



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND
PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 28. Administration and management (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 IX 2-750, 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.5/40/SR.41
2 December 1985
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/40/3, A/40/6, A/40/7, A/40/38 and Add.1, A/40/262; A/C.5/40/11 and Corr.1 (English only) and A/40/7/Add.4; A/C.5/40/18 and A/40/7/Add.6; A/C.5/40/4 and Corr.1 and A/40/7/Add.2; A/C.5/40/21 and A/40/7/Add.7; A/C.5/40/19 and A/40/7/Add.8)

First reading (continued)

Section 28. Administration and management (continued)

1. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), referring to section 28D (Office of General Services, Headquarters), asked if the Secretariat might answer the question raised by his delegation at the 40th meeting concerning the purchase of teleprinters and paper by the Political Information News Service. He also wished to know the approximate cost of the rental of a chauffeured limousine for the President of the General Assembly during the biennium 1986-1987, and whether the Organization rented that vehicle from the same company every year, or whether it periodically solicited tenders. Given that the Protocol and Liaison Service had the use of a limousine financed under the budget, it would be interesting to know whether such an arrangement had been found useful, and whether a similar arrangement might be made in connection with the limousine for the President of the General Assembly. He also asked whether the Office of General Services intended to reconsider that question, or whether it considered the matter settled.
2. Mrs. ARCHINI (Italy) also sought an answer to the question raised by her delegation at the 40th meeting with regard to the purchase of teleprinters by the Political Information News Service. In that connection, it might be possible to avoid duplication by including that appropriation under the section of the budget dealing with administrative services and not under the section relating to the Department of Public Information (DPI).
3. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that, at the request of the Secretariat, the Administrative Management Service had conducted a study which would be made available to delegations as soon as it was completed on the activities, objectives and usefulness of the Political Information News Service and on the adequacy of resources allocated and the most effective way of utilizing them in the future if it was decided that the Service should be maintained.
4. Mrs. WEIL (Assistant Secretary-General for General Services) said that costs associated with the limousine used by the President of the General Assembly during the biennium 1986-1987 amounted to approximately \$130,000. The limousine provided for the Protocol and Liaison Service could not also be used by the President of the General Assembly, because of the overlap in the periods of greatest use. The limousine was being rented on the basis of a study conducted by the Secretariat and the most favourable offers received from individual companies. The Secretariat did not consider the matter settled, but reviewed it each year in order to follow the most economical course of action.

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to paragraph 28E.1 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7), where it indicated that the proposals concerning sections 28E, 28F and 28G of the proposed programme budget would be superseded by a report to be submitted to the General Assembly at the beginning of the current session. In view of the fact that the revised estimates which were expected had not yet been submitted, the Advisory Committee was not in a position at the present time to take a position on the three sections in question.

6. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that, unfortunately, the Secretariat had not yet completed its work on sections 28E, 28F and 28G; however, all possible steps would be taken to make the revised estimates available before the Fifth Committee began its second reading.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the Advisory Committee had no comments to make on section 28H (Division of Administration, Geneva).

8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee's recommendations for reductions totalling \$82,600 in the estimates for section 28I (General Services, Geneva) were explained in paragraphs 28I.7 and 28I.12 of its report (A/40/7). The reductions related to requirements for temporary assistance for meetings and furniture and equipment.

9. The resources requested for section 28J (Staff training activities (Headquarters, Geneva and the regional Commissions)) should be considered in the context of those included in section 28C (Personnel management services). In paragraph 28J.6 of its report (A/40/7), the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction of \$10,000 in the estimate for travel under section 28J. In that connection, the view had been expressed at the preceding session that the Advisory Committee was too exacting with regard to official travel, but the Fifth Committee should bear in mind that the resources requested for that item in tables 28C.4 and 28J.4 of the proposed programme budget (A/40/6) totalled \$738,000 for the biennium 1986-1987 and that the Office of Personnel Services had some latitude in its capacity as manager of the resources in question.

10. The Advisory Committee was also proposing in paragraphs 28J.17 to 28J.19 of its report that the amounts related to the translator training programme at the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) should not be approved, since, in view of the number of translators who had already been trained and were awaiting vacancies in that Commission, there were no plans to carry out the programme in the biennium 1986-1987.

