

International Organizations and Programs



Congressional Presentation Fiscal Year 1987

United States International Development Cooperation Agency

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction.....	1
Summary Table.....	5
UN Development Program.....	6
UN Children's Fund.....	8
International Atomic Energy Agency.....	10
Organization of American States Development Assistance Programs.....	13
UN Environment Program.....	16
International Convention and Scientific Organization Contributions.....	18
World Meteorological Organization/ Voluntary Cooperation Program.....	21
UN Capital Development Fund.....	23
UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa.....	25
UN Development Fund for Women.....	27
UNIDO Investment Promotion Service.....	29
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.....	30
UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture.....	32

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS (IO&P)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
362.3	265.9	186.0

This appropriation will support certain voluntarily funded development, humanitarian, and scientific assistance programs of the United Nations (UN) and the Organization of American States (OAS). Implicit in the request is the recognition that multilateral organizations, by their very nature of interacting primarily with governments, are restricted in the overall development effort. Though they should not be viewed as the primary focus for development assistance activities in the Third World, they can play an important catalytic role. Expectations, however, must be limited as to what realistically can be achieved by the programs and activities.

The overriding need for austerity in the Federal budget has produced overall reduction in the funding level of the account. Some programs in this account directly serve specific U.S. interests (e.g., keeping track of weather patterns, nuclear non-proliferation). Others contribute indirectly to more generalized U.S. interests (e.g., our general interest in cooperating in the development process). An effort has been made to distribute the reduction in the account so as to (1) maintain funding levels for programs directly serving specific U.S. interests and (2) maintain an appropriate U.S. leadership role in programs serving more generalized U.S. interests.

Basic Interests

United States voluntary contributions to these UN and OAS programs provide the basis for U.S. efforts to improve the effectiveness and influence the substantive direction of them. U.S. contributions through this account:

- serve to advance American ideals and ideas affecting the evolution of the international system;
- provide tangible demonstration of American support for humanitarian activities;
- encourage the acceptance of international responsibilities by other nations;
- complement U.S. bilateral assistance programs, and serve U.S. purposes in areas too sensitive for, or outside the reach of, U.S. bilateral aid; and
- strengthen U.S. efforts to resist the expansion of technical assistance and other forms of program growth in the regular (assessed) budgets of international organizations.

Examples of benefits derived from U.S. contributions include:

--U.S. interests in nuclear non-proliferation are directly served by the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) worldwide safeguards program which is reinforced through U.S. voluntary contributions under this heading. In addition, many of these support activities are conducted largely in U.S. facilities.

--The UNIDO Investment Promotion Service brings together potential U.S. investors with investment opportunities in developing countries. It also provides training for developing country officials responsible for promoting foreign investment in their countries. Frequently this is their first exposure to the private sector in the United States, and through this exposure they go back home with a clearer idea of how free market economies aid the development process.

--World Meteorological Organization (WMO) efforts to strengthen the capacities of Central American and Caribbean states to monitor, collect, and disseminate weather data helps protect American lives and economic interests through improved forecasting of hurricanes and other tropical disturbances affecting the Gulf States.

--The UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) provides basic medical and educational assistance to children worldwide. It has played a major relief role in Kampuchea and is currently very active in providing emergency disaster assistance in Ethiopia and elsewhere in Africa.

--OAS technical assistance programs are an important development component of the organization's security and peacekeeping functions. The technical assistance programs are also closely integrated with development programs of other international organizations to achieve an optimum division of labor.

--The UN Development Program (UNDP), with projects in more than 150 countries and territories and an extensive technical assistance program, serves as a coordinating agency for technical assistance being provided by 35 Specialized Agencies and programs.

--Financing projects that are smaller than those usually considered by other multilateral or bilateral financial institutions, the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) helps recipients in the least developed countries to use improved appropriate technology in order to secure access to markets.

--The multilateral approach of the UN Environment Program (UNEP) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) is uniquely suited to dealing with global environmental problems which typically transcend national boundaries. CITES facilitates conservation and protects endangered species against over-exploitation through international trade. UNEP's ability to involve developing countries, especially in environmental protection efforts, is essential to the fundamental goal of preserving the global resource base.

--The International Convention and Scientific Organization Contributions facilitate continued U.S. participation in certain international scientific conventions and activities serving U.S. domestic interests which were funded through U.S. participation in UNESCC.

--The UN Development Fund for Women is unique in that it is the only UN development assistance activity specifically charged with helping women in developing nations. As such, it complements U.S. fulfillment of the amended Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 which calls for the integration of projects for women in U.S. foreign assistance.

--A U.S. contribution to the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa (UNEPTSA) provides tangible evidence of a U.S. commitment to peaceful change in Southern Africa while at the same time funding many recipient students attending schools in the United States.

Developing country governments often have a strong voice in determining the overall direction of the multilateral programs. This can encourage self-reliance, so long as the emphasis on the government's role does not discourage individual private initiative. Recipient country governments are required to provide substantial counterpart financing for these programs -- financing which encourages a sense of responsibility and accountability for their own development. This method of providing assistance can serve to enhance those internal factors required for ultimate success in the development effort if the structures developed encourage private sector development rather than are exclusively oriented toward the public sector. It also helps to promote more collaboration and less confrontation in donor-recipient relationships. Many recipient countries consequently consider multilateral assistance programs as acceptable means for stimulating internal policy reforms and even permit UNDP technical advisors to work in sensitive areas which are often not open to bilaterally funded program experts.

One risk of this type of encouragement for self-reliance, however, due to the inherent primary interaction of multilateral organizations with governments, is an undue emphasis on central government planning for development. It is U.S. policy to have more reliance placed on individuals in the private sector where the real engines for development must be located ultimately. Toward this end, we seek to assure that the primary purpose of UN system and OAS technical cooperation is to provide expertise and training for individuals in recipient countries rather than government programs. This is why programs like UNIDO's Investment Promotion Service deserve increased U.S. support.

In addition to contributing to economic growth and political stability, these programs introduce Western ideas and expertise

which promote the economic stimulation of developing countries along more pragmatic Western lines than those of the Marxist economic model. The long term benefits resulting from this inculcation of Western economic and social principles cannot be underestimated.

