



Chairman: Mr. Motoo OGISO (Japan).

AGENDA ITEM 84

United Nations International School: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*) (A/8708/Add.16, A/8856, A/C.5/1483, A/C.5/L.1096, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.12)

1. Mr. DUQUE (Colombia) said that his delegation was particularly concerned about the chronic deficit of the United Nations International School resulting from increases in operating and building costs, and about the decline in the enrolment in the School of children of United Nations staff members. Considering that, in order to preserve the School's international character, it was essential to have a high proportion of children of diplomatic personnel, his delegation had sponsored draft resolution A/C.5/L.1096, which was in line with the need, mentioned in paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's report (A/8856), for an increase in the education grant for United Nations staff. Forward-looking policies were needed if the School was to surmount its economic difficulties; consequently a report on the School's economic future should be prepared during 1973. He thanked the Chairman of the Board of Trustees for all his efforts.

2. Mr. SOEMANTERA (Indonesia), after expressing his appreciation to the Board of Trustees, its Chairman and all who had made it possible to provide rent-free accommodation for the International School since its inception, noted that the number of ex-students accepted at prestigious universities testified to the high standard of education provided by the School. His delegation was deeply concerned at the report that unless sufficient financial support was forthcoming, the programmes planned for the next academic year might not be implemented. His delegation believed that to admit a greater number of students from the local community in order to meet rising costs, thereby altering the ratio of children of United Nations staff members to others, would be to betray the purposes for which the School had been established. It therefore had no objection to the proposed increase of the present maximum education grant to \$1,500 as an *ad hoc* measure. However, a permanent solution must soon be found, for so significant an institution should not be financed on an *ad hoc* basis or by partial assistance from the United Nations. In view of the delicate financial position of the Organization, his delegation would keep an open mind to any suggestion the Secretary-General might see fit to submit on the matter to the Committee. Finally, it was to be hoped that the Board of Trustees would be able to continue to raise the necessary funds

to keep the School open and that other members of the United Nations system would follow the example of UNICEF and UNESCO in extending a helping hand.

3. Mr. CHERPOOT (India) said that all educational institutions whose purpose was to make the best education available to the not so rich had to be subsidized. It was not surprising, therefore, that the United Nations had to provide grants to the United Nations International School from time to time. His delegation shared the view expressed by the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System in its report<sup>1</sup> that the education grant should be increased and therefore supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1096, particularly operative paragraph 2, for steps must be taken to prevent rising fees from making the School prohibitively expensive for members of the diplomatic missions; otherwise the School would lose its international character. Finally, his delegation was concerned to note from document A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.12 that in the last four years there had been a considerable increase in the teaching staff from North America and Western Europe. The international character of the School would be better served if more members of the teaching staff were recruited from regions currently under-represented.

4. Mr. NAUDY (France) noted that the International School was a particularly successful example of international co-operation which should be continued. Consequently, his delegation would support the draft resolution before the Committee. The report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8708/Add.16) was relevant and its comments had quite rightly been brought to the Committee's attention. However, he agreed with the representative of New Zealand that they should not stop the Committee from adopting the draft resolution.

5. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) expressed appreciation for the support given to the draft resolution. The grant increase had been found necessary even by the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System which had, moreover, pointed out, in paragraph 308 of its report, that boarding fees had increased also and amounted to \$2,500 annually at the Geneva International School. A general increase would be justified so that Geneva would benefit from the measure as well as New York.

6. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina), explaining his vote before the voting, said that his delegation was concerned at the drop in the ratio of children of United

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 28 (and corrigendum), vol I, para. 312.

Nations staff members to other children at the School and therefore welcomed draft resolution A/C.5/L.1096. The School itself was very important, as previous speakers had already pointed out, and it should be possible for children of United Nations staff members to attend it without imposing undue hardship. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

7. Mr. GRODSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the view of his delegation, the educational grant was part of the general question of salaries and allowances dealt with in the report of the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System and should therefore not be considered in isolation. Unfortunately, since it would not be possible to consider the general question for lack of time, his delegation would not be able to support the draft resolution.

8. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had noted the correction made at the previous meeting by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the School to the effect that paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report meant that about \$78,000 would go to Secretariat staff members who now had children attending the School. He hoped that the Secretary-General would be in a position to submit more concrete statistical data concerning the various points raised in the Committee.

