



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba)

later: Mr. HADWEN (Canada)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 117: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 118: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 119: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

Programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report to the General Assembly

AGENDA ITEM 116: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (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 DC7-750, 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.5/41/SR.28
24 November 1986

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/41/627; A/C.5/41/2, 6, 12 and Corr.1, 18, 29 and 39; A/C.5/41/CRP.2)

1. The CHAIRMAN, recalling the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/213, suggested that the Committee should invite a representative of the staff of the Secretariat to make an oral presentation of the views of the staff on agenda item 117 contained in document A/C.5/41/39.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mrs. FRANGIPANI-CAMPINO, speaking on behalf of the staff of the United Nations Secretariat, said that the staff representatives welcomed the opportunity to comment on issues of concern as part of a continuing dialogue with representatives of Member States, which, they hoped, would lead to an improvement in the effectiveness of the Secretariat.
4. Personnel questions were one of the most important matters to come before the Fifth Committee, because, she believed, the staff were the Organization's most valuable resource. From that basic premise there followed a number of conclusions, such as the importance of treating staff fairly, motivating them for higher performance, investing in training and ensuring good leadership. A more scientific, coherent and comprehensive approach to staff management must be tirelessly worked on. Personnel policies must be entirely consistent with their stated objectives, and new policies governing staffing, development and administration should not compete with each other but be mutually supportive. Ad hoc responses and crisis management could no longer be tolerated in an organization that wished to transform itself into an effective twenty-first-century entity.
5. The staff had been heartened to see that the Advisory Committee recommended implementation at all levels of the classification exercise for the General Service and related categories in so far as it applied to the Trades and Crafts and Security categories (A/41/7/Add.8, para. 15). The Advisory Committee's suggestion that the reclassification should be applied in the General Service category only up to the G-6 level, however, raised troubling questions. The Advisory Committee said that programme managers should be encouraged to evaluate results of the job classification exercise as it related to their organizational units, asserting that they had not previously been consulted as to the requirements of their units or how those requirements might relate to the exercise. She wished to point out that programme managers assigned staff the functions on which job descriptions were based, and thus largely controlled who would and would not be given tasks likely to be classified at the higher levels. An entire section of the job description form had been designed for the supervisors - broadly the same people as the programme managers referred to by the Advisory Committee - to complete. The entire job description had been certified accurate by the supervisors. The staff did not understand why descriptions already certified accurate by programme managers should need to be reverified.

(Mrs. Franqipani-Campino)

6. Programme managers had had two further opportunities to ensure that job descriptions were accurate, when the job descriptions were submitted to the executive offices of their respective departments and to the heads of their respective divisions. At both stages, the descriptions given by the staff member or supervisor could have been challenged. Finally, departments had had ample opportunity to ask for the level of any post under their jurisdiction to be either raised or lowered. The Secretary-General himself - who was the ultimate programme manager - had expressed unequivocal satisfaction with the opportunity given to all parties concerned to state their positions regarding both job descriptions and the consequent level of posts occupied by staff members. The staff therefore found it difficult to agree that programme managers needed yet another opportunity to voice their opinions on the level of posts under their authority. They requested the Fifth Committee to give careful consideration to the Secretary-General's recommendations and lend respect to his authority as chief administrative officer of the United Nations by approving complete implementation of the classification exercise, as a step towards a more efficient and progressive personnel policy.

7. On the question of the status of women, a dangerous myth had been put about the Organization: that programme managers had been unable to find qualified women in the Secretariat to occupy high-level posts. That was a lie. There were thousands of highly qualified, highly dedicated women in the Organization. What did exist was prejudice. Women did not ask for special treatment, only equal treatment. It was regrettable that the organizational statistics on the advancement of women in the United Nations, which prided itself on supporting the principle of equal development for all, were so embarrassingly poor.

8. She thanked delegations for their support of previous resolutions seeking to redress the situation. She asked them now to go further, and press for accountability specifically at the departmental level. Only thus would it be possible to eliminate rhetoric and the need for theoretical studies, and finally begin to implement the resolutions on the status of women which the Fifth Committee had supported year after year.

9. The staff looked to the Fifth Committee, as representatives of the Member States, for understanding and support. The problems she had outlined could be overcome. The staff looked forward to continuation of their important interaction with the Committee, and stood ready to do their part to make a better world.

AGENDA ITEM 118: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 119: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued) (A/41/7/Add.2, A/41/9, 30, 790; A/C.5/41/1, 13, 22, 28, 36)

10. Mr. AKWEI (Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission) said that it had been implied by several delegations and the Chairman of the Pension Board, during the Committee's discussion of the reports of the Board and the Commission,

(Mr. Akwei)

that the Commission had not co-operated with the Board. In fact, co-operation between the two had been the first issue that the two bodies had discussed. Ruling out joint meetings, the two bodies had decided to continue co-operation between their secretariats in the preparation of documents and the development of ideas; he, the Vice-Chairman of ICSC and experts from the Commission had attended meetings of the Pension Board and its subsidiary organs, and the Board's Chairman and experts had attended all meetings of the Commission. Considerably more time had been spent on co-operation between the two bodies than on any other item. If the Pension Board was unhappy about some aspects of the ICSC report, it was not because its concerns had not been addressed by the Commission but rather because of genuine disagreement.

11. Several delegations, the Pension Board, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) and staff representatives had all said that, in view of the disagreement between the two technical bodies, the issue of pensionable remuneration should have been referred back to them so that a joint or common recommendation could be resubmitted. He felt it necessary to clarify that the Commission and the Pension Board were not jointly responsible for pensionable remuneration; pensionable remuneration was the statutory responsibility of the Commission, and pensions were the responsibility of the Board. The two bodies naturally co-operated and consulted, but they were not required to submit identical proposals, and referring the issue back to them would not guarantee identical recommendations. On previous occasions when the two bodies had come up with different proposals, the Fifth Committee had not found it difficult to take its own decision. Nor had the Fifth Committee, on other occasions, found it difficult to set aside a common position of ICSC and the Board, or to endorse a view advocated by a minority within the Commission rather than the majority view. Disagreement between ICSC and the Pension Board did not paralyse the search for good solutions, especially when the points of disagreement were not great.