Contributions to the voluntarily funded programs gain added value for the money expended since they encourage international burden-sharing. Every dollar contributed by the United States buys this country a leading role in influencing programs which are financed by four or five dollars from other donors. Initially, most of the items in this account were funded largely by the United States. Over the years, their value has been established, and more and more countries are now contributing larger and larger shares of their total financing. For example, the United States used to provide 40 percent of the funding for UNDP as compared to the FY 1987 request for \$102.5 million which would amount to an estimated 17 percent funding.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS & PROGRAMS
(Voluntary Contributions)
Budget Authority (\$000)

	FY 1985 <u>Actual</u>	FY 1986 <u>Estimated</u>	FY 1987 <u>Request</u>
UN Development Program (UNDP).....	\$165,000	\$142,115	\$102,500
UN Children's Fund (UNICEF).....	53,500	46,080	34,200
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).....	18,414 a/	16,953	20,500
OAS Development Assistance Programs (OAS).....	15,500	14,092	13,950
UN Environment Program (UNEP).....	10,000	8,613	6,800
International Convention and Scientific Organization Contributions.....	---	1,228	2,300
World Meteorological Organization Voluntary Cooperation Program.....	2,000	1,723	2,000
UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)	2,000	861	1,800
UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa (UNETPSA).....	1,000	861	900
UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).....	500	239	450
UNIDO Investment Promotion Service.....	100	---	300
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).....	200	172	200
UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture (UNVFVT).....	100	86	100
World Food Program (WFP).....	2,000	1,818	---
UN Trust Fund for South Africa (UNTFSA).....	343	---	---
UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).....	422	---	---
UN Fellowship Program.....	449	215	---
UN Institute for Namibia (UNIN).....	500	215	---
UN Center on Human Settlements.....	---	383	---
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)...	90,000	28,710	---
World Heritage Fund (WHF).....	248.5	239	---
UNDP Trust Fund to Combat Poverty and Hunger in Africa	---	1,368	---
TOTAL.....	<u>362,276.5</u>	<u>265,971 b/</u>	<u>186,000</u>

a/ Includes \$3.6 million supplemental (P.L. 99-88).

b/ Reflects Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions (4.3 percent).
Additionally, a rescission of \$39,760 thousand to a level of \$226,211
thousand is pending.

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (UNDP)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
165.0	142.115	102.5

Purpose: UNDP provides training and expert assistance to develop indigenous human resources in member countries and territories, with emphasis on the poorest countries.

Background: UNDP was created in 1966 to improve the coordination and effectiveness of assistance that 35 UN Specialized Agencies and programs were providing. UNDP emphasizes five project activities: (1) surveying natural resources and identifying industrial and commercial potential; (2) stimulating capital investment; (3) vocational and professional skill training; (4) transferring appropriate technologies and enhancing recipient absorptive capacity; and (5) promoting economic and social planning.

Governments provide voluntary contributions for the general resources of UNDP. The recipient developing countries supply 60 percent of required project resources through cash contributions, physical facilities and services, locally-procured supplies and the provision of counterpart personnel. Additional financing comes from third parties e.g., governments co-financing special projects or programs which UNDP is funding from general resources. UNDP is the largest single source for grant multilateral technical assistance.

In 1984, UNDP expenditures totaled \$717 million including the costs of 1,074 projects in some 150 countries and territories. Its coordinating role within the UN system permits a multi-sectoral approach to the needs of developing countries. Of its program resources, UNDP spends some 16% on agriculture, forestry and fisheries; 16% on policies and planning; 19% on industry; 28% on international trade, development and health. UNDP complements the aid programs of the United States, the World Bank and other important donors. Although its annual program is modest in size, public and private follow-up investment exceeds the UNDP contribution. In 1984, such commitments amounted to \$10.2 billion as compared to \$9.6 billion in 1983.

Through its 116 field offices and Resident Representatives/Coordinators, UNDP helps host governments to define development goals and formulate comprehensive development plans. UNDP's roundtable process provides prospective donors -- United Nations agencies, multilateral development banks and bilateral contributors -- with a forum to discuss a country's economic position and development needs.

U.S. Interests: The requested level of support reflects current economic realities. The U.S. will insist upon timely implementation of recently adopted decisions to undertake major internal programming reforms. The 1985 Governing Council approved a program for the Fourth Cycle intended to permit donor governments greater influence over operations and ensure that a greater share of resources go to the poorest countries. This program includes the

precedent-breaking decision that requires countries with per capita GNPs above \$3,000 in 1983 to reimburse UNDP for its technical assistance and the cost of local field offices. Of the 19 countries affected, two are in Eastern Europe and eight are members of OPEC. Another decision creates a 24-member group which will consider programming matters including quality, appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency between the annual Council sessions.

U.S. support for UNDP reflects our recognition of the role multilateral organizations can play as catalysts for economic development. UNDP's development efforts help the United States to resist funding technical assistance through the assessed budgets of the Specialized Agencies. Increased agricultural production and rural development are among the U.S. priorities reflected in UNDP-financed programming. The UNDP Administrator and many of his key subordinates currently are Americans. In 1984, UNDP employed 797 U.S. citizens, ordered more than \$26 million in U.S. equipment, awarded over \$9 million in technical contracts to U.S. firms, and trained 1,441 recipients of UNDP-funded fellowships in the U.S.

Other Donors: The United States pledge for FY 1985 was 26.2% of total contributions pledged. Other major pledges to the Program included \$62.4 million from Japan (9.9% of the total), \$44.7 million from Norway (7.1%), \$43.2 million from Canada (6.9%), \$42.1 million from Sweden (6.7%), and \$41.1 million from the Netherlands (6.5%).

FY 1987 Program: Governing Council decisions on the fourth five-year programming cycle beginning in 1987 set realistic resource goals that will influence the planning levels. Graduation of richer developing countries to a wholly reimbursable allocation of funds plus judicious use of existing trust funds are intended to help shift scarce resources increasingly toward the least developed countries. The African emergency will focus attention on measures to overcome the problems of drought, desertification, famine, disease, shelter and food production. We will seek to assure that Council members assert more effective oversight in programming, project formulation, field operations and program evaluation.

UN CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
53.5	46.08	34.2

Purpose: UNICEF encourages and assists the long-term humanitarian development and welfare of children in developing countries. UNICEF accomplishes this through its educational programs which make governments, communities, and private groups aware of the plight of children and the possibilities for improving their situation. In addition to stimulating self-help efforts, UNICEF also provides goods and services to help meet basic needs in maternal and child health, sanitation, clean water, nutrition, elementary education, and social services. In disasters, UNICEF also provides emergency aid.

Background: The United Nations General Assembly created UNICEF in 1946 to aid the impoverished children left in the wake of World War II. Although originally an emergency aid program, UNICEF evolved by 1953 into a long-term voluntary development fund aimed at improving conditions for the poorest children of the developing world.

UNICEF has projects in 110 countries. In its work, UNICEF cooperates closely with governments, private groups, and local communities in developing nations, and other aid donors to protect children and to enable them to develop their full mental and physical potential. Individual governments set their priorities as a result of studies of major needs, and UNICEF assists in implementing the mutually agreed upon projects.

UNICEF assistance includes both goods and expert services. All programs have a direct relation to the welfare of children and mothers. Some programs -- such as clean water and sanitation -- also benefit other members of the community. Projects are designed to maximize both the involvement of local communities and the use of equipment and materials which can be locally obtained and maintained.

UNICEF assistance is allocated on a sliding scale according to such factors as the number of children, the wealth of the country, and, especially, the infant mortality rate. Allocations are scaled so that the largest countries do not monopolize most of the assistance and the per-child allocation among countries of similar size favors the poorest countries which receive approximately 5 1/2 times as much per child as do the middle-income developing countries.