9. Although the Advisory Committee had approved the Secretary-General's estimate of the financial implications of the draft resolution, it had felt that the matter could be dealt with in the same way as other recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System. Since the education grant had been under discussion since before the appointment of the Special Committee, his delegation saw no reason why the General Assembly should not take a decision on that urgent matter separately at the current session.

10. Mr. OHTAKA (Japan) said that his delegation was deeply concerned at the International School's financial difficulties and would support the draft resolution.

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1096.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.*

12. The CHAIRMAN said that if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, then the additional amounts required which were mentioned in document A/C.5/L.1483 would be taken into account under the appropriate sections at the time of the second reading of the budget estimates.

13. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations International School) expressed his appreciation to the sponsors of the draft

resolution and pointed out that: firstly, the cost of tuition was becoming proportionally cheaper because of the increase in the student-teacher ratio; secondly, the School Development Fund had only really become effective in 1972; and, thirdly, the School had had luck in 1972 owing to strikes, which had led to the postponement of the opening of the new School; finally, a full report, which would include more refined statistical data, would be submitted in 1973 in response to the point made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

14. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should report directly to the General Assembly that the Committee had adopted draft resolution A/C.5/L.1096 and had approved its financial implications.

#### AGENDA ITEM 77

##### **Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (concluded)\***

##### *Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.20)*

15. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Rapporteur) noted that there were three amendments to be made to the draft report (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.20). Firstly, in paragraph 3, the following sentence should be inserted after the seventh sentence: "One delegation reiterated its principled stand that the so-called unpaid assessed contribution was incurred during the period when the lawful seat of the People's Republic of China was usurped and its Government could not be held responsible in any way." Secondly, in the third sentence of paragraph 9, the words "amendment proposed" should be replaced by the words "suggestion made". Finally, paragraph 22 following the words "explanation of votes before voting," should read: "that without breach of the *per capita* ceiling principle their respective Governments had decided to forgo the benefits they would have derived from the implementation of that principle as a consequence of the lowering of the ceiling of the maximum contribution to 25 per cent."

16. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the first sentence of paragraph 18 was rather long and clumsy and should be split into two. Accordingly, the words "recognizing that" should be replaced by the words "observed that as" and the word "and" following the words "their capacity to pay" should be replaced by the word "they". The comma following the word "scale" should be replaced by a full stop and the next sentence should start with the words "Those delegations therefore". Finally, he felt that changes should be made in the second parts of paragraphs 17 and 18 because they did not accurately reflect the debate as they stood.

17. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) pointed out that it was customary, whenever a delegation introduced amendments to the Committee's report,

\* Resumed from the 1540th meeting.

that those amendments should relate only to the views of that delegation. Since the sentences in question related to the views of a number of delegations, he would like to be consulted on any proposed changes.

18. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen) said that he supported the Tanzanian amendments to paragraph 18.

19. The CHAIRMAN suggested that interested delegations should hold consultations and discuss the amendments with the Rapporteur.

20. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Rapporteur) said that, following consultations, he wished to submit a number of textual amendments agreed on by the representatives of Brazil and the United Republic of Tanzania. He fully supported the amendments suggested. The words "some delegations" in the third sentence of paragraph 17 should be replaced by the words "one delegation". The following sentence should begin "It therefore considered". The last sentence of the paragraph should be redrafted to read: "At the 1540th meeting, following a statement in which the representative of Brazil said that, in a spirit of co-operation, his delegation was prepared to support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1093, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.1094, announced that, in the same spirit of co-operation, he withdrew the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1092."

21. The first sentence of paragraph 18 should be split into two sentences and amended to read: "Several delegations observed that, as some of the least developed of the developing countries were too heavily assessed in relation to their capacity to pay, they should be the first to benefit from any reductions that the Committee on Contributions might find it possible to make in the scale. Those delegations therefore supported the proposal that the minimum contribution should be reduced to 0.02 per cent."

22. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft report (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.20) was amended orally by the Rapporteur.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 81

**Personnel questions (*continued*)\* (for the earlier documentation, see 1541st meeting; A/8829/Add.1, A/8935, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.2 and 21):**

(a) **Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)\* (A/8826, A/8831 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/8836, A/8897, A/C.5/L.1472, A/C.5/L.1079, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.2)**

23. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the new revised text (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.2) of the paragraph proposed by Costa Rica

for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee.

