



Distr.
GENERAL

A/2687
6 August 1954

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Ninth session

SYSTEM OF ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS OF COMMISSIONS,
COMMITTEES AND OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OR OTHER ORGANS OF THE
UNITED NATIONS

Report of the Secretary-General

1. The General Assembly, on 27 November 1953, adopted resolution 775 (VIII) reading as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Noting resolution 505 F III (XVI) adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 28 July 1953, concerning the question of the remuneration of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body,

"Noting also the intention of the Secretary-General to undertake, during 1954, a comprehensive study of the system of allowances to members of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly or other organs of the United Nations, and to submit proposals to the General Assembly at its ninth session,

"Requests the Secretary-General to circulate his proposals, together with the comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to all Members four weeks before the opening of the ninth session of the General Assembly."

2. The present report is based on the comprehensive study referred to in the resolution above and deals in paragraphs 21 to 23 below with the particular question of remuneration of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body.

The system of subsistence allowances

3. It is not necessary for the purposes of the present report to go back beyond the year 1948, when the General Assembly adopted in resolution 231 I (III) of 8 October 1948 basic principles to govern the payment of travelling and subsistence expenses to members of the bodies under reference. While the rate of subsistence allowances was raised during 1950^{1/} from \$20 to \$25 per day for Headquarters meetings, the General Assembly made no change in the general principles established in 1948. Those principles were in fact reaffirmed by the General Assembly,^{2/} and they continue in force at the present time. Deviations authorized by the General Assembly during the years 1949 to 1953, as well as the special reasons for such deviations, are the subject of comments in paragraphs 5 to 14 below, while the separate question of honoraria is considered in paragraphs 15 to 20.

4. In resolution 231 I (III) the General Assembly confirmed "the policy [previously] followed by the Secretary-General as regards the payment of travelling expenses and of subsistence allowances at the meeting-place of a commission or committee". The terms of that policy are set forth in the following extracts from the Advisory Committee's first report of 1948:^{3/}

"There appear to the [Advisory] Committee to be only two main categories of membership in the organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations: (a) representatives of participating Members; and (b) members serving on commissions, committees and other bodies in their individual capacity.

"It may be noted that the Secretary-General introduced, in March 1946, a provisional rule (SCB/9) making a clear distinction between the two categories:

"The travel expenses and allowances of officials representing Governments to international conferences, commissions and committees will not be paid by the United Nations, but the travel expenses and allowances of members of expert commissions will be met by the United Nations."

^{1/} General Assembly resolution 459 (V), paragraph 2, of 1 December 1950.

^{2/} Ibid., paragraph 1.

^{3/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 7, document A/534, paragraphs 58 and 59.

"The General Assembly has, however, taken action varying this rule in a number of specific cases covered by resolution 70 (I), 106 (S-I), 164 (II), 166 (II), 181 (II).

"The Committee is of the opinion that the Secretary-General should continue to pay to members of commissions or committees who are selected in an individual capacity an allowance to cover their subsistence at the meeting place of the commission or committee. The accepted principle that such a payment represents subsistence and not a fee for services is confirmed."

Annex A to the present report shows how the principle adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 231 I (III) have been applied to particular organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations.

5. The pattern thus laid down by the General Assembly for determining eligibility to travelling and subsistence expenses afforded, with minor exceptions,^{4/} a rational basis for the system. Where strictly adhered to, the system has not presented administrative difficulty. As already indicated, however, the General Assembly has found it necessary to authorize several deviations which must be considered in some detail for a proper understanding of the problem under review.

6. When the Administrative Tribunal was established in December 1949, the Secretary-General proposed, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee,^{5/} the inclusion in the 1950 budget of an amount to cover a daily allowance of \$50 for the members of the Tribunal, this figure providing both for the reimbursement of subsistence expenses and for an honorarium for services rendered.^{6/} The discussion of this proposal in the Fifth Committee centred

^{4/} Among which may be cited the decision to pay travelling expenses (without subsistence) to members of functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council.

