

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 14th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TALIEH (Iran)

later: Mr. GAMBOA (Venezuela)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 104: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

(a) REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 108: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 104: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

(a) REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued) (A/32/258; A/C.5/32/6, A/C.5/32/10)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on first class travel paid by United Nations organizations would be considered by the Fifth Committee on 29 November, after ACC and ACABQ had had an opportunity to comment on the matter. There would therefore be further discussion on agenda item 104 on that occasion.
2. Mr. SEKYI (Ghana) said that his delegation wished to take the opportunity to renew its confidence in the Joint Inspection Unit, and it hoped that the Unit's independence, provided for in its statute, could be kept intact. The delegation of Ghana was satisfied with the efforts that the Secretary-General had made to implement the major recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit, as reported in document A/C.5/32/10, and supported the recommendation of ACABQ to the effect that the Fifth Committee need not be presented with a compendium of information on the implementation of all JIU reports.
3. He was glad to see that the Inspectors were producing short reports, but he noted that in some respects the performance of the Unit could be improved.
4. With regard to the JIU report on evaluation in the United Nations system (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 52 to 53), his delegation agreed that at the present stage there might be no agreed definition of the word "evaluation", and it joined in the academic debate by stating that, although evaluation might be defined differently by different people, there was no doubt that a distinction existed between internal and external evaluation. In its opinion, internal evaluation was essentially a tool of management designed to assess efficiency, whereas external evaluation mainly concerned total or over-all impact on development of a country of combined programmes.
5. His delegation regretted that it had not been able to give proper study to the Unit's report on General Service staff of the United Nations and Geneva-based specialized agencies (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 73 to 78), but it was in sympathy with most of the comments made on that report by the representative of Belgium. As for the report on first class travel (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 68 to 72), it considered that a lot of money could be saved through the implementation of some of the recommendations contained in it, and it was therefore ready to work with like-minded delegations to see how that could be done.
6. Lastly, he noted that article 1, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Unit (annex to resolution 31/192) was causing some problems for acceptance by some specialized agencies. His delegation would like to know from the Legal Counsel whether the problem could be successfully skirted through interpretative declarations and, if not, how article 1 could be amended.

/...

7. Mr. SIBAHI (Syrian Arab Republic) said he was pleased to note that the Joint Inspection Unit, although a relatively new body, had been carrying out such varied and undoubtedly useful activities. It was also satisfactory to note the freedom of action enjoyed by JIU and the weight given to its recommendations.
8. With regard to the JIU activities described in document A/C.5/32/6, he particularly supported the recommendations deriving from the report on the implementation of the personnel policy reforms approved by the General Assembly in 1974, and hoped that the Secretary-General would carry out those recommendations within the time-limits set by the General Assembly.
9. The Governing Council of UNDP would also have to implement the recommendations contained in paragraph 66 of document A/C.5/32/6, concerning strengthening of the collaboration with the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, since those two regional organizations could make an extremely important contribution to the success of UNDP programmes. The Secretariat must also implement the recommendation made in paragraph 71, concerning first class travel, since the 11 United Nations organizations could thus make an annual saving of \$777,000.
10. Concerning the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the major recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/32/10), he said that the fellowship programmes of the United Nations system were extremely helpful to developing countries like his own, and he therefore hoped that those programmes and related activities would be intensified. It should be noted that the language problems mentioned in JIU recommendations did not arise in the case of the Syrian Arab Republic, because his country provided advanced language training.
11. His delegation endorsed the comments made by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of its report (A/32/258). In view of the heavy agenda normally assigned to the Fifth Committee, and the fact that its main task was to ensure that the United Nations was financially sound, it should deal only with the implementation of JIU recommendations that had administrative and budgetary implications.
12. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) considered that the appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit to be made by the General Assembly at its current session was a very important matter. It was to be hoped that, in spite of the somewhat complex procedure provided for the selection of JIU members in the Unit's statute (annex to General Assembly resolution 31/192), persons of recognized competence would be chosen for membership in that body. His delegation had stated at the thirty-first session that it would prefer a method whereby the members were appointed directly by the Fifth Committee, and he wondered what would happen if, in the course of the consultations to be held by the President of the General Assembly, there proved to be no agreement among the various regional groups. In any case he hoped that the Unit's transition, on 1 January 1978, from its present status to its new status under the new statute, would be as smooth as possible.

