



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

87th plenary meeting
Friday, 30 June 2023, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Kőrösi (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Reports of the Fifth Committee

The President: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 135, 151 to 153, 155, 156, 159, 160, 162, 163 (a) and (b), 164, 165, 167 and 136. The Committee has also submitted a report on sub-item (a) of agenda item 118.

Before proceeding further, I would like to emphasize to delegates that as the Committee concluded its work today, its reports are available in English only. It is my understanding that they will be issued in all official languages as soon as possible. I thank everyone for their understanding.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall therefore take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Committee that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote or position. I would like to remind members that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should as far as possible explain its vote or position only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee, and that explanations

of vote or position are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats. When there are multiple proposals under an agenda item, statements in explanation of vote before the voting on any or all of them should be made in one intervention, followed by action on all of them, one by one. Therefore, there will be an opportunity for statements in explanation of vote after the voting on any or all of them in one intervention.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee, I would like to advise representatives that we will proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. That means that when recorded votes are taken, we will do the same as was done in the Committee. I should also hope that we will proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Committee.

The results of the voting will be uploaded to the e-deleGATE portal, under "Plenary announcements". I would also like to remind Members that any corrections to the voting intentions of delegations after the voting has concluded should be submitted directly to the Secretariat at the end of the meeting and uploaded to the e-deleGATE portal. In that regard, I count on everyone's cooperation in refraining from any interruptions to our proceedings.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room AB-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



Agenda item 7 (continued)**Organization of work, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items**

The President: I now invite the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the Fifth Committee submitted under sub-item (a) of agenda item 118, entitled “Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions” (A/77/567/Add.1).

Members will recall that the General Assembly concluded its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 118 at its 34th plenary meeting, on 15 November 2022. In order for the Assembly to consider the report of the Committee, it will be necessary to reopen consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 118.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to reopen consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 118?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 118 (continued)**Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments****(a) Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/567/Add.1)**

The President: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Committee on sub-item (a) of agenda item 118, entitled “Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions”.

In its report, the Committee recommends that the General Assembly appoint Minhong Yi of the Republic of Korea as a member of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a term of office beginning on 31 July 2023 and ending on 31 December 2025.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to appoint Minhong Yi as a member of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a term of office beginning on 31 July 2023?

It was so decided (decision 77/408 B).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 118?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 135**Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/658/Add.1)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled “Financial reports and audited financial statements, and reports of the Board of Auditors”.

The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/253 B).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 135.

Agenda item 151**Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/924)**

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 15 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I through IV, one by one.

The Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled “Triennial review of the rates and standards for reimbursement to Member States for contingent-owned equipment”, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.40. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/303).

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution II, entitled “Support account

for peacekeeping operations”, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.42. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/304).

The President: We will now turn to draft resolution III, entitled “Financing of the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy”, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.43. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 77/305).

The President: Next, we turn to draft resolution IV, entitled “Financing of the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe, Uganda”, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.44. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 77/306).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 151.

Agenda item 152

Financing of the United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/890/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.45, as orally amended in the Committee. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/290 B).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 152.

Agenda item 153 (continued)

Financing of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/930)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.52. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/307).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 153.

Agenda item 155

Financing of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/925)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.46. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/308).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 155.

Agenda item 156

Financing of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/926)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.47,

as orally amended in the Committee. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 77/309).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 156.

Agenda item 159

Financing of the United Nations Mission for Justice Support in Haiti

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/923)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 13 of its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.39. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/310).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 159.

Agenda item 160

Financing of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/927)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.48.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 77/311).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 160.

Agenda item 162

Financing of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/931)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.53.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 77/312).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 162.

Agenda item 163 (continued)

Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Middle East

(a) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/891/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.54.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled "Financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force". The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 77/291 B).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 163.

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/932)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 13 of its report, the text of which, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.38,

as orally amended and technically updated in the Committee. Furthermore, the Secretariat has informed me that as a result of the technical update of paragraph 16, that paragraph would read as follows:

“Decides to appropriate to the special account for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon the amount of 585,940,100 dollars for the period from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, inclusive of 537,367,000 dollars for the maintenance of the Force, 41,460,000 dollars for the support account for peacekeeping operations and 7,113,100 dollars for the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy”.

The related blanks of paragraphs 17, 18, 19 and 20 would be populated accordingly.

I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Ms. Furman (Israel): Israel has maintained and continues to maintain excellent relations with all peacekeeping forces in our region, including the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and we continually demonstrate our unequivocal support for United Nations peacekeeping operations as a whole.

The fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 4, 5 and 14 introduced in document A/C.5/77/L.38 are nothing more than an attempt to insert a political agenda into an otherwise non-political discussion of a United Nations peacekeeping mission's budget. Therefore, my delegation requests the deletion of the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 4, 5 and 14 from the draft resolution. We urge Member States to join Israel in supporting those deletions.

In case a recorded vote is requested on our request for deletion, I call on all Member States to vote in favour of the deletion of those paragraphs.

The President: The representative of Israel has proposed an oral amendment to the draft resolution.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled “Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon”.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will first take a decision on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Israel. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Canada, Israel, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay

The oral amendment to draft resolution A/C.5/77/L.38 was rejected by 67 votes to 3, with 49 abstentions.

The President: Since the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Israel was not adopted, we shall proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution recommended in the report of the Committee entitled “Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Congo

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to 3, with 1 abstention (resolution 77/313).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Tunisia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 163.

Agenda item 164 (continued)**Financing of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/892/Add.1)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.49, as orally amended in the Committee.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/292 B).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 164.

Agenda item 165**Financing of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/928)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.50.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/314).

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 165.

Agenda item 167**Financing of the activities arising from Security Council resolution 1863 (2009)****Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/929)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. The text of the draft resolution, for the time

being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.51, as orally amended in the Committee.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 77/315).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 167.

Agenda item 136 (continued)

Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/77/673/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Committee in its report. The text of the draft decision, for the time being, is contained in document A/C.5/77/L.55.

We will now take action on the draft decision entitled “Questions deferred for future consideration”. The Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 77/548 C).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 136.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Committee before it.

Agenda item 27 (continued):

Report of the Security Council

The President: The General Assembly will resume its consideration of agenda item 27 entitled “Report of the Security Council”, to hear the remaining speakers in the debate.

Mr. Hadjichrysanthou (Cyprus): I would start by thanking the President of the Security Council for the month of June, Ambassador Nusseibeh for her presentation of the annual report of the Security Council for 2022 (A/77/2) (see A/77/PV.86).

I would like to reiterate the importance of this report to my delegation, as it is one of the few tools that we have at our disposal that reflects the fact that the Council exercises its functions on behalf of the United Nations membership as a whole. For this reason, the report of the Security Council should adopt a more cooperative approach based on transparency and complementarity with respect to the General Assembly in order to achieve the overarching goals of the United Nations. We are cognizant of the amount of time and labour that goes into preparing this report, constraining its issuance at an early date.

Mr. Maniratanga (Burundi), Vice-President, took the Chair.

While the overview of the Council’s work provided by the report is useful, we believe that the membership would benefit from a more substantive and analytical report.

In that regard, we reiterate our conviction that the report should include first, a substantive depiction of where the consideration of each agenda item stands; secondly, an analysis of the state of each conflict dealt with by the Council, including the impact that the Council action has had on the conflict; thirdly, an assessment concerning implementation of Council decisions and compliance of relevant actors with them; fourthly, an assessment of the Council’s performance in fulfilling core aspects of its mandate, such as upholding the prohibition of the use of force; and fifthly, a forward-looking evaluation as to how the Council will ensure the peaceful settlement of each dispute before it.

Moreover, we believe that the report could provide first, strategic insights concerning overall conflict trends and patterns, including in relation to root causes and possible ways of making the approach of the Council more comprehensive; secondly, solutions to typical consequences of conflict, such as displacement of populations, including of a protracted nature, and consequent violations of rights and demographic engineering in conflict-affected areas; and thirdly, a special chapter on peace and justice, aiming at clarity regarding the levels of impunity for atrocity crimes in armed conflict, including sexual violence and strategies to eliminate it.

My delegation welcomes the two resolutions adopted by the Council in this reporting cycle on Cyprus, including resolution 2674 (2023), which renews the mandate of the United Nations Force in Cyprus, in

accordance with Security Council resolution 186 (1964). The Cyprus question is one of the oldest conflicts on the Organization's agenda. It remains unsolved because of the blatant disregard for the numerous relevant Council resolutions and decisions, without consequence. It is therefore imperative that the Security Council show leadership, both by enforcing its own resolutions and by holding those in breach accountable. Allowing the effects of the unlawful use of force against Cyprus to solidify not only encourages the creation of more faits accomplis on the ground, but also challenges the credibility of the Council.

Lastly, I must underline that the Council needs to improve the way it relates to Member States directly concerned or affected by the items on its agenda, as well as Member States hosting United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Alajmi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to express my thanks and appreciation for holding this meeting on the report submitted by the Security Council to the General Assembly (A/77/2), which addressed a number of items and topics inscribed on the Council's agenda during the period under consideration. Those include political, security, economic, humanitarian and environmental issues, both as emergency and chronic. We find that the content has mostly focused on the narrative nature of the proceedings of the meetings and lacks the analysis and details necessary to reflect the points of view and aspirations of the States Members of the United Nations regarding the full implementation of United Nations resolutions.

The existence and persistence of certain issues on the Security Council's agenda for long periods of time, in some cases more than 75 years, such as the just Palestinian question, should prompt us to seriously consider the causes for the successive failures in supporting the right of the free Palestinian people to achieve their legitimate demands to end the colonial occupation and establish their independent State, with Jerusalem as its capital, in accordance with the various resolutions and outcomes of the various entities of the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, which is entrusted by the Charter of the United Nations with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security.

The clear obstacles limiting the ability of the Council to live up to its main responsibilities in the light

of the growing threats and non-traditional challenges the world is facing drive us to support the efforts of many Member States to improve the working methods of the Security Council, as well as to increase the momentum of intergovernmental negotiations aimed at reforming that important United Nations organ.

