

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLYASSEMBLEE  
GENERALEA/497  
19 November 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES  
AND WORK PROGRAMMES OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED  
AGENCIESREPORT OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE JOINT SECOND AND THIRD COMMITTEE AND  
THE FIFTH COMMITTEERapporteurs: Mr. Finn MOE (Norway)  
Mr. R. Hichens BERGSTROM (Sweden)I. Introduction

1. The subject of relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies and work programmes of the United Nations and specialized agencies came under discussion in the Second Committee in its consideration of item 11 of the Agenda of the Assembly (documents A/433, A/433.Corr. 1, 2 and 3). The Joint Second and Third Committee gave preliminary consideration to the co-ordination problem as a whole in connection with those sections of Chapter IV of the report of the Economic and Social Council dealing with specialized agencies and passim during its discussion of the individual draft agreements with agencies, as is indicated in Part III of the second report of this Committee to the General Assembly (A/449). The Fifth Committee also was concerned with aspects of the same subject in connection with Agenda item 38 (f), (Budgetary and financial relationships with specialized agencies) (pages 5-9, A/C.5/SR.80).
2. Proposals relating to various aspects of the subject were introduced in the Second Committee by France and Greece (A/C.2/111 and A/C.2/112), in the Fifth Committee by Brazil (A/C.5/150), and in the Joint Second and Third Committee by Norway (A/C.2&3/51). Amendments to the Brazilian resolution were submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.2&3/57) and Norway (A/C.2&3/62, A/C.5/190); amendments to the resolution of Norway were proposed by Lebanon (A/C.2&3/52).
3. Following reference of the resolutions of France, Greece and Brazil to the Joint Second and Third Committee, the Chairman of this Committee and the Chairman of the Fifth Committee jointly obtained the approval of the President of the General Assembly to hold a joint meeting of the two Committees for the purpose of discussing all the resolutions and amendments mentioned in

mentioned in paragraph 2 above and framing a single consolidated resolution for transmission directly to the General Assembly (A/C.2&3/55, A/C.5/173).

4. Representatives of the delegations which had moved the resolutions and amendments consulted informally, agreed on the substance of the question, undertook to submit, in place of their separate resolutions, a consolidated resolution based upon the Brazilian proposal, each delegation reserving the right to submit amendments in committee (A/C.2&3/63, A/C.5/193). The intent of the French and Greek resolutions was not wholly met by the consolidated resolution and the substance of these proposals is shown below:

The Greek resolution (A/C.2/112) would have recommended to the Economic and Social Council that it set up a committee of seven experts selected on a regional basis to operate in continuous session and have as its task the co-ordination of the activities of all the Commissions and Sub-Commission of the Council working in the economic field and of the activities of the related specialized agencies of the United Nations. (Pages 3-4 of A/C.2/SR.36; page 5 of A/C.2/SR.44).

The French resolution (A/C.2/111) invited the Economic and Social Council to specify and define more exactly the tasks of the Economic and Employment Commission and the Fiscal Commission, and establish a scale of priorities with strict regard to the most pressing needs of the United Nations; to utilize the Economic and Employment Commission, its Sub-Commissions, and the Fiscal Commission more as bodies for co-ordinating the work of regional commissions, specialized agencies and States; and to define precisely the sphere of activity of the regional commissions so as to avoid duplication and assure close liaison with specialized agencies (A/C.2/SR.44).

Both of these resolutions had been opposed in the Second Committee by the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Brazil and the Philippine principally on the grounds that this was not the time to involve the Economic and Social Council in further organizational rather than substantive work; that to develop a wholly new organizational structure would increase rather than decrease expenditure, and that the Council should be allowed to exercise its responsibility in resolving problems of which it was seized. (A/C.2/SR.44).

As noted above, the resolutions were referred to the Joint Second and Third Committee at the suggestion of the United Kingdom.

## II. Committee Discussion

6. The Fifth and Joint Second and Third Committees held two joint meetings on 5 November 1947 in which debate centred on the common text (A/C.2&3/63, A/C.5/193), based on the resolution proposed by Brazil and

/taking in

taking into account, as described above, proposals made by France, Greece, Norway and the United Kingdom. It also covered the United States amendments (A/C.2&3/63/Add.1, A/C.5/193/Add.1); additional amendments were proposed during the debate by Australia, India, Canada and China. After extensive debate, a consolidated resolution was agreed upon (Summary of discussion in A/C.2&3/SR.23, A/C.5/SR.87 and A/C.2&3/SR.24, A/C.5/SR.88).

7. The chief positions taken by delegations during the debate were as follows:

Canada, China and Czechoslovakia supported the resolution as a whole, with China proposing certain drafting changes. Belgium and Egypt, while generally favouring the resolution, objected in principle to any reference to a study of a common or consolidated budget.