^{5/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Fifth Committee, Annexes, page 147, document A/986, paragraph 12; page 158 document A/1156, paragraph 3.

^{6/} The Advisory Committee on a Statute for a United Nations Administrative Tribunal, which sat in September 1946, had merely suggested that "...the compensation to be paid to the judges ... might take the form of daily allowances for their attendance".

on two main points: was the rate of allowance excessive in view of the status of the Administrative Tribunal in relation to the International Court of Justice, on the one hand, and to the International Law Commission or any other commission of the General Assembly, on the other hand? Was there not an essential difference between the members of the International Law Commission and those of the Administrative Tribunal, namely, that the latter had to act as judges, whereas the former were members of a commission of the General Assembly? The Fifth Committee, after rejecting a proposal that the daily allowance of members of both these bodies should be fixed at \$50, adopted an alternative proposal, which was subsequently approved by the General Assembly, that the rate should be fixed at \$30 for the Administrative Tribunal, comprising \$20 as per diem, plus \$10 as a "special allowance".

7. This special allowance was, however, maintained for only one year. The Advisory Committee, when reporting^{7/} during 1950 on the adequacy of the general rate of subsistence allowances and recommending an increase from \$20 to \$25 in the Headquarters rate, suggested that the General Assembly might wish to reconsider whether any body of experts whose members were at that time eligible for allowances on a differing basis (i.e. at other than the \$20 rate) should be brought within the common system. This suggestion was accepted by the Fifth Committee, whose report,^{8/} on which the General Assembly adopted on 1 December 1950 resolution 459 (V), contained the following paragraph:

"It was also brought to the Committee's attention that a special allowance of \$10 per diem, in addition to the normal subsistence allowance of \$20, had been approved by the General Assembly in 1949

7/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 7, document A/1312, paragraphs 322 to 328.

8/ Ibid., Annexes, agenda item 39, document A/1538, paragraph 12.

for members of the Administrative Tribunal. It was the understanding of the Fifth Committee, however, that any such previous decisions in respect of special daily allowances would be superseded by the following draft resolution [subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 459 (V)]...".

8. During October 1950 the Sixth Committee considered a suggestion of the International Law Commission^{9/} to the effect that the General Assembly, in order to ease the financial burden of service in the Commission, might wish to reconsider the terms of article 13 of the Commission's Statute,^{10/} In accordance with this suggestion, the Sixth Committee proposed to the General Assembly^{11/} that the members should receive a special allowance, of an amount to be determined by the General Assembly. The draft resolution was based on the following considerations: (a) the inadequacy of the emoluments then being paid; (b) the importance of the Commission's work, the eminence of its members, and the method of their election; and (c) the length of the sessions; it was accompanied by a vœu that the special allowance should be at the rate of \$35 per day.

9. When the financial implications of this draft resolution were examined by the Fifth Committee, there was general agreement that it would be difficult in practice and, in any event, undesirable in principle to discriminate between expert bodies in the matter of subsistence allowances. The Fifth Committee accordingly reported to the General Assembly^{12/} that, on

^{9/} Ibid., Supplement No. 12, document A/1316, paragraph 21.

^{10/} The text of the article reads as follows: "Members of the Commission shall be paid travel expenses and shall also receive a per diem allowance at the same rate as the allowance paid to members of commissions of experts of the Economic and Social Council".

^{11/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 52, document A/1639, paragraph 44.

^{12/} Ibid., document A/1648, paragraph 7 (b).

administrative grounds, it was not able to recommend special treatment for the International Law Commission with respect to such allowances. The conclusions of the Fifth Committee were not, however, accepted by the General Assembly which, on 12 December 1950, adopted resolution 485 (V) fixing the "special allowance" for members of the International Law Commission at \$35 per day.

