



International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

---

GC

GC(XXV)/COM.5/OR.24  
March 1982\*

GENERAL Distr.  
ENGLISH

TWENTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION: 21-27 SEPTEMBER 1981

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,  
on Thursday, 24 September 1981, at 11.5 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DALAL (India)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
10	The Agency's budget for 1982 (continued)	1 - 53

---

\*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 8 October 1981.

\*\*/ GC(XXV)/652.

---

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXV)/INF/201/Rev.2.

THE AGENCY'S BUDGET FOR 1982 (GC(XXV)/646, GC(XXV)/COM.5/15) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had completed its discussion of the budget document (GC(XXV)/646) at the previous meeting and had agreed to postpone a decision on the three draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646. Following the consultations he had had with delegations, he wished to propose the following procedure: first, the Committee should postpone for the time being a decision on those three draft resolutions; secondly, the Committee should discuss the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 and, having completed that discussion, should also postpone a decision on that draft resolution for the time being; and, thirdly, after completing its discussion of item 10 of the agenda, the Committee should proceed with a discussion of item 11. He asked whether those proposals, which were designed to expedite the Committee's work, were acceptable to it.
2. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) said that, since the Committee had apparently been in a position to recommend approval of the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 at the previous meeting, he saw no reason not to do so now before discussing other matters.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared on the whole to be a consensus about the matters before the Committee; accordingly, it should not take long to reach decisions on them. Moreover, it was important to ensure that any decision taken on the budget would be unanimous as far as possible - a different result would run counter to the traditions of the Committee.
4. Mr. TEODORANI FABBRI POZZO (Italy), supported by Mr. KENYERES (Hungary), saw no reason not to decide on the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 before discussing the draft resolution on staffing in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15.
5. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that it would save time to decide on the three draft resolutions after discussing the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15. It might be thought that there was no relationship between the draft resolutions in the budget document and the draft resolution on the staffing of the Secretariat. However, the budget and the question of staffing were linked; moreover, the financing of technical assistance was another related question. He therefore proposed that the procedure outlined by the Chairman should be followed.

6. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that it would be wrong to decide on the budget before discussing the draft resolution on staffing, which came under the same agenda item. Moreover, the financing of technical assistance was relevant to the discussion on the budget and should also be discussed before the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 were recommended for approval.
7. Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) said that, since there appeared to be a consensus on the budget and the draft resolutions in Annex VII and since no delegation had asked for a vote, a decision on those draft resolutions should be taken after the discussion of item 10 had been completed. It was normal that decisions should be taken on items on the Committee's agenda as discussion of each item was completed; otherwise there would be a danger of delegations reopening a discussion after it had been terminated.
8. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) said that postponement of a decision on the draft resolutions in Annex VII might tend to imply that draft resolution B was contentious. Since that did not appear to be the case, he maintained his position that the decision should not be postponed.
9. Mr. BIN DA'AR (United Arab Emirates) said that the draft resolution on staffing reflected certain concerns of developing Member States and that there was no reason not to decide on it together with other draft resolutions.
10. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) said that matters which were part and parcel of the budget should be decided on with the budget. Moreover, the Member States who were not represented on the Board required an opportunity to comment at the General Conference on the form they believed the budget should take. In his opinion the draft resolutions in documents GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 and 16 were both inseparable from the budget.
11. Mr. RAHMOUNI (Algeria) and Mr. BELLOUKI (Morocco) were in favour of following the procedure suggested by the Chairman.
12. Mr. SIAZON (Philippines), approving the procedure proposed by the Chairman, said that it was clearly based on a desire to follow the traditions established at previous sessions of the General Conference whereby a vote on the Agency's programme and budget would be avoided and on an awareness of the views of most Committee Members on the various draft resolutions to be examined by

the Committee. In his opinion, if the Committee agreed in a spirit of compromise to recommend approval of all the draft resolutions before it without a vote, it would obviate the need for a vote on the procedure to be followed.

13. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) suggested that the Chairman's guidance should be followed in respect of the procedure to be used. It was necessary to consider the extent to which the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 and the three draft resolutions sponsored by the Group of 77 in documents GC(XXV)/COM.5/14, 15 and 16 were related. In his view they should be examined at the same time.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure he had proposed did not reflect the views of any one group of countries but represented a compromise between the views of a number of delegations he had consulted informally.

15. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) asked the Chairman to confirm that acceptance of the Chairman's proposed procedure would not entail the possibility of the discussion on the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 being reopened.

16. The CHAIRMAN, confirming that acceptance of the proposed procedure would not entail a possible reopening of the discussion on those draft resolutions, asked whether, if there were no very strong objections to that procedure, the Committee would be prepared to follow it.

17. It was so decided.

18. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), introducing document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, said that the Director General had, in his statement at the beginning of the Conference, clearly indicated his awareness of the problem of under-representation of nationals of developing countries on the staff of the Secretariat, especially at the policy-making, management and senior levels. It was in the interest of the Agency to recruit its staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible, with due regard to the considerations set forth in Article VII.D of the Statute. The present under-representation of the developing countries was considerable: they accounted for only one of the five Deputy Directors General, five of the 22 Directors and 17 of the 115 senior Professional staff members; altogether, of the 480 or so Professional staff members subject to geographical distribution, only about 70 were from developing countries.

19. At the time when the Agency had been established, it had been reasonable to recruit staff from the comparatively small number of countries where suitable candidates were available, but, after two decades of rapid expansion of nuclear energy programmes in the developing countries, candidates meeting the Agency's high standards of efficiency and technical competence were available in the developing countries in sufficient numbers for the Agency's staff to become truly international and to reflect more closely the composition of the Agency's membership. Qualified staff from developing countries would be more aware of the needs and problems of such countries, especially where technical assistance and related areas were concerned, and would help to improve communications between the Agency and many of its Member States.

20. Since the United Nations General Assembly had adopted resolutions emphasizing the need for increased representation of developing countries on the staff, the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 was consistent not only with the Director General's intentions but also with the practice of the United Nations. The measures proposed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would mean increasing the number of staff from developing countries by 30-40 per year over a period of four years, or by 150-160 altogether. The necessary candidates, and the vacancies required for that target to be achieved, would certainly be available.

21. The draft resolution also stressed that no particular post should be reserved for any one country or group of countries; it further requested the Director General to report to the Board of Governors and the General Conference on the implementation of the resolution and asked the Board to review the Provisional Staff Regulations and to report its findings to the General Conference at its twenty-sixth regular session.

22. Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) asked the Secretariat whether there was a quota system specifying how many posts each country was entitled to, and if so, what considerations, apart from those set forth in the Statute, were applied in calculating the quotas. He further inquired on what basis the 99 Professional staff members not subject to geographical distribution had been recruited.

23. Mr. KIRK (United States of America) supported the proposal that the proportion of qualified staff members from developing countries should be increased and approved of the Director General's intention to take affirmative action to that

effect. However, it did not seem wise to fix a specific percentage for that proportion, as the rate of progress would depend on the nature and number of vacancies that arose. There could surely be no question of forcing able and efficient staff members to leave the Agency; that would cause unnecessary personal hardship as well as detracting from the Agency's effectiveness.

24. Posts in the Agency's Secretariat should in principle be open to people from all countries and regions, but the prime consideration in recruitment should be a candidate's qualifications and ability to do the job.

25. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) agreed with previous speakers that the developing countries were under-represented on the staff and that action should be taken to improve the situation, but he felt that the draft resolution was lacking in elements of the kind contained in Article VII.D of the Statute, and that no specific percentage and deadline should be mentioned. The prime consideration must be that the Agency's staff should be properly qualified to provide useful technical advice and apply effective safeguards, and the fixing of a particular percentage as a target might encourage unwise decisions concerning the qualifications of personnel.

26. It might be helpful if the Secretariat could find means of actively seeking candidates from developing countries rather than waiting for them to apply, as vacancy notices often took a long time in reaching those who might be suitable for the jobs advertised. The Agency might perhaps contact universities and other institutions directly and announce in advance when certain vacancies were likely to arise.

