



General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
22 June 2022

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 12th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 31 March 2022, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Margaryan (Armenia)
*Chair of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions:* Mr. Bachar Bong

Contents

Agenda item 137: Programme budget for 2021 (*continued*)Agenda item 138: Programme budget for 2022 (*continued*)

*Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the
Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session*

Agenda item 144: Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)Agenda item 136: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial
functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Questions deferred for future consideration

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the
delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org),
and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the
United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

22-05048 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 137: Programme budget for 2021
(continued) (A/C.5/76/L.26)

Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.26: Progress on the implementation of a flexible workplace at United Nations Headquarters

1. *Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.26 was adopted.*

Agenda item 138: Programme budget for 2022
(continued) (A/C.5/76/L.24 and A/C.5/76/L.27)

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session

Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.24: Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session

2. **Ms. Minale** (Ethiopia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Ethiopia did not recognize the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-33/1 and would not authorize its access to the country. The Committee did not have a mandate to establish or dissolve human rights mechanisms. Rather, it had a responsibility to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, especially when those principles were being blatantly violated, and to allocate the Organization's scarce resources to lawful causes. The motives for the establishment of the international commission were political, and completely unrelated to the advancement of human rights. The international commission was a prime example of abuse of the multilateral human rights system and of the hubris of the powerful.

3. Over the previous year, Ethiopia had faced unprecedented internal security challenges, which had been exacerbated by the intervention of foreign actors that had sought to legitimize criminal groups and their heinous conduct, imposed unilateral coercive measures against Ethiopia, provided material and financial assistance to agents of destabilization, exploited humanitarian assistance and humanitarian organizations in order to undermine Ethiopia, conducted propaganda campaigns vilifying its Government, and made threats of regime change. The people of Ethiopia had nevertheless persevered in protecting their country, which had been independent throughout its existence.

4. The Government of Ethiopia respected the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and its leadership, which had demonstrated professionalism in the face of immense

pressure. OHCHR had provided critical support requested by the Government and, together with the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission, an independent body accredited as complying fully with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles) by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, had investigated alleged human rights violations. OHCHR and the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission had discussed the possibility of expanding their investigation to cover places and periods outside the scope of their initial joint investigation, but those discussions had been circumvented by the futile initiative to establish the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia. In the report on their investigation, OHCHR and the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission had disproven many of the false allegations that had been manufactured in order to vilify Ethiopia and its people. Regrettably, most of those allegations had been included in a white paper that had been submitted to the Security Council in order to trigger punitive action against Ethiopia. The findings of the joint investigation had nevertheless refuted the position of the sponsors of Human Rights Council resolution S-33/1, a position based on preconceived hostility towards Ethiopia. The international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia represented an attempt by some members of the international community to create a "Darfur-like" situation in Ethiopia.

5. Governments had a clear responsibility to respect and protect human rights, and international human rights mechanisms must consistently uphold the principles of independence, objectivity and non-selectivity and avoid double standards and politicization, as stipulated in General Assembly resolution 60/251. The abuse of the multilateral human rights framework in order to advance political agendas, institutionalize neocolonial practices and promote the image of one part of the world as the "saviour" of the other must be halted. Under the draft resolution, the Assembly would therefore not approve the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session. Ethiopia called on all delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a reflection of their commitment to the preservation of human rights.

6. **Mr. Glanois** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the States members of the European Union noted with regret the introduction of draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.24 and requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution. As the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted

with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, the Fifth Committee was tasked with ensuring that the Organization's legislative bodies had adequate resources to fully implement their mandates. In order to fulfil that function, the Committee must respect the resolutions and decisions in which those mandates were set out; it did not have the authority to renegotiate those instruments. Should the draft resolution be approved, the General Assembly would allocate no resources to the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, preventing it from fulfilling its mandate. The draft resolution thus constituted a direct violation of the decisions taken by the Human Rights Council. The States members of the European Union would vote against the draft resolution and encouraged other Member States to do the same.

