



GC

International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/OR.37

January 1985*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

TWENTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION: 24-28 SEPTEMBER 1984

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Wednesday, 26 September 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. UMAR (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
18	The financing of technical assistance	1 - 4
19	Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	5 - 61

*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 18 October 1984.

**/ GC(XXVIII)/730.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXVIII)/INF/223/Rev.4.

84-6309

0196e

THE FINANCING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (GC(XXVIII)/717, 717/Add.1 and 717/Corr.1; GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/34 and Add.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/34.^{1/}
2. Mr. HERNANDEZ MATA (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of Egypt, Iraq and Mexico, said that, apart from the document number of the report referred to in the draft resolution, the text was identical to that of the resolutions on technical assistance financing adopted by consensus in the previous year.
3. 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 on the financing of technical assistance set forth in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/34.
4. It was so decided.

STAFFING OF THE AGENCY'S SECRETARIAT (GC(XXVIII)/723 and Add.1; GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 and Add.1)

5. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/419, the General Conference had requested the Director General to report to it at the current session on the continuing implementation of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. Documents GC(XXVIII)/723 and Add.1 contained statistical data presented by the Director General pursuant to resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/419. In addition, the Committee had before it a draft resolution in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.
6. Mr. HERNANDEZ MATA (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 on behalf of his own country and of Egypt and Iraq, pointed out that the text submitted was similar to that of the resolution on the staffing of the Secretariat adopted by consensus in the previous year. The only changes were that the numbers of the documents referred to had been altered where necessary and that the words "two years" at the end of the first operative paragraph had been replaced by the word "year".

^{1/} See footnote ^{4/} to para. 52 of document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/OR.36.

7. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt), expressing the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, said that his country commended the Director General for his efforts to implement General Conference resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 and trusted that he would persist with them until the resolution had been fully implemented and the developing countries had assumed their rightful place within the Secretariat. The long experience gained since the establishment of the Agency indicated beyond doubt that the developing countries were able to provide staff who were highly competent and capable of making an effective contribution to the attainment of the Agency's objectives. He recalled that his delegation had requested the Secretariat at the recent session of the Board to provide further statistical information on the staffing of the Secretariat; it would be extremely useful to know by exactly how much the representation of developing countries within the Secretariat had increased since 1981, the year in which resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 had been adopted.

8. Mr. SINGH (India), speaking on behalf of his own country and of the Group of 77, said he wished to discuss a particular aspect of agenda item 19 - namely, the staff of the Department of Safeguards. At a meeting of the Board on 20 September 1984, the Deputy Director General for Safeguards, recalling that some Member States had deplored the fact that an insufficient proportion of proposed new inspectors were from the developing countries, had said that of 29 persons being nominated for the inspectorate ten came from developing countries. More specifically, he had stated that six of those ten were from developing countries in the Group of 77, the others being from developing countries which were not members of the Group of 77. In the Secretariat's view, then, there were two categories of developing countries, those which were members of the Group of 77 and those which were not. Several delegations had immediately challenged that classification. The reply given to them had been that the Agency followed the system applied by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), under which countries receiving UNDP technical assistance or to which an indicative planning figure had been attributed by UNDP were considered to be developing countries. Subsequently, the Secretariat had stated that it regarded as developing countries all members of the Group of 77 and also - in accordance with the system allegedly applied by UNDP - countries such as Bulgaria, Portugal and Turkey.

9. However, it appeared that UNDP operated a rather flexible system which had varied over time. In some years, it had even allocated indicative planning figures to countries such as Poland. Poland, Turkey, Bulgaria and Portugal were very friendly countries, but the Group of 77 could not accept a situation where the Secretariat decided, in a unilateral and cavalier manner and without authorization from the Board or the General Conference, to consider one country or another to be a developing country. It should be recalled in that respect that the issue at stake was not technical assistance or development aid but the staff of the Secretariat or, more specifically, the recruitment of staff for the Department of Safeguards. Furthermore, UNDP assistance to countries was not necessarily conditional upon their being developing countries, and UNDP had been careful never to say that the recipients of its assistance were necessarily or exclusively developing countries.