27. Finally, he inquired why the draft resolution called for a review of the Provisional Staff Regulations and whether there was anything wrong with them.

28. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) agreed with previous speakers that there had been an imbalance between the developed and the developing countries in the staff of the Secretariat ever since the establishment of the Agency. He therefore welcomed the Director General's announcement that he would attempt to increase the number of staff members from developing countries and fully supported the draft resolution presented by the Group of 77.

29. Mr. AGIOBU-KEMMER (Nigeria) said that the Agency must have a universal outlook in order to achieve its objectives, and that it could not do so if its

staff, especially at the policy-making levels, were incapacitated by lack of personal understanding of the needs and aspirations of Member States at different levels of development in the field of nuclear technology. The world was changing, and former colonial territories had become independent sovereign States determined to plan their own development, although some former colonial Powers unfortunately did not seem to have understood that yet.

30. All previous speakers had recognized that the developing countries were under-represented in the Secretariat as a whole, and especially at the senior levels, and all wanted the imbalance to be corrected. The developing countries accounted for two thirds of the membership of the Agency, and they were only asking that one third of the staff should be from developing countries by a given time. The developing countries were not demanding any lowering of standards or qualifications, as some speakers had seemed to suggest; they were merely pointing out that they were now producing qualified people who should be given a chance to show their abilities. Of course, the term "qualified" was a subjective one dependent partly on criteria other than merit and experience. There was also no question of forcing competent staff members out of their jobs, but it should be possible, when vacancies occurred, to give priority to candidates from developing countries with a view to correcting the imbalance.

31. It had been pointed out that of the 22 staff members at the D level only five were from developing countries; it would be even more interesting to know how many of those five were at the D-1 level and how many at the D-2 level.

32. There seemed to be a policy of inheritance of certain posts; such a policy tended to perpetuate the current unjust situation and must be abolished in order to rectify the imbalance.

33. Mr. GILLON (Belgium) approved of the Director General's intention to give priority at all levels to qualified candidates from developing countries and agreed with previous speakers that the developed countries must be prepared to make posts available to suitable candidates from developing countries. However, although the Director General might aim at achieving a particular proportion of staff from developing countries, the fixing of an arbitrary percentage and date by the General Conference was not acceptable.

34. Mr. GALVEZ VILLARROEL (Peru) felt that the developing countries were able to provide the Agency with qualified manpower, especially in the field of technical co-operation, as it was now correctly called. That activity should be gradually expanded into a comprehensive system of co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and that would require the assistance of increasing numbers of staff from developing countries.

35. The Agency must adjust to changing realities; accordingly, the Director General was to be commended for his intention, announced at the beginning of the Conference, to increase the proportion of nationals of developing countries on the staff of the Secretariat. For the same reason, his delegation fully supported the proposals under discussion and hoped a consensus could be reached on the draft resolution presented by the Group of 77.

36. Mr. KOREF (Panama) said that a mission from the Agency's Secretariat had recently visited Panama in order to study the state of nuclear technology in the country. It had included staff members from developing countries and had been led by a national of a Latin American country. It had resulted in the emergence of six projects on subjects including the use of radioisotopes in medicine and animal husbandry and radiopharmaceuticals. Although it had lasted only one week it had been most successful; that type of mission was more valuable than expensive missions of experts lasting several months.

37. The adoption of the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 would benefit not only the nationals of developing countries themselves but also the Secretariat, which, by recruiting greater numbers of persons from developing countries who were qualified to take part in missions of the kind he had just described, would avoid the considerable expenses involved in hiring experts for such missions and thereby have more funds available for the recruitment of additional staff and for financing additional missions.

38. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt), supporting the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, said that there was a legitimate need for a meaningful increase in the number of staff from developing countries at all levels, especially at the senior and policy-making levels. Those countries not only had made considerable progress in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy but were in a position to offer highly-qualified and able personnel. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

39. Mrs. DAVIDOVÁ (Czechoslovakia) recalled that the matter of greater representation of developing countries on the Secretariat had been discussed

by the Board in connection with the appointment of safeguards inspectors. The Director General's statement, to which many representatives had referred, should be taken in full earnest. It was necessary to identify specific measures which would help developing countries to provide qualified candidates. For example, in view of the internal procedural difficulties in many Member States, the time limit for submission of applications could be extended from three months to five or six months.