/...

(Mr. Kemal, Pakistan)

13. He was pleased to see, from annex I to document A/C.5/32/6, that JIU would evaluate the work of the United Nations Division of Public Administration and Finance. In view of the importance of the programme carried out by the Division, his delegation thought that the JIU evaluation should provide an opportunity for an in-depth analysis of the Division's efficiency and serve as an example for the evaluation of other programmes in the economic and social sectors of the United Nations. It should also help programme managers, the Budget Division and the competent intergovernmental bodies to improve their methods of planning and budgeting. It was also to be hoped that activities of that kind would facilitate future study of the "maintenance base" of the budget, and would help the Secretariat to implement General Assembly resolution 3534 (XXX), as reaffirmed in resolution 31/93.

14. His delegation trusted that, by taking a pragmatic approach, the specialized agencies would manage to overcome the legal difficulties that prevented them from accepting the new JIU statute so that they could benefit from the services that the Unit was in a position to provide. His delegation felt that the Fifth Committee, when deciding on the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/32/258), should take into account the comment made on the subject by the Chairman of JIU at the Committee's 13th meeting.

15. Ms. MUCK (Austria), speaking with reference to the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/32/258), said that her delegation associated itself with the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and was in total agreement with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that to discontinue the current procedure would facilitate the task of the Fifth Committee, which had a very heavy workload. However, her delegation would like the Secretary-General, in accordance with the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII), to continue to submit annually, without being requested to do so by the Fifth Committee, a report on the implementation of any JIU recommendations which were pertinent to the Committee's work.

16. On looking at the JIU reports listed in document A/C.5/32/6, her delegation had noted with surprise that the Secretary-General's report on implementation of major recommendations of JIU (A/C.5/32/10) omitted all reference to two reports, namely the report on country programming as an instrument for co-ordination and co-operation at the country level (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 46 to 51), which had already been discussed by the Governing Council of UNDP and the Economic and Social Council, and the report on evaluation in the United Nations system (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 52 to 58), which had been discussed by CPC. Although the Secretary-General promised to deal with those reports at the thirty-third session, her delegation would have preferred to have his comments at the current session, since the reports dealt with planning, programming and evaluation, which were subjects of primary concern to the Committee.

17. With regard to the JIU report on first class travel paid by United Nations organizations (A/C.5/32/6, paras. 68 to 72), her delegation agreed with the representative of Belgium that the item was of interest to the Committee;

/...

(Ms. Muck, Austria)

accordingly, the report should have been circulated to all the Missions and discussed at the current session. Concerning the comments of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/32/10 on the JIU report on some aspects of the strike at the United Nations Office at Geneva (A/31/137), her delegation would like to know whether the guidelines mentioned in paragraph 92 of the Secretary-General's report had already been established. It attached the utmost importance to the establishment of a new job classification system, a question which the Committee would have to discuss in detail when considering the report of the International Civil Service Commission on the question of salaries in Geneva.

18. The agenda item under consideration was so broad in scope that it could well serve as the item under which the Secretary-General informed the Committee not only of the methods by which he intended to implement JIU recommendations but also of the more general trends in administration, finance, personnel and management.

19. Mr. ELDON (United Kingdom) emphasized his delegation's strong support for JIU and the work that it did within the United Nations system. His delegation had had some reservations about the new JIU statute adopted at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, but it would abide by the Assembly's decision. Inspection and evaluation were the corner-stones of the good management techniques needed to ensure the efficiency of any organization, and the inspections carried out by JIU were an essential part of the mechanism for ensuring efficient administration within the United Nations system. The resources of JIU had recently been expanded to enable it to exercise its new role with regard to evaluation in the United Nations system, and his delegation considered that JIU could play a most useful role in that respect.

20. His delegation hoped that those organizations which had not yet been able to notify the Secretary-General of their full acceptance of the new JIU statute would do so as soon as possible. It recognized that in some cases there might be difficulties over article 1, paragraph 2, of the new statute but, like the delegation of Ghana, it hoped that the executive heads of the agencies would take any constitutional action that might be necessary as soon as possible.