24. Mr. OHTAKA (Japan) said that his delegation appreciated the effort that had been made to improve the Costa Rican text. Nevertheless, it would still have some difficulty in supporting the new text unless the words "particularly the developing countries" were deleted. The real point at issue was to correct the unfavourable position of countries that were under-represented in the Secretariat.

25. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) said that the developing countries had a particular interest in being taken into account when personnel questions were being considered. Although he understood the Japanese position, it was very important that the developing countries should be mentioned; he could not accept the Japanese suggestion.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that since there was clearly no general agreement, the paragraph proposed by Costa Rica could not be included in the report by consensus. He asked whether the representative of Costa Rica would accept the addition, at the beginning of the paragraph, of the words "many delegations expressed the view that."

27. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) said that the principal aim of the paragraph was to ensure that special attention should be given to the developing countries. Since the under-represented countries were clearly mentioned, the paragraph did not conflict with the interests of Japan and other delegations.

28. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) said he felt the text before the Committee was more balanced than the previous version because it had introduced the principles of efficiency, competence and integrity in accordance with Article 101 of the Charter. Nevertheless, the text read like an instruction to the Secretary-General. It not only defended the position of the developing countries but also pinpointed the posts involved. If included in the report, it would be tantamount to an infringement of the Secretary-General's authority under the Charter. His delegation would abstain in the voting on the paragraph.

29. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said it was his delegation's understanding that although special attention should be given to the developing countries, the developed countries were by no means excluded. He hoped, therefore, that Japan would withdraw its objection. He asked how the Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services, would interpret the paragraph if it was approved.

30. Mr. DIPP GÓMEZ (Dominican Republic) pointed out that document A/8836 showed that Costa Rica was within its personnel quota. The Costa Rican position was an altruistic one that showed a desire to redress the balance in respect of all under-represented countries. There did not seem to be any intention in the proposed paragraph to favour the developing countries at the expense of other countries. It rep-

\* Resumed from the 1547th meeting.

resented an effort to overcome the difficulties experienced by developing countries in placing staff in the Secretariat. The action of the recruitment service seemed to be insufficiently oriented towards the developing regions. The formula now being applied meant that vacancies were usually filled before the notification had even reached the developing countries. There could be no objection to including the words "particularly the developing countries". The paragraph itself should not be taken as an instruction to the Secretary-General but rather as an expression of hope that the developing countries would be adequately taken into account. His own country was very seriously under-represented; despite terms of service of up to 25 years, nationals of the Dominican Republic held no posts higher than P-4.

31. Mr. ROWE (Australia) said that the revised text of the paragraph proposed by Costa Rica was more acceptable because it included a reference to the content of Article 101 of the Charter and reaffirmed basic and very necessary principles. Although his delegation was prepared to support the proposed paragraph, it agreed that there was a need to preserve the consensus. He proposed that the words "The majority of delegations emphasized the point that" should be added at the beginning of the paragraph to reflect the views of the Committee more accurately.

32. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) said that comments made by the Australian delegation had been given special attention in preparing the revised text of the paragraph. If the text as submitted could not command a consensus, it should be put to the vote.

33. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that an objection raised by one delegation did not mean that there was no consensus. If the majority of delegations accepted the draft, that would be a consensus, which was not the same thing as unanimity. The new text was a considerable improvement on the previous session. The interests of the Japanese delegation were taken into account. The aim of the paragraph was to request the Secretary-General to give more attention to under-represented countries, including Japan, whose interests would not be affected by the emphasis laid on under-represented developing countries.

34. Mr. GOUAMBA (Congo) said he agreed with the representative of Ghana that the consensus was not affected by an objection raised by one delegation. He wished it to be quite clear that recognition must be given to the fact that the developing countries were under-represented and that they could do nothing about the discrimination and injustice to which they were subjected in recruitment matters. His delegation did not wish to go further into an extremely delicate issue but it must be recognized that some countries were being deprived of their rights. He asked why the consideration of applications from nationals of developing countries gave rise to such difficulties. He also wished to know why French-speaking members of the Secretariat were obliged to speak English. It should be borne in mind that, unlike the developed countries, the developing countries did not have large numbers

of trained staff available and did not have universities that had been in existence for centuries.

