is not here.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): The French proposal has been called "illogical" by some delegates because according to them it mixes up competence, the studying element and the decision making process. According to these delegations the study is of value only if there is a strict division between the study aspect and the decision-making process. Also, the study is of real value only if it is independent that is, independent from member states, management and political decisions. These delegations say that the Programme and Finance Committees are composed of countries which are elected. In other words, they are part of the decision machinery which represents Governments within the Organization and therefore are not the appropriate Bodies to carry out this study.

I do not believe that because individuals have been elected they are no longer independent. I do not believe that because the member of the Programme and Finance Committees are elected they cease to become independent. I should like to point out that according to the General Rules of the Organization (Rule XXVI) the Member of the Programme and Finance Committees are elected for their personal expertise and quality. The rule states: "such members shall be elected by the Council in accordance with the procedures set forth in paragraph 3 of this Rule. Members of the Committee shall appoint as their representative individuals who have shown interest in the objectives and activities of the Organization". There follow three qualifications. Firstly, people who have no interest or love for what FAO stands for, its objectives and its activities, have no business to be elected onto the Programme and Finance Committees. Secondly, "They must have participated in Conference and Council Session". That means that they must have some knowledge of how the Organization is run. Thirdly, they must "have special competence and expertise in economic, social and technical matters pertaining to the various fields of the Organization's activities". Therefore, these individuals are chosen for their special competence either in the field of economics, social science or the technical field which are the fields of responsibility of FAO.

If, for example, Germany were elected to the Committee it could appoint the people that have been mentioned, such as Dr Bommer. If India were elected, Dr Swaminathan could be elected. If Nigeria were elected they could certainly appoint Mr Bukar Shaib to the membership of this Committee. If these people were elected to become members of the Committee, would they cease to become independent individuals just because they have been appointed members of the Finance Committee? Man does not cease to become an independent individual, and the independence of man does not depend on the duty or function he discharges. It depends on his character, make-up and personality. If men are independent they will remain independent even if they are members of a Committee.

I have serious doubts as to whether or not the Programme and Finance Committee belong to the decision making process of the Organization. In my view the Programme and Finance Committees are technical Bodies rather than governing Bodies or decision-making Bodies.

I should like to refer to Article VII of the Constitution, para 4, which states: "Subject to the general supervision of the Conference and Council the Director-General shall have full power and authority to direct the work of the Organization." The Director-General receives orders, directives and guidance only from the Council and Conference, not from the Programme and Finance Committees. In my view the Programme and Finance Committees are more technical Bodies than governing

Bodies. They look at the technical aspects of the programme and the technical aspects of financial matters. I should like to point out that in the papers submitted by the US delegation they stated precisely the position of the Members of the Programme and Finance Committee (Document C 87/30 Page A19). They said: "Traditionally, members of the Programme and Finance Committees serve as individual experts and are officially uninstructed ". Therefore, according to this view members of the Programme and Finance Committees are not representatives of the Government because they are elected according to their experience, their own competence and their own technical knowledge and they are unofficially uninstructed from the Government. For this reason there was a recommendation on page A20 which states: "we strongly recommend that members of these two Committees be charged with the responsibility of representing the views of their own Governments". If that recommendation is made, it means that the United States delegation is of the belief that the members of these Committees act as independent experts and that they do not necessarily represent the Government's views.

Furthermore, if members of these Committees are chosen for their competence, and serve as individual experts and if the Programme and Finance Committees are technical Committees I do not see why these members cannot be independent.

The second objection being raised against the Programme and Finance Committees is that the Committee is too big. (There are eleven plus twelve plus seven making thirty). Those of us who have experience of big Committees know that we cannot really work with big Committees and that is easily remedied by division, by working with sub-Committees. Those who have competence with finance will work and study those aspects of the Organization dealing with finance. Those who have competence with genetic resources will look at those aspects of the Organization that pertain to that field of

discipline, the same will apply to crops, plant protection and seed. If the Committee is big so much the better because it can be subdivided and the work can be finished earlier and the results can go back to Committee in order to get the overall view of the Committee.

Another objection raised was that the Committee should be made up of independent eminent experts of a high level. I do not know what high level means because we can appoint anybody of the highest level, of the highest category to the Programme and Finance Committees. If we are going to elect members of the Committee on Friday we will deserve the people we will elect. If we do not have the people there that are of the highest quality then it is our fault, just as it will be our fault if we do not elect anybody whom we believe should be able to do the job.

The case for reform has not been made. When you talk of reform it is because you have proved that the Organization is mismanaged, inefficient and is not able to do the job it has been founded and organized to do. I have not heard substantiation of this. It is true the Commission agrees to a review because it is healthy to look at the mirror. We should not be afraid to look at the mirror. The Contact Group has already laid out the terms of reference, that we should look at and I believe that the French proposal has the full support of the Commission. It has the full support of many other Individual member countries from other groups. If anyone has a doubt about the desire of the people here to support the French proposal, then, Mr Chairman, you can call for a vote - a roll call vote or a showing of hands - to see whether the French proposal meets with the approval of the Commission. We did not reach agreement on this matter in the Contact Group because evidently in the contact group we had to have a consensus and we have to take into account views which have been expressed in this Commission. Those views have been expressed and we know that the majority is in support of the French proposal therefore we believe a decision can now be taken.

CHAIRMAN: Antigua and Barbuda - not here.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Après l'éloquence dont a fait montre mon collègue philippin, il ne me reste plus grand chose à dire. Je voudrais tout de même faire quelques remarques sur un certain nombre de critiques qui ont été adressées au projet français et qui pourront permettre sans doute, à l'usage de certaines délégations, de redresser certaines erreurs d'interprétation qui auraient pu éventuellement se glisser dans les discours qui ont été prononcés hier.

Je ne vais pas répondre nommément, bien entendu, à chacune de ces critiques ou à chacune des délégations qui les a exprimées; je vais simplement les ramasser en bloc pour en parler les unes après les autres.

D'une part, une opposition a été faite entre le projet de résolution français et le projet de résolution norvégien sur les aspects internes et externes des experts qui seraient commis par l'Organisation. Je pense qu'en ce qui concerne le projet que nous avons soumis, il est bien clair que les experts seront effectivement des experts externes. Je ne vois pas comment on pourrait les désigner sous le label d'experts internes dans la mesure où, tout comme d'ailleurs les experts désignés par les pays membres de l'Organisation, ces experts seront choisis à l'extérieur; ils ne seront pas statutairement liés à l'Organisation. Il s'agira donc, dans tous les cas, de compétences qui viendront se greffer sur l'Organisation, mais se greffer à partir de l'extérieur.

Un deuxième reproche qui a été fait à notre projet de résolution concerne l'esprit d'indépendance de ces experts, qui a été mis en doute par certains, sous le prétexte qu'ils émaneraient des comités techniques de la FAO et qu'à ce titre ils auraient partie liée avec le fonctionnement de cette Organisation. C'est, à mon avis, une critique qui ne tient pas dans la mesure où les experts qui seront choisis garderont leur label d'experts choisis individuellement, choisis pour leur compétence.

On a cité, hier, le nom de M. Swaminathan, aujourd'hui, celui du Professeur Bornmer. Si ces experts, dont la compétence, dont le sérieux ne font aucun doute et dont la renommée est internationale, étaient choisis par les pays membres de l'Organisation, selon la procédure préconisée dans le projet de résolution norvégien et s'ils étaient choisis également selon notre projet, ils seraient

dans les deux cas indépendants. Je ne vois pas pourquoi M. Swaminathan, s'il était choisi par les comités techniques, serait moins indépendant que s'il l'était par les pays membres de l'Organisation. Cette logique m'échappe.

Par ailleurs, nous avons également reproché à nos experts d'être trop techniques. Le projet de résolution que nous avons soumis à votre attention est clair. Il indique: "choisis en fonction de leur compétence dans les domaines de l'agriculture, du développement, des finances et de l'administration". Je ne pense pas qu'il s'agisse là d'une énumération qui se perd dans les détails ou la technicité. Il s'agit de grands domaines d'activités de la FAO sur lesquels les experts pourront faire partager un point de vue qui ne concerne pas nécessairement des aspects fouillés ou très précis de l'Organisation. On ne peut pas reprocher à des gens de valeur ou des sages - appelons-les des "sages", si nous voulons - comme, par exemple, M. Swaminathan ou le Professeur Bommer, de se perdre dans des détails, de se perdre dans le labyrinthe du fonctionnement de l'Organisation simplement parce qu'ils passeront en revue les grands modes de fonctionnement de l'Organisation. Et là, je renvoie simplement mes auditeurs au mandat tel qu'il a été défini dans le document du Groupe de contact.

Par ailleurs - et cela mon collègue philippin l'a bien dit - nous ne confondons pas non plus le processus d'étude avec le processus de prise de décisions. Ces experts seront commis à la révision d'un certain nombre de processus. Ils pourront proposer un rapport. Ce rapport sera finalement soumis à l'examen du Conseil et de la Conférence, donc des organes de décision et des organes exécutifs de la FAO. Ils ne feront jamais que des propositions qui vaudront ce qu'elles vaudront, qui pourront être appréciées en connaissance de cause par les organes directeurs, c'est-à-dire par tous les pays membres, mais qui n'imposeront en rien un diktat ou une obligation pour les pays membres de cette Organisation.

Par ailleurs, je crois qu'une confusion a également été faite en ce qui concerne le nombre des experts indépendants. Certains pays ont fait remarquer, hier, qu'ils viendraient se surajouter aux membres du Comité technique et que nous nous trouverions en face d'un conglomerat d'une trentaine de personnes. Non, les experts - je l'ai bien précisé - seront choisis par les comités techniques. Cela ne veut pas dire pour autant qu'ils travailleront sans arrêt, de manière permanente, au sein de ce comité. Cela veut dire que l'étude à laquelle ils se livreront ne sera pas une étude menée conjointement et de façon permanente par tous les membres des deux comités, c'est-à-dire une vingtaine de personnes, plus les six, sept, ou huit experts indépendants. Je pense donc que ce reproche n'est pas fondé et qu'il est tout à fait loisible aux experts de se réunir séparément, de se concerter séparément du Comité technique.

