



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General
18 January 2019

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 26th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Saturday, 22 December 2018, at 5 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Bird (Australia)
*Chair of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions:* Mr. Ruiz Massieu

Contents

Agenda item 117: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (*continued*)

(b) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*)

Agenda item 134: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (*continued*)

Agenda item 137: Programme planning (*continued*)

Agenda item 139: Pattern of conferences (*continued*)

Agenda item 140: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 149: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 143: United Nations common system (*continued*)

Agenda item 144: United Nations pension system (*continued*)

Agenda item 146: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

Agenda item 135: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 147: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

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/>).



Agenda item 148: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals (*continued*)

Agenda item 165: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (*continued*)

Agenda item 136: Programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

Agenda item 135: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations

Questions deferred for future consideration

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the main part of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly

The meeting was called to order at 6.35 p.m.

Agenda item 117: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments
(continued)

(b) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions (continued) (A/73/102/Add.1)

1. **The Chair** drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General referring to General Assembly decision 73/405, adopted on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, by which the Assembly had appointed five members to the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term of office beginning on 1 January 2019 and postponed the appointment of one member to fill the remaining vacancy (A/73/102/Add.1).

2. The Government of Poland had nominated Mr. Jakub Chmielewski, whose nomination had been endorsed by the Group of Eastern European States, to fill the vacancy for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 2019.

3. Since the number of candidates corresponded to the number of vacancies, she took it that the Committee wished to recommend the candidate's appointment by acclamation.

4. *Mr. Chmielewski (Poland), for the Eastern European States, was recommended by acclamation for appointment to the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 2019.*

Agenda item 134: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.12)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.12: Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors

5. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.12 was adopted.*

Agenda item 137: Programme planning (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.3)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.3: Programme planning

6. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.3 was adopted.*

Agenda item 139: Pattern of conferences (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.17)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.17: Pattern of conferences

7. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.17 was adopted.*

Agenda item 140: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.6 and A/C.5/73/L.8)

Agenda item 149: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.7 and A/C.5/73/L.9)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.6: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.7: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations

8. **Mr. Mohamed Fouad Ahmed** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that his delegation wished to withdraw draft resolutions A/C.5/73/L.6 and A/C.5/73/L.7.

9. *Draft resolutions A/C.5/73/L.6 and A/C.5/73/L.7 were withdrawn.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.8: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.8 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.9: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations

11. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.9 was adopted.*

12. **The Chair** said that, on an exceptional basis for the 2019–2021 scale period only, three countries in level B – the Bahamas, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia – would be afforded discounts of 7.5 per cent to their assessment rates, and that those discounts would be borne on a pro rata basis by the permanent members of the Security Council.

13. **Ms. Norman-Chalet** (United States of America) said that the United States took seriously its obligations to the United Nations and its partnership with other Member States. Her delegation, which promoted reform of the Organization, also sought to reform the financing of peacekeeping operations. She was disappointed that, during the Committee's deliberations on the scales of assessments, every Member State had supported reform of the United Nations but not of its financing. In the interest of the Organization's financial health, no Member State should fund more than a quarter of the Organization's budget. The Committee had not agreed on that ceiling and the Organization would therefore continue to face a 3 per cent shortfall in its peacekeeping budget, as the United States would fund no more than 25 per cent of peacekeeping expenses. The financial

burden should be shared more equally, particularly given that the draft resolution on the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations (A/C.5/73/L.9) affirmed the need for the methodology for such apportionment to be reformed in an effective and expeditious manner. The discount that was applied to three countries in level B, whose per capita income was more than twice the average for all Member States, was unjustified, had no methodological basis and should be eliminated. The extraordinary discounts in many countries' peacekeeping assessments, including the 80 per cent discount applied to nearly half of Member States after their capacity to pay had been taken into account in the determination of the regular budget scale, were neither sensible nor equitable and clearly indicated that reform was needed.

14. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that all Member States had demonstrated flexibility in considering the scales of assessments. His delegation did not share a number of the positions set out in the statement of the representative of the United States.

Agenda item 143: United Nations common system
(continued) (A/C.5/73/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.18: United Nations common system

15. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.18 was adopted.*

Agenda item 144: United Nations pension system
(continued) (A/C.5/73/L.15)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.15: United Nations pension system

16. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.15 was adopted.*

Agenda item 146: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (continued)
(A/C.5/73/L.13)

Agenda item 135: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.13)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.13: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

17. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.13 was adopted.*

Agenda item 147: Administration of justice at the United Nations (continued) (A/C.5/73/L.10)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.10: Administration of justice at the United Nations

18. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in paragraph 28 of the draft resolution, "31 December 2022" should be replaced by "31 December 2021".

19. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.10, as orally amended, was adopted.*

Agenda item 148: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals
(continued) (A/C.5/73/L.11)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.11: Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

20. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.11 was adopted.*

Agenda item 165: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur
(continued) (A/C.5/73/L.16)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.16: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur

21. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.16 was adopted.*

Agenda item 136: Programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019 (continued)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019
(A/C.5/73/L.4 and A/C.5/73/L.19)

Draft decision A/C.5/73/L.4: Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine

22. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation wished to withdraw draft decision A/C.5/73/L.4.

23. *Draft decision A/C.5/73/L.4 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.19: Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019

24. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.19 was adopted.*

Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019 (A/C.5/73/L.5 and A/C.5/73/L.20)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.5: Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions and twenty-eighth special session

25. **Mr. Pretterhofer** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States and the sponsors of draft resolution [A/C.5/73/L.5](#), said that his delegation wished to withdraw the draft resolution.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.5 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.20: Special subjects relating to the programme budget 2018–2019

27. **Ms. De Armas Bonchang** (Cuba) said that activities related to the responsibility to protect had no legal basis because no intergovernmental agreement on the definition of that concept had been reached. In the Secretary-General's report on estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council under thematic cluster I: special and personal envoys, advisers and representatives of the Secretary-General ([A/73/352/Add.1](#)), the resources requested for the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect could not be distinguished from those requested for the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide. In line with her Government's position of principle against genocide, her delegation fully supported the functions of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and the oral amendment it wished to propose was not intended to undermine that Office.

28. She proposed that two new preambular paragraphs and two new operative paragraphs be inserted in section XIV of draft resolution [A/C.5/73/L.20](#). The first new preambular paragraph would read, "Recalling that the General Assembly has not decided on the concept of responsibility to protect, its scope, implications and possible means of implementation"; the second new preambular paragraph would read, "Noting that the estimates of thematic cluster I comprise narratives, functions, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievements, outputs, and other information related to the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect". The first new operative paragraph would read, "Decides to delete all references to the activities, functions, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievements, outputs, and other information related to the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect, as contained in the strategic framework and the related narratives of the Office of the Special Adviser to the

Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide"; the second new operative paragraph would read, "Requests the Secretary-General to issue a corrigendum to his report".

29. **Mr. Galoumian** (Canada), supported by **Mr. Litver** (Netherlands), called for a vote on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Cuba.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

30. **Mr. Tavoli** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed oral amendment. There was a serious risk of bias in the interpretation and application of the responsibility to protect. Although every State must assume responsibility for protecting its own population, no State should use force against other State on any pretext, including humanitarian or pre-emptive intervention. The actions of some proponents of the responsibility to protect had been inconsistent with the alleged objectives and purposes of that responsibility, whose validity as a principle of international law had been called into question through its selective application on the basis of the politicized interests of some States rather than human dignity and human rights. Although the General Assembly had held a formal debate on the responsibility to protect, Member States had not reached consensus on the matter. Such debate was not an appropriate means of addressing conceptual differences among Member States.

31. **Mr. Mahesh Kumar** (India) said that Member States had provided no explicit mandate for the appointment of the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect because they had reached no consensus on the concept of that responsibility, as had been reflected during the General Assembly's discussion of the matter. In fact, the Assembly had not even reached consensus on the inclusion of the matter in its agenda. While he did not object to discussion among Member States to ascertain whether a common understanding of the concept existed, serious divergences of views on the matter remained and his delegation would abstain from the voting on the proposed oral amendment.

32. **Mr. Escoto González** (Nicaragua) said that resources should not be allocated to the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, since the concept of such responsibility was not the subject of consensus in the General Assembly. His delegation would support the proposed oral amendment and encouraged other delegations to do likewise.

33. **Mr. Song Chol Ri** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that the concept of responsibility to

protect and its scope, implications and possible means of implementation were not subject to consensus in the General Assembly because some countries had manipulated the responsibility for political purposes. The allocation of regular budget funds to the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, which had not been endorsed by all Member States, was questionable given the Organization's serious lack of resources. His delegation requested that the narratives, functions, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievements, outputs, and other information related to the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect should, instead of being included in the same category of expenditure as the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, be deleted from the draft resolution, and should not be considered by the Committee until consensus had been reached on the concept of responsibility to protect. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed oral amendment.