10. These developments are set out in detail in the foregoing paragraphs because of their importance in relation to the cardinal principle that there is no element of fee for services rendered in the subsistence allowance. That principle was expressly re-affirmed by the General Assembly at its fifth session (1950) when, however, it concurrently authorized the special allowance referred to in paragraph 9 above. It is evident from the proceedings of the Sixth Committee,^{13/} which rejected proposals for either a special yearly allowance or an honorarium for the members of the International Law Commission, that the special allowance was to be regarded purely as a subsistence allowance. Difficulty may therefore arise, on a strict interpretation of the principle, in reconciling the action taken in this matter with the simultaneous decision of the General Assembly to establish the rate of subsistence allowance for all other expert bodies of the United Nations at \$25 per day for Headquarters meetings and \$20 per day for meetings elsewhere. It seems indeed important, where that allowance is concerned, to maintain uniformity of treatment among the members of all such bodies and it is not felt that factors such as the importance of the work, the method of election or the eminence of the membership do provide a practical criteria for the establishment of special rates.

11. Previous paragraphs have dealt mainly with General Assembly resolution 231 (III), and with other resolutions amending that basic instrument. Attention may also be drawn at this stage to certain other aspects of the policy that has been followed as regards the emoluments of members of expert bodies, including bodies not covered by resolution 231 (III).

^{13/} Ibid., document A/1639, paragraphs 6 to 13.

12. Two main categories may be noted:

- (a) Members of expert bodies established by and reporting to the General Assembly or the Councils receive, if eligible under General Assembly resolution 231 (III), a subsistence allowance at the rate of \$25 per day (\$20 away from Headquarters), but no fee;
- (b) Members of expert bodies appointed by the Secretary-General but reporting to the General Assembly or the Councils are assimilated to members in category (a) and accordingly receive a subsistence allowance at the same rate, but no fee.

13. The exceptions to this policy have been few in number and have been made under the express authority of the General Assembly:

- (a) In December 1950, the Fifth Committee (with the Advisory Committee dissenting) recommended, and the General Assembly authorized, the appointment of three groups of experts charged with implementing certain parts of Economic and Social Council resolution 290 (XI) of 15 August 1950 on full employment. The relevant proposal, which included provision for fees at \$50 per day in addition to travel and subsistence expenses, had been opposed by the Advisory Committee on the ground that the experts in question, though appointed by the Secretary-General, would not be made responsible to him,^{14/} a circumstance that clearly called for their assimilation to expert members within the meaning of General Assembly resolution 231 (III). The validity of this objection is reflected in the proceedings of the Fifth Committee,^{15/} which contains numerous references to the view that the cases then under discussion were to be treated as exceptions.

^{14/} See Economic and Social Council resolution 290 (XI), paragraphs 13 (b), 19 and 22, in which emphasis is laid on the exemption of the Secretary-General from responsibility for the experts' reports.

^{15/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Fifth Committee, 279th and 280th meetings.

(b) A similar exception was made in December 1952, in connexion with the Committee on the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries.^{16/} In estimating the expenses of the Committee, which again included provision for daily fees of \$50, the Secretary-General had stated that he would endeavour to secure the services of the members on the basis of subsistence allowance only; a fee would not be paid unless the services of a particular expert could not otherwise be secured. For its part, the Advisory Committee observed that the proposed arrangement "accords with the opinion previously recorded by the Advisory Committee that the payment of fees in addition to travel and subsistence expenses to members of commissions and committees, whether serving as experts or in a representative capacity cannot be reconciled with the principles adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 231 (III) ... and reaffirmed in resolution 459 (V)...".^{17/} Nevertheless the amount finally appropriated by the General Assembly included provision for the payment of fees.