L'honorable délégué de la Colombie a posé une question fort pertinente sur le nombre d'experts qui seraient mandatés ou seraient commis pour les projets de résolution. Quand nous disons un petit nombre d'experts, cela veut dire effectivement une certaine limite. L'on peut difficilement concevoir l'idée de convoquer un Comité d'experts de 40 à 50 personnes. Je pense que le chiffre de 7 (sept) qui a été proposé par l'Ambassadeur Bula Hoyos, n'est pas mauvais en soi. Bien entendu, cela pourra varier à deux ou trois unités en plus ou en moins. Cela n'a pas d'importance. Nous n'avons pas décidé de fermer le débat. Je pense qu'en fait on ne peut pas préjuger de la décision qui appartient au Comité.

Je ne voudrais pas prolonger un débat qui a été largement alimenté. Je voudrais simplement redire que le projet que nous avons présenté et qui est actuellement sur vos bureaux, se présente comme un amendement au paragraphe I du document C 87/LIM/27 et au Point 2 du document C 87/LIM/50.

En ce qui concerne ce dernier document qui est le document du Groupe de contact, il serait amené, tel que nous le définissons, à remplir le vide (entre parenthèses ou entre crochets), qui figure au Point 2 du dit document. Il s'agirait d'un complément ou d'une adjonction. Cela signifierait du même coup qu'il s'agit bel et bien d'un amendement. C'est un amendement que je présente à cette Commission et sur lequel j'espère recueillir le consensus le plus large possible.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I have had a number of questions addressed to me by the delegate of Belgium, and I will answer those before I continue. The delegate of Belgium asked how the experts were going to be paid and how this review was to be paid for. Of course, that question was thought of and discussed among the Nordic countries before we made our proposal. We found no particular

difficulty on that score. We believe that this is a question that should be considered by the membership of this Organization. By that I mean, if we had proposed one particular solution, it might easily have been misunderstood.

Of course, there are two ways of paying for such a review. One way is within the resources and budget of the Organization, and the other is by voluntary contribution. Both ways are possible. Both ways are not always practical, but I have had assurances from a great many members of this Organization that if it were so decided, and decided by the official membership, I am sure that a large part - or even the total part if the membership so wished - could be paid for by voluntary contributions here. However, that is a question for the membership as to which method would be the most correct and palatable way of having resources for the study. It is something we would venture to suggest before this particular issue has been discussed and before a decision has been taken upon the substance of the proposal itself.

If you will permit me one short comment on something raised by the distinguished delegate of the Philippines, he stated his belief that the Programme and Finance Committees were not part of the decision-making process here. Well, my belief is that indeed they are, because we look upon this as a process. A decision is not only the final "yes" or "no". In my own country that comes from the King in Council, but it is quite clear that there is a process leading up to that decision.

Not only do we have that general point. We have a few direct points which show that they clearly are decision-making bodies. If one looks in the Basic Text of the Rules, it is stated quite clearly in paragraph 7(d) of Rule XXVII that, "to approve budgetary transfers proposed by the Director-General". It also says, "to determine after consultation with the external auditor, the scope of the audit" - in other words, they approve, they determine, and those are decisions. In the same way, when six months ago in this room we discussed the use of the borrowing authority, the Director-General said he would use it only after consultation with the Programme and Finance Committees. I believe that is part of the decision-making process. It is quite clear, and I absolutely know that there is no other opinion than that the Programme and Finance Committees are an important part of the process, and those people we elect to those Committees are important members of that process.

That is why I found the suggestion made yesterday by the delegate of Kenya so very interesting, because I found quite a large strain of concern running through the debate that these two Committees should be involved and I included that in my intervention yesterday on that point. Now, I would like to make it absolutely clear that it was meant to be included as an amendment to my present text, to get that involvement quite clear, but to get it in a way that still keeps the separation between proposals and decisions.

So in paragraph 3 of document C 87/LIM/50, there has to be an addition. After the last sentence of that paragraph it should now read, "and also seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees". I shall repeat that, "and also seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees".

This is all I have to say at present, but I may have to request the floor again if other questions come up.

Václav DOBES (Czechoslovakia): I will be brief. My delegation welcomes the timely initiative by the delegation of France. As a matter of fact, in our opinion the French proposal presents a reasonable compromise between the draft resolution of the Latin American/Caribbean group and the Near East group and that of the Nordic countries. We share the view expressed clearly in this Commission that the French proposal gives us a wise solution at this particular moment in our Conference. In this connection we incline to the opinion of the delegation of the Philippines.

Adel Helmy EL-SARKI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): In the name of God the most gracious and merciful - my delegation, after having listened to the discussion on this subject, would like to express briefly its views in order to give other delegations an opportunity to make their own

statements and air their views. We would like to thank all delegations which have participated in this discussion on reforms.

My delegation feels it is important to compress expenditure, especially concerning travel expenses. We feel that FAO staff should be used much more to carry out the consultative process.

The Finance and Programme Committees are extremely important as the members are elected through the member countries. The candidates for the Programme and Finance Committees should be chosen according to their skills. We would like to welcome the French proposal on this point. The delegate of the Philippines said he agreed with the French proposal, and we would like to support it as it would speed up our work.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La delegación de Colombia está muy satisfecha por el ambiente que se ha estado creando en esta Sala desde anoche cuando usted, Señor Presidente, ha ordenado nuestros trabajos en forma satisfactoria y eficaz. Además hoy es el día de Thanksgiving Day, la fiesta de Acción de Gracias, que es muy grata al pueblo de su país, Señor Presidente. De manera que esperamos que la discusión de este Tema tan controvertido va a concluirse hoy, de manera generalmente aceptable para todos.

Creemos, que como lo han dicho entre otros el colega de Filipinas y el colega de Checoslovaquia, se tiende a perfilar un consenso en favor de la propuesta de Francia. Yo espero que la propuesta francesa pueda dar satisfacción, si no a toda la Comisión, por lo menos a la mayoría de los Miembros de esta Comisión. Porque a nuestro juicio ha aparecido claro en el curso del debate, que si bien la forma misma de la propuesta nórdica no cuenta con apoyo suficiente, sí cuenta con ese apoyo muy generalizado el espíritu de la propuesta nórdica, que está dirigido a que sea un grupo reducido que se ocupe del examen para introducir algunas posibles mejoras como lo aclaró anoche el colega Iskit, de Turquía.

Anoche expresó algunas consideraciones sobre la propuesta de Francia, que fueron repetidas por otras Delegaciones. Dos aspectos concretos nos preocupaban: dejar abierto el número de miembros del Comité limitado al solo calificativo de reducido, y la forma multitudinaria como se llevaría a cabo ese examen, si a los 21 miembros de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas sumamos los, por lo menos, siete miembros del Grupo más el personal de la Secretaría que normalmente atiende las reuniones de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

Hoy debemos reconocer con satisfacción que el colega de Francia ha hecho una aclaración muy satisfactoria y muy conveniente. No vamos naturalmente a proponer modificaciones al texto de Francia, porque esto podría complicar el debate; pero sí creemos que la adopción de la propuesta francesa podría facilitarse 'si en el Informe, en la parte del Informe sobre este Tema, constan las aclaraciones de Francia que complementa el texto de esa propuesta. O sea, Señor Presidente, proponemos que se adopte la propuesta de Francia y en el Informe se especifique que el número de miembros del Grupo de Expertos será, aproximadamente de siete. Este es el número que ha contado con algún apoyo en esta Sala. Si lo pudiéramos especificar en siete, todavía sería mejor.

Y lo que es más importante, creo que esto satisfaría a los nórdicos y a otras Delegaciones. Que ese Grupo podrá reunirse separadamente; es decir, solo los siete Miembros del Grupo y luego, periódicamente, cuando ese Grupo haya logrado un cierto número de recomendaciones, podrá presentar informes y discutir con los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

Algo más, todos sabemos que los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas tienen mandatos definidos y, justamente por eso, según las prácticas actuales, solamente se reúnen conjuntamente cuando discuten normalmente el proyecto del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto; de manera que la definición respectiva del mandato de cada uno de esos dos Comités pudiera ser también que no en todas las ocasiones sea aconsejable que los miembros del Grupo se reúnan conjuntamente con los dos Comités. Cuando el Grupo tenga propuestas que hacer sobre el Programa, por ejemplo, podrían reunirse con el Comité del Programa y discutirlos. Cuando tengan cuestiones financieras, reunirse con el Comité de Finanzas y discutirlas y, cuando tengan propuestas o recomendaciones más generales que tengan aplicaciones más amplias, podrían reunirse conjuntamente con los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

He tratado de entrar en contacto muy rápidamente con mi colega de Francia, y ahora que le llega mi intervención en su propia lengua, creo que él asiente a esta propuesta. O sea, que modifiquemos el texto de Francia que lo adoptemos, pero que en el Informe consten esas aclaraciones de Francia que, repito, facilitarían la adopción por esta Comisión.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe that we have had repeated references to the French proposal; and there is a difference between what France is saying and what other countries are saying that France has said. France stated that it would later move an amendment and others are referring to a proposal. There is a distinct difference.

Ms Josephine KAMSVAG (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation would simply like to point out that it should be extremely difficult for any delegate to express the full support of Commission II for the French proposal, when it does not have the support of the South West Pacific constituency.

Anwar Mohamed KHALED (Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of) (original language Arabic): It is my pleasure to take the floor in order to air my views before Commission II on reviewing certain aspects of FAO's activities and to speak of the democratic procedures applied here. To save time, we will not go into the details of certain issues but we feel that these issues have become crystallized in the French proposal. This proposal conciliates between the difference views and provides a positive solution to the problem, especially since it would lead to a consensus. This is a very good compromise text. Through this proposal we could work with the different technical bodies of FAO to review these aspects of the Organization's activities. On this basis, my delegation would like to support the French proposal, as well as document C 87/LIM/50, as drafted by the Contact Group.

Zbigniew KARNICKI (Poland): As the time is running out, I will try to be as brief as possible. My delegation feels that the French proposal is a good compromise and we wish to support it. We are inclined to support the number of experts as has been mentioned, which is about seven. We have to take into consideration their competence and we must have due consideration for balanced distribution. We think this is acceptable and we would also like to support it.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Nous nous sommes déjà prononcés sur cette question, parce que nous pensions au départ qu'il convenait certainement de donner suffisamment de temps à nous tous pour réfléchir sur la question du mécanisme.

Je crois que l'évolution du débat a montré que les membres de cette Commission voulaient en finir avec ce problème. Nous étions dès lors dans l'obligation de nous prononcer.

Nous devons dire que si nous nous sommes prononcés en faveur de la proposition française, nous ne pensons pas que cette solution soit idéale, mais nous pensons qu'il s'agit là d'un moindre mal. Donc si nous devons nous prononcer au cours de cette Conférence, nous devrions choisir cette solution, parce qu'elle pose moins de problèmes que la solution nordique.