11. In paragraph 28J.10 of its report, the Advisory Committee indicated that staff members at the P-5 level and above participated in the special management programme for senior administrators and, in paragraph 28J.11, it discussed the question of the professional studies programme for staff at the P-4 level and below. The Advisory Committee saw no logic in requesting resources separately for the training of the two groups, and, consequently it was recommending that the amount of \$19,000 requested for the management programme for senior administrators should be financed from the amount requested for the professional studies programme.

12. Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi) asked what plans had been made in respect of the translators trained under the ECA training programme, who, according to paragraph 28J.5 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7), were waiting for posts to become available. Given that the United Nations system was unified, it ought to be possible to fill vacancies in other regional commissions with those translators. He also wished to know why no posts had been requested for ECA when that problem had been discussed.
13. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the ECA translator training programme had been carried out on the assumption that the United Nations would utilize the services of those translators; however, staff could not be recruited for established posts unless available posts existed. As vacancies had arisen, translators trained under the training programme had been recruited. It was to be hoped that in the coming biennium established posts would become available.
14. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) requested information about the ECA translator training programme. Paragraph 28J.51 of the proposed budget indicated that no translator training programme had been held in 1984, nor was it expected that one would be held in 1985. He wished to know whether the two P-3 and P-4 staff members in charge of the programme had been assigned other duties during the current biennium, when the programme had not been held.
15. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), said that, in order to ascertain whether the resources in question had not been used in the biennium 1984-1985, one should look at the performance report to be submitted towards the end of the current session. Perhaps the Secretariat could provide detailed information on that subject.
16. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that he did not have the information requested by the representative of the United States, but would provide it later.
17. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to section 28K (Miscellaneous expenses) of the proposed programme budget, said that the Advisory Committee had considered the revised estimates for general insurance included in that section submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/40/18 and had submitted a report on the subject (A/40/7/Add.6).
18. The Advisory Committee recognized the problem which the organizations were facing as a result of ballooning insurance costs. The Secretariat was preparing a report to be submitted to the General Assembly at the forty-first session on the options for solving the problem of general liability, property and other insurance. In the view of the Advisory Committee, an appropriation should be approved for 1986 only. A decision on the appropriation for 1987 would be taken at the forty-first session on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and experience in 1986.

19. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that, according to paragraph 28K.5 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7), the after-service health insurance plan covered a high percentage of staff members whose salaries had been paid, at least during part of their careers, from extrabudgetary resources. However, it was clear that the General Assembly's intent in adopting resolution 38/235 had been to keep the financing of the health insurance plan under review. The plan was necessary, and his delegation supported it but believed that the question of its financing must be settled. If a high percentage of plan beneficiaries had been paid from extrabudgetary resources, the corresponding part of the plan might be financed with extrabudgetary resources accumulated before those staff members retired. His delegation wished to have the representatives of the Secretary-General report on that question.

20. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that, actually, a clearer distinction should be made between the two groups of staff members, taking into account the sources from which their salaries were funded. Measures were being considered to make sure that that distinction remained clear in the future, and the possibility of using extrabudgetary resources to cover the costs of some plan participants was being studied.

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to the requests for appropriations made by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) contained in Section 28L (Jointly-financed administrative activities) of the proposed programme budget, said that the Advisory Committee's observations with regard to the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/40/21) on the revised estimates relating to ICSC were contained in document A/40/7/Add.7.

22. In connection with the discussion on the proposal of ICSC to meet in Nairobi, he explained that, in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report, reference was made to an increase of \$70,200, of which \$56,500 could be attributed to the revaluation of the 1984-1985 resource base, \$10,800 to resource growth (at revised rates) and \$2,900 to an increase in the provision for inflation in 1986 and 1987. The Advisory Committee had carefully studied the requirements for holding a session of ICSC in Nairobi and had concluded that the amount of \$70,200 was not directly related to the holding of that session. Consequently, the Advisory Committee had not sought a reduction in that amount, and in paragraph 10 of its report, was recommending approval of the additional appropriations of \$70,200 requested by the Secretary-General. Accordingly, the estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for subsection 28L.1 of the proposed programme budget was \$8,124,000. In addition, an amount of \$13,000 would have to be included under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an appropriation in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

23. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, at its 24th meeting, held on 1 November 1985, the Fifth Committee had recommended to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Conferences in paragraph 1 of its report (A/40/32). Section I, paragraph 4 (g), of the draft resolution stated that ICSC would hold its regular annual session at

(Mr. Parshikov, USSR)

United Nations Headquarters and, if more than one session was required in any one year, it might accept an invitation from one of its participating organizations to hold its other session or sessions at the headquarters of that particular organization.

