



International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXIV)/COM.5/OR.19  
December 1980\*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

TWENTY-FOURTH REGULAR SESSION: 22-26 SEPTEMBER 1980

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna  
on Wednesday, 24 September 1980, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. SIAZON (Philippines)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Election of Vice-Chairmen and organization of work	1 - 7
7	The Agency's accounts for 1979	8 - 9
8	The Agency's programme for 1981-86 and budget for 1981	10 - 72

\*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 3 October 1980.

\*\*/ GC(XXIV)/637.

#### ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMEN AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that a consensus had been reached on the choice of two Vice-Chairmen in accordance with Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference and proposed Mr. Bennini of Algeria and Mr. Schmidt of Austria as Vice-Chairmen.
2. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee of the Whole wished to designate them as Vice-Chairmen.
3. It was so decided.
4. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that document GC(XXIV)/COM.5/11 listed the six items on the agenda referred to the Committee by the General Conference. He proposed that those six items should be considered in the order in which they appeared in that document.
5. It was so agreed.
6. In order for a report to be made on the work and conclusions of the Committee of the Whole to the General Conference, the CHAIRMAN proposed that he himself should present an oral report at a plenary meeting on the deliberations of the Committee, which would also be the subject of detailed summary records.
7. It was so decided.

#### THE AGENCY'S ACCOUNTS FOR 1979 (GC(XXIV)/629)

8. The CHAIRMAN presented the Agency's accounts for 1979 and proposed that the Committee recommend that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXIV)/629.
9. It was so agreed.

#### THE AGENCY'S PROGRAMME FOR 1981-1986 AND BUDGET FOR 1981 (GC(XXIV)/630)

10. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire) said that, once again, the safeguards programme had received the lion's share of the Agency's budget. While recognizing the importance of an effective safeguards system, his country could not accept such a large annual increase which, in addition, contradicted the Secretariat's statement that it had proposed a zero-growth budget for 1981.

11. Further, it was unusual for administrative expenses to represent more than 70% of the budget of a technical organization like the Agency. Operational activities such as technical assistance and reactor safety should receive much higher funding.

12. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) congratulated the Secretariat on adjusting priorities in such a way as to increase certain programmes such as technical assistance and nuclear safety while maintaining zero growth in real terms for the budget as a whole. His delegation regretted that the reductions which had been necessary in all the other programmes had affected certain promotional activities rather than the safeguards programme. It seemed pointless to apply safeguards to facilities in nuclear-weapon States, which merely caused expenditure while in no way limiting either vertical or horizontal proliferation.

13. His delegation approved the reorganization of the Department of Technical Operations, a step which would undoubtedly help to improve the implementation of its programmes. However, the Division responsible for safety questions should be renamed the "Division of Radiological and Nuclear Safety", a title which corresponded more accurately to its functions. The spent fuel management programme should be gradually limited to its purely technical aspects, and questions relating to the radiation protection of the public and to environmental protection should be made the responsibility of the Division of Radiological and Nuclear Safety just mentioned.

14. Finally, his delegation noted with satisfaction the change made in paragraph 5/9 of the Administration programme originally submitted to the Board of Governors in June (GOV/1977). It believed that the granting of assistance should not be based on discriminatory conditions such as a requirement of having acceded to a particular treaty.

15. In conclusion, his delegation approved the Agency's programme for 1981-1986 and the budget for 1981.

16. Mr. AMAN (Indonesia) said that it was extremely important to evaluate past activities in order to draw lessons for the future. Plans for programmes and reports on their implementation should be presented in a way which made them easy to compare and should, in particular, contain adequate quantitative information. The documents presented to the Conference were not entirely satisfactory in that respect.

17. Furthermore, some staff members seemed unable to understand the needs and aspirations of the developing countries requesting technical assistance. That was perhaps because they interpreted the rules in too strict a manner. The administrative sections dealing with technical assistance should contain a greater number of staff members from the developing countries, who would undoubtedly be better able to understand the particular problems of those countries.

18. Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) welcomed the fact that the budget contained increases only in the three most important areas of activity, namely technical assistance, safeguards and nuclear safety, and that overall expenditure had not increased in real terms.

