

68. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) commended the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management on the clarity of his statement, which nevertheless had left him somewhat perplexed. It would appear that the Under-Secretary-General was much more involved with personnel matters than was the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services. It would undoubtedly be desirable in the future to improve co-ordination with respect to personnel policies between the Under-Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General.

69. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that he greatly valued the

role played by Mr. Gherab as head of Personnel Services and emphasized that he himself, in his capacity as Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, co-operated as much with the Administrative Management Service and the Office of Financial Services as he did with the Office of Personnel Services.

70. Mr. GHERAB (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) emphasized that in discharging his tasks in the Department of Administration and Management, he enjoyed the fullest co-operation of Mr. Davidson.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

## 1672nd meeting

Monday, 25 November 1974, at 8.05 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1672

### AGENDA ITEM 84

**Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General (continued)\* (A/9822, A/9870)**

1. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that a number of decisions would have to be taken on the matters covered by the Secretary-General's report (A/9822).

2. The first was whether the costs, other than payments to troop contributing countries, were acceptable; if they were, funds must be provided to meet those costs, which for the first year of operation of UNEF and UNDOF exceeded the estimate by about \$20.3 million, giving a total for the year, excluding payments to troop contributing countries, of \$43.3 million. The reasons for the excess were summarized in paragraphs 7 to 16 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/9870). The estimated expenditure for UNEF, and for UNDOF assuming its mandate was renewed, from 25 October 1974 to 24 April 1975 amounted to \$22.1 million, not counting payments for troop costs.

3. The second question before the Committee was the rate of payment to troop contributing countries. The Secretary-General had described in section IV of his report the various developments which had led to a proposal by the troop contributing countries, that the rate should be \$500 per man per month, plus a supplementary amount of \$150 per man per month for specialists. The previous practice had been to reimburse troop contributing countries only for extra and extraordinary expenses incurred.

4. As the Advisory Committee had pointed out in paragraph 6 of its report, it could not, on the facts available to it, advise whether the rates proposed by the troop

contributing countries were, on average, appropriate. The matter was therefore one on which a political decision would be needed. The term "specialists" would have to be defined and some means devised of certifying their presence.

5. The third question was how to treat the sum of \$3.8 million representing that part of the original estimate which must be deemed uncollectable. The Secretary-General, as indicated in paragraph 12 of his report, could not meet all his obligations unless a way were found to cover the deficiency. A political decision was therefore needed.

6. The Advisory Committee had referred in paragraph 25 of its report to a number of potential items of expenditure which might substantially increase the estimates.

7. It had not prepared any recommendations, pending decisions on the various matters he had indicated.

8. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) recalled that the initial estimates for UNEF had been prepared in the context of an emergency meeting of the Security Council at which the decision to establish the Emergency Force had been taken and that the Secretary-General had been asked to prepare the estimates almost overnight without knowing where the contingents would be drawn from and without knowing the Security Council's decisions on several questions. The estimates had therefore had to be based on several assumptions.

9. The assumption that the forces would be transported to the site of the operations without cost to the Organization had been substantially fulfilled, and about \$15 million in transport had been provided by several donor countries. The assumption that the troops would be fully equipped when they arrived at the site had in most instances proved false. The assumption had also been that the countries which

\* Resumed from the 1654th meeting.

were not supplying troops or transport would make substantial voluntary contributions in cash or in equipment and supplies; aside from Japan, no Member States had made any such contribution so far. Another assumption, which had soon proved false, was that there would be no need to pay a daily allowance to field troops. That assumption had been based on the experience of the Cyprus operation. However, unlike the troops in Cyprus, UNEF included contingents from the developed countries and it was therefore more critical to provide some personal allowance. Moreover, as many troop contributing countries were experiencing exchange difficulties, in some instances the troops in the Middle East had no financial resources to draw upon other than the daily allowance. The Secretary-General had also assumed that the troops would be accommodated free of charge by the countries in which they were based. That had proved impossible and it had been necessary to renovate buildings and provide shelter for the forces in the Golan heights. The assumption that costs of troop rations could be extrapolated from other operations had proved inapplicable and there had been over-expenditure in that field as well. In previous peace-keeping operations, only extraordinary costs had been financed by the United Nations. However, in the current case, that had been unacceptable to the troop contributing countries, which had indicated what they all considered was a fair rate of reimbursement for troops.

