

# UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



68701  
PROVISIONAL

E/CN.14/SR.107(VI)  
27 February 1964

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA  
Sixth session  
Addis Ababa, 19 February - 3 March 1964

## PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH MEETING

held at Africa Hall, Addis Ababa,  
on Tuesday, 25 February 1964, at 3:10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. MASSAQUOI (Liberia)

Secretary: Mr. SYLLA

### CONTENTS:

Economic and social trends in Africa and review of the activities of the Economic Commission for Africa (continued)

(j) Co-ordination of plans

(k) Co-ordination of activities of the Commission and the Organization for African Unity

(l) Decentralization of United Nations activities

(m) Staffing position

---

Participants wishing to have corrections made to this provisional summary record are requested to write them on a copy of the record and to send the corrected copy to the Translation Section, Room 60, as soon as possible. If necessary, the corrected copy may be sent by post (to the Translation Section, Economic Commission for Africa, P.O. Box 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia) after the session; in that case it should arrive not later than 30 April 1964.

SECTION IV  
(IV) PART 1.15  
1981  
REVISION: 1-1-81

SECTION IV  
PART 1.15  
1981

SECTION IV PART 1.15

SECTION IV PART 1.15

SECTION IV PART 1.15

SECTION IV

SECTION IV PART 1.15

SECTION IV PART 1.15

SECTION IV

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL TRENDS IN AFRICA AND REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES OF  
THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA (agenda item 5) (continued)

(j) Co-ordination of plans (E/CN.14/239)

Mr. BATEL (Secretariat) introduced Part B, Special Articles, of Vol.2, No.1, of the Economic Bulletin for Africa (E/CN.14/239, Part B), concerning co-ordination of development plans in Africa. Since independence nearly twenty countries had drawn up development plans, which were the economic expression of their political aspirations. Thus the first stage had been reached in economic planning. The implementation of those plans required co-ordination among the countries concerned, since their investment resources were inadequate. They must think in terms of pooling their resources both to enlarge markets and to open up new economic horizons. The document discussed the various areas in which co-operation could begin, including multi-national projects. The stage had now been reached at which the different plans could be confronted with a view to allocating responsibilities. The final part of the document contained specific proposals.

Mr. BROUGH (Kenya) considered that the document before the Commission ought to be examined in conjunction with the industrial mission reports. The fundamental problems, in East Africa at least, was that of obtaining agreement on co-operation even among countries which had long been associated; invariably political and administrative difficulties arose. He therefore proposed that an attempt be made, with the assistance of the Economic Commission for Africa, to establish a procedure for negotiations.

No reference had been made in any ECA document to Kenya's most urgent problem, the development of a base for the industrial pyramid. Most countries tended to concentrate on installing one or two large firms at the top of the pyramid, and ECA had devoted some attention to small-scale industry in the middle. The whole could not survive, however, without a foundation of very small industries, locally financed and supported by Africans. Undertakings of that kind helped to diffuse skills for absorption in the larger industries when overseas support fell off. A programme

had been drawn up in Kenya covering loans, an advisory service, a training centre and industrial extension services.

Mr. DJIM SYLLA (Mali) wondered whether the time had really come to proceed to the stage of co-ordination. The present period was one of transition, and it might be more useful to concentrate on harmonizing schemes in which several States had a common interest. He therefore suggested that stress be laid on the study of multi-national programmes which could form a basis for sub-regional unity.

His main criticism of the ECA documents was that the same problems had been tackled from many different points of view by various experts who had not kept touch with one another. It would be more valuable to approach each problem in turn, examining it in all its aspects. A general synthesis would be more useful than a multitude of separate documents.

Mr. PATEL (Secretariat) said that the secretariat would try to devise ways of surmounting the difficulties involved in the co-ordination of plans. He hoped that progress would be made with multi-national projects. The secretariat took note of the suggestion that a single over-all study should be produced, rather than separate reports.

(k) Co-ordination of activities of the Commission and the Organization for African Unity

Mr. SYLLA (Secretary to the Commission) reminded the Commission that the African Heads of State had adopted a resolution inviting the Executive Secretary to assist in the creation of the OAU Economic and Social Commission. The ECA secretariat had prepared documents to provide a basis for the discussions at that Commission's first meeting, held at Niamey. At that meeting it had been decided that the OAU Commission should be responsible for formulating concepts and implementing decisions, while ECA would serve in a technical and advisory capacity. He felt that the division of responsibilities would allow the two Commissions to work together towards a common goal, and was pleased to be able to report that the provisional Secretary General of OAU had expressed the same view.

The terms of reference and programme of the OAU Commission covered the areas in which the ECA had carried out studies already. Close collaboration was therefore needed to ensure that the two Commissions complemented each other's work. There was no need to fear disagreement or competition. In undertaking any joint activity, the ECA must, of course, remain within its terms of reference. A comparison of the two programmes would indicate suitable fields for co-operation. He proposed that a small committee be set up, including perhaps among its numbers an ECA adviser and a representative of OAU, to draft a resolution specifying the fields that were suitable for co-operation and defining aims. ECA wished to be associated as a matter of course with all the activities of the OAU.