The State of Kuwait has joined and supported a number of innovative initiatives in the context of those reform efforts, such as the signing of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group's code of conduct, in which Council members pledge not to object to draft resolutions involving crimes against humanity, genocide and war crimes. We also acceded to the French-Mexican initiative that calls for voluntary abstention from using the veto power in crimes against humanity. In addition, the State of Kuwait, alongside countries of the so-called core group led by Liechtenstein, proposed a draft resolution to the General Assembly on the veto initiative. It was adopted by consensus as resolution 76/262. It stipulates the convening of a debate of the General Assembly within 10 working days when a veto is used in the Security Council. We believe that this historic resolution will enhance the role of the General Assembly while enabling its work and promoting transparency and accountability in the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

In the context of the intergovernmental negotiations to reform the Security Council, we noted positive developments during this session reflecting the desire of many Member States to support this important process by adopting a new dimension, represented in conciliatory procedures, through the creation of a website that displays all the documents submitted during the session, as well as the webcast and live stream of the governmental negotiations so as to enable a closer follow-up by all Member States and others who are interested in this vital process.

Through the experience gained by the State of Kuwait and its non-permanent membership in the Security Council for the period 2018-2019, we believe that a tangible and effective change in the Council's working methods can be achieved only through the cooperation and genuine desire of all its members. We therefore hope to see greater flexibility and innovation in order to ensure greater effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of the Council. During our term on the Council, we cooperated with the other members for the publication of document S/2019/997, relating to the time

frames for the preparation of the annual report of the Security Council submitted to the General Assembly, in order to ensure its discussion.

In conclusion, we reiterate the State of Kuwait's support for a more transparent, competent and accountable Security Council, including in the context of the work of the Security Council Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, as well as the intergovernmental reform process. We affirm our readiness to support those efforts in any way possible in order to fulfil the aspirations for the full implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, in its capacity as the organ charged with maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. Sabbagh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, my delegation thanks Her Excellency Ambassador Lana Nusseibeh, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates, for her presentation of the annual report of the Security Council for 2022 (A/77/2).

The annual reports of the Security Council constitute an important tool to reflect the transparency of the Council's work. They also provide an opportunity for Member States to assess the work undertaken by the Council on their behalf.

The majority of Member States have called for an improvement in the content of the Security Council's reports to the General Assembly, notably the need to include in them information and details of the Council's work and to not include descriptive narratives so that an objective and comprehensive assessment of the Council's activities pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations can be carried out.

My delegation would like to reiterate the following remarks.

First, there is a need to put an end to the provisional rules of procedure and to definitively adopt rules of procedure. It is necessary to respect the Council's working methods and to ensure that they are not used in a selective or biased manner according to the whims of certain Member States or their own interests, which hinders the Council's ability to shoulder its responsibilities with efficiency and effectiveness and negatively affects its capabilities to resolve various conflicts.

Second, the Security Council must work with resolve to fulfil its mandate for the maintenance of

international peace and security with regard to highly important existential issues such as the Palestinian question and the ongoing occupation by Israel of Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan and southern Lebanon. Israel continues its aggression against those territories and the sovereignty of their peoples living under the yoke of the Israeli occupation owing to the impunity afforded to it by one permanent member of the Security Council and its veto with regard to Israel.

Third, my delegation reiterates the importance of Security Council reform which must ensure equitable geographical representation and appropriate and fair representation on the Council of developing States, including Arab States, so that their voices can be heard and they can exercise their sovereign and equal rights, as other States do, without exceptions or discrimination.

Fourth, it is incumbent on all members of the Security Council, especially when a State holds the presidency of the Council, to professionally communicate with non-permanent members when the Council considers issues related to them. Council members must engage in constructive dialogue with the States concerned and take into account their concerns in the process of drafting resolutions and issuing statements and not isolate or exclude them.

Fifth, my delegation supports the idea of reconsidering the penholder system and related measures that could improve the effectiveness of the Council's work and ensure equal opportunities for and active participation by all Council members in its work. It would also prevent that noble task from being misused by some Council members and from targeting countries and violating their sovereignty. We also believe that penholders must be neutral and objective and must participate in consultations and constructive dialogue with the countries whose matters are under consideration by the Security Council. Penholders should also reflect those countries' concerns, especially when the Council drafts documents on matters related to those countries.

Sixth, the time and resources of the Security Council must be used in an efficient manner. The convening of repeated meetings on the situation in a certain country within short period of time should be avoided unless there is a dire need for that. It seems that certain States are using those meetings as a platform to bring pressure to bear on the country concerned and to cause it harm.

Seventh, the Security Council must limit its imposition of sanctions on countries and must be aware of their humanitarian consequences and not view them as an end in themselves, especially when it has been proven that those most harmed by the sanctions are the populations of those countries. Their populations suffer because they are deprived of their right to life, food, medical care, development and other human rights.

My eighth and final point is that a framework should be established for the participation of representatives of civil society and non-governmental organizations in open meetings of the Security Council. That should be done in accordance with clear criteria based on the added value their participation brings to the Council's work through the provision of their expertise and experiences. Those meetings should not be a platform for harming or attacking a Member State or for promoting a biased viewpoint or touting a falsified and non-objective picture of the matter at hand.

Mr. Mythen (Ireland): Ireland aligns itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group. We welcome the holding of this debate and thank the United Arab Emirates, as President of the Security Council, for presenting the Council's annual report (A/77/2) to the Assembly.

The presentation of this report today is about more than ticking off a reporting obligation under the Charter of the United Nations. It is a necessary opportunity for Member States to assess the work that the Security Council undertakes on their behalf. It is an essential element in the relationship that must exist between the two principal organs of the United Nations dealing with peace and security.

The importance of that relationship was demonstrated clearly last year when the Council failed to act in the face of Russia's illegal full-scale invasion of Ukraine and when it referred a situation to the General Assembly for the first time in 40 years. The Assembly stepped up where the Council failed to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to condemn the aggression and to support a return to the path of diplomacy. Yet, it is a damning indictment of the current state of the Council than the General Assembly had to step in. The world urgently needs a Security Council that is fit for purpose, a Council that is more representative, transparent, effective, inclusive and accountable to the wider membership. The longer

reform is postponed, the more we risk undermining the legitimacy of the Council and the United Nations as a whole.

The report before us today makes a valuable contribution to the transparency and accountability of the Security Council, but there is room for improvement. We believe the report lacks the kind of self-critical analysis that would provide a basis for improving how the Council operates. The first step, it is often said, is to admit that one has a problem. We believe the introductory narrative section should be expanded, and should aim to assess the Council's effectiveness in carrying out its tasks, both in terms of how it functions and more importantly how it addresses — or fails to address — its core task of maintaining international peace and security. We recognize that the requirement for consensus among Council members may make a frank assessment more difficult, but innovation is possible. For example, the views of departing members could be specifically cited without a need for unanimity on their contributions.

Ireland also emphasizes the importance of strengthening the Council's engagement with regional organizations, civil society and non-Council members. Incorporating diverse perspectives and expertise can only enrich the Council's deliberations and enhance its capacity to address complex challenges. We strongly encourage the Council to invite those with human rights and protection mandates, such as the High Commissioner for Human Rights, to brief it on a more regular basis.

While there are serious divisions in the Council, progress can nevertheless be made on even the most difficult issues. Progress can occur. We commend the adoption of resolution 2664 (2022), for example, co-penned by Ireland and the United States to provide a cross-cutting humanitarian carveout for all sanctions regimes. It shows that progress can be made and that the Council can make important, impactful decisions in even the most difficult of circumstances.

Mr. Tun (Myanmar): Let me begin by thanking the President of the General Assembly for convening today's debate and the United Arab Emirates, as President of the Security Council, for presenting the Council's annual report (A/77/2).

Today's debate on the annual report provides a great opportunity for the Council itself as well as for the whole United Nations membership. It affords all Member

States a chance to assess the work of the Council and its effectiveness, as well as its dysfunction, in responding to existing and emerging threats to international peace and security and making progress on the transparency of its working methods. The members of the Security Council, especially the permanent members, with their special responsibility, should take this opportunity to listen to the voices, suggestions and in some cases the frustration of the United Nations membership regarding the Council's action or inaction. All the States Members of the United Nations, by signing the Charter of the United Nations, confer on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. They therefore expect the Council to be a reflection of collective responsibility, since, by the terms of the Charter, and specifically its Article 24, the Security Council acts on their behalf. I therefore want to stress the letter and the spirit of the Charter, which begins with "We the peoples of the United Nations".

The Security Council is not expected to dictate how to resolve every domestic political or social dispute in every Member States. However, in some situations with regional and international ramifications, the Council's unwillingness or inability to act has had profound consequences for the lives of millions of people. My country, Myanmar, is a fine example of such situations. Since the illegal military coup d'état in February 2021, the Security Council has issued seven press statements and one presidential statement (S/PRST/2021/5). In December 2022, the Security Council took a historically significant step by adopting its first-ever resolution, resolution 2669 (2022), on Myanmar. However, if we reflect objectively on the Security Council's response so far to the deteriorating situation there, it has been discouraging to the people of Myanmar, who continue to be relentlessly and violently assaulted by the military junta.

Since the early days of the attempted illegal coup, the Security Council has repeatedly called for the immediate release of all who have been arbitrarily detained, including President Win Myint and State Counsellor Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. Yet they remain hostages of the junta following sham trials. The Council strongly condemned the junta's violence against peaceful protesters and called for restraint. Almost every statement made by the Council over the past two and half years was followed by more brutal violence on the part of the military junta. In resolution 2669 (2022),

the Council demanded an immediate end to all forms of violence and called for the swift implementation of the five-point consensus of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), among other things. While we welcome and appreciate its statements and resolution, we have seen that as far as the military junta is concerned, each and every call of the Security Council has fallen on deaf ears. The junta is waging war on its own people. There has been no progress on the implementation of the five-point consensus.