14. The above two exceptions to the general policy of the United Nations are important as admitting, contrary to the principle laid down by the General Assembly, the element of fee into the remuneration of members of commissions and committees. In that sense, they differ from the case of the International Law Commission, which involved in principle a mere increase in subsistence allowance. They have already given rise to administrative difficulties through the submission of claims, relying on a similar set of circumstances and on established precedent, for the payment of fees to members of expert commissions and committees of the General Assembly.

^{16/} The Committee was charged, in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 416 A (XIV) of 23 June 1952, with preparing a detailed plan for submission to the General Assembly.

^{17/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/2245, paragraph 10.

The system of honoraria for rapporteurs of United Nations bodies

15. The question of remunerating rapporteurs of United Nations bodies first arose in 1949, and was again discussed during 1952, both in the Advisory Committee and in the Fifth Committee. The particular cases in which honoraria have been or are being paid are: (a) the honoraria paid since 1950 on a yearly basis to the Chairman and five rapporteurs of the International Law Commission; and (b) the honorarium paid during 1952 and 1953 to the rapporteur on freedom of information.

16. As regards the International Law Commission, the decision of December 1949 that the Chairman and five special rapporteurs should receive honoraria represented a compromise, ad hoc arrangement, to meet the desires of the Commission itself and of the Sixth Committee.^{18/} With that end in view, the Secretary-General had originally suggested that payment might be made on a fixed-fee basis as a research grant and that, where the membership of the Commission as a whole was concerned, two alternatives were possible: either to increase the rate of subsistence allowance or to assimilate the members, for purposes of remuneration and subsistence, to ad hoc judges of the International Court of Justice. As an exceptional measure, the General Assembly finally agreed to the payment of honoraria to the Chairman and five rapporteurs. It rejected, however, the two alternative suggestions for the remuneration of the members.

17. The second case, considered during 1952, concerned the payment of an honorarium of \$2,500 to the rapporteur on freedom of information appointed, under Economic and Social Council resolution 442 C (XIV) of 13 June 1952, for an experimental period of one year. The Advisory Committee in reporting on this matter recalled that only in exceptional cases had the General Assembly concurred in the payment of honoraria for work performed on behalf of the United Nations; it therefore recommended, as an alternative, the payment of a subsistence allowance, as earned. This recommendation, however, was not accepted; the General Assembly authorized - as an exceptional measure - the full provision for the honorarium, although it adopted at the same time the resolution on honoraria to which reference is made in paragraph 18 below.

^{18/} Ibid., Fourth Session, Supplement No. 10, document A/925, paragraph 42; Fifth Committee, Annexes, page 71, document A/C.5/320.

18. The Secretary-General is concerned over a situation in which a strict adherence to the resolution on honoraria of the General Assembly seems neither possible nor (despite the rigid and categorical terms of that resolution)^{19/} seemingly desired by the Assembly itself. It is worthy of note that the resolution was adopted on 21 December 1952 concurrently with the 1953 appropriation resolution providing, inter alia, for the continued payment of honoraria to the rapporteurs of the International Law Commission, and, as indicated in paragraph 17 above, for a similar payment to the rapporteur on freedom of information. The Advisory Committee itself remarked on this anomaly, when suggesting in August 1953 that the General Assembly might deem it opportune (with the change in tenure of office of the members of the International Law Commission) to review the system of paying honoraria to the rapporteurs of that Commission. That suggestion was based on two main considerations: (a) that the 1949 decision was taken on a particular case and without prejudice to any future solution of the question concerning rapporteurs of United Nations bodies; and (b) that the opinion of the General Assembly on this subject was clearly recorded in resolution 677 (VII). The General Assembly, however, took no action to modify its prior decision.

19. A more recent case of appointment of a special rapporteur is the decision of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to appoint a special rapporteur on discrimination in the field of education under Economic and Social Council resolution 502 H (XVI).