35. Mr. GHERAB (Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services) pointed out that the most under-represented countries included, but were not exclusively, developing countries. Moreover, some of the developing countries were over-represented.

36. The assignment of personnel within the Secretariat was, in accordance with the Charter, the exclusive responsibility of the Secretary-General. Any paragraph included in the report should not be at variance with the many General Assembly resolutions adopted on the subject—resolutions which were also instructions to the Secretary-General.

37. Mr. OHTAKA (Japan) said that the point at issue was not one of differences between developing and developed countries; the unfavourable position of the under-represented countries must be corrected. Japan was, nevertheless, one of the five most under-represented countries. He could not withdraw his objection but suggested that the Committee should accept the Australian proposal.

38. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) said that the Costa Rican delegation had submitted an idea that was supported by a substantial majority of delegations, regardless of the degree of development or the geographical location of the countries they represented. The paragraph contained the elements of a valuable proposal that had been very well received in discussions among members of the Latin American group. If the objections in the Committee were maintained, the Committee should proceed to a vote on the inclusion of the paragraph in the report.

39. Mr. MARRÓN (Spain) said he agreed with the representative of Argentina. The new revised text of the Costa Rican proposal was a great improvement over the original version. The least that could be done for the developing countries was to acknowledge that they were under-represented. The proposal should be adopted by consensus, but failing that, it should be put to the vote.

40. Mr. A-YED (Democratic Yemen) pointed out that one or two developing countries were completely unrepresented in the Secretariat. He suggested that the words "or unrepresented" should be inserted after the words "under-represented".

41. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that, after the explanation given by the Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services, his delegation was even less inclined to support the Costa Rican proposal. In order to discover whether the proposal had majority support, it should be put to the vote.

*The new revised text (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.2) of the draft paragraph submitted by Costa Rica was adopted by 61 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

42. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should take note of the comments of the Secretary-General (see A/8897) on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on personnel problems in the United Nations, pending a full submission by the Secretary-General on the substance of the report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

*It was so decided.*

**(b) Other personnel questions: report of the Secretary-General (continued)\* (for the documentation, see 1547th meeting)**

***Amendment to the Staff Regulations of the United Nations (A/C.5/1439)***

43. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should now take up the Secretary-General's proposal that regulation 1.10 of the Staff Regulations should be amended in accordance with paragraph 6 of his note (A/C.5/1439).

44. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that it should adopt the Secretary-General's proposal.

45. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that a vote should be taken on the proposal.

*The proposal of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1439, para. 6) was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

***Amendments to the Staff Rules of the United Nations (A/C.5/1435)***

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee also wished to recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the changes to the Staff Rules reported by the Secretary-General in his note (A/C.5/1435).

*It was so decided.*

47. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that, in accordance with past practice, the Committee would wish to ask the Rapporteur to include in the Committee's report on the item to the General Assembly a draft resolution embodying the decisions which the Committee had just taken regarding the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations.

***Revised proposal for the establishment of a United Nations staff college (concluded)\* (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1, A/8935, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21)***

48. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the text of a paragraph (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21) submitted by Brazil at the 1547th meeting.

\* Resumed from the 1547th meeting.

49. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that his delegation was concerned as to whether the wisest course was to defer to the twenty-eighth session consideration of the revised proposal contained in the memorandum by the Executive Director of UNITAR (see A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1), especially since there was now adequate information on which to take action. The memorandum provided more information than the one submitted at the previous session, when the General Assembly, in approving in principle the establishment of a staff college, had decided to consider at its twenty-seventh session the proposal to establish the college. Further postponement was not an appropriate solution.

50. His delegation fully supported the idea of establishing the college, and wished to take the opportunity to commend the efforts of the Executive Director of UNITAR.

51. It would be unfortunate if, after the Secretary-General had expressed his support for the project—saying that it would represent no duplication of effort—and after the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had suggested possible ways of surmounting the financial difficulties, the Fifth Committee were merely to defer the question until the twenty-eighth session. His delegation was aware of the problems involved, but the Advisory Committee had made it quite clear in its report (A/8935) that they were not insoluble, and that the item need be deferred only as a last resort.