We need only consider the reality on the ground to understand the worsening situation. As of today, the junta has brutally killed more than 3,700 people. The indiscriminate aerial and heavy-weapon attacks on the civilian population and wholesale burning of residential towns and villages continue and have displaced more than 1.5 million people. Targeted killings of civilians continue unabated with total impunity. One of the worst massacres was the heinous targeted aerial attack on a civilian gathering in Pazigy village on 11 April this year, which killed nearly 200 civilians, including children as young as a six-month-old baby. The brutal attacks are not isolated incidents. These are targeted attacks on the civilian population. They are so widespread and systematic that the United Nations Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar concluded that they could amount to crimes against humanity and war crimes.

From all of those, one thing has become very clear. We need decisive action from the Security Council to save the lives of the people of Myanmar. Statements and condemnation are evidently insufficient. We value the important principle of close cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. Accordingly, we recognize the role of ASEAN and support its Special Envoy in trying to find a solution to the crisis in Myanmar. However, ASEAN alone is not enough. All the ongoing efforts, including those of ASEAN, need to be backed by the Security Council, with enforceable actions with a particular focus on ending the ongoing violence against the people. While we do not expect a simple solution from the Security Council for our devastating situation, it is not unreasonable for the people of Myanmar to expect it to do something to protect their lives. An argument that we frequently hear is that we should not make the situation worse. We could not agree more. Responding with the aim of stopping atrocities against civilians and war crimes in Myanmar will not make the situation worse. Holding

the perpetrators of international crimes accountable will not make it worse. Ending military impunity will not make it worse. In fact, doing so will go a long way to creating an environment that is conducive to an eventual resolution of the situation that accords with our people's aspirations.

I therefore want to take this opportunity to appeal once again to the Security Council to pay serious attention to the expectations and aspirations of the people of Myanmar and follow up by taking action to enforce the implementation of resolution 2669 (2022), in order to save the lives of the people of Myanmar.

Mr. Peñaranda (Philippines): The Philippines thanks the Security Council for the submission of its annual report (A/77/2) to the General Assembly. We also join others in thanking the United Arab Emirates for introducing the report, Brazil for preparing it and the Swiss presidency of the Council for finalizing it.

Under Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council must submit an annual report to the General Assembly for its consideration, with the submission of the annual report being the only clear obligation that the Council has to the Assembly under the Charter. With regard to the relationship between the Council and the Assembly, the Philippines has always supported their respective roles on international peace and security, and we reaffirm the role and authority of the General Assembly, including on questions relating to international peace and security, in accordance with Articles 10 to 14 and 35 of the Charter. The Philippines also agrees with the view that the General Assembly and the Security Council are complementary organs. They may have different mandates, but they share the same goal, which is the maintenance of international peace and security and global order.

Today's plenary meeting of the Assembly to consider the report of the Security Council is an opportunity to strengthen the relationship between the two bodies in working and delivering as one for the common good. More importantly, by providing its report to the Assembly, the Council has in fact recognized its obligation to account to the Assembly on how it is fulfilling its mandate. Through the annual report, we recognize the Security Council's openness in sharing its activities, initiatives and decisions with the General Assembly. That effort to ensure transparency enables Member States and the international community to

understand the Security Council's actions, debates and resolutions. But we need more discussions and open debates in order to hear the views and suggestions of the United Nations membership. We need more meaningful and concrete involvement of the membership in the process of decision-making.

While the Security Council's comprehensive report enhances the Council's accountability, there is still much to be done to ensure that Member States' inputs are duly considered and taken on board. Since Security Council resolutions are binding on all Member States, they require compliance in support of the rule of law. Respect for international law should be at the heart of the Security Council's agenda and working methods. I would like to take this opportunity to make a comment on the veto initiative. We appreciate that the General Assembly has become a forum for airing Member States' sentiments and perspectives. However, we should be able to find ways to ensure that this exercise is not just a talking shop but an avenue to achieving concrete outcomes and actions.

The report also provides Member States with vital information on the prevailing international security landscape, peacekeeping operations, disarmament efforts and regional conflicts. It will be an invaluable reference in the formulation of appropriate policies and strategies to address global security concerns effectively. For instance, the Council adopted two major resolutions last year — resolutions 2642 (2022), which renewed the authorization for cross-border humanitarian assistance for Syria for six months, and 2699 (2022), the first-ever on Myanmar, in which the Council expressed its support for concrete measures and ending the violence — that are highlighted in the report and that provide invaluable insights on responding to ongoing conflicts, emerging threats and global security challenges in our region and beyond. We recognize that the Security Council's report serves as a platform for dialogue. Its presentation enables Member States to raise questions, seek clarifications and propose solutions concerning international peace and security matters.

Finally, we should continue to identify ways to further enhance the role, authority, effectiveness and efficiency of the General Assembly so that it can partner with the Security Council for the effective implementation of resolutions and initiatives and fulfil the United Nations commitment to maintaining international peace, security and stability. The

Philippines also reiterates its support for the ongoing efforts through intergovernmental negotiations to reform the Security Council to make it more inclusive, representative and accountable and better able to reflect the geopolitical realities and aspirations of the international community.

Mr. Rojas (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru appreciates the opportunity to participate in this important debate on the report of the Security Council for 2022 (A/77/2).

In that regard, my delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) group (see A/77/PV.86), and I would like to add the following remarks in my national capacity.

The report is one of the tools with which we can assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current structure and mechanisms of the Security Council's work, especially with regard to preventing conflicts and disputes and ensuring its role in the maintenance of international peace and security, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the principle of collective security. We therefore do not view this agenda item as a compartmentalized issue, or the presentation of the report as a mere bureaucratic formality. Rather we see it as intertwined with other important processes, such as the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform, which we discussed yesterday (see A/77/PV.85).

We appreciate the fact that the report addresses emerging and very important issues such as the links between conflict and food insecurity and technology and security, as well as information on the establishment of a sanctions regime for Haiti, which is particularly important for us, as it is a country in our region. We also appreciate the inclusion of statistics in the introduction of the report, including, for example, the increase in the number of unscheduled meetings held at the request of Council members, which reflects the dynamics of the Council during 2022. As a country committed to gender equality, we also commend the inclusion of disaggregated data on women's participation. It is encouraging to see progress reflected in the fact that in 2022 46 per cent of Council briefings were delivered by women, compared with 44 per cent in 2021 and 34 per cent in 2020.

We should also underscore that the word "veto" is used in the report's introduction for the first time, and information is provided on the number of meetings at which the right of the veto was exercised, which is significant, given that its inappropriate use has often prevented the Council from taking action even when it is urgently needed. In future we would like to see a chapter on the veto included, providing details of the cases in which it was used and specific statistics, which would enable a better understanding of the obstacles that arise in decision-making and would be a first step in the efforts to overcome divisions and promote cooperation in the Council.

Peru reaffirms its firm commitment to multilateralism and the Charter in overcoming global challenges. We will continue to work both through the ACT group and with other Member States to strengthen the role of the Security Council and ensure that it fulfils its mandate to maintain international peace and security.

Mr. Ghorbanpour Najafabadi (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran notes the report of the Security Council (A/77/2) and acknowledges the potential that regular annual submissions of those reports have for enhancing transparency and accountability within the Council. The practice can serve as a valuable way to keep the General Assembly informed about the decisions and measures that the Council undertakes to uphold international peace and security. We thank Brazil for its timely preparation of the introduction to the report and appreciate its presentation to the Assembly by the United Arab Emirates' presidency of the Council.

However, while the report provides valuable factual information regarding the Council's activities, it falls short where substantive and analytical insights regarding overarching trends in international peace and security are concerned. It therefore cannot enable the General Assembly to make a comprehensive and meaningful assessment of the Council's performance and evaluate the state of international peace and security. We strongly uphold the principle that the Council has a profound responsibility to the Member States on whose behalf it acts, and it must therefore be held accountable to them. The decisions made by its members should be guided by the collective interests of the entire United Nations membership. Safeguarding the Council's credibility requires firmly rejecting any attempts to manipulate it as a way to pursue national

political interests and agendas. It is absolutely vital to that credibility that the Council reject efforts to turn it into a tool for pursuing such interests and agendas, an approach that regrettably has continued to be applied in many cases.

The Assembly needs to be able to assess the Council's performance, as well as the state of international peace and security, including in cases in which the Council has failed to act substantively and comprehensively. In that regard, I would like to highlight the most enduring problem in the Middle East, on which the Council has continued to be utterly silent. Israel has maintained its oppressive and expansionist policies, including its unlawful criminal practices in the region, particularly in the occupied Palestinian territory. Its actions have resulted in the deaths of innocent Palestinians, including women and children, the requisitioning of Palestinian properties, the seizure and demolition of homes and people's forcible eviction from them. Furthermore, Israel continues to occupy the Syrian Golan and repeatedly violates Syria's sovereignty and territorial integrity, particularly by targeting civilians and civilian objects. The Council has made no concrete reaction to any of those atrocities against the Palestinian people and other nations in the region. Indeed, Israel commits such atrocities in full view of the international community, knowing well that it will face no consequences. As is reflected in chapter 12 of part V of the report, my delegation has continued to highlight Israel's threat to peace and security in the region.

In addition, Israel's dangerous policies on the use of weapons of mass destruction and their capabilities, as well as its direct involvement in terrorist acts, remain a matter of grave concern for countries in the Middle East. Israel has refused to adhere to any weapons of mass destruction, disarmament or arms-control regimes, despite the repeated international calls for it to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, accept the International Atomic Energy Agency Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement and submit its nuclear programmes for inspection by the Agency. It has also declined to take part in two initiatives to establish a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

We are deeply concerned about the Council's inability to adequately address those significant concerns, primarily owing to the consistent support that one of its permanent members provides to Israel.

It is disheartening that the support has hindered the Council's ability to take necessary action. In the light of the situation, we call urgently on the United Nations as a whole to take immediate and decisive action to put an end to Israel's continued impunity. It is imperative that concrete measures be taken to ensure accountability and justice for the violations being committed.