24. Under the ICSC statute, the term "participating organization" could only refer to the specialized agencies of the United Nations system. The secretariats or executive heads of those agencies could not invite ICSC on their own initiative, however, since the agency extending the invitation must assume all the costs associated with holding the session away from New York, and it would thus be necessary for its governing organ to adopt a decision, which did not seem to have been the case. His delegation would like it to be explained why the estimates for ICSC included a provision for a session to be held away from New York, even though no invitation had been received from a specialized agency.

25. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that table 28L.2 of the Secretary-General's report containing the revised estimates for ICSC (A/C.5/40/21) included a provision for pension coverage for officials and that in the column corresponding to the revaluation of the resource base there was a reduction of \$149,400 for that object of expenditure, so that the estimates for the 1986-1987 biennium totalled only \$69,600. He wished to know why there had been such a substantial reduction and how that appropriation would be used in the 1986-1987 biennium.

26. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that, although ICSC could meet at United Nations Headquarters or, at the invitation of a specialized agency, away from Headquarters, Nairobi was the headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), which were subsidiary organs of the United Nations. It might therefore be possible to apply the rule of extraterritoriality and to consider that holding a meeting in Nairobi was tantamount to holding a meeting at Headquarters.

27. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), replying to the United States representative, said that, after calculating the financial implications of the membership of certain members of ICSC in the Joint Staff Pension Fund (A/C.5/37/90), a retroactive adjustment of appropriations had been necessary. It was a one-time, non-recurrent adjustment, which explained the reduction shown in the revaluation of the 1984-1985 resource base for pension coverage for officials.

28. Mr. AKWEI (Chairman, International Civil Service Commission) drew attention to rule 4 of the ICSC rules of procedure, which stated: "The sessions of the Commission shall be held at the Headquarters of the United Nations, unless it decides that a particular session be held elsewhere at the invitation of one of the participating organizations". He said it was erroneous to consider that the invitation should come from the head of a specialized agency, since a specialized agency was not the same thing as a participating organization, a category which included the United Nations. In addition, there was a precedent: in 1982, the United Nations had invited ICSC to hold a session in Geneva and had subsequently

(Mr. Akwei)

invited a subsidiary organ of the Commission to hold a session in Vienna. Consequently, the invitation extended by the United Nations for the Commission to hold a session in Nairobi was entirely consistent with rule 4 of the ICSC rules of procedure.

29. Moreover, no head of a participating organization of the United Nations common system would officially invite ICSC to meet at one of its offices unless the relevant budgetary measures had been adopted. In the case under consideration, the absence of an official invitation from the Secretary-General did not mean that there was not a tacit invitation, since ICSC had received a letter from the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management stating that all necessary administrative arrangements had been made for the Commission to meet in Nairobi and that, as soon as the Fifth Committee's budgetary and administrative work had been completed, an official invitation would be issued.

30. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not made any reference to Nairobi in his statement but simply wished to know on what basis ICSC had at the outset included resources in its programme for holding a session away from New York. His delegation could not endorse the practice described by the ICSC Chairman, which was clearly contrary to the relevant General Assembly resolutions. Specifically, he did not understand the grounds on which the Secretariat had included funds in the proposed budget for holding a session of the Commission in Geneva. According to the calendar of conferences for the biennium, 1986-1987 which had already been approved by the Fifth Committee, ICSC would be holding two sessions in 1986, one in Nairobi and the other in New York, and two sessions in 1987, in New York. At no point was Geneva mentioned as a possible venue for a session. It was truly astonishing that the Advisory Committee had not paid attention to that glaring contradiction.

31. He would therefore like to know the specific amount required for holding one of the ICSC sessions in Geneva and requested a recorded vote on its appropriation. If that amount was approved, his delegation would not be able to vote in favour of the total appropriation requested for section 28L.1.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Chairman, International Civil Service Commission) said that, in mentioning an ICSC meeting in Geneva, he was referring, not to a possible future meeting of the Commission in that city, but to the precedent set in 1982, when ICSC had met in Geneva at the invitation of the United Nations.

33. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was clearly stated in document A/C.5/40/21, paragraph 9, that resources had been envisaged for the travel of the 15 members of the Commission to attend the two sessions held away from New York, based on the assumption that one would be held in Geneva and one in a field duty station, which, as he took it, would be Nairobi.

34. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said it was reasonable to assume that Geneva was used as a basis for estimating the requirements of a meeting to be held away from New York. The Committee on Conferences, in adopting the calendar of conferences and meetings, had approved the holding of the twenty-third session of ICSC in Nairobi, so that Nairobi should be substituted for Geneva.

35. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) insisted that it was crystal clear in the document that, during the biennium, two sessions would be held away from New York. If, as indicated, one would be held in Nairobi, he wished to know where the other would be held.
36. Mr. AKWEI (Chairman, International Civil Service Commission) said that the matter under discussion was the budget for the biennium, in other words, for two years, during which period two sessions would be held in New York and two others away from New York, one in Geneva and the other at a field duty station.
37. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was all too apparent that there was an infringement of the calendar of conferences already approved by the Fifth Committee, which stipulated that during the biennium three sessions would be held in New York and one in Nairobi; the calendar made no reference whatsoever to Geneva and there was no need to hold a session in that city.
38. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee did not support the estimates included under section 28L.3 for the establishment of a new P-4 post for a salary survey specialist and one General Service post to provide support services, and for travel of the salary survey specialist. Consequently, the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction of \$178,300 in the estimates.
39. He drew the attention of the Committee to the report of the Secretary-General on the Advisory Committee on Substantive Questions (Operational activities) and the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/40/7/Add.2). In his report, the Secretary-General was proposing the establishment of a post of Co-ordinator, at the D-2 level, and a General Service post to provide support services, at an estimated cost of \$329,100, to be apportioned among the participating organizations. The Advisory Committee had been somewhat surprised by that request and considered that the costs of the activities described in the Secretary-General's report should continue to be met, as in the past, without any separate additional charge to the budgets of the United Nations and the participating organizations. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the additional appropriation requested should not be approved.
40. Mr. JAGUARIBE (Brazil) said that the functions in respect of which the Secretary-General proposed the establishment of the posts referred to in document A/C.5/40/4 seemed to correspond to relatively new Secretariat tasks and responsibilities, specifically, the co-ordination of longer-term development activities and the current food crisis in Africa. In the circumstances, his delegation wondered whether it was appropriate to refer, as the Advisory Committee had done in its report (A/40/7/Add.2, para. 3), to the fact that the expenses of the activities should be met "as heretofore", without an additional appropriation.
41. With respect to the request for a new P-4 post for a salary survey specialist, he noted that, according to paragraph 28L.30 of the estimates, the proposal had originated in a recent request by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination

(Mr. Jaguaribe, Brazil)

(ACC) for the preparation of various studies on General Service salaries. He asked the Secretariat to inform the Committee whether it would have difficulty in carrying out the studies requested by ACC if, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, the additional appropriation was not approved.

42. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, when the Advisory Committee had considered the proposal to establish the new D-2 post of Co-ordinator, it had understood that it was a matter of including the appropriation in the regular budget, since the resources from which the activity had thus far been financed were not yet available. The Advisory Committee had considered that, if justified by the functions in question, the cost should be met, as in the past, without any charge to the budgets of the organizations of the system. During its consideration of the matter, the Advisory Committee had not been informed that the new post was related primarily to the co-ordination of assistance to Africa.

43. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that the huge volume of documentation considered by United Nations organs made the work of delegations, especially small delegations, particularly difficult. It would be helpful if some unit or official of the Secretariat could assist delegations in that regard. Such a function would be more useful than that of the proposed salary survey specialist.

44. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said, in reponse to the representative of Kenya, that all officials of the Secretariat, at all levels, were at the disposal of delegations to assist them whenever necessary with the documentation under consideration.

