REPORT OF THE REVIEW TEAM ON THE STRUCTURE, ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS OF THE MULTINATIONAL PROGRAMMING AND OPERATIONAL CENTRES OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA

(Note by the secretariat)
1. The attached report of the Review Team on the Structure, organization and operations of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres of the Economic Commission for Africa (MULPOCs) has been prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 43/216 on Financial Reports and Audited Financial Statements and Reports of the Board of Auditors. That resolution, inter alia, endorsed the concurring observations and recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions which strongly recommended that the achievements of the MULPOCs be thoroughly evaluated with a view to deciding whether this experiment should be continued or whether the mandate, number and structure of these centres should be completely reorganized.

2. In its resolution 659 (XXIV) on the Review of the achievements of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres of the Commission in order to strengthen them, the Conference of Ministers responsible for economic development and planning had, among other things, welcomed the decision of the General Assembly and requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the report of the evaluation should be submitted first to the twenty-fifth session of the Commission/sixteenth meeting of the Conference of Ministers for in-depth examination and comments by that body which was responsible for creating the MULPOCs, before being transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration and decision. It is in pursuance to this request that the report of the Review Team is being submitted to the Conference of Ministers. The report itself covers the institutional evolution of the MULPOCs; their multinational programming functions; their management; proposals for their reorganization; their human and financial resource requirements; and a strategy for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the measures recommended by the Review Team.

3. In welcoming the decision of the General Assembly, the Conference of Ministers had a priori reaffirmed its interest in, and strong support for the MULPOC system, bearing in mind its great potential for providing additional technical capacity in the respective subregions. The findings and conclusions of the Review Team confirm this interest on the part of member States. The Review Team maintains that the establishment of the MULPOCs has been an important institutional evolution of ECA as an organization for promoting subregional economic co-operation and integration. It concludes that the objectives and purposes for which the MULPOCs were established are more valid today than they were ten years ago, considering the socio-economic challenges which confront African countries in the 1990s. Member States have themselves argued strongly to the Review Team, in favour of the maintenance of an institution such as the MULPOCs to provide them with the additional human, technical and financial resources required for execution of their joint projects within the framework of the intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) they have established.

4. While this felt need for the MULPOCs thus exists, it is evident from the findings and conclusions of the Review Team that the mandate and functions of the MULPOCs have generally not been well and fully understood and have consequently been subject to misinterpretation. It is the opinion of the Team that the current mandate of the MULPOCs is, itself, not only inadequate, but also not flexible enough to take full cognizance of major changes that have taken place in the social, economic and political structures of the African countries since the early 1980s. The existing institutional framework of the MULPOC system
also leaves much to be desired, while the expertise available at all the individual Centres constitutes one of their greatest handicaps being, as it is, generally at variance with the established priorities of the member States. Furthermore, the uneven pattern of coverage of countries by the different MULPOCs is clearly reflected in differences in the relative capability of individual MULPOCs to respond to member States needs.

5. The assessment, conclusions and recommendations contained in the report form a crucial basis for the complete reorganization of the MULPOCs with a view to making them more relevant and effective instruments for consolidating the fragmented African national markets to form the basis for more rapid industrialization and socio-economic transformation. The report then comes at an opportune time when resolute steps are being taken towards the accelerated establishment of the African Economic Community and when the United Nations is itself conducting another in-depth review of the efficiency and effectiveness, and coherence and co-ordination of its operational activities for development (vide General Assembly resolution 44/211 on Comprehensive triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations).

6. While the secretariat will provide explanations as required during the detailed consideration of the report by the Conference, the following general and preliminary observations on the major proposals of the report are made here for the benefit of member States.

7. Evidence is given in the report to confirm that the name Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (MULPOCs) has given rise to substantial confusion and misunderstanding as to the conceptual and operational framework of the MULPOCs as well as their role and functions. This has hamstrung the operational effectiveness of the Centres. A new name that projects more clearly the terms of reference would improve the MULPOCs' image and make them more easily understood and better accepted as institutions that provide technical support and advisory services to member States in the promotion of subregional co-operation and integration. The name ECA-Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes (ECA-STAPS) is proposed.

8. With regard to the mandate and objectives of the MULPOCs, the Team proposes the following revised terms of reference:

(a) To provide member States and IGOs with short-term advisory services in development planning and to assist in the translation of those plans into multinational and multisectoral programmes and projects, including the identification and formulation of programmes and projects for execution by them or at their request by the ECA-STATP itself, in association with the specialized agencies of the United Nations system, as required:

(b) To undertake prefeasibility and feasibility studies, research on and analyses of priority areas identified by member States and IGOs for enhancing subregional co-operation and integration:
(c) To provide assistance and support in the development of human resources and in organizing training courses, seminars, lectures, workshops and roundtables, with a view to strengthening institutional and organizational capacity of member States to execute multinational development programmes and projects for socio-economic advancement;

(d) To develop, in the light of the above, effective working relationship with the governments, the IGOs, the UNDP offices and other international organizations with a view to harmonizing the designing, programming and implementation of technical assistance programmes at the subregional level;

(e) To develop and execute programmes for more effective participation of women in all aspects of development efforts at the subregional level; and

(f) To collect and disseminate at the subregional level information and statistical data on macro-economic indicators in the member States and to assist them in establishing compatible systems for exchanging informatics amongst themselves and with their development partners.

9. These proposed terms of reference redefine the role of the Centres in clearer terms, and also provide a comprehensive policy and operational framework to enable them to carry out the much-needed tasks of acting as catalysts for subregional economic co-operation and integration for which they are particularly suited in the existing complex African programming environment.

10. The redefinition of the relationships between the Centres and the IGOs which are explicitly treated in the report is a positive step. The proposed programme linkages between the Centres and the IGOs by which the programmes of the former would be derived from those of the latter and approved and supervised directly by the ECA Conference of Ministers with appropriate reports to ECOSOC and the General Assembly, would represent a significant innovation in programme design, harmonization and execution which deserves to be fully supported. The related recommendation for the abolition of the existing MULPOC policy organs would also eliminate the present overlapping and duplication of meetings and would lead to considerable savings of resources.

11. The effectiveness of the proposed subregional programming system will, however, to a large extent, depend on the degree to which programme linkages and co-ordination with other United Nations system agencies are developed and formalized such that in line with ECA's main general development centre and team leadership role at the regional level (General Assembly resolution 32/197), the Centres would act as the focal point for the co-ordination of inter-country activities of all specialized agencies and system organizations at the subregional level.

12. These are issues that can be resolved in the context of the ongoing triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations mentioned above. It is conceivable that the multi-disciplinary and multisectoral arrangement for programme delivery envisaged at the national level with the Resident Co-ordinators acting as focal points could be replicated for
inter-country programmes at the subregional level with the reorganized MULPOCs acting as focal points.

13. Already ECA and UNDP are collaborating in the execution of a number of large-scale multisectoral projects for different IGOs in the various subregions. This has been a significant initiative in subregional joint programming. It holds considerable portent for inter-agency collaboration in inter-country programme delivery if expanded and entrusted to a reorganized and strengthened MULPOC system.

14. The resource constraint has been at the heart of MULPOCs troubles and has been the single most recurrent theme of all previous evaluations of the MULPOCs. No matter what structural reorganization of the subregional system is effected, it will not work if the problem of adequate human and financial resources is not at the same time squarely addressed.

15. The report has reiterated the need for a basic core professional and support staff at each of the MULPOCs. It identifies for each MULPOC the number of posts needed to constitute such a core, the sectoral areas in which they are needed in accordance with Member States priorities and the attendant non-staff resource requirements. These requirements must be considered the absolute minimum.

16. The report further identifies the possible sources of funding. It proposes a combination of sources including the regular budget of the United Nations, the regional IPF of UNDP, increased execution of operational activities by ECA and the subregional Centres, increased contribution to the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development (UNTFAD) and ADB, the World Bank and other multilateral and bilateral donors. While all sources must be tapped in the manner recommended in the report, the role of the United Nations regular budget will be particularly crucial with regard to the provision of the core posts since it would be essential that these posts are provided on a stable and assured basis.

17. The ECA secretariat will no doubt take up its responsibilities as regards the further decentralization of operational activities and resources to the subregional Centres. It will also take steps to further enhance supervision and co-ordination of the Centres through more precise definition and clarification of the functional relationships between the Centres and the MULPOCs co-ordinating office (ECO), the Policy and Programme Co-ordination Office (PPCO), the Technical Assistance Co-ordination and Operations Office (TACOO) and all substantive divisions; and ensure the delegation of greater authority to them in the execution of operational activities, effective administrative and financial management, as well as the choice of staff of the right expertise and calibre.

18. The effective execution of these responsibilities is of course closely related to the full implementation of all the other measures recommended by the Review Team for strengthening the MULPOCs. As already stated, with regard to the further redeployment of staff from ECA headquarters, there are already limits imposed by the requirements of the Commission’s overall programme under Section 13 of the programme budget. The bulk of the additional resources required by
the Centres will have to be new and stable. Similarly, the delegation of authority, particularly in respect of personnel, finance, procurement and contracting functions could be improved in tandem with the strengthening of the capabilities at the various Centres. However, there will continue to be stresses and strains in such delegation if it is not accompanied by corresponding decentralization of authority over such matters from Headquarters to the regional commissions as has always been advocated.

19. The Review Team invokes evidence to suggest that the smaller the number of countries served by each MULPOC, the greater the ability to effectively respond to the individual needs of the groupings and the greater the impact of their operations. The Team has accordingly proposed the regrouping of the present five MULPOCs into six entities whose membership is more evenly distributed and, therefore, more manageable.

20. Member States will no doubt debate the merits of this proposal. The present arrangement already represents a major decentralization of the secretariat’s activities in the region. Under this arrangement, a number of relationships have been developed among countries involved in each MULPOC, and this could conceivably disappear if new structures were established. New subregional relationships would have to be developed, a process which could consume valuable time. Finally, it could be argued that problems in the MULPOCs stem not from their structure and size but from the paucity of the mechanisms for co-operation, such as those that need to be established with IGOs and other United Nations agencies, etc. From this point of view, modifications in the structure and size will not produce greater effectiveness if the basic co-ordinating processes are lacking. Such an argument would lead to the conclusion that the benefits being derived under the five MULPOCs should not be easily discarded, and that an attack on problems of co-ordination might be more beneficial.

21. The ECA MULPOCs have been conceived as the Commission’s principal operational arms for fostering economic and technical co-operation and integration at the subregional and regional levels. The desire for the concept to become more operational is all the more fervent today given the various policy decisions and the practical steps being taken overall to relaunch the initiative for long-term growth and socio-economic transformation of the African region. The considerable potential of the role of the MULPOCs in these efforts have been clearly brought out in the present evaluation report. The report on the whole provides a basis for lasting solutions to be found for the MULPOCs’ pressing needs and attendant problems. Member States would no doubt reflect on the recommendations made in the report and make their own views and reactions known to the Secretary-General.
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FOREWORD

This Report has been prepared pursuant to resolution 43/216, of the General Assembly of the United Nations which endorsed the recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) that "the achievements of the MULPOCs be thoroughly evaluated with a view to deciding whether this experiment should be continued or whether the mandate, number and structure of these centres should be completely reorganized." A Review Team was accordingly appointed by the United Nations Under-Secretary-General and Executive Secretary of ECA and the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to evaluate the activities and operations of MULPOCs in the light of the above recommendations.

The Review Team was composed of the following:

Prof. Samuel K. B. Asante (Team Leader)
Head, Department of Development Studies
United Nations Institute for Namibia
Lusaka, Zambia

Mr. Bingu Wa Mutharika (Member)
Director, Trade and Development Finance Division,
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Mr. Mohammed Said (Member)
Deputy Director, Accounts Division
Controller's Department, United Nations
New York

Mr. Ngartando D. Blayo (Secretary to the team)
Economic Affairs Officer
Economic Co-operation Office
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

The Review Team wishes to express its profound gratitude to the governments, the intergovernmental organizations, the UNDP and the United Nations offices for their co-operation in providing information and materials which have been useful in the compilation of this Report. We are also grateful to the members of the current bureaux of the MULPOC policy organs and the African Regional Committee for the Co-ordination of Women in Development (ARCC) for providing information to the Review Team.

Our thanks also go to the Executive Secretary of ECA, the Directors of the MULPOCs and ECA Divisions for their co-operation and support.
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To: The United Nations Under-Secretary General and Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa; and
The Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management of the United Nations

We, the undersigned, have the honour to submit to you our Report on the "Structure, Organization and Operations of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres of the Economic Commission for Africa" prepared by us pursuant to General Assembly resolution 43/216. In conformity with this resolution, you instructed us to review and evaluate the operations and functioning of the MULPOCs and to recommend whether they should be continued, or whether their mandate, structures or number be reorganized.

The Terms of Reference were as follows:

1. To examine the original mandate as contained in document E/ECA/CM.8/26 of 8 April 1982 with a view to ascertaining its continued relevance;

2. To examine the structure and organization with a view to determining their suitability for the execution of the tasks of the MULPOCs, taking into account the recommendations made in the report of the United Nations Board of Auditors as contained in paragraph 14 of document A/43/5;

3. As a follow-up to the Rwambuya and Said's report dated 23 August 1988, to review and report on all aspects of management of the MULPOCs;

4. To examine adequacy of resources available and make recommendations aimed at strengthening the MULPOCs for a more efficient execution of their mandate;

5. To investigate the effectiveness of the linkages with ECA substantive and service organizational units;

6. To examine any other relevant matters pertaining to the efficient and effective operations of the MULPOCs; and

7. To report not later than 10 March 1989, or as soon as possible thereafter, to the Executive Secretary of ECA and the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management.

Our main findings are that the Member States fully appreciate the services rendered by MULPOCs; they want the experiment to be continued but they expect a complete reorganization of this institution. To this end, we would like to draw your attention particularly to chapter V which proposes the reorganization of the MULPOCs because of the far-reaching implications of the recommendations. This chapter proposes the transformation of the MULPOCs into the ECA Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes (ECA-STAPs) to support the multinational and multisectoral programming characteristics of the ECA strategy for co-operation and
Integration at the subregional level. Equally, your attention is drawn to the Summary of the Main Conclusions and Recommendations made in paras 1 to 9 as well as the Strategy for Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation addressed in chapter VII.

