



Chairman: Mr. Motoo OGISO (Japan).

AGENDA ITEM 73

Budget estimates for the financial year 1973 (continued)
(A/8706, A/8708 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/8739, A/8748, A/C.5/1429 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1430, A/C.5/1431, A/C.5/1436, A/C.5/1440, A/C.5/1442 to 1446, A/C.5/L.1080, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.2 and 3, E/5186/Rev.1)

Form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle (continued)* (A/8739, A/C.5/1429 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1440, A/C.5/L.1080, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.3, E/5186/Rev.1)

1. Miss WHALLEY (United Kingdom), referring to the comments made by the representative of New Zealand at the previous meeting concerning participation in the general discussion on the budget estimates, said that her delegation had decided that it would be more useful to the work of the Committee to confine its substantive interventions to items to which it attached major importance.

2. The form of presentation of the United Nations budget was an issue of first importance. Her Delegation did not favour change for the sake of change, but it was convinced that the existing presentation of the United Nations budget no longer provided an effective basis for formulating programmes, establishing priorities and determining the scale of annual expenditures. It therefore welcomed the proposals set out in the Secretary-Generals' report on the question (A/C.5/1429 and Corr.1 and 2) and discussed in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8739).

3. The proposals under consideration did not constitute programme budgeting in the full sense of the term. At present, the Committee was being asked to endorse a change to a system of budgeting by organizational unit instead of a system related primarily to object of expenditure. It was essential, however, to consider not only the immediate changes in the form of the budget but also the extent to which those changes would facilitate the further evolution of the Organization's programme and budget techniques. Her delegation did not view the changes proposed as a once for all operation but as a first significant step in the process of refining and improving budget presentation to meet the needs both of Member States and of the Secretariat. As the Advisory Committee had pointed out in paragraphs 41 to 45 of its report, further refinement was necessary in respect of expenditure on common ser-

* Resumed from the 1498th meeting.

vices. It would be necessary to develop a system of standard costing before common service expenditure could be appropriated together with the other costs of substantive programmes, and her delegation hoped that the Secretary-General would study that matter in depth during 1973 and report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

4. In the discussions in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, her delegation had expressed concern about the quality and extent of the information provided about forward programming. Sensible medium-term and long-term planning was possible only if adequate expenditure forecasts based on clearly defined assumptions were available. The Advisory Committee had suggested a number of essential requirements, and her delegation would welcome any additional information the Secretariat could provide about the basis on which forward costings would be provided in relation to the expenditure headings set out in the annex to the Advisory Committee's report. In so far as the time scale was concerned, her delegation remained convinced that for effective planning a six-year period was desirable. Nevertheless, it recognized the facts and arguments in favour of a four-year plan initially, and would be prepared to accept that modification on the understanding that the time scale would be extended as soon as practicable.

5. Programme budgeting should not only provide a framework for effective decision-making but should also be developed as a valuable management tool. For that reason, her delegation believed that the new system should have built into it the means of monitoring performance and facilities for continuous updating of the basic programme and budget documentation.

6. Her delegation shared the views expressed in paragraph 50 of the Advisory Committee's report that a detailed breakdown of the resources required for individual programme components and activities must be provided in the programme and budget documents to enable the competent intergovernmental organs to review programme and budget proposals. It would also be useful to have an indication of whether activities were of a new, continuing or expiring nature, for such information would permit objectives to be identified with some precision. Without such detail it would not be possible to utilize the new-style budget presentation to measure performance. In that context her delegation had reservations about the statement in paragraph 8 (b) of the Secretary-General's report that the new form of budget would not necessarily involve the immediate introduction of a fully integrated management system. It entirely accepted that such a system could not be

established immediately, but unless it was recognized as an essential element from the start full benefit would not be derived from the new budget presentation. Cost/benefit analyses and other techniques associated with functional costing should be seen as an integral part of the new system and her delegation hoped that from the outset it would be possible to apply them sufficiently widely to afford a continuous means of monitoring performance in the most important programme areas.