10. The Deputy Director General for Safeguards had thus been wrong in his statement to the Board on 20 September 1984. It should be recalled that the Group of 77 consisted of the countries appearing in lists A and C of the annex to General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX) relating to the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Those lists were amended from time to time through the decisions of the Trade and Development Board and were always accepted by the United Nations General Assembly, which was the supreme authority in that matter. Two countries included in lists A and C were not members of the Group of 77, namely China and Israel. Cyprus, Malta and Romania, on the other hand, were members but not included in lists A and C. Portugal, Bulgaria and Turkey were neither members of the Group of 77 nor included in lists A and C of the annex to General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX).

11. The problem was undoubtedly a very complex one. The United Nations Statistical Office had adopted a classification which was different again and under which all countries were considered developing countries except the following three groups: developed countries with market economies (United States of America, Canada, European Economic Community countries, European Free Trade Association countries, Spain, Yugoslavia, Israel, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa); the socialist countries of Eastern Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, German Democratic Republic, Romania,

Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union); lastly, the socialist countries of Asia (China, Mongolia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Viet Nam). Thus some countries - such as Yugoslavia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Viet Nam and Romania - which belonged to the Group of 77 and were recognized as developing countries by the General Assembly were not included in that category by the United Nations Statistical Office. The World Bank used only one criterion for including States in the category of developing countries - namely, per capita gross national product. As far as the World Bank was concerned, China, Mongolia, Turkey, Portugal, Greece and Israel, which were not in the Group of 77, were developing countries. In contrast, it did not consider any Eastern European country, not even Bulgaria, to be a developing country. Furthermore, while it considered China and Mongolia to be developing countries, the same did not apply to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

12. However, although the problem was a very sensitive one, it should be emphasized that the issue at stake was not technical assistance or any other type of economic assistance. It was a question solely of the staffing of the Department of Safeguards and, in that context, the only acceptable definition of the term "developing countries" was that used by the General Assembly in resolution 1995 (XIX), as amended from time to time.

13. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt and supported what the representative of India had said on behalf of the Group of 77 with regard to the statement made by the Deputy Director General for Safeguards in the Board of Governors on 20 September 1984. Iraq was grateful to the Secretariat and the Director General for their efforts to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. The standards and criteria governing the recruitment of staff were acceptable insofar as they were applied on the basis of equitable geographical distribution and took into account the professional competence of candidates. His delegation supported the initiative taken by the Director General in providing training for young professionals from developing countries. The training programme was beginning to bear fruit: the first course, in which an Iraqi had taken part, was now completed and it was to be hoped that future courses would enjoy wider participation. He would be very pleased to see new one-year courses being organized on nuclear fuel, either through the Agency or through programmes arranged by advanced countries.

14. His delegation hoped that the Director General would continue his efforts to rectify the existing imbalance within the staff, since the number of staff from developing countries was far from adequate, especially at the highest levels. It was common knowledge that that was possible and that there were candidates in developing countries who possessed all the necessary skills. Finally, he supported the Egyptian request concerning further statistical data.

15. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia) recalled that, at the previous session of the General Conference, his country and many others had expressed their concern at the fact that, despite the efforts of the Director General, the number of staff from developing regions was quite inadequate, particularly at the highest levels. Only one more year remained to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386; time was running short. The task facing the Director General was, of course, an uphill one and he was doing his best. It was also a fact that, under Article VII.D of the Statute, the paramount consideration in recruitment was that candidates should be of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence and integrity. It would be recalled, however, that due regard must also be paid to Member States' contributions to the Agency and of the need to recruit on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

16. Document GC(XXVIII)/723 showed that, on 1 September 1984, of the 546 Professional staff members in posts subject to geographical distribution 507 had been at the "P" level, 34 at the "D" level and five at the "DDG" level. Of the five DDGs, only one was from a developing country, and only 13 of those at the "D" level and 93 of those at the "P" level were from developing countries. Those figures spoke for themselves, clearly showing that the number of staff from developing countries was still inadequate. That did not mean, of course, that the Director General had not done everything in his power to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. On the contrary, he was moving in the right direction despite the difficulties he might have encountered. It might well be that the Director General required more time to implement the resolution and rectify the imbalance.

