
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 86th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

First reading:

Sections 4.A.8 (Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development) and 4.A.9 (Committee on Science and Technology for Development) (continued)

Section 6.B.4 (Science and technology)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/34/L.122 concerning agenda item 70

Proposals of the Secretary-General for the draft programme budget of UNIDO for 1980-1981 in response to the request in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.42

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/34/SR.86
28 December 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)
(A/34/6 and Add.1, A/34/7, A/34/38)

First reading:

Sections 4.A.8 (Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development) and 4.A.9 (Committee on Science and Technology for Development)
(continued)

Section 6.B.4 (Science and technology)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/34/L.122 concerning agenda item 70
(A/34/7/Add.28; A/C.5/34/101)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General, in his statement (A/C.5/34/101) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/34/L.122, had requested an appropriation of \$1,714,600 under the expenditure section for the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. Because of the late submission of document A/C.5/34/101 and related material concerning the Conference on Science and Technology for Development, the Advisory Committee, after holding discussions with the Administrator of UNDP and the representatives of the Secretary-General, had decided to make an interim recommendation, so that the results of the Conference could begin to be implemented early in 1980, pending a review by ACABQ of the Secretary-General's requirements as a whole.
2. Summarizing the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, he said that ACABQ recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's request for a post at the Assistant Secretary-General level and two posts at the G-5 and G-4 level, as outlined in paragraph 7 of document A/34/7/Add.28. The Advisory Committee also recommended approval of the request for \$38,000 for the travel of the Assistant Secretary-General and supporting staff in 1980. Because of its decision to approve requirements for 1980 only, it recommended in paragraph 9 of document A/34/7/Add.28 that \$70,000 should be allocated for consultancy services, instead of the \$144,000 requested for the biennium as a whole. The Advisory Committee also recommended an appropriation of \$135,000 for travel of representatives in connexion with the meetings of the intergovernmental group of experts (para. 10).
3. In the context of the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology the Advisory Committee recommended, in paragraph 15 of its report, that \$800,000 should be advanced to UNDP, to be refunded in accordance with recent practices in setting up similar funds. The final recommendation of ACABQ, in paragraph 21, was that the Secretary-General should be authorized, with the prior concurrence of ACABQ, to seek commitment authority of up to \$300,000 in 1980 over and above his request for appropriations under the programme budget for 1980-1981.

/...

4. In conclusion he said he hoped that the Fifth Committee would take into account the lack of time available to the Advisory Committee, which had had to prepare its report on the same day that the Fifth Committee had received the statement of financial implications.

5. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that the Group of 77 was very anxious to ensure that the meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee scheduled for January or February 1980 should be fruitful, and that it should be followed, perhaps in May, by a further meeting which would be the Committee's substantive session. However, the Centre for Science and Technology for Development itself would not be properly operational until late May 1980 if the procedure recommended in the Advisory Committee's report were followed. That would mean that the first and second meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee would be inadequately serviced. Although it could be argued that the personnel required could be redeployed at short notice from the Office for Science and Technology, there remained a problem of timing.

6. Document A/C.2/34/L.105, which contained the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.79, stated that the posts to be covered by the appropriation of approximately \$247,000 were listed as temporary posts, i.e. posts required in the initial stages of setting up the Centre. The financial implications set out in document A/C.5/34/101 referred to a commitment of a similar sum, but the manner in which the financing was to be made available was different. Document A/C.2/34/L.105 referred to appropriations to cover certain temporary posts, while document A/C.5/34/101 stated that the Secretary-General was seeking authorization to commit expenditure in the course of the year. The Group of 77 thought it would be useful if, in order to ensure adequate servicing of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Fifth Committee made, instead of a commitment, an appropriation of the amount of \$300,000, subject to review by the Intergovernmental Committee and by ACABQ at an appropriate stage.

7. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had not requested an appropriation, but rather the authority to enter into commitments in an amount not exceeding \$300,000. ACABQ recommended that those commitments should be entered into with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee could give its concurrence for the commitment authority at any time.

8. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that the financial implications presented by the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee were different from those given to the Second Committee. In paragraph 16 of document A/34/587/Add.1 of 23 November 1979 the Secretary-General requested a certain number of posts on a provisional basis for 1980. The financial estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.2/34/L.105 were the direct outcome of that paragraph. However, the estimates submitted in document A/C.5/34/101 were different in substance and presentation. The authorization requested in that document was not an authorization for the Secretary-General to commit expenditures with the prior concurrence of ACABQ. The understanding of the members of the Second Committee was that the provisional posts and the resources of \$300,000 had been earmarked from the outset in such a way as

/...

(Mr. Khamis, Algeria)

to ensure that they could be used in accordance with document A/C.2/34/L.105. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee, on the other hand, had obviously been submitted after a careful scrutiny of the Secretary-General's statement in document A/C.5/34/101, and were unsatisfactory to his delegation, which would therefore support the proposal made by the representative of India.

9. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that if the Committee continued on its present path no progress would be made. Its task was being further complicated by the Secretariat's inept servicing. Prior to taking a decision, the Second Committee had to have a statement of the financial implications such a decision would entail. Such a statement should not mention whether the funds required would be additional resources, new appropriations or anything else. Once a decision was taken, the next step was for the Fifth Committee to approve a request for appropriations. He asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services to explain what was involved.

10. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) agreed that the Fifth Committee was the only Committee that could be seized with a request for appropriations. It was true that document A/C.2/34/L.105 had used the term "appropriation". In the Fifth Committee it was the duty of the Secretary-General's representatives to explain what effect a decision would have on the budget. It had been felt that, since resources would be required immediately over and above the level of posts to be transferred from the Office for Science and Technology and since the actual number of posts and the manner in which they were to be filled was somewhat uncertain, the most appropriate way of placing the matter before the Fifth Committee would be to request a commitment authorization which would give the Secretary-General more flexibility in obtaining the necessary data and in determining when and how the posts were to be filled. That was why document A/C.5/34/101 referred to a commitment authorization.

11. The first sentence of paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.28) might create difficulties, for the Secretary-General considered that some strengthening of the Office for Science and Technology would probably be necessary immediately. The requirement that the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee be obtained raised no difficulty but the same was not true of the requirement that commitment of funds should await the determination by the Intergovernmental Committee of the need for strengthening the resources of the Office for Science and Technology since that would entail too lengthy a delay.

12. Mr. DA COSTA (Secretary-General, United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development) said that there appeared to be two issues, the first being the question of an appropriation or commitment authority. In the Second Committee the statement on the financial implications of the draft resolution (A/C.2/34/L.105) had spoken of appropriations. The second issue which was very important, though it might not seem so, was the question of the establishment of

/...

temporary posts. In that connexion, there was some confusion regarding the order in which actions were to be taken. As the representative of India had pointed out, originally there was to have been creation of temporary posts for the new Centre, redeployment of existing posts in the Office for Science and Technology according to the needs of the Centre and determination by the Intergovernmental Committee of the needs of the new Centre. The excellent report of the Advisory Committee (A/34/7/Add.28), however, seemed to envisage another order of events, namely, utilization of the Office for Science and Technology, meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee which would make recommendations, intervention by the Advisory Committee and finally allocation of new posts. To follow that order would be to delay the time when the Centre would really enter into operation.

13. It was essential that new temporary posts be established starting 1 January 1980: first, because the Office for Science and Technology was not equipped to do the work that would be involved; indeed, it could not even handle its regular volume of work so that to hope that existing staff would be able to carry out the preparations for the very important and complex meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee was excessively optimistic; secondly, if such temporary posts were not established, the Director-General and the new head of the Centre would have their hands tied; thirdly, the consensus reached at the Vienna meeting had implied that a new unit would be created immediately. While mention had been made of using posts from the Office for Science and Technology, that had been envisaged purely as a subsidiary measure. Accordingly, the best solution would be to start by establishing posts, then to determine which of the existing staff of the Office for Science and Technology would move over to the Centre, and then to deal with the intervention by the Intergovernmental Committee to determine what would be the best structure for the Centre. Accordingly, the matter could be resolved by deleting from paragraphs 18 and 21 of document A/34/7/Add.28 any mention of prior concurrence by the Advisory Committee. That was unnecessary since the whole issue would come before the Advisory Committee anyway. The important thing was to have a new team to handle the task as of 1 January.

14. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) pointed out that the Fifth Committee would not be wasting time on the issue had the Secretariat not improperly referred to appropriation of funds in its statement on the administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/34/L.105). He saw no problem concerning what the Assistant Secretary-General had said regarding paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.28); there were many examples of a situation being explained by the Secretary-General in a subsequent report. However, he noted that according to paragraph 13 of the statement on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee (A/C.5/34/101) the Secretary-General intended to identify by the end of January which posts were to be transferred to the new Centre. That statement seemed to be in conflict with what the Secretary-General of the Conference on Science and Technology had just said and his delegation did not know whom to believe.

15. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it had not been the Advisory Committee's intention to put the

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

Secretary-General in a strait jacket. The first sentence of paragraph 18 of the report could be interpreted somewhat flexibly. The Advisory Committee had merely wished to point out that it must be involved in any commitment entered into by the Secretary-General. However, a mechanism did exist for the Advisory Committee to give its concurrence at any time of the year.

16. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the difficulty had arisen purely from the statement on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution. The Advisory Committee had further clouded the issue by requiring that the Secretary-General obtain prior concurrence from that Committee as in the case of commitments entered into under the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. It was paradoxical that in a year when the Committee was dealing with the budget, mention should be made of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. The Committee had no choice but to make provision for the amount in question under the regular budget.

17. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had indicated a way out of the difficulty. There seemed to be confusion between three issues, prior concurrence by the Advisory Committee, whether the correct term should be appropriation or commitment, and the correct time sequence. Concerning the first sentence in paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.28), he said that the requirement that the Secretary-General should obtain prior concurrence from the Advisory Committee had been included, because at that late stage it was the only way that the Secretary-General's request could be considered. That device had been used in connexion with restructuring when the Secretary-General had been given a free hand to establish the new Secretariat, but the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee had been required before any commitments were entered into. His delegation would have no problem concerning prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee since that Committee was able to meet at any time. The question whether the correct term was commitment or appropriation would then become secondary. It would be helpful if the Assistant Secretary-General could explain that the correct term should have been appropriation rather than commitment. The question of the time sequence was not so important, particularly since the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had acknowledged that some flexibility was needed in interpretation of the first sentence of paragraph 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.28).

18. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) strongly supported the suggestions of the representatives of India and Algeria. Clearly a mistake had been made in drafting the documents. It was very important that the Secretary-General should be authorized immediately to enter into a commitment not exceeding \$300,000 under the regular budget. Naturally the Advisory Committee must be consulted prior to any commitment by the Secretary-General. He wondered what was the shortest way of acceding to the request contained in the resolution adopted by the Second Committee. His delegation would also like to know how and why the discrepancies between the two texts A/C.2/34/L.105 and A/C.5/34/101, presented respectively to the Second Committee and the Fifth Committee, had occurred.

/...

19. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said it was clear that a number of temporary posts would be required as of 1 January 1980 if the Intergovernmental Committee was to do its work and if the Centre was to be able to become operational. At present there was a danger that such posts would not be established, largely because the Fifth Committee was being asked for a commitment rather than an appropriation and because a certain time sequence was being indicated which would make it impossible to set up the Centre until the latter half of 1980; that would prevent the Centre from being able to service the Intergovernmental Committee which was scheduled to meet that same year. The establishment of the needed temporary posts was being threatened purely because of the discrepancy between documents A/C.2/34/L.105 and A/C.5/34/101. Perhaps the Secretariat might clarify the matter by stating that an appropriation was needed rather than a commitment.

20. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that there was nothing in the report of the Advisory Committee to prevent the Secretary-General from entering into commitments as of 1 January 1980. The only possibly controversial point in that report was the first sentence of paragraph 18 and the Chairman himself had stated that that sentence should not be too strictly interpreted.

21. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) asked the Secretariat to clarify whether what was really wanted was an appropriation rather than a commitment.

22. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said he agreed with the representative of Guinea. What was important was that the funds should be available from 1 January 1980 and that there should be no restrictions on the Secretary-General's authority to commit those funds. He would agree to a wording such as that of paragraph 18 of document A/34/7/Add.28, provided the authority of the Secretary-General to enter into commitments was not made subject to further approval.

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it would be very difficult for the General Assembly to commit \$300,000 without knowing exactly what functions or programmes were to be undertaken with those funds. The Advisory Committee had therefore sought from the General Assembly authority to give its concurrence to the commitment of those funds. That would in no way prevent the Secretary-General from entering into those commitments. Even if the amount of \$300,000 was appropriated, he did not see how it could all be spent as of 1 January 1980, unless the personnel in question were already on hand and ready to begin work immediately. Presumably, some time would be involved in recruitment. The Advisory Committee had felt that it should recommend a procedure that was in keeping with existing practice; if the Fifth Committee decided to depart from that practice, it should be made aware of the consequences of such a decision.

24. Mr. HAIDAR (India) asked whether it might not be possible to authorize half a year's expenditures immediately, in view of the urgency of getting the programme underway as of 1 January.

25. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) suggested that the provision for a time sequence in the first sentence of paragraph 18 of document A/34/7/Add.28 might be eliminated, while retaining the provision requiring prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee.

26. Mr. HAIDAR (India) suggested that the meeting should be suspended briefly in order to allow members of the Group of 77 to hold consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

27. Mr. HAIDAR (India), on behalf of the Group of 77, proposed that, in place of the request in paragraph 29 of document A/C.5/34/101, the Fifth Committee should recommend an appropriation, not a commitment, of \$300,000 under the budget sections and for the objects of expenditure referred to in paragraph 29 of the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/34/101) as amplified by paragraph 10 (b) of document A/C.2/34/L.105. For absolute clarity, he wished to point out that the amounts proposed were for requirements in 1980 only.

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be simpler merely to propose that the General Assembly should authorize an appropriation of \$300,000 to allow for the implementation of paragraph 29 of document A/C.5/34/101, without going into further detail.

29. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that he had referred to paragraph 10 (b) of document A/C.2/34/L.105 because it was his understanding that such details might be required to justify the appropriation.

30. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) noted that paragraph 10 (b) of document A/C.2/34/L.105 called for 13 staff members; it was his understanding that the discussions in the Second Committee had only referred to seven. There were 13 staff members in the Office for Science and Technology and it was his understanding that some of them were to be transferred to the Secretariat to prepare for the Intergovernmental Committee as a follow-up to the Conference on Science and Technology for Development. His delegation in the Second Committee had approved that arrangement. He agreed that additional staff should be provided, if needed, to assist in the follow-up to the Conference. He would like to know how many additional staff were being requested, over and above those that were now in the Office for Science and Technology. How much of the money would be needed?

31. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) asked the Indian representative to repeat his proposal at dictation speed.

32. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that he was proposing the following:

"Paragraph 29 of document A/C.5/34/101 should now read as follows:

"The appropriation is authorized of a sum not exceeding a total of \$300,000 based upon the following potential utilization of funds by budget section and object as follows:

/...

A. Section 5.B

Temporary posts (1980 only)

1 D-2 director	\$32,100
1 D-1 principal officer	29,300
2 P-5 senior officers	53,600
2 P-4 first officers	45,200
1 P-3 second officer	18,800
1 G-5 administrative assistant	14,800
5 G-4 secretaries and typists	<u>53,500</u>
	<u>\$247,300</u>

B. Section 28.D

Rental of office equipment	\$ 600
Rental and maintenance of premises	20,100
Communications	5,500
Office supplies and materials	800
Furniture and equipment	<u>25,700</u>
	<u>52,700"</u>

33. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said he did not see how the Fifth Committee could take a decision to amend paragraph 29 of document A/C.5/34/101, which was the statement of administrative and financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General. He insisted that the Committee must have a properly formulated proposal on which to take a decision.

34. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the representative of India had simply used some of the wording of paragraph 29 of the document in question; but that the proposal was his own.

35. Mr. BRUCE (Canada), referring to his earlier query, said it was important that the Fifth Committee should know how many of the staff members referred to in the Indian proposal would be absorbed from the Office for Science and Technology. Or did the proposal mean that another part of the Secretariat would be duplicated?

36. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that the seven posts referred to by the Canadian representative were Professional posts mentioned in the main document submitted by the Secretary-General to the Second Committee. In addition, the Secretary-General had indicated that an appropriate number of General Service posts would also be needed.

/...

(Mr. Ruedas)

37. Referring to the Canadian representative's query regarding the transfer of posts from the Office for Science and Technology, he said that the posts recommended by the Indian representative were in addition to the posts to be transferred from the Office for Science and Technology.

38. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the last sentence of paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/34/101, which stated that the total level of the actual commitments would be influenced by the number of posts to be released from the existing Office for Science and Technology.

39. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said it should be enough for the Fifth Committee to recommend approval of an appropriation not to exceed a total of \$300,000. He saw no need for any further detail, which only created confusion. It was standard practice to approve amounts based on indications regarding certain staffing arrangements, but not in such detail as to prevent the Secretariat from exercising any flexibility.

40. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said he understood the concern of the United States representative, but wished to point out that the proposal that was now before the Fifth Committee only dealt with one part of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on which the Fifth Committee had not been able to reach agreement. Once a decision was taken on that part of the recommendations, the Fifth Committee would then be able to decide on the over-all recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

41. The CHAIRMAN invited members to vote on the Indian proposal.

42. A recorded vote was taken on the Indian proposal concerning paragraph 29 of document A/C.5/34/101.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

/...

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

43. The proposal was adopted by 66 votes to 11, with 21 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN invited members to vote in first reading on certain outstanding recommended appropriations under sections 4 and 6, namely, \$169,200 under sections 4.A.8 and 4.A.9, and \$1,599,100 under section 6.B.4. He further invited members, by the same vote, to take a decision on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 20 of document A/34/7/Add.28 (i.e. to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (A/34/779), there would be need for additional appropriations in a total amount of \$1,259,000 under section 5.B (a newly created subsection), section 28.D and section 31 of the proposed programme budget for 1980-1981 and also for increases in the estimates of income in a total amount of \$820,400 under income sections 1 and 2).

45. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee for appropriations of \$169,200 under section 4 and \$1,599,100 under section 6 were approved in first reading by 84 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 20 of document A/34/7/Add.28 was approved by the same vote.

46. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as a result of the adoption of the Indian proposal, an additional amount for staff assessment would be required under expenditure section 31, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

47. Mr. McMAHON (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community, said that the nine delegations had abstained in the vote on the Indian proposal because they considered that, in light of the statement that had been made by the Chairman of ACABQ, there had been no reason for making a second proposal.

48. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said his delegation attached great importance to activities in the field of science and technology, but felt that the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 18 of its report (A/34/7/Add.28) was reasonable. He had therefore voted against the Indian proposal. His delegation found it regrettable that there should be discrepancies between the documents on financial implications that had been submitted to the Second Committee and to the Fifth Committee.

49. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations concerning activities in science and technology. The real reason for the lengthy discussion on the whole issue had now become perfectly clear. The issue had not been whether to authorize a commitment or an appropriation, but rather whether to require the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee. It was deplorable that the Fifth Committee should be involved in playing games at its own expense and that it should have to pay the price for the internal squabbles of the Secretariat. He wished to stress that it was not the Advisory Committee which had been overruled, but the Secretary-General.

/...

50. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Indian proposal. He noted the inconsistency in the position of those who had complained that the representative of India had spelled out the proposal of the Group of 77 in too much detail and who on other occasions had criticized the Group for not making its proposals specific enough.