21. With regard to the two documents which were before the Committee (A/C.5/32/6 and 10), his delegation supported the recommendation in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/32/253) that the current procedure for the issue of reports on the implementation of major recommendations of JIU should be discontinued. It considered that in future the Secretary-General should prepare only such reports as were requested by the various bodies competent to ask for them under article 12 of the JIU statute. In his delegation's opinion, such a procedure would mean that the Committee would continue to be adequately informed of the progress of the implementation of those JIU recommendations which were of interest to it. An additional merit of the procedure would be to reduce the endless flow of documents which delegations were expected to study during the session.

22. Mr. WILSKI (Poland), speaking with reference to the ninth annual report of JIU (A/C.5/32/6), acknowledged the contribution made by JIU to the efforts of the General Assembly aimed at rationalizing and improving the administration and

/...

(Mr. Wilski, Poland)

management of the United Nations and observed that the most important question regarding JIU was the implementation of those recommendations which had already been approved.

23. His delegation considered that JIU should take greater account of the discussions held in the Fifth Committee when determining the problems which evoked special interest. His own delegation, for example, would be interested in a report on the application of rules and guidelines on the use of experts and consultants in the United Nations. The subjects examined by JIU should be selected carefully and, in that regard, his delegation had considerable doubts as to the relevance of the report on the implications of additional languages in the United Nations system. The General Assembly, in resolution 31/192, had invited the organizations within the United Nations system to notify the Secretary-General of the acceptance of the new JIU statute; he asked which agencies had already done so. He expressed the hope that future JIU reports would contain more specific and workable recommendations.

24. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to comment on several aspects of the ninth annual report of JIU (A/C.5/32/6), including the implementation of the new JIU statute, the institution of the new evaluation function, the election of new members of JIU and the JIU reports on first class travel paid by United Nations organizations and on General Service staff of the United Nations and Geneva-based specialized agencies.

25. His delegation looked forward to January 1978 when the new JIU statute would come into effect. It was appropriate that JIU should assume new functions in the United Nations system. The new statute had been adopted with a view to ensuring both a constructive search for ways of improving the system and the formulation of authoritative, just and impartial recommendations to that end.

26. His delegation attached particular importance to the new evaluation function which JIU would begin to perform the following year and thought that the report of JIU on that function was a blend of pragmatism and wisdom. He welcomed the way in which JIU had approached its new responsibilities and supported JIU in that respect.

27. It seemed particularly timely to draw attention to the complexity of the procedure for electing new members of JIU. The time remaining to complete the elections was short and all parties would therefore have to co-operate fully.

28. His delegation had noted with particular interest that portion of the annual report of JIU (A/C.5/32/6) concerning the Unit's study of the use of first class travel by United Nations organizations (paras. 68 to 72). He endorsed the remarks of the representatives of Austria, Belgium, Indonesia and Syria, who had suggested that it was time to devote special attention to the question of travel since the sums that could be saved by drastically reducing first class travel were by no means negligible; his delegation would be happy to join with other interested delegations in pursuing the matter. In the meantime, he commended the decision of the members of JIU to set an example by travelling economy class.

/...

(Mr. Cunningham, United States)

29. His delegation was also particularly interested in the report of JIU concerning General Service staff of the United Nations and Geneva-based specialized agencies (paras. 73 to 78). It was concerned by the deficiencies mentioned by JIU with respect to job classification, promotion procedures, career development and in-service training. The existence of so many problems in areas fundamental to the orderly operation of a personnel system seemed inconsistent with the maturity of the United Nations.

30. His delegation had also noted the recommendation made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee with regard to the referral of reports of JIU to the Fifth Committee and could not agree with the recommendation to discontinue the existing procedure whereby information on the implementation of all reports of JIU was referred to the Fifth Committee. Those matters fell within the ambit of the Fifth Committee, which was the proper body to receive and review such reports. Accordingly, his delegation supported the views expressed by the representatives of Austria, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany and Ghana. It did not differ with the view of the representative of Sierra Leone that other United Nations bodies might follow up such reports, but it believed that the Fifth Committee had a responsibility in that respect.

31. Mr. Gamboa (Venezuela) took the Chair.

32. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation had always taken a great interest in the work of JIU, which, acting within the framework of its new statute and the extension of its functions, would continue to make a particularly useful contribution to the United Nations. He had no comments to make on the annual report of JIU (A/C.5/32/6) or on the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of major recommendations of JIU (A/C.5/32/10), but he reserved the right to make a further statement if any other reports of JIU were discussed in the context of a given agenda item.