10. Turning to two issues raised in the Advisory Committee's report, he recalled that the Fifth Committee had asked the Secretary-General to present at the twenty-ninth session a possible standard costing formula for troop reimbursements.<sup>1</sup> The Secretary-General, having been unable to obtain the necessary statistical information from all the troop contributing countries, had found it impossible to do so and instead was reporting on the negotiations that had been held with the troop contributors, as a result of which those countries had agreed on a formula of \$500 per man per month, plus \$150 per specialist per month. As the Advisory Committee had pointed out, that meant that the Fifth Committee would have to take a decision without the benefit of the detailed information concerning the cost to the troop contributors which it had expected. Secondly, there was the question of the short-fall of \$3.8 million in the first year, due to the fact that several Member States had indicated that, as a matter of principle, they did not intend to pay their share. The Secretary-General took no position on the matter but had included a provision in terms of an addition to the supplementary appropriations he would need, merely to indicate that the \$3.8 million would have to be provided somehow. The decision would have to be taken by the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly.

11. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) pointed out that the Committee was discussing a question of far-reaching political implications, directly related to Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter. In deciding to establish a United Nations Emergency Force bearing in mind the principle of equitable geographical representation, the Security Council had ensured that an international peace-keeping operation had for the first time come close to fulfilling the ideals enshrined in

the Charter. Poland had contributed a unit to the Force in the belief that the pre-eminent objective of the United Nations was to ensure world peace. The fact that troops from different regions with different socio-political systems and representing opposed military groupings had joined together in a peace-keeping effort which really worked was another important aspect of the undertaking. The Secretary-General and the Commander-in-Chief of the Emergency Force had also fostered the spirit of co-operation and dedication and their visits to the troops had convinced the latter that they were essential to the Organization. Every soldier who had ever served on the Force would most likely remain an ardent supporter of the United Nations.

12. It had been pointed out in the Security Council that UNEF's contribution to peace should outweigh any difficulties caused by differences of opinion concerning financing. Yet on 25 September 1974 the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs had drawn attention in the General Assembly (2242nd plenary meeting) to the fact that Canadians were now less inclined to accept unquestioningly the burdens of participation. He recalled that the Polish contingent had been selected as one of the two contributors to the logistic support for UNEF. Highly experienced Polish specialists, mostly engineers and doctors, had been dispatched to the Middle East and engaged in mine-clearing, water purification, road construction, medical and other activities. That had presented Poland with a shortage of such personnel at home. Accordingly, his Government had been faced with the alternative of recalling specialists employed on various projects in the developing countries or starting a training programme to train more personnel. Realizing the difficulties that would arise if it recalled its personnel from developing areas, it had opted for the latter, more expensive, solution. At the same time, it had started intensive training courses for the successive contingents bound for the Middle East. All the equipment—and the Polish unit had been fully equipped—had had to be adapted to the new conditions. His Government had also undertaken to ensure that normal pay, allowances and overseas service allowances were sent to the families of soldiers dispatched to the Middle East. Every new Polish contingent arriving in the Middle East underwent special on-site training and individual soldiers were not permitted to perform complicated and technical duties unless supervised by experts. Although that was an expensive utilization of manpower, it was the best way of avoiding accidents. Consequently, the Polish contingent was in a more difficult situation than the others, with the possible exception of the Canadian contingent. Moreover, logistic services called for greater combat readiness; whereas UNEF troops in the buffer zone could afford a rotation system, the Polish logistic contingent had to be in a permanent state of readiness. The provision of logistic functions therefore imposed a financial and organizational strain upon Poland; however, there were clear advantages for the Force itself. Indeed, in the view of his delegation, the fact that it had been possible to reduce UNEF from the originally estimated 7,000 to the current figure of 5,700 was due, to some extent, to the fact that UNEF had such a strong logistic task force.

