

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records**



FIFTH COMMITTEE
77th meeting
held on
23 January 1979
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 77th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOBINA SEKYI (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Comprehensive study of the question of honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations (continued)

Revised estimates under section 5D, Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, section 5E, Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters, and section 22D, Office of General Services (continued)

United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy: administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/33/L.84/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12 (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/33/SR.77
6 March 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Comprehensive study of the question of honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations (continued) (A/33/7/Add.39; A/C.5/31/2, A/C.5/33/54; A/C.5/33/L.47; A/C.5/33/CRP.12)

1. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan), with reference to paragraph 9 of the ACABQ report (A/33/7/Add.39), asked whether the same rates of payment would apply in respect of all the bodies concerned, regardless of the number of meetings held. If so, that would mean that members of a body such as the Investments Committee, which met for only a few days, would receive the same amounts as members of the International Law Commission, which met for six weeks.
2. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as the time factor was not taken into account in respect of honoraria, the same rates would apply to all bodies.
3. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed in principle to the payment of honoraria, on the ground that they were not precisely related to the value of the services performed, and was especially anxious to inhibit their spread or increase because of the implications in the short and the long term for the United Nations budget. It, therefore, endorsed the principal recommendation of ACABQ opposing the increases recommended by the Secretary-General and would vote against the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom.
4. His delegation found both the existing situation and the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/54) unsatisfactory. The latter was misleading in certain respects: for example, the statement that the Chairman and Special Rapporteurs of the International Law Commission currently received honoraria of \$2,500 was incorrect. In fact, the Chairman of the International Law Commission (ILC), in that capacity, received nothing; as a member of ILC he was entitled to receive \$1,000 and if he also happened to be Special Rapporteur and had submitted a report in that capacity during the year, he would receive a further \$1,500. A Special Rapporteur received \$1,000 for being a member of ILC and only in years in which he submitted a report would he receive an additional \$1,500. Such inaccuracies exposed the weak foundations on which the proposal to increase the honoraria in those particular instances was based. Furthermore, the Secretary-General's report failed to analyse the problem seriously, to make the requisite distinctions and judgements, to make clear recommendations and to deal with the questions put forward by ACABQ, as set out in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's report.
5. Accordingly, his delegation was formally proposing in document A/C.5/33/L.47 that the Secretary-General should study the matter further and report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. Since treating token payments as compensation made little sense, the Secretary-General should examine alternative, more rational means of compensation. His delegation believed that the report

(Mr. Cunningham, United States)

should address itself to the question of replacing honoraria and subsistence allowances by a special, increased allowance to be paid to members of certain bodies for days of actual attendance at meetings, in the currency of the place of meeting and possibly on a scale such as that used by ILO in respect of members of the ILO Administrative Tribunal. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of compensating Special Rapporteurs who prepared reports between sessions of bodies in proportion to the amount of professional earning time lost because they were engaged in such work. His delegation believed that an analysis of such issues covering all organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations, and especially ACABQ and ICSC, would clarify matters considerably.

6. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation, while supporting the view that honoraria should be paid in all cases or in none, believed that service in a United Nations body in a personal capacity was an honour for the individual and for his country and that the individual should receive, rather than an honorarium, a per diem allowance and travel expenses. However, since it would not be feasible to terminate the honoraria such persons were currently receiving, one of the options that might be considered by the Fifth Committee was the gradual phasing-out of honoraria, as members retired. With regard to the question of increasing the rates of existing honoraria, he said that if the Committee agreed that the present system was inequitable, there could be no question of granting any increase.

7. Mr. ABANKWA (Ghana) said that the representative of the United Kingdom had rightly pointed out that some of the honoraria currently being paid were based on international agreements which had been ratified by many Members of the United Nations. His delegation believed that it would be unfair to discontinue payment of the honoraria, especially in the case of members currently serving on United Nations bodies and that, if those persons continued to receive honoraria, equity demanded that the practice should be extended to all the other bodies referred to in document A/C.5/33/54. To give meaning to such payments, his delegation believed that the Secretary-General's recommendation to increase the rates should be accepted.

8. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that nothing had occurred that warranted a change in the principle referred to in the preamble to General Assembly resolution 3536 (XXX), namely, that neither a fee nor any other remuneration should normally be paid to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations. His delegation, therefore, agreed with the representative of Pakistan that appointment to serve on a United Nations body represented a great honour and that there was, therefore, no need to introduce any material incentives for such service. His delegation believed that ACABQ had been correct in recommending that the Secretary-General's proposal in that respect should not be approved and that existing honoraria should gradually be eliminated. His delegation was opposed in principle to the payment of honoraria and was prepared to accept ACABQ's recommendations; it would, therefore, be obliged to vote against the United Kingdom proposal.

/...

9. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) read out amendments to the note by the Secretariat in document A/C.5/33/CRP.12. In the fourth line of paragraph 1, the words "as follows" should be replaced by "as proposed by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/1677, namely:". The following foot-note to the seventh line of paragraph 1 should be added: "In the case of the International Law Commission, payment above the level indicated for other members to be conditional on the preparation of specific reports or studies between sessions of the Commission". In the eighth line of paragraph 1, the word "Vice-presidents," should be deleted and the words "of the International Narcotics Control Board" should be inserted after the word "Vice-chairmen". The figures in paragraph 2 should also be amended: the amount of \$38,500 in the second line and in the total in the final line should read \$35,000, \$11,500 in the fifth line should read \$10,000, and \$14,500 in the seventh line should read \$12,500. In paragraph 4 \$38,500 should be changed to \$35,000, \$11,500 to \$10,000 and \$19,000 to \$17,000.

10. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) stressed that his delegation's proposal as described in document A/C.5/33/CRP.12 was essentially based on the report of the Secretary-General of 20 August 1975 in document A/C.5/1677, which had still not been acted upon by the Committee or the General Assembly. He recommended that the proposal endorsing four exceptions to the basic principle adopted by the General Assembly with regard to fees and other remuneration should be adopted, so that a long period of uncertainty could be ended. The proposal had been a moderate one in 1975, given the fact that it represented the first increase in such honoraria in 18 years, and was even more moderate today in view of the high rate of inflation in recent years. His delegation welcomed the United States proposal for further study of the matter and believed that that proposal was not incompatible with his delegation's proposal to increase the existing rates of honoraria, on which a decision should be taken at the current session.

11. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that the question of honoraria was complex and needed further study. He proposed under rule 99 of the rules of procedure that the Committee should defer consideration of the subitem to the thirty-fourth session.

12. The CHAIRMAN asked if the United States representative could clarify how rule 99 applied, in his view, to deferment of the item.

13. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that under rule 99 each Main Committee was free to adopt its own priorities and set its own schedule, which, in his view, implied that it could also defer items to subsequent sessions.

14. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that the United States procedural proposal was inappropriate and sought only to avoid the issue. There had been much discussion of the item and it was now time to vote on it. He proposed closure of the debate under rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that under the rules of procedure the United States motion to adjourn the debate on the subitem under discussion took precedence over the United Kingdom motion to close the debate. He invited two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the United States motion.

16. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), speaking in favour of adjournment of debate on the subitem, said that more time was required in order to do justice to the question. The nationals serving in the organs in question gained international prestige and respect for themselves and their countries and such service could not be treated on the same level as employment. Furthermore, the term "honoraria" was perhaps not the most appropriate one and the Secretariat might find a more suitable term.
17. Mr. LANDAU (Austria) said that the United Kingdom proposal had much merit but it was much too late in the session to expect to find a rational and balanced solution to the problem which was acceptable to all. Furthermore, the General Assembly might wish to eliminate honoraria and the entire matter required careful consideration.
18. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), opposing the motion on adjournment of the subitem, observed that the question under discussion had been postponed from one session to the next since 1975 and that it was now time to take a decision, by a vote if necessary.
19. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that at the current late stage of the thirty-third session it was most unlikely that the Committee could formulate a recommendation to settle the issues of broad principle once and for all. However, that was not sufficient reason to defer yet again a decision with regard to the question of increasing the honoraria that were currently payable. His delegation favoured an increase in the rates of honoraria and hoped that the Committee would proceed to a vote on the proposal put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom. The draft decision proposed by the representative of the United States would have been acceptable to his delegation to the extent that it would have facilitated a definitive decision on the broader questions. However, his delegation had serious doubts as to whether the fees for services approach proposed in paragraph 1 (b) of document A/C.5/33/L.47 would result in economies.
20. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the United States motion to adjourn debate on the subitem until the thirty-fourth session.
21. The United States motion was adopted by 45 votes to 9, with 20 abstentions.