33. With respect to the report of ACABQ (A/32/258), his delegation could accept the Advisory Committee's suggestions that the existing procedure should be simplified in order to avoid the preparation and distribution of documents of doubtful value, but the reservations expressed by Mr. Bertrand and various delegations in that respect should be examined. From the legal point of view, it might be asked whether the provisions of paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII) were valid or whether they had been superseded as a result of the adoption of the new statute. From the practical point of view, the Fifth Committee, because of its special responsibilities, might wish to have an over-all view of the implementation of the recommendations of JIU in order to see which recommendations had been implemented, which had not and why. The two points of view might not be irreconcilable. The representative of Belgium had offered to seek a compromise formula and to submit it to the Committee, and his delegation had complete confidence in the results of that initiative.

34. Mr. Talieh (Iran) resumed the Chair.

35. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to the various questions and points raised by members of the Committee,

/...

(Mr. Davidson)

referred first of all to the status of the new statute of JIU (General Assembly resolution 31/192, annex). His reply in that respect would be incomplete, but he was able to say that, so far, some specialized agencies had accepted the statute without reservation, others had accepted it with reservations, particularly with respect to article 1, paragraph 2, and others, which had still not been able to endorse the statute for constitutional reasons, had recommended its acceptance by their respective legislative organs and in the meantime were complying with the provisions of the statute on a voluntary basis; it could be assumed that they would contribute to the costs of JIU as appropriate.

36. WHO and ICAO had already accepted the statute; ILO had accepted it with one small reservation concerning the procedure to be followed with respect to the distribution of documents; UNESCO would be examining the matter at its General Conference, to be held in October 1978, and in the meantime it would co-operate on a de facto basis; FAO would recommend that the statute be accepted with reservations by the Conference which would meet in November and December 1978; UPU and ITU accepted the statute with reservations related to article 1, paragraph 2, and to constitutional issues resulting from the fact that their legislative organs did not meet every year; WMO would examine the question at its Congress to be held in April 1979, and it was highly likely that in the meantime it would decide to co-operate on a de facto basis and make the appropriate financial contribution; finally, the executive organ of IMCO would recommend that the statute be accepted by the Assembly, which would meet in November 1977.

37. The difficulties faced by some agencies with respect to the statute were technical in nature and did not involve questions of substance, and there was nothing to indicate that they would not be prepared to co-operate fully in that respect. Attention should be drawn to certain specific problems, particularly those related to article 1, paragraph 2, which stated that the Unit would be a subsidiary organ of the legislative bodies of the organizations. The statutes of some organizations made no provision for the existence of subsidiary organs. Another problem was to decide which body in an organization had the authority to decide whether to accept the statute or not. Legal advice had been sought in that respect, and it was thought that the difficulty could be overcome by leaving each organization to settle the question on its own. Another problem was knowing whether the statute could be accepted with reservations. The statute contained no provision specifically authorizing acceptance with reservations, but a number of decisions taken by the International Court of Justice in connexion with other matters suggested that, even in the absence of such a provision, a party to an international instrument could adhere to that instrument with reservations, leaving it to the other parties to decide whether those reservations were acceptable or not.

38. The procedure for the appointment of the members of the Unit, which was set out in article 3, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the statute, was complex. Every possible effort had been made to speed up the procedure, in respect of which, however,

/...



(Mr. Davidson)

there was no provision for settling possible disagreements between countries regarding the selection of candidates. It was hoped that the regional groups would co-operate in that respect.

39. As for the procedure for the submission of the reports of JIU, he drew attention to article 11, paragraph 4 (a) and (b), of the Unit's statute, which provided that the reports should be submitted to the executive heads of the organizations concerned and should be translated. Those provisions, which would enter into force on 1 January 1978, were in line with the practice followed to date. Moreover, subparagraph (e) stipulated that when a report concerned more than one organization, it should be submitted together with the comments of the executive heads to the competent organs of the organizations not later than six months after receipt of the Unit's report.