19. The increase foreseen for 1981 was lower than that for preceding years, an achievement for which he congratulated the Director General. His delegation approved document GC(XXIV)/630.

20. Mr. HOFLAND (Netherlands) approved the increases for nuclear safety, technical assistance and safeguards. The budgetary difficulties of Member States made it necessary for the Agency to adopt a zero-growth budget. Efforts should continue to be made to seek every possible way of making savings while ensuring that the Agency remained capable of carrying out its statutory tasks.

21. He welcomed the presentation and content of the programme for 1981-1986, noting that it had been presented in a more concrete form than in the past.

22. Mr. POPP (Federal Republic of Germany) approved the draft budget. He welcomed the increase in allocations for nuclear safety and particularly for the organization of the Stockholm Conference on Current Nuclear Power Plant Safety Issues. His Government also supported the proposed nuclear safety research and development activities.

23. With respect to technical assistance, which was a priority sector, the Agency should attempt to make the best possible use of the planning basis provided by the new arrangements approved by the Board. The figures given in Tables 1 and 5 of document GOV/1977 for the extra-budgetary resources provided by his country were incorrect and he requested the Secretariat to update them. After they had been corrected, the total extra-budgetary resources provided by his country for 1981 would be US \$760 000 and not US \$653 000.

24. Activities relating to small nuclear power plants should be reviewed in the light of the conclusions of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE).

25. The creation of the Committee on Assurances of Supply was perhaps the most important result of INFCE and the cost of its activities should be included in the Regular Budget.

26. He urged that a careful evaluation be made of the current stage of the International Tokamak Reactor (INTOR) project. In view of the dimensions of the project it was essential to proceed with caution.

27. His Government was ready to co-operate with the Agency to develop new methods aimed at improving the effectiveness of safeguards while reducing to a minimum the disruption they caused to plant operation.

28. Mr. GOOCH (Canada) congratulated the Director General for proposing a zero net real growth budget while at the same time expanding the priority programmes of safeguards, technical assistance and nuclear safety. It was difficult to foresee an early end to the budgetary austerity to which the Agency and other international organizations were subject. However, the priority expenditures of the Agency would continue to grow; that applied particularly to safeguards costs as new and more complex facilities came under safeguards. Furthermore, the increase in the Technical Assistance Fund would probably lead to increases in the technical assistance costs charged to the Regular Budget which would greatly exceed the growth rate of the overall budget. Lastly, the cost of maintaining the Headquarters was already enormous and had risen from an annual US \$2 million to more than US \$8 million since the transfer. The Agency had to take immediate measures if it was to be able to carry out its functions under those conditions.

29. First, the Secretariat must strive to become more efficient, the value of meetings and symposia should continue to be analysed and personnel should be fully utilized.

30. Secondly, programmes of secondary importance should continue to be reduced. However, in order to avoid affecting the promotional activities to which the developing countries attached importance, those countries should clearly indicate their priorities to the Director General and the Board.

31. Thirdly, the Agency should redouble its efforts to reduce costs, particularly by trying to obtain more equitable tariffs for air fares and telephone and telex charges.

32. Finally, a consultant should be engaged at the end of 1981, as had been proposed the previous year, to study all possible ways of effecting economies on the maintenance costs of the Vienna International Centre. A study should be made of the extent to which the work carried out by outside contractors could be performed by the staff members of the VIC and of the procurement of equipment in countries, particularly the developing ones, which were less costly than Austria. The maintenance costs would again rise from 1 January 1981, when the Agency was to assume responsibility for part of the major repairs. Before concluding a definitive agreement with the host country, the Board should satisfy itself fully that the Agency was not undertaking commitments which might in the future be detrimental to its activities or which went beyond the compromise through which the Board had conditionally authorized the occupancy of the VIC.

33. His delegation reiterated its approval of the procedure for preparing the budget introduced two years earlier. However certain aspects of that procedure required further improvement, particularly the budget projections. Those which appeared in document GC(XXIV)/630 for 1982 and 1983 were not acceptable in the circumstances he had outlined earlier. With that reservation, his delegation approved the draft budget.

