



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/OR.83

23 November 1992

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

THIRTY-SIXTH (1992) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Wednesday, 23 September 1992, at 10.40 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. EL-SAIEDI (Egypt)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
16	The financing of technical assistance	1 - 11
18	The Agency's programme and budget for 1993 and 1994	12 - 39
20	Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	40 - 74

[*] GC(XXXVI)/1027.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document
GC(XXXVI)/INF/313/Rev.2.

Abbreviations used in this record

ASSET	Assessment of Safety Significant Events Team
EURATOM	European Atomic Energy Community
INES	International Nuclear Event Scale
IPF	Indicative planning figures
IRS	Incident Reporting System
OSART	Operational Safety Review Team
TACF	Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund

THE FINANCING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (GC(XXXV)/RES/562; GC(XXXVI)/1022 and Add.1; GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, during the June meetings of the Board of Governors, the chairman of the informal working group on the financing of technical assistance, Ambassador Anguiano of Mexico, had presented a preliminary report on the group's work. Document GC(XXXVI)/1022 contained an updated version of that report. The addendum reproduced the summary record of the discussions which had taken place in the Board the preceding week on the financing of technical assistance. Finally, document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107 contained a draft resolution submitted by Nigeria on behalf of the Group of 77.

2. Mr. HELLER (Mexico) said that the informal working group chaired by Mr. Anguiano had been chiefly concerned with establishing what the various positions of States were with regard to the financing of technical assistance, so that at a later stage, if the General Conference so decided, ways of obtaining secure and predictable resources to finance technical assistance could be studied and negotiations pursued. With that in mind, extensive consultations had taken place with representatives of Member States not only in Vienna, but also in Geneva and elsewhere. As a result, it had been possible to define clearly the various positions, draw conclusions, and gain an idea of likely future developments. There was clearly a wide divergence of opinions as to how the problem of financing technical assistance should be dealt with. It was against that background that the Group of 77 had drawn up the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107.

3. Mr. de JONG (Netherlands) said that his delegation had taken note of the progress made with regard to the financing of technical assistance. He congratulated the informal working group and its chairman on the results of the first stage of their examination of the issue, which could be viewed as an "inventory" phase. As the next step, the informal working group should be asked, through the established procedure, to continue its work and in particular to examine the specific proposals (such as the one made by India the preceding week in the Board of Governors) described in the documents submitted for the current item.

4. Mr. CHEN (China) thanked Mr. Anguiano for his diligent efforts in presiding over the consultations within the informal working group on the financing of technical assistance. His earnest and responsible attitude and his patience deserved commendation. The Board's report (GC(XXXVI)/1022) gave a precise and objective account of the useful proposals and opinions which had been put forward by various Member States. Although the content of the report was essentially procedural and preliminary, it nevertheless constituted a sound basis for future work.

5. The Board of Governors and the General Conference had been considering the issue of the financing of technical assistance for many years, but no substantial progress had yet been made. The question was certainly a complex one, but the lack of progress was principally attributable to a lack of enthusiasm and political will. As the world situation evolved, the consultations should acquire greater depth and become more rational. Member States should neither attempt to freeze the current situation by advocating the maintenance of the status quo, nor press too hastily for radical change. A realistic attitude was obviously required. Thus, when Member States were considering the issue, they would have to take account both of established objectives and current realities. The first objective should be to ensure the availability of adequate, secure and predictable resources for the financing of technical assistance. For that purpose, the various attitudes held by Member States regarding ways and means of achieving that objective had to be known. The informal working group had already made remarkable progress in that direction. Secondly, an in-depth assessment should be made of the current arrangements for the financing of technical assistance, including the main problems thereof. In other words, the situation regarding targets, pledges and payments should be examined and remedies put forward for the shortcomings found.

6. In order to move the consultations and discussions on the issue to a deeper level, the General Conference should request that the informal working group be re-established, without financial implications, with a mandate to engage in a second round of consultations based on the work it had already done and to submit to the Board of Governors and the General Conference recommendations on ways of fully implementing resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388.

He approved the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107, which had been submitted by Nigeria on behalf of the Group of 77.

7. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) thanked Mr. Anguiano for his patience and the constructive way in which he had chaired the informal working group. It was well known how much importance the United Kingdom attached to the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities. Nevertheless, his delegation felt that the indicative planning figures (IPFs) had provided assured and predictable resources for the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund (TACF) to date, and it had not changed its opinion regarding the need to maintain zero real growth in the Regular Budget. He was able to accept the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107, which had been put forward by the Group of 77.

8. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) said that his delegation was firmly convinced that technical assistance should continue to be financed by the tried and trusted method of voluntary contributions and IPFs, which had made it possible to mobilize increased financial resources for technical assistance and could therefore be viewed as assured and predictable. It was entirely appropriate that technical assistance should be financed from voluntary contributions, since that method offered the financial structure which was most favourable to recipient countries.

9. Noting that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/107 stated that the informal working group should devote itself to "negotiating feasible options for consideration by the Board of Governors and the General Conference", he pointed out that it was clear from document GC(XXXVI)/1022 that there were widely differing views on the way in which technical assistance should be financed. In the light of those differences, it was hard to see what "feasible options" there might be. The Chinese delegation had rightly proposed that the working group should submit recommendations to the Board of Governors and the General Conference on ways of fully implementing resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388. He therefore suggested replacing the passage he had just quoted from paragraph 1 of the draft resolution with the phrase "to advise the Board on ways and means to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388", since, on the one hand, it was open to question

whether "feasible options" existed and, on the other hand, the aim was to determine how that resolution could be put into effect.

10. Mr. AGU (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, requested that discussion of the issue be suspended to allow all members of the Group of 77 to express their opinions on the amendment put forward by the representative of the United States.

11. It was so decided.

THE AGENCY'S PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1993 and 1994 (GC(XXXVI)/1006; GC(XXXVI)/INF/312; GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/108)

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it document GC(XXXVI)/1006, "The Agency's Programme and Budget for 1993 and 1994", Annex IV of which contained three draft resolutions which the Board of Governors was recommending that the General Conference adopt. He drew the Committee's attention to document GC(XXXVI)/INF/312, which might be of assistance when it was considering the first of those draft resolutions. Lastly, the Committee had before it, in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/108, a draft resolution entitled "Appropriations in the Agency's budget", which had been submitted by Nigeria on behalf of the Group of 77.

13. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that, despite its difficult financial situation, Italy had expressed its readiness during the June meetings of the Board to approve the draft budget for 1993 as presented by the Secretariat. That decision had been based on its conviction that the reasons advanced for the increases in the safeguards and nuclear safety area were well founded and on the fact that the Secretariat had introduced substantial cuts in the programme originally proposed for the Department of Nuclear Energy and Safety to bring that Department's overall budget into line with the principle of zero real growth.

14. The Board's decision to impose further reductions but to exempt the safeguards and technical co-operation programmes from them had had the unfortunate result of cutting important activities in the safety area, and, in particular of diminishing the Agency's ability to carry out OSART and ASSET missions. The budget for such missions had been cut by US \$300 000, and other programmes, such as the IRS and INES had also been affected.

15. Consequently, his country was no longer able to approve the budget for 1993 and the programme of activities for 1993 and 1994 as set out in document GC(XXXVI)/1006, and it was reserving its position on the budget for 1994. He regretted the inconsistent stance of certain Member States - particularly those with special responsibilities as members of the Board of Governors - which, on the one hand, recognized the need to strengthen nuclear safety and radiological protection but, on the other hand, refused to provide the Agency with the resources, including the financial resources, that it needed to achieve that objective; worse still, the scant resources which were available were gradually being reduced. Would there have to be another nuclear accident before the Agency was allowed to implement fully all the activities that were needed? As members of the international community, Member States had a duty and responsibility to forestall emergency situations rather than acting after the event. His delegation strongly opposed the trend towards adopting measures which had a negative impact on essential activities while others remained virtually untouched.

16. The world was indubitably going through a period of crisis and savings had to be made wherever possible: to achieve that, precise priorities needed to be set. An in-depth review was needed of the role, objectives, working methods, and even the structure of the Agency, which had remained static for two decades and now required streamlining. For those reasons, his delegation had strong reservations concerning the budget estimates for 1994. He hoped that the Board would take steps to remedy the situation at future meetings and the financial resources required to implement the nuclear safety and radiation protection programme foreseen for 1994 would be made available.

17. Mr. DIJKSTRA (Netherlands) said that on the whole his delegation was satisfied with the reasons put forward to explain the real growth in the draft budget for 1993 and the estimates for 1994, which were necessarily still preliminary in nature. In view of the new challenges and obligations which the Agency was facing, especially as a result of new safeguards agreements and its role in promoting nuclear safety throughout the world, his delegation could accept, in principle, a slight increase in the budget for 1993. It would consider the budget for 1994 in the light of programme performance

in 1993 and would remain in touch with the Secretariat on that issue. It would also continue to insist that clear priorities be set and that costs be reduced wherever possible.