The holders of the permanent seats on the Council bear a special responsibility to uphold the Council's credibility, comply with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and ensure the implementation of the Council's resolutions. However, it is a matter of deep concern that the United States continues to openly violate resolution 2231 (2015). Its unlawful unilateral withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in 2018 and subsequent imposition of unilateral sanctions on the Islamic Republic of Iran are clear violations of resolution 2231 (2015). Despite the numerous calls of the international community, the United States continues to ignore its commitments and has even rejected previous agreements in the discussions on a possible return to the JCPOA's full implementation, citing reasons far beyond the scope of resolution 2231 (2015). It is also worth noting that for the first time in the Council's history, the United States, a permanent member, openly invited all Member States to either disobey the resolution or face punishment. If that alarming trend goes unchecked, it will severely damage the credibility of both the Council and the Organization as a whole, eroding the rule of law and leading to international disorder. It will be crucial to address and rectify those actions in order to preserve the integrity and effectiveness of the Council and uphold the principles of international law.

In conclusion, my delegation emphasizes how important it is that the Council refrain from deliberating on issues that do not pose a threat to international peace and security or pertain to the internal affairs of sovereign States. It will be critical to uphold full compliance with the Charter to prevent the Council from excessively and hastily resorting to its Chapter VII functions. We have observed instances in which sanctions were imposed in situations where no action was warranted, which underscores the need for careful consideration and measured responses. By continuing to adhere to those principles, the Council can ensure that its actions are proportionate to and consistent with its mandate to preserve global peace and security.

Mr. Eustathiou de los Santos (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): We welcomed the finalization in May of the annual report of the Security Council (A/77/2) under the Swiss presidency (see S/PV.9330), and we acknowledge Brazil's hard work in preparing the introduction to the document. We also express our sincere appreciation to the United Arab Emirates for presenting the report to the General Assembly.

Uruguay believes that it will be crucial for us to focus all our efforts on ensuring that the next Council report for the coming year is completed earlier, specifically in January 2024, in order to enable us in turn to discuss the topic in the Assembly sooner, thereby encouraging a timely and effective dialogue on issues of vital importance to international peace and security. We are pleased to acknowledge the report's inclusion of relevant references to trends and dynamics, especially those that reflect an improvement in women's participation in peace and security processes. That is a significant step towards building a more inclusive and definitely more equitable society.

We also appreciate the opportunity that open debates afford countries that are not Security Council members, and we hope to see debates held on new items on the international security agenda. Similarly, we underscore the references in the report to substantive issues such as the establishment of a sanctions regime for Haiti and the links between security and food security. Such aspects are crucial to addressing the complex challenges we face in the area of international security. The grave situation in Haiti, where all the scourges common to modern-day conflicts can sadly be observed, is alarming. We urge the international community to continue working to find solutions to alleviate the plight of the civilian population and lay the foundations for the re-establishment of the rule of law.

We welcome the mentions of the special reports issued pursuant to General Assembly resolution 76/262, and we encourage the Security Council to consider including a list of them, making it possible to better understand the issues addressed. It is relevant to acknowledge the annual report's first-ever reference to a veto, and it is also necessary to underscore other aspects of the relationship between the Council and the Assembly, such as the selection process for the Secretary-General, the election of judges to the International Court of Justice and matters relating to peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which are key to ensuring a solid and effective global governance system.

In that context, we want to take this opportunity to assess the Council's achievements and challenges in 2022. We should study its achievements to date and consider what lies ahead in our collective quest for peace and stability. The Council has a duty to promote international peace and the resolution of conflicts, an area where it is falling short, with the primary obstacles being rigidity and a lack of flexibility and dialogue, resulting in inaction and a failure to take the concrete measures that can make lasting peace possible and pave the way for settling conflicts. Let us take advantage of our debates to address the underlying causes of conflicts and promote effective advocacy on the part of the Council in its role as a guarantor of international peace and security. Such situations as those in Haiti, Ukraine, Myanmar and the Sudan are of great interest to the international community and require our undivided attention and concerted effort.

In conclusion, today's debate offers an invaluable opportunity to strengthen cooperation and constructive dialogue among all Member States. In that regard, we call on all Council members to work to produce a report that is analytical as well as descriptive.

Uruguay also aligns itself with the statement delivered by Portugal on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group. Let us work together to confront challenges.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council contained in document A/77/2?

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): The exercise of the right of reply has been requested. I would like to remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Ravindran (India): I would like to take the floor to exercise my delegation's right to reply to remarks by the representative of Pakistan today (see A/77/PV.86) that impinge on India's domestic affairs and on our sovereignty and territorial integrity. India just completed a two-year term on the Security Council for 2021 and 2022, in which we fulfilled our responsibility in the maintenance of international

peace and security, raised our voice against common threats to humankind such as terrorism and in fact spoke for the wider global South. As for Pakistan, the only achievements it has to show for itself are its stellar record as the world's biggest exporter of terrorism and its bigoted policies that constitutionally and legally relegate its own citizens to second class. Even today we heard a spirited defence of terrorism from Pakistan's representative, which is not surprising for a country that has harboured and continues to harbour some of the world's most wanted terrorists. That being the case, I will not dignify Pakistan's venomous comments about India by responding to them, since those who are soaked in bigotry will find it hard to understand the functioning of a pluralistic society. Such remarks deserve only our collective contempt and perhaps our sympathy for a mindset that utters falsehoods repeatedly.

As for the remarks on the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir, it is well known that Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh in their entirety are inalienable territories of India, and that includes the territory of Jammu and Kashmir that is currently under illegal occupation by Pakistan. Even if the representative of Pakistan takes the floor again, I do not want to engage with him further on the matter, and would rather like to once again suggest that he review what has just been said and perhaps reflect on it.

Mr. Chaudhary (Pakistan): I feel compelled to take the floor to respond to the remarks by the representative of India against my country. India continues to perpetuate a factually incorrect position year after year. It is completely false and wrong to say that by making any comment on Jammu and Kashmir a country is impinging on India's territorial integrity and sovereignty. Jammu and Kashmir is internationally recognized as a disputed territory and not an integral or inalienable part of India, and repeating a wrong position will not make it acceptable at any point in this forum. In his statement this morning (see A/77/PV.86), the Permanent Representative of Pakistan drew the attention of the membership to the fact that there are Security Council resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir that have been awaiting implementation for more than seven decades now. The resolutions recognize the right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to self-determination, a right clearly provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. It is vital to ensure that the Security Council takes cognizance of India's intransigence and makes a concerted effort to implement its resolutions on Jammu

and Kashmir. It has a legal responsibility to do that. It was merely that fact that the representative of Pakistan highlighted and underlined this morning. My delegation would also like to draw the attention of the Assembly to Article 25 of the Charter, which states that

“[t]he Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.”

By claiming Jammu and Kashmir as a territory that is an internal matter for India, the Indian representative has yet again challenged the legitimacy of the Security Council resolutions that unequivocally declare Jammu and Kashmir a disputed territory whose final status is to be determined through a plebiscite under United Nations auspices. India's comments, which strike at the core of the Council's authority, are an affront to the United Nations, the efficacy of multilateralism, the Charter and the principles of the multilateral work that we do in our Organization.

Let me share with members the situation that has prompted my delegation to bring the issue of Jammu and Kashmir to the attention of the international community.

India has imprisoned the entire Kashmiri leadership. It has illegally detained thousands of Kashmiri youth, women and children. It has summarily executed young boys, violently put down protests and burned down entire neighbourhoods and villages. Indian-occupied Jammu and Kashmir is the most militarized zone in the world, where close to 900,000 security forces personnel have been deployed by India to curb the Kashmiris' legitimate struggle. I want to point out to all our colleagues that those Indian crimes are not something merely suggested by Pakistan. They have been well documented by the United Nations. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has issued two reports citing massive human rights violations and has proposed the establishment of a commission of inquiry to investigate them, asking for access to occupied Jammu and Kashmir. More than a dozen special procedures of the Human Rights Council have expressed similar concerns about the human rights violations in occupied Jammu and Kashmir and have sought access to investigate them. However, India continues to hinder access for such visits. It completely denies all access to the occupied territory.

As for the allegations about terrorism, that is an old Indian tactic to divert attention from its well-established crimes in the occupied territory. My

delegation rejects those outrageous comments outright. Despite such provocations, I will not comment on the fascist anti-Muslim policies of the Indian Government and more than a dozen other human rights violations in various parts of India. I will also refrain from dwelling on the issue of the Hindu vigilante groups that violently target minorities, including for eating beef.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 27.

Agenda item 132 (continued)

The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity

Report of the Secretary-General (A/77/910)

Ms. Vittay (Hungary): Hungary aligns itself with the statement delivered earlier in the week on behalf of the European Union (see A/77/PV.83) and would like to add a few remarks in its national capacity.

We thank the Secretary-General for his report on development and the responsibility to protect (R2P) (A/77/910). We highlight the fact that the report builds on the notion that mass atrocities are the result of a confluence of structural factors, political dynamics, triggers of violence and patterns of targeting during violence. In that sentence, the word “structural” is key. The report emphasizes that poverty, long-standing institutionalized discrimination, poor education, economic and gender inequalities and social exclusion, as well as corruption and a lack of good governance, are all important risk factors for atrocity crimes. The report also sets up a correlation between underdevelopment and conflict.

Looking at the way forward, we would like to highlight a few institutional aspects, as well as some substantive observations. Concerning the institutional framework, Hungary commends the invaluable work of the Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and on the Responsibility to Protect. We also thank the Secretary-General for issuing his thematic reports. However, we also echo the need for more concrete guidance from the reports. Concrete and practical recommendations and best practices significantly assist Member States in their prevention efforts and help them to assess whether such recommendations have been implemented as appropriate. In addition, an

analysis of trends regarding risks could also facilitate the prevention efforts of Member States.

Our second point regarding the institutional framework is that other United Nations entities may also contribute to the eventual success of the responsibility-to-protect agenda. The Peacebuilding Commission, in particular, can play an important role in supporting States in the transition from conflict and atrocity crimes to sustainable peace by addressing underlying development indicators. Member States should explore the possibilities for greater engagement with the Peacebuilding Commission, which can help States and advise the Security Council with regard to meeting their obligations related to R2P.