45. With regard to the proposed establishment of a P-4 post for a salary survey specialist, the Secretariat considered the function to be essential. It was necessary to carry out studies at various duty stations, in accordance with a new methodology, and the proposed posts represented moderate and necessary increases in expenditure.

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as far as common services at the Vienna International Centre were concerned, section 28M was especially affected by the consequences of UNIDO's conversion into a specialized agency. Action on that section must therefore take into account any decision which the General Assembly might take on the matter at its current session. The Advisory Committee had concluded that it should be possible to manage resources under that section in such a way as to realize savings and, accordingly, it was recommending reductions totalling \$921,800.

47. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) proposed that the Committee should defer a decision on section 28M until it had received reports from the Secretary-General on the conclusion of the agreement between the United Nations and UNIDO. Furthermore, he noted that document A/C.5/40/7, which included revised estimates for section 28M, was not listed among the documents for consideration.

48. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that there were two different procedures which the Committee could follow. The first would be to take a tentative decision on the basis of the initial estimates. The second would be to take separate action once the revised estimates were submitted. In preparing the documentation for the Fifth Committee's second reading of the budget, the Secretariat would incorporate in the relevant sections the decisions taken in first reading.
49. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, when a similar situation had arisen with regard to section 1, the Committee had opted to take action, not on individual parts of the proposed budget, but on the total amounts proposed by the Secretary-General, subject to adjustments in due course in the light of subsequent decisions.
50. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that the Committee would probably receive two reports from the Secretary-General: one relating to the provision of conference services at the Vienna International Centre and another on the relationship between the United Nations and UNIDO. He proposed that the Committee should follow the procedure adopted with respect to section 1, and that debate should be deferred.
51. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that, in the case of section 1, the Advisory Committee had not recommended any reduction in the appropriations requested by the Secretariat, which was not true of section 28M. If the Committee deferred consideration of subsection M, the Secretariat would be obliged to revise its estimates in ignorance of the Committee's viewpoint, in which case it would no doubt have to base itself on its earlier estimate.
52. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report on section 28N (Common services, Nairobi) in document A/40/7/Add.8 said that the report dealt with two matters: the Secretary-General's report on construction work already completed at the United Nations offices at Nairobi (A/C.5/40/14) and a second report on revised estimates for the common services requirements at Nairobi (A/C.5/40/19).
53. With regard to the latter, the Advisory Committee wished to draw special attention to paragraphs 10 and 15 of its report. In addition, the Advisory Committee was recommending additional appropriations of \$960,300 under section 28N and \$16,600 for staff assessment, the latter to be offset by the same amount under Income section 1.
54. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve without a vote the observations and recommendations on the appeals system for staff contained in paragraphs 67 to 72 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7).
55. It was so decided.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve without a vote the recommendation on the acquisition of a telephone system at Headquarters contained in paragraph 11 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7/Add.4).
57. It was so decided.
58. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the Advisory Committee's recommendations in paragraph 6 of document A/40/7/Add.6, suggested that the Committee should ask the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-first session, a report on commercial insurance, that would, inter alia, take into account actual requirements in 1986 and the latest rate projections for 1987, as well as the outcome of studies on possible alternatives to commercial insurance.
59. It was so decided.
60. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) proposed, in the light of the remarks made on section 28C by the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services at the previous meeting, that the Committee should accept the Secretary-General's proposals relating to the continuation of the temporary posts referred to in paragraphs 28C.18, 28C.28 and 28C.38 of the budget estimates (A/40/6).
61. Mr. HALBWACHS (Secretary of the Committee) said that the continuation of the temporary posts referred to by the representative of Tunisia would entail the following costs: \$63,600 for a G-4 post, referred to in paragraph 28C.18 of the Proposed programme budget; \$112,100 for a P-3 post, referred to in paragraph 28C.28; \$127,200 for two General Service posts, referred to in the same paragraph; and \$127,200 for two general service posts referred to in paragraph 28C.38. The total cost of the six posts amounted to \$430,100.
62. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation would have difficulties in supporting a decision to continue the temporary posts referred to by the representative of Tunisia. In the case of the posts referred to in paragraph 28C.28 of the proposed budget, the data available on recruitment by competitive examination in the Secretariat were insufficient. The data on personnel and resources needed for the examinations referred to in annex III of document A/C.5/40/39 did not seem to agree with the information in that paragraph. Furthermore, paragraph 28C.38 stated that it was intended to submit to the General Assembly, at its fortieth session, a full-scale analysis and evaluation of the new career development system. That matter had not been debated in depth. Accordingly, a decision on both questions should be deferred until they could be considered properly.
63. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) endorsed the proposal made by the delegation of Japan to defer a decision on the temporary posts.