UNICEF has a small emergency assistance unit and continues to play a key role in many international relief efforts. For example, between 1979 and 1981, UNICEF had the lead role in the UN's Kampuchean emergency relief effort. In Lebanon, UNICEF played a key role in providing relief, and has continued to play an important role in providing rehabilitation assistance. UNICEF is playing a growing role in current emergency drought relief efforts in Africa. As reconfirmed by the 1985 UNICEF Executive Board session, UNICEF is continuing the process of strengthening its staffing in Africa (by shifting positions from other parts of the world) in order to be able to better cope with the mounting crisis.

U.S. Interests: UNICEF's approaches have generally been consistent with U.S. development assistance priorities. UNICEF complements and reinforces the U.S. bilateral assistance (e.g., in December 1985 AID, in cooperation with UNICEF and WHO, held the Second International Conference on Oral Rehydration Therapy, ICORT II, here in Washington as a follow up to the successful ICORT I held in 1983). Official U.S. support for UNICEF also conforms with the humanitarian ideals of the American people who have supported UNICEF generously through private donations over the years. U.S. participation enables the United States to serve humanitarian aims in some nations where direct bilateral assistance is not politically feasible or desirable. In these cases, multilateral aid often serves as an alternative to dependency on Soviet-bloc assistance and provides a Western-oriented presence. UNICEF also furthers U.S. political and humanitarian interests in the developing world by mobilizing assistance from public and private sources throughout the world for programs benefiting children and mothers. Up to and including the present Executive Director, James P. Grant, UNICEF has always been led by a U.S. citizen. In 1984, UNICEF spent almost \$100 million in goods and services in the United States.

Other Donors: The United States has been a leader in UNICEF since its inception and remains the largest single donor, accounting for 29.7% of the expected governmental contributions to UNICEF General Resources in 1985. Pledges by other leading governmental contributors to general resources in 1985 included (millions of dollars): Sweden - \$21.3 (11.9%); Norway - \$15.7 (8.7%); Italy - \$14.8 (8.2%); Japan - \$14.2 (7.9%); Canada - \$9.7 (5.4%); United Kingdom - \$7.9 (4.4%); the Netherlands - \$6.3 (3.5%); Finland - \$5.8 (3.2%); Denmark - \$4.9 (2.7%).

FY 1987 Program: This request for \$34.2 million gives continued meaning to the President's and Congress' 1983 expressions of support for UNICEF's "Child Survival and Development Revolution (CSDR)." Second, it will help UNICEF to continue to implement the CSDR while still devoting attention and funds to the more traditional forms of UNICEF activities, programs which are also of priority interest to the U.S. Such programs complement and reinforce U.S. development assistance, promote stability in developing countries, and demonstrate the importance the U.S. attaches to the humanitarian needs of children. (Indeed, USAID and UNICEF cooperate closely in many developing countries on activities furthering child survival.) Third, a contribution at this level would maintain the U.S. as UNICEF's largest donor and reinforce U.S. leadership in UNICEF's Executive Board and influence on UNICEF policy. Fourth, it would permit UNICEF to strengthen its programs and staffing in Africa without displacing essential programs elsewhere in accord with recent UNICEF Executive Board recommendations and with the USG's desire to increase assistance to Africa.

PROGRAM SUMMARY (In millions of dollars)		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
18.414 <u>a/</u>	16.953	20.5

Purpose: The IAEA is a central element of international efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. Through its system of international safeguards, the IAEA provides assurance that nuclear material in peaceful development programs is not diverted for non-peaceful purposes. U.S. voluntary contributions are used in part to strengthen the effectiveness of the IAEA's safeguards and to enhance the IAEA's ability to use the most advanced safeguards techniques and equipment available. U.S. voluntary contributions are also used to encourage adherence to and support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and/or the Treaty of Tlatelolco by assisting nuclear projects in a number of developing countries that are party to these important nuclear arms control treaties.

Background: The IAEA's program of technical cooperation was initiated in the late 1950s to assist developing countries in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. At present the IAEA is providing assistance in the form of nuclear training and equipment to approximately 80 of its 112 members. Thus, for many IAEA members, the IAEA's technical cooperation programs are the most important component of the IAEA's activities.

The U.S. Program Of Technical Assistance to Safeguards was begun in 1975 to assist the IAEA in the development and continued implementation of the most effective safeguards system possible. The single most impressive achievement of the program has been the development of a family of measurement instruments for the non-destructive assay of nuclear materials of many different types and forms. These reliable, portable, microprocessor assisted instruments have made possible precise measurements in the field which are essential to truly credible safeguards.

Another important feature of the U.S. safeguards program is the provision of cost-free experts to the IAEA. Their work in Vienna with the safeguards inspectors has facilitated major transfers of safeguards technology from the United States.

U.S. Interests: The United States historically has strongly supported the IAEA and its safeguards system, which serves critical U.S. security and non-proliferation interests. Under Article III of the NPT, all non-nuclear weapon states

a/ \$14.814 million appropriated under P.L. 98-473. An additional \$3.6 million was appropriated under P.L. 99-88 for a total of \$18.414 million.

party to the Treaty (over 125) are required to accept IAEA safeguards on all nuclear material under their jurisdiction. Thus, the NPT and IAEA are inextricably linked as the cornerstones of international efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. As part of U.S. efforts to maintain and strengthen these critical components of the international non-proliferation regime, the United States implements its long-standing policy of providing preferential funding in nuclear assistance to NPT/Tlatelolco parties almost exclusively through the IAEA's technical cooperation program. This practice is designed to highlight some of the benefits of participation in these important nuclear arms control treaties. U.S. efforts to strengthen IAEA safeguards through the United States voluntary safeguards support program are central to ongoing efforts to upgrade and update safeguards procedures and techniques and are consistent with safeguards activities covered under the regular (assessed) budget of the IAEA. Most of the United States voluntary contribution to IAEA safeguards and technical assistance is spent either in the United States or for U.S. equipment which results directly in income for U.S. firms and individuals and creates future demand for U.S. equipment and services.

Other Donors: Extrabudgetary voluntary support in 1985 from other countries and organizations amounted to approximately \$36.1 million. Other major donors included Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Austria, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. Some 67 IAEA members made voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund (TACF). The United States pledged \$6.5 million or 25 per cent of the target figure of \$26.0 million for the 1985 TACF. Other major donors are expected to include Italy (approximately 3-4%); Japan (10%); USSR (10%), UK (4-5%). The United States also contributed approximately \$4.664 million for in-kind and extrabudgetary support in 1985, and \$7.25 million was allocated for U.S. safeguards support and non-proliferation activities.

FY 1987 Program. The FY 1987 U.S. program of support for safeguards will focus on technical problems relating to the implementation of safeguards. The highest priority tasks are to solve problems which arise at facilities of particular concern; namely, facilities under safeguards in non-NPT states and NPT states with severe regional security concerns. The second priority is to improve the quality and effectiveness of safeguards emphasizing the activities inspectors carry out in the field. The third priority includes three types of tasks: (1) those related to the

depth and quality of the technological infrastructure of the IAEA Department of Safeguards, (e.g. equipment maintenance and repair, establishment of performance monitoring programs); (2) those related to significant improvements in the efficiency of safeguards (emphasizing the introduction of sophisticated data acquisition techniques in the field coupled with data links from the field to Vienna); and (3) those related to improving training and performance capabilities.

