

## UNITED NATIONS

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY



GENERAL

A/1852 15 August 1951

ORIGINAL: ENCLISH

Sixth session

## FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PANEL OF MILITARY EXPERTS TO BE ESTABLISHED UNDER PARAGRAPH 10 OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 377 A (V)

## First report of 1951 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

1. The Collective Measures Committee, on 17 July 1951, adopted a report submitted by its Working Group (A/AC.43/L.1) on the nature and general functions of the panel of military experts to be established under paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950. Paragraph 11 of the report reads in part:

"The Collective Measures Committee considers that the general question of financing, including that of the payment of basic salaries of members of the panel and any technicians on United Nations assignments, raises many technical problems which require further study and should be examined by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in the light of the discussion at the fifth meeting of the Committee. The Committee recommends that the Secretary-General should obtain a report on the matter by the Advisory Committee as a matter of urgency."

- 2. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has accordingly examined the above matter, and submits its comments below.
- 3. The question was previously considered by the Advisory Committee in connexion with a report (A/C.5/388) submitted in October 1950 by the Secretary-General on the financial implications of General Assembly resolution 377 (V) entitled "Uniting for Peace". The Committee noted (A/1462, paragraph 5) that paragraphs 10 and 13 of the resolution were open to the following differing interpretations:
  - (i) Appointment of a panel of military experts paid by their own governments and seconded to the Collective Measured Committee;

/(ii) Appointment A/1852

- (ii) Appointment of a panel of military experts for whom provision would be made in the regular budget of the United Nations;
- (iii) Appointment of a panel of military experts paid by a requesting Member State.
- 4. A large number of variations are possible within each of the above alternatives. There are three basic questions to be answered: (a) what will be the level of emoliments of the staff; (b) who will bear the cost of the staff; and (c) what will be the mechanism of payment to the staff.
- 5. On (a) above, the Advisory Committee's view is that the Secretary-General should fix a minimum common rate appropriate to each rapid said, in so far as the salary and allowances scale prevailing in the country of the expert falls short of this rate, the United Nations should make up the difference on a fully reimbursable basis.
- 6. As regards (b), costs consist of
  - (i) Basic salary and allowances, plus the differential referred to in paragraph 5 above;
  - (ii) International travel, as distinct from travel within the territory of the requesting Member State;
  - (111) Local allowances;
  - (iv) local travel and miscellaneous services;
    - . (v) Supporting staff. \*
- Each of these costs might be borne, in whole or in part, by the United Nations, by the requesting Member State or by the supplying Member State. In particular, the Advisory Committee considered the possibility that the differential referred to in paragraph 5 above might be borne by the United Nations, wholly or partially without reimbursement. It did not, however, feel prepared to recommend this course.
  - 7. As regards (c), the Advisory Committee considers that the appropriate mechanism would be that costs under (i), (ii) and (iii) above should be met by the United Nations and reimbursed by the requesting Member State, while those under (iv) and (v) should be borne directly by the requesting Member State.
  - 8. The Advisory Committee accordingly believes, on balance, that as a matter of principle, responsibility for payment of all costs should rest with the requesting Member State. This would obviate a complex administrative machinery. The Committee further took note of the fact that, in analogous cases in the past, requesting States have made advance deposits to cover estimated costs.