7. The interrelationship of the management and decision-making aspects of programme budgeting had important implications for the machinery needed to handle the programme and the budget and had an impact on the time-table of the appropriate legislative bodies. Her delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that at the present stage no new intergovernmental body need be established and that the bodies already in existence should be utilized and adapted as necessary. As far as the internal Secretariat machinery was concerned, her delegation was prepared to support the Secretary-General's proposals for the establishment of a small planning, programming and evaluation group which would operate as part of the Budget Division. It would welcome any information that might be available about procedures the group would apply in discharging the task of evaluation.

8. Regarding the time-table, her delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that there should be substantial revision of the proposals set out in paragraph 20 of the Secretary-General's report. It agreed that the budget must be assembled much earlier than envisaged by the Secretary-General, and that the Advisory Committee should be able to review the Secretary-General's proposals with full knowledge of the recommendations of the various programme-formulating bodies. The piecemeal approach set out in the report of the Secretary-General did not square with the need to review the budget as a whole to determine priorities. Her delegation understood that difficulties would arise in meeting the time-table proposed by the Advisory Committee but hoped that they would be transitional. Her delegation also attached importance to the requirement that there should be no updating of the programme and budget after consideration by the Advisory Committee and prior to submission to the General Assembly.

9. A related point concerned the activities of the various legislative bodies during the budget period, since if the new system was to be effective, new programme commitments would have to be examined and fitted into the agreed programme framework. There was another aspect to timing which might give rise to problems. What would be the task of the Fifth Committee and of the various legislative bodies in the "dead year" in which they were not required to formulate and consider a biennial budget? Her delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that in that year the Fifth Committee would need to monitor progress and take appropriate action to deal with unforeseen developments. It also felt, however, that the "dead year" should provide an opportunity for an in-depth forward

look which would lead to the basic updating of the medium-term plan to set the parameters of the subsequent biennial budget period.

10. The form of the United Nations budget had been under examination for a number of years. There seemed to be unanimity on one point, namely, that the present form of presentation no longer served the full interests of the Organization and individual Member States. The proposals before the Committee were not fully satisfactory to all delegations and her delegation shared some of the reservations expressed by other delegations on the prospects for programme budgeting in the United Nations. Nevertheless, after careful examination of the proposals as modified by the Advisory Committee, it was prepared to endorse the new format, on the understanding that it would not merely be a cosmetic alteration in the layout of documentation—accompanied by a possibly painful reorganization of the time-table of the work of the Secretariat and the intergovernmental bodies concerned—but would represent the beginning of planned programme budgeting.

11. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that in order to realize fully the importance of the decisions the Committee was required to take, it was essential to bear in mind that the budget document of any organization mirrored, in its form, size, preparation, execution and review, the life process of the organization. That being so, it should be modified from time to time to keep pace with the changing role and nature of the organization to which it related. The format of the United Nations budget document had been established in 1958. Since then, the role of the United Nations in the economic and social fields had expanded considerably, with the result that a slightly different form of budget document was now required.

12. In paragraphs 18 to 59 of its second report,¹ the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies had made a number of recommendations, *inter alia* on budget preparation, presentation and performance, and the reforms being considered by the Fifth Committee had been proposed partly in response to those recommendations. Primarily, the budget format should be determined by the purposes to be served, including decision-making, authority for funds, execution and evaluation of programme implementation. The budget classification must facilitate decision-making by the competent intergovernmental body concerned. To that end, the document must indicate clearly the programmes, their cost estimates and other related matters on which decisions were being sought. If decisions had already been made on programmes by committees or bodies not competent to authorize the use of funds, that fact must also be clearly indicated. Furthermore, the budget document should facilitate authorization of funds by the General Assembly for programmes and other objectives for which funds were being sought and the classification should facilitate programme management and execution as well as control of the related

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 80, document A/6343.*

authorized funds. Finally, the budget format should facilitate evaluation of programme implementation.