34. **Mr. Awad** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the responsibility to protect was one of the most controversial questions among Member States, which had not agreed on a consensual definition of the concept or its scope, implications and means of implementation. The concept therefore lacked a legal or United Nations framework. Its misuse by a number of countries was a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter, in particular sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of the proposed oral amendment.

35. **Mr. Varankov** (Belarus) said that any decision on the allocation of funding for the promotion of the responsibility to protect required prior agreement on the concept and its scope. As the vote held by the General Assembly the previous year on the inclusion of the item in its agenda and the Assembly's subsequent meeting on the matter had shown, such consensus remained a distant prospect. The inclusion of such initiatives in the Assembly's agenda adversely affected the initiatives themselves and prevented their implementation. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed draft amendment.

36. **Mr. Pretterhofer** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Committee was responsible for administrative and budgetary matters rather than political discussion related to other United Nations forums, and for adequately funding the Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, whose mandate had been approved in Security Council resolution 1366 (2001). The proposed oral amendment would hamper the performance of that mandate by the Office in

collaboration with other United Nations entities, particularly the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect. The States members of the European Union would vote against the proposed oral amendment.

37. *At the request of the representatives of Canada and the Netherlands, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by Cuba.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Paraguay, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

38. *The oral amendment was rejected by 68 votes to 24, with 48 abstentions.*

39. **Mr. Wax** (Israel) proposed that, in section XVIII of draft resolution [A/C.5/73/L.20](#), a new paragraph should be inserted, to read: “Decides not to appropriate any resources for the implementation of resolution [S-28/1](#)”.

40. **Mr. Alyahya** (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, requested a recorded vote on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Israel in relation to Human Rights Council resolution [S-28/1](#) on human rights violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem.

41. **Mr. Rahman** (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Member States should vote against the proposed oral amendment, which would adversely affect the financing of Human Rights Council resolution [S-28/1](#).

42. *At the request of the representative of Kuwait, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by Israel.*

In favour:

Australia, Israel, Liberia, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of

Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Kenya, Myanmar, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Solomon Islands, Togo, Ukraine.

43. *The oral amendment was rejected by 118 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.*

44. *Draft resolution [A/C.5/73/L.20](#) was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Wax** (Israel) said that Israel dissociated itself from the Committee's decision to appropriate resources for the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution [S-28/1](#).

46. **Mr. Fernández Rivera** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but wished to dissociate itself from Human Rights Council resolution [39/1](#) on the promotion and protection of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, which was included in the Secretary-General's report on revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council at its thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions and twenty-eighth special session ([A/73/477](#)). The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had supported the draft resolution on the basis of its position of principle that the Council, a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, was the supreme instance for addressing human rights in cooperation and dialogue with Member States. However, his delegation objected to resolutions and special procedures or other mechanisms related to the human rights situation in specific countries, and rejected the selective handling of the matter for politically motivated ends in violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

47. The practice of adopting resolutions relating to the human rights situation in specific countries violated the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity with which human rights issues should be addressed. Cooperation and dialogue were the appropriate means of and essential principles for the effective promotion and protection of human rights, and his delegation supported the related appeals of the Non-Aligned Movement. Venezuela urged Member States to press ahead with the progress made since the establishment of the Council, privilege the universal periodic review as the means of cooperation in human rights and end the practice of selectively adopting

resolutions related to specific countries, which weakened the Council's mandate.

48. **Mr. Vachon** (Canada) said that, by adopting the draft resolution, the Committee had done its duty and ensured that mandates issued by the governing bodies of United Nations system organizations were appropriately financed. His delegation welcomed the establishment of an ongoing independent mechanism for Myanmar, which was vital to ending impunity and holding the perpetrators of gross human rights abuses to account. To have done otherwise would have tarnished the Organization's reputation. In voting on the oral amendment proposed by Israel, his delegation had been guided by its understanding that the Committee's role in considering Human Rights Council resolutions was not to further evaluate the related mandates but purely to set the level of resources required to complete the approved tasks, and by its strong support for the Committee's practice of approving as a package revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council. He welcomed the approval of the revised estimates by consensus. Canada had strong reservations regarding the commission of inquiry related to the Gaza Strip, as Human Rights Council resolution [S-28/1](#) was one-sided and prejudged the outcome of the commission's investigation. His delegation had stated those positions during the Council's deliberations on the resolution, and the Fifth Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to revisit that debate. Canada supported the Secretary-General's request for resources to fund the Council mandates as a package because of its sense of responsibility regarding the human rights pillar, which had too often been threatened in the Committee. For the United Nations to operate properly, the Committee must respect the limits of its mandate and not discriminate in the funding of human rights mandates, and his delegation therefore welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