7. **Mr. Croker** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Committee was responsible for determining the level of resources needed to ensure mandate fulfilment; it did not have the authority to challenge mandates that had been approved by other bodies. Although some Member States might disagree with the mandate of the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, that mandate had been agreed upon by an intergovernmental body. In voting on draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.24](#), Member States must decide not whether they agreed with the international commission's mandate but whether they believed that the Committee should fulfil its commitment to provide the international commission with the resources necessary to implement that mandate. The belief that the Committee should fulfil that commitment was incompatible with a vote against the provision of those resources. Although the United Kingdom would have preferred to provide the international commission with the level of resources requested by the Secretary-General in his report on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session ([A/76/524/Add.1](#)), in order to reach consensus the United Kingdom had reluctantly accepted the lower level of resources proposed by the Chair as a compromise, as set out in section III of draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.27](#), entitled "Special subjects relating to the programme budget for 2022". Member States should therefore vote against draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.24](#) and support the Chair's proposal.

8. **Mr. Lui** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was important to respect the decisions of the Human Rights Council. The mandates agreed upon by the Council should not be undermined through budgetary decisions. The United States therefore supported the compromise

put forward by the Chair, as it would enable the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia to ensure accountability for violations.

9. **Mr. Pose** (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation attached great importance to the practice of consensus-based decision-making, as it gave legitimacy to the Committee. The role of the Committee was to determine the resources necessary for mandate implementation; discussions regarding the relevance, appropriateness and scope of mandates, while welcome, should be held outside the Committee, in the relevant United Nations bodies. In its resolution [S-33/1](#), the Human Rights Council had established the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, which required funding in order to carry out its mandate. The Council had discussed the appropriateness and scope of that mandate. Many States had striven to reach consensus on a draft resolution that supported the fulfilment of that mandate, in line with best working practices. Argentina hoped that the Committee would continue to work constructively in order to achieve its objectives.

10. *At the request of the representative of France, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.24](#).*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia.

11. *The draft resolution was rejected by 66 votes to 27, with 39 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27: Special subjects relating to the programme budget for 2022

12. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested.

13. **Mr. Glanois** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the States members of the European Union were determined to ensure respect for all the decisions of United Nations bodies, including the Human Rights Council. The States members of the European Union would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.27](#), which would guarantee the provision of resources to the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The States members of the European Union called on other delegations to do likewise.

14. **Mr. Hadgu** (Eritrea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, while Eritrea supported sections I and II of draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.27](#), it was opposed to section III, concerning the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session. Eritrea had consistently rejected country-specific mandates, as they prevented constructive engagement in the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms worldwide. The experience of Eritrea had demonstrated the ineffectiveness of such politically motivated mandates. The establishment of the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia without consensus and without the consent of the State concerned was a clear violation of the principles of independence, objectivity and non-selectivity and of the obligation to eliminate double standards and politicization, as enshrined in General Assembly resolution [60/251](#). Such mechanisms undermined national initiatives to investigate allegations and ensure accountability, fuelled

confrontation and undermined the sovereignty and political independence of the States concerned. The main goal of the authors of Human Rights Council resolution [S-33/1](#) was to fulfil their geopolitical objectives in the Horn of Africa under the guise of protecting human rights. It was wasteful and untenable to allocate the Organization's scarce resources to mechanisms such as the international commission. Eritrea would therefore vote against the commission's mandate and the allocation of resources thereto, and hoped that other States would do the same.

15. *At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a recorded vote was taken on section III of draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27.*

In favour:

Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

Against:

Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Philippines, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia.

16. *Section III of draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27 was adopted by 78 votes to 18, with 40 abstentions.*

17. **Ms. Minale** (Ethiopia) said that Ethiopia was disappointed by the decision to provide resources to the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia. It was unacceptable that the objectives of certain countries continued to be legitimized and funded regardless of their legality or merit. Ethiopia did not recognize any aspect of the international commission. Rather, it would protect its sovereignty and independence against the commission and would strengthen its national institutions in order to promote human rights throughout its territory. It was regrettable that the productive relationship between Ethiopia and OHCHR had been jeopardized by the adoption of the draft resolution. Regardless of their intentions, Member States that had supported the draft resolution had undermined OHCHR and its leadership. Member States that had opposed the draft resolution were to be commended for their solidarity with Ethiopia. The experience of Ethiopia had demonstrated that cooperation with OHCHR could result in punishment for the States concerned. The mechanisms established by Member States were not fulfilling their intended objectives, in particular for countries like Ethiopia. The experience of Ethiopia had also demonstrated that the fulfilment by OHCHR of its responsibility to be impartial and objective, even under pressure from the media and their ancillary institutions, was counterproductive, as fulfilling that responsibility resulted in the establishment of mechanisms that undermined the Office's role. Ethiopia was confident that it would overcome the challenges it faced. The international commission nevertheless represented a stain on multilateralism.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27 was adopted.*

