

UNITED NATIONS  
DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMME



UNDP

DP/WGOC/32/Corr.1  
26 June 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GOVERNING COUNCIL  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON SUPPORT COSTS  
Fifth session  
June 1980

DRAFT REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON SUPPORT COSTS

Rapporteur: Miss Mariam AL-AWADHI (Kuwait)

Corrigendum

Page 1

Title of document: delete DRAFT

Paragraph 1, line 2: for 2-16 June read 2-25 June.

Paragraph 2: delete last sentence.

Page 4

Paragraph 11, last sentence: delete fullstop and add following text:  
"and one member reiterated the need to draw up a budget line in projects so  
that recipient countries could more clearly identify these costs."

Page 6

Paragraph 20, second sentence: Add paragraph number 21 and for Moreover,  
they agreed read Most members agreed

At the end of new paragraph 21, add following sentence: "One member  
stated that one could not prejudge negotiations between governments and  
Agencies on support costs components of funds-in-trust arrangements."

Renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Paragraph 24, line 1: between "regarded" and "as" insert by many members

Page 7, paragraph 27, should read:

27. In closing the debate many members again stressed that the principal  
focus of these discussions was directed towards over-all reduction of the  
high level of support costs as a whole, to be achieved by increased  
productivity in UNDP and the Agencies, and one member stated that the 13  
per cent formula was a first step in attaining a lower target of e.g. 12 per  
cent. One delegation, speaking on behalf of several members, further added  
that operating expenses for UNDP and the Agencies were extremely high and  
should be reduced to a minimum and that the administrative expenses of  
Agencies should be fully reimbursed without diverting resources from the  
regular budgets of the Agencies.

Some members again noted the importance of not charging the regular budgets of Agencies with any deficit which might result from reimbursement at the rate of 13 per cent. Others felt that the decision would serve to strengthen the UNDP-Agency partnership and that the 13 per cent formula, coupled with flexibility arrangements, would not result in a need to look to the regular budgets for support. The need to introduce a policy which would spell out more explicitly the definition of the support costs was noted as was the comment of one member that this small step on support costs was only part of larger UNDP-Agency issues to be resolved and that UNDP should initiate further consultations with Agencies on how to reduce over-all support costs as a whole.