



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and  
Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 95: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

United Nations accommodation in Santiago

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/35/L.24, as amended, concerning agenda item 111

Accommodation at the Vienna International Centre

Job classification and career development of language staff

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/35/SR.58  
19 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/35/528; A/C.5/35/7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 36, 48; A/C.5/35/L.37 and Add.1)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 95: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued) (A/35/182 and Add.1; A/35/418 and Add.1)

1. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said his delegation believed that paragraph 1 of section I of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37 should be applied flexibly, taking into account the paramount considerations mentioned in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter. The principle enunciated in paragraph 3 of section I stood on its own. With regard to paragraph 4, his delegation agreed that the Secretary-General could replace staff members serving on fixed-term contracts with candidates of the same nationality but that such an arrangement was not a right but rather a matter for the discretion of the Secretary-General. In applying the provisions of paragraph 5, the requirements laid down in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter should be safeguarded, although they were not specifically mentioned in the paragraph.
2. His delegation had accepted section II of the draft resolution as a compromise. It believed that over the long run it would help to improve the international civil service and result in greater equity. His delegation understood the concept of parity between the membership and contribution factors to relate to posts over and above the 3,350 posts referred to in paragraph 1 (a).
3. Section III of the draft resolution was the most important because it related to the way in which the Secretariat could implement other policy measures approved by the General Assembly. He agreed with those delegations which considered the annex to be too detailed and believed that the matter was essentially a managerial question. The problem was that the Secretariat had not been managed from the top in such a way as to allow the Office of Personnel Services (OPS) to implement approved policy measures. He cautioned against expecting immediate results from that section of the draft resolution. He was pleased that it provided for a partnership between OPS and the substantive departments in recruiting staff. Competitive examinations should be used across the board for recruitment to fill all P-1 and P-2 vacancies. With regard to posts at the P-3 level and above, provision had been made for close co-operation between OPS and the substantive departments. His delegation understood that appointments to the P-5 and D-1 levels would be subject to approval by the Secretary-General irrespective of the views of the Appointment and Promotions Committee and Board.
4. Referring to section IV, he urged that serious consideration should be given to increasing the effectiveness of career development measures, an area that thus

/...

(Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

far had been neglected. Since the Assembly had made progress with respect to recruitment policy, it could give due attention to career development, which was essential to improving staff morale.

5. His delegation strongly supported section V of the draft resolution and believed that paragraph 5 would facilitate attainment of the goals set with respect to the employment of women. He did not see any need to establish additional bodies.

6. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1, his delegation felt that the annex to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37 to some extent obviated the need for any further significant interim measures and even perhaps for restructuring. The committee of experts should bear in mind the need for a system of checks and balances, as well as the political nature of the Organization. No single department should be made into a law unto itself and the existing structure of the Secretariat appeared to be satisfactory and well-thought out. Changes should not be introduced in order to tailor the Secretariat to fit personalities.

7. Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the draft resolution on personnel questions adopted by the Committee (A/C.5/35/L.37) should become one of the fundamental documents guiding United Nations personnel policy in the long term. The strength of the draft resolution lay in the fact that it pivoted on the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter. The task of putting it into practice, which now faced the Secretariat, would be a painstaking and difficult one.

8. His delegation trusted that those within the Secretariat responsible for personnel would adhere strictly to section I, paragraph 1, of the resolution. The target set in that paragraph had already been set in General Assembly resolution 33/143 for the period 1979-1980 but had not, unfortunately, been reached. Under-represented States were entitled, therefore, to expect specific and effective measures to be taken by the departments concerned to ensure that the target would now be reached. His delegation likewise supported section I, paragraph 2, and also paragraph 4, which sought to abolish the kind of discrimination that had in the past affected the level of representation of those Member States whose citizens served in the Secretariat on fixed-term contracts. His delegation was grateful for the sympathy shown by other delegations towards the group of States primarily concerned.

9. The new criteria to be used in calculating desirable ranges were acceptable; in the coming years Member States must concentrate on helping the Secretariat to attain the goals set and not distracting it with matters of secondary importance.

10. His delegation had had trouble in agreeing to the new appointment and promotion procedures set forth in section III and in the annex to the draft, particularly the introduction of competitive methods of appointment to the P-1 and P-2 levels. It had joined the consensus on the understanding that, while

/...

(Mr. Linatov, Ukrainian SSR)

such methods were being tried out, care would be taken to avoid any cultural or linguistic discrimination. At the same time, it welcomed the fact that pre-determined targets applying to personnel policy had been established.

11. Section IV of the draft provided guidelines to ICSC and JIU for a detailed investigation of the relationship between permanent and fixed-term contracts in the Secretariat. The recommendations those bodies produced should help the Secretariat to transcend its current archaic structure in which permanent contracts predominated, making it difficult to replace poorly qualified staff members by more experienced and thoroughly trained specialists.

12. His delegation recognized, moreover, the need to increase the proportion of women working in the Secretariat, but only in so far as the principle of equitable geographical distribution was strictly observed.

13. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that, under the old system of desirable ranges, what was proudly termed "equitable geographical distribution" had, in fact, been neither equitable nor geographical because the predominant factor used in determining the desirable ranges, namely, contributions, had nothing to do with geography. The new formula set out in section II of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37 reduced the weight of the contribution factor, while increasing the weight given to membership, and simplified the application of the population factor, thereby making the so-called equitability somewhat more geographical. His delegation would have preferred to go further than that, but realized that, at least for the time being, the provisions of the draft resolution represented a maximum which could be agreed upon by all. His delegation therefore regarded the consensus on desirable ranges as only a first step towards more genuine geographical equitability in the future.