Samuel K.B. Asante (Team Leader)
Bingu Wa Mutharika (Member)
Mohammed Said (Member)

N.D. Blayo (Secretary)
EXPLANATORY NOTES

In order to make the message of this Report clear, a large volume of materials has been encapsuled in a few easily readable chapters. In the same vein, the terminology used has been deliberately simplified and the number of diagrams and tables kept to a minimum. The following abbreviations and acronyms have been used:

ADB - African Development Bank Group
ARCC - Africa Regional Committee for the Co-ordination of Women in Development
BCEAO - Banque centrale des Etats de l'Afrique de l'Ouest
BEAC - Banque des Etats de l'Afrique centrale
CACH - Central African Clearing House
CEAO - Communauté économique de l'Afrique de l'Ouest
CEFGL - Communauté économique des pays des Grands Lacs
CILSS - Comité permanent inter-États de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel
ECA - Economic Commission for Africa (United Nations)
ECCAS - Economic Community of Central African States
ECOSOC - Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
ECOWAS - Economic Community of West African States
ESAMI - Eastern and Southern African Management Institute
IGADD - Intergovernmental Authority for Drought and Development
IGOs - Intergovernmental Organizations
IMF - International Monetary Fund
MULPOC - Multinational Programming and Operational Centre
NATCAP - National Technical Co-operation Assessment and Programme
OAU - Organization of African Unity
PTA - Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern African States
SADCC - Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference
SALC - Southern Africa Labour Commission
UDEAC - Union douanière et économique de l'Afrique centrale
UMA - Union du Maghreb Arabe
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
UNIFEM - United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNTFAD - United Nations Trust Fund for African Development
WACH - West African Clearing House
World Bank - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Review Team, having carefully considered the available evidence and the views and opinions of the Member States, concludes that the ECA subregional strategy for economic co-operation and integration provides a sound and concrete basis for consolidating the fragmented African national markets to form the basis for more rapid industrialization and socio-economic transformation. The subregional institutions have proved to be important building blocs for the eventual establishment of an African common market. It is also a practical expression of the process of "decentralization" of the United Nations operations to provide adequate technical assistance and advisory services to the African countries at the subregional level.

2. The General Assembly has on numerous occasions reiterated the role of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) as the lead agency for multinational and multisectoral programmes and endorsed it as the operational arm of the United Nations at the regional and subregional levels. Therefore, the establishment of the MULPOCs has been an important institutional evolution of ECA as an organization for promoting subregional economic co-operation and integration. The MULPOCs were intended to aid ECA operations as a decentralized network to facilitate the attainment of collective self-reliance by Member States in their efforts towards self-sustaining growth and development.

3. The objectives and purposes for which the MULPOCs were established are more valid today than they were ten years ago, considering the socio-economic challenges which will confront the African countries in the 1990s. The Member States strongly argue in favour of the maintenance of an institution such as the MULPOCs to provide them with the additional human, technical and financial resources required for execution of their joint projects within the framework of the intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) they have established. Furthermore, since many United Nations agencies and other multilateral and bilateral donor agencies essentially operate at the country level, there is an obvious case for the subregional institutions to provide multinational or multisectoral programming. This function is best suited to an institution with the broad mandate as was envisioned during the establishment of the MULPOCs.

4. However, there is overwhelming evidence to show that the MULPOCs mandate and functions have generally not been understood and have been subject to misinterpretation. For instance, the MULPOC system is often erroneously considered by some Member States as autonomous organization operating outside the United Nations, and having an independent identity, legal framework and resources. Other Member States feel that the name "MULPOC" is at variance with its actual operations and functions, and does not bear any semblance to a United Nations entity. The Review Team was therefore convinced that there was the need to redesign the MULPOCs institution in order to rectify the somewhat tarnished image that has been created.

5. It is evident from the assessment of the available information that the current mandate of the MULPOCs is not only inadequate but also not flexible enough to take full cognizance of the major changes that have taken place in the social, economic and political structures of the African countries since the early 1980s.

6. The institutional framework of the MULPOCs, especially their policy organs made up of the Council of Ministers or Plenipotentiaries, presently function separately from those of the major IGOs and the ECA and thus duplicate their functions. More seriously, the MULPOCs have not been able to exercise effectively their multinational programming role or provide adequate technical support and advisory services in the subregional development process. In fact, they have...
failed to establish a strong professional presence in the subregions. Their ability, both in terms of expertise and resources, to interact positively with Member States, IGOs and the United Nations agencies, and to provide technical assistance and information or develop operational activities, has been very marginal. This has contributed to the continuing decline of their activities, efficacy and overall impact on Member States in the process of subregional development. Specifically, the MULPOCs no longer seem to play any meaningful catalytic role in the economic and social development of the subregions. They have consequently become increasingly irrelevant as well as redundant. Not surprisingly, therefore, the MULPOCs appear to be fairly unknown, even in their respective host countries.

7. One of the greatest institutional handicaps of the MULPOCs is that their available expertise is generally at variance with the established priorities of the Member States. In other words, the current staffing is made on the basis of criteria that does not take full cognizance of the real needs of the subregions. Consequently, the MULPOCs are not in a position to respond effectively to the subregional priorities identified by their policy organs. This has been further exacerbated by the absence of any measures of autonomy to enable the MULPOCs to use their discretion in the performance of a wide range of matters essential for their efficacy. The rather top-heavy functional relationship between ECA headquarters and the MULPOCs has considerably eroded and weakened the spirit behind the establishment of the MULPOCs. Furthermore, the substantive Divisions at the ECA secretariat do not appear to give full recognition of the MULPOCs in their day-to-day interactions with the Member States or subregional institutions. Similarly, the other organizations of the United Nations system have virtually no functional links with the MULPOCs.

8. Finally, it was made evident to the Review Team that the uneven distribution of the MULPOCs has been a mixed blessing. Some of the MULPOCs, for example, those based in Lusaka and Niamey, are just too large in terms of number of countries and the geographic area to be covered to provide sufficient flexibility or quick response or delivery capacity to the Member States. On the other hand, some of them, such as the Gisenyi-based MULPOC, are too small to qualify as a full subregional entity and justify the existence of a full-fledged subregional framework or the deployment of resources of the same magnitude as the larger ones.

9. In the light of these findings and conclusions, the Review Team recommends that the General Assembly should consider the following proposals and recommendations:

(a) Immediate action should be taken to transform the MULPOCs into ECA-Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes (ECA-STAPs) (paras. 85-86). This would clear the current misconceptions about the MULPOCs and re-establish ECA's image as the main United Nations institution for providing multinational and multisectoral programming at the subregional level. New efforts should be made to meet the expectations of Member States and their IGOs and to re-orientate the United Nations strategy for subregional co-operation and integration. The ECA-STAPs should also be widely introduced and promoted among the Member States, IGOs, the United Nations system and the multilateral and bilateral institutions as the sole United Nations agency for providing technical support and advisory services for promotion of subregional co-operation and integration.

(b) The mandate and objectives of the new ECA-STAPs should be redesigned in such a way as to enable them to respond effectively to the changing socio-economic
conditions and the increasing complexity of development problems, as well as the need to realize the objectives of ECA subregional development strategy (para. 87).

(c) The ECA-STAPs should be strengthened and be provided with adequate human and financial resources without which they would hardly operate better than the existing MULPOCs ( paras. 101-102). Since the UNDP is the main funding agency for the United Nations development activities, its Governing Council should give serious consideration to provide the ECA-STAPs with additional funding within its regional programming for the execution of joint projects of the ECA at the subregional level. The ECA-STAPs should constitute a new machinery by which the UNDP regional technical assistance programmes would be channelled to African countries (para....). Furthermore, the General Assembly should provide additional posts from its regular budget for redeployment to ECA-STAPs.

(d) In order for the ECA-STAPs to become effective and meet their responsibilities in multinational programming, technical assistance and the provision of advisory services to governments, the ECA should further decentralize some of its operational activities and resources to the new subregional institutions, accord higher and equal priority to their work programmes, improve significantly its supervision and co-ordination of the ECA-STAPs and delegate greater authority to them in the execution of operational activities, administrative and financial management (para. 76 (d) & (e))

(e) The choice of staff is crucial if the ECA-STAPs, as subregional institutions, are to produce positive results and establish a solid reputation as centres of excellence. Towards this end, the ECA secretariat should undertake an immediate review of the qualifications, expertise, experiences and calibre of the existing staff of the MULPOCs before re-assigning them to the ECA-STAPs. It is the considered opinion of the Review Team that the majority of them are unsuitable as experts capable of responding effectively to subregional priorities and should therefore be recalled back to Addis Ababa to be reassigned to functional responsibilities that match their abilities and expertise. In the same way, the Directors of the ECA-STAPs should in particular be of the highest professional calibre with proven leadership qualities and breadth of vision (para. 59 & 78 (a)).

(f) The UN programmes for subregional economic co-operation and integration need to be effectively operationalized through the activities of the ECA-STAPs. Accordingly, bearing in mind the experiences and problems of delivery capacity experienced by those MULPOCs covering a large number of countries, and taking into account the uneven distribution in the number of countries served by them, the Review Team strongly recommends the reorganization and regrouping of African countries into six ECA-STAPs to replace the existing five MULPOCs. This regrouping would not necessarily be scientific but would more evenly distribute the membership of the ECA-STAPs into manageable entities ( paras. 84 & 94 ). Moreover, evidence suggests that the smaller the number of countries served by each MULPOC, the greater the ability to effectively respond to the individual needs of the grouping and the greater the impact of their operations.

(g) The Review Team strongly recommends that the MULPOC policy organs be immediately abolished and replaced by a direct system of reporting by ECA-STAPs to the ECA Conference of Ministers. This would not only make the ECA-STAPs cost-effective but would also avoid the duplication and overlapping of the activities resulting from the fact that the same Ministers participate in the meetings of MULPOCs, IGOs; and the ECA Conference of Ministers. They discuss the same basic issues and adopt some parallel programmes in the same field. Moreover, the attendance at the MULPOC policy organ meetings has persistently declined over the
years both in numbers and level of participation. Therefore, there appears to be no justification for their continuation. This would also streamline the work programmes and priorities of the IGOs with those of the ECA-STAPs (paras. 90 & 92).

(h) The mutuality of interest between the UN specialized agencies and the ECA-STAPs in the subregions should be strengthened so that they could operate more effectively than in the case at present. The new framework of relations should ensure that the ECA-STAPs make full use of the expertise and specialized skills available in the United Nations system in the execution of their work programmes. Likewise, the UN agencies and donor representatives should take a lively and constructive interest in the work of the ECA-STAPs and provide full support to this new institution (Paras. 67-68); and

(i) The Secretary-General of the United Nations should submit annual reports to the General Assembly on the implementation and follow-up of the recommendations contained in this Report.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

10. When the MULPOCs were established some 12 years ago, they were greeted with great enthusiasm by the Member States. It was expected that the MULPOCs would represent real decentralization of the United Nations system to spread the process of economic and social transformation and development to the masses through subregional and regional collective self-reliance. Therefore, economic cooperation and integration was the modus vivendi for the MULPOCs. It was believed that since the General Assembly of the United Nations found it both expedient and practical to decentralize its operational activities through the establishment of the regional commissions, the same principle should apply to the creation of the MULPOCs in so far as the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) would operate more efficiently by building its regional programmes from the grassroots upwards.

11. However, during the past eight years, the MULPOCs seem to have encountered formidable problems in the implementation of their mandates. In fact, the decentralization, which was expected from the establishment of the MULPOCs, did not materialize. The problems are of a conceptual, institutional and operational character and are described in detail in the Report. In order to appreciate the nature of these problems, it is important to take note of several of the MULPOC evaluation reports which have been prepared in the past.

Past Evaluation Reports

12. In an attempt to deal with the above problems, several MULPOC review missions have been undertaken during the past 11 years, aimed at identifying the major problems affecting the efficacy and usefulness of the operations of the MULPOCs. These review missions generally concluded that the MULPOCs, while useful in promoting subregional cooperation, were nevertheless lacking in expertise and resources to enable them to have greater impact on the Member States.

Report of the Board of External Auditors

---

1 These missions were:


13. The Board of External Auditors, in its report for the biennium ended 31 December 1987 (A/43/5, Vol.1), also reviewed the work of the MULPOCs and observed in paragraph 90 that: "Both the programming and the operational activities of MULPOCs are kept at an extremely low level. Until 1987, MULPOCs had been designated as executing agencies, on behalf of ECA, for only one project financed by UNDP (integration of women in development). That project was terminated in 1987. Indeed, the final report submitted by the project co-ordinator does not mention any activity during that year. The activity of the MULPOCs consists mostly of routine administrative work. Until 1987, two MULPOCs organized two meetings every year - an experts' meeting and a meeting at the ministerial level. As a result of the financial crisis, it was decided that those meetings would be organized once every two years. As for operational activities, at present the MULPOCs are not equipped to carry out any meaningful study. This kind of work concerning the subregions is carried out by the competent division at headquarters, which will organize a field mission rather than rely on the relevant MULPOC. MULPOCs were set up 11 years ago, originally as UNDP-funded projects. They became regular administrative units of ECA in January 1983."

14. In paragraph 91 of the same report, the Board "strongly recommended that the achievements of the MULPOCs be thoroughly evaluated with a view to deciding whether this experiment should be continued or whether the mandate, number and structure of these centres should be completely reorganized." The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) concurred with the recommendations of the Board of Auditors.

General Assembly Decisions

15. After consideration of the reports of the Board of Auditors and the ACABQ, the General Assembly adopted resolution 43/216 on Financial Reports and Audited Financial Statements, endorsing "the concurring observations and recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as contained in their respective reports, duly taking into account the divergent views expressed in the Fifth Committee on the question of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres...".

