



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 49th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 92: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1983 (continued)

Identification of activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Revised estimates resulting from decisions of the Economic and Social Council at its first and second regular sessions of 1980: Part II

Revised estimates under section 27 (Public information)

Organizational nomenclature in the Secretariat

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/35/L.111, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 61 (q)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the General Assembly in document A/35/L.30 concerning agenda item 20

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (continued)

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month 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.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/35/SR.49  
12 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 92: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1983 (continued)

Identification of activities that have been completed or are obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective (A/35/709; A/C.5/35/40 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions was unable to be present because that Committee was meeting concurrently with the Fifth Committee. On behalf of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, he formally introduced its report (A/35/709) and said that he had been informed that the Advisory Committee had nothing to add to the comments made therein.

2. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that the redeployment of existing resources through the identification and elimination of activities that had been completed, were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective was the most important tool available in achieving the common goal of exercising maximum economy in the financial management of the United Nations at a time of international economic difficulty. By that means, existing important activities could be extended and new ones introduced without necessitating additional appropriations, which Member States could ill afford.

3. His delegation had found document A/C.5/35/40 disappointing in that only 14 programme elements had been identified as obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective, and their elimination would release only some 297 Professional work-months for redeployment. In that connexion, he would be grateful if the Director of the Budget Division could indicate the financial savings that that would yield in the current biennium, although it was already clear that the elimination of those 14 programme elements, which his delegation supported, would scarcely begin to pay for the new activities which the General Assembly had authorized at the current session. He stressed that his Government would be unable to support any further appropriations, as they would add to the already excessive 2.4 per cent growth rate of the budget approved at the thirty-fourth session.

4. The failure of the Secretary-General's report to satisfy his delegation's expectations had convinced it that an effort should be made to devise new procedures. In that respect, it had found the proposals in document A/C.5/35/40 to be constructive and helpful. It strongly endorsed the Secretary-General's conclusion in paragraph 53; the identification of obsolete, marginally useful and ineffective activities should be built into the planning and budgeting cycle at four levels: in the preparation of the medium-term plan, in the preparation of the regular budget, in the performance reports, and in individual in-depth evaluation reports. An indication should be given of relative priorities in terms of programme and resource allocation, including the identification by programme managers of the 10 per cent of activities with the highest and lowest priority. Justification for continuation of the lowest 10 per cent would have to be given. The proposals should then be submitted to the appropriate

/...

(Mr. Fraser, United Kingdom)

intergovernmental body so that it could decide on appropriate action. Preparation of reports such as document A/C.5/35/40 would thus become an obsolete activity.

5. If such a system was to succeed, the initial task of programme managers should be facilitated by the mandatory application of intergovernmentally agreed criteria along the lines of those listed in paragraph 35 of the report. The establishment of such an integrated system would undoubtedly be a complicated, challenging undertaking. His delegation did not believe that the Fifth Committee could appropriately be expected to undertake what was primarily a programming task at the current stage. The body best equipped to tackle it in a comprehensive, co-ordinated fashion was the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC). His delegation would therefore be submitting a proposal in writing that CPC should be asked to consider document A/C.5/35/40 in connexion with the study of programme priority setting already called for under General Assembly resolution 35/9, and to submit proposals to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. In the meantime, the Fifth Committee should take action immediately on the 14 programme elements proposed for termination.

6. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) noted that the Secretary-General's report had been submitted not in response to General Assembly resolution 34/225 but in response to requests by CPC and the Economic and Social Council. He expressed his delegation's gratitude for the honesty and frankness with which the Secretary-General had reported on his future intentions. That seemed to mark a new approach, since previous reports had painted somewhat too rosy a picture, and had unduly raised the expectations of many Member States as to the true effect of eliminating activities that had been completed, or were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. Nevertheless, the exercise in question remained one of the most important managerial tools available to the Secretariat for improving the effectiveness of United Nations activities and offsetting, to some extent, the cost of the ever-growing number of new activities.