Agenda item 144: Joint Inspection Unit (continued)
(A/C.5/76/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.25: Joint Inspection Unit

19. *Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.25 was adopted.*

Agenda item 136: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (continued) (A/C.5/76/L.28)

Questions deferred for future consideration

Draft decision A/C.5/76/L.28: Questions deferred for future consideration

20. *Draft decision A/C.5/76/L.28 was adopted.*

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the first part of the resumed seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly

21. **Mr. Ajmal** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group welcomed the consensus achieved on a number of matters at the current part of the resumed session, in particular those relating to organizational resilience management and the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU). The Group was nevertheless concerned at the lack of agreement on human resources management, having pursued compromise by departing from its long-standing positions. However, it was encouraged that the Committee had found areas of consensus that could serve as the basis for future discussions.

22. The Group would continue to work in an inclusive manner to pursue a satisfactory conclusion on human resources matters, and in particular to ensure the introduction of action-oriented policies to achieve equitable geographical representation in the Secretariat, including by modifying the system of desirable ranges to better reflect that system's avowed aims. Although the Committee had reached agreement on a number of matters despite the difficulties related to remote working conditions during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, consensus on many issues remained elusive and in-person communication remained essential to the achievement of delicate balances.

23. **Mr. Eboa Ebongue** (Cameroon), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the Group was grateful to Member States that had worked tirelessly to achieve consensus on many issues at the current part of the resumed session. Their efforts had enabled the Committee to provide specific guidance to the Secretary-General on matters such as the revised estimates for the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). The Group particularly welcomed the successful outcome of the deliberations on UNSMIL, as reflected in section II of draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27. That draft resolution represented a departure from many previous draft resolutions on special political missions adopted by the Committee, which were minimal in scope and provided no added value. Draft resolution A/C.5/76/L.27 demonstrated the importance attached by the international community to peace and security in Libya. The Group would pay close attention to the nationalization of posts and was of the view that special political missions and peacekeeping missions must be of short duration in order to be effective.

24. The Group welcomed the consensus achieved on the implementation of a flexible workplace at United

Nations Headquarters, organizational resilience management and the report of JIU for 2021. It nevertheless noted with regret that no consensus had been reached on issues such as improving the financial situation of the United Nations, after-service health insurance liabilities and supply chain activities. The Group was also disappointed that no draft resolution on human resources management had been adopted and called on all stakeholders to put an end to the uncertainty relating to the management of the Organization's staff, its most important resource.

25. With regard to the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, the Group disapproved of any mechanism forcibly imposed on States. It strongly condemned the politicization of matters relating to human rights and believed that it was necessary to collaborate with, rather than single out, the States concerned. With regard to the second part of the resumed session, the Group welcomed the announcements of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General and the Office of the President of the General Assembly regarding the gradual resumption of in-person meetings. The Group hoped that, as a result of that development, simultaneous interpretation would again be available at critical stages of the Committee's work.

26. **Mr. Camelli** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer) said that the United Nations had been at the forefront of the pandemic response, proving more relevant than ever. During the pandemic, the Committee had enabled the Organization to continue to implement its mandates through the approval of programmes and budgets. Moreover, the Committee had largely fulfilled its own mandate through fully remote deliberations. However, its working methods had gradually deteriorated and the practice of consensus-based decision-making had been jeopardized, as evidenced, at the current part of the resumed session, by the modest results achieved and the votes called on draft resolutions. Achieving consensus required Member States to work together in a spirit of compromise, bearing in mind their national priorities. He was encouraged by the commendable willingness shown by many delegations to achieve a balanced compromise on human resources management matters, even though those efforts had ultimately been unsuccessful.