17. Finally, he fully supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

18. Ms. AJAKAIYE (Nigeria) expressed her delegation's appreciation for the Director General's efforts to implement General Conference resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. However, the imbalance which persisted despite those efforts was dismaying. It had repeatedly been claimed that qualified staff were not available in developing countries. Also, it had been said that the assistance which would enable qualified staff to be trained must be provided through voluntary contributions. Whatever the case, her delegation believed that there were adequately qualified people in the developing countries who could be recruited into the Agency's Secretariat.

19. It was disappointing to note that, in the three years since the resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 had been adopted, the proportion of Agency staff from developing countries had increased by only 3%. It was difficult to see how the Secretariat could rectify that imbalance in the year remaining to comply with the request in the resolution. Her delegation was convinced that the Director General was capable of correcting the current imbalance in the representation of developed and developing countries within the Agency provided that he were given a free hand to do so. She supported the draft resolution requesting the Director General to implement General Conference resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 in the coming year.

20. Mr. CHAUDRI (Pakistan) said that, recognizing the imbalance in the representation of staff from developing countries within the Agency, the General Conference had, at its twenty-fifth session, adopted resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386, which requested the Director General "to take immediate steps to increase substantially the number of staff members drawn from developing countries at all levels, and particularly at the senior and policy-making levels, and to make maximum efforts to rectify the existing imbalance over the course of the next four years" - in other words, before 1985.

21. The efforts made in the last three years by the Director General to implement that resolution had gone some way towards remedying the problem of the under-representation of developing countries. The proportion of staff from developing countries in the Professional category had increased from 15.4% in September 1981 to 19.96% in September 1984, which was an overall improvement of some 4.6%. Although various statistics had been bandied around, he regretted to say that the figures he had just mentioned were the

only possible basis for comparison from one year to another. His delegation thanked the Director General for his efforts and urged him to continue to take steps so that the representation of developing countries was further increased as soon as possible. It should be pointed out that developing countries constituted nearly two thirds of the Agency's Member States and that a level of representation of about one third of the Agency's staff could not be considered either unreasonable or over-ambitious.

22. In recent years, a large number of developing countries had been able to expand their nuclear programmes in various areas and now possessed qualified and experienced personnel in relevant fields. Consequently, there was nothing to prevent the recruitment of capable and qualified persons from developing countries to fill vacant posts in the Agency's Secretariat. His delegation was in no doubt that the Director General would make further efforts to ensure that the developing countries were properly represented among the Professional staff of the Agency and could thereby contribute fully to its work.

23. Mr. KRAUSE (Brazil) said his delegation appreciated the efforts made to ensure better participation of nationals of developing countries in the Agency's Secretariat. However, the number of such nationals was still extremely low in comparison with nationals of developed countries. An illustration of that imbalance was the fact that, during the period 1982-83, only five South Americans had been recruited by the Agency, as opposed to 17 West Europeans. There was no doubt that a better balance could be achieved, and his delegation was convinced that the Director General would continue his efforts in that direction. Finally, his delegation supported the draft resolution sponsored by Egypt and Mexico.

24. Mr. NANIOV (Bulgaria) said that his Government's position on the question of the appointment to the Secretariat of nationals of developing countries - of which his country was one - was well known and that Bulgaria had no objection to such appointments provided that they were in strict conformity with Article VII.D of the Statute. His country was interested in the efficiency of the Agency and considered the qualifications and personal abilities of candidates to be of paramount importance.

25. With regard to the concept of "developing country", his delegation held that for the purposes of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 developing countries constituted an economic category and not a political one and that the Secretariat should stick to that position.

26. Mr. SCHELLER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the documentation submitted by the Director General for the current session of the Conference provided an impressive picture. The statistics supplied showed that the Director General had made great efforts to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 adopted by the General Conference in 1981 and had been reasonably successful in so doing.

27. Further progress could be made in the Department of Safeguards through the training programmes for young graduates and experts from developing countries. His country had already agreed to host such a programme in 1984 and had announced its readiness to host a second one. His delegation assumed that trainees would apply for posts in the Department of Safeguards and that everything would be done to facilitate such applications.