12. He had been asked by the representative of Ghana whether the Commission had considered the impact of its recommended scale of pensionable remuneration on the actuarial balance of the Pension Fund. He could say categorically that the Commission would never wish to recommend a scale which posed a problem for the actuarial balance of the Fund. He had been disappointed to hear the Chairman of the Pension Board describe the Commission as "cavalier" in its attitude to the effect of its proposals, for he had specifically asked the Board to provide an assessment of the actuarial impact of the scale that ICSC was now recommending. The Secretary of the Pension Board had informed the Commission that the effects of the proposed scale would be minimal, and that the scale could serve for both contribution and benefit purposes. Only after receiving that reassurance had the Commission finally settled on the scale of pensionable remuneration now recommended in its report.

13. The Commission had only just been informed that the middle and lower levels of the scale it recommended could be corrected to lessen the scale's adverse effects. If the Pension Board had made such a proposal earlier, the Commission would have co-operated with it in making the necessary adjustments. Adjustments could still be made, even at the present stage.

(Mr. Akwei)

14. The representative of Brazil had argued that the General Assembly's instructions to the Commission did not represent a mandate to adopt a new scale of pensionable remuneration directly related to that of the comparator civil service. In fact, General Assembly resolution 40/245 specifically requested the Commission to "submit its recommendations" to the Assembly at its present session, taking into account views expressed in the Fifth Committee at the fortieth session. At the fortieth session it had been argued in the Fifth Committee that the margin between pensionable remuneration and pensions in the United Nations and the comparator civil service was too high, and should be corrected. The Commission, therefore, clearly had a mandate to recommend a new scale. In its report to the Assembly at its fortieth session, moreover, the Commission had spelled out its intention of recommending a new scale of pensionable remuneration for the Professional and higher categories, for consideration at the forty-first session, regardless of the status of the United States civil service retirement scheme.

15. The preference of the Pension Board for a pensionable remuneration scale ranging between 112 and 124 per cent of pensionable remuneration in the comparator service seemed to ICSC to be a serious and responsible option. The main difference between ICSC and the Pension Board was that the Board believed United Nations pensioners should be entitled to the same additional margin in their pensions as they enjoyed in their remuneration during service. The Commission, in general, did not share that view. Some members of the Commission had argued that retired United Nations staff were not entitled to any margin in pensions at all, while others had argued that some entitlement was reasonable. The Commission's recommendation of a range of 110 to 120 per cent of comparator remuneration was a compromise.

16. Many delegations and the Chairman of the Pension Board had asked why ICSC had deferred application of its decision to disregard the cost-of-living differential between Washington, D.C., and New York in the case of net remuneration calculations when it had chosen to apply it immediately to its calculations of pensionable remuneration. The Commission's decision had been based on the assumption that the General Assembly would decide on a pensionable remuneration scale at its forty-first session and then leave the matter alone for some years: therefore the decision on the cost-of-living differential must be applied immediately in the case of pensionable remuneration. The review of net remuneration, however, was an annual exercise, and the cost-of-living question could be set aside pending completion of the methodology for calculating net remuneration ranges, when the Commission could make further proposals as appropriate. The Fifth Committee had heard all the facts and arguments it needed to take a wise decision on the matter.

17. The Commission had not taken a formal vote to exclude the cost-of-living differential from pensionable remuneration calculations. The technical arguments for and against its decision could be found in paragraphs 61 to 64 of its report. The Fifth Committee would have to draw its own conclusions on the matter; the strong views on the issue expressed by the representatives of Canada, India, Japan, Ghana and Pakistan would be brought to the Commission's attention.

(Mr. Akwei)

18. The representative of India had asked why the Commission had chosen to base its calculations of pensionable remuneration on accumulated pension benefits corresponding to 25 years of service, rather than the average length of service. As indicated in paragraph 26 of the Commission's report, it had been concluded that if the Commission based its recommendation on 20 years of service (after which about 60 per cent of United Nations Professional staff retired), justice would not be done to those who stayed longer in United Nations employ. If the recommendation was based on too high a figure, too much justice would be done to staff with shorter careers. The Commission had therefore made a reasonable compromise on 25 years of service. As mentioned in paragraphs 26 and 27 of the Commission's report, the decision had pleased neither those who favoured a higher figure nor those who preferred a lower one.

19. The representative of Japan had argued that pension levels in the United Nations and the comparator civil service should be compared on both a net and a gross basis. The possibility had already been considered by the Commission. Comparison of net remuneration was not difficult to do, but a similar comparison of pension benefits was complicated. The actual amount of tax levied on comparator civil service pensions was difficult to determine because not all federal civil servants retired in Washington, D.C., or the New York area; in the case of United Nations officials, taxes applicable in some 170 countries and territories would have to be taken into account. As a result, the Commission had decided in 1979 to make its comparisons using gross pensions expressed as percentages of net remuneration.

20. Some delegations had referred to the problem of the pensionable remuneration recommended for Assistant Secretaries-General and Under-Secretaries-General. The report of ICSC outlined why the methodology recommended could not be used in the case of those two levels. The ad hoc approach used by the Commission would result in the same pension benefits for the two categories. In view of the traditional difference between the pensions and net remuneration levels of the two categories, a small adjustment could be made to introduce the necessary differentiation.

21. The representative of Czechoslovakia had said that the Commission's decisions on automatic adjustment of separation payments, increasing the adjustment index in duty stations with low post adjustment classifications and establishing a remuneration correction factor could not be justified. He had suggested that there was an increasing tendency on the part of ICSC, as soon as it had adopted decisions designed to economize, to propose new entitlements. That was not the case. The automatic adjustment of separation payments was not a decision of ICSC but one taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session in 1980 and reaffirmed at the thirty-ninth session in 1984. The decision of ICSC at its last session had in fact stopped an increase in separation payments which would have become due and had thus resulted in savings for Member States.