Method of Work and Scope of this Report

16. This evaluation is comprehensive both in its scope and coverage in that all MULPOCs were thoroughly and painstakingly investigated in order to provide an objective assessment. The evaluation included the following aspects: what the Member States considered to be the role and mandate of the MULPOCs; how the MULPOC officials understood and interpreted the MULPOC mandate; the institutional and operational relationship between the MULPOCs on the one hand and the governments, IGOs, UNDP Resident Representatives, the United Nations agencies operating in the area, the bilateral and multilateral donor agencies, and the ECA substantive Divisions on the other hand. The Review Team took into account the financial and human resources made available to the MULPOCs to carry out their mandate and how such resources were utilized, as well as supporting staff and facilities. It also carefully considered the achievements, major problems and short-comings of the MULPOCs.

17. The Review Team met in Addis Ababa with the Executive Secretary of ECA and his senior staff in March and May 1989 and visited all MULPOC offices and 12 selected Member States covering all the subregions. It also interviewed Ministers and officials in the governments, IGOs and United Nations Offices in these countries (see Annex III).
18. Following the Summary of the Main Conclusions and Recommendations, this Report is presented in seven chapters. This chapter provides the introduction and background to the Report. Chapter II deals with the genesis of the MULPOCs and the evolution of ECA subregional strategy, while chapter III examines the multinational programming of the MULPOCs and how this function has been carried out in the past as well as its shortcomings. In chapter IV, the Report analyses the management of the MULPOCs showing their functional relationships with the Member States, the ECA secretariat and other United Nations agencies. Chapter V examines the issue of the reorganization of the MULPOCs taking into account the most recent developments as well as the need to make the MULPOCs more effective. Chapter VI evaluates the resources of the MULPOCs and how the inadequacy of such resources has affected their performance, while chapter VII outlines the strategy for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the recommendations of this Report. A number of annexes are given to provide additional explanations of the Report.
CHAPTER II

THE INSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION OF THE MULPOCs

ECA Subregional Strategy

19. Right from its inception in 1958, ECA has always attached great importance to the strengthening of economic relations among African countries as a means of overcoming the constraints to production and industrialization imposed by limitations of the small size of national markets. Its main thrust is to provide technical support and advisory services to Member States in the adoption and implementation of common policies and programmes for social and economic transformation of the African economies; to assist the Member States in the definition, formulation and execution of joint programmes for attaining collective self-reliance through economic co-operation and integration; and to assist these countries to develop a common position in order to strengthen their bargaining power in international forums.

20. The African Declaration on Co-operation, Development and Economic Independence, adopted by the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1973, underlined the importance attached by African countries to collective self-reliance and provided the framework for sectoral, subregional and regional economic co-operation. In April 1980, the Lagos Plan of Action and the Final Act of Lagos were adopted at the Economic Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the OAU. This called upon African countries to establish or strengthen subregional economic co-operation arrangements as a step towards the creation of an African common market and eventually an African economic community by the year 2000.

ECA Subregional Offices

21. As early as 1962, ECA decided to establish subregional offices with a view to improving its effectiveness as an instrument for promoting economic co-operation at the subregional level. Accordingly, the Commission adopted resolution 64 (IV) establishing two subregional offices in West Africa and North Africa, and invited the Executive Secretary to consider the possibility of establishing two more subregional offices to serve East Africa and Central Africa. By 1966, four ECA subregional offices had been established in Lusaka, Kinshasa, Niamey and Tangier.

22. The four subregional offices were funded from the regular budget of the United Nations; their objective was to "provide liaison between ECA headquarters and the governments of the subregions; provide the secretariat with information on the needs and problems of the subregions so that effective programmes of assistance can be formulated; undertake studies on the economic and social development of the subregions, collect information and up-to-date documentation on various aspects of the economic and social life of the area and provide advisory services at the request of the countries concerned; give assistance to country experts and advisory teams on the specific problems of the area; and assist in organizing meetings, seminars, study tours, etc., which are to take place in the subregion" (ST/SGB/131).
United Nations Multinational Interdisciplinary Development Advisory Teams (UNDATs)

23. A further attempt was made in the early 1970s to provide the ECA secretariat with adequate means to improve its role in the promotion of subregional economic co-operation through the creation of UNDATs. The UNDAT programme was launched by General Assembly resolution 2563 (XXIV) of 13 December 1969 which, inter alia, requested the Secretary-General and the heads of other United Nations bodies "to intensify their efforts to meet more satisfactorily the requirements of Member States in the field of development planning, plan implementation, public administration and management, especially by organizing, wherever possible and appropriate, continuing advisory services in these fields". Furthermore, through its resolution 1552 (LIX) of 30 July 1970, the Economic and Social Council considered that the provision of such technical assistance in the form of advisory services through interdisciplinary teams, might be a particularly useful way of assisting some of the developing countries in building up their own capacities in those fields.

24. By 1973, three UNDATs were in existence: one in Niamey for West Africa, one in Yaounde for Central African countries and one in Lusaka which was an integral part of the ECA subregional office for Eastern and Southern Africa. These UNDATs existed side-by-side with the ECA subregional offices and, except for the Lusaka-based, their activities were not integrated with those of the subregional offices. Consequently, there existed six ECA subregional arrangements, namely, four subregional offices and two UNDATs (the Lusaka-based one being part of the subregional office).

25. The establishment of UNDATs did not, however, improve the framework to make ECA a catalyst in the economic integration process. In fact, the UNDAT activities were merely advisory and not operational instruments for propelling the integration process. In view of these deficiencies, the ECA Conference of Ministers, in its resolution 241 (XI) of 22 February 1973, recommended that the terms of reference of the UNDATs should be reoriented in such a way that they would be more operational in identifying and implementing multinational projects, and that additional resources from within the United Nations system and from donor countries should be sought.

26. Therefore in 1975, a joint UNDP/ECA Evaluation Mission reviewed the performance of the UNDATs and recommended that they should be transformed from mere advisory bodies to operational instruments for development, mainly devoted to the identification, design and implementation of multinational programmes and projects. This recommendation was endorsed by the Conference of African Planners held in 1976, and later, the ECA Conference of Ministers decided that the three UNDATs should be phased out and replaced by restructured subregional institutional arrangements described below.

Multinational Programming and Operational Centres

27. The Multinational Programming and Operational Centres (MULPOCs) were established by resolution 311 (XIII) of 1 March 1977 of the ECA Conference of Ministers (see annex I) with the following terms of reference:

(a) Identification of activities/projects of a multinational and multisectoral character, and national activities which have a multinational character;
(b) Provision of assistance to Member States of their subregions in pursuing those activities by undertaking prefeasibility and feasibility studies and in the process of implementing projects; and

(c) Provision of assistance, on the basis of the identification, by the countries of the subregion, of the core development issues of the subregion on which the Member States wish to address themselves.

28. Subsequently, by its resolution 36/178 of 17 December 1981, the General Assembly of the United Nations noted the above resolution of the ECA Conference of Ministers and emphasized the importance of the MULPOCs for the African countries and the need for substantial and adequate financial and human resources to sustain their activities.

29. Each MULPOC was established with a legislative organ consisting of a Council of Ministers or Plenipotentiaries and a Committee of Officials to provide policy guidance and to supervise and monitor its work. There are presently five MULPOCs with the following main features (see also map showing MULPOC groupings).

(a) Niamey-based MULPOC

30. The Niamey-based MULPOC located in Niamey, Republic of Niger, serves 16 countries of West Africa, namely, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo. This stretches over an area of 6,168,343 km2 with 180 million people. The subregion has approximately 40 IGOs. And in order to co-ordinate their activities, these IGOs have created an Association and requested the MULPOC to serve as its secretariat. The co-ordination of these activities is facilitated through the establishment of six sectoral committees covering agriculture, industry, trade, transport, energy, human resources development (training). The Association of the IGOs has provided the MULPOC with the sum of $US 130,000 for the purpose of servicing their meetings. It is important to stress that a substantial part of the area covered by this MULPOC is in the Sahel. This MULPOC area also consists of a long coastal belt, which makes it so complex to respond effectively to the diverse development priorities and needs of the subregion.

(b) Tangier-based MULPOC

31. The Tangier-based MULPOC is located in Tangier, the Kingdom of Morocco, and serves six countries: Algeria, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia. This covers a large area of 8,250,000 km2 with a population of 131.9 million people. This MULPOC has to respond to the decision of the North African countries to establish a preferential trade area among them and to the need to support the recently created Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA) consisting of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritania. The North African countries, being on the Mediterranean and anticipating the coming into being of the European Common Market in 1992, are trying to assess the impact which this will have particularly on subregional co-operation. The location of this MULPOC is approximately 3½ hours drive from Rabat, away from the seat of Government, and UNDP and other UN offices. Other access to Tangier is available by plane through Casablanca and Rabat. The office has to make several weekly trips to Rabat for pouches and to liaise with various sectoral ministries, UN agencies and some IGOs.
(c) *Gisenyi-based MULPOC*

32. The Gisenyi-based MULPOC, which is located in Gisenyi, Republic of Rwanda, serves three countries: Rwanda, Burundi and Zaire, covering an area of 2,398,800 km² with a population of 44 million people. This MULPOC serves only two IGOs: the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (CEPGL) and the Kagera Basin Organization (KBO). Consequently, problems associated with a large number of countries as well as IGOs are at a minimum. In terms of location, the MULPOC is approximately four hours' drive from Kigali, capital of Rwanda, where UNDP and other United Nations agencies are situated. Therefore, administration and communications are difficult and twice-weekly runs are made to dispatch and receive mail pouches. This also compounds the problem of consultations with the government and United Nations offices. The only advantage noted was that CEPGL is located in Gisenyi within proximity of the MULPOC.

(d) *Yaounde-based MULPOC*

33. The Yaounde-based MULPOC is located in Yaounde, Republic of Cameroon, and serves the following seven countries in Central Africa: Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sao Tome and Principe. This covers an area of 3,025,000 km² and has a population of 21.3 million people. The subregion has a few IGOs, namely, ECCAS, UDEAC and BEAC.

(e) *Lusaka-based MULPOC*

34. The Lusaka-based MULPOC is located in Lusaka, Republic of Zambia, and serves the following 18 countries: Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, Swaziland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. With the independence of Namibia, the number will increase to 19. This covers an area of 6,343,940 km² with a population of 178.1 million people. This MULPOC has the largest number of land-locked countries and island nations which makes it extremely difficult for the MULPOC to respond adequately to the resulting diverse interests. The IGOs in this subregion are PTA, SADCC, IOC and IGADD.

**Findings and Conclusions**

35. The establishment of the MULPOCs has been an important institutional evolution of ECA for promoting subregional economic co-operation and integration. It is therefore important to recall General Assembly resolution 36/178 where it is stated that the MULPOCs, as part of the ECA decentralization process, are intended to be the operational arm of ECA at the subregional level. They are intended to provide advice and technical assistance to IGOs and governments and to execute projects on their behalf. The MULPOCs, as stated in paragraph 29, have legislative organs which clearly duplicate those of the ECA and the major IGOs. This explains in part the misconception by some Member States who regard the MULPOCs as IGOs and as separate organizations from ECA, having an independent identity, autonomy and resources.
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CHAPTER III
THE MULTINATIONAL PROGRAMMING FUNCTIONS OF MULPOCS

General Perceptions

36. From the terms of reference of the MULPOCs described in chapter II, the Review Team got the impression that their conceptual framework presented as much difficulty as their operational framework. In order to appreciate this fully, the Report takes account of three critical inter-related issues: (a) the MULPOC perspectives, i.e., how the Member States perceive its role to be; (b) the multinational programming functions; and (c) the operational framework. In a broad sense, evidence suggests that this overall mandate of the MULPOCs has generally been misunderstood and hence often misinterpreted. This has naturally been the source of differences, sometimes quite sharp, in the "performance criteria" used to evaluate the success or failure of the MULPOCs.

The MULPOC Perspectives

37. One of the basic findings of the Review Team was that the mandate or terms of reference of the MULPOCs were not clearly defined and was generally misunderstood by all concerned. The name "MULPOC" seemed to have created some confusion in practical terms in the sense that although it implied multinational programming and operations, the Member States could not readily perceive these functions in the day-to-day activities of the MULPOCs. Nor indeed could Member States see what the name implied in terms of technical support and advisory services available to them via the MULPOCs. Therefore, senior government officials and officials of IGOs and United Nations agencies interviewed did not appear to clearly understand or appreciate what MULPOCs stand for, what their critical role is in the country's development efforts and how relevant their activities are to subregional co-operation.

38. The general basic reasons for this situation are evidently numerous but a few will illustrate the point. In the first place, it appeared to the Review Team that the ECA secretariat, having developed the terms of reference, did not define clearly the lines of relationships between the MULPOC offices on the one hand and individual governments, IGOs, ECA-sponsored institutions, UNDP and United Nations agencies on the other. Such relationships became even more blurred in relations with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the ADB Group and the bilateral donor agencies. Given that these agencies operate under their own respective mandates, a clash of interests often ensued in the demarcation of responsibilities. To illustrate this point, it was made clear to the Review Team that MULPOC officials rarely visited the offices of these institutions to assess their work with a view to identifying areas of commonality which could form the basis for subregional programming. On their part, officials of these institutions hardly visited the MULPOC offices even when they were situated in the same locality or building.

39. Another aspect in the conceptual misunderstanding is that some Member States believe that MULPOCs should have been the "first point of call" in their search for subregional co-operation. They envisioned the MULPOC as an institution that should not only have generated ideas but also implemented them. These countries also felt that MULPOCs should help IGOs not only to operationalize their individual mandates but also to avoid obvious duplication of efforts among them. Still, others felt that MULPOCs should be directly involved in the search for development financing for multinational projects. To that end, they should serve as "data banks" for
40. One other important aspect of the conceptualization by the Member States that warrants mention is that, since MULPOCs are part of the ECA secretariat, they should have at the subregional level the same mandate as that of ECA. Their understanding was that MULPOCs were designed to be the operational arm of ECA. However, in practice, at least until recently, their work programmes and priorities were not identical with that of the ECA secretariat. In practical terms, ECA's objective of using the MULPOCs to sensitize the Member States and to "internalize" the decisions of the ECA Conference of Ministers have largely been unsuccessful. It was also felt that the MULPOCs could play an important institutional role in planning and development but this requires a much stronger framework than is presently the case. Given the inadequacy of resources, the catalytic role of the MULPOCs is drastically circumscribed to the extent where their effectiveness and impact are marginalized in a majority of cases and non-existent in others. There was a general view that it is ECA's own perception of the MULPOCs that hinders their efficacy. They supported this view by stressing that all major decisions regarding the MULPOCs' day-to-day operations are centralized in Addis Ababa and MULPOC Directors have not been given any real authority to implement or follow-up policy decisions on regional co-operation and integration.

