

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/35/657 25 November 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-fifth session Agenda items 62 and 91

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III recommended by the Second Committee (A/35/628, para. 42)

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Carl C. PEDERSEN (Canada)

- 1. At its 34th meeting, on 24 November 1980, the Fifth Committee considered the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/35/45) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III, entitled "Comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development", recommended by the Second Committee (A/35/628, para. 42). The recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions were expressed orally by its Chairman.
- 2. Statements and comments made in the course of the Committee's discussion of this question are reflected in the summary record of the meeting (A/C.5/35/SR.34).

DECISION OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

- 3. The Fifth Committee decided, without objection, to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution III recommended by the Second Committee (A/35/628, para. 42), no additional appropriation would be required; however, the Secretary-General would be authorized to commit the necessary funds up to an amount not exceeding \$63,000 to be charged against section 5A (Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. In the event that an additional appropriation would become necessary, the General Assembly would take the necessary action in the context of the final performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, which will be considered at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.
- 4. The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the United States of America explained their positions after the decision.