U.S. support for the technical cooperation program will stress implementation of technical assistance projects involving medical, agricultural or basic industrial applications of nuclear energy. The United States will provide equipment, U.S. expert services, fellowships and training courses, with continued preference for programs in developing countries party to the NPT/Tlatelolco. In 1987, the United States voluntary contribution of \$20.5 million is currently planned to be divided as follows: \$7.5 million for safeguards, \$2.8 million for training and fellowships, \$1.8 million for technical assistance projects, and \$8.4 million in cash contributions to the TACF.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
15.5	14.092	13.95

Purpose: U. S. contributions to OAS Development Assistance Programs mobilize human and natural resources in Latin America and the Caribbean in multilateral development efforts to promote economic progress and strengthen U.S. ties with the area.

Background: The OAS has four voluntary funds for development: the Special Multilateral Fund (SMF), the Special Projects Fund (SPF), the Special Development Assistance Fund (SDAF), and the Special Cultural Fund (SCF).

Major program activities include regional development (SDAF), technical and vocational training (SMF), scientific and technological research into new energy sources (SMF), food production and distribution (SPF), livestock improvement (SPF), tourism promotion (SDAF), adult literacy (SMF), and promotion and commercialization of handicrafts.

The earlier focus on institution-building has been deemphasized to focus on projects benefitting the most disadvantaged members of society. Over the past two decades Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela have gradually become net donors rather than net recipients of OAS development programs. Concomitantly, the U.S. share of voluntary contributions has gradually declined from 66% in the 1960s to 49% in 1985.

The OAS has a highly effective infrastructure including specialized personnel, Inter-American Centers, a reservoir of outside technical advisors and consultants, a data bank comprising the results of earlier studies and research on development, and extensive experience in planning and administering technical assistance within the region. OAS technical services have been used by the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations Development Program and U.S. Government Departments (e.g. Interior) to carry out specific projects.

The effectiveness of OAS development programs is evident in the following: 85,000 specialists have been trained under OAS programs, including 30,000 since 1970; financial support from non-member countries and institutions is increasing, reflecting confidence in the Organization; OAS pre-investment feasibility studies have generated over \$6.5 billion in loan assistance from the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, a strong endorsement of the quality of OAS work.

U.S. Interest: U.S. policy seeks to persevere and strengthen the effectiveness of the OAS as a forum for dealing with hemispheric issues. Outcomes favorable to the United States on hemispheric issues have been consistently more feasible in the OAS than in other international fora. By way of reciprocity, other OAS members look to the United States for support in what they consider to be their primary concern--technical assistance for development. The level of U.S. contribution to OAS is perceived as a measure of U.S. commitment to the Inter-American system and influences the level of support which the United States can expect from other OAS members on issues of concern to us (such as peacekeeping, respect for human rights, and preservation of an environment conducive to fair trade and private investment).

The Inter-American Development Bank and the OAS have taken over much of the development work previously assumed alone by U.S. bilateral assistance programs and have established a de facto division of labor. Besides carrying out its own projects, the OAS focuses on prefeasibility studies and the Inter-American Development Bank devotes most of its resources to project financing.

Other Donors: OAS development programs funded by voluntary contributions in 1985 totalled \$31.2 million of which the U.S. contribution of \$15.5 million amounted to 49%. Other major contributors included Argentina (\$2.1 million or 6.7%), Brazil (\$2.7 million or 8.6%), Mexico (\$2.1 million or 6.7%). Contributions from non-member observer countries (Spain, Canada, Israel, etc.) were \$6.2 million or 19.8%.

FY 1987 Programs: Priority areas are development of the following: conventional and non-conventional energy, financing and external debt management, tourism, international trade, educational supervision and curriculum renovation, vocational education, adult education, food technology and processing, technology services (metrology, quality control, standardization), arts and crafts.

-- Special Development Assistance Fund - \$5.5 million. This fund specializes in an integrated approach, e.g. regional planning, and pre-feasibility studies for down-stream financing by the public (Inter-American Development Bank) and private sectors. The 1987 program will focus principally on energy, food production, export and tourism promotion, and employment generation. The Caribbean is a special target area. Projects are carried out principally by technical assistance of OAS specialists and externally contracted experts.

-- OAS members contributed \$12.5 million in 1985 of which the U.S. contribution of \$6 million equaled 48%. The proposed budget for 1987 is \$10.5 million; the United States share would be 52%.

-- Special Multilateral Fund - \$6.0 million. This fund works primarily through national institutions which it aims to strengthen in the fields of education, science, technology and culture. The 1987 program will focus mainly on upgrading educational supervision and teaching from elementary through higher education, adult education and literacy, technological services, metallic and non-metallic resource development, and marine resources development.

OAS members contributed \$12.2 million to the Fund in 1985, of which the U.S. contribution of \$6.5 million equaled 53%. The estimated 1987 budget is \$11 million.

-- Special Projects Fund - \$2.1 million. The U.S. started this Fund in 1973 to focus exclusively on horizontal cooperation among two or more member states. Its priorities are the same as for the Special Multilateral Fund, only the method of cooperation is different plus the practice of the more developed countries to pool resources for the benefit of the lesser developed members. Educational projects absorb approximately 30% of the budget, science and technology the remaining 70%.

OAS members contributed \$5.4 million to the Fund in 1985 of which the U.S. contribution of \$2.6 million equaled 48%. The estimated 1987 budget is \$4.4 million.

-- Special Culture Fund - \$350,000. This Fund's focus is on job-creation among marginal peoples both to preserve traditional artisanal techniques but also to upgrade products to commercial standards for export. Activities are carried out primarily through a network of Inter-American Centers which receive supplemental funding from countries. The fund also supports restoration of monuments, preservation of archives, and some archeological studies.

OAS members contributed \$1.1 million to the Fund in 1985, of which the U.S. contribution of \$400,000 was 36%. The budget estimate for 1987 is \$1.0 million.

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
10.0	8.613	6.8

Purpose: The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) promotes and coordinates international, regional, and national efforts to preserve, protect, and improve the environment and natural resources.

Background: The UN General Assembly established UNEP in December, 1972 to catalyze, direct and coordinate environmental programs and activities for UN agencies. The UNEP Environment Fund was established to finance activities that support international efforts to protect the environment. The United States has been a major participant in UNEP since its beginning, providing approximately a third of its total resources.

The principal goal of UNEP's program is to monitor and assess major global and regional environmental trends, and to coordinate international action to improve environmental and natural resource management. For example, UNEP's Regional Seas Program has developed eleven environmental Action Plans for Regional Seas including the Mediterranean, the Wider Caribbean Region (including the Gulf of Mexico) and the South Pacific Region (which includes the U.S. administered Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands). These programs encourage coastal states to act together to reduce and control pollution of their respective Regional Sea areas. UNEP has also played a key role in initiating negotiation of environmental treaties including the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species and the Convention to Protect the Atmospheric Ozone Layer (the United States is a signatory to both). Of special interest to the United States is UNEP's Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS), and in particular, its Global Resources Information Database (GRID) subprogram currently being developed with the assistance of NASA. UNEP also monitors pilot projects on tropical deforestation, soils, and rangeland under its "Earthwatch," "Terrestrial Ecosystems," and "Desertification" programs. Another UNEP activity which the United States supports is the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals, Including Pesticides (IRPTC).

