



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OKEYO (Kenya)

later: Mr. VAN DEN HOUT (Netherlands)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 113: FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS
OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC-2 150, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.5/43/SR.27
21 November 1988
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 113: FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS (continued) (A/43/5 and Add.1-8; A/C.5/43/L.4)

1. Mr. FABY (Deputy Director, Regional Office of the United Nations Environment Programme) said that the questions raised by the representative of the United Kingdom at a previous session concerned the section relating to travel in the Board of Auditors' report (A/43/5/Add.6) on the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and, in particular, the auditors' comments regarding both travel advances which were not liquidated immediately after the completion of the travel and additional travel advances that were granted although the prior advances had not been fully liquidated.

2. During the last biennium there had been 11 cases in which travel advances had been granted before the liquidation of prior advances, but in all such cases the advances were later properly liquidated. UNEP applied the rules and followed the customary procedures whereby travel advances were granted to its staff members only when prior advances had been fully liquidated. However, it was in certain cases necessary to make exceptions, such as when requests for reimbursement of travel expenses submitted by staff members could not be processed immediately because of a need to make inquiries, request information or call for the submission of additional documentation, and in such cases it was sometimes even necessary to amend the original travel authorization. In those cases, there was a possibility of a delay for which a staff member who had to travel on another official mission - and was requesting a further travel advance for that purpose - could not be held responsible. An exception also had to be made if the staff member remained at his destination for a period of only two or three days between different missions. It was unfair to expect that the request for reimbursement of travel expenses relating to the completed mission should be submitted in that short period, before the next mission began. UNEP believed that such exceptional cases must be accepted; if they were not, the normal development of its work programme would be affected.

3. As a means of further control to ensure the rapid processing of travel expense reimbursements, UNEP had for some time been successfully applying a procedure whereby its staff members had to submit their requests for reimbursement within two weeks of the completion of a mission and, in addition, those travel advances which remained unaccounted for and were not liquidated within a period of one month were automatically deducted from their next month's salary.

4. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that draft resolution A/C.5/43/L.4 was the result of intensive informal consultations and should, as a consensus text, be considered as a whole. The draft resolution retained and reaffirmed elements from previous resolutions which remained valid and incorporated other new elements derived from the discussions held during the current session. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was submitted on the understanding that a reference was made in paragraph 91 of the Board of Auditors' report on the United Nations (A/43/5) to a review of those aspects of the activities of the multinational programming and operational centres in which the Board had competence and that the relevant

(Mr. Vaheer, Canada)

recommendation was not intended to prejudge the results of the proposed evaluation. In his opinion, note should be taken of that understanding in the report of the Fifth Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)

First report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/43/7)

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the first report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/43/7), referred to paragraphs 22 to 29 concerning the implementation of recommendation 25 of the Group of 18 on the location of the functions related to liaison with non-governmental organizations and drew attention to the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraph 27. Concerning the section on the situation in Afghanistan (paras. 30 and 31), the Advisory Committee would be submitting a further report on the revised estimates of the appropriations needed for the Secretary-General to perform his task of good offices.

6. Concerning the question of judgements issued by the Administrative Tribunal, he drew attention to the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraph 12 of its report, which explained the practice followed by some Geneva-based agencies of paying a repatriation grant to French nationals working at Geneva but residing in France. The Advisory Committee supported the United Nations practice of not paying the grant and was therefore concerned at the fact that there was a disparity in the application of the rules regarding the repatriation grant. There was no reason why a repatriation grant should be paid to a staff member who was not in fact being repatriated. The Advisory Committee was therefore requesting the Secretary-General to draw those concerns to the attention of the agencies through the relevant consultative bodies. Lastly, he suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the first report of the Advisory Committee, contained in document A/43/7.

7. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) asked, with reference to paragraph 14 of the report, which noted the Advisory Committee's concurrence in the request concerning acquisition of the land on which the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) building was located, when the amounts borrowed to purchase the land would be reimbursed, what time-frame was envisaged for a double transaction of that nature and when the United Nations would begin to receive repayments of the loans granted to UNITAR.