13. General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII) exemplified the practical implementation of the principle of collective responsibility for peace-keeping. Any attempt at

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 109, document A/9428, para. 42.

changing that principle would complicate the task of UNEF, and he accordingly expressed concern over the information provided by the Secretary-General that \$3.8 million of the total \$60 million should be considered "uncollectable". While the few Member States which had chosen not to support UNEF had their own reasons for so doing, he drew attention to the admirable attitude of the Government of Iraq which, while dissociating itself from the pertinent Security Council resolution, had recognized its responsibility as a Member of the United Nations and had fulfilled its financial obligation towards the financing of UNEF.

14. Turning to the question of the real costs of the entire UNEF/UNDOF operation, he noted that revised estimates for the first year of operation, excluding payments to troop contributing countries, were almost double the original estimates. It was true that the expected voluntary contributions had not been forthcoming. However, troop contributing countries such as Poland incurred substantial material and invisible costs which would never be repaid and which should be considered as an important form of voluntary contribution. Clearly, the only way to reduce the over-all cost of the UNEF/UNDOF operation was through economy, based on the provision of Security Council resolution 362 (1974) that the Force would be maintained with maximum efficiency and economy. In that context, he welcomed the assurance given by the Secretary-General at the 1799th meeting of the Security Council, on 23 October 1974, that he would do his utmost to exercise strict economy wherever possible and introduce new measures to increase efficiency, including the visit of internal auditors to the area to check on equipment received and the rate of losses and spoilage of equipment and supplies, and the auditing of accounts of UNEF and UNDOF by the United Nations Board of Auditors. He requested more details on the results of those control measures. He also suggested a further reduction, to an indispensable minimum of United Nations civilian personnel in the area, which seemed at times to duplicate or overlap the functions of the military establishment.

15. Another element in the cost of the UNEF/UNDOF operation was the restrictions imposed by the Government of Israel on the freedom of movement of the contingents from Indonesia, Ghana, Senegal and Poland. Such action was a flagrant violation of Article 43 of the Charter, all the Security Council resolutions on UNEF and UNDOF and a number of other agreements. The Force had been established in consultation with the Security Council and the parties concerned and the Council had recommended that it was to proceed on the assumption that the parties to the conflict would take all necessary steps for compliance with the decisions of the Security Council. Moreover, the Security Council in resolution 362 (1974) had reaffirmed that the Force must be able to function as an integral and efficient military unit in the whole Egypt-Israel sector of operations without differentiation regarding the United Nations status of the various contingents. However, the Israeli authorities were not respecting those decisions, in open defiance of the provisions of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which the Government of Israel had earlier agreed to respect in connexion with the United Nations operations. Troop discrimination in the case of the UNDOF operation was

also a violation of the bilateral agreement on disengagement between Israeli and Syrian forces of 31 May 1974, which stated that UNDOF should enjoy freedom of movement and communication and other facilities necessary for its mission.<sup>2</sup> He had evidence of high and unnecessary operational expenses incurred by the United Nations because of lack of access by certain contingents to certain parts of the UNEF/UNDOF mission area. Such discrimination was not only a political challenge to the consensus decision of the international community but substantially increased the operational costs of UNEF and UNDOF.

16. The UNEF/UNDOF budgetary short-fall was not the result of the proposed man-month reimbursement rates, but was caused by unexpected operational increases, as was correctly pointed out in paragraphs 7, 10, 19 and 20 of the report of the Advisory Committee. The Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee had given a fair presentation of the situation regarding pending reimbursement payments to troop contributing countries, and he welcomed the unanimity regarding the need to treat all contingents on an equal footing. He pointed out, however, that the reimbursement rate quoted in the reports under consideration was much lower than the expenditure claims regularly presented by Poland to the Secretariat and would not cover the real expenses incurred in connexion with the highly specialized logistic services which Poland provided. Accordingly, he felt that financial compensation should be provided for the specialized functions performed within every contingent by specialist personnel. His delegation would be willing to support a decision which would be fair to the troop contributing countries, which faced a magnitude of financial and organizational problems, and to the membership of the United Nations as a whole.