22. The representative of India had said that elements of the conditions of service of the United States federal civil service that were favourable to the staff were not taken into account in determining conditions of service of United

(Mr. Akwei)

Nations officials, whereas elements detrimental to them were singled out and taken into account in deciding on the remuneration system, and had asked why ICSC took that approach. It had long been held by ICSC that the United Nations system should not be a carbon copy of the United States federal civil service, which was a home civil service with its own needs and objectives whereas the United Nations system was an international, expatriate civil service. The General Assembly and ICSC had both stated on many occasions that the differences between them must be taken into account when the remuneration package of United Nations officials was considered. The warning of the representative of Argentina against adopting an exact copy of the United States civil service was very timely. There had been an increasing tendency in certain quarters to single out conditions of employment of United Nations officials for criticism and a similar feeling had been communicated by some of the General Assembly's resolutions. At its fortieth session, the General Assembly had requested ICSC to develop further the methodology for calculating the margin based on net remuneration taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee and to study the possibility of calculating the margin based on a comparison of net remuneration for both services in New York. The views of the Committee had necessarily had an important effect on the majority decision of the Commission regarding the elimination of the cost-of-living differential.

23. The representative of Brazil had referred to the margin range recommended by ICSC in 1985 and approved by the General Assembly. He had been of the view that with a desirable mid-point of 115 for the margin, a calculation of 5 per cent in both directions would give a more appropriate margin range of between 109.52 and 120.75. On the basis of a movement of 5 per cent in both directions, he was correct. However, one class of post adjustment on the average equalled 4.5 per cent of net base remuneration. If the mid-point of 115 was adjusted downward by 4.5 per cent, the figure of 110.04 was arrived at. When the mid-point was adjusted upward by 4.5 per cent, a figure of 120.17 was arrived at. It was in view of those numbers that the Commission had recommended a range of 110 to 120.

24. The representative of Pakistan had referred to the Commission's decision to exclude bonuses and performance awards paid to senior United States officials from the margin calculation. The majority of ICSC members had considered that since such payments went to only a small percentage of United States civil service employees and did not form part of base pay they should not be taken into account in the margin calculations. Under the Pay Comparability Act, remuneration comparisons between the United States federal civil service and outside employers were carried out annually. In that comparison, the United States Government did take into account bonuses and performance awards paid to comparator employees. In determining pension benefits, however, bonuses and performance awards were not taken into account by the United States because they were not considered part of base salary.

25. The Co-ordinating Committee for Independent Staff Unions and Associations of the United Nations System (CCISUA) had expressed disappointment at ICSC's inability to arrive at a remedy for duty stations with negative post adjustment given the fact that the comparator civil service had no such adjustment. It should be

(Mr. Akwei)

remembered, however, that the philosophies behind the two systems were completely different. The purpose of the United Nations post adjustment was to equalize the purchasing power of staff members of equal level, regardless of their nationality and the country to which they were posted. A further complication arose because the base of the post adjustment system was affected by the needs of the Tax Equalization Fund. Negative post adjustment could be eliminated from the system, altogether, without changing total emoluments, by maintaining a very low net base salary and very high post-adjustment multipliers. However, that would bring the Tax Equalization Fund into bankruptcy. Accordingly negative post adjustments had been accepted as an integral part of the United Nations salary system. If those countries which taxed the incomes of their nationals in the United Nations were to refrain from doing so, as recommended by ICSC and endorsed by the General Assembly on several occasions, there would be no need for a Tax Equalization Fund and the problem of negative post adjustment would not arise. ICSC had recently approved several measures to minimize the problems faced by staff members serving in duty stations with very low post adjustment levels and several methodological improvements had been approved for application in the next round of place-to-place surveys.

26. Several delegations had noted the Commission's decision to introduce a remuneration correction factor to reduce the effect on take-home pay in local currencies of fluctuations in the exchange rate of the United States dollar. Most speakers had expressed the hope that a long-term universal solution would be found to the problem, as envisaged by ICSC, with the assistance of ACPAQ. The representative of the United States had expressed reservations about the cost of the scheme and the implementation of that change by ICSC without General Assembly approval. With regard to the financial implications, the projected amount would be substantially reduced if the United States dollar strengthened over the medium or long term. The introduction of the remuneration correction factor had been urgently needed in order to prevent organizations from adopting unilateral remedies. After appropriate consultations, ICSC had confirmed its competence to take such a decision on behalf of the common system, in accordance with the provisions of its statute.

27. FICSA had asked why some organizations had been singled out for their non-compliance with ICSC recommendations but not the United Nations. The reason was that the United Nations would have been ready to implement the Commission's recommendations had it not been for the financial crisis, but the other organizations concerned were either planning to deviate from the common system, or had deviated from it for some time, without any justifiable reason. FICSA had also objected to the view expressed in paragraph 202 of the ICSC report that geographical balance was by no means a secondary factor in staff recruitment. The Commission's interpretation did not change the meaning of Article 101 of the Charter but rather indicated that geographical balance should not be regarded as a mere afterthought. With reference to the reply by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to questions regarding performance evaluation during the discussion of the report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts, he noted that, given the proportion of highest ratings, it was clear that

(Mr. Akwei)

performance evaluation had lost its meaning as a management tool. The Commission intended to give priority to a review of the issues of performance appraisal and recognition of merit in 1987 and 1988.

28. A great number of comments had been made on the central role of ICSC in the common system and the need for all participating organizations to co-operate with it. It was understandable for organizations outside New York to resent being taken to task for divergencies, when the United Nations itself was creating a bad precedent by not complying with ICSC recommendations. The Member States of the United Nations, therefore, had an important responsibility, both in financial matters and in other supervisory monitoring capacities, to ensure that the situation was first remedied at the United Nations where much of the decision-making for the common system started. In resolutions 36/233 and 40/244, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General, as Chairman of ACC, to take supportive action in the process of monitoring and co-ordinating ICSC's decisions and recommendations. It would be useful if the Secretary-General was requested to report annually to the Fifth Committee on that monitoring role.

29. It had been alleged by FICSA that there had been a deterioration in the statutory consultation procedures between ICSC and the representatives of executive heads and staff, and a tendency for ICSC to take political rather than technical decisions and to anticipate the reactions of the General Assembly. The Commission took those comments very seriously and would discuss them thoroughly at its next session. It had also been suggested that ICSC might be taking hasty decisions solely in order to achieve savings. While he did not think that was the case, he noted that ICSC could not ignore the financial crisis so frequently referred to in the Fifth Committee, and that the Commission's own rules of procedure required it not to make substantive proposals until it had examined their financial implications.