27. The European Union was also concerned by the number of issues on which the Committee had taken no action or which it had deferred for future consideration. Although the Advisory Committee's overly complex recommendations had often diverted the Committee's attention from the substance of the matters before it,

preventing it from achieving consensus, Member States bore the primary responsibility for their inability to set aside their differences in order to reach common goals. Despite the high quality of its interaction with the Secretariat, the Committee had been unable to provide the Secretariat with adequate guidance on most issues. As a staunch supporter of the Secretary-General's management reforms, the European Union was particularly disappointed at the Committee's inability to find consensus on topics such as strengthening accountability in the Organization and supply chain management reform. It was also concerned that no draft resolution had been adopted on after-service health insurance liabilities, improving the Organization's financial situation, the establishment of financial regulations for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees or human resources management reform.

28. The outcome of the current part of the resumed session should galvanize the Committee to enhance the transparency of its proceedings, fostering active engagement and inclusive and good-faith discussions in order to make high-quality decisions. At the current part of the resumed session, the achievement of consensus on many issues had been hindered by the use of short-term tactics and a dry, transactional approach, and by the artificial linkage of items, preventing mandate fulfilment. The European Union was also deeply concerned by the expressions of distrust towards and inappropriate comments made about the Secretariat, as such statements devalued its work. The European Union appealed to its partners' sense of responsibility and accountability; Member States must advance the interests of the Organization and the people it served, while upholding their national priorities. He paid tribute to United Nations staff serving under challenging conditions worldwide; the Committee must improve its working methods in order to provide them with the support they deserved and to ensure mandate fulfilment.

29. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan) said that it was regrettable that the Committee had once again failed to adopt a draft resolution on human resources management. Although greater progress had been achieved than in previous years, new approaches, including alternative discussion formats, should be explored in order to avoid a repetition of the same outcome at the seventy-seventh session. Japan was grateful to Member States that had demonstrated flexibility in the discussions on improving the financial situation of the United Nations, nearly enabling the Committee to reach consensus on that issue; the Committee should build on that momentum at the seventy-seventh session.

30. Japan welcomed the agreements reached on matters such as JIU and the revised estimates for UNSMIL. The role of the Fifth Committee as the Main Committee entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters was essential. Member States should maintain their constructive spirit during the second part of the resumed session.

31. **Mr. Velázquez Castillo** (Mexico) said that the current part of the resumed session had been challenging, as deliberations on matters essential to the current and future performance of the Organization had not resulted in the intended outcomes. Mexico nevertheless welcomed the agreements reached on the implementation of a flexible workplace at United Nations Headquarters, organizational resilience management, the JIU report for 2021 and JIU programme of work for 2022, and the revised estimates for UNSMIL. It also welcomed the approval of resources for the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution [S-33/1](#).

32. However, the Committee had, once again, failed to reach a decision on human resources management and on matters linked to the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations, such as accountability, the establishment of financial regulations for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and after-service health insurance, which were essential to management reform and the modernization of the Organization. The current part of the resumed session offered food for thought, as it demonstrated that there was a lack of even the most basic agreement on issues of critical importance to the Organization, a situation that had prevented the Committee from providing guidance and certainty to the United Nations in its work. Mexico therefore hoped that, at the seventy-seventh session, the Committee would be able to achieve consensus on ways to improve the financial situation of the United Nations, given the importance of financial certainty for the full implementation of mandates and institutional programmes.

33. **Mr. Lui** (United States of America) said that the United States welcomed the consensus achieved on long-standing issues such as those relating to JIU, organizational resilience management and the implementation of a flexible workplace. That progress was nevertheless inadequate to achieve a twenty-first-century United Nations. For over five years, the Committee had failed to adopt a comprehensive draft resolution on human resources management in order to expand professional development through mobility, improve access to internships, enhance performance management and strengthen the independence of the

Ethics Office, reforms that would have transformed the Organization's workforce. As organizations worldwide were determining their workforce management strategies for the post-COVID-19 world, the Committee's failure to act was notable.

34. The Committee had also failed to reach consensus on ways to reform United Nations procurement policies and stabilize the Organization's financial situation. Moreover, after 15 years of analysis, the Committee had failed to take steps to ensure the long-term viability of the health insurance programme for United Nations staff. Similarly, it had failed to adopt a draft resolution on accountability in order to promote a results-based approach within the Organization and to enhance mandate fulfilment. During the preceding month, the international community had faced a humanitarian crisis as a result of the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine and had engaged in discussions on the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Our Common Agenda" ([A/75/982](#)), aimed at accelerating progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. The United Nations could not be expected to effectively address emergency situations such as that of Ukraine or to make meaningful progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals unless it transformed its workforce and working methods.