Nous voudrions néanmoins rendre hommage à l'effort de réflexion des pays nordiques, qui ont fait une proposition réfléchie, mais nous pensons qu'il s'agit là d'un extrême, et par conséquent, vu l'évolution des discussions, il nous fallait choisir une solution de compromis.

Comme je l'ai dit hier, nous mêmes avons une proposition que nous avons débattu avec nos collègues au sein du groupe de contact. Mais après mûre réflexion, nous avons pensé qu'il était mieux d'accepter un compromis si nous tenions à trancher sur cette question. A l'origine nous pensions qu'il fallait peut être poursuivre la réflexion sur ce problème de mécanisme, parce que nous ne sommes pas très favorables au vote sur un tel problème. Nous pensons que le vote n'arrange pas toujours les choses dans ce genre de questions, et notre objectif est d'arriver à un consensus sur ce mécanisme, car les problèmes que nous allons lui confier sont des problèmes importants pour l'avenir de notre Organisation.

Je crois que, comme par le passé les réformes au sein de notre Organisation se sont toujours opérées à l'issue d'un consensus et nous espérons que ce consensus puisse être atteint aujourd'hui, ou peut-être plus tard, sur ce problème important afin que les conclusions et recommandations qui sortirent de ce mécanisme puissent être discutées par les Etats Membres. C'est de cette façon, et de cette façon seulement, que nous pourrions recueillir les bienfaits d'un tel exercice.

Nous voudrions nous résumer en disant que nous étions partisans d'une réflexion approfondie sur la question, et qu'il convenait peut-être, dans toute la mesure possible de réunir un consensus sur ce problème. Mais si la Conférence en décidait autrement, nous nous sommes déjà prononcés hier en faveur de la proposition française. Nous pensons que les éclaircissements que la délégation française vient de donner ce matin pour compléter son exposé d'hier nous paraissent utiles, et peuvent nous permettre de sortir, non pas de l'impasse, mais des difficultés que certaines délégations ont pu connaître hier après l'exposé de la France.

Voilà ce que nous tenions à dire sur cette question et nous espérons qu'un consensus pourra sortir de nos travaux.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ambassador Tchicaya. I am sure I speak for all members of the body when I express to you our appreciation for your staying up to 4 a.m. this morning to chair the Drafting Committee, and not only you but the members who participated.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN-GOMEZ (Venezuela): Vamos a ser muy breves para contribuir a que este debate no se prolongue demasiado, y vamos a comenzar por expresar que, aún cuando todavía tenemos reservas con relación a la necesidad de crear un grupo de expertos de alto nivel que siga el análisis que se ha hecho aquí, será una carga más para la ya bastante cargada economía de la Organización, puesto que a estos expertos va a haber que pagarles con cargo a los recursos de la Organización, o en todo caso, habrá que hacer contribuciones voluntarias que podrían hacerse para sacar a la FAO del atolladero en que está metida ahora económicamente.

Repito que, a pesar de todo eso, nosotros, reflexionando sobre la situación que se ha presentado, y habiendo escuchado las intervenciones de Francia, Colombia, y actualmente de Congo, nos inclinamos por dar nuestro apoyo a la propuesta que ha hecho la delegación de Francia, considerando que será una salida más inteligente y muy auspiciosa para la Organización. Nos ahorramos los argumentos porque han sido expresados muy claramente por algunos de los oradores que me han precedido en el uso de la palabra para apoyar esta propuesta. Por consiguiente, Sr. Presidente, dejando expresado nuestro apoyo a esta proposición, le agradecemos la palabra.

Ms Anna Liisa KORHONEN (Finland): My delegation has not taken the floor before this moment because we are co-sponsors of the Nordic text, but I think that at this point it might be useful for us to get clarification into our debate just along the lines you yourself said, Mr Chairman, namely that we should know what is the French proposal. So far we have understood that what the French delegation has said is that they have an amendment to our text. The text which was read yesterday, I am not quite sure in what place that would be. That was last night. Also this morning I understand that our colleague from France has said that it should be in the beginning of paragraph 2 of C 87/LIM/50, but if the text that they dictated yesterday should be placed here I am a little bit confused how the sentence of the paragraph should read. Therefore, in order to be quite clear what is the status of the French proposal, I would seek your clarification on that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Finland. Your point of clarification is well taken. The Chair observed that there was a distinct difference between what France was saying and what countries were saying that France was saying, that France last evening and this morning has made reference to an amendment, others have made reference to a proposal. The Chair simply observed that they are distinctly different. It would not be in order at this time to go into details of where to place their

amendment. That will come at the time they move their amendment. France at that time will be able clearly to state where they move their amendment and what it says. But it would add to the confusion if at this point we went into details of that. At the appropriate time an amendment will be in order, but we are not now even on the basic resolution.

Leopoldo ARIZA HIDALGO (Cuba): Creemos que podemos seguir satisfechos por la tranquilidad que hemos obtenido ya en la discusión al final de la Conferencia, lastimosamente, pero estamos en posición ya de seguir adelante bien.

Sr. Presidente, específicamente, porque se han dado muchas explicaciones, muchas informaciones muy útiles para la comprensión y para poder tener un juicio a la hora de buscar el consenso; queremos decir que específicamente, como mecanismo, para examinar o revisar las actividades de FAO, puesto que todavía no hemos aprobado el alcance porque seguimos considerando que no hay condiciones ni se han aprobado para unas reformas, sino como mecanismo para examinar estas actividades, apoyamos la enmienda francesa a la proposición noruega. Consideramos que esta enmienda equilibra esta proposición, le da el equilibrio necesario entre los dos polos de discusión, cuestión que puede facilitar a todos un consenso, y le auguramos a usted que pueda lograr ese consenso esta tarde.

CHAIRMAN: We are in this afternoon already. It is nearly 12.30 and we are going to be ceasing in three and a half hours. The Chair observes that we have a considerable list of speakers remaining and a number of countries who spoke last evening and who this morning wish to go into a second round. The Chair would observe that if we give countries who have spoken already today a second round opportunity we must extend that to everyone, which would create serious time difficulties.

We are coming to a point at which it would perhaps be best to deal with the decision-making, and if we are going to talk about a resolution and the amendments there to deal with them orderly and talk about them while they are under way in the process of decision-making as opposed to what we are going to do later on. We may spend a lot of time talking about what we are going to do later and come to later and find that the time has elapsed.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Arrow Solomon OBŪRU (Kenya): We appreciate the spirit of compromise that seems to be prevailing in the course of the discussions. Now we would wish, taking note of this spirit, to request a recess of about ten minutes to allow for some consultations which may facilitate this compromise on some of the areas of amendment of taking note of both the French and the Norwegian resolutions.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe that under the Rules the Chairman has the prerogative to call such recesses. We view your suggestion as a constructive suggestion in the orderly process, so long as there is a clear understanding that time would be limited.

We would also ask for member countries who can, to forgo speaking, perhaps bearing in mind that there would be plenty of time to speak on the resolution and any amendments thereto and perhaps it would be a good idea to call a quick recess, have some private consultations and discussions, come back here, make a closure motion, suspend further discussion, get on to the business of the resolution and amendments thereto and try to reach conclusions. We will have a recess for 15 minutes.

The meeting was suspended from 12.30 to 14.45 hours

La séance est suspendue de 12 h 30 à 14 h 45

Se suspende la sesión de las 12.30 horas a las 14.45 .horas

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): I should like to inform you and the whole of the Commission that the Group of 77 wishes to meet for 45 minutes maximum in the Malaysia Room. I should like to request you to defer the meeting until 3.30 so that this Group can meet.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair hereby declares a recess until 3.30. The Group of 77 has been requested to go to the Malaysia Room for a brief discussion. The Chair will be here at 3.30 to commence proceedings. We have a 4 o'clock deadline that we are working against, so please be here at 3.30.

The meeting was suspended from 14.45 hours to 15.55 hours

La séance est suspendue de 14 h 45 à 15 h 55

Se suspende la sesión de las 14.45 horas a las 15.55 horas

CHAIRMAN: The Chair announced earlier today that we would adjourn at 4.00 p.m. It is now two to four o'clock. We have some time left. We would suggest that in the interests of the best use of the remaining time it would be prudent to suspend further talk and move to the business of trying to arrive at conclusions. Unless there is any objection, the Chair would suggest that we would suspend further discussion and move to voting on the issues before us. The Chair sees no objection. We now have to deal with the resolution introduced by Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries.

Harald HØSTMARK(Norway): I believe we have explained that we have tried to give the meeting the full thinking behind the resolution. I do not think this is the time to repeat all the arguments. I would merely recommend our resolution to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to establish some clarification for the benefit of members. We ruled yesterday that you were incorporating the recommendations of the Contact Group: is that correct?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): That is absolutely correct, depending on consensus.

Bernard LEDUN (France): La delegation française souhaite rappeler qu'elle a proposé un amendement qu'elle confirme de façon formelle maintenant. Cet amendement au texte du groupe nordique remplacerait le paragraphe 1 du document C 87/LIM/27.

J'ai lu, hier après-midi, le texte de la proposition d'amendement que nous avions faite. Je suis prêt, bien entendu, pour clarifier le débat, à le relire à nouveau.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair feels that it would be appropriate to clarify matters for everyone if you would please do precisely that, so that we can understand your amendment fully.

Bernard LEDUN (France): L'amendement est le suivant. En lieu et place du paragraphe 1 du document C 87/LIM/27, nous lirions les mots suivants:

"Décide: aux fins de l'examen mentionné au paragraphe 2 ci-dessous, le Comité du Programme et le Comité financier, travaillant conjointement, seront assistés d'un petit nombre d'experts. Ils seront choisis en fonction de leurs compétences dans les domaines de l'agriculture, du développement, des finances ou de l'administration, par le Comité du Programme et le Comité financier en consultation avec le Directeur Général, en tenant compte d'une répartition géographique équitable."

Je propose que nous passions maintenant à un vote sur l'adoption de cet amendement.

CHAIRMAN: You may, but other delegations have sought the floor.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): It is my wish to propose an amendment to the amendment, an amendment to the French proposal. If you agree, Mr Chairman, I shall go ahead and propose what I have.

CHAIRMAN: You are perfectly in order. Please proceed to explain your amendment to the amendment.