India, opposing a consolidated budget in principle, suggested, with the support of the United Kingdom, a rewording of the resolution which would call upon the Secretary-General to study improved budgetary co-ordination generally.

Brazil strongly favoured direct reference to the exploration of a common or consolidated budget, in which it was supported by France, Norway and the United States. Norway expressed the belief that an eventual consolidated budget would make possible the fixing of an order of priority in international projects; it also supported the recommendation to encourage the Governments of members of the United Nations to reconcile discrepancies between positions taken in the United Nations and those taken in specialized agencies.

The United States referred to certain considerations which accounted for the present preliminary stage of co-ordinating activities undertaken by the Council, cautioned against an expectation that priorities could be applied to the work of international secretariats in any extreme fashion, opposed the development of standard agreements, supported the recommendation for consistency in the international policies of Member States, and expressed the opinion that programme reports from agencies should be related to budgets.

The United Kingdom supported the addition of some of the amendments of the United States. Australia also supported the amended resolution and offered additional amendments; it opposed the provision for standardizing the texts of agreements and for study of central collection of contributions; while unconvinced about the possibility and desirability of a consolidated budget, it raised no objection to further study of this subject. Australia advocated joint discussion between the Council and the specialized agencies in the form of their reports.

/The Soviet Union

The Soviet Union said that there was no necessity for approval of the resolution since it reiterated separate provisions of the Charter or decisions of the last session of the Assembly. However, if the Committee nevertheless considered it necessary to approve the resolution, the Soviet Union would not object, if from the resolution were deleted points on the common or consolidated budget, centralized collection of members' contributions, and standard agreements with specialized agencies. The Soviet Union proposed to amend the common text accordingly.

### III. Formulation of bases for resolution

Among the matters dealt with in the texts before the meeting, particular attention was given during the debate to the following: actions of States members of specialized agencies; co-ordinating responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council, especially with respect to priorities and work programmes; the question of developing standard texts of draft agreements; the submission by agencies of future work programmes; the problems of budgetary and financial co-ordination.

#### 8. Actions of States members of specialized agencies

The view was expressed, particularly by Norway, the United States, France and China, that a principal obstacle in harmonizing the problems and actions of the numerous governmental organizations in an international field was to be found in the fact that different delegations representing the same Member States at various international conferences sometimes took divergent or incompatible positions on significant issues and that such conflicts in policy were not reconciled at the national level. On this account, the joint meeting attached importance to the recommendation to Member States which appears in final form as paragraph 1 of the operative section of the resolution proposed to the Assembly later in the present report. The Soviet Union considered that it was improper to take such a decision. This matter should be left to the Governments themselves.

#### 9. Co-ordinating responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council

During the discussion of a text of an instruction to the Economic and Social Council (paragraph 2 of the operative section of the proposed resolution), the United Kingdom pointed out that regard should be given to certain considerations and certain difficulties which were being overcome in the international pattern developed. Czechoslovakia and the United States called attention to the fact that in 1947 relationship agreements had been in force for only four of the specialized agencies and that the Council had been largely preoccupied in establishing its own machinery and procedures.

A number of members considered it important that succeeding sessions of the Council should deal more extensively with problems of co-ordination,

/only as

only as they relate to administrative co-operation and avoidance of duplication, but also in terms of positive policy guidance to specialized agencies. There was agreement that the factor of the relative importance of proposals and projects should be considered by the Council in its recommendations to agencies as well as in the establishment of programmes for its own subsidiary organs, and that the role of specialized agencies should be borne in mind when programmes for the United Nations were considered.

While agreed upon this basic principle, the joint meeting did not attempt to predetermine the manner and the extent in which priorities might be taken into account on recommendations of the Council. Norway, supported by France, felt that a priorities system would be desirable, with financial concentration in a given year on, for example, relief programmes, and accompanying decreases in government contributions to agencies whose programmes were not related to the priority objectives decided upon. The United States said that absolute priorities could not be realized, partly because of the inherent difficulties in assigning priorities and partly because it was inevitable that all agencies should maintain their secretariats at some relatively constant level consistent with the minimum responsibilities put upon them by their basic instruments.

10. Question of standard texts of draft agreements

The joint meeting decided to exclude from the proposed instruction to the Economic and Social Council (paragraph 2 of the operative section of the proposed resolution) a request that the Council explore the possibilities of developing one or more standard texts of draft agreements for use in future negotiations with specialized agencies or inter-governmental organizations. In proposing such a request, Norway stated that the present differences in agreements were largely the result of bargaining between negotiating committees and that the entire set of relationship agreements should be reviewed, looking toward revision in accordance with a "model" agreement, or possibly several "model" agreements which allowed for categories of agencies. In disagreeing with this view, Australia and the United States said that an attempt to standardize the texts of agreements would be difficult and probably harmful, since the agencies had certain individual differences as to size, complexity and methods of operating as well as constitutional differences which should be taken into account. The United Kingdom and the Soviet Union also opposed inclusion in the resolution of any reference to standardizing of agreements.