Proposals of the Secretary-General for the draft programme budget of UNIDO for 1980-1981 in response to the request in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.42 (A/34/7/Add.27; A/C.5/34/88)

51. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending the approval of the Secretary-General's request for the establishment of five additional posts in 1980 (three Professional and two General Service posts) and one P-4 post in 1981, at a total cost of \$296,800.

52. With regard to the amount requested for consultants' services and ad hoc expert group meetings, the Advisory Committee felt that the cost of those items could be absorbed within the over-all appropriations for UNIDO already approved in first reading. It felt, moreover, that not all of the consultants' services and ad hoc expert group meetings requested should be needed since preliminary work had already been done in some of the sectors to be covered in 1980-1981 by the system of consultations.

53. The Secretary-General was also requesting \$100,000 for travel and subsistence of 50 representatives of least developed countries. The Advisory Committee was of the view that the General Assembly would first have to decide to waive the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII) before any funds could be appropriated. The relevant decision of the Industrial Development Board, which had been endorsed by the Economic and Social Council, stipulated that the travel and subsistence costs were to be financed from sources to be determined by the General Assembly. The Secretary-General had apparently proceeded on the assumption that they would be financed from the regular budget. The Advisory Committee believed that the General Assembly itself would have to determine the source, which could be either the regular budget or extrabudgetary resources, or a combination of the two. In view of the fact that the decision of the Industrial Development Board left the question of financing unresolved, the Advisory Committee believed that there was no legal basis for accepting the Secretary-General's request of \$100,000.

54. An amount of \$100,000 was requested for consultants for the Industrial and Technological Information Bank (INTIB), but the Advisory Committee recommended reducing that amount to \$75,000 since some of the expertise called for should be available within the Secretariat.

55. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that an additional appropriation in the amount of \$598,500 would be required under section 17 of the budget should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution of the Fifth Committee.

/...

56. Mr. PAL (India) welcomed the fact that the Advisory Committee agreed to the establishment of all the additional posts requested by the Secretary-General. He trusted that additional posts would enable UNIDO to carry out the most essential part of its work.

57. He noted with concern that the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction in the Secretary-General's request for consultants' services and ad hoc experts meetings on the ground that some of the subjects to be dealt with had been discussed before. The Industrial and Development Board and the Economic and Social Council would not have authorized the holding of the various meetings if they had not believed that they would serve a useful purpose.

58. He asked whether the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee made specific reference to the travel and subsistence of representatives of the least developed countries. If it did, the Fifth Committee should approve the necessary appropriation.

59. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that an earlier version of the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee had contained a reference to specific amounts of money but no specific reference to the travel of representatives from least developed countries. The resolution adopted by the Industrial Development Board at its thirteenth session provided that the participation of 50 representatives from least developed countries in the consultations to be held in 1980-1981 should be financed from sources to be determined by the General Assembly.

60. Mr. PAL (India) said that the Fifth Committee was in a quandary since it was for the General Assembly to determine the source of financing, but the Second Committee had not provided any clear guidelines in the draft resolution it had adopted. The Advisory Committee had rightly pointed out that it had no mandate until the General Assembly took a decision on financing. He suggested that the Fifth Committee should report to the plenary that the General Assembly needed to determine the source of financing and that, should it decide to finance travel and subsistence of representatives of least developed countries from the regular budget, an additional appropriation of \$100,000 would be required.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the suggestion of the representative of India would create difficulties for the President of the General Assembly. The Fifth Committee should take a decision on the source of financing and submit its recommendation to the plenary.

62. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) agreed that the Fifth Committee should assume its responsibilities in the matter. The Secretary-General had correctly interpreted the draft resolution and had submitted a request for \$100,000 in paragraph 13 of his statement of financial implications. It had been in the Advisory Committee that the veto had come into play. He proposed that the Committee should reject the Advisory Committee's recommendation and restore the Secretary-General's original request for \$100,000.

/...

63. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee did not contain adequate authority for financing the travel of representatives of least developed countries. The issue was whether General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII) concerning the use of regular budget resources to finance the travel of representatives of Governments should be set aside, as some members seemed to believe, or whether, as his delegation maintained, it was a wise and sound decision which should be respected. The Committee could not take a decision on the Tunisian proposal until it had taken a decision on the question of principle, namely, whether the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII) should be waived.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the Tunisian proposal implied that the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII) would be waived.

65. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation did not agree that the two decisions could be combined into one.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the decisions of the Fifth Committee were in the nature of recommendations to the General Assembly. The Fifth Committee could not decide to waive the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII), but it could recommend the appropriation of \$100,000, which would imply a waiver of that resolution. If the General Assembly did not agree, it would reject the Fifth Committee's recommendation. It would be preferable to take a decision on whether to waive the provisions of the resolution, but it was not absolutely necessary to do so, especially since a single vote would enable the Committee to save time, which was of the essence.

67. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) formally proposed that the Fifth Committee should first take a decision on the application of resolution 1798 (XVII) before deciding on any recommendation regarding the appropriation which would be required.

68. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) endorsed the Tunisian proposal. The General Assembly had decided in resolution 1798 (XVII) that no travel or subsistence would be paid to the representatives of Governments unless otherwise provided.

69. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) agreed with the Chairman that there was no need to take a separate decision to waive the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII). The General Assembly, which had adopted that resolution, was clearly competent to take a decision on a recommendation by the Fifth Committee.

70. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) suggested that it might not be necessary to vote on the United States proposal if the Tunisian proposal was amended in such a way to make it clear that the appropriation entailed the waiver of the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII) and that the decision would not constitute a precedent.

71. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said he could not agree to the Italian amendment. It was not necessary for the same General Assembly to state to itself that it was waiving the provisions of a previous decision. It was not a question of semantics, but rather of the General Assembly exercising its prerogatives.

/...

72. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, when he had first spoken, the Chairman had raised the question of time and had stressed the need to expedite the work of the Committee. He shared those concerns, but noted with regret that the Committee had not been consistent at the current meeting in its concern for time.

73. The financing of travel of representatives of Governments from the regular budget clearly contradicted an existing General Assembly resolution, and his delegation had simply proposed that the Committee should decide whether the provisions of that resolution should be waived. It should be made clear to the plenary that the appropriation requested required the waiving of the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII); otherwise there was no legal basis for an appropriation. He did not understand why an effort was being made to conceal that fact.

74. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might recommend to the General Assembly that, as an exceptional measure not constituting a precedent, it should waive the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII) and approve an additional appropriation of \$100,000 under section 17 to cover travel and subsistence of representatives of least developed countries.

75. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that it was superfluous to make any mention of whether the decision would constitute a precedent.

76. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that any decision to recommend an appropriation without a decision to waive the provisions of the relevant resolution would be null and void. He proposed that the Committee should recommend that the Assembly take the following decision: "The General Assembly decides to waive the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII) with respect to the statement of financial implications contained in document A/C.5/34/88."

77. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the United States proposal was not an amendment to the Tunisian proposal, but rather an entirely separate matter. The relevant provisions of the rules of procedure should be applied.

78. He did not share the interpretation placed by the United States delegation on resolution 1798 (XVII). The General Assembly had left the door open to exceptions by stipulating that the principles set forth in resolution 1798 (XVII) should be applied unless otherwise provided.

79. The CHAIRMAN said that the relevant paragraph of the resolution stated "unless the resolution establishing the organ or subsidiary organ provides otherwise".

80. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) proposed that the words "with respect to the statement of financial implications contained in document A/C.5/34/88" in the United States proposal should be replaced by the words "with respect to the least developed countries".

81. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation was willing to substitute the words "with respect to the provisions for least developed countries contained in document A/C.5/34/88" for the words to which the Tunisian representative objected.

/...

82. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the aim of his amendment was to spare the Fifth Committee from having to have the same debate each time a similar question arose in the future. He was opposed to any reference to a specific document in the decision.

83. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Tunisian amendment went much further than what the United States delegation seemed willing to accept. He suggested that the discussion should be continued at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.