

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**



FORTIETH SESSION

*Official Records\**

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
68th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 16 December 1985  
at 7 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 68th 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)

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.51/Rev.1 concerning  
agenda item 84

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 concerning  
agenda item 39

AGENDA ITEM 120: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

---

\*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.68  
24 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.45 p.m.

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

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.51/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 84 (A/C.5/40/96)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General estimated that proposed resumption of the Second Committee for one week immediately prior to the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council in 1986 would give rise to conference-servicing requirements estimated at \$303,800. Since the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee had already considered the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements (A/C.5/40/92), any additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the first programme budget performance report for the biennium 1986-1987 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.
2. Mr. RWAMBUYA (Budget Division), referring to document A/C.5/40/96, said that the last part of the first sentence of paragraph 9 should read "and would submit it to the reconvened session of the Second Committee in 1986".
3. Replying to a question from the representative of Kenya, he said that the \$11,300 required for the Office of General Services would cover security guards and general operating expenses such as water, overtime, and sound engineers.
4. Mr. THORSTEINSSON (Iceland) asked whether providing for the reconvening of the session of the Second Committee would automatically entail the reconvening of the General Assembly.
5. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that if the Second Committee wished to report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session it could recommend that that session should be reconvened; alternatively it could report to the General Assembly at its forty-first session. In any event, he believed that it was the Assembly which would have to decide whether it should reconvene.
6. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.51/Rev.1 would give rise to conference-servicing requirements of \$303,800, estimated on a full-cost basis. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the first programme budget performance report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.
7. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) requested a recorded vote.
8. Mr. MALAGA (Peru) said that the need to reconvene the Second Committee prior to the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council had been discussed at length in the Second Committee. A decision on the proposed international

(Mr. Malaga, Peru)

conference on money and finance for development had been deferred for three years. The crisis resulting from the external indebtedness of the developing countries made it necessary not to postpone that conference any further. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of the Chairman's proposal.

9. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) fully associated himself with that statement. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposal.
10. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) associated himself with the statements of the two previous speakers and said that his delegation, too, would vote in favour of the proposal.
11. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation fully supported the proposal to reconvene the session of the Second Committee and would vote in favour of the proposal. It regretted the fact that it had not been possible to adopt it by consensus.
12. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation would have preferred it if the Second Committee could have reached agreement on the outstanding items on its agenda since it would then not have to reconvene, and the Fifth Committee have to consider the possibility of additional appropriations. However, his delegation shared the concern expressed by the representatives of Peru, Cuba and Mexico and it would vote in favour of the proposal.
13. Mr. ROY (India) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal on the understanding that, should the Second Committee adopt decisions and resolutions as a result of its work on those items outstanding, the plenary Assembly would meet to take a final decision on the Committee's recommendations.
14. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal.
15. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

16. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 6, with 22 abstentions.

17. Miss COHEN-ORANTES (Guatemala) said that had she been present for the vote her delegation would have voted in favour of the proposal.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 39 (A/C.5/40/95)

18. The CHAIRMAN recalled that some delegations had wanted to take a decision on the subject while others had not even wished to discuss it. The compromise reached during informal consultations was that the subject would be considered at the current meeting but that no decision would be taken until the following day.

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that if the General Assembly adopted draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 a group of high-level intergovernmental experts would be established for a term of one year to carry out the functions enumerated in the draft resolution. Non-conference-servicing costs had been estimated at \$835,000 and conference-servicing requirements at \$1,011,800, on a full-cost basis. As was noted in paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/40/95, it was the Secretary-General's understanding that the costs would be met from extrabudgetary resources. The conference-servicing requirement would, however, be met from the regular budget. The conference-servicing requirements had been included in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements which the Fifth Committee had already dealt with. Accordingly, the Fifth Committee might wish to inform the General Assembly that adoption of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 would give rise to conference-servicing requirements estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$1,011,800, which had been included in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

20. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation had many reservations regarding the proposals made by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/40/95. It had the strong impression that the Secretary-General still believed that there was going to be an independent, informal group of experts. However, that was not the case. Accordingly, he wished to ask several questions. Would members of the group of experts be entitled to air travel and subsistence under the rules and regulations currently in effect? Did the Secretary-General have any indication or assurance that the resources needed to finance the group would be made available? Who would be funding the group? A bank, a multinational corporation, a private trust fund or Member States? How would decisions regarding the use of the resources be made if the resources came from a trust fund or a private source?