34. Mr. KENYERES (Hungary) said that the draft budget met with his delegation's expectations. The Director General had made economies by improving administration and reducing certain programmes of secondary importance. He welcomed the expansion planned for the three most important sectors of technical assistance, safeguards and nuclear safety. His delegation therefore approved the draft budget as a whole.

35. Mr. TALIANI (Italy) congratulated the Director General for presenting a draft budget with zero real growth. Unfortunately, the figures for 1982 and 1983 were less satisfactory. He hoped that the budget forecasts could be reassessed so as to reduce the increase in the coming years to a minimum while not compromising the effectiveness of the Agency in the main spheres of technical assistance, nuclear safety and safeguards.

36. His delegation was pleased with the presentation of the draft budget. The Secretariat and the Director General should in future add, possibly in an annex, information which would allow comparisons to be made with previous budgets.

37. Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea) said that the decision to maintain the growth rate of the budget at zero should not compromise the essential functions of the Agency. More importance should be attached to technical assistance projects under the Regional Co-operative Agreement for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology (RCA), nuclear safety and safeguards. His delegation approved the programme for 1981-86 and the budget for 1981.

38. Mr. DALAL (India) drew attention to the dangers of maintaining zero budgetary growth while at the same time increasing funds for regulatory activities. It was clear that the promotional activities, which were essential, would be sacrificed.

39. Expenditure on the application of safeguards in some nuclear-weapon States was nothing but a subsidy to State Systems of Accounting and Control and should be withdrawn in order to make savings.

40. Mr. HABASHI (Sudan) observed that the Regular Budget proposed for 1981 was about US \$8 million higher than that for 1980. Of that total increase, safeguards, nuclear safety, administration and general services alone accounted for US \$5.7 million. In contrast, an increase of less than US \$500 000 was allocated to technical assistance. Food and agriculture and the life sciences were also granted only small increases. That regrettable imbalance had persisted for many years, and Sudan, together with a number of other countries, had drawn attention to the matter at each session, but to no avail. He very much hoped that their point of view would at last be heeded.

41. Mr. STROHAL (Yugoslavia) said he, too, hoped that the Agency's promotional activities would be extended and that they would take their due place alongside the Agency's regulatory functions. Furthermore, he supported the statement by the representative of India concerning the application of safeguards in nuclear-weapon States. Lastly, he wished to thank the Agency, and especially the Division of Technical Assistance and the appropriate nuclear safety services, for the valuable assistance provided to his country during the final stage of construction of its nuclear power station. He hoped that collaboration would continue.

42. Mrs. DAVIDOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that her country approved document GC(XXIV)/630 as a whole and especially all sections dealing with safeguards, nuclear safety, the International Nuclear Information System (INIS) and the applications of isotopes and radiation. She hoped that the Agency would continue its active collaboration with experts from her country in those fields.

43. The idea of zero growth was certainly not a very satisfactory one, but it seemed justified in the circumstances. It was to be hoped that the Agency would endeavour to reduce administrative costs and non-productive expenditures. The reorganization of the Department of Technical Operations should promote efficiency and allow savings to be made. She trusted that the Secretariat would pay due heed to the remarks made on that subject at the June meetings of the Board of Governors.

44. Mr. VYCHEGZHANIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that he approved document GC(XXIV)/630 and the draft resolutions attached thereto. He was particularly pleased to note that a zero-growth budget was proposed for 1981. However, the forecasts for 1982 and 1983 seemed too high.

45. The increase in expenditure on nuclear safety and environmental protection, safeguards, technical assistance and training would be barely sufficient to allow the Agency to perform its tasks properly. In particular, the increase in expenditure on safeguards was far from excessive; in fact, despite the improved equipment and techniques being used, it was not even adequate to meet the requirements in that sector, especially in view of the increase in the number of inspections.

46. With regard to the programme for 1981-1986, his delegation would like to see some real planning of activities relating to nuclear power and reactor safety. The siting of installations near towns should be studied, and detailed analyses should be made of the results obtained with gas-cooled fast reactors and with various types of fuel cycle.