49. **Ms. Khyne** (Myanmar) said that Myanmar rejected Human Rights Council resolutions [37/2](#) and [39/2](#) and the related mandates, and did not support any country-specific mechanisms or mandates. The three resolutions related to Myanmar included in the Secretary-General's report on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council at its thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions and twenty-eighth special session ([A/73/477](#)) were apparently politically motivated, lacked impartiality and objectivity, and infringed the sovereignty of Myanmar. Cooperation with the United Nations, including in human rights, was the cornerstone of the foreign policy of Myanmar, which provided the necessary information in response to communications

from United Nations bodies and agencies and submitted reports to the relevant treaty bodies. The contributions of those mechanisms, however, were not constructive and drained the scarce resources of the United Nations. No political mission established without the consent or cooperation of the country concerned would produce positive results, and her delegation did not support the allocation of budgetary resources for the implementation of such measures.

Draft report of the Fifth Committee
([A/C.5/73/L.21](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.5/73/L.21](#): Draft report of the Fifth Committee

50. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019 ([A/C.5/73/L.21](#)), which described the actions taken by the Committee and contained its recommendations. She invited the Committee to consider the recommendations in part IV.

Draft resolution I: Special subjects relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019
([A/C.5/73/L.20](#))

51. **The Chair** recalled that draft resolution I had been adopted earlier in the meeting.

Draft resolution II: Programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019

52. **The Chair** drew attention to draft resolution II. Section A dealt with revised budget appropriations for the biennium 2018–2019, section B with revised income estimates for the biennium 2018–2019 and section C with the financing of appropriations for the year 2019.

53. *Draft resolution II was adopted.*

Agenda item 135: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations (A/C.5/73/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.14: Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations

54. *Draft resolution A/C.5/73/L.14 was adopted.*

Questions deferred for future consideration (A/C.5/73/L.22)

Draft decision A/C.5/73/L.22: Questions deferred for future consideration

55. **The Chair** suggested that the Committee defer its consideration of human resources management to the main part of the seventy-fourth session.

56. **Mr. Mohamed Fouad Ahmed** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said his delegation was disappointed that the Committee did not have before it a draft resolution on human resources management, despite the time invested in the consideration of the matter. The Group would have preferred to defer further consideration to the first part of the resumed current session, since most of the related work had been completed.

57. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that, at the main part of the seventy-fourth session, the Committee would be immersed in deliberations on budgetary matters. It would be preferable for the Committee's consideration of human resources management be deferred to the first part of the resumed current session.

58. **Mr. De Preter** (Observer for the European Union) said that the main part of the seventy-fourth session was the appropriate time to consider human resources management.

59. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the words "Item 141: Human resources management", followed by a list of the related documents introduced at the main part of the current session, would be inserted in section B of the draft decision.

60. *Draft decision A/C.5/73/L.22, as orally amended, was adopted.*

Completion of the work of the Fifth Committee at the main part of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly

61. **Mr. Mohamed Fouad Ahmed** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the negotiations on the scales of assessments had been conducted under exceptional circumstances, and many developing countries had seen their contributions increase despite the economic challenges they faced. The Group, however, welcomed the consensus reached on the scales, as well as on the appropriation from the programme budget to support the resident coordinator system, which would ensure predictable funding to support the repositioning of the United Nations development system to help achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. He also welcomed the conclusion of the Committee's deliberations on the placement of human resources functions, construction and property management, the first performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019, programme budget implications relating to that budget, the revised estimates resulting from decisions of the General Assembly, and the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund.

62. The Group was disappointed, however, that despite months of work the Committee had not reached consensus on human resources management and would not consider the matter at the first part of the resumed seventy-third session with a view to taking decisions on gender parity, equitable geographical representation, the refinement of performance management, and deficiencies in the staff selection process. The late issuance of documents had significantly affected the Committee's ability to make progress in the matter.

63. **Ms. Riley** (Barbados), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), said that the Committee's decisions at the current session were essential to the functioning of the United Nations. Of particular importance was the consensus on the scales of assessments. The achievement of consensus in the Committee depended on respect for the negotiation mechanism and the sovereign right of Member States to pronounce on the Organization's administrative and budgetary functioning; any future consideration of the scales should be approached with the highest regard for the Member-State-driven intergovernmental process. With regard to the programme budget, the Committee's achievements included the approval of the revised estimates for the resident coordinator system, programme budget implications and funding for capital projects at the regional commissions. CARICOM welcomed the progress made in the administration of justice, management reform and the pension system.

The Community was committed to transparent, inclusive and open negotiations in order to achieve consensus, and expected a spirit of cooperation, flexibility and compromise to underpin the Committee's deliberations.