13. Apparently no classification of the United Nations budget capable of combining all those requirements could be found. The existing classification by object of expenditure was, for example, good for ensuring that as little money as possible was spent, but it did not serve the need to take informed decisions nor was it useful for proper evaluation and analysis of output. The system of budgeting by organizational units now being proposed also served the purposes of control and accountability but did not show clearly what the unit was doing, or indicate to the legislative body the amount of resources spent on, or the results achieved through, similar activities being carried out by different organizational units. Budgeting by main fields of activity helped to concentrate attention on the totality of funds and other resources being spent in such fields as industry, population, education and agriculture and was generally, although not always, useful in the evaluation of results. However, it did not lend itself readily to strict control of funds. It seemed, therefore, that the best solution would be to adopt a form of budget classification best suited to the nature of the United Nations. The format chosen must judiciously serve, in one way or another, all the purposes he had mentioned without being unduly weighted in favour of any of them. Perhaps the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been aware of that dilemma when, in recommending common principles of budgetary presentation, it had called for budget documents in which information would be presented by objects of expenditure as well as by main fields of activity.²

14. It had been stated by many speakers that the Secretary-General's proposals did not constitute programme budgeting as it was understood in certain countries. In his opinion, it would be useless to discuss theoretically the meanings of programme budgeting or even PPBS, as there was still no unanimous agreement on what they constituted. He agreed with the Secretary-General and other speakers that programme budgeting was a technique neither for increasing nor decreasing programmes or resources. In his opinion programme budgeting, or whatever budgeting system was used, and the duration of the budget cycle, were neutral techniques which bore no direct relation to the political judgements which largely determined the size of programmes and the level of resources to implement them. In the opinion of his delegation, it would also be wrong to appear to emphasize the resource side of programme budgeting at the expense of its programme side. It seemed fair to state that programme budgeting would lead to an improved system of resources management for a number of United Nations activities, but the end of programme budgeting was not, and should not be, simply to achieve the most rational utilization of limited resources. It would be wrong to imply that if they were not limited there would be no need for programme budgeting. The rational use of scarce resources was but one aspect of the system; the other was related to programme management and implementation. The rationale of allocating resources

² *Ibid.*, para. 32.

could only acquire full validity after the programmes had been so managed and implemented as to achieve the agreed objectives. The programming of scarce resources was therefore but one aspect of a larger process, and to ignore other aspects of the process would be to defeat the whole purpose for which the system had been established.

15. His delegation wished to comment, *inter alia*, on the duration of the budget cycle. It had been contended in the past that the United Nations budget cycle should be synchronized with those of the majority of the specialized agencies. Few arguments had, however, been advanced to substantiate the contention and little regard had been paid to the fact that the United Nations was a much more complicated organization than any of the specialized agencies. In discussing the proposals now before the Committee, the Advisory Committee stated, in paragraph 15 of its report (A/8739), that a biennial cycle had much to commend it. On the other hand, it appeared from the report of the Secretary-General that he assumed that a biennial budget cycle was a foregone conclusion and he had not even bothered to examine the impact of that assumption on such matters as assessed contributions and their collection and the size of the Working Capital Fund, which were referred to in paragraphs 60 to 62 of the Advisory Committee's report.

16. In neither the assumptions of the Secretary-General nor the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, had any attempt been made to examine whether the questions raised in the past on the feasibility of a biennial budget cycle for the United Nations had been settled. The *Ad Hoc* Committee had failed to reach agreement on the subject and in the study made in 1967³ in response to the recommendation contained in paragraph 56 of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's second report, the Secretary-General had reached the conclusion that most of the advantages claimed for a biennial budget cycle could only be considered valid if a properly phased system of programme and budget preparation were established. In its related report,⁴ the Advisory Committee had endorsed that conclusion and, in paragraph 17, had recommended that before the matter was taken further additional information should be obtained on four questions. In paragraph 30 of his 1970 report on the form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle,⁵ the Secretary-General had concluded that the programme and budget formulation procedure he had described would logically involve the adoption of a biennial budget cycle but had provided very few reasons which would lead delegations to believe that the reservations which had been expressed on the subject in 1967 were no longer valid. It was a matter for regret that, partly because it had been issued late and partly because the Committee had doubted whether it could adopt proposals on the new form of the budget at that time, the 1970 report had not been discussed in detail by the Fifth Committee.