U.S. Interests: UNEP's activities generally closely parallel U.S. interests and, therefore, complement and aid the efforts of the United States to improve our own environment. The development of standardized international guidelines, if others observe them, also will improve the competitive stance of U.S. businesses which must meet high domestic environmental standards. There are also benefits for U.S. industries which supply pollution control equipment.

UNEP uniquely serves U.S. interests in protecting the global environment and promoting sustainable development. UNEP's multilateral approach promotes cooperation to resolve regional problems, such as marine pollution and desertification. Its global mandate enables it to address issues such as carbon dioxide buildup, ozone depletion, and acid rain.

UNEP serves other U.S. interests as well. At the 1985 Governing Council, the Executive Director and the Governing Council worked together to keep political issues out of environmental programs. While the member nations supported UNEP and the importance of its programs, they sought improvement in UNEP's management in order to use existing resources more effectively.

An unresolved problem in our relationship with UNEP is the unacceptably low level of U.S. citizens (5-10%) on the UNEP professional staff.

Other Donors: Pledges for 1985 total \$28.5 million, including: U.S. \$10.0 (35%), Japan \$4.0 (14%), USSR \$3.0 (10.5%), Sweden \$1.8 (6.3%), FRG \$1.4 (4.9%), U.K. \$0.9 (3.2%), Canada \$0.8 (2.8%).

The FY 1987 Program: We expect the completion of a protocol (on controlling chlorofluorocarbons) to the Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and completion of the Regional Seas Convention for the South Pacific. UNEP will continue to expand its GEMS/GRID program with assistance from NASA, and its efforts in connection with the UN Action Plan to Combat Desertification. UNEP will also cooperate with other UN organizations such as WHO, FAO, and WMO especially in areas of human health, deforestation, and climatic impacts. There will also be follow-up activities to the successful World Industry Conference on Environmental Management (WICEM).

The FY 1987 request level of \$6.8 million represents 24.3% of total anticipated receipts of \$28 million to UNEP's Voluntary Fund. Thus it reaffirms strong U.S. support for UNEP while at the same time clearly indicating that we believe it is time for other nations to begin contributing a greater share towards UNEP programs.

PROGRAM SUMMARY (In millions of dollars)		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
0	1.228	2.3

PURPOSE: To continue support for U.S. participation in and to meet U.S. commitments to international conventions and scientific organizations engaged in work considered essential and important to U.S. interests.

BACKGROUND: With its withdrawal from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) effective December 31, 1984, the United States no longer contributes its share of costs for activities supported directly by UNESCO even though they may benefit significantly U.S. domestic interests. The activities included in this request are those considered to serve significant U.S. domestic interests; they would be considered U.S. obligations if the United States were to remain active in these programs, and will not continue as individual budget requirements in the future should the United States resume membership in UNESCO.

U.S. Interests: The U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO does not alter the U.S. policy of supporting international cooperation in educational, scientific, cultural and communication activities where there are technical, economic and political benefits to the United States. The programs proposed for funding in this request protect the more important, direct benefits to American scientific, educational, cultural and business communities derived through membership in UNESCO. The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, International Hydrological Program and International Geological Correlation Program were of U.S. origin or created with the encouragement of the United States, and our continued influence in them is important to us. Data exchange networks associated with them provide information on a global scale not otherwise available through bilateral or regional agreements. The Universal Copyright Convention is worth many millions of dollars to us. The others, similarly, respond to the needs of U.S. constituencies and provide tangible benefits to them.

FY 1987 PROGRAM: The following items reflect estimates of continued activity by the United States on mutually agreeable terms with other participants in these forums.

Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC). American oceanographic research work benefits directly through access to data otherwise unobtainable. In addition, UNESCO enables American oceanographic experts to participate in research workshops and allows U.S. vessels, under UNESCO aegis, access to foreign waters for research. The United States remains eligible to be a member of the IOC by virtue of its UN membership; \$500,000 per year would finance continued active U.S. participation.

Intergovernmental Committee on the Universal Copyright Convention (ICUCC)

The United States is a signatory to the Convention and would be expected to make an appropriate contribution to the costs of the Committee, whose work benefits U.S. copyright interests relating to home video and audio recording and protection of computer software and satellite signals; \$150,000 per year would be sufficient.

International Geological Coordination Program (IGCP). This program directs attention of geologists worldwide to important projects on mineral and petroleum deposits and correlates data on geological strata, research projects, and on standards for geological maps and earth science projects. Continued participation in these programs, heretofore funded through the UNESCO budget, would cost \$175,000 per year.

Natural Hazards Program (NHP). This program includes the work of the International Advisory Committee on Earthquake Risk. Program funds at the rate of \$75,000 per year would be used to support continued U.S. participation in the projects of the Committee, including site surveys and information exchange programs.

International Hydrological Program (IHP). This program undertakes studies and promotes standards and cooperation among UN specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations which provide the United States with valuable information on water resources worldwide. Although the United States loses its place on the IHP Intergovernmental Council because of withdrawal from UNESCO, support of American participation at the rate of \$250,000 per year would permit the United States to remain active in important IHP projects.

Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB). This is an interdisciplinary program of ecological research that enables USG agencies and American scientists to carry out studies abroad among its 105 members states, acquire data and cooperate in the development of new resource management techniques for ecosystems of particular interest to the United States, e.g., tropical forests, arid zones, Caribbean Islands, and polar regions. Although the United States will lose its place on the MAB Intergovernmental Coordinating Council, \$450,000 per year would support U.S. participation in selected MAB projects, international workshops and technical advisory bodies, and contribute a fair share of the MAB Secretariat costs for its work in information coordination and functions in areas of special U.S. interest.

International Libraries, Archives and Science Documentation Program. This activity sets standards for and provides data on international information technology activities. Continued U.S. participation is of particular benefit to the American computer and information industries and support is estimated at \$225,000 per year.

Non-Governmental Research Organizations. UNESCO budget funds are used for direct financial support to certain organizations, including the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), the International Brain Research Organization (IBRO) and other learned or scientific international and regional organizations. Support to continue benefits to U.S. interests is estimated at \$300,000 per year.

International Cooperative Research Programs. Certain international research activities directly benefit U.S. research and are not included in the above categories, e.g.: International Biological Collection Centers; International Organization of Biotechnology and Bioengineering; other related international and regional organizations. Support for U.S. participation in a limited number of these programs would be \$125,000 per year.

International Conventions. The United States has ratified several additional international conventions which are under UNESCO's administration and are vital to U.S. interests. Continued U.S. participation would require payment of administrative overhead costs in lieu of dues to UNESCO, estimated to total \$50,000 per year. These conventions include, e.g.: the Beirut Agreement (1984) and the Florence Agreement (1950) concerning the international transfer of educational, cultural and scientific goods; the Convention on the Exchange of Official Publications and Documents (1958); the Convention on the Exchange of International Publications (1958); and the Convention on the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cultural Property (1970).