47. Mr. KIRK (United States of America) said that his delegation approved the proposed Regular Budget for 1981 and the target for voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance Fund recommended by the Board.

Since his country, like many other countries, faced severe budgetary constraints, he commended the presentation of a Regular Budget which offered overall zero growth while providing for needed growth in the priority areas of safeguards, safety and technical assistance. A praiseworthy effort had also been made to reduce and eliminate low-priority activities. The identification of low-priority projects should become a regular feature in the preparation of the annual budget. The real growth rate of the budget should be held as close to zero as possible while still permitting substantial increases in priority programmes. His delegation could endorse a very substantial, real increase in the technical assistance target for 1981.

48. Mr. de PEYSTER (France) congratulated the Secretariat on formulating a zero-growth budget for 1981 while still according the appropriate preferential treatment to the technical assistance, safeguards and nuclear safety programmes. However, the figures for 1982 and 1983 were not acceptable, and the Agency should give serious thought to reducing expenditure on travel, maintenance and administration. With those reservations, which had already been stated during the Board's meetings in June, France approved the Regular Budget for 1981.

49. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the document under review was an excellent paper which allowed a detailed study to be made of the main guidelines for the future. The emphasis should be placed on areas such as nuclear power, the fuel cycle, the safety of nuclear power plants, environmental protection, waste disposal and the exchange of scientific and technical information. Safeguards activities were also very important for their role in the non-proliferation campaign, which was in the interest of all countries.

50. The new presentation made for greater efficiency and better monitoring of programme implementation. In conclusion, although he considered that more systematic economy measures would have to be taken in the future, the budget for 1981 seemed realistic and therefore met with his delegation's approval.

51. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) said he was pleased to note that the proposed budget for 1981 was not higher in real terms than the budget for 1980. However, he was rather concerned by the effects which a zero-growth budget could have on such Agency promotional activities as agriculture, life sciences and physical sciences: after all, the Statute laid particular emphasis on

promotional activities. Priorities should certainly be established, but promotional activities should not be sacrificed for the sake of zero growth. His country therefore approved the budget for 1981 but hoped that in future promotional activities could be spared by adopting a more flexible approach to the drafting of the budget.

52. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that he found it hard to understand why the principle of zero growth had been adopted for the 1981 budget. The development of the uses of nuclear energy should be promoted and not simply regulated. If the Agency continued along that path, there might be more and more regulations and less and less activities to regulate: in the present circumstances, the time would seem ripe for the Agency to develop its activities and not to stabilize them. The uses of nuclear energy certainly did pose a number of problems, but at present there was clearly no alternative to the development of that source of power, as had been stressed by the participants at the World Energy Conference in Munich. The world's need for nuclear power was greater than ever in view of the oil supply problems and the lack of alternatives in the foreseeable future.

53. The cost of the programmes had increased by 1.2% whereas prices had risen by more than 8%. Expenditure on safeguards, i.e. on regulatory activities, had increased by 15%, and all other programmes had had to be cut back in order to hold the budget at the previous year's level. The appropriation for technical assistance had increased only slightly, although it was just as important a part of the budget as safeguards. The nuclear power programme had been reduced considerably, despite the fact that its usefulness had become more apparent than ever. Furthermore, the reorganization of the Department of Technical Operations should be postponed since it did not seem to be immediately necessary: it would give rise to extra expenditure and overlapping.

54. The 6.4% increase in expenditure on nuclear safety was entirely justified, especially in the light of the concern felt by the public, particularly after the Three Mile Island incident. His country was very much in favour of the proposal that the Agency should provide emergency assistance in the event of an incident occurring in a developing country, or in any other country for

that matter. In the current world situation, the emphasis should be placed on safety, nuclear power and the environment. Information to the general public was also a priority item: the Director General could, perhaps, find a way to use extra-budgetary resources in order to fund activities intended to provide the public at large with a more realistic view of the advantages and disadvantages of nuclear power. INIS, too, deserved general support.

