



FIFTH COMMITTEE
66th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 8 December 1981
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand)

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

APR 2 1982
CONTENTS

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

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi

Common services at the United Nations Centre, Nairobi

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.32 concerning agenda item 31

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.33 concerning agenda item 31

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.19 concerning agenda item 29

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.101 concerning agenda item 72 (b)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.61 concerning agenda item 12

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.73/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12

* 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.66
16 December 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONTENTS (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.20 and Corr.1 concerning agenda item 64

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/36/L.13/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 120

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/36/L.17 concerning agenda item 112

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 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))

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (A/C.5/36/57; A/36/7/Add.14)

Common services at the United Nations Centre, Nairobi (A/C.5/36/39; A/36/7/Add.14)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee on United Nations accommodation at Nairobi and common services at the United Nations Centre, Nairobi (A/36/7/Add.14), recalled that at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, a revised project for the construction of the headquarters of UNEP had been approved by the General Assembly at a cost of not more than 254,944,000 Kenyan shillings (resolution 35/222). That revised project was described in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/36/57, which stated that the cost of the project had now risen to 269,581,300 Kenyan shillings, 14,637,300 Kenyan shillings more than the limit which had been set by the General Assembly. The report also said that, since tenders would not be opened until January 1982, it was not possible to state the exact cost of the project in Kenyan shillings. In paragraph 22 of his report the Secretary-General stated that the total cost of the revised project was estimated at \$27,078,200, of which \$7,942,400 had already been appropriated under the programme budgets for 1978-1979 and 1980-1981. Of the amount already appropriated, \$5,477,200 had already been disbursed up to and including September 1981, leaving a balance of approximately \$2.5 million for future expenses.

2. He said that the Advisory Committee, after giving the matter careful attention, had decided not to recommend approval of the procedure outlined in paragraph 24 of document A/C.5/36/57 for three reasons: first, it was not politically acceptable to allow the Secretary-General to change unilaterally a project which had been carefully considered by the Fifth Committee; secondly, changing the project might result in further delays and further expenditure; and thirdly, the cost of the revised project was unlikely to exceed in dollar terms the amount originally envisaged by the General Assembly. He drew the attention of the Committee to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 12 of document A/36/7/Add.14.

3. In conclusion, he drew the attention of the Committee to paragraphs 13 to 19 of the same document, which dealt with common services in Nairobi, and, in particular, to paragraphs 16 to 19, which contained the observations that the Advisory Committee wished to be submitted to the General Assembly.

4. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on common services in Nairobi, since his delegation had raised that question two years previously. He was pleased that 11 functions had already been approved and would be included in the operations of a single organizational unit. There were, however, still six functions which would be the subject of further analysis and consultations. He agreed with the Advisory Committee what, even though managerial authority was vested in each of the Executive

/...

(Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

Directors, the final decision regarding the common service functions should be taken in the best interests of the Organization as a whole. He was sure that the Executive Directors would take that into account. He agreed with the comment made in paragraph 16 of the report of the Advisory Committee that there was no need for separate conference and language services, and he drew attention to paragraph 19, which, echoing one of his delegation's original concerns, stated that staffing of the common unit should be provided to the maximum extent possible through redeployment. That appeared to be a sensible approach since there were already people in Nairobi engaged in administering most of the services listed. In conclusion, he said that he appreciated the progress already accomplished and looked forward to a further report at the thirty-seventh session.

5. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that since General Assembly resolution 35/222 had requested the Secretary-General to proceed, "without delay", with the construction at Nairobi, he would like to know why one year after that resolution had been adopted, there were as yet no bids to consider.

6. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) asked whether, in view of the delay in opening tenders and starting work, as well as the effects of inflation, the recommendation in paragraph 12 (d) of document A/36/7/Add.14 was still valid.

7. Dr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) assured the representative of Canada that the Executive Director of HABITAT and himself were determined to act completely objectively when deciding on the final allocation of common services. He pointed out that, before any recommendations on a final proposal could be put before the Committee or the Advisory Committee, he and his colleagues would have to be in a position to inform those bodies of the cost-effectiveness of the proposal.

