



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

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

International Computing Centre - 1981 budget estimates

Revised estimates under section 28G. Electronic Data Processing and Information Systems Division - International Computing Centre, Geneva (United Nations share)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/35/L.31 concerning agenda item 99

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.72 concerning agenda item 65

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee in documents A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/35/L.26, A/C.1/35/L.30, A/C.1/35/L.19, A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2, A/C.1/35/L.46, A/C.1/35/L.16, A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/35/L.10 concerning agenda items 31, 32, 34, 37, 44 (j) and 48 (b) (c) and (e)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/35/L.19 concerning agenda item 91

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/35/L.35 and A/35/L.36 concerning agenda item 18

/...

\*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.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.5/35/SR.55  
22 December 1980  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 98: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The meeting was called to order at 8.05 p.m.

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

International Computing Centre - 1981 budget estimates

Revised estimates under section 28G. Electronic Data Processing and Information Systems Division - International Computing Centre, Geneva (United Nations share) (A/C.5/35/97)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, had decided to consider, and approve, the budget of the International Computing Centre (ICC). In the Secretary-General's report on the subject (A/C.5/35/97), the expenditure for ICC in 1981 was estimated at \$5,037,000, based on a rate of SwF 1.71 to \$US 1.00. The estimates in question were given in summary form in table 2. Table 3 showed the funding of the Centre, which was an interagency body serving the 12 organizations which provided funds for its budget.
2. The Advisory Committee recommended that the estimates for ICC for 1981 should be approved by the General Assembly. In part II of his report, the Secretary-General indicated the United Nations share, which he estimated at \$3,828,000, or \$691,600 above the appropriation for 1980-1981. However, he was merely requesting an additional appropriation of \$200,000 under section 28G. The Advisory Committee was of the view that, if supplementary financing became necessary, the question should be considered in the context of the performance report, by which time the United Nations total usage of ICC in the biennium 1980-1981 would be known.
3. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should recommend that the General Assembly approve the budget estimates of the International Computing Centre for 1981, as set out in document A/C.5/35/97, in an amount of \$5,037,000. With regard to the revised estimates under section 28G, in connexion with the United Nations share in the expenditure of ICC, no additional appropriation would be required at the current session, but the matter might, as appropriate, be considered in the context of the Secretary-General's performance report for 1980-1981, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.
4. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/35/L.31 concerning agenda item 99 (A/C.5/35/110)

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that in draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.31, which had been adopted, the Fifth Committee was recommending the establishment of three posts (one P-3, one G-5 and one G-4) in the Cost-of-Living Section of the ICSC secretariat. In his statement on the subject (A/C.5/35/110), the Secretary-General estimated the

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

financial implications of the draft resolution at \$100,000. The Advisory Committee noted that, contrary to normal practice, the Secretariat had not applied the delayed recruitment factor to the cost of the three posts. If account was taken of that factor, the requirements for salaries and common staff costs would amount to \$46,600. The Advisory Committee was therefore recommending approval of a total amount of \$67,800, i.e. \$46,600 plus \$21,200 for common services.

6. In paragraph 4 of his statement, the Secretary-General recalled that the specialized agencies which had accepted the statute of ICSC reimbursed the United Nations 63 per cent of the costs of the ICSC secretariat. If the Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted, the sums to be reimbursed would amount to \$42,700 and would be entered under income section 2. A further provision of approximately \$15,000 would be required for staff assessment, which would be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1.

7. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.31, an additional appropriation of \$67,800 would be required under section 28L of the programme budget for 1980-1981 and that a provision of \$15,000 would be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), which would be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1; in addition, estimates of income under income section 2 would need to be increased by \$42,700 because of the reimbursement by the specialized agencies of 63 per cent of the additional appropriation under section 28L.

8. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.72 concerning agenda item 65 (A/C.5/35/98)

9. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Classification Section in the Office of Personnel Services had been invited to decide on the classification of the Professional posts requested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 10 of the statement of administrative and financial implications submitted in document A/C.5/35/98. The Advisory Committee had been informed that the Classification Section had not yet announced its decision. It was therefore recommending an additional provision of \$70,000, in a lump sum, to finance the posts requested, on a temporary basis. Their permanent inclusion in the staffing table, together with their grading, would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983. Common services costs for the two posts were estimated at \$10,000; the Committee recommended that that amount be absorbed within available resources.

10. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his Government took a keen interest in the subject-matter of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.72. In paragraph 4 of the draft, the Secretary-General was requested to take the necessary steps to provide sufficient resources to ensure that the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs was able to

/...

(Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

discharge its responsibilities faithfully. It was to be noted that the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders had entrusted the Branch with additional responsibilities in seven important new areas, yet the staff of the Branch had been reduced from 12 to 8 - barely enough to permit the Branch to discharge its current responsibilities and clearly inadequate for the performance of its new functions. In the statement of administrative and financial implications submitted to the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.91, the Secretary-General expressed the view that the Branch's staff should be reinforced. The Canadian delegation concurred with that opinion.

11. The transfer of the Branch to Vienna gave cause for apprehension that the question of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders might be somewhat neglected. His delegation, which was anxious that that matter should be kept under constant review, wondered whether it might not be appropriate to establish a liaison office at New York modelled on that of the Division of Human Rights. The Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs had in fact proposed the establishment of such a unit. His delegation, although not yet ready to endorse the proposal, nevertheless took the view that it should be given serious consideration.

12. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) endorsed the opinion expressed by the representative of Canada. The idea of having a liaison officer in New York seemed to him to be worth considering, and he would like the Secretariat to state its position on that matter.

13. Mrs. de BARISH (Costa Rica) also endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Canada. Close co-ordination should be established between the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and other Headquarters units, Member States, non-governmental organizations and other bodies which were not necessarily represented in Vienna. Her Government was very sensitive to that problem of co-ordination, particularly as it had a research and training institute which served the whole of Latin America. Moreover, draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.72 entrusted the Secretary-General with co-ordination functions, the performance of which made it essential to establish a liaison office at New York. That idea might be examined as part of the review of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983, since the matter would in any event be reconsidered in connexion with the permanent inclusion in the staffing table of the posts currently requested by the Secretary-General.

14. Mr. BRODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that, while he also agreed with the representative of Canada, the proliferation of liaison mechanisms gave him some pause. The Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs already had a liaison office in New York, and he wondered whether it was justifiable for a branch of the Centre to establish a liaison office of its own. His delegation would like to know what was the established practice in that regard.

15. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Secretariat was conscious of the need for continuous liaison between the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs and the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch of the

/...

(Mr. Begin)

Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs. The Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs would see to it that such liaison was maintained and strengthened. The fact that the Secretary-General had not requested additional funding for the establishment at Headquarters of what some delegations had termed a liaison office did not mean that the Secretariat was not concerned to ensure close relations between the two administrative units concerned.

16. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said the Advisory Committee was very concerned that there was a growing tendency to expand the concept of liaison functions. In paragraph 14 of its report (A/35/7/Add.24), the Advisory Committee referred to a unique case where an organizational element in Vienna would establish a liaison unit with its parent department. The Advisory Committee expressed its opposition to the creation of such a liaison unit because the necessary co-ordination activities at Headquarters could be undertaken by the parent department of the Branch for the Advancement of Women, i.e., the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. Moreover, he felt that the establishment of liaison units of that kind was often proposed for reasons other than the reasons adduced. He said that the Advisory Committee would take into account the concerns expressed by delegations in the Fifth Committee when it considered future requests for establishing liaison offices.

17. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said he wondered whether the substantive department at Headquarters had sufficient resources to achieve continuity and comply with the mandates of the Sixth United Nations Congress and the Third Committee, because crime prevention and criminal justice was a specialized field requiring special expertise. That was an area of great concern to all countries, especially those in the Latin American region, as the position adopted by many Latin American countries at the Congress demonstrated. Because of its special links with Costa Rica, Panama was concerned about the question of liaison and collaboration with the Latin American Institute situated in Costa Rica. It was essential to establish an appropriate liaison mechanism in order to co-ordinate such regional activities and to provide the necessary continuity and integration of work in that field, in implementation of the recommendations of the Congress and the General Assembly.