Thirdly, we encourage all Member States to appoint a national R2P focal point and join the Global Network of R2P Focal Points. Sixty-one Member States and two regional organizations have so far appointed R2P focal points and are building their national and collective capacities for preventing mass atrocity crimes. We can maximize the network effect only if we have as many participants as possible.

Turning to the substantive remarks, we note that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982) provide a framework for global cooperation in achieving a better and more sustainable future. Furthermore, as articulated in *Our Common Agenda*, the New Agenda for Peace should be focused on strengthening prevention, understanding key risk factors and addressing all forms of violence, as well as the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 16 on peace, justice and strong institutions. We underline that in order to have an effective prevention system, we must agree on the early warning signs and clarify the early action to be taken in response to such alarms. In that regard, effective early warning should be rooted in accurately identifying all the factors that pose risks of violence, including the risk factors associated with atrocity crimes, rather than focusing solely on the risk of conflict.

Finally, Hungary would like to emphasize that the protection of cultural heritage is a crucial and indispensable instrument for peace and reconciliation as well as inclusive and sustainable development. The destruction of tangible and intangible cultural heritage can severely affect and endanger social cohesion and the peaceful coexistence of peoples and lead to an escalation of conflicts. That strong correlation has

already been recognized. The time is therefore ripe for paying greater attention to the area. We encourage States to criminalize offences against cultural heritage in their domestic legal systems and hold individuals accountable for crimes against or affecting cultural heritage.

Mr. Tun (Myanmar): This debate is a great opportunity for all Member States to reflect on the concept of the responsibility to protect (R2P). I appreciate the Secretary-General's examination of the relationship between R2P and sustainable development in this year's report (A/77/910).

I would also like to thank the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General, Mr. George Okoth-Obbo, for introducing the report (A/77/910) (see A/77/PV.83).

We affirm that States have the primary responsibility to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Nonetheless, the international community has a responsibility to help States fulfil this obligation and take collective action in a timely and decisive manner, especially when an authority-in-power itself is perpetrating those crimes against its own people. The consequences of failing to respond decisively to atrocity crimes are severe, not only for the immediate victims but also for the very foundations of international law.

Protection is not just about responding to imminent risks of such serious crimes. Addressing the structural risks for mass atrocities is also a key tenet of the protection responsibility of States. To that end, we have a global road map in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Unfortunately, we note with alarm that we are now off track in attaining most of the targets set forth in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In many situations, including my own country, Myanmar, hard-won gains in the implementation of the SDGs, including poverty reduction, are in regression.

As the General Assembly is aware, the people of Myanmar have been subject to repeated atrocious crimes committed by the illegal military junta. Accordingly, I wish to highlight governance-related drivers of atrocities in the context of what is happening in my country. Sustainable Development Goal 16 is a key foundation for preventing the structural risks that could lead to atrocities. This Goal encompasses promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, providing access to justice for everyone, strengthening the rule of law and building effective and accountable institutions

at all levels. However, in Myanmar, this foundational goal has been totally demolished since the illegal coup by the military junta.

The elected civilian Government's efforts to build effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive institutions have been eliminated by a junta that has not been held to account. In fact, the junta has created and maintained a culture of impunity within the rank and file that encourages the inhumane use of violence against anyone it deems to be sympathetic to growing anti-coup resistance forces. Under that perceived sense of impunity, the military has been relentlessly waging a campaign of terror against the people of Myanmar in order to exert control over the population. Since it is unable to contain the nationwide resistance, the illegal junta has been turning to targeted killings of civilians as their military tactic. The junta forces have brutally killed almost 3,700 people.

The United Nations has extensively documented the junta's brutal conduct, including arbitrary arrests, torture of detainees, wholesale burning of residential homes, indiscriminate area attacks and bombings, and — in several massacres — targeted killings of civilians. The military's brutal attacks against civilians are not isolated incidents. These attacks are so widespread, systematic and coordinated that the United Nations Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar concluded that they amount to crimes against humanity and war crimes, which are among the four atrocity crimes for which the responsibility to protect was intended to be invoked.

The people of Myanmar are determined to bring about the end of the inhumane junta and rebuild their country by re-establishing the rule of law, democracy and respect for human rights under the federal governance system that guarantees self-determination for the ethnic peoples of the country. Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in Myanmar largely depends on the ability of the people of Myanmar to establish these crucial foundations. To do that, we need support and help from the States Members of the United Nations.

Myanmar is in a situation where its military institutions have been attacking people who refuse to submit to their illegal and illegitimate rule. In the face of the relentless assaults by the brutal military machine, the people of Myanmar have long been asking the international community, particularly the Security

Council, to take decisive action against the junta's ongoing violence. Unfortunately, with no adequate action from the international community, the military junta has been emboldened to continue further serious international crimes with total impunity. Over the past six months, the military has escalated its brutal attacks meant to instil terror and intimidation. We have all been witnessing the military's escalating brutality and attacks following the adoption of Security Council resolution 2669 (2022). Clearly, the Security Council needs to adopt effective follow-up measures to that resolution.

I therefore wish to appeal to the Security Council, individual Member States and our neighbouring countries to protect the civilians in Myanmar by utilizing the available tools suggested by the Secretary-General in his annual reports on the responsibility to protect.

While the international community is not providing protection to the people of Myanmar who are under relentless violent assaults from the illegitimate junta, the very least that Member States can do is to refuse to enable the Myanmar military to commit further atrocity crimes against the people of my country. On behalf of the people of Myanmar, I urge all Member States not to equip the inhumane military with the weapons and technologies it can use to commit further war crimes and crimes against humanity against the people of Myanmar, which also is in line with the Assembly's call in resolution 75/287; that they not help fund the military's brutal campaign of terror against its own people; that they not encourage the military junta by legitimizing its illegal attempted coup; and that, finally, and most importantly, that they help us end military impunity in Myanmar by holding perpetrators of serious international crimes accountable.

The situation in Myanmar is a stark reminder of the challenges we face in ensuring accountability and justice in the world. It is a call to action for all of us.

Mr. Abesadze (Georgia): Georgia aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the European Union in its capacity as observer (see A/77/PV.83). Allow me to deliver the following statement in my national capacity.

At the outset, I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report (A/77/910), which analyses the nexus between the challenges to sustainable development and the causes of atrocity crimes.

Today's debate once again demonstrates the positive impact that the institutionalization of the principle of the responsibility to protect within the United Nations has had in the course of its development. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, along with the international human rights instruments, represents a blueprint for action for a peaceful and prosperous world. Given the inextricable link between peace and development, we firmly believe that the effective realization of the 2030 Agenda can significantly mitigate the risk of atrocities.

Nowadays, our world has to confront unprecedented levels of violence, conflict and displacement. We are witnessing a variety of circumstances in which populations are victims or at risk of being subject to atrocity crimes. We fully concur with the Secretary-General that poverty, long-standing institutionalized discrimination, poor education, economic and gender inequality, social isolation, and a lack of effective governance are all significant risk factors for atrocity crimes. Indeed, sustainable development plays a critical role in building the social resilience of populations.

Unfortunately, despite the unanimous agreement of international community in 2005 on the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity (resolution 70/1), today we are witnessing increased levels of violence, atrocities and record-high displacement. Among these, we have unfortunately witnessed war crimes committed by Russia in my own country, Georgia, and continue to witness ever-increasing violations of human rights in the Russia's illegally occupied Abkhazia and Tskhinvali regions of Georgia.

Georgia remains deeply alarmed by the enormous human suffering in Ukraine caused by Russia's premeditated, unjustified and unprovoked full-scale aggression. According to numerous reports and international mechanisms, a wide range of war crimes committed by Russia in Ukraine is documented. Those blatant violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law create acute risks to peace, security and development and demand that the international community take a resolute stance.

Ahead of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Summit, we voice our steadfast support to the joint actions aimed to achieve a more sustainable future for all.

At the national level, Georgia has continued its efforts to advance the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Government of Georgia has offered high-level political support to incorporating Sustainable Development Goals into national priorities since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and has continued its efforts to advance the Agenda throughout these years. In September 2022, the Government of Georgia adopted the Vision 2030 development strategy for Georgia, a nationwide policy document. It covers the key priorities of our nationwide development by 2030 and is fully aligned with all 17 SDGs. To mainstream the SDGs in the local Government, a localization plan was developed for their implementation at the local level. The goal is to localize the SDGs in all municipalities by 2025, which should contribute to achieving the set targets for 2030. Georgia is equally committed to further strengthening its national human rights machinery and attaches great importance to cooperating with existing human rights mechanisms.

Before concluding, I would like to reaffirm Georgia's commitment to advancing the goals and objectives of R2P and to express support to the Secretary-General's proposed New Agenda for Peace, which we view as a much-needed opportunity to promote peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen the framework for a peaceful world.

Mr. Geisler (Germany): Germany aligns itself with the statements delivered on behalf of the European Union and on behalf of the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect. We thank the Secretary-General for this year's report (A/77/910) and its recommendations, and we thank Special Adviser Okoth-Obbo for his presentation of the report.

The responsibility to protect (R2P), as reflected in the 2005 World Summit outcome document, serves as a cornerstone of our individual and collective commitment to prevent and respond to the most heinous international crimes. It demands that we, as members of the international community, recognize our duty to safeguard populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Upholding that responsibility requires efforts encompassing political, humanitarian and socioeconomic dimensions. Germany reaffirms its unwavering commitment to R2P as a holistic concept, resting on its three pillars.

We commend the focus of this year's report on development, as the power of economic development in fostering stability, resilience and social cohesion must not be underestimated. To effectively integrate economic development within our efforts to prevent atrocities, we must pursue comprehensive strategies that address the interconnected drivers of violence. That entails promoting good governance, strengthening the rule of law, accountability, protecting human rights and combating corruption. By establishing conducive environments for economic growth and promoting social inclusion, we can empower individuals and communities to actively participate in the development process, fostering a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for peace and stability.