28. Mr. BARTELL (United States of America) welcomed the Director General's efforts to discharge his responsibilities under General Conference resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. The figures contained in document GC(XXVIII)/723 indicated that nationals of developing countries held a significant and ever-increasing number of posts in the Agency.

29. As had been stated by his delegation in the Board, the criterion of recruiting staff "on as wide a geographical basis as possible" was not the principal one contained in the Statute. Under the Statute, the "paramount" consideration was "to secure employees of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence, and integrity". It was essential not to lose sight of that consideration when implementing the resolution.

30. Mr. NITZSCHE (German Democratic Republic) associated himself with all delegations which supported a policy which conformed to the Agency's Statute. The guiding principle for recruitment should be Article VII of the Statute, which set out three fundamental criteria: technical competence,

financial contributions and geographical distribution. As his delegation had stated at the previous session of the General Conference, the first of those criteria was the paramount consideration, but the criterion of geographical distribution should not be neglected either. The action taken by the Director General in the past two years showed the direction in which the Agency was heading. Training courses for young graduates and professionals from developing countries had been organized and vacancies were being announced well in advance. The first results of those steps were beginning to appear.

31. The representation of nationals of developing countries in senior posts within the Secretariat had increased, in accordance with resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386, and his delegation was convinced that the Director General was taking appropriate steps to ensure that due regard was paid to the legitimate rights of Member States in filling vacant posts within the Secretariat. He pointed out that the German Democratic Republic, although not a developing country, was currently under-represented in the Secretariat.

32. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) said he understood that, in addition to the draft resolution sponsored by Egypt, Mexico and Iraq, there was a draft resolution in preparation relating to the use of working languages in the Secretariat. In those circumstances, it would perhaps be advisable to hold consultations under the guidance of the Chairman of the Committee in order to produce a single draft resolution and thus avoid duplication of effort.

33. Mr. DI BIASE (Uruguay) reiterated his support for the principle of equitable geographical distribution and thus for the fair representation of developing countries within the Secretariat. Unfortunately, the proportion of staff from developing countries - and from Latin America in particular - was still not satisfactory, but he felt sure that the Secretariat would continue its efforts to improve the present situation. It was in that spirit that his delegation supported the draft resolution set out in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

34. Mr. ZOBOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), taking note of the report on the staffing of the Secretariat, said he was pleased to see that positive steps had been taken to implement resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/386 and that in the past year the number of staff from developing countries in the Secretariat had increased substantially. At the same time, his delegation felt that the personnel policy of the Agency should take into account the interests of all groups of States and trusted that all members of the Committee accepted as the basic principle of that policy that - in conformity with the provisions of the Statute - the criteria applied in recruiting staff should be competence, qualifications, skill and efficiency.

35. His delegation was deeply concerned that, as shown in the documents before the Committee, the number of staff members from East European countries at the P-5 level had decreased by five in the past year. His delegation would like the Secretariat, as a matter of urgency, to take steps to remedy that unfortunate situation.

36. Mr. ZHOU (China) said that his delegation considered the demand for an appropriate increase in the number of staff from the developing countries to be a reasonable one. Recognizing its justification, his delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35. It also endorsed resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386, which had been adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference and which the Director General had done his best to implement. Some success had been achieved, but the issue would not be resolved until a comprehensive and reasonable solution had been found. Accordingly, efforts must continue to be made to achieve a satisfactory solution which would strengthen the universality and efficiency of the Agency.

37. Mr. BASSOY (Turkey) said that, as a developing country, Turkey had no difficulty in supporting the draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

38. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt), referring to the proposal made by the representative of Morocco, pointed out that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 concerned a question which had been under consideration since 1981 and simply confirmed a position adopted previously.

39. In contrast, the other draft resolution mentioned by the representative of Morocco was something quite new to the Egyptian delegation and probably to many other delegations. He therefore felt that some time would be needed in order to examine the new draft resolution, concerning which consultations might also have to be held; that was not the case for the first draft resolution, on which there seemed to be a consensus in the Committee. He requested the representative of Morocco to reconsider the matter in the light of what he had just said.