The views expressed in the Sub-Commission in this connexion may be summarized as follows:

Members supporting the suggestion for the appointment of a rapporteur considered that where controversial and delicate matters are involved, there are

^{19/} The following is the text of resolution 677 (VII):

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing that the appointment of a person as a rapporteur of a United Nations body confers honour upon his country and distinction upon himself,

- "1. Considers that no such appointment should carry remuneration;
- "2. Requests all organs of the United Nations to bear in mind in the future the views of the General Assembly as expressed in the present resolution."

suggestions which a rapporteur acting in an individual capacity and not as a representative of his Government, can put forward, but not the Secretariat. Great care has to be exercised by the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies not to give offence to particular Member States in documents produced under their own responsibility. Moreover, a secretariat must rely for the most part on information communicated by official sources, and is therefore to a certain extent dependent on the willingness of Governments.

Those who opposed the suggestion pointed out that it would be inappropriate for the Sub-Commission, which was itself composed of experts and was intended to act, as it were, as rapporteur to the Commission on Human Rights, to shift its responsibilities in the matter to others. Furthermore, the General Assembly had decided in resolution 677 (VII), that since the appointment of a person as rapporteur of a United Nations body conferred honour upon his country, no such appointment should carry remuneration. In compliance with that resolution, only the Secretary-General might, funds permitting, appoint a remunerated consulting expert, but he himself would then be responsible for the standard of work carried out, which might in those circumstances equally well be entrusted to the Secretariat. It was also noted that the provisions of paragraph 4 of Economic and Social Council resolution 502 H (XVI) envisaged clearly that studies which fell within the scope of specialized agencies or other bodies should normally be carried out by the specialized agencies or other bodies directly concerned.

20. The Secretary-General believes that his views should be requested beforehand by any organ of the United Nations before the appointment of a special rapporteur is agreed upon. He does, however, recognize the fact that in certain fields such an appointment might have advantages and it is with this consideration in mind that he has framed the proposals in paragraph 24 below.

Remuneration of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body

21. The Advisory Committee considered this question during October 1953, on a report of the Secretary-General^{20/} submitting the views of the Permanent Central Opium Board as endorsed by the Economic and Social Council.^{21/} In reporting to the General Assembly^{22/} the Advisory Committee at that time noted that the Secretary-General "while recognizing the problem to which the present rate of allowance gives rise in the case of [these two bodies] does not feel that proposals can at present usefully be submitted, in view of the complexity of this matter, which may affect the general system of subsistence allowances for members of commissions and committees of the United Nations, and in view also of the financial consequences which an isolated decision in a specific case might produce". The Committee further noted that "it is the intention of the Secretary-General to undertake during 1954, a full study of the question and of its relation to other United Nations bodies, ...".

22. The Secretary-General believes that there are good grounds for a separate treatment of this question, that such a treatment would not necessarily affect the general system of subsistence allowance, and that, on the substance of the case an increase in the emoluments of members of the Central Board and the Supervisory Body would be justified. The supporting arguments having been presented in his previous report (A/2509), the Secretary-General confines himself to the following points:

(a) In its report to the Council (E/OB/8), the Board reported that in the case of both the Board and the Supervisory Body, "the volume of work has grown steadily from year to year, extending, particularly in the Supervisory Body, beyond the bounds of the regular sessions, which these two bodies have been led by a proper concern for economy to keep within narrow limits. Consulted by correspondence and asked to make what often proved to be lengthy and difficult studies, the members have had to devote an increasing proportion of their time to tasks of

^{20/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 68(b), document A/2509.

^{21/} Economic and Social Council resolution 505 F III (XVI) of 28 July 1953.