14. On the question of the target set in section I, paragraph 1, for the recruitment of nationals from unrepresented and under-represented countries, his delegation understood that, in implementing that provision, section II of the draft resolution concerning the new system of desirable ranges, especially paragraph 2, should be taken fully into account. In any event, the 40 per cent target should not be interpreted as closing the door to nationals of Member States which were within range or slightly over-represented.

15. His delegation continued to believe in the validity of the principle of non-inheritance of posts. Although the implementation of that principle might not totally exclude the possibility of replacing a staff member by a national of the same country, it was nevertheless clear that no post, especially a senior one, could justifiably be claimed as an exclusive preserve of any country. In view of the importance of increasing the representation of developing countries in senior and policy-formulating posts, his delegation was encouraged by table 6 of document A/35/528 and hoped that the positive trend indicated therein would continue.

16. His delegation preferred to refrain from any comment on whether the number of staff serving on fixed-term contracts should be increased or decreased. It

(Mr. Brotodiningrat, Indonesia)

accepted the phenomenon as a fact and supported the view that more attention should be devoted to that category of staff. Consideration should be given to their career development and to ways of assuring even further their true independence as international civil servants.

17. His delegation supported every effort to increase the representation of women in the Professional category. Of course, in order to prevent further discrimination, the recruitment of women should also be subject to the principles of the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, and the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

18. With regard to staff mobility, he stressed that one of the most important characteristics of dedicated international civil servants was their readiness to serve at any duty station. Accordingly, his delegation whole-heartedly supported section IV, paragraph 3.

19. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1, his delegation looked forward to receiving an objective and constructive report from the committee of experts.

20. Mr. ADJEYI (Togo) said the problem of recruitment was a matter of concern to all delegations. His delegation regretted that the relevant General Assembly resolutions had not been implemented and hoped that the Secretariat would take action in response to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37. His delegation was deeply concerned over the conflicts which arose between OPS and the substantive departments. For example, OPS was never informed of vacancies prior to recruitment. His delegation favoured a restructuring of the relevant Secretariat units with a view to enhancing the authority of OPS, and appealed to substantive departments to furnish OPS with a list of vacancies in good time.

21. It was necessary always to bear in mind the requirement of geographical distribution, and it was essential to avoid the predominance of staff members from a single country in a Secretariat unit. His delegation endorsed the proposals of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) regarding the use of competitive examinations for recruitment and a more systematic use of the roster. He appealed to the Budget Division to co-operate with OPS by providing a list of vacant posts and staff movements. As to the competitive examination for promotion from the General Service to the Professional category, his delegation considered that the established limit of 30 per cent should not be exceeded.

22. In recruiting for the higher levels of the Professional category, it was necessary to strike a balance between the recruitment of internal and external candidates so as not to block the recruitment of qualified young people. A study should be made of recruitment procedures so as to ensure that the selection of candidates, which currently took place in secret, would in future be subject to closer scrutiny by OPS. In order to improve the situation of many under-represented countries, more competitive examinations should be held for recruitment to the Professional category. Such examinations should be held in the capitals of all Member States under the supervision of the UNDP resident representative. In making use of the roster, OPS should, prior to recruitment, take into account, inter alia, the university degrees of candidates.

/...

(Mr. Adjeyi, Togo)

23. Greater publicity should be given to vacancy notices, which should be circulated in all official languages at least several months before the post was to become vacant.

24. His delegation fully supported section II, paragraph 2, of General Assembly resolution 33/143, concerning the inheritance of posts, and urged that it be strictly applied.

25. Every effort must be made to provide guidelines and establish procedures to increase the employment of women in the Secretariat, on an equal footing with men. Measures must be adopted by the United Nations and the other organizations of the system to increase the proportion of women in the Professional category and above in order to promote equal employment opportunities and career prospects for men and women. All organizations of the system should follow the example of FAO and WHO, which had taken special administrative action to monitor the application of general policy statements on the question of the employment of women. It was to be hoped that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) would not limit its attention to monitoring the implementation of resolution 33/143 but would also seek to generate constructive ideas to improve the situation of women. He appealed to the Governments of under-represented countries to put forward more female candidates for vacancies in the United Nations. The recruitment of women should not be carried out on a regional basis since such a system would prove discriminatory owing to the differences between regions with respect to concern over women's issues. Secretariat units should, as an exceptional measure, earmark posts for women in order to attain the target of 25 per cent of Professional posts for women.

26. With regard to the recruitment of young Professional staff members, he stressed the necessity of not granting extensions beyond the mandatory retirement age and of replacing retirees with competent young people. Staff members should be made aware of their approaching retirement and vacancy announcements should be issued as early as possible.

27. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed satisfaction that a consensus had been reached in the Formal Working Group on Personnel Questions as a result of the goodwill of all participants. The draft resolutions represented a compromise and, needless to say, if they had been put to a vote, his delegation would not have been able to support every provision. The interpretation of some provisions had been left open, and it was therefore important for delegations to make their positions clear.

28. His delegation deeply regretted that the Fifth Committee had been compelled to arbitrate between various units of the Secretariat and that differences between units had been laid before Member States. It was inappropriate for Member States to be asked to intervene in the workings of the Secretariat and he hoped that they would not be asked to do so again.

/...

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

29. The persistent under-representation of some States was one of the main problems dealt with by the Working Group. The Secretary-General's representatives had stated that it had not been possible to meet the target set, but no justification had been provided to substantiate their position. It was to be hoped that a serious effort would be made to achieve that target during the next biennium. It would not be possible to blame failure on internal difficulties, since draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37 laid down procedures to enable OPS to carry out that policy more effectively than in the past.

30. His delegation was satisfied with the compromise reached with regard to desirable ranges and paid a tribute to the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services for having suggested an approach which had provided the framework for a solution. His delegation considered that the concept of parity, referred to in section II, paragraph 3, of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37, was no more and no less logical than any other concept used for distributing posts in the Secretariat. Scientific logic did not apply to the distribution of posts, which was a matter for negotiation.