7. The Secretary-General had laid stress on the need for some kind of ongoing identification of obsolete activities as an integral part of programme planning. However, as his delegation had made clear in its statement on the medium-term plan, it viewed the preparation of the programme budget as one of the levels of programming and planning, and would like to see the identification of obsolete or ineffective activities closely linked to that process. The comments of the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services as to the kind of relationship he foresaw between the programme budget and the identification of activities that had been completed or were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective would be most welcome. It would be interesting to know, furthermore, in what form the Secretary-General would inform the General Assembly of the results of the exercise. He wondered, for instance, whether there would be a separate section on the subject in the foreword to the proposed programme budget or perhaps in the body of the budget itself.

8. His delegation had the impression that there was a distinct change of tone in the report in comparison to the one submitted to the thirty-fourth session. If

/...

(Mr. Abraszewski, Poland)

the Secretary-General was indeed taking a new conceptual approach, it would be interesting to know exactly what it was. There would appear to have been a shift in emphasis from budgeting to programming. Understandably, CPC had an important role to play in the exercise, but his delegation wondered which particular office of the Secretariat would be involved in the task.

9. Referring to the conclusions contained in paragraphs 52 et seq. of the report, he said that his delegation found it difficult to accept the statement in paragraph 52 to the effect that the Secretary-General had been dealing with the matter for only 14 months, since the first request had been made to him in General Assembly resolution 3534 (XXX). More substantial results could have been expected after such a long period. Bearing that in mind, his delegation requested further clarification in respect of the Secretary-General's suggestion that the comprehensive report on the implementation of that resolution should be deferred until the thirty-seventh session. He would reserve further comment pending receipt of the answers to his questions.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General's representatives had informed him that they would not be in a position to reply until the following meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)  
(A/35/30 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/37, A/C.5/35/39 and A/C.5/35/61; A/C.5/35/L.31)

11. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had received fairly satisfactory replies from the Acting Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) and from the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services to the questions it had raised. However, in a number of cases, no answers had been given, or those given had not been entirely satisfactory.

12. Information had still not been provided on the financial implications of all the decisions adopted by ICSC during 1980. It was his delegation's belief that Member States must be kept informed of those financial implications and, in that connexion, he reaffirmed the views it had already expressed on the matter. Likewise, document A/C.5/35/WG.1/CRP.9 provided only a partial answer to the queries raised on job classification. It had still not been explained how the classification system proposed by ICSC could be linked to and made compatible with the Noblemaire principle. Neither had any substantive information been provided to indicate that the organizations were indeed having increasing difficulties recruiting and retaining the necessary staff. However, the absence of a reply could be considered a reply in itself. His delegation therefore drew the conclusion that the ICSC thesis was somewhat artificial and did not reflect the true state of affairs.

13. Regarding the Tax Equalization Fund, he said that it was obvious from the reply received that the General Assembly had never taken a specific decision to justify the introduction of rule 105.3 of the Financial Regulations. In his delegation's opinion the rule was neither justified nor appropriate. Member States could not and should not be expected to bear the costs arising from the increased

/...

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

taxation of United Nations staff members who were citizens of certain countries. It therefore welcomed the intention of ICSC to study the whole problem, but believed that it should be asked to report on the outcome of its work at the thirty-sixth session.

14. Lastly, he welcomed the assurance from the Acting Chairman of ICSC that an effort would be made to ensure that future reports were shorter, more readily comprehensible and free of repetition.

Revised estimates resulting from decisions of the Economic and Social Council at its first and second regular sessions of 1980: Part II (A/35/7/Add.16; A/C.5/35/23 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)

15. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the report of the Advisory Committee contained in document A/35/7/Add.16, and said that he had been asked by the Chairman of that Committee to inform the Fifth Committee that the Advisory Committee had no further comment to make thereon.

16. He suggested that the Fifth Committee should endorse the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and approve an additional appropriation of \$128,100 under section 12 of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, together with an additional appropriation of \$9,600 under section 31, to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

17. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under section 27 (Public information) (A/35/7/Add.19; A/C.5/35/52)

18. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the report of the Advisory Committee contained in document A/35/7/Add.19, and said that the Chairman of that Committee had asked him to inform the Fifth Committee that the Advisory Committee had nothing to add to the information contained in that report.

19. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that Development Forum was the only regular publication of the United Nations in the economic and social field, and its importance as an inter-agency publication for the dissemination of the objectives of the new international economic order had been confirmed, inter alia, in General Assembly resolution 34/182. The Nordic delegations had therefore supported the appropriation of a sum of \$200,000 for 1980 as an interim measure to stabilize the periodical's precarious financial situation, at the same time emphasizing the need for a long-term solution. They could therefore support the request of the Secretary-General that the same sum should be appropriated for 1981. At the same time, they had noted with concern the expected decline in income, which would reduce the number of issues in 1981 from 10 to 8. Ways and means should be sought to avoid that.

20. Lastly, the Nordic delegations welcomed the plan for a long-term solution devised by the Joint United Nations Information Committee. That solution, which

/...

(Ms. Mustonen, Finland)

was based on predictable voluntary contributions, financial support from the business edition, and a grant from the regular budget, was worthy of consideration. The Nordic delegations looked forward to an agreement being reached among participating organizations as to the organizations' respective contributions, following which they would determine their position on the final scheme and the relationship of its various parts in the long-term financing of the publication.

21. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation had already expressed its views on the Development Forum in the course of the debate in the Special Political Committee. It was a serious publication which enjoyed the respect, not only of experts, but of every one interested in development issues. The reduction of delays in the publication of the French version and the possibility of publication in other official languages in the future were encouraging. The publication could, in his delegation's view, be somewhat improved if it dealt with a more limited range of topics in greater detail. Nevertheless, his delegation would enthusiastically support the appropriation requested.

22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should approve an additional appropriation of \$200,000 under section 27 of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, and that it should take note of the observations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 11 of its report (A/35/7/Add.19).

23. It was so decided.

24. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, unfortunately, the Chairman had not noticed his delegation's request for a vote before the decision was taken. In the event, it wished to announce that had the additional appropriation been put to the vote, it would have voted against it.

25. The CHAIRMAN apologized for not having noticed that a vote had been requested.

26. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, had the additional appropriation been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted against it, on the basis of the views it had already expressed in detail at the thirty-fourth session on the transfer of expenditure for the Development Forum to the United Nations regular budget.

Organizational nomenclature in the Secretariat (A/C.5/35/47)

27. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had asked him to indicate that the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Fifth Committee should take note of the Secretary-General's report. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee agreed on that course of action.

28. It was so decided.

/...

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/35/L.111, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 61 (q) (A/35/7/Add.23; A/C.5/35/74)

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had asked him to draw attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendations and observations in paragraphs 14 to 16 of its report.

30. Mr. Basharat ALI (Bangladesh) said that he was concerned over the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 6 of its report that the estimate of \$954,400 for conference servicing costs should not be included in the consolidated statement. It had been the intention of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.111, as orally revised, that the cost of the subregional review meetings should be charged to the regular budget. Such preparatory meetings were an integral part of the Conference on the Least Developed Countries and should not be divorced artificially from it. The Fifth Committee should authorize the Secretary-General to include his estimate of the conference servicing costs of those meetings in the consolidated statement.

31. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad), referring to section II, paragraph 11, of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.111, as orally revised, said that the sponsor had obviously intended that the preparatory activities for the Conference should be financed from the regular budget. He did not find convincing the Advisory Committee's reasons for rejecting the Secretary-General's estimate for conference servicing costs. The Fifth Committee should take a decision along the lines suggested by the representative of Bangladesh.

32. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraph 5 of its report to the effect that it might well be necessary for the General Assembly to consider financing all or part of the costs of activities recommended by the Preparatory Committee from the regular budget. The Advisory Committee was not prejudging any decision which the General Assembly might take on that matter, but, in the absence of a clear manifestation of the Assembly's political will, it felt unable to recommend the inclusion of the Secretary-General's estimate for conference servicing costs in the consolidated statement.

33. Mr. Basharat ALI (Bangladesh) proposed that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that all costs of the Conference, including the costs of the subregional review meetings, should be met from the regular budget, as requested by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/35/74.

34. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta), Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia), Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin), Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad), Mr. PAPENIAH (Central African Republic), Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria), Mr. RUGWIZANGOGA (Rwanda) and Mr. SAMAKE (Mali) endorsed the proposal made by the representative of Bangladesh.

35. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation was strongly in favour of convening a conference on the least developed countries. It was convinced, however, that the Advisory Committee must act in accordance with normal procedures and not make recommendations to the Fifth Committee based on the

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

intentions of sponsors when it scrutinized statements of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General. The Fifth Committee, for its part, should not criticize the Advisory Committee when it acted properly and in accordance with its legal mandate. Paragraph 11 in section II of the draft resolution clearly required the Secretary-General to meet the expenses of the Conference from within existing resources, and, in the absence of specific legal authority to charge those costs to the regular budget, the Advisory Committee had acted properly. The recommendations of the Preparatory Committee could not be regarded as constituting sufficient legal authority for that purpose. It was essential for resolutions adopted by Main Committees to express their intent clearly; it was becoming increasingly common for the Fifth Committee to be faced with resolutions containing provisions that were ambiguous and vague.

36. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that the Advisory Committee had a legal basis on which to authorize the Secretary-General's request, namely, paragraph 11 in section II of the draft resolution. The Secretary-General had indicated that he could not ensure the success of the Conference from within existing resources, and it was therefore necessary to provide the resources requested.

37. A recorded vote was taken on the Bangladesh proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

38. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 18.

/...

39. Mr. LÖSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany), explaining his vote after the vote, said that programmes and subprogrammes affecting the least developed countries were accorded the highest importance by his Government. His delegation had been constrained to vote against the Bangladesh proposal by its belief that the recommendations of the Advisory Committee should not be overturned and its fear that the Fifth Committee was becoming accustomed to neglecting the advice and expertise of that Committee.

40. Mr. SUEDE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he had voted in favour of the proposal on the ground that the Advisory Committee's reluctance to make an unequivocal recommendation on the necessary appropriations was an indication that it left the decision up to the Fifth Committee.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.111, as orally revised, an additional appropriation of \$670,100 would be required under section 4 of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, together with an additional appropriation of \$88,900 under section 31, to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1. Conference servicing costs not exceeding \$2,114,200 would be taken into account in the context of the consolidated statement to be submitted before the end of the session.

42. It was so decided.

43. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation sympathized with the needs of the least developed countries and the aims of the forthcoming Conference. Because, however, the Chairman's suggestion involved the rejection of a recommendation made by the Advisory Committee, his delegation could not have supported it had it been put to a vote.

44. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, despite its strong support for the Conference, his delegation would have abstained, if there had been a vote, because the Committee's decision disregarded a recommendation by the Advisory Committee and because it was convinced that some of the costs involved could be absorbed within existing resources.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the General Assembly in document A/35/L.30 concerning agenda item 20 (A/35/7/Add.22; A/C.5/35/86)

45. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 15 of its report (A/35/7/Add.22) and its observations, in paragraph 16, concerning the honorarium for the President of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

46. He suggested that the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/35/L.30, additional appropriations of \$1,435,400 and \$90,000 would be required under sections 2C and 27, respectively, of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. In addition, an amount of

/...

(The Chairman)

\$278,600 would be required under section 31, to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1. Conference servicing costs not exceeding \$4,405,100 would be taken into account in the context of the consolidated statement to be submitted before the end of the session.

47. It was so decided.

48. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not have supported the Chairman's suggestion had it been put to a vote because the appropriations were quite unjustified and excessively inflated.

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (continued) (A/35/7/Add.9; A/C.5/35/32 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 and A/C.5/35/L.28/Rev.1)

49. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the end of the 48th meeting the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had proposed the closure of the debate on the question of the Information Systems Unit. He invited the Committee to vote on the proposal.

50. The proposal was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

51. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) withdrew his proposal for the consideration of the two texts before the Committee (A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 and L.28/Rev.1) in reverse order of submission, and stated that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 on the ground that operative paragraph 3, requiring users to reimburse the Unit for the cost of services, was not in the interests of the developing countries or the less affluent Member States.

52. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that since the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 had agreed to incorporate the three amendments suggested by his delegation, he would vote in favour of its adoption.

53. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 were it not for the provisions of operative paragraph 3; accordingly, it had decided to abstain.

54. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that the explanations given by the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination made it plain that operative paragraph 5 of the United States draft resolution rendered the remainder of the text meaningless, and his delegation would accordingly vote against it.

55. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that he would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1, whose adoption would spell the end of the Information Systems Unit.

56. Mr. AWOKOYA (Nigeria) said that he found the United States proposal less definite than the Canadian proposal, and would abstain in the vote.

/...

57. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that, although his delegation had some reservations as to the use that might be made of the material in the Development Information System, it would vote against the United States draft resolution on the ground that its adoption would mean the demise of the Information Systems Unit.
58. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that he would abstain in the hope of securing the immediate future of the Unit and allowing it an extended trial period.
59. Mr. YUSUF (Somalia) and Mr. FALL (Mauritania) said that they would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1, whose effect would be to do away with the Unit.
60. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said he believed that the United States proposal was detrimental to activities benefiting developing countries. He would vote against it.
61. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation was prepared to allow the Unit another year in which to prove itself. Recognizing, however, that some positive features that had been introduced into the draft resolution as a result of negotiations, he would abstain during the vote.
62. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that he too would abstain, being unable to support operative paragraph 3. His abstention should be understood by those in charge of the Unit as a warning that its performance must improve.
63. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 was rejected by 33 votes to 22, with 47 abstentions.
64. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he had voted in favour of the United States proposal on the strength of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He had heard no argument to counter the Advisory Committee's view that the costs of the Unit should not be borne by the regular budget. He understood operative paragraph 3 to mean that organizations within the United Nations system would have to pay for the services provided by the Information Systems Unit but that Member States would not.
65. Mr. PAL (India) said that he, too, had voted in favour of the draft resolution, not because he believed that the Unit was not valuable, but because the work in which it was currently engaged did not seem to justify the allocation of resources from the regular budget.
66. Mr. BEGIN (Director of the Budget Division) informed the Committee that, if draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted, the salaries and common staff costs of the basic staffing complement of the Development Information System, comprising one P-4, one P-2, one G-5 and one G-4 post, would temporarily be financed from the regular budget. There would thus be a need for an additional appropriation of \$116,500 for salaries and related costs under section 6 of the programme budget, together with an additional appropriation of \$26,200 under section 31, to be offset by a corresponding amount under income section 1.

/...

67. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28/Rev.1 in the belief that its provisions would guarantee the continued existence of the Information Systems Unit.

68. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he would vote in favour of the Canadian proposal on the understanding that: firstly, the Committee's decision would not prejudice the decision on the Unit's future to be taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session; secondly, the Inter-organization Board for Information Systems (IOB) would submit an evaluation report on the Unit; and, thirdly, the Secretariat would take into account the points of view expressed during the debate on the issue.

69. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that he would support the draft decision because it provided for an appropriate interim arrangement for financing the Unit. He would have preferred, however, to incorporate in it the positive elements contained in the preamble and operative paragraphs 2 and 4 of the United States proposal.

70. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation regarded the continued existence of the Unit as both unwarranted and damaging. It would vote against the draft decision, and it would have no part in the financing of the Unit, in accordance with its usual principle of refusing to accept financial burdens transferred from extrabudgetary funds to the regular budget. He trusted that the Secretary-General could be relied on, in his search for activities that were obsolete, ineffective or of marginal usefulness, to investigate the Information Systems Unit.

71. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said he believed that the Unit was of some interest to developing nations and that the information it could provide was of some value; he had also noted the comments made regarding the Unit's potential. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft decision.

72. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation's abstention in the forthcoming vote was intended to indicate its concern that IOB had not yet submitted a report on its evaluation of the Unit.

73. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that although he was not satisfied with the Unit's current level of work he believed that its performance could be improved, and he would therefore vote in favour of the draft decision.

74. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that the Unit had not lived up to Member States' legitimate expectations. He would normally have voted against the continued provision of funds; but because under the terms of the Canadian proposal the Development Information System would be submitted to continued external evaluation and the Assembly would take a definitive decision at its thirty-sixth session, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

75. Draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 15, with 18 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.