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): As a resumé, we propose this, influenced purely by the interests to compromise. We appreciate and have noted the discussions that have gone on here. We realize a deadlock, a deadlock which if allowed to sustain itself is not solving the interests of the member countries, nor of the Organization. We realize that the best solution to a deadlock is a compromise. A compromise means give and take and it is in this spirit of give and take that Kenya wishes to propose, because what we have tried to put here is a bridge which would belong neither to the French proposal nor to the Nordic, like bridges that link countries or various parts of a country. We hope that in this spirit our proposal will be accepted. I shall now read what we propose, and if accepted it will replace paragraph 1 of the French proposal. This is what it is:

"A group of experts consisting of seven members shall be selected by the Independent Chairman of the Council in consultation with the regional groups, taking into account their competence in the fields of agriculture, finance, development or administration. Before beginning its work the group shall elect a Chairman from among themselves. In their work they shall consult and seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees."

CHAIRMAN: We now have a resolution, an amendment and an amendment to the amendment. We shall now proceed with the discussion on the amendment to the amendment.

Costa Rica on a Point of Order?

The Chair will state this and will not repeat it. We have repeatedly had points of order that were not points of order. As you proceed to state your point of order, if it is not a point of order I will cease to recognize you and proceed to the issue at hand. We will waste no more time on mislabelling. State your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): El mío es un Punto de Orden; un clásico Punto de Orden. El texto que acaba de leer la Delegación de Kenya no es una enmienda a la enmienda de Francia. Es una enmienda alternativa. El texto que ha sido leído en estos momentos, está mucho más cerca de la propuesta de los Países Nórdicos de lo que está la enmienda de Francia.

Por lo tanto, yo creo que la Delegación de Kenya tiene derecho de que su enmienda sea votada después y no antes de la propuesta francesa.

Por si acaso Ud. no interpretara la cosa como lo digo, yo me permito de sugerir, yo de antemano pido una votación de la Comisión sobre si la propuesta de Kenya es una enmienda o una enmienda a la enmienda. De acuerdo con mi interpretación, es una enmienda separada mucho más cercana a la proposición inicial, y por lo tanto tiene que ser votada después.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that there has been a resolution introduced, but notwithstanding your opinion that there has been an amendment to that advanced and Kenya has advanced an amendment to that, under parliamentary procedure, under the Rules of this Organization an amendment to an amendment must be voted on first. Kenya's amendment is perfectly in order. France's amendment clarifies your wishes to move the Norwegian resolution in a certain direction, Kenya's further refines it. Kenya is perfectly in order and under the Rules of this body and under standard procedure in any organized body they have the floor. The motion has been moved, the discussion is on Kenya's motion. Does anyone wish to speak to Kenya's amendment? Colombia, state your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Conzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Yo quiero pedirle al Consejero Legal que lea la primera frase del párrafo 26 del artículo XII del Reglamento General de la Organización; y que el Consejero Legal diga si usted tiene razón o la tiene Costa Rica, porque pienso que la enmienda de Francia debe votarse primero.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would caution that the French amendment is open to another possible interpretation under the Rules of being considered as a separate proposal. We tried to take a flexible approach to avoid that and if we do make a ruling in that direction in which we are headed and that division will be an up or down vote on the Nordic resolution followed by an up or down vote on the French proposal.

CHAIRMAN: We will have a roll call vote; a roll call vote has been requested by the United Kingdom. We will have a roll call vote on whether or not to rule Kenya out of order.

Ton A. M. OOMEN (Netherlands): Do you allow me a point of clarification?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Ton A.J.M. OOMEN (Netherlands): I got the impression that the meeting is not completely aware of what the proposal of Kenya tried to say. As a matter of fact our Kenyan colleague stated a sentence starting with "a group of experts" but that will replace, in my reconciliation, after the text put forward by the delegation of France that reads "decides that for the purpose of the review mentioned in para. 2" and then it starts with "a group of experts consisting". That is what I understood and perhaps you can ask the Kenyan delegate if he tried to intend it.

CHAIRMAN: Kenya? It would help to have clarification, can you so indicate?

Arrow Solomon OBURU (Kenya): In fact I had a copy of the French text with me adding after "decides that", that was the French one and then you add "a group of experts", "decides that a group of experts".

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe that the French amendment makes reference to a small group, the Kenyan amendment further amends that to define that as seven and the Kenyan resolution or motion, the amendment to the amendment, is clearly an appropriate amendment to the amendment, that we have used the word "small" and we have a further refining of that in the Kenyan proposal. It is perfectly in order, it is perfectly appropriate.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I heard the proposal quite clearly. It was very precisely an amendment to a proposal made by France which itself was an amendment to the Nordic text and it seems to me under the appropriate rules there cannot be any question of paragraph 26 applying. We are not talking about two rival amendments to the same proposal. We are talking about an amendment to an amendment, which then will be taken in relation to the proposal. Consequently I would respectfully submit that we are right to continue the discussion and if nobody else wishes to speak to vote on the Kenyan amendment. If it can be accepted by the delegation of France, of course, perhaps that would make it easier.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair must draw your attention to paragraph 26 of Rule XII. Under the rules "when an amendment to a proposal is moved the amendment shall be voted on first". You will not get attention simply by being loud and out of order. "When an amendment to a proposal is moved the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments to a proposal are moved Conference and Council shall first vote on the amendment deemed by the Chairman to be furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the amendment next removed therefrom", and so on until all the amendments have been put to a vote. "Where, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another the latter shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted the amendment proposed shall then be voted upon."

Kenya, under every legislative body that ever observed, your motion is perfectly in order.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Je constate qu'il me faut agiter ma pancarte avant d'être enfin vu. Je regrette de différer sur l'interprétation donnée à la proposition kenyenne. La proposition kenyenne, à mon avis, est un amendement au texte norvégien, et non pas un amendement à l'amendement français. Dans ces conditions, je demande une consultation du Conseiller juridique qui nous permettra de trancher ce débat.

CHAIRMAN: I am sorry but that is a misstatement of fact; the Legal Counsel renders opinion, the body decides. You may not like facts but they still remain facts.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Gracias, Sr. Presidente. La Delegación argentina entiende que las interpretaciones dadas por la Delegación de Costa Rica y la Delegación de Francia acerca de la enmienda que acaba de presentar la Delegación de Kenya son correctas. La Delegación de Costa Rica pidió que fuera el Cuerpo, es decir, este Comité, el que votara acerca de esta interpretación. Si el Sr. Presidente no quiere que escuchemos la opinión del Asesor Legal, que parece ser muy necesaria en este momento, mi Delegación pediría que se hiciera lugar a la moción de Costa Rica. Gracias, señor.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair has asked the Secretary who handed me the list of persons who have stated a point of order in the order as she sees them and we will try to proceed with them but on a point of correction, Argentina, the Chair does not say that we should not hear the Legal Counsel, the Chair corrected a misstatement pointing out that the Legal Counsel does not decide, the Legal Counsel recommends, the body decides. Those are the facts. Madagascar, you had a point of order. Did you? I do not want to ask you to invent one if you did not but if you do please state it.

Apolinaire ANDRIATSIFAJATO (Madagascar): Est-ce-que vous me donnez la parole? Je la prends. C'est pour dire simplement...

CHAIRMAN: I said this earlier, if you have a point of order state your point of order, if you do not you will not be recognised. If you have a point of order state your point of order.

Apolinaire ANDRIATSIFAJATO (Madagascar): C'est une motion d'ordre. Je veux simplement appuyer la proposition française de consulter le Conseiller juridique...

CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Costa Rica, you have a point of order? State your point of order.

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Si, Señor Presidente, he formulado una solicitud de votación en la Asamblea después...

CHAIRMAN: That is not a Point of Order. United States? You have a Point of Order?

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): I do not have a Point of Order.

CHAIRMAN: Congo? You have a Point of Order? State your Point of Order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): C'est une motion d'ordre, Monsieur le Président. Il y a longtemps que je la demande, elle vient très tard. Ma motion d'ordre est celle-ci: j'ai écouté avec intérêt le débat sur les amendements. Mon problème est de savoir avant tout si cette Commission est pour que nous puissions passer au vote réellement. Je pense, pour ma part, que nous avons fait quelques progrès sur ce sujet et que passer au vote ne me semble pas la meilleure solution pour aborder cette question. Je crois fermement que nous devrions pouvoir permettre à notre Organisation de faire en sorte que nous puissions continuer le dialogue. Je ne pense pas qu'en mettant au vote tel ou tel amendement, telle ou telle résolution, nous réglerons le problème. C'est pour cette raison qu'avant de passer au vote je voudrais qu'il y ait un vote qui détermine oui ou non si nous sommes prêts à voter sur ces résolutions.

CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid the train has left the station.

The Chair has ruled Kenya's amendment is the amendment furthest removed; that has been disputed. Under the rules of the Organization it is in order to have a vote, the Chair has ruled that Kenya's motion is furthest removed.

There has been a rejection of that in the motion put forth by Costa Rica and concurred in by Argentina, concurred in by one or two others. It is in order to have a vote on that. Those who feel that Kenya's motion is in order as an amendment to the amendment, that is furthest removed, should vote yes to sustain the ruling. Those who feel otherwise should vote no.

United States you have a Point of Order?

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): Mr Chairman, before we proceed to a vote, I would like to call for a roll-call vote.

CHAIRMAN: We are in a roll-call vote right now. We will proceed with the vote.

The Chair is having a vote as requested by Costa Rica and as supported- by some other Member Countries. That is what the rules provide; they must be followed. Let me state that in less parliamentary terms.

The Chair has given a ruling that under what the Chair read earlier as the Rules that are the Rules adopted by this body, Kenya's motion is the motion furthest removed, that is to say, it was properly an amendment to an amendment. That decision has been appealed to in a point of order by Costa Rica. That point of order has been concurred in. That was essentially the same point of order made by other Member Countries. Under the Rules of this Organization the point of order of Costa Rica is in order and we can have a vote on that. Under the motion by the United Kingdom

that vote must be under the Rules a roll-call vote.

Those who sustain the view of the Chair that Kenya's motion amendment is in fact the amendment furthest removed should vote yes. Those who feel otherwise should vote no.

It will be a roll-call vote.