31. With regard to the relationship between the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) and JIU, his delegation was of the view that the constitutional authority for dealing with personnel questions for the common system was vested in ICSC and not JIU. While valuing the contributions of JIU in the personnel field, his delegation did not wish to see the authority of ICSC diluted.

32. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1, his delegation would have preferred not to have a study carried out by outside experts, but it had accepted the establishment of a committee of experts in a spirit of compromise. He understood that the experts would study not only personnel questions but the question of the structure of the Secretariat in the personnel, financial and administrative areas, giving equal emphasis to each, including the matter of the functions and title of "Controller". It was not clear what was intended by the interim measures, other than the procedures described in the annex to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37. His delegation agreed that the committee of experts should examine the structure of the Secretariat on the understanding that, until it submitted its report and the General Assembly took a decision, the Secretariat structure in the administrative, financial and management fields would remain unchanged.

33. Mr. CROM (Netherlands) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.49. The sponsors considered it necessary for the Fifth Committee, by virtue of its responsibility for the well-being of staff, to take action to guarantee adequate protection for international civil servants in the performance of their tasks. It would be for the General Committee to decide at the next session which Main Committee would be entrusted with the consideration of the report requested of the Secretary-General in paragraph 2, and under which agenda item it should be considered. His delegation had carried out extensive consultations with many delegations on the draft resolution, which enjoyed broad support, and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

/...

34. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) questioned whether the subject raised in draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.49 fell within the Committee's competence. In his view, the protection of United Nations officials was primarily a legal issue and as such should be considered in the Sixth Committee.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, as he understood it, the draft resolution was not seeking to change the privileges and protection enjoyed by international civil servants under the terms of a number of international conventions, but applied only to the practical application of those conventions and the bearing that that had on the execution of the tasks incumbent upon international civil servants. Moreover, even drafting international conventions was not the exclusive preserve of the Sixth Committee; any of the Main Committees could do so. He saw no reason, therefore, why the Fifth Committee should not consider the draft resolution.

36. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in that case, the Committee's consideration of the draft resolution should not set a precedent for other drafts relating to the legal status of Secretariat employees, nor should it mean that the Fifth Committee was assuming the role of employer of the United Nations staff. Under Article 97 of the Charter, the Secretary-General was the chief administrative officer of the Organization, and was responsible for all questions relating to employment and promotion.

AGENDA ITEM 100: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM (continued) (A/35/9 and Add.1, A/35/30 and Corr.1, A/35/720; A/C.5/35/37, A/C.5/35/41 and Corr.1, A/C.5/35/63; A/C.5/35/L.39, L.41, L.46, L.47 and L.51)

(a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would take up the draft resolution recommended by the Pension Board in annex VI to its report (A/35/9) and draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.46 and L.51, together with the proposed amendments thereto, before turning to the draft resolutions concerning investments of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (A/C.5/35/L.39, L.41 and L.47).

38. Mr. STEVENSON (Chairman of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board) announced that the Austrian delegation had indicated its satisfaction with the information he had supplied to it regarding the implications of the ICSC report. He personally had been most impressed with the concern delegations had shown for the welfare of the Fund's beneficiaries while at the same time remaining keenly aware that conditions in a changing world must be taken into account. He was sure the Board would benefit by their comments.

39. Mr. AKWEI (Acting Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission) said it was gratifying to note that there was broad agreement in the Committee on the joint recommendations of the Pension Board and ICSC. He noted that the question of updating the scale of staff assessment for the General Service category had featured prominently in the statements of some delegations. He



assured the representatives of New Zealand, Panama and Morocco that there would be no immediate reduction in anyone's pensionable remuneration in absolute terms as a result of the Commission's recommendation, since the Commission had provided that the revised scale would be applied only when there was a revision of the General Service salary scale at a particular duty station, that, if the revised scale resulted in a lower gross salary, the higher existing gross salary should be maintained until overtaken by subsequent salary increases, that there should be more frequent review and revision of the staff assessment rates, and that the 36-month average of exchange rates should be used rather than the spot rate. There would inevitably be a certain slowing down of the rate of increase in pensionable remuneration over a period of time, but that was not of immediate consequence.

40. It had been asked why a revision of the staff assessment scale should not be delayed, as requested by FICSA and staff representatives. As he had already stated, the staff assessment scale was based on tax rates prevailing in 1964 and any further delay would have the inevitable consequence of widening the gap which had to be closed.

41. The representatives of Morocco, Kenya and Panama had stated that FICSA had not been given sufficient time for consultations before the Commission had taken its decision. However, FICSA had had the same time to consider the matter as representatives of member organizations and members of the Commission themselves. Moreover, the question of review of staff assessment had been before the Commission since 1976. The crux of the matter was simple: over the years, General Service salaries had increased, keeping pace with the best prevailing conditions and inflation, while pensionable remuneration had also increased by not keeping pace with prevailing tax rates. He assured the representative of the United Kingdom that in future when recommendations were made on the issue of staff assessment, the Commission would bear in mind the need to provide details on developments relating to relevant tax rates. It had also been suggested by some representatives that the Commission should apply local taxes to establish the gross. There was, however, no practical way of studying the many different tax systems in the more than 150 duty stations. FICSA itself had opposed such an approach and had opted for a universal system linked to that applied to the Professional category.