41. It is important at this stage to underscore the fact that the objectives of the MULPOCs are most welcome among the Member States. The general feeling, however, is that the term and concept of "MULPOC" need to be redefined to indicate clearly what it stands for, its identity within the United Nations system, especially ECA, and that its specific role should not duplicate existing institutions. A clear definition of its tasks and operations, as well as the means of providing assistance, should be clearly spelt out. It is particularly important to define the new mandate in such a way as to fill in the obvious gaps arising from the operations of other United Nations bodies at the subregional level. This is done in chapter V.

Multinational Programming and Operations

42. The Member States generally welcome the multinational and multidisciplinary character of the MULPOC mandate as the only United Nations office responsible for subregional economic co-operation and development. The major sectors of high priority identified by the Member States include: agriculture, environment, industry, transport and communications, trade, finance, energy, hydrology, social development, human resources, natural resources, science and technology, integration of women in development and economic planning. There was a general feeling, however, that MULPOC programmes were often too ambitious without any real institutional or operational capacity to implement them. Moreover, it was stated that decisions on identification of priorities for multinational projects were not normally done in a systematic manner but through an ad hoc formula using, as in the case of the Niamey-based MULPOC, the sectoral committee meetings.

43. In practice, the MULPOCs do not participate in ECA programming review meetings, neither do they participate in UNDP NATCAP and review meetings. As a consequence, the linkage between national and multinational priorities, which is a critical element of multinational programming, does not exist. This leads to discrepancies or even contradictions in focus especially between MULPOCs and UNDP.
programmes. The same is true of the relations between MULPOCs and the African Development Bank, the World Bank and bilateral donors.

The Operational Aspects of the MULPOC Mandate

44. Member States felt that MULPOCs lack the necessary autonomy and resources to execute their mandates and that this was a great handicap to the operational efficiency of this institution. Decisions from legislative organs on programmes and projects are transmitted through the ECA secretariat to the MULPOCs without the corresponding resources to implement them. It is therefore important to underline the fact that there is an obvious structural weakness in the operational framework of the MULPOCs.

45. The second aspect of operational weaknesses of MULPOCs arises out of ECA's own perception of what MULPOCs should do. It was demonstrated to the Review Team that the ECA substantive Divisions continue to direct the major operations from Addis Ababa, whereas these could be performed with cost-effectiveness by MULPOCs thereby giving the latter the opportunity to interact professionally and technically with their counterparts in the governments, the IGOs and the United Nations system as a whole. In fact, many officials were of the view that no real decentralization was achieved by the establishment of the MULPOCs.

46. The third aspect gathered by the Review Team is that MULPOCs have not been aggressive at all in identifying multisectoral or multinational projects of interest to more than one Member State. They have also never attempted to "sell" their professional competence effectively in terms of what services they can offer. An illustration of this was that MULPOC Directors have never been formally accredited to the member countries even at the duty stations where they are hosted. Similarly, the other staff and expertise of the MULPOCs are hardly known to the governments. For instance, it was the feeling of some government officials that the MULPOCs should have been active and should have made their presence felt in the ongoing debates on critical issues such as external debt and the African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-Economic Recovery and Transformation.

47. Figure 1 illustrates in part, some of the problematiques of MULPOCs' multinational programming cycle. Decisions of MULPOC legislative organs are discussed by the ECA Conference of Ministers of Planning, who also consider reports and proposals of a multisectoral or multinational character prepared directly by ECA substantive Divisions without inputs from the MULPOCs.

48. The mechanism for consultations between MULPOCs and other operators in the field does not really exist. This was further complicated by the problems of coordinating multisectoral priorities based on different plan periods in the constituent Member States, to the extent that the sectoral priorities do not always have the same weighing at each planning period. A further complicating element was the existence of "parallelism" between ECA and MULPOC work programmes which until recently were different. Although the MULPOCs are an integral part of ECA, they have not effectively participated in the execution of UNDP-funded multinational programmes.
THE MULPOC OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK

1. Implements programmes and projects adopted by the ECA Conference of Ministers of Planning
2. Undertakes research studies on multisectoral programmes
3. Provides advisory services and technical support to member States
4. Maintains links with IGOs

MULPOC LEGISLATIVE ORGANS
1. Discuss MULPOC staff papers and studies and adopts decisions
2. Discuss papers from ECA substantive Divisions prepared without MULPOC participation

IGOs
1. Prepare and implement multinational programmes based on desk studies and field missions
2. Submit reports and recommendations to their legislative organs
3. Maintain working relations with MULPOCs

ECA CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS OF PLANNING
1. Discusses reports of MULPOC legislative organs and endorses their decisions
2. Discusses sectoral reports, programmes, projects and studies by substantive divisions of interest to MULPOCs
3. IGOs participate as observers.
49. In the programming exercise, the MULPOCs use their meager resources to obtain information from Member States through limited missions, and largely depend on correspondence and questionnaires or second-hand information and data from economic reports published by ECA, ADB, the World Bank and other United Nations agencies. In some cases, however, the information is also obtained through the Association of IGOs as in the case of West Africa.

50. It is also important to highlight that the larger part of MULPOC activities consists in servicing a large number of meetings of their policy organs. For instance, during the 1986-1987 biennium, each of the MULPOCs held four meetings of its policy organs. In the case of the Niamey-based MULPOC, in addition to these four meetings, it serviced four meetings of the officials and Chief Executives of the Association of the West African IGOs, as well as 8 meetings of the sectoral committees of this Association. This leaves little time for technical advisory services as well as execution of multinational programmes and projects.

Achievements of MULPOCs

51. Evidence seems to suggest that there is no single set of "performance criteria" that can be applied across-the-board to evaluate the success and achievements of the MULPOCs. Peculiar circumstances do exist in each MULPOC area which call for closer scrutiny before generalizations can be made. However, the overall "performance criteria" have to be viewed within the concept of subregional economic co-operation strategy adopted since the early 1960s. In this framework, institutional building for economic co-operation and co-ordination of the activities of IGOs were given the highest priority. Therefore, throughout this period, starting with ECA subregional offices, the UNDATs and later the MULPOCs, this objective became paramount and should be the performance criteria.

52. Viewed in this sense, there is a general consensus among Member States that MULPOCs have been successful in supporting institution-building efforts and in strengthening their operational framework, especially during the period when they had access to adequate UNDP funding. MULPOCs have assisted in the establishment of the PTA, IGADD, ECCAS and ESAMI. They also actively participated in the establishment of subsidiary organs of these IGOs such as the PTA Trade and Development Bank, the PTA Clearing Arrangement, the Eastern and Southern African Trade Promotion and Training Centre and the Central African Clearing House.

53. With regard to operational activities, the MULPOCs have not been able to implement on their own multinational programmes and projects. These are implemented by ECA headquarters with marginal participation by the MULPOCs. This is due to a combination of factors, as indicated in paragraphs 44 to 50.

54. The above achievements soon become marginalized during the post-institution building period when UNDP withdrew its financial support to the MULPOCs and when the institutions they helped to establish grew. The problem arose out of what new role the MULPOCs could play vis-a-vis the new and existing IGOs. This was reflected the difficulties of adjusting to new socio-economic environment by developing a co-operation framework through which the MULPOCs could jointly work together with the IGOs to design and implement new aspects of co-operation and integration. It became evident to the Review Team that neither the MULPOCs nor ECA really had an immediate answer, despite past evaluations of the MULPOCs.
Findings and Conclusions

55. From the evidence gathered by the Review Team, it would appear that the ability of the MULPOCs to exercise their multinational programming role has been circumscribed by difficulties they encounter in providing professional and technical assistance at the subregional level in the promotion of economic and social development through economic co-operation and integration. Secondly, there are formidable problems in the interactions and experiences of the MULPOC with their partners in developments, namely the Member States and the IGOs, the ECA substantive Divisions, the United Nations specialized agencies and other international organizations, due mainly to the lack of definition of lines of relationships between these bodies and the MULPOCs. Furthermore, there has been some misunderstanding of the functional role of the MULPOCs largely arising from a lack of clear definition of their mandate.

56. The conclusion drawn from the above is that the operational functions of the MULPOCs have had marginal impact on the socio-economic development of the Member States. This has been largely due to their failure to provide (a) the much-needed technical assistance and expertise to the IGOs through the establishment of more business-like and rational working arrangements for delivering outputs better tailored to the countries' needs, and (b) information and technical know-how in the analysis of multinational projects and development strategies both at the national and subregional levels. The MULPOCs also have not demonstrated dynamism and initiative and made themselves known to and appreciated by development operators. They have not been provided with high calibre of staff as well as adequate financial resources. Finally, the ECA has been unable to decentralize its operational activities to the MULPOCs.
CHAPTER IV

MANAGEMENT OF THE MULPOCS

57. This chapter deals with the management aspects of MULPOC functions in the area of project execution, administrative and programme support as well as the relationship with the Member States, IGOs, United Nations agencies and the linkages with the ECA secretariat.

The MULPOC Leadership Role in Subregional Co-operation

58. In the early years of their existence, the MULPOCs were to a large extent able to provide some technical and professional leadership at the subregional level. This was achieved through some basic theoretical and statistical studies connected with subregional communities, and by acting as a catalyst in securing the agreement of and co-operation among the Member States concerned in setting up the necessary institutional machinery for subregional co-operation. The MULPOCs were able to do this largely because of adequate UNDP funding.

59. By the mid-1980s, it had become evident that there is a lack of personnel with qualifications and expertise matching the priority needs of the Member States. Many of the experts, though professionally qualified, have no sectoral expertise to enable them to establish a strong MULPOC presence in the subregional. Consequently, none of the MULPOCs is in a position to serve as a subregional "think tank" or make contribution through the execution of development projects.

Relationship with the Member States and IGOs

60. In the early years of their existence, the MULPOCs’ thrust on subregional economic co-operation, integration and development, was widely accepted by the Member States as a welcome "outreach" for bringing ECA programmes closer to the grassroots level. It was also felt that with the support of the MULPOCs, the way was open for development planners to have a constructive dialogue on development issues where such a rapport would not have been easy to achieve with ECA headquarters located so far away. Hence, the MULPOCs were seen by many Member States as subregional ECA "consultants".

61. In operational terms, this enthusiasm petered out rather rapidly. For one thing, it became evident that the programmes entrusted to the MULPOCs were too complex and too highly demanding for a system which was not endowed with the necessary human and financial resources as well as the required institutional capacity for the execution of such programmes. In another sense, the Member States were seriously concerned about the widening gap between their ever-increasing development requirements and the human and financial resources available to the MULPOCs for addressing those needs. This led to a situation where Member States steadily lost interest in the MULPOCs and thus bypassed them when searching for technical assistance. This was further aggravated by the significant decrease in resources for official travel to Member States following the withdrawal of UNDP funding.

62. Therefore, the impact of the MULPOCs, either within the specific area of policy planning or that of programming or execution of projects, steadily declined. Its shortcomings and limitations as an operational arm of the ECA secretariat are made evident by their inability to initiate packages of multinational projects that can attract funding from donor agencies. For example, the capability of the
MULPOCs to conduct substantive studies, identify critical gaps that could be filled by subregional projects is almost non-existent. Similarly, they are unable to assist Member States in developing and exchanging project-oriented information and in assisting in the preparation of protocols for co-operation; they have also not worked closely with Member States to analyse the most difficult areas and bottlenecks in key projects and to provide assistance in locating needed funding or expertise to solve the problems. As seen by member States, many of the studies carried out by the MULPOCs especially in recent years, are of a general nature and not particularly useful or relevant for policy formulation. In fact, these studies are characterised as desk studies not based on extensive research or field data reflecting the realities of the subregion(s) concerned.

63. Evidence abounds to support the member States' disappointment with the MULPOC system. For instance, the low level of participation by Member States at MULPOC policy organ meetings, as shown in table 1, has not only been low, but has also steadily been declining. Apart from the Gisenyi-based MULPOC (because of its comparatively small membership), it is becoming increasingly difficult to have an average above 20 per cent of ministers attending any MULPOC meeting. For example, it was indeed extremely difficult for the Yaounde-based MULPOC to have a quorum for its biennial meeting in Malabo, Equatorial Guinea, in March 1989.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference number of meeting, indicating date</th>
<th>Number of Ministers Present</th>
<th>Percentage of Ministerial attendance</th>
<th>No. of High-ranking official (ambassadors, etc.) present</th>
<th>Number of countries absent</th>
<th>Percentage of country attendance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inaugural meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Niamey, Niger) 16-17 June 1978</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Banjul, Gambia) 22-23 February 1979</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Niamey, Niger) 15-16 February 1980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>2 deputy ministers and one ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Freetown, Sierra Leone) 14-16 February 1981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Banjul, Gambia) 12-13 February 1982</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>One vice-minister and one ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Cotonou, Benin) 28-30 March 1983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>One ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Niamey, Niger) 15-16 February 1985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>One secretary of State and 3 ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Niamey, Niger) 15-16 February 1985</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Lome, Togo) 15-15 February 1986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth meeting of the Council of Ministers of the MULPDC for West Africa (Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso) 16-17 February 1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>One deputy minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** N/A: not available

64. It is also important to stress that there is a strong feeling in some quarters that the MULPOC meetings are generally striking for what appears to be a "ritual" repetition of account of previous proceedings, charting no new path for development, breaking no new grounds, offering no new perspectives. All this tends to suggest that the MULPOC policy organ has become increasingly irrelevant as a decision-making machinery. Despite this apparent disillusionment, the Member States in all the five subregions visited by the Review Team, strongly argued in favour of maintaining closer and more effective working relations with the MULPOCs. They also stressed the need for greater decentralization of ECA, with the necessary delegation of authority and adequate resources to enable them to respond especially to ad hoc requests of member States.