VOTE

VOTE

VOTACION



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

(Item 12)

Vote on

Vote sur

Votación para KENYA's AMENDMENT TO FRENCH AMENDMENT

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	20
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	73
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	10
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	52

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	93
--	----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	47
--	----

REJECTED
REPOUSSEE
RECHAZADA

Date 26/11/87

Fecha

Elections Officer

Fonctionnaire électoral

El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) GRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

Session of the Conference

Session de la Conférence

Periodo de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT

APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN

VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Item 12

Vote on

Vote sur

..... Votación para ... KENYA'S AMENDMENT to ERENCH AMENDMENT

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan			X		Cambodia			X		Pakistan				X
Albania			X		Germany (Fed. Rep. of)	X				Panama		X		
Algeria		X			Ghana		X			Papua New Guinea				X
Angola		X			Greece		X							
Antigua and Barbuda		X			Grenada			X		Peru		X		
Argentina		X			Guatemala			X		Philippines			X	
Australia	X				Guinea		X			Poland		X		
Austria	X				Guinea-Bissau			X		Portugal	X			
Bahamas			X		Guyana			X		Qatar				X
Bahrain		X			Haiti		X							
Bangladesh		X			Honduras		X			Rwanda			X	
Barbados		X			Hungary		X			St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Belgium		X			Iceland			X		Saint Lucia				X
Belize			X		India		X			St. Vincent & the Grenad				X
Benin	X				Indonesia		X			Samoa				X
Bhutan		X			Iran (Islamic Rep. of)		X			Sao Tome and Principe				X
Bolivia		X			Iraq		X			Saudi Arabia		X		
Botswana		X			Ireland			X		Senegal			X	
Brazil		X			Israel			X		Seychelles				X
Bulgaria		X			Italy		X			Sierra Leone				X
Burkina Faso		X			Jamaica			X		Solomon Islands				X
Burma			X		Japan		X			Somalia				X
Burundi			X		Jordan		X			Spain		X		
Cameroon			X		Kenya		X			Sri Lanka				X
Canada	X				Korea (Rep. of)			X		Sudan		X		
Cape Verde		X			Kuwait		X			Suriname				X
Central African Rep.			X		Laos			X		Swaziland				X
Chad			X		Lebanon		X			Sweden		X		
Chile		X			Lesotho		X			Switzerland		X		
China		X			Liberia			X		Syria			X	
Colombia		X			Libya		X			Tanzania		X		
Comoros			X		Luxembourg			X		Thailand		X		
Congo		X			Madagascar		X			Togo				X
Cook Islands			X		Malawi			X		Tonga				X
Costa Rica		X			Malaysia		X			Trinidad and Tobago		X		
Côte d'Ivoire		X			Maldives			X		Tunisia		X		
Cuba		X			Mal			X		Turkey				X
Cyprus		X			Malta			X		Uganda				X
Czechoslovakia		X			Mauritania			X		United Arab Emirates				X
					Mauritius			X		United Kingdom		X		
D.P. Rep. of Korea		X			Mexico		X			U.S.A.		X		
Denmark	X				Mongolia		X			Uruguay		X		
Djibouti			X		Morocco		X			Vanuatu				X
Dominica		X			Mozambique			X		Venezuela		X		
Dominican Rep.		X			Namibia			X		Viet Nam		X		
Ecuador		X			Nepal			X		Yemen Arab Republic		X		
Egypt		X			Netherlands		X			Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)		X		
El Salvador		X			New Zealand		X			Yugoslavia		X		
Equatorial Guinea			X		Nicaragua		X			Zaire		X		
Ethiopia			X		Niger		X			Zambia		X		
Fiji			X		Nigeria		X			Zimbabwe				X
Finland	X				Norway		X							
France		X			Oman		X							
Gabon		X												
	6	32	2	13		7	24	2	20		7	17	6	19

CHAIRMAN: The body has decided that Kenya's proposal is not the furthest removed.

The Chair now advises the body that it has a request from Norway on a ruling that the French amendment implies rejection of the Norwegian proposal. The Chair rules in favour of Norway, that is, that Norway's motion would be voted on as one proposal, the French as another. If anyone wishes to appeal? The Chair has recognized India on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): I thought the whole purpose of the meeting of the Contact Group was to establish whether or not the Nordic -

CHAIRMAN: We are holding a discussion. If you have a point of order say so. If you do not have a point of order, we will proceed with those who do.

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): I feel the decision with the Nordic position is not correct.

CHAIRMAN: That is a valid point of order. We have heard your point of order and we must recognize others. It will be considered.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): El punto de orden de la delegación Argentina está dirigido a saber cuándo y cómo ha hecho Noruega esta apreciación; nosotros no escuchamos en la sala que Noruega dijera esto y no sabemos a qué se debe su gula.

(ante la intervención del Chairman se producen protestas)

CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to confirm that Norway? Do not nod your head; please say yes.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You could not see him nod his head. He said yes.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Acabamos de votar sobre cuál de las dos enmiendas se alejaba más de la propuesta, (le interrumpe el Sr. Presidente)

CHAIRMAN: State the point of order and the Chair will proceed. Telling us what occurred recently is not a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): ¡Es una moción de orden! ¡Acabamos de votar sobre cuál de las dos enmiendas se alejaba más de la propuesta de los países nórdicos y usted ya reconoció personalmente, poniéndolo a votación, que había dos enmiendas y a estas alturas usted se permite retirar todo lo que hemos hecho hasta ahora! ¡Es una exageración lo que está pasando!

CHAIRMAN: That is not true. That is not a point of order. Costa Rica, please, please spend some time in reading and understanding what a point of order is. You have yet to state a point of order; rarely have you stated one. If you think the Chair can save some time, there is a motion by India to deal with and obviously it has to be concurred with. Do you wish to repeat that? We can take up time repeating it, but the Chair understands that India's point of order is agreed to by Argentina and we can follow the procedure. What you are doing is to agree with India, but if you wish to have more time to state another point of order, take the time to do it. It does not bother the Chair, but we insist that a point of order is a point of order. Algeria, do you have a point of order to state?

Mile Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Monsieur le Président comme le veut le Règlement je viens simplement appuyer la motion d'ordre de l'Inde.

CHAIRMAN: That is valid. You are perfectly in order.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Sr. Presidente, la delegación de Colombia impugna su decisión "y por lo tanto corresponde a la Comisión decidir. Usted se divierte sometiéndonos a votaciones continuas; está convirtiendo esta sala en un rodeo de Texas para cow boys (rumores)

CHAIRMAN: Texas cowboys are free to vote; they are free people; they live in a democratic society and VOTE. You do, TOO. I thought, the Chair had made it clear that we are totally uninfluenced by loud noise.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Sí, Sr. Presidente. Mi punto de orden se refiere a una decisión tomada por Noruega. Cuando un proponente pone en una Asamblea cualquiera, y ésta es una Asamblea muy importante, una proposición, sea ésta una resolución, sea una enmienda o sea una propuesta suelta, ella la entrega a la asamblea y ya no tiene derecho a calificarla, de manera que Noruega no tiene derecho a decir que la enmienda de Francia es así o de otra forma y que quiere que le modifique su proposición. Está en poder de la Asamblea y solamente la Asamblea puede decidir, o el Presidente cuando está asistido por un reglamento y por un Asesor Legal; la decisión de que Noruega retira su propuesta porque ya no quiere que Francia haga esto o lo otro, está absolutamente fuera de orden. Éste es mi punto de orden; no podemos estar considerando que Noruega decida, porque no tiene poder de decisión ante una propuesta que ya ella entregó a esta Asamblea y que está en manos de la Asamblea; es jurídicamente cierto por la decisión parlamentaria.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You happen to be wrong. I observe that essentially you are making the same point of order that India made succinctly at the beginning. If you wish to make an echo, fine; you may do so, but it will consume a period of time unnecessarily. The Chair will rule that India's point of order is perfectly in order and under the rules will have to be decided on by the body. If you wish, the Chair will be willing to let the body decide on that now.

E. Patrick ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): We wish to support India's position on which you have ruled, Mr Chairman. Also, we would like to be advised as to the basis on which you have ruled that the French proposal automatically rejects the Norwegian proposal?

CHAIRMAN: I did not say automatically"; I said "implies a rejection". It is in the rules. Norway, you said you had a point of order.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I asked for the floor because there has been an obvious misunderstanding of my position and I want to make perfectly clear what my position is. I did not specify a point of order, but it is a point of clarification. I make that perfectly clear. The penultimate speaker believed I asked for a withdrawal of the French motion. That is not so at all. I feel that the French proposal negates completely in essence, in spirit and in substance the motion I have put.

Accordingly I have respectfully requested the Chair to put my motion to the vote before the other motion, which is a totally different one. I repeat I have not asked, nor do I feel I have the right to ask, the French to withdraw their motion. That is not at all implied in my request.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair feels that you have been absolutely clear all along. India has put a point of order. We are not going to plough the same ground. A motion has been made by the United Kingdom for a Roll Call vote.

Akbar Mirza KHALEELI (India): The fact that the Norwegian proposal is the only one is not correct. There was a Mexican draft and because there was a Mexican draft and a Norwegian draft we had a Contact Group. Therefore it was our understanding with the Contact Group that where we agreed with the Norwegian position it would be put, and the French one would be put as the amendment to it. That was our understanding at that time; but I will not make an issue of this and delay the meeting any further.

CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, but the point of discussion here is the Norwegian proposal. We have not yet reached the Mexican proposal, although perhaps we can do so. We are now in a vote. A vote Yes is a vote to have an up-or-down vote for the Norwegian resolution. A vote No is to have first a vote on the French and then on the Norwegian. Is that clear? So we are taking a vote. A vote Yes is to sustain the ruling, the result of which would be to have a separation: an up-or-down vote on the Norwegian proposal, and you could have a subsequent vote on France. A vote No would be to have a vote first on the French amendment and then a vote on the Norwegian motion. It is very clear, commence the vote.

