



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



LIMITED

E/AC.31/L.13  
21 December 1949

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Ad Hoc Committee on Implementation

DRAFT ADDITION TO SECTION ON TIME TABLE IN E/AC.31/L.12  
SUGGESTED BY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

The Committee considered the relative advantages of a two or a three-year cycle for the purpose of reporting to the Assembly. In favor of a two-year cycle, it was argued:

- (1) that a longer period would not keep the question before the Council and the Assembly with sufficient frequency;
- (2) that four or five years was the longest period of time for which resolutions should be left without an inquiry into their implementation;
- (3) that reporting Governments preferred a smaller accumulation of work every two years to a larger accumulation every three years.

In favor of a three-year cycle, which was preferred by four Members of the Committee, it was argued:

- (1) that once every three years was sufficiently frequent an interval for consideration by the Council and the Assembly;
- (2) that a three-year cycle would allow a fairer and deeper assessment of what had been done;
- (3) that the longer period would enable the exclusion of a larger number of resolutions from the implementation procedure, thus cutting down the work involved.

-----