17. Mr. SINGGIH (Indonesia), while expressing his appreciation for the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General, regretted the inclusion of paragraphs 14 to 16 of that report, which were not necessary and would only reopen sensitive questions and prolong the Committee's deliberations. He believed that an understanding had been reached between the troop contributing countries and the Secretariat, and that the Secretary-General had explicitly agreed on the principle of equality. Accordingly, he would prefer the Committee to disregard those paragraphs in discussing the item under consideration.

18. While the report of the Secretary-General might give the erroneous impression that the request for an additional \$23.6 million was caused by the reimbursement proposal of troop contributing countries, he pointed out that a careful study of the report, in particular paragraph 23, would show that the amount originally allocated for reimbursement had been \$37 million for the first year. Had that allocation been retained, it would have been adequate. The real reason for the need for additional funds was the additional expenditure on rations, rental, maintenance and construction of premises, purchase of transportation and other equipment, supplies and services and freight, as could be seen from annex I of the Secretary-General's report. While the formula in General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII) had been

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1974*, document S/11302/Add.1, annex II.



an *ad hoc* arrangement, it should be used to assess contributions and the additional amounts requested. No better solution acceptable to the majority of Member States could be found. He expressed the hope that Member States would promptly pay their contributions, as the importance of UNEF and UNDOF operations in the Middle East must be obvious to all. All Member States should do their part to prevent any recurrence of the suffering and bloodshed of October 1973, at least by paying their contributions to UNEF. The fact that only 82 countries had paid for the first six-month period and only 41 for the second period would adversely affect the ability of developing countries to participate in UNEF and UNDOF. Nepal had already withdrawn its contingent, Panama intended to withdraw its contingent the following month, and Peru and Indonesia had reduced the size of their contingents and might very soon consider withdrawal of their troops; that would mean that Latin America and Asia would no longer be represented.

19. Turning to the question of reimbursement to troop contributing countries, he said that the most important principle was the principle of equality, under which each country would receive the same amount per man per month. The Secretary-General had apparently agreed to that principle. The amount itself was not of primary importance, and his delegation would accept the wish of the majority in the Committee. Any differentiation in remunerations would reflect a colonialist approach and was completely unacceptable. The Secretariat should not be permitted to spend more than had been originally appropriated for certain kinds of expenditure by withdrawing amounts from allocations for other categories; that should be stipulated in the draft resolution to be adopted by the Committee. He requested clarification of what disbursement had already taken place. Approximately \$45 million of the total \$60 million budgeted for the first year of UNEF had been received; only \$6.2 million of the estimated \$37 million for reimbursement had been paid, while the \$3 million provided for non-military personnel had been almost entirely spent. He requested further detailed clarification and breakdown of that expenditure and the reasons for paying out only a small part of the reimbursement for troop contributing countries but almost all of the budget for non-military personnel. Other irregularities had also occurred and he wondered whether the Secretariat felt it was free to juggle with the figures. In connexion with the question of reimbursement of Force-wide equipment, he said that each State should be fully compensated for any expenditure in that category.

20. In conclusion, he said that his delegation was fully prepared to adjust its views in accordance with any valuable suggestions made by other delegations.

21. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta), recalling the decision taken by the Committee at its 1654th meeting, authorizing the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the month of November 1974, asked whether the Committee would have to take a provisional or final decision on the item under consideration before 30 November. He also requested clarification of paragraph 6 of document A/9870.

22. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) replied that, since the Secretary-General's authorization to enter into commitments for the month of November 1974 expired at midnight on 30 November 1974, the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly would have to take a decision before that date.

23. In connexion with paragraph 6 of document A/9870, he said that it referred to a political decision by the competent intergovernmental "organ", and not "organs" as was stated in the versions in languages other than English.<sup>3</sup>

24. Mr. KITI (Kenya) suggested that the Committee should concentrate exclusively on the item under consideration to enable it to take a decision before 30 November. He requested information on how much of the \$5 million, for which amount the Secretary-General had been authorized to enter into commitments, had been appropriated.