30. The representative of the United States had expressed disappointment about the absence of the report on mobility requested in resolution 40/244 in view of the need to review conditions of service of staff in the field. The conditions of service of staff in many field duty stations of the United Nations system compared extremely unfavourably with those of United States civil servants. The Commission had not taken any decision about those conditions at its last session but the problems were well known. Redressing conditions of service in the field did not necessarily depend on a mobility study, but mobility would be reviewed as resources permitted. He hoped that if well-substantiated proposals in that regard led to net increases for the common system instead of savings, they would be welcomed by the United States and the General Assembly.

31. The comments of the Eastern European delegations regarding possible savings through reduced representation of organizations and staff at meetings of the Commission would be brought to the Commission's attention. The Commission would resume its detailed review of the post adjustment system in 1987 and the re-examination of the scope of the education grant would be continued. The inputs from the organizations expected to be received in 1987 would be all the more timely

(Mr. Akwei)

in view of the additional elements concerning the grant that had been raised directly by the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts and indirectly by many delegations in the Fifth Committee. The Commission hoped to provide a comprehensive report on the education grant and related matters in the light of the various helpful comments made in the Committee at the current session.

32. Mr. Hadwen (Canada) took the Chair.

33. Mr. FULCHERI (Chairman of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board) said that the importance of the pension system for the recruitment and retention of the kind of staff demanded by Article 101 of the Charter was the first of the several common threads running through most of the statements made in the Fifth Committee on the United Nations pension system. That point was especially crucial seen from the perspective of the Pension Board, on which Member States, administrations and participants from all organizations of the common system were represented. He emphasized that any decision by the Fifth Committee affected not only the United Nations Secretariat but the participants from the agencies, who were numerically equally important. The second area of general agreement had been the need for a period of stability, at least five years in the view of some speakers. Stability had been one of the Board's main preoccupations over the last few years, since uncertainty and lack of stability had been among the causes of an increase in early retirements. Despite the Board's pleas for stability, however, less than two years after the approval of the current scale of pensionable remuneration the matter was once again being discussed. The Board agreed with the view expressed by a number of delegations that, while the pension system should be reformed, it should not be tampered with every year.

34. Stability must be achieved on the basis of decisions that were technically sound, acceptable to all parties and not likely to create anomalies and distortions in the future. The new system must have its own internal logic and be able to stand the test of time. A new scale of pensionable remuneration must be approved on a basis that would lead to an orderly transition and adjustment as circumstances changed, so that the end-result would be a plan which was financially and actuarially viable, provided a reasonable level of security and did not become a burden to Member States.

35. The Board had been very sensitive to the views of the Fifth Committee, in particular its concern to ensure co-operation with other bodies. The Board had made and would continue to make every effort in that direction. He expressed his appreciation for the spirit of co-operation shown in the Board by the representatives of the Fifth Committee and the governing bodies of the agencies, who had worked hard with the other members in the analysis and interpretation of the various studies in order to arrive at a satisfactory package of benefits which would be equitable both to staff and to Member States. Technical problems, however, remained. While savings should accrue to the member organization, it was essential to take into consideration the actuarial impact on the Fund of all the measures approved. When comparing the United Nations system with that of the comparator, the total benefit package and not single elements should be taken into

(Mr. Fulcheri)

account. As a number of representatives had said, an international system could not be a photocopy of a national system, particularly in a period of rapid, radical and largely unknown changes in the comparator service.

36. He had been gratified by the large measure of support expressed for the concept of income replacement and for the Pension Board's own view that to subtract the cost-of-living differential between New York and Washington, D.C., was inconsistent with a methodology whose starting point was income replacement at the base.

37. Views had been somewhat divided on the question of the margin. He emphasized the Board's concern over the technical aspects of that issue. From a purely mathematical standpoint, a margin range of 10 to 20 per cent of net salaries was not equal to a margin range of 10 to 20 per cent when net salaries were grossed-up to arrive at the amount for pensionable remuneration. Artificially forcing pensionable remuneration into a margin range of 10 to 20 per cent might give results that would not be technically sound.

38. The Pension Board had also disagreed with ICSC regarding the level of pensionable remuneration for Under-Secretaries-General. He noted that several delegations had agreed with the Board that the level should be somewhat higher than that for Assistant Secretaries-General.

39. There had been virtually unanimous agreement in the Committee on the need for a speedy settlement of the question of pensionable remuneration for the Professional and higher categories. Of the two approaches suggested, referring the matter back to ICSC and the Pension Board or bridging the differences between them through the consultations in the Working Group, ACC, staff associations and a large number of the members of the Pension Board would prefer the former. He was confident that if the matter was referred back, an agreed solution would be forthcoming.

40. The report of the Pension Board contained recommendations other than those related to the question of pensionable remuneration. The two delegations which had referred to them had endorsed the position of ACABQ in that respect, which concurred in the Board's recommendation.

41. In conclusion, he stressed the Board's awareness of its role as a subsidiary organ of the Fifth Committee and its sensitivity to the Committee's concerns and suggestions. The Board had always tried, and would continue to try, to respond to those concerns with well-studied, well-thought-out proposals, soundly based on technical considerations, so that the decisions of the Fifth Committee would bring stability, economy and equity to all concerned, Member States and staff.

42. Mr. Fontaine-Ortiz (Cuba) resumed the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

Programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report to the General Assembly (A/41/24 (part II) and Corr.1) (A/C.5/41/38)

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), said that the statement of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/41/38) dealt with the programme budget implications of five draft resolutions (A-E) recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which were contained in the Council's report to the General Assembly (A/41/24 (part II) and Corr.1). Additional information relating to the recommendations was contained in chapter II of part II of that report. Consideration of the Secretary-General's statement had been hampered by its late submission, and the Advisory Committee hoped that statements would in future be submitted in a more timely fashion.