8. With regard to the comments made by the representative of the United States, he said that document A/C.5/36/57 included a time-table which had been approved by the General Assembly. As indicated in that time-table, the tendering period was from November 1981 until January 1982. It had been made quite clear at the previous session that, if the General Assembly approved the modifications, 10 months would be needed to revise the design and that there could be no cost plan for the revised project until the architect's design drawings had been finalized. It had been indicated that that process would take until November 1981, which would be the date for offering tenders and asking for bids. That was precisely the time-table followed, despite the fact that, in approving the recommendations of the Executive Director, the General Assembly had added two main conference rooms, necessitating an additional month of design.

9. Replying to the representative of Ghana, he said that when the project had been originally submitted to the General Assembly, account had been taken of the expected inflation rate up to the time of tendering and an allowance of 10 per cent had been made for price changes during construction. The only change over the previous year had been the devaluation of the Kenyan shilling, which had resulted in an estimated 6.5 per cent increase in the number of Kenyan shillings required for construction. Therefore, the Secretary-General had recommended an additional 13 million Kenyan shillings. He felt that the Advisory Committee had been right in assuming that the original dollar equivalent of the 254,944,000 Kenyan shillings approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session would not be exceeded.

/...

10. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that the original approach with regard to common services had been to investigate the arrangements at Vienna and Geneva and to see how they could be applied to Nairobi. It had, however, been established that there was no direct comparability between the situation in Nairobi and that in Geneva and Vienna. He was grateful to the Executive Director of UNEP for raising the point that calculations with respect to cost-effectiveness would be necessary to indicate whether such common services would be useful or otherwise at Nairobi. He felt that the Executive Director would himself be in the best position to make such calculations as he thought relevant for submission to the Committee.

11. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) asked whether the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would specify the limit for the total cost of the project in United States dollars or indicate why a rather inexact formulation had been chosen in paragraph 12 (d) of A/36/7/Add.14.

12. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the representative of the United States, said that when the Advisory Committee considered the report, it had recognized that in dollar terms the current limit was \$27,078,200. He had just been informed by the Executive Director that that figure was incorrect. However, the Advisory Committee had had no other amount in mind when it had approved the report in document A/36/7/Add.14. But, as the representative of the United States would understand, it was not advisable, in the case of a project such as the one under consideration, to mention other amounts at the present stage.

13. Dr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) said that the representative of the United States appeared to be referring to paragraph 12 (d) of document A/36/7/Add.14, which would authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments, with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee, in excess of the appropriations, provided that the total cost of the project in United States dollars remained within the dollar equivalent of Kenyan shillings 254,944,000 at the time the General Assembly specified that amount as the limit of the cost of the project. The figure mentioned by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was the current cost estimate referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 of that document. He did not have the exact figure available in dollars but recalled that it was somewhere in the region of \$31,000,000, based on the rate of exchange on 17 December 1980, when General Assembly resolution 35/222 had been adopted. It was important to return to that equivalent, as reflected in document A/C.5/36/57, and to retain it as the ultimate limit in case the Secretary-General, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee, had to go beyond the cost estimate of \$27,078,200.

14. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that the representative of the United States was now prepared to participate in a decision on the Advisory Committee's recommendations in paragraph 12 of document A/36/7/Add.14.

15. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$19,135,800 under section 32 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1981-1983 for construction at Nairobi was approved in first reading.

16. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the other recommendations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 12 of A/36/7/Add.4.

17. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee in subparagraphs (a), (c) and (d) of paragraph 12 of document A/36/7/Add.14 were approved.

18. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would have voted against the proposal, had it been put to a vote.

19. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) said that section XI of General Assembly resolution 34/233 should be fully implemented; there could be no question of not performing work already authorized by the General Assembly. His Government was already concerned over construction delays. Future exchange rate fluctuations and cost inflation would be absorbed in the normal way.

20. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said that his delegation was pleased that the proposal had been adopted by consensus. The construction project at Nairobi should result in model facilities. His delegation attached importance to the regional commissions, and had spent some \$40 million to provide a permanent headquarters for ECWA.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General on common services at the United Nations Centre at Nairobi (A/C.5/36/39) and of the relevant paragraphs of the report of ACABQ (A/36/7/Add.14).

22. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.32 concerning agenda item 31 (A/C.5/36/83)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.33 concerning agenda item 31 (A/C.3/36/84)

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that draft resolution A/36/L.32 requested the Secretary-General to provide the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights with additional resources so that it could implement an expanded work programme. It further called for the holding of regional seminars and for more widespread dissemination of its publications in all the official languages of the United Nations. Four temporary posts, two at the P-3 level and two at the G-4 level, had been requested to help the Unit to organize meetings and seminars, which would lead to expenditure on conference services and on travel and subsistence. In paragraph 7 of document A/C.5/36/83 a request had been made for an annual allocation of \$300 for certain information centres for local distribution of information materials relating to the question of Palestine. Amounts of \$17,000 and \$209,000 would be required for the translation of pamphlets and for the production of a documentary film and photographic exhibit, respectively. The Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's total estimate of \$998,000, under sections 1, 27 and 28. Conference-servicing costs would not exceed \$2,140,400.

/...

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

24. Draft resolution A/36/L.33 authorized the convening of an International Conference on the Question of Palestine not later than 1984. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was to act as the preparatory committee for the Conference. It further requested the Secretary-General to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference and to provide appropriate assistance. The statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/36/84) indicated that the nature and size of the secretariat required for the Conference could only be determined in the light of the recommendations to be made by the Preparatory Committee. Some indication of the staff resources required was provided in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's statement, although no appropriation for that purpose was being requested. An appropriation had, however, been requested for consultants' services in the amount of \$30,000 and for travel of staff in the amount of \$25,000, which had been accepted by the Advisory Committee. A further \$622,800 for conference-servicing facilities would be reviewed in a consolidated statement.

25. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that his delegation wished recorded votes to be taken on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions. His delegation would vote against them.

26. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that the draft resolutions and their financial implications were unacceptable. At a time of budgetary restraint when valuable programmes were being cut, it was outrageous that the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights was being authorized to keep up its propaganda aimed at besmirching Member States. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Special Unit had contributed nothing to peace efforts in the Middle East. His delegation would vote against the financial implications of the draft resolutions.

27. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/36/L.32.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

28. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted by 75 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions.

29. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/36/L.33.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

30. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted by 78 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

31. Mr. FARIS (Jordan) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the administrative and financial implications of both draft resolutions, had it been present at the time of the vote.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/36/L.19 concerning agenda item 29 (A/C.5/36/85)

32. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that ACABQ recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's request for \$13,700.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that there would also be conference-servicing costs of \$38,300. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the

(The Chairman)

Advisory Committee's recommendation and to take note of the amount required for conference servicing.

34. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.101 concerning agenda item 72 (b) (A/C.5/36/69)

35. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to assist the Government of Sao Tome and Principe to prepare national income statistics to be submitted to the Committee for Development Planning so that the latter could re-examine that country's request for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries. The Advisory Committee accepted the Secretary-General's request for \$11,900 for travel and consultancy fees.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, having regard to the recommendation of the General Assembly that the Fifth Committee should not discuss recommendations of the Advisory Committee involving expenditures of less than \$25,000, the Committee would proceed immediately to a decision. He suggested that the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.101, no additional appropriations would be required, since it was the intention of the Secretary-General to absorb the costs indicated in his statement within the over-all resources available under section 1 of the programme budget. Should additional requirements arise in the course of the implementation of the draft resolution, they would be reported in the first budget performance report for the biennium 1982-1983.

37. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.61 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/36/82 and Corr.1)

38. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, under the terms of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would organize a seminar under the programme of advisory services in the human rights sector. It had been assumed that the seminar would be held for two weeks in Colombo in 1982 and that there would be 35 participants. Travel and subsistence and other expenses would amount to \$129,300, which would be absorbed within the appropriation under section 24 of the budget. There would thus be no additional requirements. The sum of \$344,400 for conference servicing would be included in the consolidated statement.

39. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/36/L.61, no additional appropriations under section 24 of the budget would be required. Additional conference-servicing costs, estimated at \$344,400 on a full-cost basis, would, however, arise. The actual appropriations that might be

(The Chairman)

required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements for 1982.

40. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.73/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/36/81)

41. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the establishment of the open-ended working group to prepare a draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who were not citizens of the country in which they lived would give rise to conference-servicing costs estimated at \$217,000. That amount would be included in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be considered at a later stage of the current session.

42. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/36/L.73/Rev.1 would give rise to conference-servicing costs estimated on a full-cost basis at \$217,000, which would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of such costs to be submitted later in the current session.

43. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.20 and Corr.1 concerning agenda item 64 (A/C.5/36/70 and Add.1)

44. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee would have the General Assembly request the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories to continue to investigate Israel's policies and practices in the Arab territories it had occupied since 1967. The various activities called for in the coming year were described in the Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/36/70 and Add.1). The Advisory Committee had concluded that the Special Committee's programme of work for 1982 would be essentially the same as that for 1981, and it concurred in the Secretary-General's view that an appropriation of \$283,200 would be required under section 23, together with \$39,000 under section 31, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1. Conference-servicing costs in the amount of \$356,600 would be included in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs to be considered at a later stage of the current session. The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should be so informed.

45. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that, in line with the position which his delegation had expressed in the Special Political Committee during the consideration of draft

/...

(Mr. Oron, Israel)

resolution A/SPC/36/L.20 and Corr.1, he wished to request a vote on the financial implications of the draft resolution. His delegation would vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

46. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

47. Mr. FARIS (Jordan) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/36/L.13/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 120 (A/C.5/36/74)

48. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee would, *inter alia*, have the General Assembly establish a working group of the Sixth Committee to meet during the thirty-seventh session to deal with the question of multilateral treaty-making. The Secretary-General would be requested to prepare documentation for discussion by the working group as described in paragraphs 4 to 6 of his statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/36/74). The additional resources requested, totalling \$37,500, included \$12,400 for the translation of certain documents. The Advisory Committee considered that the latter amount had not been adequately justified and that the translation costs should be absorbed. It also believed that the amount of \$11,400 requested to cover the services of a consultant should not be granted in full. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee, an additional appropriation of \$20,000 would be required under section 26 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

49. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted.

50. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while the Advisory Committee had rightly recommended a reduction in the amount which the Secretary-General estimated would be required to implement the draft resolution, it had not gone far enough to satisfy his delegation. Accordingly, had the recommendation been put to a vote, he would not have been able to support it.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/C.6/36/L.17 concerning agenda item 112 (A/C.5/36/77)

51. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, under the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee, the General Assembly would request UNITAR to complete work on a study it had undertaken concerning the progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order and would request the Secretary-General to submit that study to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session. The Secretary-General estimated that, in order to complete phase II of the study, UNITAR would require \$119,600 to cover the costs of one project officer at the P-3 level, five consultants, five research assistants, one secretary, and travel, subsistence and documentation.

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

52. The Advisory Committee noted that the posts of project officer and secretary were budgeted for 12 months; it doubted whether that was necessary in view of the fact that the report requested should be made available to the General Assembly by the beginning of the thirty-seventh session or shortly thereafter. The Advisory Committee was generally concerned that requests for Professional posts, whether established or temporary, were invariably accompanied by requests for secretarial assistance as well. He thought that some secretarial assistance already approved under section 26 could be made available for the project. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee considered that an amount of \$90,000 should be sufficient to carry out the project.

53. After the Advisory Committee had come to that conclusion, he had been approached by a representative of UNITAR, who had made representations to the effect that the amount of \$119,600 already reflected a considerable reduction of the original cost estimate and that any further reduction would make it impossible for UNITAR to complete the study requested in the draft resolution. The representative of UNITAR had also stated that, if the amount was to be reduced, it would be necessary to notify the sponsors of the draft resolution and the President of the General Assembly that UNITAR would be able to carry out only a part of the project by the thirty-seventh session, and that specifically it would have to forgo the use of consultants. He wished to pass that information on to the Fifth Committee so that UNITAR would not feel that its views were not taken into account. However, he was not convinced that the Advisory Committee's recommendation would make it impossible to complete the study. Consultants services and research assistance would still be available, and, if the Advisory Committee's recommendation caused any problem, resources under section 26 of the programme budget should supplement what ACABQ was recommending to ensure completion of the project.

54. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said it was his recollection that a substantial amount had been appropriated under section 26 of the budget for general temporary assistance. The Advisory Committee's recommendations therefore seemed valid. Since the Fifth Committee was particularly concerned with all matters relating to the control and limitation of documentation, it should be told why it had been thought necessary to request the Secretary-General to waive the rules on the control and limitation of documentation in the case of the UNITAR study.

55. Mr. PADUA (Philippines) emphasized the importance of the study requested of UNITAR, which had to be prepared by a competent group of individuals under the direction of a qualified leader. He requested additional information regarding the request for a P-3 project officer.

56. Mr. FRANCK (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that the project which the Sixth Committee wished to assign to UNITAR was extremely complex and onerous. Having completed a compendium of the norms and principles of international law relating to the new international economic order as contained in written sources, UNITAR would now be asked to examine the actual conduct of States and their instrumentalities. No other United Nations unit or organization could carry out such a study in the time allotted. The reason why it had been possible to complete phase I of the study in only one year was that UNITAR had assembled a small core staff comprising a law professor on leave from his university and a secretary who had been with the project since its inception and was

(Mr. Franck, UNITAR)

thoroughly familiar with its methodology. In addition, some 15 law students from 10 different countries, who were studying at United States universities, had been working on the project as volunteers. Co-ordination of the project alone was an enormous task. To suggest that the project had to be wound up in July was as good as issuing its death warrant. The project would not be successful unless the project officer was present when the report was considered by the Assembly, and unless the secretarial assistance was provided by someone who was familiar with the project methodology. The Advisory Committee was recommending false economies and, if its recommendations were adopted, UNITAR would have to abandon the study altogether to forgo the regional consultations which were planned.

57. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that, in pursuance of his policy of budgetary austerity, the Secretary-General had requested only \$7,400 for temporary assistance under section 26. That amount was far below what had been appropriated for the current biennium.

58. Mr. PADUA (Philippines) proposed that, in the light of the statement made by the representative of UNITAR, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution would necessitate an appropriation of \$119,600, as outlined by the Secretary-General in paragraph 5 of his statement (A/C.5/36/77).

59. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the comments made by the representative of the United States, said that he had been informed that the paragraph requesting the Secretary-General to waive control and limitation of documentation rules with respect to the UNITAR study had been deleted from the draft resolution.

60. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the \$90,000 recommended by the Advisory Committee would still provide for at least nine, and not six, work-months for a project officer and a secretary.

61. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) requested further information regarding the regional consultations referred to by the representative of UNITAR and asked whether, if the post for the project officer was funded for not more than nine months, some other UNITAR official could present the report to the General Assembly at its next session or whether it was absolutely essential for the entire project team to be retained during that period.

62. Mr. FRANCK (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that if the project officer and the secretary were employed for only nine months rather than 12, neither would be present when the General Assembly considered the item or would be able to take part in discussions concerning follow-up action. That was unsatisfactory from the point of view of both the General Assembly and UNITAR.

63. The student volunteers who were working with the project were invaluable but they did not have the necessary experience or expertise to carry out the regional consultations that were necessary for the success of the project. For that purpose, it was planned to engage the services of consultants, who would be recognized legal experts from the various regions. They would help process the

(Mr. Franck, UNITAR)

information compiled by the volunteers and obtain information that was not readily available in New York. If the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee was provided, UNITAR would be forced either to terminate the contract of the project officer before his work came to an end or to forgo the services of the five consultants. While the second alternative was the lesser evil, neither was desirable.

64. The project team comprised only the project officer and his secretary. UNITAR itself had no resources, beyond what would be provided by the General Assembly, to cover their salaries. There was no official in UNITAR to see the study through the various stages of consideration as effectively as the project officer himself.

65. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that, in view of the late hour, the Committee should defer its decision on the matter to its next meeting.

66. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.