18. The CHAIRMAN observed that no delegation had made a proposal departing from the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

19. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) inquired whether the Advisory Committee had asked the representatives of the Secretary-General about the possibility of transferring posts allotted to programmes with lesser priority. Such a transfer would have made it possible to avoid the establishment of new posts, as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

20. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee always explored every possible avenue for achieving savings. In view of the importance of the programme in question, it

/...

recommended that the posts should be financed on a temporary basis for one year, at the end of which it would reconsider the question.

21. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.72, an additional appropriation of \$70,000 would be required under section 6 of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

22. It was so decided.

23. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the Advisory Committee's recommendation had been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted against it.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee in documents A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/35/L.26, A/C.1/35/L.30, A/C.1/35/L.19, A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2, A/C.1/35/L.46, A/C.1/35/L.16, A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/35/L.10 concerning agenda items 31, 32, 34, 37, 44 (j) and 48 (b), (c) and (e) (A/C.5/35/101 to 106 and A/C.5/35/109; A/35/7/Add.26)

24. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General estimated total expenditures in 1981 under section 2B at \$426,000 and under section 29 at \$2,374,400. The Secretary-General's request for appropriations was limited at the present stage to \$426,000 under section 2B, broken down as shown in paragraph 5 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/35/7/Add.26). The related conference-servicing costs would be reflected in the consolidated statement to be submitted to the General Assembly before the end of its current session.

25. With regard to expenditures that would be incurred by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1, on the study on conventional disarmament, the Advisory Committee recommended that recourse should be had to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 34/231, of 20 December 1979, on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1980-1981. Therefore, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1 should not entail additional expenditures. The Advisory Committee also recommended an over-all reduction of \$83,800 in the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General for ad hoc expert groups, a reduction of \$20,500 in the appropriation requested for printing, and a reduction of \$23,500 in the appropriation requested for consultants. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending additional appropriations under section 2B totalling \$298,200, broken down in the following manner: \$27,200 attributable to draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, L.26 and L.30; \$97,600, to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.19; \$42,400, to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2; \$17,500, to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.46; and \$113,500, to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10.

26. The CHAIRMAN, suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the

(The Chairman)

General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/35/L.26, A/C.1/35/L.30, A/C.1/35/L.19, A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2, A/C.1/35/L.46, A/C.1/35/L.16, A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/35/L.10, an additional appropriation of \$298,200 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. The related conference-servicing costs would be indicated in the consolidated statement to be submitted to the General Assembly towards the end of its current session.

27. It was so decided.

28. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) emphasized the importance which his delegation attached to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2, relating to chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Since the reduction in the appropriations requested for experts and consultants, which was recommended by the Advisory Committee, was only a small one, his delegation could accept it. Canada also supported the resolution concerning the world disarmament campaign (A/C.1/35/L.46) and noted that the Advisory Committee based its recommendation for a reduction in the appropriation requested for consultants on the fact that there were staff members within the Secretariat who had the necessary technical expertise to prepare the study. His delegation requested the Secretary-General, as indeed did the draft resolution, to give preference to members of the United Nations Secretariat in composing the group of experts provided for in that resolution.

29. Mr. DEUTSCHER (German Democratic Republic), Mr. HOANG HAI (Viet Nam), Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. MORET-ECHEVARRIA (Cuba) and Mr. SLABY (Czechoslovakia) said that, if separate votes had been taken on the various recommendations of the Advisory Committee, they would have opposed the appropriation requested for draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2.

30. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that, if separate votes had been taken on the various recommendations of the Advisory Committee, his delegation would have abstained in the voting concerning the appropriation under draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1 and would not have participated in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10.

31. Miss GUIMARÃES (Brazil) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus in view of the fact that the Advisory Committee had considered that it would be premature to request appropriations at the current session in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.1. Her delegation was of the opinion that the Secretary-General should have recourse to the provisions of resolution 34/231, relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1980-1981, only when the Disarmament Commission had worked out the general approach to the study, and its structure and scope.