8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that paragraph 14 was in fact a very brief summary of a complicated presentation that had been made to the Advisory Committee. The transaction apparently involved borrowing money to purchase the land and, once the entire property was acquired, reselling it at a higher price. However, the representative of the Secretary-General might perhaps be able to provide a written explanation in response to the questions put by the representative of Italy. That did not mean

(Mr. Mselle)

that a document would be issued, but simply that the Fifth Committee would be informed in writing as to the stage reached in the real estate transaction.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the Controller would provide a written statement in reply to the questions raised by the representative of Italy, taking due account of the comments made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

10. Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) requested the Secretariat to explain the reasons why a decision had been taken to sell United Nations property. He also wondered what was going to happen to UNITAR and where it would establish its headquarters in the future.

11. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation would also appreciate the provision of assurances in the Controller's reply that there was in fact no possibility of confusion and duplication of work between the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and Secretariat Services and the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, as referred to in paragraph 27 of document A/43/7.

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council in 1988 (A/C.5/43/5 and A/43/7/Add.1)

12. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that paragraph 6 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/43/7/Add.1) referred to requests for additional appropriations for 1988-1989 totalling \$550,800 in connection with the implementation of four resolutions of the Economic and Social Council. Paragraph 4 dealt with conference-servicing requirements. The Advisory Committee had noted that, for reasons explained in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/43/5), no additional resources were being requested under section 29 at the present time. As indicated in paragraph 5 there would be other costs which would be met from extrabudgetary resources. Finally, paragraph 19 recapitulated the additional amounts which the Advisory Committee was recommending for approval under sections 6B, 9 and 13 of the budget for the biennium 1988-1989, and paragraph 20 indicated the additional amount that would have to be appropriated under section 31 and that would be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

13. With regard to the implementation of Council resolution 1988/56, concerning the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia, for the reasons stated in paragraph 13 of its report, the Advisory Committee was recommending against approval of the request for \$48,000 for consultant fees in light of the consultant services available to the Centre on Transnational Corporations and the possible redeployment of available resources under the various objects of expenditure within section 9. Nevertheless, it was making that recommendation on the understanding that, if such redeployment proved impossible, the Secretary-General would make the commitments necessary to carry out the planned activities and report thereon in his second performance report.

14. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation could not accept the requests for additional appropriations made in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/43/5) in connection with the implementation of various resolutions of the Economic and Social Council.

15. With regard to Council resolution 1988/25 concerning the situation of Palestinian women, the proposed mission exceeded the mandate of the Commission on the Status of Women, was politically motivated and bore little relationship to questions of real interest for women. Similar missions could be sent to other parts of the world ruled by régimes which did not respect women's fundamental rights. For that reason, he requested that the appropriation of \$53,000 requested under section 6B (Activities on global social development issues) should be the subject of a separate recorded vote.

16. It should be recalled that Council resolution 1988/54 concerning assistance to the Palestinian people served as a basis for draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.13/Rev.2, which had been adopted in the Second Committee. Both envisaged the hiring of 20 experts, but no information had been provided in the Second Committee with respect to the financial aspects of the proposed activities. His delegation had already expressed its opposition to resolution 1988/54 and to draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.13/Rev.2, as well as to the duplication of activities and extravagance involved in the proliferation of studies on that subject. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee indicated in paragraph 9 of its report (A/43/7/Add.1) that a number of activities on aspects of the question of Palestine were being carried out under various sections of the programme budget. For those reasons, his delegation requested that the additional appropriation of \$121,500 recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 10 of its report should be the subject of a separate recorded vote.

17. His delegation was also opposed to the additional appropriation of \$185,900 under section 9 (Transnational corporations), as recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 19 of its report, and requested that that appropriation should also be the subject of a separate recorded vote.

18. Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) said that United Nations activities in connection with the question of Palestine were of the utmost importance, because they addressed the concerns of a people which had been undergoing enormous suffering for decades. His delegation supported the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General for the provision of assistance to the Palestinian people and the corresponding recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

19. Mr. ABDULLAH (Iraq) said he agreed with the remarks made by the representative of Tunisia and referred to the United States' insistence on a recorded vote. In view of the critical situation of the Palestinian people, which was the object of constant persecution, it was important not to request recorded votes. The resolutions of the Economic and Social Council called for the support of all Member States.