Revised estimates under section 5D, Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, section 5E, Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters, and section 22D, Office of General Services (continued) (A/33/7/Add.35; A/C.5/33/98)

22. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) said that the question had been raised as to whether the redeployment of posts in the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters (OSSECS) had been justified to any legislative body. That question could not be dissociated from the demand that the Secretary-General should firmly exert his authority as chief administrative officer by ensuring, through the redeployment of resources, the most economical use of personnel. The Secretary-General's decisions on

(Mr. Debatin)

redeployment in OSSECS had been taken in accordance with that mandate and had been explained to the intergovernmental body authorized to act on behalf of the General Assembly, namely ACABQ. The latter had concurred with the Secretary-General's proposal, as explained in document A/33/7, paragraph 21, and a detailed justification in that respect was given in document A/C.5/33/98, paragraphs 7 to 20.

23. In reply to the second question, why the Secretary-General, when referring to two major bodies in the economic and social field, had not mentioned the Third Committee, he explained that the latter had traditionally been served by the Division of Human Rights and that at the present stage of restructuring, that arrangement was still being maintained.

24. With regard to the possibility of providing through redeployment a G-5 post to accommodate a personal assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General, he said that he personally had examined the submissions for the G-5 posts in question. There was no doubt that the Assistant Secretary-General was entitled to an assistant at the G-5 level and, that, since the existing G-5 posts were properly graded in relation to the functions, there was no possibility of redeployment. In the field of conference servicing, many functions required G-5 posts, which accounted for the apparently disproportionate number of posts at that level, to which members of the Fifth Committee had drawn attention.

25. On the question of reclassification during the biennium, he confirmed that the classification of the posts under discussion had been examined by the Classification Section (OPS).

26. He fully shared the view that, under a constrained budgetary policy, recommendations for the reclassification of posts should be submitted as far as possible in the context of the initial budget proposals. However, that course could not be followed without exception. Functions, and not people, were under scrutiny and, once it was established that a certain function should be graded at a certain level, it was only logical and consequent to provide for that level. He was not opposed to a policy whereby functions would not be reassessed at all during the biennium. What concerned him was the approach whereby it was agreed in the middle of the biennium that a post deserved a higher grade but the decision on reclassification was shifted to the next budget submission. The Controller was then obliged to honour the reclassifications indirectly endorsed by the Fifth Committee and was unable to produce a zero base assessment for all requested reclassifications. Truthful budgeting required that, once it was recognized that a function deserved a higher ranking, the corresponding budgetary decision should be taken immediately.

27. With regard to the D-1 post for servicing CPC, he pointed out that approval of that post had been granted before the General Assembly had adopted resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system. In that resolution the General Assembly had instructed the Secretary-General to reassess all relevant functions ab initio and to redeploy available staff to the best advantage. That directive had been complied with.

Although it was true that the Secretary-General could have surrendered the D-1 post in question and requested another post to reflect the new functions as they emerged from the restructuring, the traditional practice was to reassess staff requirements in the framework of redeployment of existing staff resources, as, indeed, the Secretary-General had been asked to do in resolution 32/197.

28. The new structure approved in resolution 32/197 had brought changes in two directions in respect of the post under consideration. Firstly, the function attached to the D-1 post of assistance in the supervision of the work of the Office as a whole had now been assigned to the D-2 post of the Director and Deputy to the Assistant Secretary-General for Secretariat Services. Secondly, the year-round tasks that went beyond the immediate responsibilities entrusted to the D-1 post as Secretary of CPC had been transferred, in accordance with the resolution in question, to the Programme Planning and Co-ordination unit of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. It was not true that the Secretary-General's proposal to discontinue the D-1 post allocated to CPC would violate or negate any decision of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General had taken scrupulous care to respect the letter and the spirit of all decisions of legislative organs. Thus, he had responded to resolution 32/197 by undertaking a full reassessment of all functions now combined in the new Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters and by ensuring through redeployment, maximum rationalization and streamlining of operations.