Mr. DJIM SYLLA (Mali) thought that conflicts might arise because one Commission was mainly political while the other was technical. It was accordingly essential to draw up terms of reference in a context of frank co-operation. A decision had to be taken as to where the political aspects ceased and the technical ones took over. For instance, projects like the Development Bank and a Payments Union must first be set in a political framework; ECA could then undertake preliminary studies, and submit them to OAU for a final political decision; the project would then be returned to ECA for basic study. The pattern of that to-and-fro movement should not become too rigid: ECA would be free at all times to initiate proposals.

Mr. MENSAH (Ghana) considered that the relations between OAU and ECA should be similar to those between a politician and a civil servant. The latter served the former as technician, adviser and executive. He was also entitled to proffer suggestions. OAU would be responsible for settling problems (such as the location of an industrial plant or a financial institution) at the political level.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY pointed out that such analogies could be dangerous. In reaching decisions, politicians had also to take account of the decisions' financial implications. Collaboration between the two bodies might take the following form: OAU could confirm an ECA decision, and ECA could take up an OAU suggestion. It should be noted that all

OAU interests had been covered by the ECA work programme. Where an identity of interests existed, and funds were available, there could be no difficulty. Problems would arise if the OAU made proposals without budgetary provisions. In any event, ECA could work only within its own terms of reference.

Mr. SHOLOLA (Nigeria) pointed out that an OAU meeting of Foreign Ministers was being held simultaneously with the present ECA session. He proposed therefore that a select committee be set up to discuss the question of co-ordination and report to the Commission in writing in due course.

Mr. ADOSSAMA (Togo) thought that until an absolutely objective doctrine had been evolved, embracing all shades of political and social thought, no problem could be effectively studied.

Mr. COULIBALY (Ivory Coast) considered that the point at issue was whether or not ECA could take the place of the OAU Commission. He requested the Secretary to provide details of the OAU resolution concerning ECA, and the OAU Commission's views on the new role allotted to ECA.

Mr. SYLLA (Secretary to the Commission) said that the Heads of State had emphasized the complementary nature of the two bodies, and the OAU Commission, at its first meeting, at Niamey, had implicitly complied with their wishes. The OAU Commission's programme of work reflected the studies carried out by ECA: in fact, the programmes of the two bodies were identical. The reason for the repetition was that ECA could not solve political problems: its concern was with the technical side. The resolution adopted at the first meeting of the OAU Commission referred to subjects on which ECA was at present working and requested ECA to support the OAU's programme. He hoped that ECA would adopt a resolution complying with the OAU request.

Mr. SIDIKOU (Niger) pointed out that all the proposals made by the OAU Commission involved expenditure, which ECA, as the Executive Secretary had pointed out, could hardly accept. He supported the proposal that a committee be set up to consider co-ordination between the two bodies.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY said there was no point in setting up a committee to study a non-existent problem. His own position, if he were instructed to work with OAU, would be to ask what facilities it could offer and how ECA could make use of them. Moreover, the present issue concerned not only ECA, but also all the specialized agencies. It was not for the Commission to go into the working methods of the specialized agencies.

Mr. SOGLO (Dahomey) said that under its terms of reference ECA was competent to conclude an agreement with OAU, whereas the Charter of African Unity made all OAU Commissions responsible to the Council of Ministers, so that any draft agreement would eventually have to be submitted to the Council.

Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) considered the discussion altogether out of place. ECA was a United Nations body, which delegates attended as technicians, not as politicians. No one present was entitled to enter into a political commitment on behalf of his country. Members ought to confine themselves to purely technical issues and avoid encroaching on the OAU Commission's territory, which was primarily political. If conflicts arose, they should be resolved by the two secretariats. Representatives attending the present Commission were not entitled to combine their OAU and ECA functions.

Mr. SHOLOLA (Nigeria) said that he had proposed the setting up of a committee simply as a method of proceeding in the matter, since the OAU Commission's decisions were at present being considered by the OAU meeting of Foreign Ministers.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY stated that the Lagos decisions would be taken into consideration. No question of competence arose: the OAU Commission had taken certain decisions, which ECA members might, if they wished, request ECA to include in its programme.

Mr. SYLLA (Mali) considered it a mistake to leave the position indefinite. He opposed the suggestion that conflicts should be resolved by the two Secretariats. A specific mandate ought to be given to the Executive Secretary.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY pointed out that from the procedural and legal points of view the OAU Commission's resolution was perfectly correct. The OAU Commission had drawn up a programme. If parts of it did not appear in the ECA programme, members were at liberty to propose that they should be included in it.

Mr. SOGLO (Dahomey) agreed with the delegate of Mali. The Commission ought to authorize the Executive Secretary to collaborate with OAU.