65. With regard to the relations with IGOs, it was made clear to the Review Team that working arrangements have never been established between them and some MULPOCs in terms of operational activities to the extent that no joint programming has ever been envisaged so as to avoid duplication of efforts. Even the exchange of research studies and information has been on ad hoc rather than regular basis. Consequently, the impact of the MULPOCs on the activities of IGOs has, at the very best, been minimal. It is for this reason that some Member States and IGOs who strongly feel that having helped in the creation of such major IGOs as the PTA, the MULPOCs have accomplished their mandate and should therefore be discontinued. They further see no fundamental difference between the IGOs and the MULPOCs, arguing that both are in essence intergovernmental organizations with almost similar mandate and objectives.

66. While each subregion would seem to have its own special interests and peculiarities, a clear definition of the relationship be made between the MULPOCs and the IGOs as a sine qua non for enabling them to adequately translate their mandate into concrete action and to operate as dynamic instruments. This should best be centred around the provision of technical assistance to the IGOs, effective participation in their standing committees, preparation of surveys and studies on problems of interest to them, and providing know-how in their multinational programming. Towards this end, the Review Team concludes that the integration of the policy organs of the MULPOCs and those of the major subregional IGOs would be a step in the right direction.

The MULPOCs within the United Nations system

67. In practice, no real collaboration on an active and continuing basis exists between the MULPOCs and the United Nations specialized agencies even in the field of programming, which is considered necessary for integrated effort. For instance, although FAO is the lead agency in implementing agricultural programmes and projects, the MULPOCs do not participate in these activities. It is, in recognition of this short-coming that the eleventh meeting of the Lusaka-based MULPOC Council of Ministers held in Harare, Zimbabwe, in March 1989, urged the MULPOC to hold discussions with FAO with a view to developing a programme for establishing a financial umbrella to cover aquacultural development plans of the countries of the subregion.

68. UNDP occupies a special position in the development activities of the United Nations family in that it provides funding for the main programmes and projects as well as logistics and administrative support to ECA and the MULPOCs. From our discussions with the Resident Co-ordinators, it was felt that there was a need to study ways and means of co-ordinating the operational activities between multinational
projects and national projects having inter-country character. To this extent, mutually beneficial arrangements should be developed between UNDP and MULPOCs, through the exchange of information and ideas concerning the multinational programming and execution of projects. At present, there is no substantive operational relationship between the Resident Co-ordinators and the Directors of MULPOCs.

Relationship with the ECA secretariat

69. In order to establish a clear relationship between the ECA substantive divisions and the MULPOCs, the Executive Secretary's Circular No. 10/79 of 14 June 1979 on "Guidelines on Operations of the ECA Multinational Programming and Operations Centres" was issued to all staff members. This was in compliance with resolution 355 (XIV) of the fifth ECA Conference of Ministers adopted at their Rabat meeting in March 1979 which, among other things, recommended the Executive Secretary, in the overall interest of the Commission, to "decentralize the operational activities and resources of the Commission in line with the spirit behind the establishment" of the MULPOCs. One of the purposes of this circular was to devolve specific responsibilities to the MULPOCs in the execution of the programmes approved by their respective policy organs and by the ECA Conference of Ministers. It spelled out what the relevant divisions of the ECA secretariat were expected to do to ensure the success of the new experiment.

70. In practice, the general attitude of ECA Divisions towards the MULPOCs has created some complex structural and operational problems which have seriously affected the efficacy of the MULPOCs. The existence of the MULPOCs as integral part and, operational arm of ECA does not appear to have received due recognition. As a result, the ECA substantive Divisions do not involve MULPOCs in their work. This attitude would seem to emanate from the past history of the MULPOCs which, as in the case of subregional offices or UNDATs, were structured in such a way that they have been operating quite differently from ECA. As experience has shown, the MULPOCs never actually developed into an operational arm of ECA.

71. This situation is borne by the fact that decision-making, both in terms of operational activities as well as administrative and financial management, is totally concentrated at ECA headquarters. This rigid control has not only weakened the decentralization effort of the secretariat, the raison d'être for the creation of the MULPOC scheme, but the capacity of the MULPOCs to perform and to act on their own in a wide range of matters essential for their efficacy. For example, the MULPOCs have not been given the authority for quick response to requests from Member States for technical support and advisory services.

(a) Supervision of the MULPOCs

72. At the ECA secretariat, the MULPOCs report directly to the Economic Co-operation Office (ECO) on their activities. They also maintain relationship with the Policy and Programme Co-ordination Office (PPCO) and with the Technical Assistance Co-ordination and Operations Office (TACOO) in the areas of programming and technical assistance respectively. While PPCO has the responsibility of overseeing the work of the MULPOCs in programming and supervising the budget performance aspects of their work, TACOO identifies extrabudgetary resources for the MULPOCs' operational activities and monitors the management and implementation of projects entrusted to them. ECO coordinates the entire web of relations between the substantive and support Divisions on the one hand, and the MULPOCs on the other. It is also responsible for supervising
and co-ordinating MULPOC operations involving, among other things, their relationship with the Administration.

73. It needs to be stated that almost all the staff of the five MULPOCs were unanimous in their view that the supervision of the MULPOC operations by ECO has been haphazard and ineffective. Although ECO has established direct professional links with the MULPOCs, these have not been effective. For instance, it was stated that the ECO Director or his staff rarely visited the MULPOCs for consultations on programme performance.

(b) Technical and substantive Support to MULPOCs

74. The ECA substantive Divisions are required to provide all necessary technical support particularly in the following areas: clearance of the draft work programmes; monitoring and assisting the implementation of such programme; ensuring their effective participation in meetings of MULPOCs policy organs; and assigning deployment of substantive staff to the MULPOCs. However, evidence shows that the substantive Divisions have not extended to the MULPOCs the full support necessary for the implementation of their work programmes. Moreover, division Directors generally resist the transfer of their staff to augment the work of the MULPOCs, even on a short-term basis.

(c) Administrative and management support to MULPOCs

75. The Review Team found that the MULPOC Directors have not been given adequate administrative responsibilities affecting the MULPOCs. For instance, the authorization of travel of MULPOC staff within the approved programme is still subject to cumbersome clearance procedures; recruitment of short-term consultants, even when funds are available has to be approved and processed by ECA headquarters; similarly, no authority has been delegated to the MULPOCs to enable them to take decisions on matters concerning general service staff such as settlement of medical claims, short-term appointments, approval of sick leave etc.

Findings and Conclusions

76. The Review Team found that, in general, the MULPOCs have not been able to exercise their leadership role in subregional economic co-operation. The MULPOCs now seem to be operating suboptimally unlike their predecessor organizations - the ECA subregional offices and UNDATS. For this reason, the MULPOCs do not seem to be playing any meaningful catalytic role in the economic development of the subregions. Similarly, because of the low management profile, the impact of the MULPOCs either within the specific area of policy planning or that of programming or execution of projects at the subregional level has sadly declined with the passage of time. There is also discrepancy between the existing qualifications and calibre of the staff and the priorities of the subregions. Unlike their counterparts, in other United Nations agencies, the MULPOC lack the ability to establish a strong professional presence in the subregions without the assistance of expertise from ECA headquarters. Consequently, none of the MULPOCs has developed into a subregional institution which could make an intellectual and professional contribution to the management of the economy of the subregion.
77. The morale of the staff in these offices is low and their sense of duty is blended with uncertainties and insecurity about their future. No adequate effort has been made to address this unhealthy situation so as to enable the staff to know where they stand in their tenure, i.e. their condition of service and their welfare which has a direct bearing on the work of the MULPOCs and fulfilment of their mandate.

78. In order to rectify the problems identified in this Chapter, the Review Team recommends the following specific measures:

(a) Recruitment and assignment of high-calibre staff with appropriate qualifications, skills and expertise, as well as having broad experience in development management and in the working of the United Nations system. Such qualifications and expertise should match the priorities and requirements of the Member States in each subregion:

(b) The framework should be dynamic and sufficiently resourceful to enable it to identify and help implement priority subregional projects and to become the centre for the dissemination of information on multinational programming among member States and their partners. To this end, the staff should be more responsive and aggressive in assisting Member States in their unrelenting struggle against the social and economic crises, and in enhancing the process of socio-economic development through collective self-reliance at the subregional level;

(c) Adequate resources should be made available to enable the staff to devise suitable mechanisms for the dissemination of information on their work programme and priorities as well as advisory services. It is also important that financial resources be provided for holding, inter alia, round-tables, seminars and workshops, undertaking regular visits by staff to Member States and for regular distribution of publications on research and related issues;

(d) There should be greater delegation of authority to the subregions in the execution of operational activities, administrative and financial management so as to give them greater flexibility in matters such as routine decisions concerning recruitment of temporary staff, hiring of short-term consultants for projects, response to emergency requests from member States and administrative matters such as approval of sick and emergency leaves; and

(e) Immediate consideration should be given to improving the supervision of the ECA subregional institutions through, inter alia, according higher and equal priority to their work programme by ECA programme managers, strengthening their technical assistance programming and operational activities of the MULPOCs.
CHAPTER V
RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE MULPOCS

The New Setting

79. The last three chapters of this report suggest that the MULPOCs cannot effectively function within the present framework. There is, therefore, the need for a new and more operational framework to be developed to situate the MULPOCs in the mainstream of Africa's social and economic development process. This view arises from the fact that the objectives for which this MULPOC institution was established are more valid today than at the time when they were made due to the deepening socio-economic crisis in the continent. Therefore, while the mandate is still valid, the social and economic conditions have considerably changed, calling for redefinition of this mandate in the light of recent developments.

Regrouping of the MULPOCs

80. In the light of our terms of reference, the question of the regrouping of the MULPOCs was thoroughly reviewed, taking into account the number of countries covered by each MULPOC, the geographical spread, the political environment as well as delivery capacity. In order to effectively operationalize the activities of ECA at the subregional level and bearing in mind the problems experienced by those MULPOCs covering a large number of countries, the Review Team strongly feels that serious consideration be given to the regrouping of the MULPOCs. From the discussions with senior officials in the governments and IGOs, there appears to be no objection to such regrouping, provided that this would result in the strengthening of subregional cooperation.

81. Two alternative proposals are suggested showing possible resource and management implications of each alternative. These alternatives are: (a) leaving the five MULPOCs as they are; and (b) creating six new subregional institutions, two in Eastern and Southern Africa, one in Central Africa, two in West Africa and one in North Africa.

Option 1: Maintaining the Existing MULPOC Groupings

82. Under this option, it would have to be assumed that the present groupings, as shown in chapter II, are adequate and practical since they are based on previous ECA subregional offices and UNDATs.

83. The disadvantages of the present MULPOC groupings are however basically two-fold: Firstly, experience has shown that two of them are too large in terms of numbers of countries and the geographic area to be covered and this has never permitted effective contacts by MULPOCs with the Member States at the grassroot levels. For instance, it became obvious to the Review Team that the Niamey-based MULPOC (16 countries) and the Lusaka-based MULPOC (18 countries) are simply too large to enable effective and constant dialogue to be maintained with the Member States. This is borne by the fact that most of the countries have never been visited by the MULPOC staff or its Director during the past three to four years. Secondly, some observers have questioned the justification of the discrepancy in the numbers of
countries served by Gisenyi-based MULPOC (3 countries) as against the Lusaka-based MULPOC (18 countries).

Option 2: Establishment of six subregional groupings

84. The Review Team found that smaller MULPOCs, for example those based in Gisenyi and Tangier with fewer countries to serve have generally been more operationally effective than larger ones in so far as they are able to interact more closely with the Member States and IGOs in the area. Similarly, response to government requests for programming and advisory services is more effective in smaller MULPOCs with smaller number of countries. The only apparent disadvantage in this option is that additional resources and expertise would be required to finance the one additional MULPOC. However, the Review Team strongly feels that this additional cost is justifiable and is a small price to pay if real decentralization of the United Nations Technical Assistance activities to an accelerated subregional and regional cooperation and integration is to be achieved, and if the ECA and its subregional institutions are to become an effective vehicle for socio-economic growth. Therefore, under this option, it is proposed to create the following six new groupings instead of the present five, corresponding more or less to UNDP groupings for regional programmes:

Grouping 1: Southern African Grouping would have ten (10) countries (Zambia, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Madagascar, Mauritius). Area: 4,913,000 km². Population: 54 million.


Grouping 3: Central African Grouping would have nine (9) countries (Angola, Zaire, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Congo, Sao Tome and Principe, Central African Republic, Cameroon and Chad). Area: 6,617,000 km². Population: 58.4 million.


Grouping 5: Western African Grouping would have eight (8) countries (Guinea, Mali, Senegal, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Gambia). Area: 1,916,000 km². Population: 30 million.

Grouping 6: North African Grouping would have seven (7) countries (Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Egypt, Sudan). Area: 9,291,000 km². Population: 133.8 million.

Conversion of MULPOCs into ECA Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes

85. During the review missions, Member States voiced concern about the lack of clarity in the name "Multinational Programming and Operational Centre". Firstly, it was thought that MULPOCs are autonomous IGOs functioning outside the ECA framework and
capable of taking and implementing their own decisions; secondly, that MULPOCs as presently defined, can undertake multinational programming; and thirdly, MULPOCs are and can be more operational than ECA itself. In fact, the MULPOC image is so tarnished that a more overhaul of the function or mandate would not remove the present rather negative attitude towards them.

86. In order to meet the expectations of Member States and clarify the United Nations strategy for subregional co-operation, it is proposed to transform the MULPOCs into "ECA Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes (ECA-STAPs)" with the new mandate as described below.

The Proposed Mandate of the ECA-STAPs

87. On the basis of its findings, the Review Team submits the following draft terms of reference of the ECA Subregional Technical Assistance Programmes:

(a) To provide Member States and IGOs with short-term advisory services in development planning and to assist in the translation of those plans into multinational and multisectoral programmes and projects including the identification and formulation of programmes and projects for execution by them or at their request by the ECA-STAP itself, in association with the specialized agencies of the United Nations system, as required:

(b) To undertake pre-feasibility and feasibility studies, research on and analyses of priority areas identified by Member States and IGOs for enhancing subregional co-operation and integration;

(c) To provide assistance and support in the development of human resources and in organizing training courses, seminars, lectures, workshops in and around round-tables. With a view to strengthening institutional and organizational capacity of Member States to execute multinational development programmes and projects for socio-economic advancement;

(d) To develop in the light of the above, effective working relationship with the governments, the IGOs, the UNDP offices and other international organizations with a view to harmonizing the designing, programming and implementation of technical assistance programmes at the subregional level;

(e) To develop and execute programmes for more effective participation of women in all aspects of development efforts at the subregional level;

(f) To collect and disseminate at the subregional level, information and statistical data on macro-economic indicators in the Member States and to assist them in establishing compatible systems for exchanging informatics amongst themselves and with their development partners.