21. Mr. DE CLERCK (Belgium) said that his delegation was ready to take a decision forthwith.
22. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) wondered whether, in view of the general desire to keep expenses to a minimum, it would not be possible for the Organization to absorb some of the costs outlined in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/40/95 for example by redeploying staff from other parts of the Secretariat.
23. Mr. DITZ (Austria) asked why the Committee should not take a decision on the matter without delay, particularly since it appeared that no additional appropriations were being requested.
24. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) asked for confirmation that that was indeed so.
25. Mr. NTAKIBORORA (Burundi) said that his delegation, too, would be quite prepared to take a decision at the current meeting.
26. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that his delegation had asked that the question should be deferred until the General Assembly had adopted the draft resolution. It had no objection to discussing the question but did not want any decision to be taken at the current stage. Most delegations were still awaiting instructions on the matter from their Governments. He wondered whether adoption of the draft resolution would imply that the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee had failed to fulfil their mandate in respect of administrative and financial matters.
27. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) pointed out that the Spanish text of the draft resolution referred to a group of governmental experts while the English text referred to a group of intergovernmental experts. Which was correct? Was there any precedent for meeting the conference-servicing costs of a group of intergovernmental experts from extrabudgetary resources?
28. Mr. ROY (India) said that account should be taken of the possibility of using vacant posts, in addition to the possibility of redeploying staff. Moreover his delegation would appreciate clarification of whether the extrabudgetary resources in question would be provided piecemeal or whether they would be provided in full before the Group started its work.
29. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), responding to a question raised by the representative of Brazil, said that he wished to draw attention to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1. That paragraph indicated that the members of the Group would be appointed by the President of the General Assembly, in consultation with the regional groups, which meant that they would be appointed in their personal capacity. The travel and subsistence costs of the members of the Group would be paid, since the members would be serving in their personal capacity.
30. In response to another question raised by the representative of Brazil and also by the representative of Jordan, he wished to draw attention to paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/40/95, which indicated that it was the Secretary-General's understanding that non-conference-servicing costs would be met from extrabudgetary resources. Funding was assured and would not be on a piecemeal basis. There was a donor, and the resources in question would come from a trust fund that had been in

(Mr. Annan)

existence for some time. It had been agreed, in consultation with the donor, that appropriate costs could be charged to the trust fund. If other Governments wished to make contributions, the charges to the particular trust fund in question would be reduced accordingly.

31. In response to the questions raised by the representatives of Kenya and India, he wished to stress that the possibility of absorption of costs had not been ruled out. Provision for funding the posts concerned had been made in order to give the Group some flexibility in the selection of staff. If it proved possible to use existing staff, there would be no need to use the funds offered by the donor. The arrangement whereby use was made of temporary posts, as in the case of the Office of the Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women, was not to be encouraged, since it gave rise to considerable difficulties.

32. In response to the question raised by the representative of Yemen concerning a possible conflict between the Group's terms of reference and the mandates of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee, it would seem that the Group's terms of reference represented an amplification of the work of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee.

33. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee), responding to a point raised earlier in the meeting by the representative of Cuba, said that the Spanish title of the Group would be brought into line with the other language versions.

34. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that his delegation shared some of the concerns voiced by the representatives of Brazil and Cuba. In particular, it would appreciate clarification of the procedure followed in approving the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs.

35. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation welcomed the initiative to review the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations. In the light of the statement made by the Director of the Budget Division, it believed that all the costs should be charged to the regular budget.

36. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that, although there should be no difficulty in charging non-conference-servicing costs to extrabudgetary resources, his delegation wished to have further assurance that funds would actually be available. It would also appreciate clarification of the reasons for meeting such costs from extrabudgetary resources, as well as additional information concerning the establishment of the trust fund referred to by the Director of the Budget Division. It noted that the Director of the Budget Division had indicated that the possibility of the absorption of costs had not been ruled out, and wished to draw attention to the fact that that possibility was often considered as a first option.

37. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that he wished to know whether the staff members referred to in paragraph 5 (e) of document A/C.5/40/95 would be recruited from outside the Secretariat.

38. Mr. CHUA (Singapore) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 and was satisfied that financing would not be a problem. The Committee should take a decision on the matter without delay.

39. The CHAIRMAN, responding to points raised earlier in the meeting by Mr. SINGH (Fiji), Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) and Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan), and to the observation just made by the representative of Singapore, said that the Committee was unable to take a decision on the matter before it at the current meeting because some delegations were awaiting instructions from their governments as to whether the costs referred to in paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/40/95 should be charged to the regular budget or whether they should be covered by extrabudgetary resources.

40. Mr. CHIBANDA (Zambia) said that his delegation was disappointed that it was not possible to take a decision on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

41. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) said that if the tasks of the proposed Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts were confined to daily routine United Nations operations and efforts to improve them, she wondered why it should not be financed from the regular budget and why any part of it should have to be funded from some ill-defined trust fund, about which more information would be needed. In her view, every Member State should share in the financial responsibility for such an important group, since it would benefit the entire Organization. She therefore proposed that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$835,000 would be required to meet the costs referred to in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/40/95.

42. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) proposed that the Committee should take a decision on the Argentine proposal at the current meeting so that the Advisory Committee would be able to discuss the matter before the Fifth Committee's afternoon meeting of the following day.