Vote

Vote

Votación



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

Item 12

Vote on
Vote sur
Votación para Norway Amendment

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	18
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	81
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	0
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	56

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	99
--	----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	50
--	----

REJECTED
REPOUSSEE
RECHAZADA

Date 26.11.87 Elections Officer
Fecha Fonctionnaire électoral
El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) GRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

Session of the Conference
Session de la Conférence
Período de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT
APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETTIN
VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Item 12

Vote on

Vote sur

Votación para NORWAY AMENDMENT

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan				X	Gambia				X	Pakistan				X
Albania				X	Germany (Fed. Rep. of)	X				Panama		X		
Algeria	X				Ghana		X			Papua New Guinea				X
Angola	X				Greece		X			Peru		X		
Antigua and Barbuda	X				Grenada				X	Philippines		X		
Argentina	X				Guatemala				X	Poland		X		
Australia	X				Guinea		X			Portugal	X			
Austria		X			Guinea-Bissau				X	Qatar				X
Bahamas				X	Guyana				X	Rwanda				X
Bahrain	X				Haiti		X			St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Bangladesh	X				Honduras		X			Saint Lucia				X
Barbados	X				Hungary		X			St. Vincent & the Grenadines				X
Belgium	X				Iceland				X	Samoa				X
Belize				X	India		X			Sao Tome and Principe				X
Benin				X	Indonesia		X			Saudi Arabia		X		
Bhutan				X	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)		X			Senegal		X		
Bolivia	X				Iraq		X			Seychelles				X
Botswana	X				Ireland		X			Sierra Leone				X
Brazil	X				Israel				X	Solomon Islands				X
Bulgaria	X				Italy		X			Somalia				X
Burkina Faso	X				Jamaica				X	Spain		X		
Burma				X	Japan		X			Sri Lanka				X
Burundi				X	Jordan		X			Sudan		X		
Cameroon	X				Kenya	X				Suriname				X
Canada	X				Korea (Rep. of)		X			Swaziland				X
Cape Verde	X				Kuwait		X			Sweden	X			
Central African Rep.				X	Laos				X	Switzerland	X			
Chad				X	Lebanon		X			Syria		X		
Chile	X				Lesotho		X			Tanzania		X		
China	X				Liberia				X	Thailand		X		
Colombia	X				Libya		X			Togo				X
Comoros				X	Luxembourg				X	Tonga				X
Congo	X				Madagascar		X			Trinidad and Tobago		X		
Cook Islands				X	Malawi				X	Tunisia		X		
Costa Rica	X				Malaysia		X			Turkey		X		
Côte d'Ivoire	X				Maldives				X	Uganda		X		
Cuba	X				Malta		X			United Arab Emirates		X		
Cyprus	X				Mauritania				X	United Kingdom		X		
Czechoslovakia	X				Mauritius				X	U.S.A.	X			
D.P. Rep. of Korea	X				Mexico		X			Uruguay		X		
Denmark	X				Mongolia		X			Vanuatu				X
Djibouti				X	Morocco		X			Venezuela		X		
Dominica	X				Mozambique				X	Viet Nam		X		
Dominican Rep.	X				Namibia				X	Yemen Arab Republic		X		
Ecuador	X				Nepal				X	Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)		X		
Egypt	X				Netherlands		X			Yugoslavia		X		
El Salvador	X				New Zealand		X			Zaire		X		
Equatorial Guinea				X	Nicaragua				X	Zambia		X		
Ethiopia				X	Niger				X	Zimbabwe				X
Fiji				X	Nigeria		X							
Finland	X				Norway		X							
France	X				Oman				X					
Gabon	X													
	5	32	0	16		7	26	0	20		6	23	0	20

CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to a vote on the French amendment. All the ground has been pretty well covered. We have some votes. We have clearly a pattern here. A vote is in order on the French amendment to the resolution by Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries. Whether that amendment passes or does not pass there will then be a vote on the original proposal. The Chair would highly recommend that with all the hours that have gone into it, and with Plenary hoping to meet in another hour, it is likely that everything that has any bearing has been said, and we should proceed to an orderly vote on the amendment, followed by a vote on the resolution. It is easy to do, United Kingdom, you have the floor for a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I formally request a roll call vote on the French amendment.

CHAIRMAN: There will be a roll-call vote. There is only one more after this.

A yes is a vote for the French amendment, a No is a vote against the French amendment. That is to say, in this, as in the previous one, yes means yes, no means no.

Vote

Vote

Votación

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

	Vote on	
1st	Vote sur	French Amendment
.....	Votación para
.....	

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	82
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	15
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	2
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	56

Number of votes cast	97
Nombre de suffrages exprimés	
Número de votos emitidos	

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	49
--	----

ADOPTED
ADOPTEE
ACEPTADA

Date 26.11.87 Elections Officer B Linley
Fecha Funcionario electoral
El oficial de elecciones

CF 13 1105 654321 - W/22644/c

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

Session of the Conference

Session de la Conférence

Periodo de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT

APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN

VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Vote on

French Amendment

Vote sur

15.1 Votación para

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan				X	Gambia				X	Pakistan				X
Albania				X	Germany (Fed. Rep. of)			X		Panama	X			
Algeria	X				Ghana	X				Papua New Guinea				X
Angola	X				Greece	X				Peru	X			
Antigua and Barbuda	X				Grenada			X		Philippines	X			
Argentina	X				Guatemala			X		Poland	X			
Australia		X			Guinea	X				Portugal	X			
Austria	X				Guinea-Bissau			X		Qatar				X
Bahamas				X	Guyana			X		Rwanda				X
Bahrain	X				Haiti	X				St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Bangladesh	X				Honduras	X				Saint Lucia				X
Barbados	X				Hungary	X				St. Vincent & the Grenadines				X
Belgium	X				Iceland			X		Samoa				X
Belize				X	India	X				Sao Tome and Principe				X
Benin				X	Indonesia	X				Saudi Arabia	X			
Bhutan				X	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	X				Senegal	X			
Bolivia	X				Iraq	X				Seychelles				X
Botswana	X				Ireland	X				Sierra Leone				X
Brazil	X				Israel			X		Solomon Islands				X
Bulgaria	X				Italy	X				Somalia				X
Burkina Faso	X				Jamaica			X		Spain	X			
Burma				X	Japan		X			Sri Lanka				X
Burundi				X	Jordan	X				Sudan	X			
Cameroon		X			Kenya			X		Suriname				X
Canada		X			Korea (Rep. of)	X				Swaziland				X
Cape Verde	X				Kuwait	X				Sweden		X		
Central African Rep.				X	Laos			X		Switzerland			X	
Chad				X	Lebanon	X				Syria	X			
Chile	X				Lesotho	X				Tanzania	X			
China	X				Liberia			X		Thailand	X			
Colombia	X				Libya	X			X	Togo				X
Comoros				X	Luxembourg			X		Tonga				X
Congo	X				Madagascar	X			X	Trinidad and Tobago	X			
Cook Islands				X	Malawi			X		Tunisia	X			
Costa Rica	X				Malaysia	X				Turkey	X			
Côte d'Ivoire	X				Maldives			X		Uganda	X			
Cuba	X				Mali	X				United Arab Emirates	X			
Cyprus	X				Malta			X		United Kingdom		X		
Czechoslovakia	X				Mauritania			X		U.S.A.			X	
					Mauritius			X		Uruguay	X			
D.P. Rep. of Korea	X				Mexico	X				Vanuatu				X
Denmark		X			Mongolia	X				Venezuela	X			
Djibouti				X	Morocco	X				Viet Nam	X			
Dominica	X				Mozambique	X			X	Yemen Arab Republic	X			
Dominican Rep.	X				Namibia			X		Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)	X			
Ecuador	X				Nepal			X		Yugoslavia	X			
Egypt	X				Netherlands		X			Zaire		X		
El Salvador	X				New Zealand		X			Zambia	X			
Equatorial Guinea				X	Nicaragua	X				Zimbabwe				X
Ethiopia				X	Niger			X						
Fiji				X	Nigeria		X							
Finland		X			Norway		X							
France	X				Oman	X								
Gabon	X													
	32	5	0	16		26	5	2	20		24	5	0	20

CHAIRMAN: Norway has asked to make a brief comment to the body on this reservation. Norway, could you please do so.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): In explanation of the vote that has just been taken I formally have to state on behalf of the co-sponsor group of this Resolution that is before the House that the co-sponsor group, the Nordic countries, no longer feel that they can be associated with it as it has been amended.

CHAIRMAN: I think some members missed your announcement. If you can please repeat it loudly, some countries missed it.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I shall do so, Mr Chairman. As this resolution has now been amended to a certain extent that we feel that it negates the spirit of the intent of the Resolution that we had originally placed before the House we, the Nordic countries, do no longer wish or feel that we can be associated with the Resolution as amended.

Bernard LEDUN (France): Non, ce n'est pas une motion d'ordre mais une simple déclaration que je souhaite faire. En premier lieu, je souhaite remercier tous les pays qui ont bien voulu voter pour la proposition d'amendement que nous avons soumise en Commission II. En second lieu, compte tenu de la décision que vient de faire connaître la Norvège, qu'en passant je remercie pour l'effort de proposition qu'elle a mené, tout au long des derniers mois, et la contribution qu'elle a apportée à l'amélioration de notre organisation. Cela étant, comme la Norvège vient de retirer l'ensemble de son projet de résolution, je suggère qu'en ce qui nous concerne la proposition d'amendement que nous avons faite, et qui a été accueillie à la majorité par cette assemblée, devienne le paragraphe 1 du document du Groupe de contact C 87/LIM/50. En ce qui concerne le préambule de ce document du Groupe de contact, la délégation française...

CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, France, you had the Chair's attention on a point of order and we tried to indulge that. We have limited time left. We have the General Committee asking us to please commence our business in fifteen minutes. We are trying to move expeditiously.

Norway's withdrawal does not kill the motion, the issue before us, it does not kill it but the motion that was made before is the motion that must now be voted on as amended. We shall proceed to a vote on what used to be called the Nordic Resolution as amended by the vote just taken. Philippines, state your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT DE L'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio GARANDANG (Philippines): The Philippine delegation wishes clarification on what paragraphs of the so-called Nordic proposal are going to be voted right now.

CHAIRMAN: The document that will be voted on is what used to be called the Nordic Resolution, as was introduced earlier by Norway and was subsequently amended by France. There could be no further alteration of that without a subsequent vote or votes on specific different amendments.

For your point of information let the Chair give the body a point of information. The General Committee has communicated with us. We have tried to work against deadlines here. We were going to adjourn at 4.00 o'clock. In a clearly overwhelming view of the body today there was a time when it appeared more prudent to recess and try to work things out. That was attempted and was not successful. There is no problem with that. The Chair has moved back its 4.00 o'clock deadline as a result of that because it would not be fair.

The General Committee, which must set the schedule, postponed its meeting and then met, and it has said that considering the limited time available they have decided that Commission II wind up its meeting at 18 hours, 14 minutes from now. Thursday, 26 November, to permit the Plenary to convene at 18.15 hours, any unfinished work of the Commission to be examined by the Plenary.

The General Committee also decided to fix the adjournment of the Conference at 13 hours on Friday, 27 November. The Chair must try to work in concert and cooperation with the General Committee. We were making a judgement that we were finally proceeding on an orderly vote, but the vote in order would have to be a vote on what used to be the Nordic proposal or amendment, as amended. That is what is before us; we cannot alter that. Snudi Arabia, state your point of order.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of): It is not a point of order.