^{22/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 68(b), document A/2528, paragraph 4.

ever-growing complexity. The Presidents and Vice-Presidents of these bodies are entrusted with organizational and representational functions which have often proved a heavy burden.";

(b) Exceptional treatment seems justified in view of the peculiar condition of service as a member of the Central Board. Article 19 of the 1925 Convention on Narcotic Drugs (amended by the Protocol of 1946) provides that members "shall not hold any office which puts them in a position of dependence on their Governments". This condition does not apply to any other United Nations body;

(c) It is also stipulated, in the same article of the Convention, that the members of the Board shall be persons "who by their technical competence, impartiality, and disinterestedness will command general confidence". Since the members are typically persons engaged in university teaching, in legal or medical practice, or other non-official occupations, time spent on the work of the Board may often result in a reduction in professional earnings or fees;

(d) Although the restrictive conditions regarding dependence on Governments does not apply to the four-member Supervisory Body, the functions of the Board and the Body are closely inter-related, much of their work is done in joint session, and there are, normally and by intention, members common to both bodies. On that ground, and because the merging of the two bodies is proposed in the draft Single Convention, it seems logical to envisage identical treatment in the matter of remuneration.

23. Concrete proposals designed to meet the views of the Central Board and the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council are submitted in paragraph 24, section B below.

Proposals submitted by the Secretary-General

24. On the basis of the foregoing paragraphs, the Secretary-General submits for the consideration of the General Assembly the following proposals which distinguish, on the one hand, between an appropriate subsistence allowance for an expert while attending the sessions of the organ to which he has been

appointed and, on the other hand, appropriate remuneration for an expert who, by reason of the terms of reference of the organ to which he has been appointed, must undertake additional work between sessions.

A. Allowances for members of expert bodies
for attendance at meetings

Inasmuch as the General Assembly has confirmed the principle that payment of a subsistence allowance does not represent a fee for services rendered, the Secretary-General is of the opinion that the system of paying a subsistence allowance at a uniform rate to members of all eligible United Nations bodies is correct.

The Secretary-General recognizes that, in resolution 485 (V), the General Assembly fixed a "special allowance" for members of the International Law Commission in an amount different from that authorized as subsistence allowance for other bodies; he does not believe, however, that that exception makes it necessary to change a basic system designed to provide uniformity in treatment among members of the several commissions and committees of the United Nations.

The Secretary-General has examined the adequacy of the subsistence allowance authorized by General Assembly resolution 459 (V), but finds no justification to recommend to the General Assembly at this time any change in the current level of payment.

B. Honoraria for special rapporteurs and
members of certain bodies

Reference has been made above to the absolute terms in which the General Assembly expressed its opinion on the remuneration of rapporteurs. The question therefore arises whether it is not desirable so to amend the relevant legislation that it shall conform to the actual practice of the law-making authority of paying an honorarium to special rapporteurs for work between sessions as illustrated in the annual appropriations for the International Law Commission.

(a) Special rapporteurs. Apart from the specific case of the International Law Commission, the Secretary-General believes that consideration should also be given at the time of any amendment to

General Assembly resolution 677 (VII) to the possibility that other cases may arise in the future in which there may be justification for entrusting a given project to a special rapporteur in preference to using the services of the Secretariat. In these cases, which are likely to be few in number and exceptional in character, the Secretary-General would propose that:

- (i) Two main criteria should be applied in determining whether an honorarium should be paid: first, whether the work is better entrusted to a rapporteur rather than to the Secretariat; that decision should be governed by considerations such as are outlined in paragraph 19 above, and not by the factor of technical expertise in a given subject or a given field, although that factor would enter into the selection of a particular person; secondly, whether the project is of a creative character - for example, a study carried forward by the rapporteur to the point where action can be taken on the part of the expert body with a minimum of exploratory discussion - as distinct from a project only involving the gathering and analysis of material, which would come within the competence of the Secretariat and which, for reasons of economy, should be undertaken by the Secretariat.
- (ii) Before any organ resolved to appoint a special rapporteur, it would be the responsibility of the Secretary-General to make his views known on the question to the organ concerned. His comment at that stage would have regard to the nature of the particular study involved, the reasonable length of time necessary to complete it and his opinion on the most effective manner in which the study should be undertaken.
- (iii) As a general rule, the payment of an honorarium would be subject to the approval of the General Assembly and its amount included in the regular budget estimates. In a case of exceptional urgency where provision would need to

be made before the General Assembly had examined the budget estimates specific indication to the Secretary-General to that effect should be given, so that he would be in a position to make the necessary provision, acting in concurrence with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

(iv) The maximum honorarium should be fixed at \$1,500 a year.