40. The various JIU reports to which reference had been made in the debate were at different stages of that procedure. The report on first class travel paid by United Nations organizations had been received on 26 July 1977 and it was assumed that it had also been sent to executive heads. It would shortly be circulated officially, once it had been translated into all the official languages. It was intended that ACC should submit its comments on that matter in time for the Fifth Committee to take a decision during the current session. A different situation prevailed with regard to the reports on the implications of additional languages in the United Nations system and on General Service staff of the United Nations and Geneva-based specialized agencies, which had been received on 20 and 15 August 1977 respectively. It was doubtful whether the General Assembly would be able to consider either of those reports at the current session since the joint comments of the executive heads must be received beforehand. Those reports would, however, be distributed in the official languages in the course of the next few weeks.

41. The report on evaluation in the United Nations system had been transmitted to CPC at the explicit request of JIU. An ACC working group had likewise considered the report, in order that ACC, following its meetings on 31 October and 1 November, might transmit its views to CPC and the Economic and Social Council. As was apparent, therefore, the problem of obtaining the Unit's reports in time for the meetings of the various governing bodies had yet to be resolved. In that respect, it had not been possible to draw up a time-table, but it had been suggested to the Unit that reports received before 1 July in any given year should be considered in time for submission to the General Assembly or to the appropriate body that same year, while those received after that date should be held over until the following year.

42. With regard to the content of the Secretary-General's report on implementation of major recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/32/10), it should be pointed out that the report complied with General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII), which required the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly on measures taken to implement the recommendations in all the Unit's reports. The Secretariat

/...

(Mr. Davidson)

would seek a legal opinion on the possible invalidity of paragraph 8 of that resolution in the light of the Unit's new statute. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that the Fifth Committee had not yet approved the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/32/258, para. 7).

43. On the subject of an earlier JIU recommendation concerning the location of the offices of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, he said that although the Unit had indicated that the Fund could operate without serious handicap if the offices were located outside the Secretariat building, it had recognized that there were real advantages in keeping the Fund's offices in the Secretariat building (A/C.5/32/10, para. 8 (ii) (b)). After careful consideration of both possibilities, the Secretary-General had concluded that the Fund's offices should remain in the Headquarters building; when the Fifth Committee had considered the Secretary-General's report the previous year, it had raised no objection to that conclusion.

44. With reference to the Secretariat's activities in connexion with the fourth recommendation in the Unit's report on some aspects of the strike at the United Nations Office at Geneva (A/31/137 and A/C.5/32/10, paras. 91 and 92), he said that the Secretariat, bearing in mind General Assembly resolution 31/193 B and particularly the provisions relating to the development of job classification standards for the General Service category at Geneva, had prepared classification instructions that included six evaluation factors. The instructions had been submitted to a working group of the Joint Advisory Committee at the Geneva Office so that the necessary consultations could be held with the staff. The Secretariat had also, with the aid of a working group of the CCAQ Standing Committee on Job Classification, drawn up a tentative structure of occupational groups whose definitions were in preparation. The results of the job classification study were expected to be similar to those achieved by ILO and WHO. Those two organizations already had job classification systems in operation. However, after careful examination, it had been decided not to adopt either of the systems en bloc since staff distribution among the various General Service grades differed from that of the United Nations. In both systems many more officials were concentrated in the higher grades than at the United Nations. For example, 12.6 per cent of WHO, 11 per cent of ITU, and 8.3 per cent of ILO General Service staff were to be found in the highest grade of the General Service category, while the figure was only 5.5 per cent in the case of the United Nations. Likewise, in the three highest grades the figures were 61 per cent for ITU, 45 per cent for WHO, 41.7 per cent for ILO and 37.8 per cent for the United Nations.

45. Part of the concern about the lack or inadequacy of a job classification system was the possibility of "grade creep", the tendency to promote staff on the basis of length of service and similar considerations. The figures cited seemed to indicate, however, that "grade creep" was less frequent in the United Nations Office at Geneva than in the agencies to which he had referred.

46. In the light of the progress made in preparing the job classification plan, it had been decided not to implement the interim set of guidelines for career

/...

ranges for General Service posts referred to in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/32/10, para. 92) since it would be useless to apply them only for a short period until the preparation of the job classification standards had been completed. However, work on the post description questionnaire would be continued (para. 91). One thousand four hundred questionnaires had been distributed, completed and analysed, 1,100 of which described in detail posts the holders of which, with their supervisors, had approved the relevant descriptions. Definitions of six pertinent factors used in the ILO system had already been prepared and a group of typical posts had been selected to be used as a basis for reference in the final instructions. Lastly, the draft instructions had been forwarded to the Director-General of the Office at Geneva in order that he should organize the necessary consultations with the staff representatives in the Joint Advisory Committee. It was clear that the preparatory work on the job classification system was practically completed. However, when considering its application, the delicate salary situation at Geneva should not be overlooked. The report of the International Civil Service Commission on that matter, which would probably pose very serious problems for the executive heads of the agencies concerned, should be given the highest priority and be very carefully studied. The question of the job classification system, which would inevitably have disturbing effects, must be considered in the light of the solution to that problem and be given secondary importance.

47. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that JIU should use a selective criterion in determining the subjects to be studied, concentrating on economic development. His delegation welcomed the Unit's report on Asia and the Pacific. However, it was worried about the co-operative relations between ESCAP and the intergovernmental organizations in the region. In that connexion, he would like clarification from the Secretariat about why only five of ESCAP's 381 "specific activities" should involve participation by regional and subregional movements of integration and co-operation (A/C.5/32/6, para. 38).

48. He fully supported the recommendation in paragraph 39 of the Unit's report (A/C.5/32/6). He also considered, with regard to the strengthening of the secretariats of the regional movements, that the officials seconded from United Nations agencies to those movements should be chosen on the basis of their familiarity with co-operation agreements.

49. With regard to the legal point raised concerning the handling of JIU's reports referred to in General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII), his delegation would like to know if the provisions on that point in Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII) were still valid. His delegation shared the opinion of the Advisory Committee that there was no justification for the Fifth Committee to receive reports from JIU which did not directly concern it. With regard to the constitutional problem raised by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, he hoped that the information submitted to the Fifth Committee would contain the opinion of the executive heads of the agencies on that matter.

/...

50. Mr. HART (Australia) said that his delegation did not wish to dissent from the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/32/258, para. 7) on discontinuing the present procedure whereby a compendium of information on the implementation of all JIU's reports was submitted annually to the Fifth Committee. It noted, however, that while some of those reports did not always refer to items studied by the Fifth Committee, there were many instances in which the Committee, by virtue of its budgetary powers, was in a position to influence the implementation of JIU's recommendations. His delegation would continue to examine JIU's activities carefully, and would study with special interest the qualifications of the persons recommended for nomination as members of the Unit.

51. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) thanked the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management for the information he had provided on the implementation by the Secretary-General of some of JIU's recommendations. He pointed out, however, that if the Secretariat possessed data to complement the information included in document A/C.5/32/10, it should have submitted them to the Fifth Committee before the latter began its consideration of item 104. Without them, the Committee had no alternative but to base its discussions on the documents before it.

52. His delegation quite understood that the problem to be discussed at Geneva was particularly difficult, as it had pointed out at the 13th meeting, when it had recommended, for example, that the greatest caution should be exercised with respect to the salaries of General Service staff at Geneva. In any case, neither the delicacy of the situation nor the new difficulties which might arise from the report of the International Civil Service Commission which the Fifth Committee was to examine within a few weeks should prevent that Committee from dealing with all the problems raised and especially the implementation of JIU's recommendation concerning career development planning for General Service staff.

53. The Committee's discussion had shown that some delegations seemed unable to accept the suggestion made at the 13th meeting that brief Secretariat reports should in future be prepared on the implementation of the recommendations of JIU. Those delegations seemed to prefer that the system established under paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII) should continue in force, although it was not yet known whether that provision would be valid after 1 January 1978, when the new statute of JIU came into effect.

54. Mr. SEKYEI (Ghana) requested that, in view of the importance for the Fifth Committee of possessing the maximum possible information on the situation at Geneva, the part of the statement of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management which concerned the Secretariat's implementation of JIU's recommendations on the career development system for General Service staff should be published as a Committee document.

55. Mr. BERTRAND (Chairman, Joint Inspection Unit) reminded the Committee that in his statement the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had said that JIU's report on evaluation in the United Nations system, after being examined by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, would be submitted to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with the usual procedure. That seemed to preclude its submission

/...

(Mr. Bertrand)

to the Fifth Committee. It was true that that report was intended primarily for CPC and the Economic and Social Council but, in view of the close relationship between evaluation on the one hand and budgeting and programming on the other, and in accordance with the provisions of article 11, 4 (d) of its statute, the Unit would like that report on evaluation to be submitted to the Fifth Committee as well.

56. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the Secretariat would comply with the request just made by the Chairman of the Joint Inspection Unit.

57. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the ninth annual report of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/32/6), the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the major recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/32/10) and the relevant report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/32/258). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.

58. It was so decided.

59. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, for the record, it should be noted that, until such time as a new decision was adopted on the matter, the procedures outlined in General Assembly resolution 2924 B (XXVII) concerning the presentation of reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit would remain in force.

AGENDA ITEM 108: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/32/146; A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1; A/C.5/32/L.8/Rev.1; A/C.5/32/L.9)

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to examine separately the resolutions before it (A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1, A/C.5/32/L.8/Rev.1 and A/C.5/32/L.9).

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. IYER (India) introduced the revised draft resolution in document A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, to which Ghana had been added. The first preambular paragraph recalled earlier resolutions on the composition of the Secretariat, especially resolution 31/26. The second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1 and 2 referred to the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat, paragraph 2 reflecting the general impression of the Committee regarding the implementation of the resolutions mentioned by the Secretary-General. Operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, which were procedural, requested the Secretary-General to redouble his efforts for implementation of the relevant resolutions and to provide data that would enable the Committee, at the thirty-third session, to evaluate the progress made, taking into account the

/...

(Mr. Iyer, India)

opinions and suggestions put forward during the debate. His delegation hoped that that broad reference to the suggestions which had been made would be acceptable to all members of the Committee. He and the other sponsors hoped that the draft resolution, which was basically a procedural one, would be adopted by consensus.

63. Mr. HART (Australia) said that the Committee had before it another draft resolution (A/C.5/32/L.9) which referred to several of the issues covered by the one under consideration; he wondered what effect the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 would have on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.9. His delegation had not yet been able to study the latter because it had just been circulated.

64. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said it would be preferable to discuss the two draft resolutions jointly, but only after careful study; as the Australian representative had pointed out, there had not yet been time to study the one recently distributed.

65. Mr. IYER (India) said that the Committee should first decide whether it wished to adopt or reject draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1; on the basis of that decision, it could take a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.9.

66. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said he had hoped it would be possible to study the two drafts jointly. It was important to note the differences between draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.9. Although they were similar in spirit, they could not be equated, since the latter covered matters which were not dealt with in the former.

67. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had decided to examine the draft resolutions separately and that the one contained in document A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 had priority.

68. Mr. HANNAH (New Zealand) said it would be preferable to examine the two drafts jointly, since they dealt with similar matters.

69. Mr. GANGA-MBALA (Congo) said he shared the concern expressed previously by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon concerning discussion of drafts which members had not had time to study; he was afraid that practice might be perpetuated. He felt that the text of the two drafts had certain points in common and he suggested that the sponsors should be asked to try to reach an agreement; that would, of course, necessitate postponing the examination of the two texts.

70. Mrs. ZEA (Colombia) said it was essential to have more time to study carefully draft resolutions which touched on substantive issues, as did the one contained in document A/C.5/32/L.9. Operative paragraph 7 of that draft resolution, for example, envisaged the promotion of qualified women staff members without taking into account the need for them to be from developing countries. That was an issue which would have to be considered by the Group of 77 as well.

/...

71. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) supported by Mr. SFKYI (Ghana) said that draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 had been submitted in its original form several days before and the revised version represented a compromise. As one of the sponsors of that draft resolution, he felt that the one contained in document A/C.5/32/L.9 should be considered separately, after it had been duly introduced.

72. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a point of order raised by Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that, according to rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, as a general rule no proposal should be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting unless copies of it had been circulated not later than the day preceding the meeting. Nevertheless, the Chairman had the authority to make an exception to that rule. With regard to the draft resolutions concerned, what was important was that document A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 had already been formally introduced and had precedence.

73. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said that his delegation would be willing to accept the suggestion made by the representative of the Congo. Furthermore, the revised version of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1 had been introduced during the current meeting and he would therefore like to have more time to hold consultations.

74. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan), referring to draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.7/Rev.1, said that in the view of his delegation the tone of operative paragraph 2 was too strong, as it practically accused the Secretary-General of not complying with the resolutions of the General Assembly. He therefore suggested to the sponsors that they should replace the words "does not sufficiently fulfil" by the words "shows only limited progress towards meeting the".

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.