40. The CHAIRMAN said he hoped that the representative of Morocco was prepared to accept the point of view expressed by the Egyptian delegate.

41. Mr. HERNANDEZ MATA (Mexico) said he wished simply to endorse the arguments skillfully advanced by the representative of Egypt with regard to the importance and necessity of retaining the text of the draft resolution co-sponsored by his delegation and already submitted to the Committee.

42. The CHAIRMAN said he believed that, having heard the previous speakers, the Moroccan representative was willing to be co-operative.

43. Mr. CHAUDRI (Pakistan) wished simply to add that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 was based on a previous resolution relating to a period of four years and that from year to year the Committee of the Whole examined the measures taken to implement that resolution. He understood the proposal made by the Moroccan representative and, without wishing to state his opinion on it, he felt that a new element would be added which ought to be dealt with separately from the issues involved in resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386.

44. Mr. WANGURU (Kenya) said his delegation supported the efforts of the Director General. The documents on the staffing of the Secretariat submitted to the General Conference showed that the Director General had indeed done everything possible to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386.

45. As his delegation had said in the Board, the criteria applied in selecting Agency staff were appropriate but did not yet fully meet all delegations' aspirations and requirements. He had listened with much interest to the comments of the representative of the United States and shared his view that recruitment criteria should include not only technical competence but also geographical distribution, efficiency, integrity and financial contributions. The last-named should not be the sole criterion but should nonetheless be taken into account. His delegation endorsed the statement made in the Board by the Director General to the effect that basic criteria were applied in deciding whether a candidate was well qualified, qualified or not qualified. He was pleased to hear that, according to the Director General, all the candidates accepted by the Agency were well qualified. With all due respect to the Director General, however, he felt that only candidates sponsored by their Government should be considered. That would remove any impression that technical competence, geographical distribution or the candidate's efficiency and integrity might not be taken properly into account. The Governments of the Agency's Member States effectively applied such criteria in establishing their priorities and requirements.

46. Having said that, he had no difficulty in supporting the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

47. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that the Director General was making considerable efforts to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. He associated himself with the views expressed by previous speakers who, referring to the Statute, had said that the paramount considerations in recruitment were the efficiency, competence and integrity of candidates. With regard to the additional requirement that there should be wide geographical distribution, however, he pointed out that the number of Dutch nationals on the staff of the Agency was steadily decreasing and informed the Secretariat of his delegation's deep concern about that development, which seemed to be becoming a trend.

48. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) explained that his proposal had been in no way intended to hinder the work of the Committee. He had merely thought that it would be in the interests of all for the Committee to consider a single text. Having listened to the explanations of the representative of Egypt, he would withdraw his proposal.

49. Mr. MORALES (Cuba) said he had carefully studied document GC(XXVIII)/723 and thanked the Secretariat for the valuable information contained in it. In addition, he commended the Director General on his efforts in the past few years to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. Despite the results achieved, however, further efforts would have to be made to improve the representation of developing countries within the Secretariat. The Secretariat should, of course, strive to recruit persons of the highest competence to carry out its work, but such persons were available in developing countries.

50. He had no difficulty in recommending that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 be submitted to the General Conference for adoption.

51. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea), referring to the statistical data in document GC(XXVIII)/723 on the recruitment of staff to the Secretariat, noted that the representation of developing countries in 1984 was still below 20%. The efforts made in the last three years to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 were far from satisfactory. He shared the views expressed by the representatives of Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan on that issue and urged the Director General to take new initiatives to increase substantially the number of staff from developing countries and to rectify the existing imbalance. He supported the draft resolution sponsored by Egypt, Mexico and Iraq.