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)
VOLUNTARY COOPERATION PROGRAM (VCP)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
2.0	1.723	2.0

Purpose: The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP) provides training and equipment to assist less developed countries to improve their national meteorological and hydrological services. This enables them to participate in the World Weather Watch (WWW) and other WMO programs, and to obtain and utilize weather data relevant to their national economies. The VCP undertakes projects which cannot be funded through the regular (assessed) WMO budget or the UN Development Program. Since donor countries manage 95% of contributions to the VCP, these resources are used according to the priorities of the donors.

Background: A U.S. initiative established the VCP in 1967. Voluntary contributions fund the VCP which enhances the capacity of LDCs to participate in the WWW. The WWW monitors atmospheric and oceanic conditions, and coordinates the rapid collection and exchange of weather data on a global basis. The VCP assists LDCs to upgrade basic observation networks and related telecommunications systems to improve local data processing capabilities and weather forecasting techniques, and enhances LDC capacity to use weather data. The VCP also provides equipment and training for meteorologists in developing countries and supports LDC training at regional training centers and donor institutions. Countries may contribute either cash or equipment and services to the VCP.

The U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) administers the U.S. contribution to the VCP on behalf of the United States.

U.S. Interests: LDC participation in the WWW enables the United States to obtain otherwise unavailable data that is necessary for our national requirements. U.S. participation in the VCP has led to more timely and reliable data for the United States National Meteorological Center, and provides international meteorological reports which are used by U.S. civil and military agencies, and private companies. For example, NOAA uses enhanced observation and reporting capabilities by Central American and Caribbean LDCs, coordinated through WMO, to more accurately forecast hurricanes affecting the United States. NOAA and USDA use WMO reports to analyze and forecast international weather and agricultural production. USAID uses this information for early warning of natural disasters around the world. U.S. aviation requires this meteorological information for international flight planning.

Since the United States contribution utilizes primarily U.S. equipment, our participation in this program supports U.S. interests and priorities.

Other Donors: In 1984 the WMO VCP received contributions totalling \$5,470,750 including \$2.3 million (42%) from the U.S., USSR \$1,500,000 (27%), U.K. \$380,000 (6.9%), France \$300,000 (5.5%), and China \$100,000 (1.8%). Five percent of contributions received in 1983-84 were in cash, and 95% were in goods and services. Contributions in 1985 are expected to be around \$5.5 million with a U.S. contribution of \$2.0 million (36%), including a direct cash contribution of \$150,000 (43% of cash contributions) and \$1.85 million in equipment and services.

FY 1987 Program: Donor countries largely determine the VCP program, since most contributions are for equipment and training. NOAA will provide necessary equipment and related service to LDCs for the WWV and other WMO programs. In particular, this includes upper air equipment, instruments for surface-observing stations, and improvements in telecommunications equipment for timely data dissemination to other member nations. LDC personnel will receive appropriate training for this equipment, thus enhancing their cooperation with the WMO. This arrangement requires recipient countries to play an increasing role in monitoring climate programs and environmental quality. U.S. assistance is provided worldwide.

UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (UNCDF)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
2.0	.861	1.8

Purpose: The Fund provides seed capital, on a grant basis, for small development projects requiring only low to moderate level technology. Because of their size, such projects might not attract financing by the multilateral development banks. UNCDF seeks to promote self-reliance and accelerate self-sustaining economic growth among the least developed countries by balancing resource allocation between the basic needs of low-income groups and the productive sectors. UNCDF seeks to promote private initiative, make maximum use of local resources, and create demand for imported goods. It provides credit to small businesses and farmers. The Fund stresses projects in the least developed countries, particularly those in drought-stricken Africa.

Background: The General Assembly established UNCDF in 1966 and in 1967, placed it under the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, subject to policy guidance from the UNDP Governing Council. The United States first contributed to UNCDF in 1978. UN Specialized Agencies, working with host governments, international development banks and private entities, execute UNCDF projects. At the end of 1984, total commitments for UNCDF ongoing projects were \$120.3 million. During 1984, the Fund approved 27 new projects valued at \$36.8 million.

U.S. Interests: Our continued support, while reflecting current economic realities, demonstrates our view that UNCDF is a well-run program which channels its assistance to the least developed countries. Its assistance is concentrated in Africa, placing it in a position to effectively complement the crisis work of the United Nations Office for Emergency Operations in Africa with medium-term and longer-term programs of development.

UNCDF has concentrated on the basic needs of the rural sector. Approximately 32% of the Fund's total commitments have gone to develop agriculture and agricultural water resources. Other important sectors receiving significant UNCDF allocations were potable water (19.6%), transport and communications (14.5%), industries (8.8%), housing (4.6%), education and training (5.0%), and energy (8.3%). Typical UNCDF projects include food stores for drought relief, flood protection, and improvement of water supply.

Other Donors: In 1985, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Norway continued to be major donors to the Fund. Sweden pledged \$3.6 million (17.7% of total pledges), the Netherlands \$3.3 million (16.4%), and Norway \$3.0 million (14.8%). The \$2 million U.S. contribution was 9.8% of total pledges to the Fund.

FY 1987 Program: The Fund has been expanding the scope and volume of its commitments as it has moved from full funding to partial funding operations. In addition, the Fund coordinated its activities with UNDP and other development agencies so that there is follow-up to pre-investment activities, capital and technical assistance, and financing of operating costs. UNCDF adapts its program to the priority needs of the LDCs, and coordinates its activities with other concerned institutions. It also strengthens the complementarity between UNCDF capital assistance and other types of UNDP assistance.

UNCDF estimates project approvals in 1987 of \$27.6 million without any significant change in project make-up and delivery. Major emphasis will be on fund raising through increased voluntary and trust contributions. UNCDF will introduce a loan program, at concessional rates, designed to facilitate small scale production projects.

The U.S. contribution will be about 8.6% of total voluntary contributions in 1987. Continued U.S. support of UNCDF is consistent with our policy of helping the poorest countries.

UN EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (UNETPSA)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
1.0	.861	0.9

Purpose: To provide scholarships for secondary and college level education and advanced technical and vocational training to students from the Republic of South Africa and to a lesser extent from Namibia who are denied such education and training in their own countries. The training helps prepare these students to assume leadership roles in the development of their countries.

Background: The UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa (UNETPSA) was created in 1967 to provide advanced education to non-white indigenes from the Portuguese African territories, Namibia, Rhodesia, and South Africa, who did not enjoy full political, social and economic rights. Following the independence of the Portuguese territories and Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), UNETPSA ceased giving new grants to students from those nations, although renewals will continue to be made until existing students finish their studies. (Most recently available information indicates that there are 70 students from Zimbabwe in the program and none remaining from the former Portuguese territories. By FY-1987 almost all of these students will have finished their courses of study.) The program is now designed to provide students from South Africa and Namibia with education and training opportunities denied to them in their own countries. The objective is to enable these young people to play a full role in their societies as they become independent or as majority rule is achieved and to provide general support for the concept of peaceful transition in southern Africa.