42. It had been alleged that the WAPA system had anomalies and should be reformed before being applied to pensionable remuneration. The Commission was making every effort to investigate all possible anomalies in the post adjustment system with a view to proposing remedies. It was necessary, however, to await the results of the review that the Commission was carrying out before considering the question of the continued use of WAPA, which had been raised by the representative of Belgium. In his view, there was no other alternative if the Commission was to take into consideration the universality of the post adjustment system. Such a universal system must involve averaging, with its inevitable unfortunate consequences for the lowest and uppermost limits. In recommending the freezing of WAPA the preceding year, the Commission had expected that the income replacement concept would become the basis for the pension system, but the Fifth Committee had not found that approach acceptable. The Commission had therefore had to revise the basis of its recommendation. Moreover, the Commission's proposal for freezing WAPA had not been

(Mr. Akwei)

accepted by ACC, the Joint Staff Pension Board or ACABQ, on the ground that it might reduce contributions to the Fund. The Commission felt that its recommendation that WAPA should be used for contribution purposes and the United States CPI for benefit purposes was in the interest of the Fund.

43. He drew attention to document A/C.5/35/CRP.3, which contained information requested by the representative of Belgium concerning pensionable remuneration in the United Nations and in the comparator civil service. As he had already explained, the Noblemaire principle was currently limited to salaries. In that connexion, there had been reports that salaries in the United States Civil Service were to be increased. The Commission was carrying out a study of total compensation and, pending completion, it would be premature to base the existing system on total compensation, including pensions. Care should be taken to avoid hasty comparisons. There was, for example, no compulsory retirement age in the United States Civil Service and the maximum retirement benefit amounted to 80 per cent of final remuneration, whereas retirement at 60 was mandatory in the United Nations and the maximum benefit was 65 per cent. The Commission was aware of the importance of taking into account the effects of income tax on pensions but believed that, because of the complexity of the issue, it was not possible to make recommendations at the current time. The Commission had decided to carry out an in-depth study of the policy and technical considerations and hoped to be in a position to present definite views or proposals in the future.

44. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, although he had no official information about the new ceiling mentioned by the Acting Chairman of ICSC, he understood that the United States Congress was working on an adjustment to the so-called "pay cap" resulting from the proposed increase in the salaries of members of Congress. Further information would be conveyed to ICSC as soon as it was available.

45. Mr. ROOBAERT (Belgium), replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, said that his delegation was satisfied with the information contained in document A/C.5/35/CRP.3 on the matter it had raised at the previous meeting.

46. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that earlier remarks by the representative of the United States concerning the agreements on the transfer of pension rights between the Pension Board and the Governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics clearly showed that the matter had not been properly understood. The claim that any such agreement must contain a clause requiring new participants in the Pension Fund to transfer their previously acquired pension entitlements to the Fund could not be upheld and was, indeed, at variance with article 13 of the Fund's Regulations. An agreement similar to those under discussion concluded between the Fund and the Government of Canada had been approved by the General Assembly. Nor could it be claimed that the agreements in question would affect the Fund adversely: discussions with the Consulting Actuary had made it plain that they would do nothing of the kind.

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

47. Article 100 of the Charter had nothing to do with the agreements, either. It had more bearing on the recommendation by ICSC concerning supplementary payments by certain Governments to their citizens employed in international organizations, and that recommendation did not apply to the Soviet Union. As for the temporary secondment of national civil servants to the United Nations, the practice was common to many States; it was not peculiar to the Soviet Union.

48. As a further argument against acceptance of the agreements, it had been suggested that other Governments might wish to conclude similar agreements with the Pension Fund. His delegation felt that any such initiative should be welcomed, in that it would result in enhanced opportunities for those employed in international organizations.

49. Finally, it had been suggested that the agreements contained no safeguards for the pension entitlements of United Nations employees. Fears on that score were groundless. The agreements had been concluded at the request of participants in the Pension Fund and in their interests, and gave them an option between the benefits available from the Fund and those available under the agreements: the staff members affected would be free to make their choice. It was to be hoped, therefore, that members of the Fifth Committee would support the recommendation of the Pension Board and ACABQ, and concur in the agreements.

50. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) welcomed the Board's proposal to admit to the Fund the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (A/35/9, para. 73); the admission of new members should be encouraged as a means of strengthening the Fund. He also welcomed agreements on the transfer of pension rights, of which he hoped there would be more in the future. He had no problem with any particular agreement since it was obviously the fruit of careful negotiations between the Fund and the Government concerned.

51. With respect to the establishment of an index which would take into account the various levels of taxation applied to pensions in different countries, his delegation favoured setting a deadline of January 1982 by which ICSC should submit its findings on the subject.

Draft resolution contained in annex VI to the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (A/35/9)

52. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the Austrian amendment (A/C.5/35/L.50) to the draft resolution contained in annex VI to the Board's report.

53. The Austrian amendment was adopted.

54. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that, because his delegation was under the impression that the request made in paragraph 92 of the Board's report (A/35/9) for an additional P-3 and an additional G-5 temporary assistance post for 1981 was justified by the complexities of the new procedure, and that any shortage of staff

/...

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

might have a detrimental effect, in that pensioners world wide might experience delays in receipt of the benefits on which they depended, it proposed that the sum of \$25,000 to cover those two temporary assistance posts should be restored to the Advisory Committee's recommendation with respect to the administrative expenses of the Fund mentioned in paragraph VI of the draft resolution contained in annex VI to the Board's report.

55. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Kenyan amendment.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Canada, France, Japan, Portugal, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Congo, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Singapore, Sweden.

56. The Kenyan amendment was adopted by 63 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

57. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that he had inadvertently pressed the wrong button; he had, of course, intended to vote in favour of his own amendment.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution contained in annex VI to the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (A/35/9), as amended.

59. The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

60. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) said that his delegation was still not completely clear about all the ramifications of the revised pension adjustment system, and was not fully convinced of the adequacy of consultations on the matter. It had therefore been obliged to abstain.

/...

61. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution as amended.

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.46

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.46 without a vote.

63. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.46 was adopted.

Draft decision A/C.5/35/L.51

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.5/35/L.51 without a vote.

65. Draft decision A/C.5/35/L.51 was adopted.

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the draft resolutions relating to the investment of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund contained in documents A/C.5/35/L.39, L.41 and L.47.

67. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) said the Secretary-General bore the prime responsibility for investing the assets of the Fund in accordance with the fundamental criteria laid down by the General Assembly. To the greatest extent possible, those assets should be invested in marketable portfolio investments in accordance with the sound principle of international diversification of investments to yield adequate returns. He had noted that in document A/C.5/35/L.41, as in some other United Nations documents, his country had not been listed in its rightful place among the developing countries. As one of the founder members of the Group of 77 there was no doubt that it belonged to that category and the Secretariat should in future follow the categorization used by the World Bank.

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39

68. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39, reminded the Committee that the amendment proposed at a previous meeting by the representative of New Zealand had been accepted by the sponsors, but did not appear in the text. That amendment, which was a reiteration of operative paragraph 1 of resolution 34/222 C, would insert a new operative paragraph between existing paragraphs 1 and 2 to read, "Requests the Secretary-General to continue to diversify the investments of the Fund in appropriate investments in developing countries whenever this serves the interests of the participants and beneficiaries and is in accordance with the criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility;". The existing operative paragraph 2 would be renumbered accordingly.

69. Mr. MORET-ECHEVARRIA (Cuba) said that, while his delegation supported the idea of diversification, the wording of the third preambular paragraph was too vague. It made no reference to developing countries nor to the need to explore opportunities for new portfolio investments in those countries. Furthermore, it left the door open to investments in transnational corporations.

70. The use of the words "with appreciation" in operative paragraph 1 gave the false impression that all delegations were totally satisfied with the report of the Secretary-General. As for the new operative paragraph 2 that had been introduced, it was not acceptable to his delegation in that it made any investments in developing countries contingent upon the interests of the participants and beneficiaries. On that basis, investments in transnational corporations might generally be considered to be in their best interests. His delegation also noted the omission of any reference to the high percentage of assets of the Fund which remained invested in such corporations. For all those reasons, it would vote against the draft resolution.

71. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that his delegation would also vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39, for similar reasons. There was a contradiction between the third preambular paragraph, which referred to world-wide diversification of investments, and the new operative paragraph 2, which restricted that diversification in developing countries by stating that it should take place only when it served the interests of participants and beneficiaries. As far as he was concerned it was safe to assume that the Investments Committee always took the interests of beneficiaries and participants into account. Furthermore, the use of the word "world-wide" might result in investments not in keeping with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or with the view of the overwhelming majority of Member States. There was no need to elaborate on the kind of investments to which he was referring. He had the distinct impression that an attempt was being made to pull the wool over the Committee's eyes in the belief that once the draft resolution had been adopted the "world-wide diversification" could be interpreted to apply to investments which would not meet with the approval of the majority of Member States.

72. At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39 as orally revised.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and

/...

Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Panama, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstaining: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, Gabon, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay.

73. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39, as orally revised, was adopted by 53 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.41

74. Mr. ROOBAERT (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on behalf of the nine member States of the European Economic Community, said that they were fully cognizant of the timely efforts being made to diversify the investments of the Fund and to study investment opportunities in all capital markets more thoroughly. They supported the principles governing management of the portfolio, including that of giving preference to investments in developing countries where the requirements of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility could be met. However, they were equally concerned that there should be a high return on investments in order to guarantee that the Fund could discharge its obligations towards the participants and beneficiaries to whom it belonged. Out of concern for profitability, balance in the investment of the Fund's assets, and good management of the portfolio, they regretted that they would be unable to support draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.41.

75. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation did not share the concern expressed in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. The Secretary-General should be investing in whatever capital market was best for the Fund. If the four criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility were to be observed, then there could be no legislative preference for any specific investment. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

76. Mr. FARMER (Australia) said that his delegation concurred with the views expressed by the two previous speakers and would vote accordingly.

/...

77. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.41.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Somalia.

78. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.41 was adopted by 72 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.

79. Mr. SAGRERA (Spain) said that his delegation had voted in favour of similar resolutions at previous sessions of the General Assembly and had seen no reason not to do likewise with respect to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.41, since it recognized that prime responsibility lay with the Secretary-General and the Investments Committee. However, he did have certain reservations about the last preambular paragraph, which did not do justice to the comments made in paragraphs 15 to 17 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/35/41).

80. Mrs. SANDIFER (Portugal) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution for the same reasons as the members of the European Economic Community. In addition, it could not support operative paragraph 3 because it did not believe that the Fifth Committee was competent to involve itself in the matter of investments in an increasingly detailed fashion. The submission of a detailed biennial inventory of investments would make work for the Committee which it was incapable of doing.

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.47

81. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that the words "external financing for development projects"

/...



at the end of the operative paragraph might cause problems since, logically, it would mean that the Secretary-General would have to make a judgement in each case as to whether there was a need for external financing and whether the investment of assets from the Fund would be in keeping with it. He did not believe that the Secretary-General could go so far as to make such a judgement; it was properly the province of the countries concerned to decide whether or not external financing was required.

82. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) announced that Kenya had joined his delegation in sponsoring the draft resolution.

83. The Under-Secretary-General was correct in saying that it was the Governments concerned which determined the respective amounts of external and domestic financing required for a particular project. The purport of the wording in question was that investors should be in a position to take account of the total package. However, in view of the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General and the fears expressed by some delegations informally, the words "need for external financing for development projects" at the end of the operative paragraph should be replaced by "development requirements of African countries".

84. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.47 as orally revised.

85. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.47, as orally revised, was adopted.

86. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had had certain reservations about the draft resolution in that it did not specifically refer to all four criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility. However, on the understanding that it would form part of an omnibus resolution on the subject of investment of the assets of the Fund, which would include draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.39, which did refer to those criteria, he had not objected to its adoption by consensus.

87. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that, over and above the need to take account of the four criteria of safety, profitability, liquidity and convertibility, nothing should stand in the way of compliance with the draft resolution, given the importance the Committee attached to the need to take advantage of all development-related investment opportunities in African countries.

The meeting was suspended at 2 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)  
(A/35/7/Add.15, A/35/30 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/37, 39, 61 and 96, L.40 and L.42)

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.40

88. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.40 on the question of supplementary payments to international civil servants, said that his delegation's sense of principle had been stirred by paragraphs 115-123 of the

/...

(Mr. Maycock, Barbados)

report of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) (A/35/30) and by the comments of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (A/C.5/35/61) on that issue. The proposal of his delegation represented the minimum that the Committee could do to shoulder its responsibility under the Charter to ensure the independence of, and equity in, the Secretariat. It was of the utmost importance that the General Assembly should issue a directive to ICSC concerning such supplementary payments and, in an effort to reconcile quite divergent views, his delegation had held consultations with many delegations.

89. His delegation appealed to the Commission, in compliance with the operative paragraph of the draft resolution, to assist Member States in their task by producing firm and balanced recommendations based on a comprehensive study of the whole question of supplementary payments. His delegation hoped that, once the Commission's considered recommendations were available, the Committee would find a method whereby the practice of supplementary payments would be ended or some machinery would be established for meeting the peculiar difficulties of certain Member States.

90. His delegation hoped that draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.40 would be adopted by consensus.

91. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had been consulted by the representative of Barbados and would have no difficulty in going along with the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.40 by consensus. His delegation hoped, however, that in its future studies ICSC would examine the relationship of United Nations staff members with their own countries and would also address itself to the problems which had given rise to such supplementary payments.

92. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) expressed the hope that the ICSC review would take proper account of all aspects of the question of supplementary payments.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.40 by consensus.

94. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.42

95. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.42 without a vote.

96. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

United Nations accommodation in Santiago (A/C.5/35/80)

97. The CHAIRMAN invited the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to report orally on the report of the Secretary-General on United Nations accommodation in Santiago (A/C.5/35/80).

/...

98. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had been able to appreciate the problem of space requirements at ECLA headquarters when the Committee had visited Santiago. The Advisory Committee had borne that experience in mind when it had considered the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/35/80). The Advisory Committee's recommendation was that the Fifth Committee recommend to the General Assembly to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed with the architectural and engineering study and that any additional expenditure that might be required be reflected in the final performance report for the biennium 1980-1981.

99. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Committee of its earlier decision that the Secretariat would not, after 4 December 1980, submit any further documents for consideration by the Fifth Committee at the thirty-fifth session. Document A/C.5/35/80 was very brief and he could not understand why the Secretariat had not submitted it before 9 December. He therefore proposed that consideration of the question of United Nations accommodation in Santiago should be postponed until the thirty-sixth session.

100. Mr. MORET-ECHEVARRIA (Cuba) supported the proposal of the Soviet Union.

101. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that, in the view of his delegation, the statements of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and of the representatives of the Soviet Union and Cuba were all valid. When, however, a legal point arose in relation to a factual situation which, if implemented, would redound to the benefit of a particular community, the legal consideration should clearly give way to the factual. The space requirements of ECLA in Santiago called for urgent attention. As the work of ECLA benefited the entire Latin American region, his delegation considered that the Fifth Committee should support the Advisory Committee's recommendation and vote in favour of the appropriation of \$125,000.

102. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation was not opposed to the provision of adequate space for ECLA. The brief report in document A/C.5/35/80 did not adequately demonstrate the existence of a space problem. Moreover, it was not fitting that the Secretary-General should, in a document dated 9 December 1980, respond to a decision taken by ECLA in April 1979. His delegation was not opposed to the Advisory Committee's recommendation but wished to record its extreme displeasure at the practices and procedures of the Secretariat demonstrated in the current case.

103. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) agreed with the representative of Panama that, when the Committee was faced with a de facto problem, it should not use a legal pretext to postpone a decision regarding its solution. The Fifth Committee should not delay action which would benefit an institution simply because it was located in an unpopular country and in order to satisfy the political considerations of other countries.

104. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

105. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation appreciated the comments of the representative of the United States regarding the timing and brevity of document A/C.5/35/80 but had difficulties with the proposal of the Soviet Union and Cuba. If that proposal was accepted, the question would arise as to what the cost to ECLA would be during the intervening period. He invited the Secretariat to comment on that point and, in particular, on the adequacy of existing facilities.

106. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that he fully appreciated the Committee's difficulties consequent upon the submission of document A/C.5/35/80 at such a late date. The only reason had been the huge volume of work in recent days and the fact that the document in question, although brief, had nevertheless required to be processed.

107. In reply to the representative of Kenya, he said that the cost to ECLA would be represented by a delay of one year. In November 1979 ECLA had pointed out that urgent action was necessary but had been informed that it was too late for action to be taken at the thirty-fourth session.

108. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that, in view of the statement by the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services and of the importance which Latin American delegations attached to the adequacy of ECLA accommodation in Santiago, he would appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union to withdraw the procedural question which he had raised and to accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

109. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a vote was taken on the following proposal: "That the Fifth Committee take note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/35/80) and authorize him to conduct the architectural and engineering study referred to in his report, on the understanding that it will not be necessary to allocate additional funds in the budget for 1980-1981 during the present session. The Secretary-General is requested to make every effort to meet the cost of this study within the appropriations which have already been approved and, if necessary, additional requirements would be considered in the context of the budget performance report to be submitted to the thirty-sixth session."