18. The emergency steps which the Director General had been obliged to take with regard to the 1992 budget were highly undesirable. What was the point of detailed budget discussions if the non-payment of contributions by some Member States forced the Agency to adopt disruptive measures of the kind seen in 1992?. Although across-the-board cuts seemed to some to have the merit of being equitable, the results were not always satisfactory since that approach did not necessarily take account of the relative weight and priority of the programmes affected.

19. He sincerely hoped that Member States would do what they could to avoid similar treatment of the Agency's budget in future years. In the plenary meeting his delegation would be supporting the Director General's appeal to Member States to pay their contributions on time. That would reinforce the significance of priority setting, which remained one of the fundamental tools for sound management of the programme and budget.

20. Mr. GUZMAN MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that he disagreed with the arguments put forward in paragraph 50 of the General Introduction to document GC(XXXVI)/1006, in which reference was made to Security Council resolution 687. Moreover, the Medium-Term Plan had not yet been approved, and he therefore reserved his position with regard to the third objective set out in paragraph 2 of the Director General's introduction to the same document.

21. Mr. SAVERIJS (Belgium) said that his country could join in any consensus on the programme and budget for 1993 contained in document GC(XXXVI)/1006. It should be stressed, however, that his delegation's approval applied only to the first part of the biennial cycle. As it had indicated during the June meetings of the Board of Governors, his delegation was not convinced that a real increase in the safeguards budget was absolutely necessary. Some adjustment of the budget for safeguards and other elements would thus be required for 1994. His Government viewed it as essential to return to the practice of zero real growth in the budget.

22. The new partnership arrangements concluded pursuant to the agreement reached at the end of April by the Director General and the European Commissioner, Mr. Cardoso e Cunha, could result in much more substantial savings than were foreseen in the draft budget. The Secretariat was nevertheless to be commended on the considerable progress made in the technical discussions which had begun in July 1992. The conclusion of a first partial agreement, which should enter into force before the end of the year, showed that major results could be achieved in a relatively short space of time. Better co-operation between Agency and EURATOM inspectors would not, of course, stop the Agency from drawing its own independent conclusions.

23. Mr. PAPANIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation had taken note of the reductions made in the budget for certain projects, but felt that there was still room for savings and that the Secretariat should make further reductions. Greece had paid its contributions for 1992 in full and, as part of its efforts to strengthen the Agency's efficiency, it had always stressed the particular importance it attached to safety and safeguards, which were two essential areas of the Agency's activity. He hoped that the Secretariat would take account of developments in national programmes when evaluating world needs, and that it would establish priorities within the Agency's programme. The Agency had been functioning with exactly the same structure since 1957, and the time had come for the Director General to carry out a study with a view to submitting to Member States proposals for structural changes. In addition, when preparing the programme, the Secretariat should remain open to the idea of introducing structural change in order to anticipate future developments.

24. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt) recalled that it had been his delegation's position for several years that the principle of zero real growth should not be viewed as sacrosanct and that the budget should respond to real needs. The draft budget for 1993 indicated clearly the new needs which had arisen as a result of the increase in the number of countries participating in the safeguards system. He also welcomed the increases in other programmes. His delegation was confident that, in the coming two years, the Secretariat would strive to increase efficiency by making savings wherever possible without

harming existing programmes. He questioned the wisdom of the 13% across-the-board cut: such an approach was dangerous since it had an adverse affect on all programmes and did not take account of the real needs of all countries. He appealed to all States to pay their contributions to the budget without delay so that the Agency would not find itself facing the same situation again in the future. In conclusion, he approved the draft programme and budget contained in document GC(XXXVI)/1006.

25. Mr. HOGG (Australia) expressed his full support for the draft programme and budget contained in document GC(XXXVI)/1006, which was the result of long consultations and which responded to the demands that were currently being placed on the Agency. Australia continued to attach importance to the principle of zero real growth and was concerned that it had been necessary to implement an across-the-board cut of 13% in 1992. He hoped that Member States would honour their budgetary obligations and noted that, if priorities were assigned to programmes, it would be possible to make cuts in a more rational manner than simply applying them across the board.

26. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation remained attached to the principle of zero real growth: at a time of world economic recession, all organizations had to tighten their belts. He therefore welcomed the efforts which the Director General and his staff had made to bring the 1993 programme closer to zero real growth and was particularly pleased with the reductions in Programmes I and X. However, he urged the Director General to make every effort to avoid real growth in 1994. Finally, he associated himself with the view expressed by some delegations that across-the-board cuts were not a desirable practice.

27. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) said that his country continued to support strongly the principle of zero real growth and maximum absorption of non-discretionary cost increases. In view of the Agency's statutory obligation to maintain the safeguards system, his delegation considered the proposed increases in the safeguards budget to be non-discretionary and in keeping with the policy of zero real growth. His delegation was prepared to support the proposed programme and budget for 1993

contained in document GC(XXXVI)/1006. However, as in the past, the United States contribution to the budget for 1993 would be contingent on the availability of funding.

28. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France) said that his delegation felt that the draft programme and budget for 1993 should remain as it stood in document GC(XXXVI)/1006, which was the result of discussions in the June Board and represented a consensus which it would be dangerous to upset. France's support for the principle of zero real growth, which was entirely attributable to the difficult economic climate, made allowance for increases in activities arising from new obligations, particularly in the safeguards area. That did not mean that the Agency should not continue its efforts to increase efficiency.

29. Calling upon Member States to honour their budgetary commitments to the Agency, he expressed his support for draft resolution B (contained in Annex IV to document GC(XXXVI)/1006) concerning the TACF and the hope that the level of payments to the TACF would improve in the future. Finally, he supported draft resolution C on the Working Capital Fund, which was essential for sound and efficient management.

30. Mr. RUIZ (Spain) said that throughout the long deliberations on the draft budget his delegation had maintained its support for the principle of zero real growth, in accordance with the strict financial policy adopted by the Spanish Government. That policy, which had recently been reinforced by new measures, had resulted in major reductions in various sectors of the national budget for both 1992 and 1993. Clearly, that policy also affected Spain's contributions to the budgets of international organizations, including the Agency, despite the importance of the latter's work. His delegation believed that further savings could have been made in the Agency's draft budget for 1993 with a view to achieving the desired objective, namely zero real growth.

31. Consequently, his delegation could not approve the draft programme and budget set out in document GC(XXXVI)/1006. He noted with regret that, in the latest version of the draft, cuts had been made principally in the nuclear safety area, thereby reducing the relative weight of that area within the Agency's programme as a whole.

32. With respect to the resolution on the TACF for 1993, Spain, which had not taken part in the Board's discussions since it was not a Board member, had reservations regarding the proposed target for the TACF. Spain contributed to the Agency's technical assistance activities in various ways and its contribution to the TACF was only one of them.

33. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) approved the draft programme and budget as presented. Though his delegation also continued to support the principle of zero real growth, it was not unaware of the fact that the Agency had new and very urgent needs in various sectors, and it viewed certain priority areas - in particular safeguards and safety - as very important. With respect to safeguards, greater savings could be made by avoiding duplication of effort in certain regions. The progress which had been made in the negotiations between the Agency and EURATOM on the establishment of a new partnership arrangement was most welcome.

34. Mr. TALIANI (Italy) said that for the reasons he had given earlier his country remained opposed to the proposed budget. In particular, he felt that it was time that affairs were put in order within the Agency: for example, it was astonishing that the Secretariat had taken 20 years to realize that inspections in the European Community cost twice as much as elsewhere. Nevertheless, he could accept the draft resolution being adopted without a vote, on condition that the Committee's report stated that one delegation had opposed the draft budget.

35. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Italy for his co-operative attitude and assured him that the Secretariat would carefully examine all the proposals made and that the position of the Italian delegation would be faithfully reflected in his report to the plenary meeting of the General Conference

36. Mr. RUIZ (Spain) said that, despite the reservations it had expressed earlier, the Spanish delegation, in a spirit of solidarity, would not stand in the way of a consensus on the resolutions concerning the budget and the TACF, but he requested that Spain's position on those two issues be reflected in the summary record.

37. Mr. TALIANI (Italy) said that his country had not contributed to the TACF for some years - which it was within its rights to do since the Fund was financed from voluntary contributions - but that it had contributed more than its share to technical assistance through the International Centre for Theoretical Physics in Trieste. While his delegation was ready to accept the draft resolution on the TACF being approved without a vote, it was nevertheless not joining the consensus.

38. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt draft resolutions A, B and C in Annex IV of document GC(XXXVI)/1006 and the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/108.

39. It was so decided.

STAFFING OF THE AGENCY'S SECRETARIAT (GC(XXXV)/RES/564; GC(XXXVI)/1012; GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/111, 112 and 112/Add.1)

40. The CHAIRMAN said that, for item 20 of the agenda, the Committee had before it document GC(XXXVI)/1012 and two draft resolutions: the first, which was contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/111, had been submitted by Nigeria on behalf of the Group of 77; the second, which was contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, had been submitted by Germany and the United States of America and was being co-sponsored by Brazil.

41. Mr. HELLER (Mexico) said that his country wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution set out in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112.

42. Mr. CHEN (China) said that document GC(XXXVI)/1012 provided Member States with useful statistical information and data on staff in the Professional and higher categories. He would have liked it also to contain some information on permanent and fixed-term contracts. His delegation supported the rotation system for Agency staff, since it was the only way of maintaining a keen edge and bringing in new skills. He noted with satisfaction that the percentage of posts in the Professional and higher categories occupied by nationals of developing countries had increased over the years. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that the rate of increase was slowing down and he hoped that the Director General would intensify his efforts to implement resolution GC(XXXIV)/RES/541.

43. Mr. EKECRANTZ (Sweden) and Mr. ORJUELA BERMEO (Colombia) said that their countries would also like to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112.

44. Mr. PRAKASH (India) said that the statistics in document GC(XXXVI)/1012 showed clearly that the percentage of posts occupied by nationals of developing countries was still low, particularly at senior and policy-making levels. Staff members from countries in the Group of 77 still comprised less than 30% of the Agency's total staff. Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see that the proportion had increased slightly over the years and he hoped that that trend would continue, in accordance with the provisions of resolution GC(XXXV)/RES/564 and similar resolutions which stipulated clearly that additional measures should be taken to remedy the imbalance. He urged the Director General to redouble his efforts in that direction.

45. He noted with satisfaction the very slow but steady increase in the number of women holding Professional posts, which was a step towards correcting the present imbalance in the Agency - an imbalance which was apparent in many other United Nations organizations also. In that context, it might be helpful, for the purposes of comparison, to look at the texts which had been adopted by the Third Committee of the General Assembly in relation to targets set for, and the actual number of, female Professional staff.

46. Ms. LACANLALE (Philippines) associated herself with the comments made by the Indian delegation on the representation of developing countries in the Secretariat. With respect to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, her delegation would have preferred paragraph 3 to have been deleted, since it might preclude the consideration of suitably qualified young women for senior posts in the Secretariat. Her delegation would none the less like to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

47. Mr. HOGG (Australia) said that his country wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112. However, he would like the wording to be modified slightly. First, while he recognized the importance of the Agency's Provisional Staff Regulations and Staff Rules, he felt that reference should also be made in paragraph (e) to Article VII.D of the Statute. Secondly, he suggested that the wording of paragraph 1

should be modified to read: "Requests the Director General to intensify his efforts to increase the number of women in the Secretariat, particularly in senior policy-making posts, through the recruitment of suitably qualified women".

48. Mr. McRAE (Canada) said that his country also wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution on women in the Secretariat. He associated himself with the comments made by the Australian delegation and suggested deleting the last phrase of paragraph 1.

49. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) said that, if the German delegation agreed, he would have no objection to the modifications proposed, particularly the amendment to paragraph (e). It should be noted, however, that if that paragraph were modified in the way suggested it might create the impression that Article VII.D also governed promotions, which was not the case. That having been said, it was important to retain the word "promotions" since it was mainly through that channel that women would reach senior levels. The problem was one of drafting and perhaps the Secretariat could be asked to come up with a solution.

50. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea) noted with satisfaction the progress made in implementing resolution GC(XXXV)/RES/564. Document GC(XXXVI)/1012 showed that the percentage of posts occupied by nationals of developing countries had almost doubled in the past 10 years. He hoped the Director General would continue his efforts in that direction since there was still room for improvement. The Director General should also give due consideration to the distribution of posts among developing countries themselves, as the representation of certain developing countries, and in particular the Republic of Korea, had hardly increased at all in 10 years. That imbalance should be corrected, although due account must, of course, be taken of the provisions of the Statute concerning technical competence, integrity, and so on. However, where qualifications were identical, the Director General could use a country's level of contributions as a criterion. The Republic of Korea's contribution to the Agency's Regular Budget in 1993 would be three times higher than in 1992. His Government was prepared to accept that considerable increase, but felt that it should be

taken into account for the purposes of staff recruitment. With those comments, he endorsed the draft resolutions set forth in documents GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/111 and GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 with the amendments proposed.