Germany is a leading donor in the field of development cooperation. We are determined to do our part on the path towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. As co-facilitator of the Summit of the Future, we are firmly committed to help bring along the transformative changes we need to address the challenges of the future. In particular, the New Agenda for Peace offers the potential of strengthening prevention, understanding key risk factors and implementing SDG 16, on peace, justice and strong institutions.

Germany firmly believes that investing in preventive measures, early-warning systems and robust institutions is not only morally imperative, but also cost-effective in the long run. By strategically allocating resources to conflict prevention and sustainable development, we can mitigate the human and economic costs associated with responding to crises. We must, therefore, encourage greater international cooperation, knowledge-sharing and capacity-building in order to enhance our collective ability to prevent, detect and respond to the signs of impending atrocities.

Germany supports the work of the Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect. As early warnings are key to prevention, we strongly encourage the United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect to issue statements on specific-country situations and to provide thematic briefings and country analyses at appropriate meetings. We believe that the systematic sharing of information and analysis with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the

Human Rights Council can contribute significantly to meaningful prevention.

Germany is deeply concerned about grave situations unfolding in several countries, with particular attention to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and the situation in the Sudan. We call on the international community to intensify efforts to protect the populations from atrocities and to work towards sustainable solutions that ensure accountability.

Women and girls, in all their diversity, are disproportionately affected by mass atrocities, facing specific forms of violence, such as sexual and gender-based violence, forced displacement and systematic discrimination. It is imperative that our response to atrocities is centred on the needs, rights and agency of victims and survivors, particularly women and girls, ensuring their protection, empowerment and meaningful participation.

Germany stresses the importance of the women and peace and security agenda in addressing the gendered dimensions of conflicts and atrocity crimes. By integrating the women and peace and security principles into our policies and programmes, Germany aims to ensure that the rights, needs and perspectives of women and girls are effectively addressed and their voices are heard and respected. We also need to be mindful to include young people, as reflected in youth and peace and security agenda.

In conclusion, let us recommit to the three pillars — the responsibility to protect, genocide and atrocity prevention and sustainable economic development. By integrating those interconnected strands, we can foster a world where every individual can live in peace, dignity and prosperity. Germany stands ready to collaborate with all Member States, the United Nations and relevant stakeholders to translate those aspirations into concrete actions.

Mr. Moussa (Djibouti): At the outset, Djibouti is pleased to welcome today's meeting. This is the sixth occasion in which the General Assembly has formally considered the responsibility to protect (R2P). It is also the second meeting since the General Assembly adopted resolution 75/277 on 18 May 2021, in which it decided to include R2P on its annual agenda and formally requested that the Secretary-General report annually on the topic.

The fifteenth report of the Secretary-General on the R2P (A/77/910) examines the interrelationship between sustainable development and the R2P. It recognizes that development can build the conditions for sustainable peace, equitable growth and accountable governance and constitutes one of the building blocks for realizing the fundamental purposes and objectives of R2P — the prevention of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing. It is axiomatic that development deficits or exclusion from associated rights can potentially trigger and/or escalate the risks of atrocity crimes, especially when combined with other critical factors.

The report recognizes the intersection between development and R2P and urges States to leverage development programming across the spectrum of atrocity risk assessment, early warning, preparedness and response to avoid, reduce or mitigate those risks and occurrences. The report is timely and demonstrates the contribution that R2P can make to the development framework.

In the context of today's debate, we would like to underscore the following four points.

First, 18 years after the adoption of the 2005 World Summit Outcome reflecting R2P, the imperative for concrete action to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity remains more urgent than ever.

Secondly, R2P is the *raison d'être* of the State. One of the most fundamental objectives of the State, as a sovereign entity, is the protection of its population. Sovereignty equals responsibility.

Thirdly, the implementation of R2P requires a wide-ranging partnership among States, on the one hand, and bilateral, regional and multilateral actors, on the other hand.

Fourthly and last but not least, the development-R2P nexus as proposed and described in the current report links the first and second pillars of R2P and provides a framework for consensus-building and the convergence of perspectives on that important principle.

In the light of the foregoing, let us recommit ourselves to the full realization of the solemn declaration made by world leaders in the 2005 World Summit Outcome to expedite actions in consensus-building on consolidating the implementation of R2P, consistent with established principles of international law, ahead

of the twentieth anniversary of its proclamation in 2025. Let us take the upcoming twentieth anniversary as a clarion call to action to perfect R2P.

In conclusion, we thank the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect for the leadership he has provided in developing the principle and building consensus around it. We urge support to the two Special Advisers and the Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and encourage Member States to explore options to enhance and strengthen the role of the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect in providing United Nations early warning assessments and recommendations on how to prevent atrocities, including to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council.

Ms. Hayovyshyn (Ukraine): Ukraine aligns itself with the statement delivered by the European Union (see A/77/PV.83) and would like to make a few remarks in its national capacity.

We reaffirm the Ukrainian Government's commitment to the 2005 World Summit Outcome document. We have committed to protecting all populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Ukraine is a party to the core instruments of international law relating to the prevention of atrocity crimes, the protection of populations, the upholding of human rights and the elimination of all forms of discrimination. And Ukraine is now at the forefront of protecting its own people on the ground.

The principles of the responsibility to protect (R2P) reject the use of military force by one State against another under the pretence of protecting a population from alleged threats, especially when the actual goal is to occupy another State's territory. Military force should not be employed to alter borders or occupy territories. However, Russia has launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine, using the false pretext of protecting its population from genocide. Since 24 February 2022, United Nations official information indicates that the number of civilian casualties in Ukraine has reached almost 25,000, although the actual number of victims is likely much higher.

Despite those losses, Ukraine is actively resisting the aggressor. In response to its military failures on the battlefield, Russia is resorting to terrorizing civilians

in Ukraine by targeting critical infrastructure and residential areas with missiles, multiple-launch rocket systems, guided aerial bombs and Iranian-made attack drones. Those attacks have resulted in significant casualties and widespread destruction.

The scorched-Earth tactic employed by Russia is emblematic of its dictatorial nature. Throughout history, it has repeatedly used that tactic and continues to do so today, resembling a medieval monster.

The atrocities committed by the Russian army in towns and villages across Ukraine are reminiscent of the Ukrainian genocide known as the Holodomor, which was carried out by Russia's predecessor from 1932 to 1933.

In an effort to prevent counteroffensive actions by Ukraine across the Dnipro River, the Russian occupiers deliberately destroyed the dam at the Nova Kakhovka hydroelectric power plant on 6 June. That act resulted in the largest ecological and humanitarian disaster in Europe in decades. Despite the United Nations request for access to the residents of the flooded settlements on the left bank of the Dnipro River under Russia's temporary military control, the Kremlin declined to grant permission.

According to Ukrainian intelligence, Russia has made preparations to destroy Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant. The potential consequences of such a disaster are highly unpredictable.

The actions of the Russian forces in Ukraine clearly demonstrate that their objective in invading Ukraine is the annihilation of Ukraine as a nation. While we speak, Russia is actively pursuing the genocide of the Ukrainian people.

We have consistently emphasized the United Nations crucial role in the prevention of atrocity crimes, particularly regarding the second and third pillars of R2P. The Security Council holds a special responsibility in that regard. However, the use of veto power or even the threat of its use impedes the Council's ability to respond promptly in situations requiring urgent action to protect civilians.

At the onset of the invasion, Russia misused its veto power to obstruct the Council from fulfilling its primary responsibility. As a result, the General Assembly took on the responsibility and fulfilled its role by adopting six resolutions during the eleventh emergency special session.

To effectively curb the aggression, it is imperative to pursue demilitarization and hold the Russian military and political leaders accountable for their crimes. Again, the General Assembly must assume that role by establishing a special tribunal to hold accountable those responsible for the crime of aggression against Ukraine. This is not only about saving Ukrainian lives. It is also about averting potential global catastrophes and preventing further genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity everywhere the Russian army has been abusing R2P principles — in Ukraine, Georgia and elsewhere in the world.

Ms. Jiang Hua (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Venezuela on behalf of the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations (see A/77/PV.83) and takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the responsibility to protect (A/77/910). I would like to share three points.

First, preventing and addressing the root causes of conflict is key to implementing the principle of the responsibility to protect. The Secretary-General's report stresses that development deficits can exacerbate social unrest and lead to risks of conflict, even triggering genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. China believes that promoting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and advancing development for peace is an important way to eliminate the root causes of conflict. The international community should work in every part of the world to eliminate poverty, address development imbalances, build inclusive societies, help developing countries enhance their capacity for autonomous development and lay a foundation for preventing conflict and protecting civilians.

Secondly, States have the primary responsibility to protect civilians. The international community can provide assistance, but it is ultimately the States concerned that have to fulfil their responsibilities. The international community should adhere to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, fully respect the sovereignty of the countries concerned, prevent the escalation of tensions through good offices and negotiations and create favourable conditions for national Governments to fulfil their responsibility to protect.

Thirdly, the development assistance provided by the international community to developing countries

should be aimed at supporting the countries concerned in implementing their development strategies and should focus on their needs rather than attaching preconditions to assistance based on self-established assessment criteria, let alone by making decisions for them. Development is foundational to peace and security. China would like to work with the international community to support developing countries in responding to security challenges, maintaining common security and enhancing their capacity to protect civilians with additional resources and means by realizing sustainable development.

Mr. Pieris (Sri Lanka): We thank the Secretary-General for his report (A/77/910) on the responsibility to protect (R2P) and its application in the context of sustainable development, which I thought was commendable. However, in an ideal world, all States would undoubtedly take responsibility to protect their populations. It is a *sine qua non*, perhaps. But in reality, projecting that responsibility at an international scale remains problematic, in my view, for there will always be the issue of who should act, when and how. In my view, adopting specific threshold and precautionary principles would be a crucial step in making it harder for States to make false humanitarian claims. It is argued that they would strengthen strong arguments and weaken weak ones, which matters for Governments that fail to persuade other States, the media and global public opinion and risk condemnation and sanctions in consequence of that principle.