88. The Review Team strongly believes that this revised mandate, coupled with significant increases in resources, would enable ECA-STAPs to acquire the capabilities to provide technical assistance in multinational programming and joint project execution. This would also enable them to establish their integrity and reputation as an institution capable of responding to the needs of Member States in their efforts towards economic co-operation and integration.
Institutional Framework of the ECA-STAPs

89. The ECA-STAPs, to be more operational and effective, would have the institutional framework as described in figure 2. This would work as follows:

(a) The ECA/STAPs, operating as technical assistance arms of ECA at the subregional level, in consultation with secretariats of major IGOs would identify, design and prepare multisectoral programmes and projects based on the priorities approved by the summits of the Heads of State and Government of the IGOs:

(b) The project and programme reports and studies would, where appropriate be prepared jointly by the ECA-STAPs and the Secretariats of IGOs and would simultaneously be submitted for consideration by the ECA Conference of Ministers and the Council of Ministers of IGOs;

(c) The ECA-STAPs would directly report to the ECA Conference of Ministers taking into account the decisions, proposals and feedbacks from the IGOs. In the same way, the IGOs would continue to submit their reports directly to their respective legislative organs, having duly taken account of the decisions of the ECA Conference of Ministers through the ECA-STAPs.
FIGURE 2: FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE ECA-STAPS

**ECA-STAPS**
- New decisions and instructions
- Jointly prepare programmes, projects, studies, research and reports for submission to ministerial meetings

**ECA CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS**
1. Considers reports of ECA-STAPs (prepared in consultation with IGOs)
2. Takes account of feedbacks from IGO Council of Ministers
3. Approves ECA-STAPs programmes
4. Submits report and recommendations to ECOSOC for transmission to UN General Assembly

**ECOSOC considers report of ECA Conference of Ministers**

**IGO COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**
1. Considers joint reports of IGOs (prepared in consultation with ECA-STAPs)
2. Considers comments and suggestions from ECA Conference of Ministers
3. Submits its report directly to Heads of State and Government

**UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**IGO SUMMIT OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT**

**MAJOR IGOs**
- New decisions and instructions

Note: The diagram illustrates the flow of decisions and instructions between ECA-STAPs, ECA Conference of Ministers, IGO Council of Ministers, ECOSOC, and the United Nations General Assembly, highlighting the collaborative process in the functional relationship of the ECA-STAPs.
90. The implications of the new arrangements are that it would no longer be necessary to continue with the meetings of the MULPOC policy organs whose functions would be adequately covered as above. This would remove the present overlapping and duplication of meetings and would result in considerable savings of resources. Furthermore, there would be no conflicts between the programmes executed by the ECA-STAPs and the IGOs at the subregional level. Similarly, the fact that those programmes are formulated in consultation with the IGOs provides the necessary political support.

91. The ECA-STAPs are designed to become technical support and advisory units of ECA at the subregional level. The fact that their reports would simultaneously find their way to the Heads of State and Government of the IGOs as well as the General Assembly of the United Nations through ECOSOC would provide the rare opportunity of co-ordinating the work of the United Nations with that of the IGOs. At the same time, this would provide IGOs with the opportunity for acquiring direct recognition of their activities by the United Nations General Assembly and would eventually persuade the donor community of the need to increase their support and financing of multinational or regional programming in Africa.

**Findings and Conclusions**

92. The Review Team is convinced that if the ECA subregional institutions are to play an effective role in the development process, their mandate needs to be revised and that they should be reorganized and transformed into ECA-STAPs along the proposals made in this chapter. In this connection, the Review Team has recommended the abolition of the MULPOC legislative organs, as these have been found to be duplicating those of ECA and IGOs and are increasingly becoming irrelevant. The new ECA-STAP is perceived as the ECA subregional office with its legislating mandate emanating directly from the ECA Conference of Ministers. In addition, the inputs by governments of the subregion in multinational programming will be assured through the new functional relationship with the IGOs.

93. Therefore, it is recommended that the new arrangement should have highly competent and experienced staff capable of responding effectively to the priority programmes of the subregions. To this end, the Review Teams feels strongly that every effort be made to provide the new ECA-STAPs with a "core staff" below which they cannot effectively function and respond to the needs of the Member States.

94. Based on the experience of the MULPOC over the years, and on the series of the reviews and studies conducted in the past, the Review Team recommends that the regrouping of the existing MULPOCs into six new ECA-STAPs should be seriously considered as this would be extremely beneficial and is a step in the right direction. This regrouping would facilitate contacts with governments and IGOs, as this would provide for greater participation of IGOs in the work programme of the ECA-STAPs, than is possible under the present arrangements, thereby ensuring greater co-ordination and avoidance of duplication.
CHAPTER VI
HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

General background

95. As has become evident from the two preceding chapters, the inadequacy of resources at the disposal of the MULPOCs has been the biggest obstacle in fulfilling their mandate. This matter is largely historical and it also relates to the resources allocation policy of the United Nations itself. It seems clear to the Review Team that decisions on MULPOC resources were made in an ad hoc manner in that there was no systematic study and analysis made of the resources that were critically essential to ensure that the MULPOCs would make the necessary impact on the Member States.

96. The four ECA subregional offices, which had by 1966 been established in the North, Central, West, Southern and Eastern African subregions were funded from the United Nations regular budget. The Review Team was unable to obtain information on the composition of staffing and non-staff resources of the subregional offices at that time. The UNDATs and MULPOCs, which were subsequently established, were funded by UNDP. The funding of the MULPOCs by UNDP during 1977-1982 amounted approximately to $9.3 million, including $450,000 for consultancy and ad hoc expert meetings and $1.1 million for official travel.

Table 2 shows the existing MULPOC resources which were made available by ECA based on 1988-1989 allotments. The five MULPOCs have presently 31 professional posts of which eight are at L levels and 45 general service and support staff posts. The Review Team confirms that the existing staffing and those non-staff resources are grossly inadequate to place the MULPOC in a position where they can make any meaningful impact on the development process of the countries concerned.

Resources requirements

98. Table 4 shows the resources required by the new ECA-STAPs. Significant increase in resources is recommended in order to make the new ECA subregional institutions more effective. Table 5 shows the increase in the number of the staff of the six ECA-STAPs from 31 professional and above category posts and L-levels to 64. The general service and other support staff would correspondingly increased from 45 to 74. The existing non-staff resources are also to be significantly increased from $934,400 to $2,108,500. In proposing the level of funding shown in Table 4, and the additional staffing in Table 5, the Review Team has considered the following as the basis for its recommendation:

(a) The priorities established by the Member States, as shown in Table 3 and provision made for at least one professional or L-level expert staff to cover each of the priorities identified at the ECA-STAPs. This creates a minimum "core staff" needed with the requisite expertise, without which the subregional arrangements of ECA can hardly really operate and effectively respond to the needs of the Member States. The provision for 74 general service and support staff is made on the basis of generally accepted criteria of 1 to 3 ratio for secretarial staff (except in the case of the Director) and for the other support staff on the basis of requirements of drivers, guards, cleaner/messengers.

(b) The expenditures involved in the establishment of the six ECA/STAPs as follows:
(i) Temporary assistance for meetings: (for servicing ad hoc expert group meetings)

(ii) General temporary assistance: provision is made for 18 work-months (w/m) to cover peak periods (6 w/m) and maternity, extended sick leaves and leave without pay (12 w/m);

(iii) Consultancy and ad hoc expert meetings: provision is made for at least 6 w/m of consultancy (including travels) and two ad hoc expert meetings to respond to new and urgent requests by member States or to hold meetings of governments' experts to address such issues;

(iv) Overtime: to provide for a minimum need of approximately 40 hours of overtime during peak work periods;

(v) Official Travel: provision is made to make each staff of the ECA-STAPS to be able to visit each of the constituent Member States at least once a year. The assumption is that on one trip, a staff member would visit, at least three countries and spend at least five working days in each country. This will enable the ECA-STAPS to effectively respond to governments' requests for technical assistance and advisory services.

(vi) Contractual services: provision is made for external printing and publications as well as the preparation and distribution of information kits on the work of the ECA/STAPs;

(vii) General operating expenses: this item is estimated on the basis of current rate of expenditure, taking into account the required to upgrade the level of the various services needed for maintenance of premises, equipment and vehicles ($213,000); provision is also made for a token hospitality fund ($500) for each ECA/STAP. Communications is an essential element of expenditure ($135,000) in the execution of the ECA/STAP work programme. An estimate for supplies of new stationery and subscriptions to periodicals and miscellaneous items ($84,500) is included; and

(viii) Equipment: provision is made for the acquisition of new equipment and for replacements estimated at $737,000 for all ECA-STAPs. It is proposed to provide each ECA-STAP with new telex machines and improved telephone systems. ($556,000). Provision is also made for the purchase of new vehicles or replacement of old ones for each of the ECA-STAPs based on their needs.

Source of funding

99. The requirements set out in Table 4 can be met from the following sources:

(a) The regular budget of the United Nations by means of redeployment of resources from Sections 13 and 24, and by requesting and justifying additional resources from the General Assembly;

(b) UNDP through its regional IPF for experts to render advisory services to governments in strengthening their management capability in executing multinational development programmes and projects;
(c) Increased execution of operational activities by ECA and the ECA-STAPs will provide additional resources in programme support costs (overhead) reimbursement. This could be used by ECA for technical advisory and administrative support to backstop project implementation.

(d) Increased contribution to the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development (UNTRFD) which serves as a source of additional finance programmes and activities.

(e) The ADB, the World Bank Group, and other multilateral and bilateral donors should be solicited through, _inter alia_, the presentation of more viable programmes and projects.

100. The Review Team believes that the ECA management has a formidable task to accomplish in the reorganization of the new subregional decentralization process as recommended in this report.

Findings and Conclusion

101. It became evident to the Review Team that the resources made available to the MULPOCs, both human and financial, have been grossly inadequate. This constitutes the single most important obstacle in the fulfilment of their mandate. This scarcity of resources has been aggravated by the withdrawal of UNDP funding of the MULPOCs in 1982, as well as the lack of interest by the donor community.

102. Therefore, the Review Team strongly recommends that serious consideration should be given to providing adequate resources as shown in table 5, on a more predictable basis to enable the ECA-STAPs to execute their new mandate. The additional resources required, which are minimal by United Nations standard, consist of only 33 posts at the professional level and above and at levels: 63 general service and other support staff; and about US$ 1,565,100 for non staff resources. The established posts and common staff costs are excluded from these calculations.
Table 2: Human Resources for Biennium: 1988-1989

(A) Staffing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Niamey</th>
<th>Tangier/ North Af.</th>
<th>Gisenyi/ Grt/Lks</th>
<th>Yaounde/ Central Af.</th>
<th>Lusaka/ East/South</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Professional and above and expert level staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) L. staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/4</td>
<td>-1b</td>
<td>1b/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: P+L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) General Services and other Support Staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS - P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS - O</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*b</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a(1) D/1 and (1) GSO posts to be abolished by 31.12.1989 as a result of retrenchment policy of the UN.

b(2) L/4 outposted to MULPOCs from ECA for convenience for civil registration project of the region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Niamey/</th>
<th>Tangiers/</th>
<th>Gisenyi/</th>
<th>Yaounde</th>
<th>Lusaka/</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established posts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary assistance meetings</td>
<td>78,400</td>
<td>78,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>234,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General temporary assistance</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>58,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy and ad hoc experts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common staff costs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>192,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>88,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>77,100</td>
<td>74,170</td>
<td>47,240</td>
<td>48,360</td>
<td>56,850</td>
<td>303,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of equipment</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246,300</td>
<td>225,870</td>
<td>110,240</td>
<td>138,460</td>
<td>213,550</td>
<td>934,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: ECA-STAP’s Priorities and Staff Requirements a/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities identified by Member States</th>
<th>&quot;Core&quot; professional staff required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western African ECA-STAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(one) Hydrologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>(one) Livestock expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>(one) Fishery expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agronomist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Industrial economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and monetary affairs</td>
<td>(one) Financial and monetary affairs expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>(one) Trade economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>(one) Transport economist (surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development planning</td>
<td>(one) Development Economist (planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources (training)</td>
<td>(one) Human resources expert (in training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central African ECA-STAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agricultural economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>(one) Trade economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and monetary affairs</td>
<td>(one) Expert in finance and monetary affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>(one) Energy expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>(one) Transport economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Industrial economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development (women in development)</td>
<td>(one) Social development expert (women in development specialist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(one) Hydrologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern African ECA-STAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agricultural economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-economic analysis</td>
<td>(one) Development economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Industrial economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources</td>
<td>(one) Mining Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(one) Hydrologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>(one) Transport economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and monetary affairs</td>
<td>(one) Financial and monetary affairs expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>(one) Trade economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources development</td>
<td>(one) Manpower development expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>(one) Specialist in women in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology</td>
<td>(one) Scientific expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities identified by Member States&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>&quot;Core&quot; professional staff required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) North African ECA-STAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic planning</td>
<td>(one) Development economist (planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agricultural economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>(one) Maritime transport expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Trade economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>(one) Environment expert on marine life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration of workers</td>
<td>(Consultants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Western African ECA-STAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(one) Hydrologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>(one) Livestock expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>(one) Fishery expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agronomist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Industrial Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and monetary affairs</td>
<td>(one) Finance and monetary affairs expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>(one) Trade economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>(one) Transport economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development planning</td>
<td>(one) Development economist (planner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources (training)</td>
<td>(one) Human resources expert (with skill in training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Eastern African ECA-STAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-economic analysis</td>
<td>(one) Development economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>(one) Agricultural economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>(one) Industrial economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources</td>
<td>(one) Mining engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(one) Hydrologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>(one) Transport economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and monetary affairs</td>
<td>(one) Finance and monetary affairs expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources development</td>
<td>(one) Manpower development expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>(one) Women in development expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology</td>
<td>(one) Scientific expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> These priorities are based on the decisions of the policy organs of the IGOs and are not given in any ranking order.
Table 4: Summary of ECA-STAPs Staffing and Non-Staff Requirements
Based on Identified Programme Priorities

