



FIFTH COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Thursday, 29 October 1981
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

Revised estimates under section 19, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. Resources for the work programme at the regional level

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.5/36/SR.25

9 November 1981

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983
(A/36/6, A/36/7, A/36/38 (chaps. V and VII D) (continued))

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee, said that the Secretary-General's estimate for section 18 was \$13,148,600. The creation of eight local-level posts was proposed: five for the Conference Services programme and three for the Administration and Common Services programme. The Secretary-General stated that there would be no real growth for section 18 as a whole, since the cost of the five additional posts for Conference Services would be fully offset by a reduction in requirements for temporary posts were described in paragraph 18.50 of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983. Those functions differed from the functions of the temporary assistance posts reported to the Advisory Committee in 1979 during its consideration of the estimates for 1980-1981. The Committee had not received additional information to clarify that discrepancy. Accordingly, as was explained in paragraph 18.8 of its report, it was not convinced that the conversions had been fully justified.
2. As to the three other local-level posts proposed (one finance assistant, one technician and one administrative clerk), the information provided to the Advisory Committee conflicted with what had been reported to it in 1979. At that time, the Committee had been informed that UNEP had 19 administrative assistants, 7 of whom were financed from the regular budget and 12 from the Environment Fund, and that it had nine finance assistants, two of whom were in regular-budget posts. According to the information provided in 1981, UNEP currently had seven administrative assistants, four of whom were in posts financed from the regular budget and three in posts financed by the Environment Fund under the programme and programme support costs budget. It also had 12 finance assistants and one technician. Because of those discrepancies, the Committee could not approve the creation of the three local-level posts and therefore recommended a reduction in the estimate of \$107,700.
3. The Advisory Committee also recommended a reduction of \$11,700 in the estimate for temporary assistance. Accordingly, the reductions recommended by the Committee totalled \$119,400.
4. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) said that the disparities referred to by the Advisory Committee were due to the fact that the Fund of UNEP was always used to finance posts which, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), which established the United Nations Environment Programme, were to be charged to the regular budget of the United Nations. The General Assembly had laid down the principles for distributing programme costs between the Fund of UNEP and the regular budget. In accordance

/...

(Mr. Tolba)

with those principles and in pursuance of a recommendation of the Advisory Committee, five posts had been transferred from the Fund to the regular budget in 1977, on the understanding that 13 further posts would later be charged to the regular budget. Because of the current financial difficulties of the Organization and of the adoption of a zero growth rate, UNEP had been unable to secure the movement of those posts to the regular budget for 1982-1983. Accordingly, the existing situation, in which expenditures were being transferred from the regular budget to the Fund of UNEP, would continue during the forthcoming biennium.

5. He asked the Committee to excuse him for a short time, so that he could attend a meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

6. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that the Advisory Committee referred in its report to the introduction of common services at Nairobi, which had not been mentioned in the proposed programme budget. He asked whether the appropriations sought for common services would have to be changed in the event of common services being instituted in Nairobi.

7. Mr. CORDEIRO (Brazil) said that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had recommended in paragraph 501 of its report that programme element 9.1 (environmental law) together with its output, should be deleted from subprogramme 9, given the fact that there was no legislative text authorizing those activities. Such a deletion would reduce the appropriation by \$58,600. He asked whether the Advisory Committee had taken account of that CPC recommendation when it reviewed the appropriations asked for under section 18.

8. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Committee that they had agreed, in order to facilitate the work to examine the sections of the budget that had not been the subject of the CPC recommendations, although the Secretariat had not yet prepared reports on the financial implications of those recommendations. The Committee's decisions on those sections could be amended in the light of any decisions it took later on on the recommendations of the CPC.

9. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said he was pleased that the Fifth Committee had reached agreement on the procedure to be followed for the consideration of the reports of the Advisory Committee and CPC. In reply to the representative of Brazil, he explained that the CPC recommendations must first be adopted by the Fifth Committee. Once adopted, their administrative and budgetary implications, as determined by the Secretariat, would be referred to the Advisory Committee; the latter would report to the Fifth Committee. Thus, it was not in order for the Advisory Committee to consider the budgetary implications of the CPC recommendations concerning the United Nations Environment Programme until those recommendations had been accepted by the Fifth Committee.

10. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that he would welcome information on the criteria applied to determine which programmes and activities of UNEP were charged to the regular budget of the United Nations and which were financed by extrabudgetary funds.

/...

(Mr. Papendorp, United States)

11. With regard to the proposed special session of the Governing Council of UNEP in 1982, his delegation believed that the related expenditure should be financed by the appropriations requested or by redeploying resources already provided for in the proposed programme budget for the 1982-1983 biennium.

12. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) asked whether the recent fall of approximately 15 per cent in the Kenyan shilling would affect the construction costs of the UNEP headquarters in Nairobi.

13. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said, in reply to the question of the representative of Canada, that the Secretary-General would in the near future submit to the General Assembly a report on the introduction of common services at Nairobi. Without prejudging his conclusions, the probability was that the report would have implications for the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 inasmuch as the introduction of common services in Nairobi would depend to a large extent on the completion of the new UNEP headquarters, which would not be ready until the end of 1983.

14. The Secretary-General would also submit to the General Assembly a report on the status of construction work at UNEP headquarters in which the effects of the devaluation of the Kenyan shilling would be discussed.

15. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that the payment of first-class travel for members of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation was unjustified. Moreover, his delegation regretted that neither section 18 nor many other sections of the budget gave any indication of which programmes were considered as having priority.

16. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation was one of the expert groups whose members were entitled, by decision of the General Assembly, to the payment of first-class travel costs provided, of course, that the journey, by the most direct route, lasted over nine hours. Consequently in the case in question UNEP had merely obeyed a decision of the General Assembly.

17. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) pointed out that the bulk of UNEP's resources came from voluntary contributions. For the first time the developing countries had agreed on a resolution, submitted by them at the previous session of the United Nations General Assembly, in which they identified the UNEP activities which they considered to be priority activities. Given the fact that zero growth, in real terms, in the proposed programme budget of the United Nations was bound to have an adverse effect on the priorities so established, he urged the major contributors to the Fund of UNEP to maintain their contributions at a level at least equal to that of the previous biennium.

18. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) asked whether the programmes mentioned by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in the paragraphs of its report dealing with UNEP had been included in the UNEP budget estimates considered by the Advisory Committee and whether the Advisory Committee had taken them into account in its

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

recommendations. His delegation had no quarrel with the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee; it merely wanted the Executive Director of UNEP to state how a zero-growth regular budget would affect the continuation of the programmes that UNEP considered essential.

19. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme), replying to the question asked by the United States representative, referred to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), in which it had been decided that a small environment secretariat should be established, the operating costs of which were to be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations. Under that resolution it had also been decided to set up a voluntary fund for programmes of general interest. In 1976 the Governing Council of UNEP had asked that in consultation with the Secretariat, the basic principle should be laid down governing the inclusion in the regular budget of certain posts which had until then been financed by extrabudgetary funds. With the concurrence of representatives of the Secretary-General, the Executive Director had identified 18 posts in the programme sector within the UNEP secretariat which would gradually be transferred to the regular budget. In 1977 the Advisory Committee had approved the inclusion in the regular budget of five of the six posts proposed by the Secretary-General in the proposed programme budget and had on that occasion lifted the ban on the transfer of posts to the regular budget. The Advisory Committee had added that other transfers of the same type might be envisaged provided they were clearly justified by the Secretary-General. In 1979, however, by reason of the serious financial difficulties facing the Organization, the Secretary-General had not even been able to propose, in the proposed programme budget for 1980-1981, the inclusion of six more posts in the regular budget. That had also been the case in the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983. The Governing Council of UNEP had accordingly had to arrange to continue to finance those posts from extrabudgetary funds.

20. He explained, in reply to the representative of Kenya, that of the appropriation of approximately \$13 million requested for 1982-1983, some \$2 million was for financing consultants' services or special expert groups. The programme expenditure approved by the Governing Council at its most recent session, for financing from the Fund of UNEP, had been estimated at some \$93 million, the total target for voluntary contributions to the Fund being \$120 million. Thereafter more cautious estimates had reduced the figure to approximately \$76 million. Clearly, therefore, the bulk of UNEP's activities were financed by extrabudgetary funds, as provided in General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII).

21. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) asked for clarifications concerning expenditure for temporary conference servicing staff, common staff costs, consultants and overtime.

22. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) replied that the increase in resources requested under overtime was due to the heavier workload, which had not been offset by an increase in staff. He also pointed

/...

(Mr. Tolba)

out that UNEP had estimated that 10 per cent of the established posts charged to the regular budget would not be filled, compared to the five per cent usually estimated for the Secretariat as a whole. As for the established posts financed by the Fund of UNEP (programme and programme support costs), the UNEP secretariat estimated a vacancy rate of 20 per cent. With regard to the growth in spending on consultants, he said that it had proved necessary to study a number of new problems which consultants were better equipped to tackle than UNEP regular staff. Those studies had been requested in General Assembly resolutions and it was logical that their cost should be charged to the regular budget. As for calculating staff costs, the Assistant-Secretary-General for Financial Services was in a better position to supply clarification.

23. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services), replying to the representative of Yugoslavia, pointed out that the estimated costs for temporary staff to service meetings were less than the 1980-1981 appropriations (A/36/6, vol. II, table 18.4). With respect to consultants, the Secretariat had indicated, as far as possible, the aims and results of the studies undertaken (para. 18.22 of the proposed programme budget).

24. Common staff costs were calculated on the basis of costs incurred in the previous biennium. It was difficult to assess them exactly, since they included a number of variables (dependency allowance, education grant, home leave, contribution to the Joint Staff Pension Fund, etc.). Common staff costs calculated in that way accounted for a percentage of estimated costs for established posts which was more or less the same for the various services at the same duty station.

25. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) asked for additional information concerning unfilled established posts. He wondered whether those posts were charged to the regular budget or financed by extrabudgetary funds.

26. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) explained that the percentage of the established posts charged to the regular budget which were not filled was approximately 10 per cent (four posts out of 41), while in the case of posts financed by extrabudgetary funds it was approximately 20 per cent (20 posts out of a total of 106).

27. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) asked whether there had been any follow-up to the request made at the previous session of the UNEP Governing Council to create 30 additional posts for activities relating to the law of the sea.

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that any decision by the Governing Council that was likely to have an impact on the budget for the biennium 1982-1983 would be submitted to the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee, which would consider its financial implications in accordance with the normal procedure. The Fifth Committee could therefore approve section 18 in its present form, on the understanding that any request for additional appropriations would be considered by the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee.

/...

29. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations and subject to the necessary adjustments that might be required as a result of subsequent decisions of the Fifth Committee on the relevant recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, that the Committee should approve in first reading an appropriation of \$13,029,200 under section 18 for the biennium 1982-1983.

30. It was so decided.

31. Mrs. de HEDERVARY (Belgium) wished to know the percentage of women in the 147 established professional posts in UNEP. According to her information, that percentage was less than 10 per cent, although the expertise required with respect to the environment could not be considered a male prerogative.

32. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) recalled that the provisions of section V of General Assembly resolution 35/210 referred essentially to posts charged to the regular budget. However, he had made a personal commitment to implement them also with respect to posts financed by extrabudgetary funds.

33. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) took up the question raised by the representative of Belgium, applying it to the geographical distribution of UNEP staff members.

34. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) gave the same reply to the representative of Morocco as he had given to the representative of Belgium.

35. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) asked the Executive Director of UNEP for the figures relating to the number of women occupying professional posts in UNEP.

36. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) said that he would ask the UNEP secretariat for precise information in order to be able to reply to questions of delegations. In any case, even if the figures were lower than the percentage recommended by the General Assembly, his concern about rectifying that imbalance was no less sincere.

Section 19 - United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

Revised estimates under section 19 (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements) - Resources for the work programme at the regional level (A/C.5/36/15; A/36/7/Add.4)

37. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recommended that the Fifth Committee approve the Secretary-General's estimate of \$9,705,500 for section 19. Introducing the Advisory Committee's report on the revised estimates under section 19 (A/36/7/Add.4), which dealt with the conversion to an established basis of the 12 temporary posts approved by the General Assembly in 1980 and 1981, he said that the Fifth Committee could now take a decision on the matter. As was indicated in that report, in 1980 the Advisory Committee had been unable to support the conversion of those posts, owing to inadequate information. At the current session, instead of

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

providing for the 12 temporary posts in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, the Secretariat had preferred to submit a separate document (A/C.5/36/15), requesting that they be converted into established posts. In the light of the information in that document, the Advisory Committee had no objection to the request. At the same time, it recommended, as was indicated in paragraph 8 of its report, that the Commission on Human Settlements and the governing bodies of the regional commissions should monitor the human settlements programmes at the regional level to ensure that the staff resources were used effectively and that there was no duplication of work. Instances of possible duplication - for example, between the Centre's programmes and the human settlements programmes of the regional commissions - were given in paragraph 5 of its report. However, in the light of the information provided by the representatives of the Secretary-General, the Committee was convinced that such overlaps had been eliminated. It was therefore recommending an additional appropriation of \$1,029,600 under section 19 to cover the cost of the 12 new posts.

38. Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (Executive Director, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements) said that he simply wished to recall that the Advisory Committee had recommended the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General and indicated that he was prepared to reply to any questions which members of the Committee might wish to ask him concerning section 19.

39. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) said that Yugoslavia supported the appropriation requested for the Centre but he could not understand the considerable increase in travel costs. Table 19.4 of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983 (A/36/6, vol. II) showed that the rate of real growth of travel costs of representatives was 50.2 per cent while the rate of real growth for official travel of staff was 46.8 per cent. He could not understand that difference and wondered why a third category of travel costs, that of staff sent to service meetings, had been added to the two previous ones. Furthermore, he would like to know why those costs had increased so quickly.

40. Mr. MALKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that the information in tables 19.1 and 19.3 of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983 (A/36/6, vol. II), according to which estimated expenditure for 1982-1983 was 19.2 per cent higher than the appropriation granted for 1980-1981 while the rate of real growth would only be -9.2 per cent, was bound to mislead the members of the Committee. The additional appropriation of \$1,029,600 requested by the Secretary-General, and unfortunately approved by the Advisory Committee, corresponded to the cost of converting 12 temporary posts into established posts, which meant that the total percentage increase of appropriations requested under section 19 was not 19.2 per cent but 31.9 per cent. That was a considerable sum when set against the percentage increase for the budget as a whole, 13.67 per cent.

41. His delegation was surprised that the increase in spending on policy-making organs should amount to 67.2 per cent and found it even more difficult to accept since it was related to travel costs, overtime and temporary staff. It was surprising that the Advisory Committee, which noted in paragraph 19.4 of its report that no progress had been made in achieving economies, had not proposed any reduction in spending on the Centre's policy-making organs.

/...

(Mr. Malko, Ukrainian Soviet
Socialist Republic)

42. With regard to the conversion of 12 temporary posts into established posts, his delegation reaffirmed that the Ukrainian SSR was in principle opposed to such practices. Since the Advisory Committee claimed in paragraph 5 of its report (A/36/7/Add.4) that overlapping between the work of the Centre and that of the regional commissions had been eliminated, his delegation would like to know the size of the resources freed as a result, because none of the documents before the Committee provided information on the subject.

43. Taking those considerations into account and noting that the Secretariat forecast an increase in costs to cover inflation, his delegation could not support the appropriation requested under that section.

44. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that he would like an explanation of why table 19.1 of the proposed programme budget indicated that the increase in estimated costs to cover inflation was 16.4 per cent while he had believed that the regular rate for Nairobi was 10 per cent.

45. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) said that his country was seriously concerned about the deterioration of the habitat in a large part of the world, giving rise to a critical situation that affected the political stability of the developing countries. Nigeria was convinced that the habitat was an area in which action by the international community could produce substantial results for the developing countries. The Centre, which was one of the newest services in the United Nations system, was an effective instrument for helping the developing countries to face the complex problems of the human habitat.

46. In order to enhance its effectiveness, the Centre should be provided with resources commensurate with its mandate, which was a matter of high priority for the developing countries. His delegation was therefore extremely disappointed to note that the habitat was one of the rare sections of the budget in which the Secretary-General had proposed a negative growth - one of -9.2 per cent. It hoped that the revised estimates in section 19 (A/C.5/36/15) would have the effect of compensating, at least in part, for the negative growth provided for in the proposed programme budget. An examination of the Centre's programme of work, which had been submitted to the Commission on Human Settlements at its third and fourth sessions, would show that there was a gap of \$10 million between the budgetary resources provided for and the resources required to implement the approved programme of work for 1982-1983. He assumed that, because of the guidelines with respect to zero growth, the Executive Director had not requested any additional appropriations under the regular budget, and since it would be necessary to alleviate the lack of resources from voluntary contributions, he urged Member States to make substantial contributions to the programme, to which his country was making its own modest contribution. Lastly, he fully supported the requests for appropriations submitted under the section, including the revised estimates.

47. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) appealed to all Member States to provide the Centre with all the resources it needed to fulfil its mandate. The fact that the requests for appropriations submitted by the Centre had been accepted in full by

/...

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

the Advisory Committee testified to the importance of the Centre's activities, which should serve as an example for other bodies. He asked whether the expenditure under the heading "other official travel of staff", in table 19.4, was justified by field activities.

48. Mr. PAL (India), referring to the growth in the human settlements programme, asked which of the explanations provided so far was the correct one. Was it a question of strengthening the Organization's financial credibility, reassessing the resources base while maintaining existing programmes, or restructuring programmes?

49. In accordance with the intergovernmental decision of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the growth rate for human settlements should be above average. However, the real growth rate for the major programmes had been -6.33 per cent and for the Centre, -9.2 per cent. He would welcome explanations on the subject.

50. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) supported the additional appropriation requested by the Secretary-General - which would make it possible to raise the real growth rate of the Centre - together with the measures envisaged by the Advisory Committee to prevent overlapping between the work of the Centre and the work of the regional commissions. He asked whether the resources assigned by the regional commissions to programme elements relating to human settlements had been or would be released as a result of the additional appropriation requested, as had been the case with respect to the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP).

51. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that Kenya followed the Centre's activities closely, since the habitat problem was particularly acute in the developing countries. His delegation hoped that the international community could provide the Centre with the necessary resources to enable it to fulfil its mandate effectively.

52. His delegation was extremely disappointed at the application of the zero growth concept. It nevertheless supported the programme and activities of the Centre, together with the Advisory Committee's recommendations, on the understanding that the important programmes that had been excluded from the proposed programme budget could be included in the revised estimates for section 19. It also hoped that the order of priority assigned to the Centre by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be respected in the next budget.

53. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division), replying to the question raised by the United States representative, briefly explained how the Secretariat had reached the 16.4 per cent inflation rate figure. Since the resources for the biennium 1982-1983 were the same as for the biennium 1980-1981, if a base of 100 was taken as an example, an inflation rate of 10 per cent would give a base of 110 for 1982; for 1983, an inflation rate of 10 per cent applied to the 1982 base would give a base of 121; thus, for the two years of the biennium, a base of 231 (110 + 121) would be obtained, representing an increase of 31 over the

/...

(Mr. Begin)

resources base for the preceding biennium, or an increase of 15.5 per cent. Table 19.1 of the proposed programme budget showed a slightly higher rate (16.4 per cent), which took account of the anticipated inflation rates for post adjustment payments. There was a certain time-lag between the inflation rate and the rate of post adjustment movements, and the difference between the figures of 15.5 per cent and 16.4 per cent was explained by the delay in post adjustment payments to staff members in 1981.

54. With respect to the Yugoslav representative's question concerning travel costs, he explained that the estimates in that regard were drawn up with great precision, starting from zero, and not with reference to the amount of relevant appropriations approved for the preceding biennium. Detailed explanations concerning the calculation of travel costs were given in paragraphs 19.12, 19.20, 19.40 and 19.50 of the proposed programme budget. The appropriation requested was higher or lower than the relevant appropriation approved for the preceding exercise, according to the case concerned; when the amount was higher, that was very often for the simple reason that fares had increased considerably in recent years, and at a far more rapid rate than the rate of inflation.

55. Replying to the Indian representative's comments, he said that the Secretariat had set forth at length, particularly in paragraphs 19.4, 19.35 and 19.36 of the proposed programme budget, the considerations on which it had based its budget formulation. In paragraphs 19.6 and 19.7 of its report (A/36/7), the Advisory Committee had accurately summarized the situation and had stated that the Secretary-General would return to the question in a separate report, taking account of the experience gained in 1980 and 1981; he had added that if the cost of the posts in question had been included in the appropriations requested in section 19, the real growth rate for the section would have been 0.9 per cent. If the Fifth Committee approved the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/36/15, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, the real growth rate for section 19 would thus be 0.9 per cent. If the Fifth Committee approved the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/36/15, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, the real growth rate for section 19 would thus be 0.9 per cent.

56. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) asked how many women were employed in the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). If there was one programme in which the participation of women appeared to be particularly appropriate, it was that of the Centre.

57. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation intended to call for a vote on the section. He asked how the appropriation of \$31,700 requested in paragraph 19.12 of the proposed programme budget, under the heading of travel costs of members of the bureau of the Commission on Human Settlements and of members of liberation movements attending the Commission's sessions, was distributed.

/...

58. Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (Executive Director, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)), replying to the question raised by the representative of Morocco, said that, at the time of the Centre's establishment, there had been only two women staff members in the professional category, while on 1 October 1981 there had been 12. He assured the Japanese representative that there would be no overlapping between the activities of the Centre and those of the regional commissions, which were complementary. Representatives of the commissions had visited Nairobi in 1981 and were to do so in the coming years in order to consider questions related to the execution of the programme budget and to the medium-term plan. The manning table of the Centre showed no growth as between 1980-1981 and 1982-1983: it was merely proposed to convert into established posts those posts which had hitherto been financed from appropriations for temporary staff. He also drew attention to the fact that the budget proposals for the biennium 1980-1981 had in fact been only estimates, since there had been insufficient experience at the time to assess the situation with precision.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that it was difficult to reply immediately to the question raised by the United States representative. He asked whether that representative would agree that an immediate vote should be taken in order to save time.

60. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation would like to facilitate the Chairman's task but it would prefer the voting to be deferred until the next meeting.

61. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.