Without the adoption of such principles and without considerable reform of the Security Council, which remains highly unlikely, the *realpolitik* of our global order will continue to undermine the R2P concept. It is therefore currently still far from being able to effectively make our world a more secure place. In our international order, States have a duty to individuals and communities. They are endowed with inalienable rights and have an obligation to secure those rights now and over time. That means that it is the duty of States to prevent serious violations — of economic, social, cultural and environmental rights as well as civil and political ones — that fuel cases of international crimes. And the original definition of sustainable development as expressed at the World Commission on Environment and Development clearly encompasses that human rights angle, especially with respect to the lives of future generations.

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. If States fail to meet the universal agreed goal of sustainable development, future generations are liable to be the victims of living conditions that are below the agreed human rights standards. I say that because in the traditional sense, the concept of the responsibility to protect has challenged the natural order of the international system by providing a different understanding of State sovereignty, including State accountability.

It is therefore clear that although there is tension between State sovereignty, sustainable development and the defence of human rights, it is possible to overcome that clash by looking at sovereignty as the State's responsibility for the protection of its own citizens, rather than merely as a mechanism available for unbridled power. It must therefore be appreciated that the doctrine of the responsibility to protect specifies that the primary responsibility to protect lies with the State itself and not with the international community. The general idea is that sovereignty and military intervention should be seen as counterbalancing factors, where military intervention is used only as a last resort. Resolution 60/161 on R2P, adopted by the General Assembly in 2005, tried to overcome many prevailing tensions, but it still recognized the ultimate authority of the Security Council. According to the resolution, each State had a responsibility to protect its population, but collective action was to be taken through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis.

Why is that relevant? I say it is relevant because it points to a fact that we must appreciate, which is that as one academic puts it, R2P is a mere aspiration — and a rather weak one at that — as opposed to a real principle of international norms or even international law. R2P sometimes not only runs against the practices of practical politics, where national sovereignty still reigns supreme, but more important, it is at odds with a fundamental principle of the United Nations itself — the ultimate legal deference to national sovereignty, as decided by the members of the Security Council. The Council might approve of the concept with respect to one particular case but might not do so in the case of another because certain members of the permanent five are at cross-purposes. Its protagonists

often say that intervening in the face of mass murder is an option that cannot be relinquished. Undoubtedly that cannot be more true, but we do not need R2P to exercise that option. Whether the Security Council authorizes such an intervention will always be one of practical judgment.

No one is prepared to defend the claim that States can do what they want with their people and then hide behind the principle of sovereignty. There is no justification for the core crimes of genocide, ethnic cleansing and so on. In 2001 the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty called on the international community, its members and nations and non-governmental organizations, to embrace the idea of the responsibility to protect as a basic element in the code of global citizenship and its vital necessity. But it is critical to consider these issues concerning the concept of the responsibility to protect, because they emphasize that the history of the doctrine of the responsibility to protect sounds almost like a fairy tale, and one of the most striking aspects is the gap between the promise and the reality. While State representatives and international organizations have continued to endorse the concept as a permanent principle, individual States and groups of States alike continue to emphasize the primacy of State sovereignty where domestic affairs are concerned in order to point out the Security Council's limited competencies and to emphasize that the responsibility to protect has not yet gained legal force.

It must be appreciated that the R2P doctrine is riddled with too many contradictions and practical problems to make it seriously implementable. However, we should not forget that the responsibility to protect is an ambitious project that represents a vital opportunity for the world community to transform its understanding of humanitarian intervention rather than see it as a new licence to intervene militarily. R2P challenges and obliges nations to affirm and realize socioeconomic rights in the developing world. Countries coming out of prolonged armed conflict are vitally dependent on socioeconomic development to help them avoid relapsing into violence and brutality. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide a framework for defining and prioritizing the most essential development needs, as well as a blueprint for investing in and focusing development assistance in individual countries. Implementing a social-welfare version of R2P through the SDGs will require innovative

fundraising strategies, including the transformation and channelling of private credit in the public interest and a robust global financial architecture.

Improving women's access to food, employment, education and reproductive and other health services is at the heart of the Sustainable Development Goals. Such efforts are also crucial to fighting poverty, protecting children, lessening economic inequality and preventing social instability and armed conflict at the global level, and should therefore be central aspects of the responsibility to protect. The Sustainable Development Goals are essential benchmarks for countries at risk of war and repression, as well as those struggling to emerge from armed conflict and humanitarian emergencies. When States embrace R2P through the SDGs, they commit to a human security partnership with countries in socioeconomic distress in pursuit of long-term conflict resolution. For human rights activists, that human-welfare-centred vision of the responsibility to protect is an essential reminder that social justice and civil liberties are equal pillars of and partners in the global human rights movement.

Mr. Gómez (Ireland): Ireland aligns itself with the statements made on behalf of the European Union and by the representative of Croatia on behalf of the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect (see A/77/PV.83).

Let me begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his report (A/77/910). I also want to take this opportunity to thank Special Adviser Okoth-Obbo for his insightful remarks (see A/77/PV.83) and to reaffirm Ireland's support for the Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect.

In what feels like an increasingly fragile, violent and fractured world, there are some who would have us believe that the responsibility to protect (R2P) is no longer relevant, or that it is an outdated and unworkable idea. We firmly reject that assertion. From the Sudan and Afghanistan to Myanmar and the occupied Palestinian territory, the need to protect populations at risk of mass atrocity crimes is as important now as it has ever been. The fact that we remain far from the objective envisaged in 2005 is not a failure of R2P. It is a failure of political will and of our collective determination to prioritize the safeguarding of human lives over narrow interests and geopolitical considerations. The truth is that the responsibility to protect is only as effective as our commitment to its principles. The promises we

make in this Hall are meaningless if they are not backed by decisive action, timely interventions and robust accountability mechanisms.

With the Sustainable Development Goals Summit fast approaching, the report of the Secretary-General is a welcome and timely reminder that sustainable development is critical to our prevention efforts. Poverty, inequality and weak institutions can create environments conducive to conflict and violence. It is our responsibility as Member States to tackle those challenges head-on and to prioritize the well-being and protection of vulnerable populations. The role of women is also key to prevention. We know from our own experience of conflict on the island of Ireland that women have a transformative role to play in the prevention of violence and in mediation and peacebuilding. We must ensure that the women and peace and security agenda is implemented so that we can achieve women's full participation and leadership in the prevention and resolution of conflict. We must also pursue accountability for conflict-related sexual violence, to which women and girls are especially vulnerable, and which can constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity or constitutive acts with respect to genocide.

Much like our commitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, our commitment to R2P is far off track, but we can still change course. Within the context of *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982) and the New Agenda for Peace, there is an opportunity to reassess and recalibrate our approach to the prevention of atrocities. Likewise, the twentieth anniversary of the 2005 World Summit, two years from now, should serve as a catalyst for renewed commitment and action towards our shared vision of a future where the responsibility to protect is not just a lofty ideal but a tangible reality. Ireland recognizes the importance of regional and international partnerships, including with civil society, in fulfilling our responsibility to protect. We support the vital role of the United Nations and call for the continued strengthening of its early-warning and prevention mechanisms. Where prevention fails, the Security Council has the responsibility to take collective action to prevent and halt atrocity crimes. Ireland urges all Member States to join the code of conduct of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group and the French-Mexican initiative on the use of the veto in the Security Council in cases of mass atrocities.

Mr. Faati (Gambia): At the 2005 World Summit, Member States agreed unanimously on the international community's responsibility to protect populations, regardless of their race or creed, from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. While that obligation is a primary responsibility of individual Member States, at the same time it is one that is shared by all of us. We must acknowledge that progress has been made since then. However, much remains to be done, and in the current global context, some of that progress risks being reversed. We thank the Secretary-General for this year's report (A/77/910) entitled "Development and the responsibility to protect: recognizing and addressing embedded risks and drivers of atrocity crimes".

In Africa today, there is undisputed recognition of the strong interlinkages between peace and development, with studies confirming that armed conflicts and atrocity crimes remain a major obstacle to development. Apart from the heavy human and material costs, conflicts and atrocities impede development, damage infrastructure, prevent the reliable delivery of social services and disrupt the growth of societies. Conflicts on the continent have perpetuated poverty, which at the same time has had a negative impact on our progress towards our collective goal of achieving sustainable peace and security.

The challenge of addressing the root causes of conflicts and insecurity requires greater global solidarity and leadership on the part of the United Nations. The international community should intensify its collective efforts to accelerate progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and the goals and targets of the African Union's Agenda 2063, including those of the Silencing the Guns in Africa initiative. We must also strengthen the partnership between the United Nations and the African Union in formulating joint responses to existing and emerging threats to peace, security and development in Africa.

As we are addressing development challenges, the United Nations agencies and other development partners need funding flexibility and predictability to deliver programmes that support building prosperous and structurally transformed economies that leave no one behind, especially in the least developed and middle-income countries. We are aware of the geopolitical competition for influence by regional and global Powers, but as small States Members of the United Nations, we are more interested in seeing greater

cooperation in addressing the risk of atrocity crimes and in fighting poverty, climate change, conflicts and global insecurity.

The Government of the Gambia champions the promotion and protection of human rights as one of the central pillars of its domestic and foreign policies related to the well-being of its own people and peoples elsewhere in the world. Our policies and approach continue to be guided by our awareness of the difficult history that we travelled as a country in our journey to democracy. The Gambia continues to seek national reconciliation, entrench its democracy and consolidate the rule of law. It is in that context that the Gambia is committed to accountability for atrocity crimes as we continue to seek justice for the Rohingya minority of Myanmar. As a global community with a conscience, we cannot continue to ignore the plight of victims of atrocity crimes and must uphold our collective responsibility to protect and our obligations under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

The Gambia will continue to contribute to the global pursuit for peace and security and the protection and promotion of human rights through the progressive development of international law, with a view to remedying the lack of a dedicated convention on preventing and punishing crimes against humanity. The international community must not relent in its quest for accountability for atrocity crimes. We look forward to hearing from Member States during today's debate on best practices for ending the current climate of impunity and inaction regarding the risk of atrocity crimes across the globe. Our debate should be a reminder of the importance of continuing this exchange of information and the need to strengthen our individual and collective prevention efforts.