(A) Staffing Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mid-West Africa</th>
<th>West Africa</th>
<th>North Africa</th>
<th>Central Africa</th>
<th>Southern Africa</th>
<th>East Africa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional and above and Expert Level Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (i)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) General services and other support staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GSP</th>
<th>GSO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (ii)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (i)+(ii)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of countries

| COVERED | 7     | 8     | 7     | 9     | 11*   | 10    | 51*   |

*Includes Namibia
### Table 4: (cont’d)

#### (B) Other Non-Staff Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established posts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To be computed on the basis of current standard costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary assistance for meetings</strong></td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>391,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General temporary assistance</strong></td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultancy and ad hoc experts</strong></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overtime</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common staff costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To be computed on the basis of current standard costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>488,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual services</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>90,500</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>435,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition of equipment</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>156,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>737,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Non-post</strong></td>
<td>387,700</td>
<td>461,700</td>
<td>347,700</td>
<td>362,500</td>
<td>464,700</td>
<td>475,200</td>
<td>2,499,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Comparison Between Resources made Available and "Core" Resources to be made Available to ECA-STAPs

(A) STAFFING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource made available for 1988-1989</th>
<th>Proposed resources</th>
<th>Additional requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Professional and above and expert level staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (i)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) General Service and other Support Staff Level

- Principal 3 6 3
- Other 41 68 27

Total: (ii) 44 74 30

Grand total (i) + (ii) 75 138 63

(B) OTHER NON-STAFF RESOURCES: (in "000" of US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1988-1989</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary assistance for meetings</td>
<td>234.7</td>
<td>391.0</td>
<td>156.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General temporary assistance</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy and ad hoc experts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>270.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>488.0</td>
<td>296.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>303.7</td>
<td>435.5</td>
<td>131.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of equipment</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>679.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

934.4 2,499.5 1,565.1
CHAPTER VII

STRATEGY FOR IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

103. The implementation of the measures recommended in this Report requires a strict programme of monitoring and evaluation. It is important to establish some form of accountability in this respect. Therefore, this Report recommends several levels of responsibility that need to be taken in order to establish and strengthen the new ECA-STAPs so as to enable them to have significant impact on the process of subregional co-operation and integration.

(a) Action by the ECA secretariat

104. The ECA Executive Secretary should consider re-deployment of selected staff with qualifications and expertise matching the identified priorities of the subregions to be assigned to the new ECA-STAPs. In this exercise, the Review Team stresses that what is of paramount importance is the quality of technical assistance services to be provided to the Member States by the ECA-STAPs. It is also proposed that a review of the qualifications and expertise of the present staff in the MULPOCs should be made as a matter of urgency and re-assignments should be carried out so as to begin the process of equipping ECA-STAPs with well-qualified personnel.

105. The Review Team feels that it should be possible for the ECA as executing agency, to increase the level of its operational activities and hence resources from programme support costs from the UNDP and other funding agencies. These would provide additional resources to finance technical and administrative backstopping in the execution of multinational projects.

106. In order to make this exercise successful, the ECA substantive Divisions and support services should be instructed to provide full support to the multinational programming activities and the technical advisory services of the ECA-STAPs. Furthermore, new policy guidance should be developed to provide modalities for closer and more effective co-ordination of the ECA's regional activities with those carried out at the subregional level by the ECA-STAPs.

(b) The UNDP Funding for the ECA-STAPs

107. Within the framework of the new UNDP regional programming structures, a provision should be made to resume funding to the ECA-STAPs, as part of its overall technical assistance programmes at the subregional level. UNDP should be requested to provide an adequate number of senior experts/advisers for each ECA-STAP starting with the next programming cycle. During the present cycle all, effort should be made to provide short-term advisory and/or consultancy services to Member States through ECA-STAPs in technical co-operation programmes. To this end, ECA, in consultation with UNDP, should develop a viable project document for this purpose. In view of the increasing importance attached to the role of women in African development, UNDP should be requested to consider providing sufficient resources, through UNIFEM, for the implementation of women's programmes in the ECA-STAPs. This is in line with UNDP's policy for world development by the year 2000 (DP/1989/14) of 9 May 1989.

(c) The United Nations General Assembly

108. The United Nations General Assembly should consider appropriating additional posts to strengthen the ECA-STAPs to at least the level of the "core staff"
recommended in this Report. Such additional resources could, among other things, be provided under Section 13 of the ECA budget and Section 24, United Nations Programme for Technical Assistance. This would enable the new institution to become fully operational and to undertake technical assistance support and advisory services for multinational programming.

(d) Support by African Governments

109. In line with their commitment to subregional co-operation and integration, the African Governments should support the ECA-STAPs through greater contributions to the UNTFAD than has hitherto been the case. They should also consider increasing other contributions in kind and as well as the secondment of their nationals with requisite expertise to the ECA-STAPs to assist in the implementation of multinational programmes and activities.

e) Support for the ECA-STAPs by the Organizations of the United Nations System

110. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/197, Annex VII, paragraph 52 c, on restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, the organizations of the United Nations system are requested to give due recognition and provide support to the ECA-STAPs. They should also be requested to intensify their efforts in developing co-operation and, where possible, joint planning and execution with the ECA-STAPs’ in their multinational programmes and activities.

The Implementation Time-Frame

111. It is fully recognized that the transformation of MULPOCs into fully operational and more effective ECA-STAPs would have to be achieved over a period of time. However, the process of re-assignment of ECA staff to the new ECA-STAPs and the new co-operative arrangements with the organizations of the United Nations system could start immediately. It is important to note that in this process sufficient time should be allowed to ensure that existing programmes of ECA and other United Nations agencies in the region are appropriately adjusted. It is therefore plausible to envisage such an exercise extending over at least two programme budget periods i.e 1990/1991 and 1992/1993.

112. With regard to the UNDP and bearing in mind that the current programming cycle is already underway, it can only be expected that any new allocations to ECA-STAPs might be made initially from “unprogrammed” funds and savings rather than new allocations. However, the Review Team recommends that serious consideration be given in the next programming cycle to a significant increase in the allocation of resources to support the technical assistance activities in the multinational programmes and projects of the African region through the ECA-STAPs.

113. The General Assembly on its part, might wish to consider appropriating a number of “temporary posts” during the 1990-1991 budget period, through revised budget estimates. However, in the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993, the General Assembly could allocate the required posts and other resources to the ECA-STAPs.

Follow-up

114. Following consideration of this report by the General Assembly, the ECA Executive Secretary should be requested to establish a mechanism for monitoring and
evaluation of the performance of the ECA-STAPs. He should, following considerations with all parties involved in the implementation of these recommendations, submit annually a progress report to ECOSOC through the ECA Conference of Ministers.

115. The Secretary General of the United Nations in turn should be requested to submit annual reports to the General Assembly on the implementation and follow-up of the recommendations contained in this Report.
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311 (XIII), Multinational Programming and Operational Centres

The Conference of Ministers.

Having examined the report of the Conference of African Planners on its sixth session,

Recognizing that subregional and sectoral integration constitute the foundation for the establishment of a regional common market,

Conscious of the urgent need to mobilize additional financial resources from within and outside Africa for the effective implementation of the Commission's subregional programmes.

1. Decides to set up a number of Multinational Programming and Operational Centres to replace the United Nations Multinational Interdisciplinary Development Advisory Teams;

2. Requests the Executive Secretary, as a matter of priority, to take immediate steps to apply in respect of the Centres the recommendations of the Evaluation Mission dispatched by the United Nations Development Programme and the Economic Commission for Africa to examine the United Nations Development Advisory Teams in Africa regarding:

(a) The strengthening of existing Teams;

(b) The creation of four additional Teams, taking into account the considerations set out in paragraph 53 of the report:

(c) The integration of the Teams' work programmes with the Commission's work programme, so that the Teams may become the operational arms of the Commission:

(d) The subsequent phasing out of the Commission's subregional offices;

(e) The establishment of policy organs at the ministerial and expert levels to develop and supervise the technical and administrative activities of each UNDAT;

3. Further decides:

(a) That the groups of countries to be served by each Centre should be according to the attached list, as recommended by the Mission and endorsed by the Conference of African Planners;

(b) That the list may be revised in future, as considered appropriate and necessary by the supervisory policy organs of the Centres;

(c) That for the Central African Centre (Yaounde) and the new Central African Centre (Burundi, Rwanda and Zaire) a Council of Ministers and a Committee of Officials should be created in each case as soon as possible;

(d) That a meeting of officials of member States of the North African subregion should be convened as soon as possible to consider, inter alia, the
creation of policy organs for the supervision of the North African Centre, and to submit recommendations to member States;

4. **Recommends** that the policy organs for the two West African Centres (Niamey and the other Centre to be created) should be the Ministerial Council of the Economic Community of West African States and its appropriate Committee of Officials;

5. **Further requests** the Executive Secretary, in co-operation with the Executive Secretary of the Economic Community of West African States, to enter into consultations with member States of the Community for the implementation of the recommendation in paragraph 4 above;

6. **Further decides:**

   (a) That beginning from 1977, the chairmen of the Councils of Ministers and Committees of Officials of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres should meet annually, at meetings to be convened by the Executive Secretary;

   (b) That the chairmen of the supervisory bodies of the Centres should participate *ex officio* in the meetings of the Executive Committee of the Commission;

7. **Urges** the Secretary-General of the United Nations to give priority to Africans in filling the posts of the Centres, and particularly the posts of Team Leader, in accordance with Conference resolution 259 (XII) on staff and administrative questions;

8. **Expresses** gratitude to the United Nations Development Programmes for providing financial resources for the maintenance of the Development Advisory Team programme in 1976, and for agreeing to provide financial assistance until 1981;

9. **Appeals** to the Administrator of the Programme to expand the resources made available to the Commission for the establishment and operation of the Centres, as soon as circumstances permit;

10. **Invites** the African Development Bank, the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa and the other similar multinational and regional development finance institutions to co-operate with the Executive Secretary of the Commission in the mobilization of financial resources for the implementation of projects prepared by the Centres;

11. **Stresses** the need for member States to give special consideration to the resource requirements of the Centres in accordance with Conference resolution 288 (XIII) on the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Commission's medium-term plans for 1976-1981 and 1982-1986.

---

193rd meeting
1 March 1977
Having considered the financial reports and audited financial statements of the United Nations, including the International Trade Centre and the United Nations University, for the biennium ended 31 December 1987, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, the voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Fund of the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, all for the year ended 31 December 1987, and the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation for the biennium ended 31 December 1987, and the audit opinions and reports of the Board of Auditors and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions,

Having also considered the Board’s report on its expanded audit of the financial report and accounts of the United Nations Children’s Fund for the year ended 31 December 1986,

Recognizing the progress made in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 42/306 of 11 December 1987,

Noting with concern that the Board of Auditors, for the reasons stated in its reports, issued qualified audit opinions on the financial statements of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund, and also issued qualified audit opinions on compliance with the Financial Regulations and legislative authority on the transactions of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the International Trade Centre,

Noting also with concern the delay in the issuance of the Board’s reports at the Forty-third session of the General Assembly,

Taking into consideration the views expressed by delegations, by the Board of Auditors, by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and by representatives of the United Nations organizations and programmes during the debate in the Fifth Committee on this item, and the widely expressed support for measures to improve the efficiency, management, financial accountability and budgetary control of the United Nations organizations and programmes concerned,

Recognizing that the qualifications on the certification of programme expenditures in the audit opinions on the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund accounts are technical in nature and require co-ordinated action by the administrations and governing bodies of the Programme and the Fund and the executing agencies concerned,
1. **Accepts** the financial reports and audited financial statements and the audit opinions and reports of the Board of Auditors regarding the aforementioned organizations;

2. **Requests** the governing bodies of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the International Trade Centre to require the executive heads concerned to take immediate steps within their competence to correct the situations or conditions that gave rise to the qualification of audit opinions of the Board of Auditors;

3. **Urges** the panel of external auditors, administrations, governing bodies of the executing agencies and other relevant parties concerned to solve the problem with regard to the certification of programme expenditures executed and reported by United Nations executing agencies in co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme as well as with the United Nations Population Fund;

4. **Endorses** the concurring observations and recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as contained in their respective reports, duly taking into account the divergent views expressed in the Fifth Committee on the question of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres and the Pan-African Documentation and Information System;

5. **Requests** the competent governing bodies to ensure that the executive heads concerned take necessary steps on a priority basis to implement the recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as contained in their respective reports, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session;

6. **Also requests** the Secretary-General and the executive heads of United Nations organizations and programmes concerned to take without delay appropriate measures within their competence in light of the comments, observations and recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, including those relating to financial reporting, budgetary controls, unliquidated obligations, cash management, trust funds, and hiring of consultants, experts and temporary assistance, and to report to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, through the governing bodies of these organizations and programmes;

7. **Further requests** the Secretary-General and the executive heads of United Nations organizations and programmes concerned to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, through the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, specific measures taken to implement previous recommendations of the Board of Auditors, and also requests the Board and the Advisory Committee to evaluate the efficacy of those measures;

8. **Recommends** that all future reports of the Board of Auditors continue to include separate sections that summarize recommendations for corrective action to be taken by the organizations and programmes concerned, with an indication of relative urgency;

9. **Further recommends** that the Board of Auditors continue to submit to the General Assembly a concise document summarizing its principal findings.
conclusions and recommendations of common interest, classified by audit area
and, where appropriate, identifying the audited organization:

10. **Requests** the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on
Administrative and Budgetary Questions to continue to cover in their reviews
of the organizations and programmes, including peace-keeping operations, the
areas relating to the efficiency and effectiveness of the financial procedures
and controls, the accounting system and related administrative and management
areas, in accordance with regulation 12.5 of the Financial Regulations of the
United Nations, and to recommend measures, as appropriate, to strengthen
financial and management controls;

11. **Also requests** the Board of Auditors to study the desirability and
feasibility of conducting its reviews as stipulated in regulation 12.5 of the
Financial Regulations of the United Nations in a more comprehensive manner and
to report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session;

12. **Stresses** the need to standardize the presentation and format of
financial statements and accounting policies among United Nations
organizations and programmes;

13. **Requests** the Secretary-General and the executive heads of United
Nations organizations and programmes and other relevant entities, in
consultation with the Board of Auditors, to explore the possibility of
standardizing the presentation and format of financial statement and
accounting policies of all audited organizations and programmes, taking into
account previous relevant studies, and to report with proposals thereon to the
General Assembly at its forty-fourth session;

14. **Invites** the administrations of the United Nations, the United
Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Population Fund to review
their accounting policy with respect to unliquidated obligations taking into
account generally accepted accounting principles;

15. **Requests** the Secretary-General to reflect the results of the
reorganization of the United Nations Postal Administration, as well as the
status of implementation of the Board of Auditors’ recommendations, in the
proposed budget for the biennium 1990-1991;

16. **Invites** Governments that are represented on the governing bodies
of organizations and programmes for which audited financial statements have
been considered by the General Assembly to ensure that full consideration is
given to the reports of the reports of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory
Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the comments made
thereon by the Fifth Committee;

17. **Encourages** governing bodies of organizations and programmes to
invite a representative of the Board of Auditors to be present at their
meetings when considering the reports of the Board;

18. **Underlines** the importance of an effective internal audit function
in the organizations and programmes reported on, and requests the Secretary-
General and the executive heads of United Nations organizations and programmes
concerned to ensure that their respective internal audit units carry out
follow-up audit work to assess the corrective action taken by the
administrations in response to the main recommendations of the Board of
Auditors:
19. Requests the Board of Auditors and the concerned administrations to co-operate and ensure that all reports under this item are issued in time in accordance with existing rules.
ANNEX III

LIST OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED BY THE REVIEW TEAM

NIGER

1. Government Officials

a) Ministry of Planning
   - Dr. Tounkara Yahaya, Minister of State for Planning
   - Mrs. Hama, Director of Economic Analysis and Planning

b) Ministry of Water and Animal Resources
   - Dr. Mazou Ibrahim, Secretary General
   - Director of Programming

c) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
   - Mr. Sandi Yacouba, Secretary of State for Co-operation

d) Ministry of Trade, Industry and Handicraft
   - Mr. Ali Sabo, Minister of Trade, Industry and Handicraft

BURKINA FASO

1. Government officials

a) Ministry of Plan and Co-operation
   - Mr. Youssouf Ouedraogo, Minister of Plan and Co-operation
   - Mr. Cyrille Karfo Talato, Civil Servant in charge of Transport

b) Ministry of Livestock
   - Mr. Ambroise T. Nitiema, Director of Animal Production and Industries
   - Dr. Abou Bado, Department of Animal Health

2. Intergovernmental Organizations

a) Inter-State Committee for Combatting Drought in Sahel (CILSS)
   - Mr. Michel Koutaba, Director of Projects and Programmes
   - Mr. Ibrahim Camara, Director of Surveys and Planning

b) Liptako - Gourma Authority
   - Mr. Silimane Ganoua, Director General
Mr. Mahamane Kabaou, Chief, Division of Communication Infrastructures
- Mr. Cheick Abdel Kader Keita, Chief, Division of Water, Energy and Mines
- Mr. Andre Kabore, Chief, Division of Documentation and Information
- Mr. Alphonse Bonou, Chief, Agriculture and Livestock Division
- Mr. Philippe Ouedraogo, Mining Engineer
- Mr. Albert Kikietta, Hydrogeologist

c) Communauté économique de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (CEAO) (Economic Community of West Africa)
- Mr. Mohamed Abdellahi Ould Mohamed Ahmed, Deputy Secretary-General
- Mr. Maina Ari Adji Kirgam, Director, Industrial Development
- Mr. Modibo Boly, Economic Adviser
- Mr. Sereme Moussa, Chief, Agricultural Development Division
- Mr. Bruno Kafando, Chief, Trade Promotion Division
- Mr. Abdoulaye H. Sow, CAF

3. International Organizations

UNDP
- Mr. Christopher Metcalf, Resident Representative
- Mr. Bernard Ntegeye, Deputy Resident Representative
- Mrs Agnes Guimba, Assistant Resident Representative for Programme

MALI

1. Government Officials

a) Ministry of Plan
- Mr. Seydou Honzon Traore, Chef de Cabinet
- Mr. Diallo, Director of Planning

b) Ministry of Livestock and Environment
- Mr. Foutiko Sako, Technical Advisor

c) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Chef de cabinet.
SENEGAL

1. Government officials
   a) Ministry of Plan and Co-operation
      - Mr. Cheikh Kane, Directeur de Cabinet
      - Mr. Baba Top, Director of Planning
      - Mrs. Salimata S. Dembele, Chief, Sectoral Policies and Project Evaluation Division
   b) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
      - Mr. Aliou Diagne, Director of Economic and Technical Affairs

2. Intergovernmental Organizations
   a) African Centre for Monetary Studies
      - Mr. Andrew K. Mullei, Director General
   b) Organisation de mise en valeur du fleuve Senegal (OMVS) (Organization for Senegal River Development)
      - Mr. Sidi Ould Ahmed Deya, Secretary General

3. International organizations
   UNDP
      - Mr. Salif Ndiaye, Resident Representative
      - Mrs. N. Asanga, Assistant Resident Representative for Programme

MOROCCO

1. Government Officials
   a) Tangier Province
      - Secretary General of the Province
   b) Ministry of Agriculture
      - Mrs. Benchekh, Director of Multilateral Agricultural Co-operation.
   c) Ministry of Planning
      - Mr. Ahmed Amani, Deputy Director of Planning
d) **Ministry of Transport**
- Mr. Hamza Ottmani, Director of Transport Studies, Planning and Coordination

e) **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**
- Mr. Ahmed El Ouardi, Director of Multilateral Co-operation.

2. **Heads of Diplomatic Missions**
- Mr. Sanhouri, Ambassador of the Republic of the Sudan to Morocco
- Mr. Mounir Zahrane, Ambassador of the Arab Republic of Egypt to Morocco

3. **International Organizations**

**UNDP**
- Mr. Samith Chacra, Deputy Resident Representative

**RWANDA**

1. **Ministry of Foreign Affairs**
- Mr. Jean Damascene Bizimana, Secretary General

**Ministry of Interior**
- Mr. Celestin Gahamanyi, Director General of People’s Education and Social Affairs, in Charge of Women’s advancement
- Mrs. Mukariyanga Landrada

**Ministry of Plan**
- Mr. Callixte Nzabonimana, Minister of Plan

2. **Intergovernmental Organizations**

Communaute économique des pays des Grands Lacs (CEPGL)
- Mr. Antoine Nduwayo, Executive Secretary
- Mr. Vital Barkuwunguka, Director of Economic Development programmes.

3. **International Organizations**

**UNDP**
- Mrs. Wane, Deputy Resident Representative
Mr. Blaise Essomba Ngoua, Ministry of Plan, Cameroon

Mr. Gerges Tchovmkev, Assistant Director, Ministry of Plan, Cameroon

e) Gisenyi-based MULPOC

- Mr. Callixte Nzabolimana, Minister of Plan, Rwanda
- Mr. Salvator Sahinguvu, Secretary of State for Plan
- Mr. Jean-Marie Vianney Ndagijimana, Ambassador of Rwanda to Ethiopia
- Mr. Mbala Mwambila-Bantu, Acting Charge d’Affaires of Zaire, Addis Ababa

African Regional Co-ordinating Committee for Women’s advancement (ARCC)
(List)

CAMEROON

1. Government Officials

a) Ministry of Plan

- Mr. Ndanga Ndunga, Secretary of State for Plan
- Mr. J. M. Oyono, Secretary General of the Ministry of Planning
- Mr. G. Tchuenkam, Charge d’etudes assistant
- Ms. Claudine Bahiya, Cadre at the Directorate of Economic and Technical Co-operation

b) Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- Mr. G.L. Sao, Director for International Organizations and Multinational Co-operation
- Mr. G. Byakolo Byakolo, Chief, South-South Co-operation Service

c) Ministry of Trade and Industry

- Mr. Maurice Edjenguele, Secretary General of the Ministry of Trade and Industry
- Ms. Marguerite M. Etock, Assistant Director
- Mr. Felix Fotso, Chief of Service

d) Ministry of Agriculture

- Mr. Pierre Kouang, Deputy Director, Department of Studies and Projects
- Mr. Anthony Ngenge Mawa, Chief, Division of Studies

e) Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications
- Mr. Maurice Bayemi, Director of Posts
- Mr. Francois Wakimi, Director of Telecommunications
- Mr. Dieudome Tchimkap, Assistant Director for Regulations and International Affairs, Department of Posts

f) Ministry of Transport and Public Works
- Mr. Joseph Simo, Charge d'études

2. Intergovernmental organizations
a) Bank of Central African States (BEAC)
- Mr. Jean-Edouard Sathoud, Vice-Governor
- Mr. J.B. Assiga Ahanda, Director, Department of Studies

b) Institute for Training and Research in Demography (IFORD)
- Mr. M. Sala-Diakanda, Director

c) Conference des Administrations des postes et telecommunications d'Afrique centrale (CAPTAC)
- Mr. Ahmed Mahamat Saker, Chief Accountant, Acting Executive Secretary
- Mr. Pascal Okombi Yoka, Chief, Administration and Finance Service

3. International Organizations
UNDP
- Mr. Paolo Coppini, UNDP Resident Representative

GABON
1. Government officials
a) Ministry of Planning and Economy
- Mr. Emmanuel N'Kiet, Advisor to the Minister

b) Ministry for the Promotion of Women
- Mrs Marie Onkra, Deputy Director General
- Mrs Beatrix Ratanga, Advisor to the Minister
- Mrs Marie-Agnes Mouely Koumba, Director for Women's Condition
Mrs. Yvette Owanga, Advisor
Mr. Christian Quentin, Advisor to the Director General
Mr. Julian Mouvoungou, Chief, Guidance Service

2. Intergovernmental Organizations

Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)
- Prof. Lunda Bululu, Secretary General
- Mr. Robert Naah, Deputy Secretary General for Economic, Social, Cultural and Scientific Affairs
- Mr. Simon Yannou, Director, Department of Transport

International Organizations

UNDP
- Mr. Ousmane Sylla, Deputy Resident Representative

ZAMBIA

1. Government officials

a) Cabinet Office
- Mr. Siteke Mwale, Principal Advisor to the Government on Regional Co-operation

b) Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives
- Mr. M.C. Soko, Deputy Director of Planning

c) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr. F.F. Bwalya, Deputy Permanent Secretary
- Mr. James Mbewe, Economist

d) National Commission for Development Planning
- Mr. M.S. Mwale, Director (ETC)

e) Ministry of Commerce and Industry
- Mr. M. Imakanda, Economist

g) Ministry of Finance
- Hon. Gibson G. Chigaga, Minister of Finance and National Commission for Development Planning
2. **Heads of Diplomatic Missions of Member States of the Lusaka based MULPOC accredited to Zambia**

- Mr. P. Sekwababe, Acting High Commissioner, Botswana High Commission
- Mr. Jack B. Tumwa, High Commissioner, Kenya High Commission
- Mr. Tembo, High Commissioner, Malawi High Commission
- Mr. O. Elija, Third Secretary, Mozambique Embassy
- Mr. Lugoe, High Commissioner, Tanzania High Commission
- Mr. V.K. Baguma, Acting High Commissioner, Uganda High Commission
- Mr. Mtetwa, High Commissioner, Zimbabwe High Commission

3. **Intergovernmental Organizations**

**Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern African States (PTA)**

- Mr. Zewde Demissie, Director of Trade, Customs and Monetary Affairs
- Mr. G. Walusiku, Director of Administration
- Dr. P. Ramsamy, Senior Trade Expert

4. **International Organizations**

   a) **UNDP**

   - Mr. Alieu Sallah, UNDP Resident Representative

   b) **ILO**

   - Mr. Kenneth E. Andoh, Director of ILO Office

   c) **FAO**

   - Mr. S. Wadda, FAO Resident Representative

**Botswana**

1. **Government Officials**

   a) **Ministry of Finance and Development Finance**

   - Mr. S.G. Tumelo, Chief Economist (Projects)
   - Mr. G.N. Thipe, Chief Economist (Contingencies)
   - Ms M. Nthebolan, Planning Officer
b) Ministry of Commerce and Industry
   - Mr. E.J. Matenge, Acting Permanent Secretary
   - Mrs N.M. Dambe, Senior Commercial Officer
   - Mrs. M. Nthomiwa, Commercial Officer

c) Ministry of External Affairs
   - Mr. S. Mpuchane, Permanent Secretary
   - Mr. D. M. Moremi, External Affairs Officer

2. Ministry of Agriculture
   - Mr. T. Taukobong, Acting Permanent Secretary

International Organizations

UNDP
   - Mr. F. Tissot, UNDP Resident Representative
   - Mr. P. Sweeney, Assistant Resident Representative (Programme)
   - Mr. Oriani Vieyra, Programme Officer

MAURITIUS

1. Government Officials
   a) Ministry of Planning
      - Mr. Sibartie, Senior Economist
      - Mr. Purusram Ujoodha, Principal Economist

   b) Ministry of Trade
      - Mr. Jacques R. Rosalie, Permanent Secretary

   c) Ministry of Industry
      - Mr. P. Momith, Permanent Secretary

   d) Chamber of Commerce and Industry
      - Mr. Hamid Jhumka, Economist

2. Intergovernmental Organizations

Indian Ocean Commission
   - Mr. Pulton, Administrative Assistant
3. **International Organizations**

**UNDP**

Mrs. Asa Smedler, Deputy Resident Representative