44. The financial implications of the five draft resolutions, calculated at full cost, were estimated at \$6,508,400, as summarized in paragraph 78 of the statement. Of that amount, conference-servicing requirements at full cost were estimated at \$602,500. As stated in paragraph 84, those requirements would be dealt with in the context of a consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted to the current session of the General Assembly. The estimated amount of \$602,500 comprised a component of \$106,900 to cover conference-servicing requirements for a five-day international seminar in 1987 in Latin America, as well as the related journalists' encounter, and a component of \$495,600 for the extraordinary plenary meetings of the Council in southern Africa in May 1987, as well as a related meeting of the Steering Committee of the Council and a journalists' encounter. The activities relating to those two components were described, respectively, in paragraphs 31 to 33 and annex I and paragraphs 42 to 45 and annex II of the statement.

45. The Advisory Committee had noted that, as indicated by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 31 and 43, the holding of the seminar and the extraordinary plenary meetings away from Headquarters would constitute an exception to General Assembly resolution 40/243. Furthermore, the preparation of verbatim transcripts for the proceedings, as requested by the Council, would involve exceptions to General Assembly resolutions 3415 (XXX) and 37/14 C.

46. Non-conference-servicing requirements amounted to \$5,905,900. However, as explained in paragraphs 80 to 83 and as summarized in paragraph 87, after taking into account savings amounting to \$296,500 based on the pattern of past expenditure, as well as uncommitted resources included in the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 for the implementation of activities relating to Namibia, the Secretary-General was requesting total additional appropriations of \$4,550,800 on a net basis under sections 1B, 3B, 3C, 27 and 29A of the programme budget. A breakdown of the requirements was provided in paragraph 83, while paragraph 79 and annex III compared the activities proposed for 1987 with those undertaken in 1986.

47. The net additional requirements included an allocation of \$1,500,000 for the Trust Fund for Namibia, as well as an allocation of \$500,000 for the Council's

(Mr. Mselle)

programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations. It also included an amount to cover additional staff requirements. In that connection, the Advisory Committee noted, in paragraphs 32 and 44 of the statement, the proposal that general temporary assistance should be provided to the Department of Public Information, to replace staff of the Department attending the seminar and the extraordinary plenary meetings. The Advisory Committee had been informed that one week of such assistance would be required in each case and it recommended that the total sum required, amounting to \$1,900, should be absorbed.

48. A four-month general temporary assistance provision at P-2 level under section 29 had been requested in paragraph 46, to cover the increased work-load for the Planning and Meetings Servicing Section of the Department of Conference Services resulting from the international seminar and the extraordinary plenary meetings. Although the Advisory Committee had sought additional information in that connection, it remained unconvinced that the request was fully justified and therefore recommended that the requirements should be met from the resources available under section 29.

49. Paragraph 48 referred to a proposal by the Council that the post of the Secretary of the Council should be upgraded to the director level (D-2) and that the post of the officer responsible for organizing and servicing of the journalist encounters should be upgraded from the P-3 to the P-4 level. An additional General Service post was also proposed, on the grounds that journalist encounters had become the ongoing activity in the programme of the Council for the mobilization of public opinion in support of the Namibian cause. The creation of a further General Service post for the purpose of better co-ordination of the Council's programme of co-operation with NGOs was proposed in paragraph 57.

50. With regard to the upgrading of the post of the Secretary, the Advisory Committee had received very little information on which to base its recommendation. Moreover, it had noted that proposals for reclassification were usually submitted in the context of the proposed programme budget rather than in mid-biennium. It therefore recommended that the proposal should not be approved but should instead be resubmitted in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989, together with a detailed justification. Nevertheless, if the General Assembly should decide to accept the reclassification during the current session, the Advisory Committee recommended that it should be implemented through redeployment.

51. The Advisory Committee noted the intention of the Secretary-General, as expressed in paragraph 50 of the statement, to meet the Council's request for an upgrading of the P-3 post by exchanging it for a P-4 post from elsewhere. The Advisory Committee did not object to that proposal, on the understanding that no additional appropriation was required. It also noted the proposal, in paragraph 58, that the Council's request for two additional General Service posts should be met through the provision of 12 work-months of general temporary assistance in 1987 on the understanding that in addition the possibility of redeploying a post at that level to the Council's secretariat from section 3 of the

(Mr. Mselle)

1986-1987 programme budget would be explored. While the Advisory Committee did not object to the proposal for redeployment, it was not fully convinced that there was sufficient need for the general temporary assistance requested. It therefore recommended approval of additional appropriations totalling \$4,499,800, comprising \$21,800 under section 1B, \$4,239,800 under section 3C and \$238,200 under section 27.

52. Mr. MUDHO (Chairman of the Committee on Conferences) said that in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/10 A, the Committee on Conferences had examined the request of the United Nations Council for Namibia to meet away from United Nations Headquarters for the purpose of holding a series of extraordinary plenary meetings in May 1987. The preferred venue for these meetings was southern Africa, for reasons explained to the Committee. The Committee had noted that the Council for Namibia was unable to specify in which country the plenary meetings would take place because consultations to decide that matter were still continuing.

53. The Council for Namibia was also proposing to hold a seminar next year in Latin America. With respect to that proposed seminar, the cost estimates in the statement of budgetary implications before the Committee, document A/C.5/41/38, were based on what was likely to be the most expensive of the possible venues for the seminar.

54. While the Committee on Conferences understood the motivation for the Council's requests, the Committee had been informed in the course of its meeting that the Council had not in the past made sufficient efforts to persuade host Governments to defray the actual additional costs involved in holding their meetings away from established headquarters. The Committee on Conferences would therefore call upon the Council for Namibia to exert greater efforts in future in requesting host Governments to defray those expenses, so that the United Nations does not have to bear the cost.

55. In that context, some members of the Committee on Conferences had expressed concern during its meeting about the presentation and the fullness of the information regarding the Council's proposed programme of work which had been submitted to the Committee. The view had been expressed that requests by the Council for departures from General Assembly resolutions governing conference-servicing were not appropriate under the present circumstances.

56. One delegation, on technical grounds had expressed strong reservations concerning the Council's requests for exceptions, and considered that they should not be granted.

57. Subject to those considerations, the General Assembly might wish to grant the exceptions to its resolutions 37/14 C and 40/243.

58. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to record its objection to the procedure followed in considering the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the Council for Namibia. The Fifth Committee was once again forced to take a hasty decision in order to conform to the

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

schedule for voting on the relevant draft resolutions in the plenary Assembly. Since delegations had had little or no opportunity to review the extensive financial requirements involved, the decision which was about to be taken by the Committee was no more than a formality. It was the tradition in his country that important budget requests should undergo careful scrutiny before any action was taken by the legislative branch, whereas, in the case of the draft resolutions currently under consideration, virtually no time had been provided for proper analysis, let alone for consultations or the proposal of revisions.

59. The outline of total financial requirements for programmes relating to Namibia during the biennium 1986-1987, as presented in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's statement, was only partial. Apart from the amount of \$11,236,800 allocated under section 3C of the programme budget, his delegation requested estimates of the resources devoted to Namibia-related programmes under sections 3B and 27. Although it had been estimated that the Council and its subsidiary machinery would hold some 340 meetings during the biennium 1986-1987, no specific details of those bodies' conference-servicing requirements had been provided. The request for a net additional appropriation of \$4,550,800 should therefore be seen in the context of total budget outlays.

60. Since no details were provided with respect to the Council's expected requirement for 40 missions during 1987, as stated in paragraph 21, it was difficult to see what assurance Member States might have that all such missions were justified and that the amount of \$729,000 associated with them would be used for the proper purposes.

61. His delegation opposed the proposal, in paragraph 23, that the United Nations regular budget should cover the membership fees to be paid by the Council to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), or to any other organizations.

62. With reference to the holding of an international seminar in Latin America, which would require an exception to General Assembly resolution 40/243, the Council had assumed that the United Nations regular budget would defray the cost of holding a meeting away from Headquarters, as it had in previous years. However, his delegation hoped that the Council would implement the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences that it should request host Governments to defray those expenses. While understanding the need for a survey mission in connection with the seminar, as mentioned in paragraph 32, his delegation would expect that the Department of Conference Services should make every effort to assess requirements before dispatching any staff. It failed to understand the need for general temporary assistance for the Department of Public Information in New York while one staff member attended the seminar and believed that existing staff should be able to cover for one colleague during such a short period.

63. With regard to the proposal, contained in paragraph 35, that the United Nations regular budget should finance the participation of experts in four workshops, his delegation wondered if those experts would be in a position to

(Mr. Michalaki, United States)

provide unbiased views if the United Nations governed their travel and per diem expenses.

64. His delegation requested more specific details, particularly with respect to staffing requirements, of the proposed support, amounting to \$401,600, to be provided to the Office of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in New York. His delegation opposed any funding by the United Nations regular budget for that Office, as well as coverage of the travel expenses of SWAPO and the two other liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity, as referred to in paragraphs 39 and 41.

65. His delegation questioned why, in a time of financial constraint, the extraordinary plenary meetings should be held away from Headquarters. Commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Council did not constitute a sufficient justification. With regard to the staffing requirements and costs associated with those meetings, his delegation did not understand why, as stated in paragraph 44, as many as 13 staff members would be required and wished to know if all those staff members would be sent from New York or whether some would be provided from local offices. Although the text of that paragraph referred to a two-day journalists' encounter, the relevant travel and subsistence component in the breakdown of costs appeared to be calculated on a basis of 11 days, and his delegation therefore requested a full explanation of the requested figure of \$96,000. It was again questionable whether journalists could be expected to provide an objective and independent analysis of the event if their travel and subsistence was paid by the United Nations. His delegation also questioned the need for general temporary assistance for the Department of Public Information during the absence of one press officer.

66. His delegation supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee with respect to the proposals for upgrading of posts contained in paragraph 48.

67. With respect to the amount of \$709,000 listed in paragraph 53 for the acquisition, reproduction and distribution of other materials, he noted that the relevant items listed in document A/41/24 (part II) included posters and commemorative buttons, the need for which appeared doubtful at a time of financial austerity.

68. With regard to the proposal, referred to in paragraph 55, that use of an allocation of \$500,000 should be subject to decisions taken in consultation with SWAPO, his delegation objected to the provision of funds for use at the discretion of liberation movements rather than Member States.

69. With respect to the proposed allocation of \$1.5 million to the United Nations Trust Fund for Namibia, his delegation objected to the use of regular budget funds for operational programmes.

70. Despite the assurances of the Council that the financial circumstances of the United Nations had been taken into account during the formulation of its 1987

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

programme of work, his delegation failed to see what economies the Council had imposed upon itself. Noting that the additional appropriations currently proposed, amounting to \$4,550,800, were approximately \$1 million above the level of additional appropriations approved for the same item during the fortieth session of the General Assembly, his delegation requested that a recorded vote should be taken on the proposed additional appropriations.

71. Mrs. PERKOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the question of Namibia was a subject of the highest priority for the United Nations and would continue to be so while that country remained subject to occupation by the racist régime of South Africa. Noting that the activities of the Council for Namibia were of particular importance and that its programme of work included many components which assisted the cause of SWAPO and the people of Namibia, her delegation supported the recommendations as presented in document A/C.5/41/38.

72. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Yugoslavia. All Member States should continue to finance the programme of activities of the Council for Namibia so long as the Territory was not given its rightful place in the international community.

73. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee with regard to paragraph 48 of document A/C.5/41/38, might hinder the Secretariat support required for the promotion of the activities outlined in the document. He therefore appealed to members to give due consideration to upgrading the posts in question and to approve the \$1.5 million grant to the United Nations Trust Fund for Namibia. It was clear from paragraphs 79 (a) and (b) that the Council had decreased the level of many of its activities to achieve substantial economies.

74. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said that the Council for Namibia had taken account of the difficult financial situation of the United Nations by reducing its budgetary requirements by \$1.1 million in comparison with the previous year. Namibia was a special responsibility of the United Nations. If a country serving as venue of a United Nations meeting declined to defray the additional costs involved, that should not result in a decision not to hold the meeting there. In such cases, the costs should be borne by the Organization.

75. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), replying to the assertion by the United States delegation that document A/C.5/41/38 did not provide a complete picture, said that paragraph 82 gave a total picture of the situation and indicated the resources applied to the programme over the period 1986-1987. It also indicated that the resources requested for 1987 appeared to be \$1 million higher than the appropriations granted in 1986. The apparent increase in the requirements for 1987 was due to the fact that part of the appropriations for 1987 had been used to finance some of the 1986 requirements, which had exceeded the 1986 portion of the initial estimates.