Ms. Arumpac-Marte (Philippines): The Philippines has consistently supported the agenda item on the responsibility to protect (R2P) because we believe in the need for the General Assembly's formal and continuing consideration of the evolving concept of R2P. In that regard, we note with appreciation the Secretary-General's report (A/77/910), which provides an examination of the relationship between sustainable development and the responsibility to protect and the ways in which development can be leveraged to realize the aims of R2P.

We would like to take this opportunity to share the AmBisyon Natin 2040 of the Philippines, our strategic vision that has guided the Philippines' development plans. Its vision is clear. No Filipino should be poor or hungry, Filipino families should live together and have a work-life balance, and all should feel secure over their entire lifetimes. The plan lays out a foundation for inclusive growth, a high-trust and resilient society and a globally competitive knowledge economy. In the realization that the world we want, as elaborated in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), aligns with the life that we want, the Philippines has mainstreamed the SDGs in its development plans through its strategic vision. We have made inroads on the means of implementation and are enhancing those institutional mechanisms with a view to recovering quickly and accelerating progress in the wake of the impact of the coronavirus disease pandemic.

We note that the report encourages States to recognize the intersection between development and the responsibility to protect and to leverage development programming across the spectrum of atrocity risk assessment, early warning and preparedness and response in order to prevent, reduce and mitigate the risks and occurrences of such atrocities. In relation to the recommendations in the report, we want to take this opportunity to share developments from our end and to reiterate our understanding of R2P.

The first duty of States is to protect their populations from actual harm and threats to their safety and welfare. That is ultimately the basis of State legitimacy. As a constitutional democracy that values the dignity of every person and protects the most vulnerable, the Philippines understands sovereignty as responsibility. As early as 2009, we enacted into law the Philippine Act on Crimes against International Humanitarian Law, Genocide and Other Crimes Against Humanity. It proceeds from the principle that the most serious crimes of concern to the international community must not go unpunished and that their effective prosecution must be ensured by taking measures at the national level.

In terms of strategies aimed at poverty alleviation and economic equality, the Philippines remains steadfast in its commitment to achieving the world we want and to the vision of AmBisyon Natin 2040 as part of that responsibility. Building on our previous initiatives on stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization and monitoring, our strategies have expanded to include

financial inclusion, savings mobilization, insurance coverage and effective social protection for the most vulnerable and most at risk.

On strengthening the human rights protection system, while reaffirming the importance of human rights and international humanitarian law, we would like to highlight the United Nations Joint Programme on Human Rights in the Philippines, launched in 2021, as a tool for fostering systematic and coherent engagement among United Nations entities, Member States, international partners and civil society. With regard to addressing conflict and advancing peacebuilding, the Government's rehabilitation programme in Marawi is being fast-tracked, including to compensate the victims of violence and terrorism.

Trust and respect for sovereignty are essential if we are to advance the operationalization of the prevention mandates of the relevant United Nations entities. R2P will be best implemented by strengthening national institutions for good governance. However, it should not be misused for political purposes or as a means to justify foreign intervention. The assessment of the possible causes of failure in the responsibility to protect should be impartial and evidence-based, free from double standards and hidden agendas. The R2P principle should be applied strictly according to the parameters of the 2005 World Summit Outcome and the Charter of the United Nations. Our experience with R2P serves to remind us that it is imperative to respect the principle of sovereignty. We can work with it, but never against it.

Ms. Andrić (Croatia): Croatia aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer, and that delivered by my own delegation on behalf of the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect (see A/77/PV.83), and I would like to add some remarks in my national capacity.

We would like to thank Mr. George Okoth-Obbo, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect, for his statement and his work in promoting the responsibility to protect (R2P). His position is one with many challenges and limitations, and rightly, as the principle of the responsibility to protect remains a cornerstone around which the international community can unite when vulnerable populations face the threat of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We

are deeply concerned about the continued prevalence around the world of the occurrence of atrocity crimes and risks of their occurrence, and we therefore believe that we need to step up our consideration of ways to enhance the effectiveness of measures to prevent or mitigate them.

It would be easy to paint R2P as a divisive topic, just as it would be easy to do for almost any topic we discuss in this Hall. In today's world there is an alarming disregard for the fundamental tenets of international law, including international humanitarian and human rights law. But it is not our job to run away from difficult topics and questions or to abandon any topic that cannot achieve full consensus. Voting in the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council has consistently shown support for R2P, and this year's annual debate featured voices in favour of the concept from all regional groups. We all agreed on that in 2005. We did not shy away from finding a solution after we saw the signs of impending bloodshed and watched it happen.

The discussion surrounding the responsibility to protect in the United Nations can often be fraught with assumptions, fears and questions about what Member States really want. As we approach the end of this debate, it should be clear what Member States want. We therefore join the calls of many speakers before us encouraging the Special Advisers to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and on the Responsibility to Protect to use their leadership roles to advance R2P and the prevention of atrocities and to highlight the potential risks in ongoing and emergent crises. Like many before us, we also urge the Special Advisers to strengthen those efforts, share their analyses with the wider United Nations membership and regularly provide the necessary early-warning assessments and recommendations on how to prevent atrocities, including to the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council. Additionally, as others have in this debate, we would like to once more encourage the Secretary-General to include in his future reports assessments of the implementation of recommendations from previous reports and an analysis of trends regarding the risks of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, as well as their prevention.

As we approach the twentieth anniversary of the World Summit, it will be prudent to take stock and look forward with a view to understanding how to improve

the implementation of R2P and remove obstacles to it. The anniversary is a perfect time to review what has been achieved and what lies ahead. Let us use the time between now and 2025 to gather best practices, identify challenges and strengthen our strategies. Finally, in this Hall, it is our words that are our tools, but we want our every word to have an effect on the situation on the ground. As the Special Adviser on R2P said recently to the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect, we have to dispel the notion that the responsibility to protect is about beautiful concepts and principles, as opposed to what it is really about, which is how to keep people safe.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the observer of the Sovereign Order of Malta.

Mr. Beresford-Hill (Sovereign Order of Malta): The Permanent Mission of the Sovereign Order of Malta joins our distinguished colleagues in addressing a matter of profound global significance — the responsibility for preventing genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Our shared history bears witness to the unimaginable atrocities that have scarred our world and sadly continue to do so. It is in the face of those appalling realities that the global community has rallied together, recognizing again the pressing need to prevent and protect against such abominations.

In 2005, the General Assembly adopted a historic resolution (resolution 60/1) outlining the responsibility to protect (R2P), symbolizing a collective commitment to safeguarding the rights and security of individuals. R2P is built on three pillars that continue to guide all of us — the pursuit of peace, justice and the prevention of mass atrocities. The first pillar highlights the responsibility of sovereign States to protect their own populations from genocide and other crimes. The second underscores the responsibility of the international community to assist States in fulfilling their protective obligations, and when a State is unwilling or unable to protect its people, the global community must step forward with timely and decisive responses to prevent or halt mass atrocities and provide aid to those who need it. The third pillar recognizes the necessity of collective action in promoting preventive measures, in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

As we gather here today, we feel compelled to reflect on R2P's profound significance and implications for

our shared future. Our discourse should revolve around bolstering our preventive strategies, strengthening our early-warning mechanisms and fostering a culture of accountability. Together, as we engage in this discourse, let us bear in mind the countless lives lost, the resilience of survivors and the enduring hope that lies in our collective pursuit of a more just and peaceful world. Through respectful dialogue and an exchange of diverse perspectives, we can pave the way for an enlightened future, one where the responsibility to protect is upheld and the spectre of mass atrocities remains forever banished.

The Sovereign Order of Malta is committed to the promotion of the health and dignity of people in need, and we ask the Assembly, and each State and organization represented in it, to reaffirm its commitment to attaining the common good of all societies and to look past our own privatized, individualistic and inwardly nationalistic priorities. After all, the goodness of a thing can truly be good only when it is common to all. As Pope Francis has said, “Either we are brothers and sisters or we will destroy each other.” And as he remarked in a statement read to the Security Council recently, “We are suffering from a famine of fraternity” (see S/PV.9346). Surely here, in this bastion of hope, the fraternity that binds so many of us together can and should transcend these walls and should echo in the corridors and halls of power and in the hearts and minds of those who sent us here.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): We have heard the last speaker for this item.

The exercise of the right of reply has been requested. I would like to remind members that statements in the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Ghorbanpour Najafabadi (Islamic Republic of Iran): As there were some references and accusations concerning the involvement of Iranian-made weapon systems in the Ukraine conflict, made by various countries, including the United States — which has had by far the world’s largest military budget and expenditure for decades, and since its establishment

has been involved in nearly every armed conflict around the globe — I want to say that my delegation categorically rejects those baseless and unsubstantiated allegations. They are based on fabricated assumptions and are nothing more than a propaganda tactic that various States use to further their political agendas. In that regard, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in good faith and based on its constructive approach to the Ukraine conflict, stands ready to engage constructively in joint technical and expert cooperation with Ukraine to clarify the unfounded accusations made against Iran.

The Islamic Republic of Iran reiterates its commitment to its obligations under international humanitarian law and emphasizes that all of its arms exports are conducted in full compliance with international law, international humanitarian law and the applicable rules and regulations governing international trade and conventional weapons. My Government continues to call for a comprehensive, peaceful and sustained resolution to the current conflict, including an immediate ceasefire, a resumption of dialogue and the provision of humanitarian assistance to people in need.

Mr. Skachkov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We noted that a number of States used the high rostrum of this forum to artificially link the issue of the responsibility to protect to what is happening in Ukraine, making accusations in that regard against Russia.

The basis for the conduct of our special military operation is Russia’s exercise of its inalienable right to self-defence as enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. We notified the Security Council to that effect in due course via a letter issued on 24 February 2022 (S/2022/154, annex). Anyone who wishes to may acquaint themselves with the letter.

The Acting President (*spoke in French*): May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 132?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.