110. The proposal was adopted by 80 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

111. Mr. MORET-ECHEVARRIA (Cuba), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had abstained for the reasons which he had given earlier. His delegation did not share the view that additional construction should take place in Chile, because it was not possible for all countries to have access to that country. The usefulness of the accommodation in Santiago was thus diminished. As a member of ECLA his delegation supported the provision of proper accommodation but urged that ECLA accommodation should be removed to another Latin American country. The proposed study should focus on the possibility of expanding the facilities in Mexico City or Port of Spain.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/35/L.24, as amended, concerning agenda item 111 (A/C.5/35/113)

112. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, when the Sixth Committee had adopted draft resolution

(Mr. Mselle)

A/C.6/35/L.24, as amended, it had done so on the understanding that, since the analytical study requested would be carried out by UNITAR, no additional appropriation would be required under the regular budget. But since the General Assembly had recently recommended that a grant-in-aid requested by UNITAR for 1980 and 1981 should be granted for 1980 only and that the request for 1981 should be considered in 1981, the financial position of UNITAR was not as sound as had been expected.

113. Accordingly, in his statement on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.6/35/L.24, as amended (A/C.5/35/113), the Secretary-General had pointed out that should the General Assembly wish the study to be carried out as recommended by the Sixth Committee, the provision of additional resources in an amount of \$115,100 would be necessary in section 26 of the budget.

114. There were two alternatives for dealing with the situation. Either the funds could be granted to UNITAR in order to enable it to carry out that study, or the study could be carried out by the Secretary-General. The Advisory Committee had discussed document A/C.5/35/113 with the representatives of the Secretary-General and had reached the conclusion that, under the circumstances, if the study was carried out by the Secretary-General, there would be no need at that stage to appropriate the \$115,100 and that any over-expenditure should be reported in the context of the performance report. That was the same procedure that had been recommended with regard to accommodations in Santiago.

115. He emphasized that the denial of funds did not mean that the study would not be undertaken. It merely meant that at the present stage, it was not possible to forecast whether all the funds appropriated for the 1980-1981 programme budget would be overspent. The latest forecast indicated that the budget would be approximately \$1.15 billion. Certainly \$115,100 could be made available from that over-all amount. If that was not possible, then the General Assembly should consider appropriating an amount not exceeding \$115,100 under section 26 at its thirty-sixth session.

116. He wished to stress once more that the Advisory Committee was not recommending against completion of the activity recommended. In the past, some delegations had had the impression that the appropriation of resources was equivalent to the completion of the activities concerned. That, however, was not always the case. There had been instances where funds had been appropriated and the Secretary-General had later reported that for various reasons he was not able to carry out the activities in question. He hoped that the Fifth Committee would accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

117. The CHAIRMAN asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee whether UNITAR had requested the amount of \$115,100. Was the Advisory Committee recommending that that amount should be given to UNITAR from existing resources?

118. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) replied that, if the General Assembly wished the Secretary-General or UNITAR to carry out the study, any additional requirements that might be required should be dealt with in the final performance report.

/...

119. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation and did not understand why there should be any misunderstanding about it. He hoped the Fifth Committee would adopt the Advisory Committee's recommendation without a vote.

120. Mr. RODRIGUEZ MENDOZA (Venezuela) asked whether the Advisory Committee's recommendation would imply that the analytical study requested in draft resolution A/C.6/35/L.24 would be carried out by the Secretary-General and not by UNITAR.

121. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the recommendation of the Advisory Committee stood, regardless of whether there were political factors that would militate against the Secretary-General's carrying out the study and whether the Sixth Committee, in recommending that UNITAR should carry it out, had had other factors in mind. It simply meant that, whatever assistance the Secretary-General might provide under section 26 to any entity that might carry out the study, no additional appropriation would be required at that stage.

122. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America), supported by Mr. KUYAMA (Japan), said that his delegation was willing to go along with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, but wished to know why the Secretary-General had not informed the Sixth Committee that UNITAR would require additional resources to carry out the study. It was the duty of the Secretary-General to find out immediately, and report to the relevant Committee, if there was any possibility of such a situation arising. The matter should have been addressed in the Sixth Committee at the appropriate time.

123. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that it was not clear whether the Secretary-General or UNITAR would carry out the study. He requested clarification from the representative of the Secretary-General.

124. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that, while the draft resolution requested that the study should be carried out by UNITAR, the Secretary-General should co-operate with UNITAR in that task. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee merely referred to the manner of reporting on the use of the funds.

125. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) noted from the Assistant Secretary-General's clarification that the Fifth Committee would merely be approving the appropriation of the funds for the study; it was not concerned with who actually carried out the study.

126. Mr. BROTDININGRAT (Indonesia) said that what was important was that the study requested by the Sixth Committee should be carried out. His delegation did not attach much importance to the question whether the appropriation should be made now as requested by the Secretary-General or reported later in a performance report.

127. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/35/L.24, as amended, it would not be necessary to

make additional appropriations in the 1980-1981 programme budget during the current session. Any additional appropriations that might be necessary should be considered in the context of the performance report to be submitted at the thirty-sixth session.

128. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to his suggestion.

129. It was so decided.

Accommodation at the Vienna International Centre (A/35/7/Add.28, A/C.5/35/81)

130. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/35/7/Add.28), which referred to negotiations which had taken place during the past year between the Austrian authorities, the United Nations and IAEA. As explained in that paragraph, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Secretary-General should submit the final text of the agreements and the protocol to the Advisory Committee before they were signed. The Advisory Committee would refrain from commenting on the matter until those texts were received.