40. Mr. SIEVERING (Deputy Director General for Administration), in reply to some of the questions asked, said that the time limit for submission of applications had already been extended to four months. It was intended to circulate to Member States well in advance a list of anticipated vacancies arising through the expiry of contracts, retirement of incumbents and so forth, so that the States could consider whether they had qualified candidates to propose. With regard to the geographical distribution of posts, the quotas for the different countries were calculated solely on the basis of their financial contributions.

41. Of 22 D-level posts, 8 were D-2 and 14 were D-1. All five nationals from developing countries were at the D-1 level.

42. Mr. CHIMA (Director, Division of Personnel) pointed out that answers to most of the questions that had been raised were contained in document GOV/INF/390. The posts of editors, translators, interpreters, some members of the Secretariat of the Policy-making Organs and one of the Medical Officers were not subject to geographical distribution, whereas the posts of the Director of the Division of Languages and the Chief Interpreter were.

43. Mr. VELLODI (India), replying to a question asked by the United Kingdom representative, said that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution called for a review of the Provisional Staff Regulations because parts of them dealt with appointments and promotions, matters closely related to the subject of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. do NASCIMENTO e SILVA (Brazil) stressed the need for a review of the Provisional Staff Regulations, especially as they had been approved in 1957, at a time when few developing countries had been in a position to supply qualified personnel. Under Article VII of the Statute, the Director General was

responsible for the appointment of the staff and should perform his duties in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board. Therefore, considering that many changes had taken place since 1957, there could be no objection to reviewing those regulations.

45. The Agency's good reputation was due largely to the excellent performance of its staff, and the draft resolution was not intended in any way to detract from that reputation.

46. Mr. TEODORANI FABBRI POZZO (Italy) drew attention to the fact that document INFCIRC/6/Rev.5 was entitled Provisional Staff Regulations as amended up to 27 February 1981. One might reasonably think that it was too early to make a review of those regulations.

47. Mr. SIAZON (Philippines) wondered whether the practice of basing a country's quota solely on its financial contribution was fully consistent with the Statute - it was after all only one of the criteria mentioned in Article VII.D - and whether the Board had approved the quotas established. He also wished to enquire how the Secretariat intended to modify its quota system in the light of United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/210.

48. Mr. CHIMA (Director, Division of Personnel) pointed out that the Agency was not guided by the United Nations General Assembly but by its own policy-making bodies. It would be difficult for the Agency, a much smaller organization, to adopt the practices of the United Nations. Document GOV/INF/390 had been circulated for information only. In establishing the quota, a margin of  $\pm$  25% was allowed in the figure calculated from the financial contribution; in the case of the highest contributors, like the United States and the Soviet Union, the actual quota was 25% less. The Board had neither approved nor rejected the figures. It might be recalled that the Director General intended to put the matter on the Board's agenda.

49. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) observed that there was a consensus, among both developing and developed countries, about the need to increase the representation of developing countries on the Agency's staff. As for the quality of the candidates and the proportion and target date, those matters could be left to the Director General, who would no doubt take all relevant factors into account. The

Committee could perhaps request the Chairman to incorporate the special points raised at the meeting in the wording of the draft resolution.

50. Mr. DE PEYSTER (France) said he had every sympathy for the objectives of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution and was confident that in making appointments the Director General would pay very careful attention to the efficiency of the staff. However, no time limit should be set for reaching a target. The fact that adequate time needed to be allowed for submission of applications after the issue of a vacancy notice was obvious.

51. Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) also sympathized with the developing countries, for his country was one of those least represented on the staff of both the Agency and the United Nations. In that connection, he welcomed the Director General's statement on the subject. The draft resolution would be more balanced if it included not just the developing countries but all under-represented countries - in the spirit of United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/210, which reflected the consensus of the international community.

52. The CHAIRMAN, noting that there were no more speakers, assumed that the Committee had completed its discussion of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 and wished to defer a decision thereon.

53. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.