51. Ms. KSENTINI (Algeria) said she shared the concern expressed by other representatives of the Group of 77 concerning the imbalance in the representation of developing countries. Despite some improvement in recent years, developing countries continued to be poorly represented and she urged the Director General to intensify his efforts to correct that situation.

52. There was also an imbalance in the representation of women in the Secretariat, particularly where senior posts were concerned. She supported the spirit of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, although some improvements in the wording were still required. Paragraph (d), for example, could include the specific provisions of the General Assembly's resolutions on women in the Secretariat. Many of those resolutions expressly stated what efforts were to be made to help women in developing countries, who - as women and as nationals of developing countries - were in effect being subjected to double discrimination. The draft resolution should take account of the dual nature of the problem. That could be achieved by amending paragraph 1 to read: "Requests the Director General to intensify his efforts, particularly with regard to the recruitment of women from developing countries ..." Similarly, in paragraph 4, the Director General should be requested, when submitting his report, to include specific information on how the recruitment of women from developing countries was being encouraged. With regard to paragraph 3, she feared that, instead of leading to better representation of women in the medium term, the effect of the measure suggested might be to accentuate discrimination, there being a risk that women might be kept in junior posts. The paragraph should therefore be reformulated so that it placed the emphasis on the efforts which the Secretariat should be making to give women appropriate training rather than to recruit them for junior positions.

53. Mr. OSTROWSKI (Poland) said that his country wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, and approved the amendments which had been proposed.

54. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said that, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, his delegation was pleased at the support it was receiving. The amendments put forward by Sweden to paragraph (e) and paragraph 1 were entirely acceptable to his delegation; however, it would be useful to hear the Secretariat's opinion on those amendments, and in particular on whether it was possible from the legal viewpoint to refer to both the Agency's Statute and the Provisional Staff Regulations and Staff Rules. The amendments proposed to paragraph 3 would have to be examined more closely in order to ensure that they would not have unforeseen negative consequences.

55. Mr. NORENDAL (Norway) said that his country supported the two draft resolutions under discussion and wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112.

56. Mr. ARIAS-SALGADO (Spain) said he had examined document GC(XXXVI)/1012 carefully. His delegation was of the opinion that the paramount criterion for the recruitment of Agency staff was set forth in Article VII.D of the Statute. His delegation was concerned over the relative decrease in the representation of the countries of Western Europe, and in particular of Spain, in the Secretariat. When selecting candidates, account must be taken not only of numerical criteria but also of qualifications. The current trend was unacceptable. Lastly, he expressed his full support for the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112.

57. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) said that, in the interests of transparency, the Secretariat should tell Member States what criteria it used to establish each country's quota of Professional posts. It should also indicate what the appropriate quota for each Member State was relative to the level of its contributions. Brazil, which had co-sponsored one of the draft resolutions, supported both the draft resolutions under discussion.

58. Mr. PAREDES PORTELLA (Peru) observed that there was an imbalance in the composition of the staff, particularly those in the Professional and higher categories. That situation should be rectified and better participation of developing countries encouraged, since those countries

possessed highly qualified staff both inside and outside the Secretariat. Peru supported the two draft resolutions under discussion.

59. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America), referring to one of the proposed amendments to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, stressed that the wish to see women from developing countries better represented in the Secretariat was entirely legitimate, but that the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/111, which the United States would support, responded to that concern in a highly satisfactory manner. As for the fears which paragraph 3 of document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 had aroused, it was quite clearly not the intention of the authors that women should be relegated to junior positions in the Agency. He wished to dispel those concerns and, having just consulted the German delegation, proposed that the word "young" be deleted from the first line of the paragraph and that the phrase "initially for junior positions" be replaced by the words "by Member States for positions". Thus amended, paragraph 3 might at first seem very similar to paragraph 2, but it did introduce an additional element in that it referred to women in scientific careers, who would be able to apply for senior posts on the same basis as their male colleagues.