20. Mr. COHEN (Israel), referring to Economic and Social Council resolutions 1988/25 and 1988/54, said that Israel supported UNDP assistance to the

(Mr. Cohen, Israel)

Palestinians, but would not co-operate with missions and studies by other bodies such as the Economic and Social Council. Therefore, it would not admit the 20 experts referred to in resolution 1988/54, nor the five experts and staff members indicated in resolution 1988/25. The sums of \$121,500 and \$52,000 requested, respectively, in each of those resolutions should be used for other purposes, such as the programme of assistance for the flood victims in the Sudan. It was worth noting that the various United Nations programmes and activities relating to Palestine amounted to a total of \$8.5 million, while the funds for cases of natural disaster amounted to \$7.2 million. Neither, apparently, would there be any reduction in the expenses relating to the PLO, even though it was committed to attacking States Members of the United Nations.

21. Mr. BREHO (Ghana) expressed his delegation's resolute support for Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/56 on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia. It was Ghana's firm conviction that apartheid was a crime of lese-humanity and that the international community had the political and moral obligation to bring that abhorrent régime to a rapid end. With that aim, the activities of transnational corporations must be publicised so that the international community would pressure those corporations to divest from South Africa or, at least, to refrain from making further investments. Ghana supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, subject to the conditions indicated by the ACABQ Chairman.

22. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that the activities provided for in the three draft resolutions were examined and re-examined every year without ever really settling any of the issues. Two years earlier, it had been decided that the regular activities would be included in the biennial budget, in particular those activities related to Afghanistan, South Africa, Namibia, Kampuchea and Palestine. Without going into detail on the matter of Israeli practices or the rights of the Palestinian people and other related questions, which were being considered in other Committees, his delegation wished to point out that not all the activities relating to the Palestinian people were described in the news reports. That was a very important question which should be taken up by the United Nations, as whatever had been revealed about the situation of the Palestinian people had been kept to a minimum, or even distorted.

23. Mr. AL-DUAINI (Kuwait) said that his delegation endorsed the statements by the representatives of Tunisia, Jordan, Iraq and Ghana and reaffirmed its support for the contents of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/43/5) on the revised estimates resulting from Economic and Social Council resolutions 1988/25, 1988/54 and 1988/56. In that connection, he wished to stress that the Advisory Committee supported the Secretary-General's report.

24. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation agreed with the statements made by the Tunisian, Ghanaian, Kuwaiti, Jordanian and Iraqi delegations. In a different vein, he wondered whether the agenda contained an item entitled "United Nations procedure", as one delegation had succeeded in indicating those organs of the United Nations with which it was prepared to discuss the Organisation's activities relating to the Palestinian people and those organs which did not

(Mr. Ladjouzi, Algeria)

deserve that honour. Moreover, the same delegation had taken a disparaging view of such activities.

25. Particularly since the General Assembly had adopted resolution 41/213 on improving the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations, it had been - and his delegation hoped it would continue to be - the common desire of Member States to seek, through every possible means, to have the budget and the proposals which had financial implications adopted by consensus. The selective criteria used by some in seeking that consensus was unfortunate, since all the questions contained within the framework of the United Nations budget deserved equal treatment at the very time when a consensus was being sought.

26. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$53,000 under section 6B for the biennium 1988-1989.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

27. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$53,000 under section 6B for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved by 87 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

28. Mr. ABDULLAH (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the additional appropriation resulting from Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/25 out of the belief that no effort must be spared in order to assist the Palestinian people and that the United Nations must play a

(Mr. Abdullah, Iraq)

substantial role in ensuring that the Palestinians and other oppressed peoples could exercise their rights.

29. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$185,900 under section 9 for the biennium 1988-1989.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Denmark, Israel, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden.

30. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$185,900 under section 9 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved by 92 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

31. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against an additional appropriation under section 9 in error, when it had intended to cast a favourable vote.

32. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$121,500 under section 19 for the biennium 1988-1989.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German

Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Chile, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

33. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$121,500 under section 19 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved by 88 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions.

34. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the three additional appropriations because it believed that the General Assembly had assigned special tasks to the various organs of the United Nations, and that the Economic and Social Council was the competent organ for dealing with economic and social matters. The fact that the Council had recommended that certain tasks should be carried out by specific organs was sufficient reason to support the proposals. The Fifth Committee should set a good example by respecting - and not weakening - the mandate of an intergovernmental organ such as the Council. Moreover, the Fifth Committee was not the appropriate forum for dealing with questions of a political nature which were being considered and decided upon in other bodies.

35. Mr. VILLADSEN (Denmark), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted incorrectly on the additional appropriation under section 9 in connection with Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/56. He requested that his vote should be corrected, since his delegation had wished to vote in favour of the additional appropriation.

36. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) and Mr. KRIEGER (Luxembourg), speaking in explanation of vote, said that in voting they had followed the order in which the proposals were presented in document A/C.5/43/5 and hence, since they had followed the correct order, they would have voted against the additional appropriation under section 19 and would have abstained in the voting on the appropriation under section 9, in connection with Council resolution 1988/56.

37. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) suggested that the Committee should proceed to a second vote in order to ensure that each delegation had voted in the way it had intended.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the rules of procedure did not allow for a second vote and, if a delegation explained the way in which it had wished to vote, its intention would be recorded in the summary records.

39. Mrs. OLDFELT (Sweden) said that her delegation had wished to abstain in the vote on the additional appropriation under section 6B in connection with Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/25, to vote in favour of the appropriation under section 9 in connection with Council resolution 1988/56, and to abstain in the vote on the appropriation under section 19 in connection with Council resolution 1988/54.

40. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) and Mr. DORANI (Djibouti) said that, if they had been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the three proposals.

41. Mrs. FRIESSNIGG (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had intended to vote in favour of the additional appropriation under section 9 in connection with Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/56, and to abstain on the appropriation under section 19 in connection with Council resolution 1988/54.

42. Mr. MOOKODI (Botswana), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had intended to abstain on the proposal under section 9 relating to Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/56.

Use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups (A/C.5/43/13 and A/43/7/Add.2

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/43/7/Add.2) referred to the Secretariat's practice with regard to the evaluation and remuneration of consultants and related costs. The Committee had been informed that no remuneration was paid if the consultant failed to complete the service specified in the agreement to the satisfaction of the United Nations. During the biennium 1986-1987, following evaluation of their work, payments to consultants had been withheld in nine cases. The Committee had felt it necessary to include that information in view of the comments made in paragraphs 77 to 81 of the report of the Board of Auditors (A/43/5/Add.7) concerning the practice of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) with regard to the remuneration and evaluation of its consultants. In the Advisory Committee's view, those practices should be corrected.

44. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland), said that the information provided in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/43/13) referred to the biennium 1986-1987 and its value was therefore historical. Since 1987, the situation with regard to consultants had changed substantially owing to the fact that the Group of 18 had recommended a 30-per-cent reduction in expenditures on consultants' services. The programme budget for 1988-1989 reflected that reduction, which applied to the use of consultants but not to ad hoc expert groups. Paragraph 4 of the ACABQ report (A/43/7/Add.2) indicated that, compared with the biennium 1984-1985, there had been significant decreases in expenditure on ad hoc expert groups and financial consultants under the regular budget and under extrabudgetary funds.

(Mr. Abraszewski, Poland)

45. Part III of the Secretary-General's report, which dealt with the application of guidelines - and with which ACABQ was apparently satisfied - was of particular interest. Nevertheless, in paragraphs 10 to 17 of that report, six guidelines were mentioned; and the last, according to which the selection of outside expertise should be from the widest and most representative number of countries as possible, including developing countries, was of particular concern to Member States. An attempt should be made to arrive at a conclusion on the functioning of the current system. Although there had been a noticeable improvement in areas relating to the recruitment of consultants, delegations would be in a better position to assess the situation when a more conclusive report was submitted. The Fifth Committee should take note of the reports of the Secretary-General and of ACABQ.

46. Mr. Van Den Hout (Netherlands) took the Chair.

47. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) requested a clarification of paragraph 7 of the ACABQ report, which indicated that, following evaluation of their work, payments to consultants had been withheld in nine cases.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that that issue would be discussed further, with the participation of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. He said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee wished to act in accordance with the suggestion of the representative of Poland, namely, to take note of the reports of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee.

49. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.