UNETPSA's ability to award new scholarships is based on total annual contributions and pledges received, balanced against the increasing cost of education and the need to renew the awards of continuing students. For the UNETPSA fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, contributions and pledges totalled \$3.04 million, as against \$3.48 million the previous year (a 12.6% reduction). The total number of awards granted under the program during the 1983-1984 reporting year was 896 (410 new awards and 486 renewals), as against 808 (263 new awards and 545 renewals) for the previous reporting period. These figures are not completely comparable, however, because the UN Secretariat earlier included certain non-UNETPSA scholarships in the UNETPSA totals that are no longer so included.

During the 1983-1984 report period, student placement by region was as follows: Africa, 446 (49.78%); North America, 317 (35.38%); Asia, 102 (11.68%); Europe, 28 (3.13%); and Latin America and Caribbean Countries, 3 (0.33%) out of a total of 896 (100.00%).

U.S. Interests: The primary United States interest in supporting UNEPTSA is to indicate U.S. support for the aspirations of the dependent and newly independent countries of Southern Africa to create modern societies. An additional interest is to assist in the provision of a core of specialists and administrators who are able to assume positions in the governments of Southern Africa when those areas receive their independence. The core of trained personnel produced by the Program should assist in the transition to independence in the newly independent countries of the area and in the maintenance of stability in the region following independence.

The U.S. continues to serve on the UNETPSA Advisory Committee, which is the governing body of the Program. Many of the scholarship recipients will continue to study in the United States (294 of 896 -- 32.81% -- in the current reporting year). Although precise figures are not available, we estimate that educating these students in this country resulted in least \$2,500,000 in tuition and other receipts for U.S. institutions during the 1983-84 report period.

Other Donors: In 1984, the U.S. contribution of \$1,000,000 supported almost one-third of the program (32.9%). Other major donors during this period were: Norway, \$718,259 (23.6%); Denmark, \$287,797 (9.5%); Canada, \$268,391 (8.8%); Japan \$200,000 (6.6%); Sweden \$125,200 (4.1%); Finland, \$106,289 (3.5%); Australia \$83,853 (2.8%); France, \$79,310 (2.6%); and others, \$167,106 (5.5%).

FY 1987 Program: UNETPSA is concentrating on students from the Republic of South Africa and Namibia. Due to the relatively low educational standards which exist in these countries for black students, the Program has begun special pre-entry courses for students who require remedial training prior to being accepted by a university.

THE UN DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR WOMEN (UNIFEM)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
.5	.239	.45

Purpose: The purpose of the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) is to improve the status of women through their increased integration in the economic and social development processes in the least developed countries.

Background: The United Nations Voluntary Fund for the UN Decade for Women was created by UN General Assembly resolution 31/133 in 1976. UN General Assembly resolution 39/125 (1984) decided that the activities of the Voluntary Fund for the UN Decade for Women should be continued beyond the end of the decade through the establishment of a separate, identifiable entity in autonomous association with the UN Development Program (UNDP). Thus, the Voluntary Fund for the UN Decade for Women was renamed the UN Development Fund for Women, with the acronym UNIFEM, and the autonomous association with UNDP came into effect on July 1, 1985.

The Fund provides financial and technical assistance to promote economic growth and social equity through stimulating the full participation of women, who have too often been considered marginal to the essential processes of development. Priority is given to the least developed, land-locked, and island developing countries. The Fund's resources are used mainly within two priority areas: 1) to serve as a catalyst, with the goal to ensure the appropriate involvement of women in mainstream development activities, as often as possible at the pre-investment stages; and 2) to support innovative and experimental activities benefitting women in line with national and regional priorities.

The Fund became operational in 1978, and now has 460 projects. During the period 1983-84, the distribution of support for projects were: Development planning/project design/research 21%; Employment-generating activities/revolving loan funds 31%; Technology/energy 7%; Human resource development 14%; Information/publications 8% and; Rural/urban development 19%. Eighty percent of the projects are at the country level, with UNDP having responsibility for their screening and monitoring. The remaining regional projects are similarly handled by the UN regional commissions in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and Western Asia. Final decisions on project selection are made by a special consultative committee representing the five UN world regions. Norway represents the Western Group.

The Fund is the only UN development cooperation mechanism whose frame of reference lies specifically at the interface of development and women. In its project support operations the Fund reflects this basic point of connection between the two issues. During its eight operational years (1978-85), the Fund has followed the primary criterion that development is the overall goal and women are an integral part of it.

U.S. Interests: The management of UNIFEM as a result of its autonomous association with UNDP is of importance because the transfer represented one of the significant achievements of the UN Decade for Women, i.e., accomplishing an integration of UNIFEM into the mainstream of development activities, yet maintaining UNIFEM's autonomous purpose and identity.

The United States has been the principal contributor to the Fund, with cumulative donations in excess of \$8 million. Our contributions have been a manifestation of our commitment to women in the least-developed countries.

Other Donors: Pledges from governments to the Fund amounted to \$2.9 million as of June 1985. Non-governmental contributions, which include individual and non-governmental organizations and national committees (five throughout the world--U.S. UK, Belgium, Denmark, and Finland) amounted to \$1.4 million. Norway was the largest single governmental contributor in 1985 with a contribution of \$790,960 or 27.3% of the total pledges from governments. The U.S. contribution of \$500,000 represented 17.2% of the total pledges from governments. Other major contributors included: Japan \$300,000 (10.3%); Italy \$184,211 (6.4%); and Finland \$154,512 (5.3%).

FY 1987 Program: Emphasis will continue to be placed on income-generating activities, utilization of energy resources, agro-industry, and industrial development. The objectives of future projects will be consonant with regional and national strategies for the promotion of development in that they will deal with poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, self-reliance, health and nutrition.

UN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)
INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICE (IPS)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
.1	0	.3

Purpose: The UNIDO Investment Promotion Service (IPS) office in New York City trains investment promotion officers from developing countries and supports their efforts to attract private investment capital for industrial projects in their home countries.

Background: The IPS program is a part of UNIDO's International Cooperative Program. The New York IPS office, founded in 1978, is one of seven such offices worldwide. The others are in Austria, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Switzerland, and Poland. The United States contributed \$100,000 (approximately 10 percent of the \$963,464 budget) to the New York IPS office in FY 1985 through the International Organizations and Programs appropriation. All other IPS offices are fully funded by their respective host governments. Following UNIDO's conversion to a specialized agency on January 1, 1986 private sector opportunities to participate in UNIDO activities are expected to increase.

U.S. Interests: Promotion of private sector development is a major U.S. priority. The IPS network worldwide reflects UNIDO's recognition of the importance of private investment capital in the industrial development process. The IPS program stimulates the private sector in developing countries, producing a catalytic impact on their domestic economies. Industrialization of the developing countries leads ultimately to increased markets for U.S. goods and services. The New York IPS office provides a valuable service to the private sector. It helps to identify developing country projects which require capital investment, to make useful business contacts and to teach U.S. business practices to the investment promotion officers.