35. Although, at the current part of the resumed session, most Member States had considered the proposals before them in good faith and on the merits, there had been a countervailing tendency among some delegations to establish linkages between issues for their own benefit, and to delay the finalization of nearly complete draft resolutions until the advanced stages of informal consultations in order to gain an advantage and then make unreasonable demands, jeopardizing the entire process. Such tactics led to ineffective policy outcomes, unnecessarily delayed deliberations, fostered ill will and reflected poorly on the Organization. Although the outcome of the current part of the resumed session represented a missed opportunity for organizational reform, the United States remained committed to strengthening the United Nations and to upholding its founding principles, and looked forward to working with countries that shared that commitment.

36. **Mr. Croker** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom welcomed the agreements reached on organizational resilience, a critical matter in view of the COVID-19 pandemic. It also welcomed the approval of funding for UNSMIL, as that would ensure adequate, cost-effective resources for the ceasefire monitoring mechanism established pursuant to the Agreement for a complete and permanent ceasefire in Libya between the Libyan Army of the Government of National Accord and

the Libyan National Army of the General Command of the Armed Forces, in order to support the national peace process, and regional peace and security. He hoped that the deliberations on the report of the Secretary-General on improving the financial situation of the United Nations ([A/76/429](#)) would lay the groundwork for further discussions in that regard at the second part of the resumed session in order to improve the Organization's financial health, in particular by addressing the return of credits to Member States, given the high volume of credits due to be returned in 2023.

37. Although the United Kingdom and other Member States had departed from their long-standing positions in order to pursue compromise on human resources management, no agreement had been reached. However, the Committee had come closer to consensus than in previous years, and he hoped that it would build on that progress in future discussions. The United Kingdom was concerned at the failure to address after-service health insurance liabilities, given their projected high levels in the future, and to improve supply chain management by adopting sustainable procurement methods, in accordance with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Member States must strive to make progress in those areas in future sessions in order to transform the Organization.

38. While welcoming the outcomes of the votes on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third special session and the provision of some resources for the international commission of human rights experts on Ethiopia, the United Kingdom was dismayed that a vote had been requested on the matter. Although his delegation remained concerned at the level of resources allocated to the international commission under the compromise proposal set out in draft resolution [A/C.5/76/L.27](#), it welcomed the Chair's initiative in that regard. His delegation paid tribute to United Nations staff worldwide for their dedication to realizing the principles and purposes of the Charter and to implementing the Organization's mandates.

39. **Mr. Kalugin** (Russian Federation) said that the Russian Federation welcomed the consensus reached on draft resolutions on such issues as the revised estimates for UNSMIL, the organizational resilience management system, flexible workplace arrangements and JIU. It was regrettable that consensus had not been reached on other important draft resolutions. The Russian Federation was particularly concerned at the lack of General Assembly decisions in recent years on human resources management and supply chain activities in the Secretariat. His delegation had participated in the discussions at the current part of the resumed session as

constructively as possible, putting forward proposals in order to achieve mutually acceptable compromises, including on the basis of previous General Assembly decisions, decisions of the International Civil Service Commission and recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The Russian Federation would take a similar approach in the future and trusted that other delegations would do the same. He requested the Chair to remind certain colleagues that the Committee's mandate was administrative and budgetary matters. Other platforms existed for political discussions and comments on world events unrelated to that mandate.

40. **Mr. Cheng Lie** (China) said that it was regrettable that the Committee had, once again, failed to adopt a draft resolution on human resources management. That lack of consensus nevertheless demonstrated the importance of the issue. He hoped that the Committee would achieve further progress on the matter in the future. Despite the lack of a draft resolution on human resources management, efforts should be made to improve equitable geographical representation, in accordance with the Charter. In its future discussions on the financial situation of the United Nations, the Committee should look beyond short-term measures and identify more effective solutions to manage the Organization's financial situation, while supporting management reform. China would engage actively in the deliberations at the second part of the resumed session. Member States must not only work expeditiously but must also demonstrate the political will to reach compromises.

41. **The Chair** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the first part of the resumed seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.