32. Mr. REIMERS (Denmark) said that the study envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.2/Rev.2 should be undertaken as soon as the Disarmament Commission had worked out the general approach to the study, and its structure and scope. Under the terms of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General was to submit a progress report in spring 1982 and work was to commence in 1981 so that, at its thirty-sixth

/...



(Mr. Reimers, Denmark)

session, the General Assembly could allocate the necessary resources for the study. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that it would be premature to request appropriations at the current session and consequently supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

33. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China), said that, if separate votes had been taken on the various recommendations of the Advisory Committee, his delegation would not have participated in the vote on the appropriation requested in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10. His delegation supported the other recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

34. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, if the administrative and financial implications of the various draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee had been considered separately, his delegation would not have approved the appropriations requested in respect of draft resolutions A/C.1/35/L.19, A/C.1/35/L.46 and A/C.1/35/L.10.

35. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, if separate votes had been taken, he would have voted against the appropriations requested in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2; his delegation had explained in the First Committee its reasons for opposing that draft resolution.

36. Mr. GUBSCI (Hungary) said that his delegation had been able to join in the consensus on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee but that, if those implications had been considered separately, his delegation would have been unable to support the appropriations requested in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.2.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/35/L.19 concerning agenda item 91 (A/C.5/35/82)

37. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, if the General Assembly adopted draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19, an additional appropriation of \$160,100 would be required under section 28 of the budget for the biennium 1980-1981. A further provision of \$10,500 would be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by the inclusion of an equivalent amount under income section 1.

38. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said it was indicated in paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/35/82 that, if draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19 was adopted, approximately 600 more meetings annually would be serviced with Arabic interpretation at Headquarters. That increase in the workload would necessitate the establishment of 18 interpreter posts in 1982 and 1983; if the posts already to be established were added to that number, the total was 25 new interpreter posts. It was indicated in paragraph 15 of the same document that the meetings of the International Law Commission, the Governing Council of UNDP and the summer session of the Economic and Social Council, for which Arabic interpretation services would be provided, would amount to a total of 280; in addition, there were the services that would be provided to the Governing Council of UNEP and to

/...

(Mr. Allafi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

UNIDO. He therefore wondered how the Secretariat planned to cope with the increased workload at Geneva, Vienna and Nairobi when no provision had been made for the establishment of new interpreter posts at those duty stations.

39. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division), said that because of the deadlines it had had to meet, the Secretariat had not been able to make an accurate assessment of requirements as far as the services to be provided at offices away from Headquarters were concerned. In paragraphs 15 and 16 of document A/C.5/35/82, the Secretariat recognized the need to study that question in detail, and it intended to do so in 1981.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph 19 of document A/C.5/35/82 should meet the concerns of the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, since it indicated that any other requirements which might arise from the adoption of the draft resolution would be reviewed during 1981 in the light of ensuing decisions of the Economic and Social Council and that related appropriations would be requested through the Secretary-General's report on that matter to the thirty-sixth session.

41. On the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, he suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19, an additional appropriation of \$160,100 would be needed under section 28, consisting of \$110,100 under section 28 C and \$50,000 under section 28 D. Furthermore, an additional appropriation of \$10,500 would be needed under section 31 (Staff assessment), which would be offset by the inclusion of an equivalent amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

42. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/35/L.35 and A/35/L.36 concerning agenda item 18 (A/C.5/35/112)

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said it was indicated in paragraph 16 of document A/C.5/35/112 that, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolutions A/35/L.35 and A/35/L.36, a total additional appropriation in an amount of \$264,700 would be required. The Advisory Committee had studied the matter with representatives of the Secretary-General and had been informed that the programme of work of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples would be carried out from within the resources available under the 1980-1981 programme budget, amounting to \$325,000. Since, according to the estimates, the expenditure for the Special Committee's activities in 1980 should not exceed \$126,000 and, moreover, the Special Committee's programme of work for 1981 was virtually the same as that for 1980, the appropriations already made under the budget ought to suffice. Thus, at the current stage, the adoption of draft resolutions A/35/L.35 and A/35/L.36 should not require additional appropriations. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee recommended that, if additional funds were required, the Secretary-General should make a request to that effect in his performance report for 1980-1981.

/...

44. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolutions A/35/L.35 and A/35/L.36, no additional appropriation would be required at the current session. Nevertheless, if the appropriations already made under the 1980-1981 budget were not sufficient, the matter should be considered in the context of the performance report to be submitted by the Secretary-General at the thirty-sixth session.

45. It was so decided.

46. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in order to speed up the Fifth Committee's work, his delegation had not commented on the various revised estimates and the administrative and financial implications which had been considered and approved by the Committee. Nevertheless, on the basis of its position of principle, his delegation could not support the 1981 budget estimates for the International Computing Centre (A/C.5/35/97), or the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.31 relating to the establishment of three temporary posts in the secretariat of the International Civil Service Commission (A/C.5/35/110).

AGENDA ITEM 98: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/35/528, A/C.5/35/7, A/C.5/35/36)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.5/35/10, A/C.5/35/9, A/C.5/35/16, A/C.5/35/17, A/C.5/35/48; A/C.5/35/L.37 and Add.1)

47. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had established a working group to consider a range of personnel questions. He thanked the Chairman of the Working Group, the representative of Austria, whose patience and competence had enabled the Group to arrive at a consensus on two draft resolutions (A/C.5/35/L.37 and Add.1).

48. Miss MUCK (Austria), speaking as Chairman of the Formal Working Group on Personnel Questions, thanked all the members of the Group for their co-operation, which had made it possible to prepare the two draft resolutions before the Committee.

49. Under the joint responsibility of the representatives of the United States and Trinidad and Tobago, the Working Group succeeded in establishing new methods of calculating desirable ranges, as submitted in section II of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37. With regard to the complex question of recruitment, the Working Group had striven to establish, with the maximum objectivity and clarity, the recruitment procedures for posts subject to geographical distribution in the Secretariat. Because of its length, that text had been annexed to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37. In order to underscore the importance of the status of women within the Secretariat, the Group had decided to devote a part of the draft resolution (section V) to that question. On the other hand, in order to expedite its work, the Group had agreed not to include in the text of the draft the question of the

/...

(Miss Muck, Austria)

participation of staff representatives in the work of the Fifth Committee. A number of delegations were continuing their consultations on that matter.

50. Pursuant to the letter from the Secretary-General addressed to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/35/48), the Working Group had, after lengthy negotiations, reached agreement on a draft resolution that had been issued separately (A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1). Under that draft, the Assembly would decide to establish a committee of governmental experts to evaluate the present structure of the Secretariat in the administrative, finance and personnel areas. That committee would comprise 17 experts appointed by the Secretary-General through consultations with regional groups and with due regard to equitable geographical distribution. The Secretary-General would provide the necessary support to the committee of experts and, if he deemed it appropriate, submit his observations on the report prepared by that committee.

51. She proposed two amendments, of a purely technical nature, to the draft resolutions. In section V, operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37, the words "the provisions of Assembly resolution 33/143, in particular, section III" should be replaced by the words "the provisions of section III of Assembly resolution 33/143". The second amendment was intended to take into account resolution 35/5 of 21 October 1980 whereby the Assembly had declared, as a temporary measure, a one-year moratorium on the establishment of new subsidiary organs of the General Assembly. Consequently, the beginning of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1 would read: "1. Decides, as an exception to its resolution 35/5 of 21 October 1980, to establish a committee ...".

52. She invited the Committee to adopt draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.37 and Add.1 without objection.

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Director of the Budget Division would provide the Committee with approximate figures regarding the financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.37 and A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1. Subsequently, those implications would be worked out in greater detail and submitted in writing to the Advisory Committee. The Director of the Budget Division would also draw attention to a problem regarding the wording of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1: operative paragraph 1 referred to a "committee of governmental experts", while operative paragraphs 2 and 3 referred merely to "experts" and "committee of experts". The Committee should indicate its preference on that point because, if the experts were governmental, the United Nations would not have to defray their travel and subsistence expenses whereas, if they were experts appointed by the Secretary-General, it would have to do so.

54. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) indicated what would be the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1 on the assumption that the committee of experts were to meet for six weeks, holding two meetings per day, namely, two weeks in New York, one week in Geneva, one week in Addis Ababa, one week in Nairobi and one week in New York. Interpretation for the meetings would be provided in six languages and the documentation, which would also be in six

/...

(Mr. Begin)

languages, would be broken down into 25 pages pre-session, 50 pages in-session and 32 pages post-session. The total cost of preparing the documentation was estimated at about \$94,000, meetings services at about \$230,000 and travel and subsistence expenses for staff assigned to the Geneva, Addis Ababa or Nairobi meetings at about \$54,000, giving a total of approximately \$398,000. Since, by its resolution 1798 (XVII), the General Assembly had decided that "travel and subsistence expenses shall be paid in respect of members of organs and subsidiary organs who serve in an individual personal capacity and not as representatives of Governments", the figures which he had just mentioned did not provide for the payment of travel and subsistence expenses for the experts.

55. The Secretariat had not had the time to study draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37 in sufficient detail to be able to submit a statement of the precise financial implications. At the current stage, it could only put forward an approximate total figure of \$650,000.

56. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Director of the Budget Division had based himself on the precedent of a group of experts established in 1978 which was similar to that proposed in draft resolution A/C.5/L.37/Add.1. The financial implications presented by the Director of the Budget Division were purely indicative figures. Before the Fifth Committee could authorize appropriations, the Advisory Committee would have to examine a detailed and precise statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretariat and make recommendations on the matter. If the Fifth Committee believed that the United Nations should defray the travel and subsistence expenses of the experts, then it should introduce in the draft resolution a new paragraph whereby the General Assembly would make an exception to the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII). He invited delegations to state their positions on that particular point. He noted that a substantive discussion on the composition and terms of reference of the committee of experts had already taken place in the Formal Working Group and urged delegations not to submit proposals which might destroy the consensus reached by the Working Group.

57. Mr. DENIS (France) said that he would like the Secretariat to provide explanations concerning the establishment of a "globe-trotting" committee of experts. It had been his understanding that the problem which the committee of experts would study was not basically one which arose in Nairobi or in Addis Ababa but, rather, one which concerned New York. Furthermore, the Chairman had requested the Committee not to disrupt the consensus reached by the Formal Working Group but at the same time had suggested the introduction of an additional paragraph making an exception to the provisions of resolution 1798 (XVII), a matter that had not arisen during the discussions in the Working Group. That being so, his delegation could not at the present time state its position on the Chairman's suggestion.

58. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said he shared the concerns of the French delegation. He feared that, if the work of the committee of experts was too wide-ranging, its success would be jeopardized. The developing countries were prepared to agree to the meetings of the committee being held in different places provided that the Secretariat demonstrated the necessity of such a step, although they would prefer

/...

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

those meetings to take place in New York, where they had a greater number of experts who were more familiar with the problems connected with the structure of the Secretariat. However, if the Secretariat could satisfactorily justify the need to hold meetings in such a variety of places, his delegation would be prepared to endorse those proposals.

59. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he was surprised by the number of venues for meetings proposed by the Secretariat. He had understood that the committee of experts would meet in New York for approximately two weeks and would subsequently submit a report to the General Assembly. As to whether the committee should comprise governmental or non-governmental experts, he thought that the word "governmental" had not been mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution because it already appeared in paragraph 1. The problem could be overcome by specifying that the designation used in paragraph 1 also applied to the following paragraphs. With regard to the question of precedents, he cited the very recent case of the intergovernmental group of experts of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development entrusted with studying the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development. His country had participated in the work of that group. Travel expenses and subsistence allowances for the experts had been paid by the United Nations, although the body concerned had been intergovernmental. The establishment of a committee of governmental experts did not, therefore, seem to be incompatible with the payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances.

60. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that he too was surprised by the great number of venues proposed for the meetings of the committee of experts, which he had understood was to meet only in New York. Perhaps the Secretariat wished the experts to familiarize themselves on the spot with the problems of the regional commissions, or with those of the headquarters of United Nations organs. With regard to the question of the payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances, his delegation would not oppose the insertion in the draft resolution of a new paragraph making an exception to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII). However, it would be sufficient for the Chairman to state that it was understood that the experts would be entitled to payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances if they did not reside in the place where meetings of the committee of experts were to be held.

61. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) observed that the role of the Secretariat was to advise Member States on technical and procedural matters. The Secretariat had always been represented at meetings of the Formal Working Group, and its representative could have raised the question of travel expenses and subsistence allowances for the committee's experts. Instead of that, the Chairman of the Fifth Committee had made a last-minute suggestion aimed at derogating from the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII). It was to be regretted that such an important question had been broached so late.

62. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that he was taken aback by the financial implications which had been put forward and thought the wise course would be to refer the question to the Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, he believed that the matter could be resolved without difficulty.

/...

63. The CHAIRMAN said that the remarks made by delegations had provided the Secretariat with indispensable information. He agreed with the representative of the United States that the Advisory Committee was the most appropriate body to submit recommendations on the financial implications of the draft resolutions.
64. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he understood, from the remarks made by delegations, that the Fifth Committee had no objection to the committee of experts' meeting in New York, or to the payment by the United Nations of travel expenses and subsistence allowances for experts not residing in New York. The Committee could proceed to take a decision on the matter.
65. The CHAIRMAN said that the Director of the Budget Division should first of all submit new estimates, in view of the remarks made by delegations.
66. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee might clarify the procedure to be followed. The Director of the Budget Division had submitted figures based on certain assumptions. If he could submit other figures based on new assumptions, the Committee could then take a decision.
67. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Fifth Committee was competent to decide whether or not the members of the committee should be governmental experts and whether travel expenses and subsistence allowances for experts not residing at the place where meetings of the committee were to be held should be paid by the United Nations. The Committee could then take a decision on the basis of the statement of financial implications submitted thereafter by the Director of the Budget Division. The latter would subsequently submit to the Advisory Committee an official statement of the financial implications of the draft resolutions, which the Advisory Committee would consider, in order to be able to recommend the necessary appropriations.
68. The CHAIRMAN said that the Fifth Committee should decide whether or not the proposed committee should be composed of governmental experts. With regard to the question of travel expenses and subsistence allowances for the experts, the Committee could agree that those expenses would be met by the United Nations if the experts did not reside in the city in which the committee's meetings were to be held. The Fifth Committee was in a position to take a decision on those two matters immediately. Once the Advisory Committee had considered in detail the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions, the Fifth Committee could approve or reject the appropriations requested.
69. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he was surprised by the way in which the draft resolutions had been considered. The Director of the Budget Division had begun by submitting figures based on a series of assumptions. Subsequently, delegations had put forward other assumptions, and now the Committee was being asked to take a decision in principle. The existing wording of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37/Add.1 had been formulated by the Formal Working Group, and any proposal aimed at modifying it was too important for the Committee to be able to take a decision without additional information.

/...

70. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, at the Committee's next meeting, the Director of the Budget Division should submit new estimates which would allow delegations to take an informed decision.

71. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) agreed that the Committee should defer taking a decision on the various questions raised at the meeting. However, he would like the Director of the Budget Division to explain why the Secretariat had proposed that the committee of experts should meet at such a variety of places.

72. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Office of Financial Services, through lack of time, had only been able to submit assumptions which were not based on a predetermined plan. Those assumptions had, nevertheless, made it possible to clarify a number of points and provided a basis for new estimates. If necessary the Secretariat was ready to revise them.

73. Miss GUIMARÃES (Brazil) said that she was surprised by the number of venues proposed for the meetings of the committee of experts, since that question had not arisen in the debates of the Formal Working Group.

74. Mr. SAMAKE (Mali) agreed with those delegations which had requested that the Committee should not take an immediate decision on the draft resolutions. The question should be considered impartially and in depth, since it raised a number of important and sensitive matters concerning the structure of the Secretariat.

75. Mr. RUGWIZA NGOGA (Rwanda) proposed a drafting change in the second preambular paragraph of section V of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.37. In the French text, the phrase "Expressing deep concern" had been translated by "Exprimant sa profonde déception". It would have been more appropriate to have translated the English word "concern" by "préoccupation".

The meeting rose at 11.20 p.m.