76. The United States delegation had also asked why the United Nations should defray the costs relating to SWAPO in connection with its participation in the

(Mr. Annan)

activities of ILO and FAO. The General Assembly had on several occasions requested the other organizations in the system to waive, where possible, the fees in question for national liberation movements. During the current year the United Nations Industrial Development Organization had agreed to do so, but ILO and FAO had not yet been persuaded to take action along those lines. Efforts towards that end would be continued.

77. Referring to the question of general temporary assistance for replacement of Department of Public Information staff released to service seminars or workshops, he said that the need for such assistance depended on when the seminars or workshops were held. Such assistance was required, for instance, in January, or in September when the Department, which had a limited number of trained staff, had to cover major United Nations conferences. However, the point was well taken that the Department might perhaps be able to stretch its resources to cover for staff released to service other meetings.

78. With regard to the question of the payment of travel expenses of SWAPO, he said that details would be made available to the United States delegation at a later date.

79. Referring to the matter of the journalists' encounter, he said that the budget provided for 11 days although the encounter lasted 2 days because the journalists would remain throughout the extraordinary plenary meetings. The entire period would include one weekend.

80. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, assured the representative of Zambia that the recommendation of the Committee on Conferences was in no way intended to lead to the conclusion which seemed to give rise to concern on the part of his delegation.

81. Speaking as representative of Kenya, he fully endorsed the remarks by the representative of Sierra Leone with regard to the Council's request in paragraph 48 of document A/C.5/41/38.

82. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) thanked the Director of the Budget Division for the information he had provided but said that his delegation still had difficulty with estimated requirements under some sections of the programme budget. It looked forward to receiving the additional information requested.

83. The CHAIRMAN proposed, that on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that if it approved the recommendations of the Council for Namibia, as contained in its report (A/41/24 (part II) and Corr.1), additional appropriations totalling \$4,499,800 would be required for the biennium 1986-1987 (\$21,800 under section 1B; \$4,239,800 under section 3C; and \$238,200 under section 27). Conference-servicing costs not exceeding \$602,500, would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted towards the end of the current session.

84. Mr. GREGG (Australia) said that, as a member of the Council for Namibia, his country sought to ensure the most effective use of the available resources and was pleased to note that efforts had been made during the current year to reduce non-essential expenditure. On the whole, therefore, it was satisfied with the increased restraint shown and in view of the high priority attached to the work of the Council by the international community, his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal concerning the programme budget implications of the Council's recommendations.

85. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Spain.

86. The proposal was adopted by 96 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.

87. Mr. DANIELSSON (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation was of the view that the United Nations had a unique responsibility for Namibia. His delegation therefore supported an active role of the Council. Sweden was one of the main contributors to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. His delegation had welcomed the review of the programme of work of the Council initiated by the Council itself. It noted with satisfaction the gradual reorientation of activities and some cost-saving measures compared with the previous year. It would, however, have preferred a more careful analysis by the Council leading to a further concentration of activities. Those should be planned by experts and carefully monitored and evaluated. In view of the current financial

(Mr. Danielsson, Sweden)

crisis, a careful scrutiny was of particular importance. For those reasons, his delegation had voted with some hesitation in favour of the proposal.

88. Mr. HADWEN (Canada) said that, although the requirements for the Council for Namibia were lower than those for the previous year, there was still room for further economies in respect of missions, documentation and the number of conferences. His delegation was also concerned at the proposed upgrading of posts and the proposal to hold an international seminar in Latin America without the host country agreeing to defray the additional expenses. As a consequence, he had abstained in the voting.

89. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that as in previous years, his delegation had cast a negative vote with regard to the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia. That vote had been based on budgetary considerations and did not reflect his delegation's position on the substance of that important question. While appreciating the efforts made by the Council to take account of the financial crisis facing the United Nations, he felt that it had not exercised maximum restraint in planning its activities for 1987. Moreover, some of the planned activities would not help the Namibian people in their struggle for independence.

90. Mr. KOUNDJIA (Central African Republic) said that by mistake he had pushed the "abstention" button in the voting. He asked that the record show that his delegation had intended to cast an affirmative vote.

91. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland) emphasized the importance of the timely issue of statements of programme budget implications. The requirements identified for the Council for Namibia for 1987 were more realistic. Her delegation nevertheless had reservations with regard to the financing of certain vaguely defined proposals for meetings and the frequent exceptions to the general principles set forth in General Assembly resolution 31/140. The priorities of the Council's programme of work should be geared more towards activities of greater benefit to the people of Namibia.

92. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) noted with satisfaction the unanimous support of the African countries for the proposal on the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the Council for Namibia. Namibia was also a special responsibility of the United Nations, and the African countries hoped that those delegations which had abstained or cast negative votes would join in the struggle of the Namibian people for independence, especially since some had said that their votes had been prompted by financial considerations and not by the merits of the question.

93. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his Government's firm commitment to the independence of Namibia and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was well known. However, his delegation had been unable to accept the financial implications set out in the document under consideration (A/C.5/41/38). In its opinion, the proposals for meetings and seminars were excessive and the benefits hard to identify. Accordingly, it had voted against the proposal. It endorsed the remarks about the late submission of the document.

94. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote solely on budgetary grounds. Moreover, the statement of programme budget implications had not been submitted in time for his delegation to give it careful consideration, particularly in view of the substantial sums involved and the difficult situation facing the United Nations. It was well known that his Government was in favour of the speedy independence of Namibia; his delegation's abstention in no way reflected its position with regard to the merits of the question.

95. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana) said that had he been present during the voting he would have voted in favour of the proposal.

96. His delegation found excessive the delay in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the suffering of the people of Namibia because of the intransigence of South Africa, which was supported by some of its powerful friends in the West. His delegation felt that the concern expressed about the level of expenditure should be matched by positive action on the part of those in a position to exert pressure on South Africa to co-operate in implementing the relevant Security Council resolutions. He would have wished that it was not necessary to present programmes of work on behalf of the Council for Namibia every year. The fact that such a need existed was only a commentary on South Africa's intransigence and on the lack of will of those States which, by their collaboration with that country, made possible its continued domination of Namibia.