CHAIRMAN: Philippines, state your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT DE L'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): You did not give us the explanation we were asking for. We are not clear what the Nordic proposal is right now. It has been amended by the French proposal. It has been amended by the Report of the Contact Group, but we don't know whether that includes paragraphs 6 and 7 of the former Nordic proposal. Do I understand that the Report of the Contact Group amended paras. 1-7 of the Nordic proposal?

CHAIRMAN: Norway in stating its resolution clearly stated prior to its introduction that it incorporated the language of the Contact Group. It very clearly stated that it did so.

Norway, please correct the Chair if the Chair is mis-stating your position. The Chair clearly heard you several times yesterday express that as your intent and clearly heard you state yesterday that is what you were doing, and clearly heard you state that today. Please respond.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): I can confirm that the Chair's impression is correct.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): I should like to put a very precise question. Did the report of the Contact Group substitute paras 1-7 of the Nordic proposal, yes or no?

CHAIRMAN: The Philippines has asked a very precise question that ought to be answered. I would ask the Chairman of the Contact Group to please respond specifically to that question. It is a legitimate point of clarification and the body should know exactly what it is voting on. The Chair totally agrees with the representative of the Philippines that the body ought to have an understanding of what it is voting on. I absolutely uphold your point.

John JURECKY (Chairman, Contact Group): I will read to you the text of what I reported yesterday. I said that we continued from para. 2; that is where we actually began our work. We got as far as para. 5, where only limited discussion was possible due to the exhaustion of our available time. Therefore, the Contact Group agreed that paras. 2 through 4 of C 87/LIM/27 were to be replaced by the language in the document that should now be before you.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair must point out also that Norway in moving its amendment not only stated that it was adopting the recommendations of the Contact Group, it clearly addressed itself to the issues of the parenthesis, brackets, and it added at the end of para 3 after the work "Conference", the phrase "and also seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees".

Norway, those are the notes that the Chairman took while you were speaking. Is that an accurate statement of what you moved?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): That is accurate.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): I move that the vote on the Nordic proposal exclude paras, 5, 6, and 7, because those paras. have not been agreed upon in the Contact Group and therefore, they should be voted upon separately.

CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair respond to one point of order at a time, please. The Representative of the Philippines has made a motion. We are now on that Resolution. We are now on what used to be called the Nordic resolution. Call it the non-Nordic Resolution. Under the Rules the Representative of the Philippines has moved that we vote separately on certain paragraphs which he enumerated.

Under the Rules parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately if a delegate or representative requests such division, provided that if objection is made the question of division shall be decided by the Conference or the Council. Those are the Rules.

United Kingdom, you have a point of order. State your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): I think the proposal was in effect to delete paras. 5, 6 and 7 from the Draft Resolution rather than to take everything point by point. Perhaps I have misunderstood the Philippines but I think that was the correct proposal, rather than taking them bit by bit.

CHAIRMAN: The Philippines said that those particular paragraphs should be deleted, in which case on part of the proposal there would be a decision of inclusion or exclusion. That is a decision that the body would have to make.

Philippines, for a point of clarification could you state for the body? You moved to delete paras, 5, 6 and 7. Is that correct?

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): That is correct.

CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that people could hear.

The Chair asked the Philippines for a point of clarification. The Chair believes that it heard the Philippines move to delete paras. 5, 6 and 7 of the non-Nordic Resolution.

Horacio CARANDANG (Philippines): I move that paras. 5, 6 and 7, be deleted because we have not reached an agreement on this.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Leo HERTOOG (Netherlands): I have a point of clarification. Who is now the sponsor of the non-Nordic Resolution? I guess Norway is no longer the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN: Norway has disassociated itself from that. In Norway's judgment the adoption of that amendment would so alter its proposal as to be counter to it. Norway made that point. The body voted opposite of that. Norway then took the floor to say that it disassociated itself from that as a result of the outcome of that vote. That is very clear.

We are now on what used to be called the Nordic Resolution. It has no name. Let me explain this please, because this could be confusing.

Norway moved to disassociate itself after the amendment was adopted. Under the Rules of this body if there is a disassociation like that after an amendment, Norway's disassociation does not kill the motion that was before the body. Had Norway wished to do that, Norway could have withdrawn its support prior to a vote being taken on the amendment. Norway did not do that.

Norway instead withdrew its support after the amendment was adopted. You still have a proposal. It will appear in the documents as a Resolution adopted by the body. It will not have a name. At this point we are on that Resolution.

The Philippines has asked for clarification and received it, and further made another specific amendment, which is perfectly in order. The motion of the Philippines is to vote to delete from what used to be the Nordic Resolution and what will be Document C 87/LIM/27, paras. 5, 6 and 7 completely. That is perfectly in order, and the Chair would recommend that in the interests of time we proceed to a vote on the motion of the Philippines.

Those who wish to delete paras. 5, 6 and 7 would vote yes. Those who do not wish to delete those paragraphs would vote no. How do you wish to have a vote? Does anyone request a roll-call vote? No one requests a roll-call vote. Let us have a division by hand.

VOTE BY SHOW OF HANDS
VOTE A MAIN LEVEE
VOTACION A MANO ALZADA

CHAIRMAN: Those who support the motion of the Representative of the Philippines to delete paras. 5, 6 and 7 please raise your hand to signal yes. A "yes" will be raising your country sign in support of the motion by the Philippines.

It is obvious that the motion carries, but please for the benefit of the Secretariat would you please leave your signs up so that they can get a ball-park figure. Thank you.

Those countries that oppose the motion of the Philippines and who wish to vote "no" please so indicate by holding your country sign up.

The Chair rules that the motion on the Philippines has prevailed and that the Resolution before us, which used to be the Nordic Resolution, now with the language of France included but with paras. 5, 6 and 7 excluded, fails. Clear? Clear.

Unless there is another amendment we may now proceed to a vote on the Resolution. The Chair would remind you, please, that we are trying to help the General Committee to convene the Plenary.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): We ask for a roll-call vote.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je crois que dans la même foulée de la proposition faite par notre ami des Philippines, nous pensons que le groupe de contact n'ayant pas également eu le temps d'étudier le préambule, ce préambule peut être modifié, et je propose formellement que nous prenions le préambule fait par la France.

CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. That is a motion. I do wish when we ask for points of order, please would you state the point of order because it would facilitate things. If you wish to put forward a motion on that, do so, and we must then vote on your motion. I hear no motion.

POINT OF ORDER
POINT D'ORDRE
PUNTO DE ORDEN

Temel ISKIT (Turkey): This is a point of clarification. Am I correct in assuming that since document C 87/LIM/50, the Report of the Contact Group, supercedes paragraphs 2 to 4 of the so-called Nordic Resolution, and since the French amendment which is accepted supercedes paragraph 1 of the

so-called Nordic amendment, we will be voting for the French amendment plus the report of the Contact Group? Am I correct in this understanding?

CHAIRMAN: Partially correct. You are absolutely right insofar as you have gone except that there further is the phrase I read to you before, that Norway incorporated under paragraph 3 - alter "Conference" to add "and also seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees". That was not in the printed document. It is a minor change and everyone seems to have concurred with it. In addition, the motion of the Philippines has prevailed. So that there is no confusion, it is almost the whole that you are voting on. The vote here will be a vote on the resolution as amended by France and the Philippines. The hour is late; it is two minutes past the time that we promised Plenary we would end. Plenary is convening at a quarter after six and at that time I shall adjourn this meeting. If you wish to spend the rest of time on points of order, so be it. If you wish to have a vote, so be it. Time is running out. Costa Rica state your point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Sí, Sr. Presidente, es para aclarar respecto a la frase "informado el Comité de Finanzas y el Comité de Programas". Esto ha sido superado aceptando la enmienda francesa, porque está en contradicción con el mecanismo aceptado por la enmienda francesa.

CHAIRMAN: You raised a point, Costa Rica, that has validity in it, that because of the two languages in the French proposal there is repetition. It says that the Programme and Finance Committees should be involved and then it goes on to say that the Programme and Finance Committees then would seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees. That is true. There is nothing mutually exclusive here except that the body who is doing the work would seek its own views. The Chair recommends to Norway that because of this repetition it might be in order to withdraw that particular phrase, if you have no objection, because it is repetition. Costa Rica, Norway has withdrawn the phrase, "and also seek the views of the Programme and Finance Committees" to accommodate your notation which is somewhat repetitious.

Elio PASCARELLI (Italy): Briefly I do not understand whether this preamble, as mentioned by the distinguished delegate of the Congo, the preamble we are voting on, is the one in the former Nordic Resolution, or that of the French document that we have on the project.

CHAIRMAN: The vote is on the preamble as originally prepared by Norway, unless you adopt a substitution.

Sra.Mónica DEREGBUS (Argentina): Es un punto de aclaración, Sr. Presidente. El LIM/50, que se supone que va a reemplazar los párrafos 2 a 4 del LIM/27, contiene varios corchetes. Yo quisiera saber cuál es el procedimiento que vamos a adoptar con relación a esos corchetes.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair stated earlier that Norway, in accepting the Contact Group's paper, explicitly stated it was accepting them with the language included between the brackets. That is the recollection of the Chair. Was that how you moved that yesterday, Norway?

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): That was how I moved it, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: The vote is in order. How do you wish the vote to be taken? A roll-call vote has been requested by the United Kingdom.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of): I swear I do not understand what we are going to vote on. Can you make it clear please?

CHAIRMAN: What you are going to vote on is what has been explained for the past 15 minutes. You are going to vote.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of): No.

CHAIRMAN: The answer to that is not "no"; the answer to that is "yes". We have tried to frame and state this over and over. The delegate of Turkey just a few moments ago stated the issue and he framed it very precisely save for the fact that he did not include the exclusion of the three paragraphs. The Chair told the delegate of Turkey in front of everyone that as he had stated it, it was absolutely right except that it excluded the paragraphs excluded by a vote of this body. We have only a few minutes. People know what we are voting on here. We have been talking about it for two days. A vote "yes" is a vote in favour of the resolution as amended by France and the Philippines. Call the vote.