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 80, document A/C.5/1122, para. 36.

⁴ *Ibid.*, document A/6887/Rev.1.

⁵ Document A/C.5/1335, of 19 November 1970.

17. Like the Brazilian delegation, his delegation believed that little would be gained by extending the duration of the budget cycle until the existing methods of planning and programming had been improved. If that was a fair assumption, it would be interesting to learn from the representative of the Secretary-General exactly what had happened between October 1967 and October 1972 to warrant the Secretary-General's confidence in the practicability of a two-year budget cycle for the United Nations. What improvements, for example, had been made between 1967 and 1972 in the forward planning of programmes and budgets, an essential prerequisite for a biennial budget cycle? It would also be interesting to know whether a biennial budget cycle was desirable or essential for medium-term planning in the United Nations. Depending on the answer to that question, perhaps the representative of the Secretary-General could tell the Committee whether it was conceivable that the Committee might recommend adoption of the proposals before it without adopting a biennial budget cycle. One of the most difficult problems to solve in a biennial budget cycle was that posed by the conference schedule of the various bodies of the United Nations. Perhaps the representative of the Secretary-General would tell the Committee what had become of the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 17 (a) of its 1967 report⁴ and of the request made by the General Assembly in paragraph 5 of resolution 2370 (XXII), of 19 December 1967.

18. The second point on which his delegation wished to comment was that of long-term planning. The comments made by the Advisory Committee on that subject in paragraph 18 of its report (A/8739) had apparently been ignored. The integrity of the planning period must be a function of the experience and expertise available, and the United Nations did not have sufficient experience or expertise to plan for six years. In any case, not all United Nations activities could be planned ahead. Activities in the economic and social fields were those best suited to forward planning and it had been in those areas that Mr. Bertrand, in his report of September 1969 entitled "Programming and budgets in the United Nations family of organizations",⁶ had been most categorical in recommending that medium-term planning and programme budgeting should be adopted. The current proposals of the Secretary-General assumed, however, that everything could be planned. In the circumstances, he wished to ask the representative of the Secretary-General whether, in view of the limited experience of the Organization in planning, it would not have been advisable to proceed first on the basis of medium-term planning and programme budgeting for the economic and social activities of the United Nations.

19. Turning to the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 20 of its report, he asked how the Secretary-General intended to employ the procedure laid down in General Assembly resolution 2370 (XXII) to implement the current proposals relating to a two-year budget cycle. The process outlined in that resolution had been based to some extent

on the recommendations made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee in its second report,⁷ particularly paragraphs 68 to 73 which had dealt with integrated long-term planning and clear definition of priorities among competing demands. It had been hoped that the procedure established in resolution 2370 (XXII) would enable the General Assembly to lay down policy directives on programme levels and their related costs 12 months in advance. His delegation attached great importance to the manner in which the Secretary-General intended to use that procedure in the coming years, particularly in view of the recommendations made in paragraph 22 of his report now before the Committee, concerning the establishment in the Secretariat of a planning, programming and evaluation service and a high-level programme and budget review committee. It would be interesting to know how the review committee would implement the provisions of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph 22 (b). In particular his delegation wished to know by what method the committee would assess human as well as financial resources likely to be available to the Organization from all sources during the next programme and budget planning periods. It also would welcome the comments of the representative of the Secretary-General on the criteria the proposed committee would use in determining a budget level likely to be acceptable to the General Assembly. His delegation feared a possible conflict of jurisdiction between the proposed planning, programming and evaluation service and the proposed review committee. There were no convincing reasons why the two should not be combined, even though the establishment of such a group had been one of the principal recommendations of Mr. Bertrand in his report. It was essential to ensure that such a group did not view the problems of the Organization only from the narrow point of view of budgetary considerations and limitations.