Other Donors: Major contributors to UNIDO's New York IPS office in FY 1985 were: UNIDO (assessed budget) - \$313,335 (32.5%); UNDP - \$158,166 (16.4%); State - \$100,000 (10.4%); World Bank - \$108,706 (11.3%); Caribbean Development Bank - \$75,000, (7.8%) and AID - \$180,000 (21.6%)

FY 1987 Program: Emphasis will be upon training and supporting investment promotion officers from the Caribbean and Central America. It is supportive of our Caribbean Basin Initiative.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES (CITES)

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
.2	.172	.2

Purpose: CITES promotes international cooperation in conservation and provides a mechanism for protection of endangered species of wildlife and plants against over-exploitation through international trade.

Background: CITES is a key instrument of international wildlife conservation, with wide U.S. public support. It is the result of a conference held in Washington in 1973 at U.S. invitation to promote the conservation of endangered and potentially threatened species of wild fauna and flora. Support of the Convention is a major element of United States conservation policy. Nearly 90 nations are Parties to CITES at present; including most wildlife producing and consuming countries.

The CITES Trust Fund supports the operation of the Secretariat and meetings of Parties. The United Nations Environment Programme's financial support of CITES ceased at the end of 1983, although it continues to administer the CITES Trust Fund as well as the Secretariat. The Parties to the Convention began to provide funding in 1980, in accordance with a consensus decision that contributions would be pledged on the basis of each donor's rate of assessment to the regular United Nations budget adapted to CITES' membership. The CITES budget for the 1986-87 biennium was approved at the fifth Conference of CITES Parties, held in Buenos Aires in April/May 1985.

CITES' principal achievement is its acceptance by producing and consuming countries alike as the worldwide instrument for control of trade in wildlife and wildlife products. Other notable achievements are: a) guidelines for the shipment of live specimens of plants and animals; b) development of an Identification Manual for use by customs officials in identifying protected species at ports of entry; c) progress in standardization of documentation, annual reports on wildlife trade and information required to amend listings of endangered and threatened species; d) more effective controls on trade in such specimens as elephant ivory, rhinoceros horn, whale products, exotic furs, reptilian leather, and rare birds; e) improved acquisition and exchange of data and statistics on wildlife trade; f) improved cooperation among regional Party members through regional seminars on enforcement and implementation; and g) improved enforcement of CITES regulatory mechanisms and wildlife legislation in general.

U.S. Interests: All countries benefit from CITES' protection of endangered and potentially threatened species of wild plants and animals--irreplaceable natural resources. CITES resulted largely from a U.S. Congressional initiative, receives strong public support, the backing of both powerful conservationist and trade

organizations, and is implemented in the United States through the Endangered Species Act and other legislation. Private American commercial ventures in wildlife trade have a sounder, more reliable basis than they could have without an effective international convention, and farming and ranching of formerly endangered species, such as the American alligator, is of substantial benefit to U.S. producers and traders. Participation provides a vehicle for United States leadership in an area in which there has been almost universal acceptance of common policy goals. Other countries and the American public look to the U.S. to remain in the vanguard of international conservation and wildlife preservation.

Other Donors: The CITES Secretariat 1986-87 biennium budget approved by the Parties is \$1.469 million. Based on the UN assessment scale as adapted to CITES, principal donors other than the United States pledged to contribute as follows in 1986-87: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 10.5%; Japan, 10%; Federal Republic of Germany, 8.5%; France, 6.5%; United Kingdom, 5%; Italy, 4%; and Canada, 3%. Altogether, over ninety countries are expected to be Parties and contribute to support of CITES in 1987.

FY 1987 Program: In 1987, CITES is expected to continue its development along the lines taken thus far, as a major contributor to international conservation and the primary international mechanism governing international trade in wildlife. Increased trade data and statistics will be made available by the Secretariat to CITES Parties through improved coordination with the World Trade Monitoring Unit of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). The focus will be on implementation of the decisions of the 1985 fifth Conference of CITES Parties, which inter alia: a) reviewed and amended the CITES listings of wildlife and plants endangered or threatened by trade (currently 1700 species of wildlife and 30,000 varieties of plants); and b) considered a wide variety of technical issues related to interpretation of the Convention and decisions of earlier Conferences of Parties. Work will continue on major projects such as the Identification Manual, investigation of legal and illegal trade in species of key concern, and technical, legal and administrative assistance to Party governments in meeting the goals of the Convention. Having stressed improving understanding and implementation of the Convention in wildlife producing countries in 1983 and 1984, the Secretariat and key CITES Parties (including the United States) will concentrate in 1985-1987 on improving enforcement in wildlife consuming countries, and in developing financial resources to assist less-developed State Parties to participate in the Convention.

UN VOLUNTARY FUND FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE

PROGRAM SUMMARY <i>(In millions of dollars)</i>		
FY 1985 Actual	FY 1986 Estimated	FY 1987 Request
.1	.086	.1

Purpose: The Fund provides worldwide humanitarian assistance to victims of torture and to their families. Its major goal is to provide medical (both physical and psychological) assistance to victims and to their families. Secondary goals are legal, financial and social assistance to victims and to their families.

Background: The United Nations General Assembly established the Fund in 1981. The United States strongly supported the Fund's establishment but not until FY85 did the U.S. make a contribution to it. The Fund has expended \$807,000 on 28 projects aimed at the medical and psychological rehabilitation of victims of torture, including a grant to the well-known and respected International Rehabilitation and Research Center for Torture Victims, Copenhagen, and the French Medecins sans Frontieres. Further, several rehabilitation projects are carried out for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. Eighty-three percent of Fund expenditures are made in developing countries. Grants are awarded by the Fund's Board of Trustees who report directly to the UN Secretary General. The Board's mandate requires it to distribute aid through "established channels of humanitarian assistance," such as hospitals, research and training centers and overseas doctors projects. The Board may contribute to on-going projects or it may give to a humanitarian operation detailed criteria of the Board's desires for a particular project. The Fund is genuinely humanitarian.

U.S. Interests: U.S. contributions to the Fund both supplement U.S. bilateral human rights efforts and boost the U.S. in world opinion as a nation dedicated to unselfish support of the unfortunate victims of human rights violations. Equally as important, the very nature of the Fund singles out for censure those nations that chronically violate human rights, thus achieving a U.S. policy objective without the direct action of the United States.

The U.S. contribution will be an estimated 25% of receipts in 1987. U.S. financial support of the Fund is consistent with our policy of strong support for human rights and for giving relief to the victims of human rights violations.

Other Donors: To date about \$1,500,000 has been contributed to the Fund by governments (Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, San Marino, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the U.S.), by one non-governmental organization (the World Lutheran Federation) and by several individuals.

FY 1987 Program: The Board of Trustees expects that in 1987 the Fund will expend about \$280,000 for hospitals and overseas doctors projects treating torture victims. The Fund plans to expand its operations from its present purely medical concentration to include some social services to torture victims and to their families. These will include small grants to assist victims and their families in rebuilding shattered lives through self-help projects and small stipends while rehabilitated victims look for work.