



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited  
13 June 2025

Original: English

---

## Committee for Programme and Coordination

Sixty-fifth session

New York, 12 May–13 June 2025

### Draft report

*Rapporteur:* Mr. Rodrigue Edgar Tchoffo Mongou (Cameroon)

#### Addendum

### Programme questions: proposed programme budget for 2026

(Item 3 (a))

#### Proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation

1. At its 10th meeting, on 16 May 2025, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on the proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation ([A/80/69](#)).

#### Discussion

2. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the clear presentation of the report and for the informal briefing held on 12 May. They underscored the importance of the Organization's regulatory framework in ensuring that the planning, programming, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation cycle fostered, in the most effective manner, coordinated activities and the alignment of available resources with the legislative intent of Member States.

3. Some delegations supported the approval of the amendments and highlighted the technical nature of the document in translating decisions made by the General Assembly into the Regulations and Rules, including new terminology and the decision by consensus on the shift to an annual budget cycle, as well as the sequential nature of the review process and the respective roles of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Committee for Programme and Coordination. It was recalled that the role of the latter Committee was not to question decisions made by the General Assembly in other forums, but rather to consider the



technical adjustments triggered by those decisions and to ensure that the Regulations and Rules would be actionable and would enhance the agility and efficiency of the United Nations.

4. One delegation expressed the view that it was premature to make a decision on the proposed revisions, recalling paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution [77/267](#), in which the Secretary-General was requested to conduct a comprehensive review on the annual cycle and to submit a report for consideration by the Assembly at its eighty-third session, in 2028. Another delegation enquired as to the consequences of not approving the proposed revisions. A third delegation recalled that the adoption of Assembly resolution [58/269](#) of 23 December 2003 had led to the replacement of the four-year medium-term plan framework with a biennial strategic framework, which had been promulgated in the Regulations and Rules some 15 years later, in 2018 (see [ST/SGB/2018/3](#)), presumably after an evaluation of that replacement had been made. The same delegation recalled that, in its resolution [72/266](#) A of 15 January 2018, the Assembly had approved the change from a biennial to an annual budget period, and questioned whether that change should be reflected after only seven years of implementing the annual budget cycle, or after its comprehensive review had been presented to the Assembly in 2028. Other delegations questioned whether it was appropriate for the Committee to deliberate on the merits of the annual budget cycle as decided by the Assembly and observed that the time had come to act in recognition of the work that had resulted in the proposed revisions and that had provided the Secretariat with an updated framework.

5. It was highlighted that the staff of the United Nations was an invaluable asset (General Assembly resolution [77/278](#), para. 1) and that its views should be taken into account. A delegation observed that both Secretariat staff and staff unions had protested against the annual consideration of the budget owing to the increased workload it represented and to the fact that it distracted project managers from implementing intergovernmental mandates and cooperating with Member States. Another delegation expressed the view that Secretariat staff had successfully adapted to the annual budget cycle, stating that parliamentary documentation had been available in time for the start of the Committee's session.

6. The view was expressed that the annual budget cycle had significantly contributed to the financial difficulties facing the United Nations. In referencing the UN80 Initiative of the Secretary-General to reduce costs and increase efficiency, a delegation observed that creative solutions should not be ruled out during periods of transition, including a possible return to biennial budget planning. The same delegation questioned how the Committee would review any programmatic changes resulting from the submission, at the main part of the eightieth session of the General Assembly, of revised estimates pertaining to the Initiative, as well as how it would review the possible impact on mandate implementation, deliverables and key performance indicators.

7. Particular appreciation was expressed for the presentation, in the annex to the report, of the existing regulation or rule, the proposed regulation or rule and the explanation for the change. The suggestion was made that future programme plans could follow the same structure and include the previous programme plan, the new programme plan and justifications and explanations for changes, such as outcomes adopted by the General Assembly or stemming from other intergovernmental processes.

8. While the change in terminology in existing regulation 5.6 was noted, the revised regulation 5.5 on the role of the Secretary-General in presenting discontinued deliverables to the General Assembly was considered less detailed than the existing formulation. With regard to existing regulation 5.7, the removal of the timeline to

submit the proposed programme budget to the Advisory Committee was questioned. A delegation sought clarification on the rationale for the numerous changes made to revised rule 105.1 compared with existing rule 105.2, which were considered to have made the text too succinct. It also enquired as to the rationale for deleting existing rule 105.4 (a) (ii) e., entitled “Technical cooperation”.

9. In the context of the delegation of authority framework, clarification was sought on how the Secretary-General’s role in monitoring progress towards planned results and corresponding performance measures had been reflected in revised regulation 6.1. Clarification was sought on the proposed deletion of existing rule 106.1 (d) and the revision of existing rule 106.2 (a). The point was raised that the timing of the Committee’s session in May and June meant that any new mandates issued in the second half of the year were taken up by the General Assembly as revised estimates and were not reviewed by the Committee.

---