/11. Submission

11. Submission by specialized agencies of future work programmes

In connection with the proposed recommendations to be made to the specialized agencies (see especially paragraph 3 (a) of the operative section of the proposed resolution), there was general agreement with the views put forward by Brazil and the United States that the Council would require reports from agencies, not only on past activities, but also on future programmes of operations if it was to make useful recommendations, especially as regards responsibility for specific projects and priorities as among projects. The Soviet Union considered that this matter was covered already in the Charter and in the various agreements with specialized agencies.

12. Problems of budgetary co-ordination

The joint meeting agreed on a proposed recommendation to agencies as to the date for submission of budgets or budgetary estimates to be attached as information annexes to the United Nations budget. In proposing that such budgets be submitted for each year before 1 July of the year preceding that to which the estimates related, delegations had it in mind that the budgets would come for review to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and that the Advisory Committee's comments should be available to the Council for its reference in formulating recommendations on agency programmes prior to the convening of the General Assembly.

13. The proposed report of the Secretary-General (paragraph 4 of the operative section of the proposed resolution) should make recommendations to the third regular session of the General Assembly on various budgetary and financial matters. A majority of delegations desired the report to be submitted first to the Economic and Social Council because of its implications for programme co-ordination. The Soviet Union opposed this method of transmission on the ground that the Council was overburdened with work already.

Of the items listed for action by the Secretary-General, general debate occurred on paragraphs 4 (c) and (d) of the common text (A/C.2&3/63, A/C.5/193), and a substitute text (see paragraph 4 (c) of the proposed resolution) resulted. The original paragraphs referred to "the possibility of establishing eventually a common or consolidated budget for the United Nations and the specialized agencies which might be approved by the General Assembly" and "the possibility and desirability of central collection of Members' contributions to the United Nations and the specialized agencies." There was general agreement on inclusion in the resolution of provision for study of the fiscal year of specialized agencies and of the schedule of meetings with a view to facilitating the purposes of paragraph 3, which dealt with transmission of programme reports and budgets.

14. Common or consolidated budget

The term "consolidated budget" was used during the debate as meaning either a "common" or a "consolidated" budget, although the delegations of Brazil and the United States pointed out that a "common" budget would be structurally unified whereas a "consolidated budget" would be a grouping of independently prepared budgets. The United States considered that, given the differing composition of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, it would be possible to delete the word "common" from the phrase "common or consolidated budget"; this suggestion was not pursued.

Opposed to a consolidated budget in principle were Belgium, Egypt, India, and the Soviet Union. Belgium, supported by Egypt, contended that at San Francisco, the League of Nations system of a single budget approved by a central organ had been deliberately renounced, and that a consolidated budget would be contrary to Article 17, paragraph 3 of the Charter. It also considered such a budget impracticable because of (a) membership differences between the United Nations and the specialized agencies; (b) legislative difficulties within those countries which treated the individual budgets for different agencies as part of various departmental budgets; and (c) the inability of the Assembly immediately to change the charters of the specialized agencies, all of which prescribe procedures for approval of budgets. India gave as reasons against establishment of a consolidated budget membership differences and the unwholesome separation which would result between the policy-deciding body and the budget-deciding body. It proposed the re-wording finally adopted by the joint meeting, which calls upon the Secretary-General to study and make recommendations on improved budgetary co-ordination generally.

Agreeing with all the foregoing views, and mentioning particularly its belief that a consolidated budget would be unconstitutional, inasmuch as specialized agencies were not organs of the United Nations, the Soviet Union said that opposition to a consolidated budget should not be misunderstood as objection to the use of the budget as a means of co-ordination. The Soviet Union stated that it would vote against the entire resolution if paragraph 4 (c), which gave encouragement to the idea of a consolidated budget, were adopted, but would vote in favour of the resolution if 4 (c) were deleted or if the Indian amendment was approved.

Brazil, supported by France, Norway, and the United States, favoured retention of the explicit reference to a consolidated budget. No constitutional objections had been raised by the Preparatory Commission in London, when, in considering possible implementation of Article 17,  
/paragraph 3 of

paragraph 3 of the Charter, it had expressed the view that a consolidated budget was a desirable objective; nor by a majority of the members of the Council and the Assembly when they approved certain of the agreements with specialized agencies which make specific reference to an eventual consolidated budget. However, Brazil did not consider that the proposed text of paragraph 4 (c) endorsed the principle of a consolidated budget; it simply called for a report on feasibility so that the Assembly could determine whether the idea should be pursued or whether the legal and technical difficulties were so great that it should be discarded. France, Canada, and Australia shared this view, with Australia indicating its doubt that a consolidated budget was possible or desirable.