60. Ms. KINSKY (France) recalled that her country had always been in favour of remedying the underrepresentation of certain countries that resulted from too strict adherence to the Statute and geographical quotas. That applied even more to the representation of approximately half the population, namely women. Her Government had always been of the opinion that competence should be the paramount criterion in the selection of candidates and that no country or group of countries, any more than one or the other sex, could claim a monopoly on competence. She therefore supported the two draft resolutions under discussion. With respect to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, the proposal put forward by the United States seemed at first sight to be quite acceptable. It improved the wording of paragraph 3, which had not been entirely satisfactory.

61. She had noted with regret, on reading document GC(XXXVI)/1012, that the countries of Western Europe had lost a further 13 posts in one year, bringing their total loss since 1989 to 27 posts and since 1985 to 38 posts. The

tables in the document showed that the implementation of resolution GC(XXXV)/RES/564 and the preceding resolutions on that issue had been accomplished entirely at the expense of one geographical group, Western Europe. The Secretariat should take steps to improve that situation in the future.

62. Mr. SHINOTSUKA (Japan) supported the two resolutions under discussion and pointed out that the underrepresentation of certain countries, including Japan, had not been taken into consideration sufficiently, particularly in the appointment of senior officials. He hoped that effective measures would be taken to remedy that state of affairs.

63. Mr. FADYL (Indonesia), recalling that his country attached great importance to the advancement of women in all areas, endorsed the two draft resolutions under discussion. He would, however, like the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 to be modified along the lines suggested by Algeria.

64. Mr. MIKHALEVICH (Belarus) suggested that the two draft resolutions, which were complementary to one another, be combined into one; if that were done, Belarus would co-sponsor the resultant resolution.

65. Ms. BRIDGE (New Zealand) and Mr. IONESCU (Romania) said that their countries wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 with the amendments proposed.

66. Mr. GOETHEL (Director, Division of Personnel), referring to the question raised by the representative of Germany concerning the amendment to paragraph (e) of draft resolution GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, said that it was perfectly possible to include a reference to Article VII of the Statute in that paragraph since that article set forth the fundamental principle governing the recruitment of staff. With respect to the wording of the amendment, paragraph (e) could start with a reference to Article VII.D of the Statute followed by a quotation of the relevant passage from that article, but the paragraph would then be rather long. It might be simpler to add the words "and further recalling Article VII.D of the Statute" at the end of the paragraph.

67. With regard to the amendment to paragraph 3 proposed by the United States, he observed that even without the amendment it was clear that paragraph 3 dealt with a specific aspect of the question, namely the recruitment of women in scientific careers, whereas the overall issue of increasing the number of women in the Secretariat, and especially at senior levels, was dealt with in paragraph 1.

68. Mr. DAVIES (Secretary of the Committee), recapitulating the amendments which had been proposed to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112, suggested that, in paragraph (e), the words "the provisions of Article VII.D of the Statute and" should be inserted after the word "further". Furthermore, paragraph 1 would now read: "Requests the Director General to intensify his efforts to increase the number of women in the Secretariat, particularly in senior policy-making posts, through the recruitment of suitably qualified women". Lastly, the beginning of paragraph 3 would read: "Suggests, as a medium-term measure, that women in scientific careers be put forward by Member States for positions in the Secretariat ..."

69. Mr. PRAKASH (India) said that the issue of the representation of women was being discussed in other United Nations bodies as well, and that it would be useful to take account in particular of what was being done in that respect at the United Nations General Assembly. In addition, the representative of Algeria had quite rightly pointed out that women from developing countries were doubly penalized when it came to recruitment and promotion. Paragraph 1 of United Nations General Assembly resolution 45/125 made special mention of the case of women from developing countries, and he suggested that, in order to reflect concern over that situation, the terms of the General Assembly resolution could be incorporated in the draft resolution under consideration.

70. Ms. KSENTINI (Algeria) said that, while she was aware of the complementary nature of the two draft resolutions under discussion, she must insist that there be an explicit reference in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 to women from developing countries, who were being discriminated against on two counts. She therefore associated herself with the proposal which had just

been made by the representative of India. Moreover, in paragraph 4, the Director General should be requested to report specifically on that issue. Thus, after the words "geographical areas", the phrase "in general, and women from developing countries in particular," could be inserted.

71. Mr. PREUSCHEN (Austria) said that his country wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112 with the amendments proposed.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/111.

73. It was so decided.

74. The CHAIRMAN requested the representatives of Algeria, Germany, India and the United States to consult each other before the next meeting of the Committee in order to produce a new version of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVI)/COM.5/112.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