Ato MENGESHA (Ethiopia) endorsed the views expressed by the delegate of Morocco. There could be no question of conflict: both Commissions had specific functions to perform. Close co-operation had already been established between them, and any change in present arrangements would introduce an element of doubt. He therefore proposed that the status quo be maintained. If difficulties eventually arose over the division of responsibilities, the two Commissions could then recommend practical ways and means of overcoming them. He agreed with the view that the Commission should authorize the Executive Secretary to co-operate with OAU.

Accordingly he proposed that the Commission endorse the decisions taken by the OAU Commission at Niamey, and invite the Executive Secretary to continue to collaborate with OAU.

It was so decided.

(1) Decentralization of United Nations activities (E/CN.14/257)

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, introducing his report, Implementation of Decisions on Decentralization of Economic and Social Activities and Strengthening of the Regional Economic Commissions (E/CN.14/257), drew the Commission's attention to the progress made in decentralization during the past year. During that period ECA had played a much larger part in planning and implementing regional projects. Regional advisers had been assisting African governments, in response to specific requests from them, in the formulation and evaluation of their development programmes; and, since the staff position had improved, it had been possible to extend regional programmes.

Requests for assistance ought in all cases to be forwarded through the Resident Representatives of the Technical Assistance Board and to the directors of Special Fund programmes. The ECA secretariat was at present co-operating with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs at Headquarters in advising African governments on the subject of their technical assistance needs and requests for 1965-1966.

Mr. BROUGH (Kenya) welcomed the trend towards decentralization and hoped that it would go further still, so that the Executive Secretary and the secretariat could make their own decisions.

He wondered whether, when regional funds were not available - as in the case of the establishment of the training centre of middle-level statisticians proposed by the Third Conference of African Statisticians - Headquarters could not be approached for financial assistance.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY replied that Headquarters, too, had financial problems. The shortage of funds would not, however, necessarily extend beyond ECA's current budget.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Commission take note of the Executive Secretary's report (E/CN.14/257).

It was so decided.

(m) Staffing position

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY reported that between 1960 and 1963 the total number of posts had been increased from 105 to 280. In 1960 there had been 42 professional posts and in 1963, 113, 15 of which were in the Division for Administration, Conference and General Services; of the remaining 98 professional posts, 83 had been filled by the end of 1963, 40 of them by Africans. In addition, there were three trainee posts, two of which had been filled by Africans, while one remained vacant. Outside the Division referred to, that brought the total number of professional posts filled of Africans to 42, as against 43 filled by non-Africans.

The approved Manning Table for 1964 was 292 posts, of which 117 were professional. On 31 January 1964, 85 of the substantive posts were occupied, 41 of them by Africans and 44 by non-Africans. Of the vacant 17 posts 8 were already committed, 5 to Africans and 3 to non-Africans.

Recruitment efforts continued and preference was being given in all cases to qualified Africans. At present there were 18 African countries not represented on the secretariat. So far it had not been possible to find many interpreters or translators from African countries and it was even difficult to find qualified African secretaries.

Arrangements had been made with ILO, WHO, UNESCO and UNICEF to have representatives assigned to ECA to work together in the Social Affairs Section. There was a joint ITU/ECA project, and close collaboration existed with ICAO.

The Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations at Headquarters had provided 30 regional advisers in 1963, and a further extension of the regional programme, with particular emphasis on the development of regional advisers' services, was contemplated for 1964.

Every effort was being made to raise the standard of general service staff and to recruit more qualified African staff.

Mr. COULIBALY (Ivory Coast) asked whether ECA could give fellowships to train translators and interpreters.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY replied that the secretariat had examined the possibility, but there was no such provision at the moment, partly owing to the length of the time that such training required.

Ato MENGESHA (Ethiopia) welcomed the efforts of the secretariat to Africanize ECA. However, Africanization should not be effected at the expense of destroying ECA's international character and should not mean the exclusion of capable, willing non-Africans.

He asked the Executive Secretary to consider the possibility of establishing a programme for the exchange of personnel between regional

organizations. In view of the difficulties of training staff in African countries, he hoped that ECA would organize training courses for personnel to occupy responsible positions in ECA. Alternatively, ECA might provide fellowships for staff to be trained in developed countries, on the understanding that they would afterwards take up senior positions in ECA.

The EXECUTIVE SECRETARY reminded the Commission that ECA still had arrangements for the exchange of staff with ECE, ECAFE and ECLA.

The Commission took note of the Executive Secretary's oral report on the staffing position.

The meeting rose at 5:45 p.m.

- - - - -

1944

The following information was obtained from the records of the  
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and  
the Bureau of Reclamation, regarding the land in question.

The land in question is situated in the  
County of \_\_\_\_\_, State of \_\_\_\_\_, and is  
owned by \_\_\_\_\_, who is the  
legal owner of the same.

Very truly yours,  
\_\_\_\_\_