29. It would not seem to be feasible to combine the post for servicing CPC with that of the Assistant Director who would supervise the Programme, Calendar and Documents Planning Unit and the Editorial Control Section although both were D-1 posts, since, firstly, the work assigned to the latter post was quite distinct from the technical servicing of an intergovernmental body and, secondly, the Secretary of CPC was also expected to service other bodies.

30. While the Secretary-General was anxious to respect the wishes of every intergovernmental body within the Organization, and particularly those of CPC, which had only recently been reorganized and entrusted with very important functions, he would reject the idea that CPC or any other governing body could impose upon him a decision as to the level he should propose for a post to be discussed in the Fifth Committee. Subject to those observations, the Secretary-General would certainly wish to take into account any observation or opinion emanating from the Fifth Committee so as to ensure that a solution could be reached which would show that the utmost had been done to provide CPC with proper services.

31. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that the Controller's statement was not at all satisfactory. He had not expected that an attempt would be made to justify the unjustifiable; it was therefore necessary to refer back to the decisions taken by the General Assembly in 1977.

32. His delegation had studied the reports of the Secretary-General (A/33/410/Rev.1 and A/C.5/33/98) and the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.35) in the light of General Assembly resolution 32/197, which could be regarded as the blueprint for the restructuring process. He noted that paragraph 7 of document A/33/410/Rev.1

(Mr. Pirson, Belgium)

referred to the internal organizational structures envisaged for the new units established within the Secretariat, even though the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197, in paragraphs 37 to 49, expressly provided for a considerable strengthening of the planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation activities within the Organization. Paragraph 61 (e) of that annex indicated that the United Nations Secretariat should provide technical secretariat services for CPC, the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly, ad hoc conferences and intersecretariat co-ordination machinery. It was no accident that CPC was mentioned first, for it had been felt that, if the new Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation was to be able to meet his responsibilities successfully, better co-ordination of programmes, both within the United Nations and at the system-wide level, and also a much greater degree of concerned planning between elements of the system would be required. In the United Nations itself, the functions of programming and evaluation, which were the special responsibility of the CPC, had to be improved so that the Director-General would be able to ensure coherence, co-ordination and effective management of activities in the economic and social fields. Paragraph 61 (e) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 provided that full technical secretariat services must be provided in the first place in support of the relevant intergovernmental bodies to enable them to exercise their functions, and in addition must be provided to intersecretariat co-ordination machinery. It appeared from the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/98), however, that those priorities were not being respected. The new Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters must carry out the functions set forth in paragraph 60 (e) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197, so that the best possible technical Secretariat services would be provided.

33. The Advisory Committee had opportunely reminded the Committee that at the end of 1977 the General Assembly, aware of the new responsibilities entrusted to the CPC, had decided to create a D-1 post for a Deputy to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council who would, inter alia, act as the Secretary of CPC; yet that post had not yet been provided for and his delegation understood from the Secretary-General's reports and from the statement made by the Controller, as well as from the current vacancy notices, that the Secretariat was not planning to implement that decision of the General Assembly, as it considered that the situation had changed as a result of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 32/197. All those involved with CPC were aware that, if the situation had changed, it was not that there had been any decline in the need for technical services and funds, but rather the opposite. It would have been very easy for the Secretariat to consult the Chairman and members of CPC, who had not even been informed of what was being planned. The new Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters had been set up to support relevant intergovernmental bodies and that was the reason for its existence.

34. There was nothing in General Assembly resolution 32/197 to suggest that the technical functions to be performed by the Secretariat should be less extensive than a year previously, and it was intolerable that, surreptitiously, without consultations, and for reasons which it was most charitable not to explain, certain members of the Secretariat were ignoring clear-cut decisions by the General

Assembly. That high-handed attitude was quite unacceptable, and could only increase the reluctance of States to respond to requests from the Secretariat for additional appropriations and increased contributions to the regular budget. Paragraph 61 (e) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 did not call for the establishment of high-level posts or of a new administration which might overlap with the functions of the substantive services and of the Department of Conference Services. His delegation agreed with the views of the Advisory Committee in that respect, and believed that the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters must be organized on the basis of the prescriptions of the General Assembly. Its function was to provide technical services to various bodies and it must do so scrupulously and conscientiously; if it failed to perform that function, it would be necessary, after a careful evaluation by the competent committee, to consider whether the Office should be retained.