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that if the Fifth Committee decided that the \$835,000 should be covered from the regular budget, then he saw no need for the Advisory Committee to make a similar recommendation. He would not advise the Advisory Committee to make a recommendation involving absorption of part of the amount because that could affect the work of the group in question.

44. The representative of Kenya had made an important observation in noting that Member States must decide whether funding would be from the regular budget or from extrabudgetary funds, but the Secretary-General had the authority to make a recommendation and the Fifth Committee must decide whether it wished to accept it or to adopt an alternative proposal.

45. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a decision on the matter should be deferred until the following day.

46. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 120: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.21)

47. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.21, said that his delegation strongly supported the Joint Inspection Unit and would do its utmost to improve its productivity and maximize its cost-effectiveness. Draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.21 would improve its procedures and enhance its role, and its operative part was fully consistent with the statute of JIU.

48. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark), Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) and Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that they would need time to study draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.21 with the attention it deserved and wondered why it had been submitted instead of the draft resolution they had expected from the Chairman.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that he could not submit a draft resolution when a delegation had done so.

50. Mr. DITZ (Austria) proposed that an operative paragraph 4 should be added to draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.21 to read: "Invites the Joint Inspection Unit to evaluate the results of its activities and to report thereon to the forty-first session".

51. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that in paragraph 1 the words "of the implementation" should be added after the word "review" and that everything after the word "organization" should be deleted. The last part was unnecessary because the point relating to mandates had already been covered.

52. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that his delegation accepted the Austrian amendment and would consider the Soviet one and comment on it later.

53. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said that his delegation had intended to prepare its own draft resolution but had refrained from doing so in the expectation that the Chairman would submit one. A discussion of the matter should be postponed and the Chairman should submit his draft resolution on the following day.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that it was improper for him to submit a draft resolution when a delegation had already done so.

55. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that while he favoured the procedure suggested by the representative of Egypt, he nevertheless wished to propose that the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.21 should be deleted and paragraph 1 replaced with the operative paragraph proposed by the representative of Austria.

56. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) proposed that reference should be made in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to the JIU mandate to indicate that what was suggested was already provided for in the JIU statute.

57. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should continue its consideration of the draft resolution at a subsequent meeting on the basis of a revised text.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

58. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) suggested that, in completing its consideration of the agenda items still outstanding, the Committee should give priority to those which had programme budget implications so that the Secretariat would be able to prepare the draft report on the proposed programme budget in ample time for its consideration in the plenary Assembly.



59. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that in order to seek instructions from their Governments on the final reading of the budget delegations must be provided with information on the total level of appropriations approved so far - which would not be affected greatly by the financial implications of the outstanding items - and on the nominal growth rate, resource growth and real growth rate of the budget. If that information was not provided before the following meeting, his delegation, for one, would have to seek a postponement of a final decision on the budget.

60. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that he understood that the draft resolution of personnel questions (A/C.5/40/L.16) had programme budget implications which would have to be added to the figures already approved.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the provisions of the draft resolution relating to the competitive examinations and the Office of the Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat had programme budget implications and adoption of the draft resolution would imply approval of the appropriations sought by the Secretary-General for those purposes.

62. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the provisions of the draft resolution relating to after-service insurance coverage would also have financial implications, totalling \$420,000, which could not be absorbed.

63. Replying to the representative of Belgium, he said that the figures to be submitted to the Fifth Committee in second reading, subject to any changes required by subsequent decisions having financial implications, were as follows: total appropriations under expenditure sections: \$1,663,714,500; total estimates of income: \$317,315,400; net expenditures: \$1,346,399,100. Those figures did not include the \$24 million loan to UNIDO, which would bring the total budget to \$1,687,714,500. He did not have at hand the comparative figures on non-recurrent expenditure for the biennia 1984-1985 and 1986-1987. However, the Secretary-General's initial estimates had included non-recurrent items totalling \$18,033,400, the Advisory Committee had recommended approval of an amount of \$14,894,500, and the Fifth Committee had approved \$73,062,300 in first reading. The quantum jump which had occurred in the first reading was the result of the \$24 million loan to UNIDO and some \$25 million for construction and other major maintenance projects. It also reflected the programme budget implications of activities relating to Namibia and the rights of the Palestinian people. With respect to the real growth rate, the Secretary-General's proposals reflected growth of 0.4 per cent, the Advisory Committee's recommendations -0.3 per cent and the appropriations approved so far 0.1 per cent.

64. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) noted that in the computation of the new real growth rate, the final figures given by the Director of the Budget Division excluded UNIDO, which the Secretary-General's initial proposals and the Advisory Committee's figures did not. He asked whether the Secretariat had subtracted the expenses attributable to UNIDO from the 1984-1985 budget in computing that rate.

65. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Secretariat had subtracted the amounts in question and had treated the deduction not as negative growth, but as an adjustment to the base.