Vote

Vote

Votación



RESULT SHEET / RESULTATS / RESULTADOS

ROLL CALL VOTING
APPEL NOMINAL
VOTACION NOMINAL

Vote on
Vote sur
1st Votación para RESOLUTION AMENDED BY FRANCE AND PHILIPPINES

Votes for Voix pour Votos favorables	79
Votes against Voix contre Votos en contra	7
Abstentions Abstentions Abstenciones	15
No reply Aucune réponse Ninguna respuesta	54

Number of votes cast Nombre de suffrages exprimés Número de votos emitidos	86
--	----

Majority required Majorité requise Mayoría requerida	44
--	----

ADOPTED
ADOPTÉE
ACEPTADA

Date 26.11.87 Elections Officer B. Linley
Fecha Fonctionnaire électoral
El oficial de elecciones

RULE XII - 13(a) CRO

If a vote is equally divided on a matter other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at a subsequent meeting to be held not less than one hour after the conclusion of the meeting at which the equally divided vote occurred. If the second vote is also equally divided the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.

En cas de partage égal des voix lors d'un vote ne portant pas sur une élection, on procède à un deuxième vote au cours d'une séance ultérieure, qui ne peut avoir lieu moins d'une heure après la fin de celle à laquelle s'est produit le partage égal des voix. Si les voix restent également partagées lors de ce second vote, la proposition est considérée comme repoussée.

Si hubiera empate en un asunto que no sea una elección, se repetirá la votación en una sesión subsiguiente la cual no deberá celebrarse hasta que haya transcurrido una hora, por lo menos, desde la conclusión de aquella en que se produjo el empate. Si en la segunda votación hubiera también empate se considerará rechazada la propuesta.

CF 13 1185 534321 - W/22844/c

Session of the Conference
Session de la Conférence
Período de sesiones de la Conferencia

ROLL CALL VOTING AND ISSUE OF BALLOT PAPER REPORT
APPEL NOMINAL DISTRIBUTION DE BULLETIN
VOTACION NOMINAL Y DISTRIBUCION DE PAPELETAS

Vote on

Voce sur

1st Votación para RESOLUTION AMEND. BY FRANCE AND PHILIPPINES

COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR	COUNTRY	Yes	No	Abs	NR
Afghanistan				X	Gambia				X	Pakistan	X			
Albania				X	Germany (Fed. Rep. of)			X		Panama	X			
Algeria	X				Ghana	X				Papua New Guinea				X
Angola	X				Greece	X				Peru	X			
Antigua and Barbuda	X				Grenada				X	Philippines	X			
Argentina			X		Guatemala				X	Poland	X			
Australia		X			Guinea	X				Portugal	X			
Austria			X		Guinea-Bissau				X	Qatar				X
Bahamas				X	Guyana				X	Rwanda				X
Bahrain	X				Haiti	X				St. Christopher & Nevis				X
Bangladesh	X				Honduras	X				Saint Lucia				X
Barbados	X				Hungary	X				St. Vincent & the Grenadines				X
Belgium	X				Iceland				X	Samoa				X
Belize				X	India	X				Sao Tome and Principe				X
Benin				X	Indonesia	X				Saudi Arabia	X			
Bhutan	X				Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	X				Senegal	X			
Bolivia	X				Iraq	X				Seychelles				X
Botswana	X				Ireland	X				Sierra Leone				X
Brazil	X				Israel				X	Solomon Islands				X
Bulgaria	X				Italy				X	Somalia				X
Burkina Faso	X				Jamaica				X	Spain	X			
Burma				X	Japan		X			Sri Lanka				X
Burundi				X	Jordan	X				Sudan	X			
Cameroon			X		Kenya			X		Suriname				X
Canada		X			Korea (Rep. of)	X				Swaziland				X
Cape Verde	X				Kuwait	X				Sweden				X
Central African Rep.				X	Laos				X	Switzerland		X		
Chad				X	Lebanon	X				Syria	X			
Chile	X				Lesotho	X				Tanzania	X			
China	X				Liberia				X	Thailand	X			
Colombia			X		Libya	X				Togo				X
Comoros				X	Luxembourg				X	Tonga				X
Congo	X				Madagascar				X	Trinidad and Tobago	X			
Cook Islands				X	Malawi				X	Tunisia	X			
Costa Rica	X				Malaysia	X				Turkey	X			
Côte d'Ivoire	X				Maldives				X	Uganda	X			
Cuba	X				Malta	X				United Arab Emirates	X			
Cyprus	X				Mali				X	United Kingdom		X		
Czechoslovakia	X				Mauritania				X	U.S.A.			X	
D.P. Rep. of Korea	X				Mauritius				X	Uruguay	X			
Denmark			X		Mexico	X				Vanuatu				X
Djibouti				X	Mongolia				X	Venezuela	X			
Dominica	X				Morocco	X				Viet Nam	X			
Dominican Rep.	X				Mozambique				X	Yemen Arab Republic	X			
Ecuador	X				Namibia				X	Yemen (P.D. Rep. of)	X			
Egypt	X				Nepal				X	Yugoslavia	X			
El Salvador	X				Netherlands				X	Zaire		X		
Equatorial Guinea				X	New Zealand				X	Zambia	X			
Ethiopia	X				Nicaragua	X				Zimbabwe				X
Fiji				X	Niger				X					
Finland			X		Nigeria				X					
France	X				Norway				X					
Gabon	X				Oman	X								
	31	2	6	14		23	1	8	21		25	4	1	19

Carlos DI MOTTOLA BALESTRA (Costa Rica): Mi delegación ha votado este texto que ha tenido un gran apoyo en el entendimiento que en el párrafo 2 los corchetes se quedaban porque se dijo que se habría votado sobre lo que había sido acordado en el Grupo de Contacto y en el Grupo de Contacto se pusieron los corchetes y no hubo ninguna consulta sobre la eventual eliminación de corchetes antes de la votación.

CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has produced the result of the vote - and incidentally if you voted on that premise you voted wrongly - on the Resolution, which has no name now, which was amended by France and also by the Philippines. Here are the results and I shall read them twice: votes for 79; votes against. 7; abstentions, 15; no reply 54; number of votes cast. 86; majority required, 44. it is adopted

We shall continue for five more minutes. Plenary is about to begin. We will conclude our business and everything else will be referred to Plenary. I would ask you to proceed there. However, out of courtesy to member countries who have asked to be recognized so that they may explain their votes, we will so recognize those countries. We would merely ask you please to be brief.

George Henry MUSGROVE (Canada): This delegation would like to give an explanation of vote. Having voted against the resolution that was before us is somewhat of a dichotomy, because for some three or four years we have sought an independent external review of our Organization and the role it should be playing during the next few years. We have heard the Democrats speak today and in our view they have rejected an independent external view of the Organization. As such, we do not feel that this Resolution answers our basic needs. It is a matter of some interested indifference to us that there is to be such a study. We do not feel that it will respond to the requirements we have for it: nor will it have the independence of view that was sought. We would not wish others not to have the right to that exercise, but we do not feel that the expenditure will be worth the outcome.

While I have the floor, I should like to express our thanks to the Nordic delegation and others who very thoughtfully put forward a resolution initially that sought to achieve compromise from all quarters of the room in an attempt to have it approved. It is our disappointment that they were not successful in so doing.

Sra. Mónica DEREGBUS (Argentina): La delegación argentina quisiera también explicar su voto en abstención.

La delegación argentina ha debido abstenerse en la votación que antecede por cuanto no cree que el grupo que se está estableciendo deba estudiar la función de la FAO puesto que las funciones de la FAO están establecidas en su Constitución.

Asimismo ha debido abstenerse por cuanto en el párrafo 2.b) se refiere a que dicho grupo debe examinar si es necesario introducir cambios en las estructuras internas y los procedimientos de la FAO, y esta formulación tan general no resulta aceptable por no conocer su verdadero alcance.

Ian BUIST (United Kingdom): The Resolution which has just been voted upon by the Commission will be passed to the Plenary, when I am sure it will be submitted to a further vote. My delegation will make a statement of explanation of its vote in the Plenary after the vote has taken place.

Paul Richard BRYDEN (Australia): We were unable to support the Resolution on this important item. In our view, there is a clear consensus that there is a need for a review of FAO. However, while the Resolution which has just been adopted by a majority vote contains many good ideas, we consider that the mechanism established to carry out such a review is in no way adequate to the weighty and difficult task entrusted to it. Democracy, in my country, is not the tyranny of the majority. We regret that our Conference has missed an historic opportunity to reaffirm and revitalize the commitment of us all to the noble mandate and role of FAO at a time when such a reaffirmation has never been more sorely needed.

Finally, I should like to thank the Nordic delegations for putting forward their draft Resolution, which contained so many good and fruitful ideas. I should also like to thank the Contact Group for its genuine efforts to achieve consensus.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe that it is difficult sometimes to hear speakers when there is noise in the room. May I ask you please to show courtesy to other delegations.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Mi delegación es copartícipe de una resolución presentada a esta Asamblea como el LIM/29 y revisión 1. En espíritu de gran compromiso, nos sentamos a la Mesa países representantes, varias regiones para tratar de buscar fórmula de compromiso en una tarea tan difícil como es ésta, la cual no era deseable para los países en desarrollo porque considerábamos que no estaba aún madura la situación para llegar a tal punto; sin embargo, y en aras de buscar consenso nos sentamos y dirimimos prácticamente todos los elementos contenidos en una resolución hecha con mucho cuidado y que representaba los intereses de los países en desarrollo.

Espero que se estime, como nosotros hemos estimado enormemente, el trabajo y la contribución que han hecho los países nórdicos, los colegas de las otras regiones que, sentados en paridad, discutimos ampliamente como lo reportó nuestro Presidente del Comité de Contacto; por tanto, creo que hemos hecho un esfuerzo conjunto, que debe apreciarse la voluntad de todos, que no queríamos llegar al voto y que si lo hemos tenido que expresar en esta manera lo hacemos también en el espíritu y con las salvedades que ha hecho la delegación de Argentina.

Antonio GAYOSO (United States of America): In deference to your request for brief statements, I will defer my statement on this issue until I speak in the Plenary tomorrow, or tonight, when the issue is debated there.

Harald HØSTMARK (Norway): This is not an explanation of vote: but permit me two words. I regret that we have not been able to reach a compromise on this resolution, but I wish personally in my own capacity to thank all those members in this Commission from many nations and many regions who have worked hard and willingly and who have tried in a good spirit to find a compromise. I do not think it will offend anybody if I especially mention Mexico as one of those which has worked the hardest with me; but I thank them all. That is all I would wish to say at this moment.

CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe that our time has expired. We have some unfinished business and we have other resolutions that have not been reached. They will be dealt with in Plenary. The Chair declares this Commission finished.

The meeting rose at 18.30 hours

La séance est levée à 18 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 18.30 horas