35. He shared the views expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 12 of its report (A/33/7/Add.35) and believed that the Secretariat should reflect carefully before modifying any of the decisions taken by the General Assembly in December 1977. There was nothing in General Assembly resolution 32/197 to justify any reduction in the technical services to be provided to CPC and his delegation hoped that the Secretariat would decide to inform the Committee at the end of the discussion that the D-1 post included in the manning table for the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters would be used, inter alia, to provide services to CPC.

36. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation agreed entirely with the observations made by the representative of Belgium, and with the latter's description of the sequence of events. He asked the Controller whether it was to be understood that the General Assembly's decision on the post in question would stand, and whether the instructions of the General Assembly would be carried out in spite of the Secretariat's reservations on the matter.

37. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) said that the Secretariat was duty-bound to offer full explanations of its thinking, particularly when accusations of disregard for General Assembly decisions were made. He personally had not been involved in the deliberations on restructuring, but those who had been involved in those deliberations on the Secretariat side held very firm views, which had been the basis for the proposal put forward. He could not accept the allegation that there had been an attempt to justify the unjustifiable, as the Secretariat certainly knew what its obligations were. His own conclusion from the discussions in the Committee was that the CPC should be served at the D-1 level as had been previously agreed. He had explained the Secretary-General's proposals in order to assist the discussions in the Committee.

38. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that the Controller had done an excellent job of defending the Secretariat's views on the question under discussion; however, there was a wider principle involved, which was that an intergovernmental body had taken a position on the level of services which it wished the Secretariat to provide, and that decision had been approved by the Advisory Committee and subsequently by the Fifth Committee itself. That decision must be respected, and the D-1 post in

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

question must be made available to provide services to CPC. He hoped that the Committee would be able to conclude its discussion with the assurance that the decision in question would be implemented.

39. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that a good case had been made for the reclassifications which the Secretary-General had requested. Nevertheless, his delegation would be prepared to go along with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which impugned not the intrinsic merit of the request but only its timing. It supported the establishment of a G-5 post in OSSECS for the personal assistant to the Assistant-Secretary-General, in keeping with standard United Nations practice, since the job descriptions for the other G-5 posts in the Office clearly showed that none of those posts could be redeployed for the purpose.

40. The decision to establish a D-1 post to accommodate the Secretary of CPC had been taken prior to the adoption of the resolution on restructuring (resolution 32/197), when it had been envisaged that the Secretary of CPC would have substantive responsibilities. However, as a result of the debate on restructuring at the thirty-second session, the situation had changed and it had now been decided that those responsibilities would devolve on the Office of the Assistant-Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination and that the Secretary of CPC would perform purely technical functions. His delegation believed that a D-1 post could not justifiably be allocated where no substantive functions had to be carried out. Retaining the D-1 post for the secretary of CPC would create a further anomaly: the medium-term plan, for which CPC was responsible, was only one item among many on the agenda of the Fifth Committee, whose Secretary occupied a P-5 post.

41. In his delegation's view, the redeployment of the D-1 post in question was quite acceptable. Members of the Main Committees should not interfere unduly in the internal workings of the Secretariat. He therefore hoped that the Committee could accept the recommendation appearing in paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report.

42. Mr. KOTHARI (India) observed that most delegations, like that of Pakistan, had emphasized the need not to impose undue restrictions on the action of the Secretary-General. But, as the Belgian representative had pointed out, the issue had arisen because the Secretariat had not originally studied its requirements in detail and presented the facts to the Fifth Committee. The Committee must be assured that any posts requested of it in the future would not be subjected to the same process as that currently under discussion, and that programmes would not be "tailored" to the wishes of individuals within the Secretariat.

43. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that it was not up to persons who had no part in the work of CPC to decide whether the nature and standards of the technical servicing provided to that Committee had altered over the past year. The members of CPC knew the answer to that question.

44. He would not wish to claim that the Secretariat generally did not obey instructions given to it by the General Assembly, but in the present instance that

/...

(Mr. Pirson, Belgium)

had certainly been the case. Staff members had been assigned to new units before the Assembly had had an opportunity to consider the new arrangements. In order to avoid further debate on the subject, however, he would be prepared to accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations, provided that he received an assurance from the Controller that the D-1 post in OSSECS would be used, inter alia, for the servicing of CPC.

45. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) asked whether that post had, in fact, been occupied for the past year.

46. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Assistant Secretary-General for Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters) said he wished to dispel the notion that the Secretariat, in not using the D-1 post previously approved by the Fifth Committee for the Secretary of CPC, had failed to give the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination the necessary technical support. In justification of his view, he outlined the history of the request for the new post against the background of the restructuring exercise. He emphasized that there had been no intention of bypassing or ignoring the resolution on restructuring, although there had been difficulties in interpreting that resolution, which in some of its provisions conflicted with other decisions taken at the thirty-second session.

47. The D-1 post had been requested because the secretariat of the Economic and Social Council had been doing substantive work for CPC in the absence of a unit to service CPC directly. It had later been felt advisable to transfer the post to the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters because, as a result of restructuring, a new unit had been created that was able to take on many of the responsibilities which earlier would have devolved on the D-1 post. The Fifth Committee appeared to disapprove of that arrangement; but he believed that any other course the Secretary-General might have suggested would have been equally open to criticism.

48. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) repeated that, provided it was understood that the holder of the D-1 post would be engaged, inter alia, in servicing CPC, his delegation would be prepared to accept the recommendation of ACABQ.

49. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) pointed out that he had not yet received any answer to the question he had posed earlier in the meeting. His delegation shared the concern voiced by the Belgian and Kenyan representatives: a post approved in order to give assistance to CPC should be used for that specific purpose.

50. Mr. CORDOVA (Ecuador) said he agreed with the representative of Pakistan regarding the substance of the matter and the procedure for the reclassification of posts. His delegation believed there was ample justification for the reclassifications referred to in paragraphs 13, 14 and 17 of the Secretary-General's report, and for the creation of an additional G-5 post to accommodate a personal assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General.

51. Mr. FALCONI (Peru) and Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that they, too, agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Pakistan.

/...

52. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) informed the Algerian representative that the vacancy at the D-1 level had been announced, and the job description had been issued; but the position had yet to be filled.

53. He asked whether the statement by the representative of Pakistan implied that the Secretariat should be free to rearrange posts internally, as it proposed, or whether the intention was still that CPC must be serviced at the D-1 level.

54. Mr. AYENI (Nigeria) said that his delegation favoured the establishment of a G-5 post for a personal assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General.

55. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) suggested that in approving the recommendation in paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Committee should make it clear that it understood that the D-1 post was to be used, in particular, for the technical servicing of CPC. Since the General Assembly had authorized a D-1 post in 1977 for CPC and in view of the increased workload of that body there was no justification for withdrawing the post. If the Secretariat had had doubts regarding the wishes of the Assembly it should have sought guidance from the Assembly.

56. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) urged that both the proposal made by the representative of Argentina at an earlier meeting for the establishment of a new post of personal assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General at the G-5 level and the Belgian suggestion should be put to the vote.

57. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that the Committee had two alternatives: either it could approve paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report as it stood and leave it to the Secretariat to give an undertaking that the D-1 post would also be used for the technical servicing of CPC; or it could decide to amend the recommendation in paragraph 12. His delegation preferred the first alternative as it did not believe that the Committee should go so far as to stipulate that the D-1 post had to be used to service CPC.

58. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that if the Secretariat would provide firm assurances, to be reflected in the summary record, that the D-1 post would be used primarily to service CPC, his delegation would not press its suggestion.

59. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that if the Fifth Committee concurred with the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 12 as it stood, from a technical point of view the post in question could not be used exclusively to service CPC. It was essential for the Committee to state clearly what decision it wished to take.

60. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that he shared the view of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee; the representative of Belgium should make a formal proposal regarding a D-1 post to service CPC and should not seek to amend paragraph 12, which had been drafted with a different situation in mind.

61. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation would prefer to have paragraph 12 amended.

62. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) suggested that paragraph 12 might be amended to indicate that the functions of the D-1 post should be redefined in such a way as to include the technical servicing of CPC.
63. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) said that, as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had observed, paragraph 12, as it stood, left no room for the D-1 post to be used for the servicing of CPC. If the Committee amended that paragraph, it should be aware that it was reversing the priorities of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.
64. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Controller had clearly indicated the problems which would arise if the Belgian suggestion was adopted. He therefore urged the representative of Belgium to make a separate proposal regarding the servicing of CPC.
65. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation was prepared to agree to the suggestion made by the representative of Algeria. His delegation's aim was to ensure that CPC would receive adequate servicing. Accordingly, the Fifth Committee should state clearly that the redefined functions of the D-1 post must include the servicing of CPC. He urged that the Committee should take a decision on the matter without delay.
66. Miss COURSON (France) endorsed the views of the representative of Belgium.
67. Mr. MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the proposed amendment to paragraph 12 was acceptable to his delegation.
68. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee first to take a decision on the Argentine proposal to establish a G-5 post for a personal assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General. Approval of the proposal would entail additional expenditure of \$14,400 under section 5E of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, and an additional amount of \$4,000 under section 25 for staff assessment, offset by a corresponding amount under income section 1.
69. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the proposal be put to a vote.
70. The proposal was adopted by 61 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.
71. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the proposal because it saw no justification for revising the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.
72. The CHAIRMAN observed that there were observations and recommendations in the report of the Advisory Committee which the Committee might wish to concur with. He therefore suggested the adoption of the following draft decision.

"The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it:

- (1) take note of the report of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/33/98 with regard to revised estimates under sections 5D, 5E and 22D of the

/...

(The Chairman)

programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979 and the related report of the Advisory Committee in document A/33/7/Add.35; (2) concur with the observations and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 12 of its report, on the understanding that the redefinition of the functions of the D-1 post will, in particular, include technical servicing of CPC."

73. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by consensus.

United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy: administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/33/L.84/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12 (continued) (A/33/7/Add.31; A/C.5/33/109 and Corr.1)

74. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had estimated that a total of 60 work-months of consultant time at a cost of \$210,000 would be required for 1979, or roughly \$3,500 per work-month. The Advisory Committee recommended that, should the General Assembly decide to make an exception to resolution 32/209, it should approve only 50 work-months for 1979. Those 50 work-months would, at a rate of \$3,500 per work-month, entail expenditure of \$175,000. The figure of \$105,000 given in paragraph 28 of the Advisory Committee's report was a typographical error and should be corrected to \$175,000.

75. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation was concerned to avoid a situation in which the Conference would not have any technical papers on which discussion could be based. He had therefore proposed that the General Assembly should make an exception to the terms of General Assembly resolution 32/209 and approve the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 28 of its report. The panels of experts described in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/109) should be convened during the preparatory period and draw on the technical support services of the specialized agencies.

76. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the representative of Kenya, explained that the eight technical officers to service the technical panels had been costed separately in the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/33/109). The Advisory Committee had recommended that, instead of eight technical officers, there should be only four, and that any additional expertise that might be required be provided by the Secretariat. He also drew attention to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.31), concerning the Secretary-General's request for consultant services at a cost of \$210,000, in respect of which the Advisory Committee had recommended that 50 work-months of consultancy services should be provided, at a cost of \$175,000.

77. Mr. IYER (India) said that the current situation was ironic. In General Assembly resolution 32/209, the Secretary-General was requested to ensure that no supplementary estimates were presented for expenditure on experts and consultants during the biennium 1978-1979. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General had made a number of requests for consultant services. The Advisory Committee had

(Mr. Iyer, India)

been precluded under that resolution from scrutinizing each of the requests with the necessary thoroughness, leaving the Fifth Committee no option but to make an exception to the resolution. As a result the resolution, instead of restricting the use of funds for consultants, was having precisely the opposite effect. In view of the importance of the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, his delegation would vote in favour of the Secretary-General's request, but the Committee should ponder very carefully the effectiveness of the machinery which it set up, so as to avoid such situations.