Norway considered an eventual consolidated budget a cornerstone of international organization, saying that it would make possible the fixing of an order of priority in international projects, and that the problems involved, such as membership differences, were soluble and should not be allowed to defer consideration of eventual central budget approval.

When the vote was taken and the Indian substitute was adopted, the United States, supported by France, affirmed its understanding, as had been mentioned by the United Kingdom in seconding the Indian proposal, that the new wording of sub-paragraph 4 (c) did not relieve the Secretary-General of his responsibilities under resolution 81 (I) of the General Assembly and that it did not preclude the possibility of studying the feasibility of a consolidated budget. The representative of the Soviet Union said that the Secretary-General knew his responsibilities, and resolution 81 (I) did not provide for a consolidated budget.

15. Central collection of contributions

Sub-paragraph 4 (d) of the common text was deleted, the Soviet Union opposed in principle to the idea of central collection of Members' contributions to the United Nations and the specialized agencies and Australia being doubtful of the practical advantages.

16. The revised text of the resolution was then voted as a whole and adopted by forty-three votes to none with one abstention.

17. Resolution

The joint meeting recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following resolution:

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND  
WORK PROGRAMMES OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

HAVING EXAMINED the report of the Economic and Social Council,  
(document A/382) and the interim report of the Secretary-General on the  
budgetary and financial relationships between the United Nations and the  
specialized



specialized agencies (document A/394/Rev.1);

HAVING HAD ITS ATTENTION DRAWN to the interim report of the Co-ordination Committee to the Economic and Social Council (document A/404), which deals with budgetary and financial relationships of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related programme matters;

CONSIDERING that it is essential, in order to prevent overlapping of activities and duplication of effort, to develop more effective co-ordination in the economic and social fields among the organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations, among the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and among the specialized agencies themselves, and to provide means for assessing the relative urgency and importance of projects;

CONSIDERING that it is desirable without detriment to essential activities to minimize the financial burden imposed upon Members by the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies; and

CONSIDERING that these results can most effectively be achieved by mutual application of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and development of the methods of co-operation foreseen in General Assembly resolutions 50 (I) and 81 (I):

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY THEREFORE

1. CALLS UPON Members to take measures to ensure on the national level a co-ordinated policy of their delegations to the United Nations and the different specialized agencies in order that full co-operation may be achieved between the Organization and the specialized agencies, and, in particular, to instruct their representatives in the governing bodies of the specialized agencies to use every effort to ensure the transmittal of reports, programmes of operation, and budgets or budgetary estimates referred to in paragraph 3 of this resolution;
2. COMMENDS the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General, and the specialized agencies for the steps already taken, including the establishment of a Co-ordination Committee, to achieve programme and administrative co-ordination among the specialized agencies and the United Nations; and requests the Council to give constant attention to the factor of the relative priority of proposals, and to consider as a matter of urgency the further steps which should be taken to develop effective co-ordination of the programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs and the specialized agencies;
3. CALLS UPON the specialized agencies, as appropriate under the terms of their respective agreements with the United Nations:

- (a) To present each year to the session of the Economic and Social  
/Council

Council preceding the opening of the regular session of the General Assembly their reports on past activities and their programmes of operations for the subsequent fiscal year to enable the Council to promote the most efficient and practical use of the resources of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, by recommendations concerning the definition of responsibility for specific projects and concerning priorities for action;

(b) To transmit their budgets or budgetary estimates for 1949 and for each year thereafter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations before 1 July of the preceding year in order that the Secretary-General may incorporate these budgets or budgetary estimates as information annexes in his annual budget estimates for transmittal to the General Assembly, together with such summaries as he may deem appropriate and useful;

4. REQUESTS the Secretary-General, in consultation with the specialized agencies through the Co-ordination Committee and in consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to prepare a report for submission to the Economic and Social Council and the third regular session of the General Assembly with recommendations concerning:

(a) Measures for achieving greater uniformity in presentation of the budgets of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies with a view to providing a basis for comparison of the several budgets;

(b) The fiscal year and schedule of meetings of the specialized agencies in their relation to the procedures envisaged in paragraph 3 above;

(c) The feasibility of improved budgetary co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies; and

5. REQUESTS the Secretary-General, in consultation with the specialized agencies through the Co-ordination Committee and where appropriate, the Advisory Committee, to promote the development of similar budgetary, administrative and financial practices in the United Nations and the specialized agencies.