52. For example, the Advisory Committee suggested in paragraph 7 of its report that, if the staff college was to be located at Geneva, some courses should be provided in New York, and possibly in Vienna and at the headquarters of the regional economic commissions, if only for reasons of economy. The Executive Director of UNITAR had informed the Advisory Committee that such alternatives were possible.

53. His delegation felt that the uncertainties regarding financial contributions had been constructively dealt with by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 21 of its report and he would therefore have difficulty in supporting the inclusion in the Fifth Committee's report of the draft paragraph proposed by Brazil.

54. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) said that his delegation wished to express its support, as it had done at the previous session, for the idea of setting up a staff college. However, in the light of the Advisory Committee's report, his delegation had some doubts as to the advisability of taking a final decision at the present time. Participation by UNDP was very important and should not be only financial; on the contrary, UNDP should participate in the various aspects of the curriculum of the college, as outlined in paragraph 4 of document A/8829/Add.1.

55. His delegation wished to express its satisfaction with regard to the work of the Executive Director of UNITAR. It was pleased to note from paragraph 6 of document A/8829/Add.1 the benefit which the resident representatives and deputy resident representa-



tives of UNDP could derive from the courses that would be offered by the proposed college. It would therefore be useful to know the final attitude of the Governing Council of UNDP: in paragraph 21 of its report, the Advisory Committee made a clear appeal to UNDP for financial support, which could also be regarded as an appeal to UNDP to participate in the academic programme of the college.

56. In conclusion, he said that his delegation firmly supported the idea of establishing a college. In supporting the Brazilian proposal, his delegation hoped that the way would be opened for a positive decision at the twenty-eighth session.

57. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that, in accordance with rule 133 of the rules of procedure, the recommendation of the Advisory Committee should be voted on first, since it had been submitted before the Brazilian proposal.

58. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said that his delegation found itself in a difficult position. On the one hand, it very much agreed on the need to establish a staff college at the earliest opportunity. That need was in no way diminished now that the United Nations was embarking on programme budgeting. Furthermore, it was proper for the General Assembly to take a lead by expressing its support prior to the decision of the Governing Council.

59. On the other hand, his delegation agreed with those who had expressed doubts as to whether the details were sufficiently worked out to enable the Committee to take an informed decision before such an important venture was embarked upon. On balance, therefore, his delegation had reluctantly decided to support the Brazilian proposal.

60. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that, if paragraph 21 of the Advisory Committee's report could be taken as a recommendation—and he hoped for clarification on that point—his delegation wished to second the motion made by the representative of France.

61. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to the words "should the General Assembly at its present session decide to establish the college" in paragraph 20 of the Advisory Committee's report, and to the words "If the United Nations were to decide to appropriate" at the beginning of paragraph 21 of that report. In other words, the Advisory Committee was clearly leaving the decision to the General Assembly—as distinct from the previous session, when it had made a definite proposal for deferring consideration of the question.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of that explanation, the only formal proposal before the Com-

mittee was the Brazilian proposal (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21).

63. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was inclined to support the Brazilian proposal. It was premature to take a decision on the question, since the position of UNDP would not be known until the Governing Council had considered the matter in January 1973.

64. Furthermore, in view of the fact that many delegations had expressed doubts in the matter, and that the Advisory Committee had left the decision to the General Assembly, it was even more imperative to postpone consideration of the question.

65. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) did not agree that the only formal proposal before the Committee was that of Brazil. In document A/8935, the Advisory Committee was reporting on a proposal submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2.

66. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said he agreed with the Chairman that the only formal proposal before the Committee was that of Brazil. If, however, the Secretary-General's proposal was also to be voted on, the Brazilian proposal should be considered an amendment to it, and should therefore be voted on first.

67. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) suggested that the Brazilian proposal should be voted on first. The Committee might then take note of or adopt the Secretary-General's report (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2). In fact, there might be no inconsistency between the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraphs 20 and 21 of its report and the Brazilian proposal.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would rule that the Brazilian proposal (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21) as amended by the United States proposal at the 1547th meeting, should be put to the vote.

*It was so decided.*

*The proposal was adopted by 58 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.*

69. Mr. DIPP GÓMEZ (Dominican Republic) said in explanation of vote that his delegation had voted in favour of the Brazilian proposal because, while supporting the idea of establishing the staff college, it felt that the financial participation of UNDP was not yet clear.

*The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.*