131. He then drew attention to paragraphs 26 to 31 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/35/7/Add.28), which referred to the question of common services provided by UNIDO. When the members of the Advisory Committee had visited Vienna, they had been able to appreciate the factors that would lead to considerable expenditures in common services. Some of the factors were mentioned in paragraphs 29 and 30 of its report. The Advisory Committee believed that prudent management of the resources allocated for common services should lead to economies. Accordingly, it recommended that the Secretary-General's request for 1980-1981 should be reduced by \$1 million.

132. With regard to paragraphs 32 to 34 of the Advisory Committee's report, on the question of conference services in Vienna, he said that during its visit to Vienna and during the discussions of the report of the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee had learned that conference service expenditures were met by suballotment out of the appropriations for section 29. The Advisory Committee recommended that that procedure should be continued in 1980. The Advisory Committee was also of the opinion that the experience gained in 1979, 1980 and part of 1981 would be used in recommending whether there should be a permanent establishment for conference services in Vienna. Accordingly it recommended that the amount of \$1,673,000 requested by the Secretary-General should not be appropriated at that stage.

133. As members could see from the recapitulation in paragraph 40 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/35/7/Add.28), the Advisory Committee recommended that an amount of \$11,694,800 should be appropriated, to be distributed as set forth in that paragraph.

134. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), Rapporteur, said that his delegation had been struck by the fact that the operation of the Vienna International Centre had turned out to be

(Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

much more expensive than anticipated and that there was a danger that the high costs would impinge upon the substantive programmes of the tenants of the Centre, especially the IAEA. He noted that only 40 per cent of the total area was usable space. He hoped that the United Nations, UNIDO and IAEA would work with the Austrian Government to reduce operating costs.

135. His delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee set forth in paragraphs 28, 29 and 31 of its report (A/35/7/Add.28).

136. Mr. ROOBAERT (Belgium) said that his delegation was struck by the fact that organizations accommodated at the Centre were forced to use a considerable part of their budgets for maintenance and operational costs, which were not covered by the Austrian Government. His delegation endorsed the views of the Advisory Committee with regard to an additional appropriation for the cost of operating the Centre and called on the respective heads of the various organizations using the Centre to ensure that maintenance and operating costs and expenditures for common services were carefully monitored in years to come.

137. Mr. FARMER (Australia) expressed his delegation's concern that the substantive operations of the agencies using the Centre were suffering because of the high operating costs, which were apparently due, at least in part, to the design of the Centre. IAEA in particular had been forced to cut back its programmes. All tenants of the Centre and the host Government should co-operate on a sustained basis to keep the costs down.

138. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) felt that the Advisory Committee could have recommended even further reductions. Action was needed to reduce the maintenance and operating costs of the Centre, improve efficiency and achieve greater space utilization. If the recommendation for an additional appropriation were put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

139. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) agreed with the concern expressed by other delegations with regard to the enormous maintenance and operating costs at the Vienna International Centre and the impact of those costs on the substantive work of the tenants of the Centre, particularly IAEA.

140. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should approve additional appropriations in the total amount of \$17,858,600, under section 17 (\$188,300), section 28 M (\$16,481,800), section 29 F (\$77,000) and section 31 (\$1,111,500) of the programme budget for 1980-1981, to be offset by an increase in income of \$6,163,800. Consequently, the net additional requirement would be \$11,694,800.

141. It was so decided.

142. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had not opposed the additional appropriation just approved by the Committee but hoped that the Secretariat would take into account the views of delegations and continue to take the necessary steps to ensure that common service costs at the



(Mr. Belyaev, Byelorussian SSR)

Vienna International Centre were more equally shared. The appropriations from the regular budget must be used with the greatest possible economy and efficiency, primarily for the needs of United Nations activities financed from the regular budget.

143. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had not insisted on a vote on the additional appropriation just approved. If a vote had been taken his delegation would have abstained.

144. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation had supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations with regard to the accommodation at the Vienna International Centre and recognized the need for more economical operation of the Centre. Nevertheless, he felt it necessary to express his delegation's appreciation to the Government of Austria for having placed such a magnificent Centre at the disposal of the United Nations at a rental cost of only 1 schilling per year. The high maintenance costs, particularly the air conditioning costs, could not have been anticipated and the Committee should perhaps investigate ways of reducing them.

145. Mr. BROTODIWINGRAT (Indonesia) supported the views of the representative of Pakistan.

Job classification and career development of language staff (A/C.5/35/L.45)

146. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.45 on job classification and career development of language staff, said that the situation of the language staff had become a chronic problem, which now required a more definitive solution. Some assurances had been given to the language staff and they should not be disappointed. In attempting to deal with the problem, the Secretary-General had established a group to study the problem with the participation of the staff concerned, an excellent procedure that should be followed in similar cases in the future.

147. It had been confirmed by the various groups and individuals that had examined the situation that a problem definitely existed and the situation caused difficulties within the Secretariat and could have an impact on the work of the General Assembly. On the one hand, the ratio of posts in the language services, particularly at the P-4 and P-5 levels, showed that the career prospects of language staff were severely limited in comparison with other departments of the Secretariat and, on the other hand, the criteria used in classifying Professionals in the other departments could not be applied to the language staff. The career of the language staff evolved in a way similar to that of doctors, for instance, in that an interpreter began as an interpreter and continued progressing in his career, staying in the same job but gaining experience and developing his competence gradually and without any marked stages. That experience should be recognized and appreciated appropriately.

148. The draft resolution sought to ensure that the equal status of all of the official and working languages of the United Nations was preserved and that the

/...

A/C.5/35/SR.58

English

Page 26

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

quality of documents did not suffer as the result of any specific measures adopted, such as self-revision. It would be appropriate to introduce self-revision on an experimental basis in areas where it was deemed appropriate. The Secretary-General would report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the implementation of all steps taken.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.