20. The question of legislative machinery was crucial and the Secretary-General had stated that the ideal would be to have one body approve the programme and budget of the United Nations, as was done in the specialized agencies. In the United Nations, however, matters were more complicated and it was therefore proposed that the new programme and budget system should be built on the existing machinery, subject to later modification. In its comments on the question, the Advisory Committee had amended the Secretary-General's proposals on the calendar for the preparation and approval of the programme and budget in a manner that would enable the Advisory Committee to pass judgement on the programme and budget after all the other legislative organs had had a chance to look at them. The reforms proposed by the Secretary-General, as amended by the Advisory Committee would, if carried to their logical conclusion, lead to the preparation of one programme and budget document which would be submitted for comment to the Economic and Social Council, the Trade and Development Board, the Industrial Development Board and to the Advisory Committee, which would submit its final recommendations to the Fifth Committee. There would be no revised estimates. It was not, however, only the absence of revised estimates that was novel in the new procedure

⁶ Document A/7822 (of 3 December 1969), annex.

⁷ See foot-note 1.

but the fact that the Advisory Committee would be able to pass judgement on the programmes as well as on the budget. That seemed to be the logic of paragraph 13 of document A/8739.

21. The Fifth Committee must be aware of the full implications of the proposals before it. Acceptance or rejection of the Advisory Committee's proposal must be based upon two conditions, namely, the need and desire for change in the unsatisfactory existing methods of programming and budgeting in the United Nations and the lack of suitable machinery to meet the requirements of the multiplicity of legislative organs and the complexities of the Organization's activities.

22. The question of information was also very important; the Secretariat had an immense responsibility in determining the type and quality of information to be included in the programme and budget document. In that task, the Secretary-General would have few rules and guidelines to go by, since there was no agreed criterion for deciding the matter beforehand. In drawing up the document, however, the Secretary-General should bear in mind that it was being prepared for people who might sometimes be totally unfamiliar with the United Nations. The information must be clear and relevant, must avoid generalities and must always be geared towards the goal of enabling Members of the General Assembly to take decisions. Care must be taken to avoid the use of terms and descriptions which, though they might be meaningful at the national level, could be totally meaningless or irrelevant to United Nations problems.

23. In conclusion, he said that he did not wish to give the impression that the budget reforms had all been proposed at the initiative of the Secretary-General. Responsibility for any faults that there might be in the new budget system must be placed on the shoulders of those Members of the Organization who had urged introduction of the new system.

24. Mr. OHTAKA (Japan) recalled that the proposed programme budgeting was intended to achieve the most effective and rational utilization of the limited resources of the United Nations by establishing a more rational relationship between programme formulation and budgeting, and also to help the competent intergovernmental organs determine which programmes and activities should be undertaken, their relative priorities and the most economical means of implementing them. In the report of the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination on its twelfth session (E/5186/Rev.1, para. 48) it is stated that the proposed new approach to programming and budgeting should considerably strengthen intergovernmental control over the various activities in the economic and social field. However, he felt that the degree of effective control that the intergovernmental organs could exercise over budget formulation would to a large extent depend upon the kind of programme and budget documentation to be provided to the intergovernmental organs. Budget formulation was not an abstract exercise that could be done in a vacuum, but a very concrete task, namely translating programme objectives into monetary terms.

Abstract discussions and general observations on the medium-term plan and the biennial programme and budget in the programme formulating bodies would be of little practical use to the Fifth Committee in its consideration of the budget. The programme and budget proposals would therefore have to be prepared in such a manner as to enable the intergovernmental organs to produce specific comments and observations and to take concrete action.

25. In that connexion his delegation agreed with the statement in paragraph 50 of the report of the Advisory Committee to the effect that a more detailed breakdown of the resources required for individual programme components and activities should be given. The recommendation in paragraph 20 of the same report that the plan for the second biennium should be accompanied by preliminary cost estimates was also important. His delegation supported a four-year medium-term plan in view of the comment by the Advisory Committee that, since the United Nations had little experience in medium-term programming, the outline for the fifth and sixth years would probably be too sketchy to be of much practical use.

26. His delegation was prepared to go along with the proposal for programme budgeting as a whole, as modified by the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

27. Mr. MARIKO (Niger) said he was glad to note that the increase in the budget for 1973 was only approximately 3 per cent, the smallest increase for a long time. He hoped that the various austerity measures being taken in the field of personnel recruitment and the reductions in operating costs would help to improve budget and personnel management and to give Member States more confidence in the Secretariat.