97. Mr. KOOIJMANS (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted against the proposal only because of budgetary considerations. The current financial situation of the United Nations had not been duly taken into account in the work programme of the Council for Namibia.

98. Mr. SABA (Burkina Faso) said that his delegation had been absent during the vote and that it would like the record to show that it would have voted in favour of the proposal.

AGENDA ITEM 116: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued) (A/41/11; A/C.5/41/L.5)

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

99. Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi), introducing the draft resolution in his capacity as Chairman of the informal consultations on the item said that in the third preambular paragraph the word "scale" should be written in the plural since the capacity to pay of Member States was the fundamental criterion for determining all scales of assessments. Efforts had been made in the informal consultations to take into account the concerns of all delegations. The Committee on Contributions had put forward several formulae for the apportionment of expenses, none of which had been entirely acceptable to the Fifth Committee and some of which had been categorically rejected. It had been generally recognized that the results had been less than satisfactory because the General Assembly had not given the Committee on Contributions specific guidelines. It was therefore imperative to fill that legislative void in order to ease the General Assembly's task in 1987.

(Mr. Ntakibirora, Burundi)

100. To enable the Committee on Contributions to lay the groundwork for future negotiations on the item the draft resolution requested it to continue its work on a methodology that was more in keeping with the principle of the capacity to pay. In other words, the members of that Committee should not waste their time on proposals that were not within the scope of their mandate, which was spelt out in rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and in all previous relevant resolutions of the Assembly on the scale of assessments. It was to be hoped that the Committee on Contributions would be in a position to submit its report thereon to the forty-second session of the General Assembly.

101. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.5 as orally revised without a vote.

102. It was so decided.

103. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that it was indeed gratifying that the Committee had been able to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

104. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation which had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, attached great importance to the principle of the capacity to pay as a fundamental criterion in determining scales of assessments. His delegation therefore expected the Committee on Contributions, in accordance with paragraph 1, to dedicate most of its time to the implementation and further improvement of the current methodology used and to take into account such elements of the current methodology as the low income and debt-servicing allowance formulas. That point warranted an explanation since paragraph 1 was unclear and even ambiguous.

105. Mr. GAMA FIGUEIRA (Brazil), said that although his delegation was not satisfied with the terms of the draft resolution, it had joined in the consensus. In the view of his delegation, the reference to all previous, relevant resolutions in the first preambular paragraph referred to General Assembly resolutions 31/95 A and B, 34/6, 36/231 A, 37/125, 38/33 and 39/247 B. Since the capacity to pay remained the fundamental criterion for determining the scales of assessments, it was to be expected that the Committee on Contributions would, among other things, try to update the upper limits of the low per capita income allowance formula, to refine the scheme to limit the variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales of assessment and to perfect the existing relief formulae to take into account the concerns of all Member States, especially the developing countries. With regard to paragraph 1, it was to be hoped that the Committee on Contributions would consider the views of Member States and therefore decide not to develop further the alternatives which had not enjoyed their support. It was clear to his delegation that work on alternatives I, III and IV as well as the hypothesis mentioned in chapter IV of the Committee's report (A/41/11) should not be pursued.

106. Mr. BANOUM (Cameroon) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution in a spirit of co-operation but wished to clarify a number of ideas. The reference made to the capacity to pay in the third preambular paragraph meant and would continue to mean the capacity to pay as it appeared in previous, relevant resolutions. That paragraph should in no way be considered as a step backwards in relation to earlier resolutions. The concept expressed in paragraph 1 implied that the Committee on Contributions, taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee and especially its own mandate, would reject a number of the ideas developed in its report and act solely on the basis of its mandate, as embodied in rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the relevant provisions of earlier resolutions.

107. Mr. FERNANDEZ MAROTO (Spain) said that the draft resolution was a balanced and flexible document. His delegation expressed its trust in the competence of the Committee on Contributions to carry out its mandate in accordance with the Fifth Committee's wishes.

108. Mr. FERNANDEZ de COSSIO (Cuba) said that the Committee on Contributions should not go beyond its mandate in carrying out a study that was not based on the capacity to pay and departed from the existing methodology, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 39/247 B. Consequently, paragraph 1 meant that the Committee on Contributions should continue to work on the existing methodology with a view to achieving more equitable scales of assessments. His delegation rejected the alternatives presented in document A/41/11 and hoped that the Committee on Contributions would take his views into account.

109. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that it was her understanding that the Committee on Contributions would not only try to improve the present methodology but also continue to study those alternatives that were consistent with the fundamental criterion of the capacity to pay. Of the four alternatives presented in document A/41/11, only alternative I gave due consideration to that criterion. It was therefore her understanding that the Committee on Contributions would devote its time to the study of that alternative.

110. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution even though it did not fully meet his delegation's concerns. The first preambular paragraph confirmed the series of resolutions adopted so far on the item, in particular General Assembly resolution 39/247 B. In accordance with the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the Committee on Contributions must ensure that the principle of capacity to pay was reflected in any methodology chosen for determining an equitable scale of assessments. The fourth preambular paragraph was also very relevant. It was to be hoped that the Committee on Contributions would recall the need for shared financial responsibility and consider measures to bring it about. Although paragraph 1 requested the Committee on Contributions to continue its work on a methodology, that did not imply the acceptance of any of the methods proposed in its report.

111. Mr. KHAN (Saudi Arabia) said that the mandate referred to in paragraph 1 derived fundamentally from General Assembly resolution 39/247 B. In that connection, he drew attention to his country's proposal discussed in paragraphs 69 to 74 of the report of the Committee on Contributions. Although the preliminary findings on that proposal were commendable, much remained to be done. The findings focused on a graduated relief scale ranging from 85 per cent to 35 per cent, but it was to be hoped that, over the next year, the Committee on Contributions would experiment on a wider scale ranging from 85 per cent to 10 per cent. Due regard should also be paid to the criterion of the real capacity to pay and the need for Member States to meet their obligations under Article 17 of the Charter, especially in the light of the current financial situation. Since the report of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts had not managed to address the question of financing of the Organization's budget, it was to be hoped that the draft resolution would in some way fill that gap.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.