25. Mr. PINTO BAZURCO (Peru) recalled that his country had been one of the first to offer troops for the operations under consideration. There were some points in the Secretary-General's report with which he could not agree. In general, he endorsed the observations of the Indonesian representative regarding section IV of that report, which failed to give an accurate idea of the origin or the real meaning of the concept of reimbursement. The Secretary-General had referred to his efforts to establish a rate of reimbursement; actually, the Fifth Committee had taken the initiative in asking the Secretary-General to determine a rate, and the troop contributing countries had subsequently asked the Secretary-General to establish a standard rate for all troops irrespective of nationality. The Secretary-General had referred in paragraphs 19 and 20 of his report to the elements of cost to be covered, including a "usage factor", whereas that concept had not been discussed. Nor was the term "deduction" in paragraph 20 clear: it was a deduction from what? In the original budget submission made when UNEF had been approved, a reimbursement rate of \$440 per man per month had been requested. It was therefore not accurate to imply that the request for a reimbursement rate of \$500 per man per month constituted one of the elements of cost referred to in paragraphs 19 and 20 of the Secretary-General's report.

26. Mr. CARRASCO (Chile) pointed out that the second date in the heading of annex II of document A/9822 should read "*el 24 de abril de 1975*" in the Spanish text.

27. Mr. BENKHAYAL (Libyan Arab Republic) reaffirmed his delegation's position with regard to the financing of UNEF and UNDOF, as recently stated at the 2273rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, on 31 October 1974, and at the 1654th meeting of the Fifth Committee.

28. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) asked what was meant by the term "specialist" in the reports of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee.

29. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) asked how the Committee would organize its work so as to meet the deadline of 30 November for passage of the item through the General Assembly.

<sup>3</sup> A corrigendum (A/9870/Corr.1) was subsequently circulated.

30. After a procedural discussion in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. KITI (Kenya), Mr. PINTO BAZURCO (Peru), Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. STOBY (Guyana) participated and during which information was given by the representative of the Secretary-General, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the list of speakers should be closed at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, 26 November.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION III SUBMITTED BY THE THIRD COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/9829/ADD.1 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 12\* (A/C.5/1630)**

31. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1630) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III submitted by the Third Committee in its report (A/9829/Add.1, para. 37) and which was entitled "Consultative Committee for the Conference of the International Women's Year".

32. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee believed that voluntary funds should be administered in the same way as funds from the regular budget. The Secretary-General could authorize travel and subsistence of members of committees in derogation of the principle established in General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII) of 11 December 1962, but the Advisory Committee had been given no justification for an exception in the current case. The Committee therefore trusted that the exception would constitute no precedent.

33. In his note the Secretary-General had said that documentation, as distinct from interpretation, could be provided from within available resources. That statement was difficult to reconcile with the contention by the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments at the previous meeting that the difficulties with regard to conference staff were not confined to

interpreters. The Advisory Committee accordingly assumed that, if the costs other than interpretation could not be absorbed, they would be met from voluntary funds. Subject to those conditions, the Advisory Committee accepted the Secretary-General's conclusion that an expenditure of \$47,000 would be involved and would be met from voluntary funds.

34. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, if the draft resolution of the Third Committee were adopted, an expenditure of \$47,000 would be involved, which would be met from voluntary funds.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS A AND C SUBMITTED BY THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/9872 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 40\* (A/C.5/1609, A/C.5/1629)**

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider notes by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1629 and A/C.5/1609) the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A and C submitted by the Special Political Committee in its report (A/9872, para. 15).

36. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee did not question the financial implications of the proposals.

37. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, if the two draft resolutions were adopted, supplementary appropriations of \$76,800 and \$8,400 respectively would be required under section 20 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 10 p.m.*

\* Report of the Economic and Social Council.

\* Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.