(v) In no case whatever would an honorarium be paid to a rapporteur or special rapporteur in respect of work performed on behalf of an expert body in the course of a session of that body.

(b) Special arrangements for certain bodies. The Secretary-General considers that there is a valid case for the payment of honoraria for work performed between sessions in the case of the following bodies:

(i) Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.

The grounds on which increased emoluments are proposed for the members of these two bodies have been stated in paragraph 22 above. The Secretary-General accordingly suggests that, in addition to subsistence allowance, the members should receive honoraria to be paid on an annual basis at the following rates:

	\$
President	1,200
Vice-President	700
Members	500

(A member serving on both bodies to receive 50 per cent of the second honorarium.)

No budget provision was made in 1954 under this heading. Adoption of the suggestions set out in paragraph 24, section B(b)(i) would require an estimated budgetary provision of \$7,300.

- (11) Administrative Tribunal. In the case of the Administrative Tribunal, the workload between sessions shows wide variations according to the calendar of applications. In lieu therefore of payment on an annual basis, the honoraria might be related to actual sessions of the Tribunal, as follows:

For preparatory work undertaken in connexion with any one session (other than the annual procedural session):

	\$
President	300
Members	150

No budget provision was made in 1954 under this heading. Adoption of the suggestions set out in paragraph 24, section B(b)(11) would require an estimated provision of \$1,500.

Related administrative questions

25. The Advisory Committee raised, during November 1953, the question whether, in the case of missions of inquiry (or analogous bodies), the rate of allowance might not reasonably be reduced after a certain number of months of service in the mission area. While not taking a firm position in the matter, the Secretary-General is, in balance, not in favour of varying the existing practice, since he takes account of considerations previously advanced by the Advisory Committee itself, namely, that members of such missions are absent from their homes for a period of one year and that they frequently serve in areas where special clothing is required.^{23/}

^{23/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 7, document A/1312, paragraph 326.

A N N E X

The following table shows how the principles adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 231 I (III) of 8 October 1948 have been applied to a representative list of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations:

1. Bodies for which no travel or subsistence is paid:
 - (a) Security Council;
 - (b) Economic and Social Council;
 - (c) Trusteeship Council;
 - (d) Disarmament Commission;
 - (e) Special conferences to which Governments are invited to send representatives, e.g., World Population Conference, United Nations Tin Conference.
2. Bodies for which travel (without subsistence) is paid:
 - (a) General Assembly: Up to five representatives or alternate representatives of each Member;^{24/}
 - (b) Commissions of the Economic and Social Council to which representatives are nominated by Members in consultation with the Secretary-General and subsequently confirmed by the Council.
3. Bodies for which travel and subsistence are paid:
 - (a) Commissions of inquiry, mediation or conciliation established by the General Assembly or the Security Council, e.g., Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration;^{25/}
 - (b) Other bodies:
 - (i) Administrative Tribunal, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, Committee on Contributions, International Law Commission.
 - (ii) Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Social Council on which the members serve in a personal capacity;

^{24/} General Assembly resolution 14 D (I) of 13 February 1946.

^{25/} In the case of commissions in category (a), travel and subsistence are also paid to one alternate representative of each Member participating, provided that the organ concerned decides that alternates are necessary.

- (iii) Visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council;
 - (iv) Advisory committees of an expert character, the members of which are appointed by the Secretary-General, e.g., International Civil Service Advisory Board, Investments Committee.^{26/}
-

^{26/} In the case of the Investments Committee, the appointments are made by the Secretary-General after consultation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and subject to subsequent confirmation by the General Assembly.