64. Mr. NEGRE (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) said that the posts which the Secretary-General proposed should be maintained in the Division of Recruitment related to three categories of activity: the preparation of the medium-term recruitment programme for the following biennium, the projection of vacancies, and the earmarking of posts to be filled by competitive examination. The document to which the representative of Japan had referred (A/C.5/40/39) dealt with the costs of examinations held during the current biennium and not those to be held in the next. That was why there was a lack of agreement between that document and the Secretary-General's proposal to continue the posts referred to in paragraph 28C.28 of the proposed programme budget. Those posts were needed to ensure the continuity of the examination process and should be retained.

65. He thought there was some confusion regarding the two posts referred to in paragraph 28C.38 of the proposed programme budget. Those posts were in Staff Service, which was completely different from the Career Development and Placement Unit. They too were essential since they related to functions performed in respect of all permanent or temporary staff throughout the Organization, which represented an extraordinary volume of work.

66. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) said that, having heard the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services, his delegation would like the Committee to vote immediately on his proposal.

67. Mr. ROY (India) said that, in the light of the explanations given by the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services, his delegation felt the situation was very clear and was ready to support the Tunisian representative's proposal.

68. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was opposed to altering the Advisory Committee's recommendations and would therefore vote against the Tunisian proposal.

69. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Tunisian proposal because it did not involve taking a stand against the Advisory Committee, still less against the maintenance of temporary posts. As the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services had explained very clearly, those posts had been established in order to carry out a specific mandate which was not yet completed, and accordingly the Secretary-General's recommendation that the posts should be maintained until it was ought to be accepted. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the proposal.

70. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) said that although in general he endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations, he had been surprised by the reductions proposed for section 28C. His delegation found the Secretariat's arguments in favour of maintaining the temporary posts justified and would vote in favour of the Tunisian proposal.

71. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Tunisian proposal for the maintenance of one P-3 post and five General Service posts under section 28C (Personnel management services).

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Liberia, Norway, Sweden.

72. The Tunisian proposal was adopted by 61 votes to 27, with 6 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN recalled that during the debate the representative of the Soviet Union had asked for a recorded vote on travel costs in connection with the holding of a session of ICSC in Geneva.

74. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his proposal referred only to the estimate for holding a session of ICSC in Geneva in 1987 and did not in any way affect the holding of the session in Nairobi in 1986.

75. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, when the Committee on Conferences had examined the matter, reference had been made to holding a session of ICSC away from Headquarters, in the case in point in Nairobi, but not to holding a session in Geneva. Since there was some contradiction between what was indicated in the proposed programme budget and what appeared in the calendar of conferences, it would be advisable to seek a further explanation before taking a decision.

76. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation shared the Cuban delegation's concern and thought that the Committee must have more information before it took a decision on the matter.

77. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation was in favour of taking a decision at once. The Secretariat, specifically the secretariat of ICSC, had had an opportunity to explain the situation. The Soviet delegation's proposal was clear and should be voted on immediately.

78. Mr. GIERI (Deputy Controller) said that in recent years ICSC had held two sessions a year, one in New York and the other in Geneva or Vienna. The difference in cost involved in holding sessions in New York and in Geneva or Vienna had always been reflected in the budget. That was what had been done in the case in point, the possibility being envisaged that one 1987 session would be held in Europe, in either Geneva or Vienna.

79. It must be admitted, however, that the practice of meeting once in Europe and once in New York had not been reflected in the calendar of conferences, perhaps because when the calendar was being prepared it had not yet been decided whether ICSC would meet in Vienna or in Geneva in 1987. At all events, the practice had been that the Commission would meet in New York and also in one of the other headquarters cities of the common system.

80. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that, in order to ensure that the Fifth Committee's decisions were logical and consistent, the Secretariat must be asked to provide clearer explanations. He therefore proposed that the decision should be postponed.

The meeting rose at 10.20 p.m.