28. His delegation approved the proposed new form of presentation of the budget and the proposed budget cycle; they would enable the United Nations to modernize its financial system and to make short and medium-term plans in personnel recruitment and training and in technical assistance programmes for developing countries. Although the new proposals, like any administrative or budgetary reform, might give rise to doubts, his delegation felt that the proposed modernization in planning was indispensable, particularly for the implementation of technical assistance programmes. Management, in government and private enterprise, was devoting more and more attention to planning and modernization, and the United Nations Secretariat could not escape the need to modernize and introduce new methods of management and administration. Accordingly, he approved the initiative taken by the Secretary-General to provide the United Nations with effective management and control machinery, thus abandoning the traditional cumbersome routine that was a mark of old-fashioned administrations.

29. His delegation also supported the suggestion that the draft biennial programme and budget and the report of the Advisory Committee should be submitted to

Member States at least five weeks before the opening of the General Assembly session.

30. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the present form of presentation of the budget had been established in 1958. Since then changes in the scope and nature of the activities of the United Nations, particularly in the economic and social sphere, had led to a considerable increase in the budget. For the last 10 years the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had been suggesting that a system of medium-term planning and programme budgeting should be implemented in view of the fact that the present form of presentation did not give a complete picture of the input utilization and output of the resources contributed by Member States.

31. The documents before the Committee proposed a biennial programme and budget which would undoubtedly lighten the work of the Budget Division and the Advisory Committee and enable them to devote more time to preparing the budget estimates and to analysing the requirements of the various bodies on a programme-budgeting basis. That procedure would also help the Fifth Committee in its consideration of the estimates.

32. His delegation found most of the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee acceptable. Commenting on the recommendation concerning an annual review of the implementation of the programme and budget, he said he hoped that would not involve an annual review of supplementary estimates. His delegation was also concerned by the Advisory Committee's recommendation regarding the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. His delegation felt that all unforeseen expenses should be covered by economies or by reorganizing programme priorities. Revised and supplementary estimates should be limited to expenditure arising from decisions taken by the Main Committees of the General Assembly. All other expenditure should be included in the budget estimates before they were submitted to the Advisory Committee, for all programme-formulating bodies should end their sessions before the Advisory Committee made its report on the budget estimates.

33. With regard to the recommendation of the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 27 (b) of his report, his delegation agreed in principle with the

Advisory Committee, which had supported the recommendation with the reservation that the procedure proposed should not limit the powers of the programme-formulating bodies to determine the objectives to be reached. His delegation felt that one of the most important tasks at the United Nations was to formulate programmes as precisely as possible. Programmes should be formulated on the basis of the existing resources of the United Nations and the priorities established by the intergovernmental bodies, and also with due regard to the possibility of completing the programme within the specified time-limit. The various departments of the Secretariat should act exclusively as executing agents, while the legislative bodies of the United Nations should decide which programmes should be implemented.

34. In that connexion, his delegation could not support the proposal of the Secretary-General that a high-level committee to review the programme and budget, and a programming, planning and evaluation service should be established within the Secretariat. His delegation approached the whole question with the object of stabilizing and strengthening the financial situation of the United Nations. A proposal to establish a new unit involving additional staff and appropriations clearly ran counter to that aim and should be rejected. The work of evaluation could be carried out quite adequately by the existing administrative and financial departments.

35. With those reservations, his delegation supported the proposals and recommendations of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee concerning the proposed new form of presentation of the budget and the duration of the budget cycle.

36. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) requested confirmation from the representative of the Secretary-General that the intention of the Secretariat, according to document A/C.5/1429/Corr.2 was not to create any high-level committee to review the programme and budget, but simply to retain the normal procedures for consultation between the heads of the departments concerned, with no additional expenditure.

37. Mr. COÏDAN (Director of the Budget Division) said that that was indeed the Secretariat position, as reflected in document A/C.5/1429/Corr.2.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.