55. Among the areas which had suffered from the cutback in expenditure, food and agriculture were especially important for the developing countries. Expenditure in those sectors would be reduced by 4.2%, whereas the cost of maintaining the Headquarters would soon alone exceed the total allocated to technical assistance. Such costs should be limited, as should travel expenses, which were artificially inflated by the schilling exchange rates used.

56. He wished to thank all those States which had provided extra-budgetary resources in addition to their contributions. He hoped that they would continue with that practice, which allowed the balance between promotional and regulatory activities to be restored to some extent. In conclusion, his delegation approved the programme and budget.

57. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that he did not wish to dwell on his Government's concern regarding the size of the Agency's general overheads: he hoped that those costs would be kept under close scrutiny in the future. Nevertheless, there were three areas where savings should not be made indiscriminately, namely, safeguards (the importance of which for all countries lay beyond doubt), safety and technical assistance. The funds for technical assistance, originating mainly from voluntary contributions, had increased considerably in real terms. In conclusion, his country supported the budget for 1981, which had been kept within reasonable limits given the present difficult circumstances.

58. Mr. GARCÍA-LÓPEZ SANTAOLALLA (Mexico) said that he would not repeat the remarks made by his delegation in the Board. He could approve the budget in so far as no real net increases were proposed but only adjustments to cover, for instance, fluctuations in the exchange rate of the schilling. He hoped that technical assistance would be strengthened.

59. Mr. PICTET (Switzerland) considered that the Secretariat had presented a well-balanced programme. His delegation attached great importance not only to nuclear safety and the management of radioactive waste but also to public information, where even greater efforts would be in order. He congratulated the Director General on producing a zero-growth budget which met the concerns of his country. On the other hand, he was worried by the forecasts for 1982 and 1983, which seemed too high. From the document under review, it was not easy to determine to what extent the increases envisaged corresponded to the rise in the cost of living or to a real growth in activities.

60. In principle, his delegation could agree to the proposed reorganization of the Department of Technical Operations. However, noting that it was planned that the Division of Nuclear Safety and Environmental Protection should become the Division of Nuclear Safety, he wished to know what would then happen to environmental protection activities. His delegation was particularly concerned by that subject since his Government was constantly being challenged by anti-nuclear movements. The new Division should not deal solely with radiation protection.

61. Mr. COELHO (Brazil), recalling his Government's views on the budget for 1981, said he was in favour of a zero growth in expenditure, provided that none of the priority activities would suffer on that account. He requested the Secretariat to take steps to reduce the imbalance between the promotional and regulatory activities. He called for a maximum reduction in all expenditure and approved, in particular, the Secretariat's proposal for entrusting more inspection-related work to staff in the General Service category. The Secretariat should see to it, however, that the staff concerned were subject to the same regulations as the inspectors, that their work should not duplicate that of the inspectors, and that the measure did not entail the creation of other administrative posts.

62. Mr. CHAGULA (United Republic of Tanzania) stated that, while supporting the draft budget, his delegation was against the safeguards expenditure increasing more rapidly than the technical assistance expenditure. He hoped that the reorganization of the Department of Technical Operations and the establishment of three Divisions would lead to greater efficiency. In paragraph A/20 of the budget document, the expression "less developed countries" should be replaced by "the least developed countries", in accordance with United Nations terminology, so as to avoid any confusion.

63. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt) expressed his support for the draft budget. Nuclear energy had now proven its worth and appeared to be the only way of meeting the need for increased energy. It was therefore heartening to see that the Agency was seeking to provide technical assistance to countries that had decided to embark upon nuclear power programmes. The developing countries in general, and the countries of Africa in particular, would be in a position to gain considerably from the application of nuclear energy in areas such as hydrology and soil water conservation. Egypt was willing to give the benefit of its experience and its facilities to countries in need of them. He hoped that despite the slow-down in certain programmes the Agency would intensify its efforts to solve the problems facing the development of nuclear power.

64. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) supported the changes in priority made in the draft budget, as compared with the previous years. The Austrian Government approved the document in question and welcomed, in particular, the establishment of the Committee on Assurances of Supply (CAS), in which it intended to take an active part.

65. Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom), recalling that his delegation had already made known its views in the Board, approved the 1981 draft budget as a whole, but considered that the estimates for 1982 and 1983 were excessive, especially as regards administrative costs. Resources should be allocated first and foremost to the priority areas, which in his opinion were safeguards, nuclear safety and technical assistance. Furthermore, his delegation had already approved a considerable increase in the target for the Technical Assistance Fund as well as an increase in the corresponding activities financed under the Regular Budget. It had to be kept in mind, however, that promotional activities were not all of the same importance and that it might be necessary to eliminate some programmes that were no longer topical in order to free funds for more essential activities.

66. Mr. RAKOTO ANDRIANTSILAVO (Madagascar) stressed the importance of technical assistance for countries which were in process of developing their nuclear activities. It should not be forgotten that technical assistance depended to a high degree on extrabudgetary resources, and he expressed his appreciation to the countries that were placing such resources at the Agency's disposal. The Agency should also be able to improve the quality of its assistance by selecting experts more carefully and by organizing seminars

and conferences better suited to the needs of developing countries. He pointed out that a zero growth in the budget was perhaps admirable from the standpoint of financial stringency, but that it did not take into account the needs of Member States. Furthermore, he regretted to see the marked imbalance existing between the outlay on safeguards and nuclear safety, as against the appropriation for technical assistance.

67. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation approved the draft budget. Because of the present economic crisis, it was encouraging that the amount proposed was the same as in 1980, although it should not be forgotten that an increase in activities might become necessary in certain priority areas such as safeguards, technical assistance and nuclear safety. Despite apparent divergences of view, those were the three areas of prime interest to the Member States of the Agency as a whole. The Irish Government, for its own part, attached very great importance to nuclear waste management. He therefore requested the Agency to step up its activities in those four areas and also called for the greatest possible reduction in administrative costs, which might grow out of all proportion in the coming years.

68. Mr. HOSSAIN (Bangladesh) pointed out that, although in the overall budget for 1981 the total funds available for the safeguards programme and for technical assistance and education seemed to be the same, the resources available for technical assistance actually stemmed mainly from voluntary contributions, only US \$4 million being provided for the programme in the Regular Budget. Since the amount of the 1981 draft budget was not greater than the budget for 1980, despite the increased cost of living, it was inevitable that resources available for certain programmes, such as life sciences or food and agriculture, should have diminished. The Agency would have to remedy that situation. He recalled that the Regional Co-operative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology (RCA), which was of interest to the countries of the Far East, South-East Asia and the Pacific, and which had just recently been extended, was such as to justify a regional centre financed from the Agency's budget in the same way as the International Centre for Theoretical Physics at Trieste and the International Laboratory of Marine Radioactivity at Monaco.

69. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) pointed out that the zero growth of the budget as against the previous year had only been possible at the expense of the Agency's technical assistance and training programme, which was one of the principal functions of the Agency and one for which the allocated

resources were insufficient. The appropriations provided for safeguards and nuclear safety, on the other hand, had been increased. He therefore urged the Agency to do away with the imbalance, to increase the funds available for technical assistance and to ensure that the budget provided for the needs of the Member States as a whole. Nigeria, for its part, was seeking to produce energy in other ways than from its oil, which it was planned to reserve for the chemical industry. He wished to repeat a proposal made by his delegation in New Delhi, namely that there should be set up a nuclear physics training centre for the countries of West Africa.

70. Mr. ABBADESSA (Director, Division of Budget and Finance) said he would make the corrections requested by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. He informed the representative of Switzerland that the Secretariat had drawn up the 1981 draft budget on the assumption that the increase in the cost of living would be roughly 8.8%. Figures of 11.8% and 8.3% had been used for the calculations for 1982 and 1983. On the other hand, allowance had not been made for possible depreciation of the dollar. It seemed even now that the percentage envisaged for the cost-of-living increase in 1983 might be too small.

71. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee of the Whole wished to adopt the draft resolutions contained in Annex VI of document GC(XXIV)/630 relating to the Regular Budget appropriations for 1981, the Technical Assistance Fund allocation for 1981, and the Working Capital Fund in 1981.

72. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.