52. Mr. COUSINS (Australia) said that the Secretariat had supplied a very detailed status report. In 1981, the General Conference had given the Secretariat the task of substantially increasing the number of staff from developing regions, particularly at senior and policy-making levels. The Director General and his colleagues had performed creditably in implementing that resolution. In so doing, they had not only been obliged to comply with certain criteria in the Statute but had also been subject to other constraints: in some cases, for instance, Governments had not always been prepared to give official sponsorship to candidates. Nonetheless, the Secretariat had achieved very positive results within a short time. It was instructive to look at the rate of change in the situation since 1981 and at

the filling of new posts. Between September 1981 and June 1984, the number of staff from countries in the Group of 77 had risen from 71 to 106, or by about 49%, while the number of staff from developed countries had increased by only 7%. In the same period, 51 Professional posts had been created of which 32 (or about 63%) had been filled by nationals of developing countries. There had been nine posts created at the Director level with six going to candidates from developing countries. In other words, approximately one third of Director posts were now occupied by nationals of developing Member States. That constituted a very positive achievement and his delegation felt that an imbalance no longer existed at the Director level. At lower levels, significant progress had been made and the stage would soon be reached where the Agency's staff was better balanced. In conclusion, his delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35 and hoped that text would be adopted by consensus.

53. Mr. KENYERES (Hungary) welcomed the efforts made by the Director General to implement resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. However, as his delegation had said in the Board, recruitment must be based on competence and professional qualifications, which were the essential criteria for filling new and vacant posts. It would be necessary to continue examining the question of staffing, and his delegation therefore supported the draft resolution set out in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

54. Mr. SIEVERING (Deputy Director General, Head of the Department of Administration) observed that resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 requested the Director General to increase the number of staff from developing areas but that the text gave no guidance on the definition of the terms "developing area" and "developing country". The Indian representative had described in detail the complexity surrounding that question in the United Nations system and had rightly pointed out that different definitions were applied within the system. When the Secretariat had prepared the statistical data in document GC(XXVIII)/723 and in the documents which had preceded it, it had been decided that, in the absence of any universally accepted definition, the statistics would be given country by country and that it would be left to each Member State and each area to make its own assessment according to its own definition.

55. In response to a request for information made by the Egyptian representative, he said that, if UNDP's definition of developing country was used, for posts subject to geographical distribution the representation of

developing countries had increased from 24.3% in 1981 to 27.3% in 1984. If only countries belonging to the Group of 77 were considered, then, for posts subject to geographical distribution the representation of developing countries had risen from 14.8% in 1981 to 20.3% on 1 September 1984.

56. With regard to policy-making posts (P-5 and above), if UNDP's definition was used the representation of developing countries had risen from 24.7% in 1981 to 27.4%. If only countries in the Group of 77 were counted, however, the figures for the same category of post were 16.9% in 1981 and 20.4% in 1984. Finally, for posts at the Director and Deputy Director General levels, the figures were 30% in 1981 and 35.9% in 1984 if the UNDP definition was used and 23.3% in 1981 and 33.3% in 1984 if only countries belonging to the Group of 77 were considered.

57. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt), thanking Mr. Sievering for the additional information, pointed out, with regard to the concept of "developing country", which UNDP and the Group of 77 defined in different ways, that resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 had been drafted by the Group of 77 and then approved by consensus. It was clear, therefore, that the term "developing country" should be understood in the way in which the Group of 77 interpreted it. The criterion used by UNDP had never been mentioned when the General Conference had considered and approved resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. He requested that information of the kind just given by the Deputy Director General be reproduced in future reports which the Director General prepared on the staffing of the Secretariat. That would be useful to all delegations in assessing the extent to which the resolution had been implemented.

58. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) welcomed the positive steps taken to improve the representation of developing countries on the staff of the Agency. However, as he had pointed out in the Board, there was still a long way to go before the objectives set out in resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 were achieved. That resolution called for a substantial increase in the number of staff from developing countries at all levels and not just in one category. He thanked the Deputy Director General for the information he had given. His delegation intended to study it carefully.

59. As could be seen from preambular paragraphs (e) and (g) of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386, the terms "developing countries" and "developing areas" had been used interchangeably in that resolution, and he recalled that, when the resolution was being considered, the delegations of developing Member States had meant "developing countries" rather than "developing areas" and had considered that the main body of developing countries was represented by the Group of 77. Operative paragraph 1 of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386 should be fully implemented by continuing to increase substantially the recruitment of staff from developing countries.

60. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/COM.5/35.

61. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