64. **Ms. Nalwanga** (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that at the main part of the session the Committee had faced challenges relating to the scales of assessments, the Pension Fund, special political missions, the common system, the administration of justice, human resources management and the placement of human resources functions. It was regrettable that the Committee had been unable to provide the Secretary-General with policy guidance on improving the welfare and working conditions of staff, or on equitable geographical representation and gender parity, at a time when reforms in those areas were shaping the history of the United Nations and of the world. The Secretary-General and his managers should discharge mandates in full and in a timely manner, while giving due consideration to the Organization's dire financial situation. Having adopted the scales of assessments, Member States should pay their contributions on time, in full and without conditions. The Group requested the relevant offices to ensure that documentation was submitted to the Committee for consideration in a timely manner.

65. **Mr. Otsuka** (Japan) said that the Committee had had before it at the main part of the session complex matters related to United Nations reform, human resources management, special political missions and construction projects. His delegation was disappointed that no decision had been made on human resources management, despite long and thorough deliberations, and looked forward to future negotiations on the matter. Japan welcomed the achievement of consensus on the scales of assessments, despite Member States' varying positions on the matter, and renewed its commitment to fulfilling its financial obligations faithfully. The Committee must review its working methods to conduct its negotiations in a more orderly and efficient manner.

66. **Mr. Gohar** (Pakistan) said that the agreement on the scales of assessments had resulted from painful concessions made in a spirit of flexibility by the Group of 77 and China and other groups. Given that Member States had renewed their commitment to reforming the methodology for determining the scales, those Member States in arrears should settle them promptly and in full. As the United Nations reform process had culminated in the Committee with the appropriation of an additional amount to fund the resident coordinator system and the restructuring of human resources functions, the need for a reinvigorated Organization was greater than ever.

Pakistan had supported the Secretary-General's efforts to make the Organization more inclusive, democratic and fit for the purpose of implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and fulfilling mandates. As a major troop-contributing country, Pakistan would strive to bring peace, prosperity and well-being to millions of people. The General Assembly had undertaken to reform the resident coordinator system, which must be aligned with national priorities and have poverty eradication as its overarching principle, with a view to achieving sustainable development so that no one was left behind.

67. In order to be credible, the United Nations must be more representative and reflect the views of all Member States. Intergovernmental processes, equitable geographical representation and the representation of troop-contributing countries were therefore essential to the reform of the Organization. It was regrettable that, despite months of deliberation, the Committee had deferred its consideration of human resources management and other important matters, and had missed the opportunity to discuss such management at the current session.

68. **Mr. Fu Daopeng** (China) said that the main part of the current session was being held against a backdrop of universal support for multilateralism and a stronger role for the United Nations in international affairs, and of progress in the reform of the Organization. The Committee had considered such important matters as the scales of assessments, the placement of human resources functions, the funding of the resident coordinator system as part of the reform of the United Nations development system, and special political missions. The Committee's achievements would contribute to mandate fulfilment and help secure for the Organization a central role in multilateral affairs and global governance.

69. Financial resources were the foundation of the governance of the United Nations. Under the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations agreed upon in the draft resolution (A/C.5/73/L.8), China would, from 2019, be the second largest contributor to the regular budget, which would represent a significant amount for a developing country with a population of 1.4 billion. As a responsible country, China would fulfil its financial obligations and support the Organization's work through practical action. He appealed to other Member States, especially those with the capacity to do so, to pay their assessed contributions on time and in full. At the same time, the Secretariat should strengthen budgetary management, promote comprehensive performance management in relation to budgetary activities, enhance financial discipline, manage financial resources more efficiently

and make the best use of every penny contributed by taxpayers. As a staunch supporter of multilateralism, China would actively participate in the United Nations reform process, help build a shared future for humankind and transform the global governance system, and contribute Chinese wisdom, proposals and strength to the cause of peace and development.

70. **Mr. Velázquez Castillo** (Mexico) said that the results of the Committee's work were essential to the Organization's financing and functioning and to the Secretary-General's reforms, which would be implemented as of 1 January 2019. The draft resolutions on the scales of assessments were crucial to the determination of Member States' contributions, on which the Organization's operations and support for international peace and security depended. His delegation welcomed the Committee's approval of additional resources for the resident coordinator system, which would be essential to development reform and the repositioning of the United Nations development system in the field. He welcomed the agreements reached on special political missions, infrastructure projects, Umoja, the common system, the pension system, the efficient use of resources and accountability.

71. **The Chair** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the main part of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 8.25 p.m.