78. Mr. BEGIN (Director of the Budget Division), replying to a question raised earlier by the representative of the United States, said that the following additional amounts for consultant services had been approved by the Fifth Committee during the thirty-third session: \$50,000 for the Office of Financial Services (A/C.5/32/66 and A/33/7/Add.1); \$75,000 in connexion with draft resolutions A/33/L.13, L.14 and L.15 (A/C.5/33/104 and Corr.1 and A/33/7/Add.32 and Corr.1); \$120,000 for the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation (A/C.5/33/110 and A/33/7/Add.34); \$151,600 for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (A/C.5/33/108 and Corr.1 and A/33/7/Add.29); and \$19,200 in respect of draft resolution A/33/L.31 (A/C.5/33/103 and A/33/7/Add.37). Those sums totalled \$415,800. The addition of the amount currently requested for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy (\$287,200) would bring the total to \$703,000.

79. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) recalled that the Controller had indicated that no amount had been expended from the 10 per cent which the General Assembly had set aside for consultants. The Fifth Committee, by its selective actions in granting exceptions to General Assembly resolution 32/209, had added more than \$400,000 to the sums available for consultants, with the possibility of a further approval of almost \$300,000.

80. His delegation was concerned that supplementary requests for consultant services had not received as thorough a scrutiny by the Advisory Committee as was required. In the light of the funds already available for consultant services, there was no need for the current request. His delegation, considerably alarmed at the consequences of such additional requests, would vote against the Kenyan proposal.

81. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said he would support the Kenyan proposal, believing that the Secretary-General's requests represented what was required to carry out scientific and technological tasks in the area of natural resources. He regretted, however, that the Fifth Committee did not have the benefit of the Advisory Committee's analysis.

82. His delegation was concerned about the farcical implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/209. It noted that the bureaucratic will of the Secretariat was more effective and perhaps more powerful ultimately than the political will of the General Assembly.

/...

83. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that he was prepared to support the Kenyan proposal for three reasons. First, although the Fifth Committee had applied rule 123 of the rules of procedure to reconsider the proposal, it had not acted on the proposal, and thus its action constituted not a reconsideration of the proposal but a reopening of the question under the same subitem. Secondly, the Committee would be acting in keeping with the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/33/7/Add.31, para. 21). Thirdly, although his delegation shared the concern about maintaining the intention behind General Assembly resolution 32/209, in areas such as new and renewable sources of energy, there was a clear lack of expertise available within the Secretariat, and additional consultancy services were needed.

84. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), referring to the statement just made by the Director of the Budget Division, pointed out that the additional sum recommended for approval for 1979 in respect of consultants for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, was \$175,000, which, if approved, would bring the total amount approved by way of exception to General Assembly resolution 32/209 to \$590,800.

85. The CHAIRMAN replied that the Kenyan proposal related to the whole of paragraph 28 of document A/33/7/Add.31, for which the corresponding appropriation would be \$287,200, the figure quoted by the Director of the Budget Division. That was therefore the amount on which the Committee would be asked to vote.

86. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) explained that both sums referred to in paragraph 28 of document A/33/7/Add.31 would be covered by General Assembly resolution 32/209. In paragraph 24 of that document it was indicated that the Secretary-General drew attention to the fact that the experts attending the technical panels would be government experts, and estimated the cost of their travel and per diem at \$112,200 for 1979. Since General Assembly resolution 32/209 also dealt with expert groups, it was the view of the Advisory Committee that the General Assembly might also wish to make an exception to its resolution 32/209 in respect of the amounts requested.

87. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) requested that the Committee should first vote on the question of an exception to Assembly resolution 32/209 and take a separate vote on the appropriations for consultant services, since, in his delegation's view, they could be absorbed within the considerable funds already available.

88. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it make an exception to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 32/209.

89. The proposal was adopted by 67 votes to 8.

90. The CHAIRMAN further proposed that the Committee should report to the General Assembly that such an exception would result in additional appropriations of \$287,200 under section 4 of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979.

91. The proposal was adopted by 63 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.