

**General Assembly**

Fifty-sixth session

Official RecordsDistr.: General
20 December 2001

Original: English

Fifth Committee**Summary record of the 34th meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 10 December 2001, at 2 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Effah-Apenteng (Ghana)
*Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions:* Mr. Mselle

Contents

Agenda item 131: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*)

Agenda item 132: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*)

Agenda item 134: Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*)

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (*continued*)

Other matters

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.



The meeting was called to order at 2.05 p.m.

Agenda item 131: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*) (A/56/495 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/56/501 and A/56/665; A/C.5/56/14)

Agenda item 132: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*) (A/56/265-S/2001/764, A/56/497 and Add.1, A/56/500 and A/56/666; A/C.5/56/14)

1. **Mr. Kennedy** (United States of America) expressed satisfaction that the budget proposals for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda had for the first time been presented on a biennial basis. His Government fully supported the Tribunals in their task of bringing to justice those who were guilty of truly heinous crimes but, in view of the requests for significant increases in resources, had serious concerns over the introduction of the respective budget sections at such a late stage. Both Tribunals had suffered in the past from serious mismanagement and inefficiencies and had been beset by allegations of corrupt practices. The short time frame that members of the Committee had been given to consider the large and important budget proposals was therefore wholly inadequate. It would be an injustice to both the Tribunals and Member States not to give the two budget proposals the consideration they deserved.

2. Both Tribunals were seeking substantial increases in resource requirements to support planned growth in capacity in order to fulfil their programmes of work. While his delegation welcomed the accelerated pace of work, given past performance concerns, it had difficulty supporting the increases sought over the appropriations for the biennium 2000-2001. The substantial requests for new posts at both Tribunals seemed excessive and unjustified in the light of previous management problems and the high level of

vacancy rates. His Government would need assurances that oversight measures were being put in place to address its concerns about mismanagement, inefficiencies and alleged corruption.

3. Furthermore, in the case of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the budget proposal stated that progress in disposing of the Tribunal's caseload would require the use of ad litem judges, which would be the subject of a separate request from the Tribunal to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The Tribunal must provide assurances that it would work efficiently and expeditiously to complete its caseload. Indeed, both Tribunals must be held to a specific programme of action for completion of their work by 2007-2008, given that they would continue appellate functions beyond those dates. The Tribunals must also continue to demonstrate that all their judges were working to full capacity and were continuously present when the Tribunals were in session.

4. Since his delegation believed that an improved oversight mechanism was needed at both Tribunals, it welcomed the proposal to introduce on-site auditors and investigators at the Tribunals. Clearly, such an important initiative needed to be discussed in the context of the Committee's review of the budget proposals. His delegation therefore proposed that temporary commitment authority should be granted to the two Tribunals and that consideration of the budget proposals should be deferred to the resumed session of the General Assembly in March or May, when the Committee's programme of work would be less congested. The intervening period could be used to more closely scrutinize the budget proposals. In addition, there was merit in the idea of moving consideration of the budget proposals for the Tribunals to an off-cycle, non-budget year.

5. **Mr. Chandra** (India) said that the budget proposals had vindicated his delegation's concerns at the high level of expenditures proposed for the two Tribunals. Further information was needed on the justification for the additional posts and increased appropriations being sought. He would also welcome, in writing, information on the number of judges who had been on tour for each of the previous three years and the number of days of proceedings that had been postponed as a result of their unavailability.

Agenda item 134: Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*)

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
(*continued*) (A/C.5/56/L.17)

6. **Mr. Mirmohammad** (Islamic Republic of Iran) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/56/L.17, entitled “Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon”, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

7. **The Chairman** said that the Committee would take a decision on the draft resolution at a later stage.

Other matters

8. **Ms. Salim** (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management), replying to questions about the status of documentation for agenda item 126, “Human resources management”, which delegations had raised at a previous meeting, said that a number of documents were in the final stages of preparation and would be available shortly. She apologized for the delay and wished to thank the Committee for its keen interest in human resources issues. Two reports, one on the age of retirement and the other on the internal justice system, could not be completed until all relevant bodies, including the Staff-Management Coordinating Committee had discussed the issues. The document on the internal justice system should be ready during the first quarter of 2002. The report on monitoring would also be completed at that time. The report on the use of consultants and retirees would be submitted for translation that week. Lastly, she expected the report on the mandatory age of separation to be ready by the end of the week.

9. **Mr. Nakkari** (Syrian Arab Republic) noted that the delay in the issuance of the report on the internal justice system was due to consultations between the administration and staff. Those consultations must be undertaken in such a way as to reflect the independent views of the staff. The report of the Secretary-General must contain tables that reflected those views. It was useful for delegations to obtain both viewpoints on the internal justice system.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.