



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

107th plenary meeting
Monday, 16 September 2019, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Ms. Espinosa Garcés. (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 14 (continued)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Draft resolutions (A/73/L.117 and A/73/L.120)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Jamaica to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.117.

Mr. Rattray (Jamaica): It is my distinct honour to present draft resolution A/73/L.117, under agenda item 14, on the International Labour Organization (ILO) Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work, also known as the Centenary Declaration, which was adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 108th session on 21 June. The draft resolution was introduced by Belgium and Jamaica as co-chairs of the Group of Friends of Decent Work for Sustainable Development.

The Centenary Declaration highlights the need to ensure a just transition to the future of work while harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productivity growth, including through the critical role of social dialogue and international labour standards. It stresses the importance of promoting the acquisition of skills, competencies and qualifications for all workers throughout their working lives and emphasizes the role of the private sector as a principal source of economic growth and job creation.

It reminds us all that promoting workers' rights is key to the attainment of inclusive and sustainable growth and that achieving gender equality at work is of the utmost priority. The shift to a human-centred approach is vital to building a future that is sustainable, equitable, just and inclusive.

The draft resolution welcomes the adoption of the ILO Centenary Declaration in the context of the implementation of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and calls for its implementation. It welcomes with appreciation the positive contributions that the International Labour Organization, including its constituents — namely Governments, employers and workers — have made during its century of work. It stresses that full and productive employment and decent work for all are key elements of sustainable development and should remain a priority objective of both national policies and international cooperation. It recognizes the particular relevance of the ILO Centenary Declaration to informing the work of the United Nations system in shaping a people-centred approach to the future of work and encourages active dialogue and collaboration among various components of the system, including with employers' and workers' organizations, the private sector, civil society and other non-governmental organizations.

The draft resolution provides a platform for cooperation and policy coherence within the United Nations system by requesting United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agencies and financial

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 U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

19-28180 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



institutions to continue to mainstream the goals of full and productive employment and decent work for all in their policies. The draft resolution also encourages the integration of the policy contents of the ILO Centenary Declaration into the work of United Nations country teams as part of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, as appropriate and according to national priorities. The adoption of the draft resolution will contribute to the further strengthening of multilateralism, while enhancing the critical role of social dialogue and international labour standards.

With this draft resolution, we encourage Member States to consider applying the principles set out in the Centenary Declaration at the national level in an effort to promote policy coherence around the promotion of full and productive employment and decent work for all.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Gabon to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.120.

Mr. Biang (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): Draft resolution A/73/L.120, which is before the General Assembly this morning, is the fourth on the issue of tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife, which is indicative of the international community's resolve to effectively combat and eradicate this phenomenon. As Members know, the President of the Republic of Gabon, His Excellency Mr. Ali Bongo Ondimba, attaches particular importance to these repeated resolutions, reflecting Gabon's commitment to pursuing advocacy for this cause, together with other nations, especially Germany. Allow me to thank my friend Ambassador Heusgen of Germany, who has worked tirelessly in our common quest to put an end to poaching.

(*spoke in English*)

Allow me to express once again, on behalf of Gabon and Germany, our gratitude to everyone who took part in the achievement of this successful outcome. Co-sponsored by Gabon, Germany and more than 50 countries, the draft resolution, to be adopted by consensus, is, we hope, tangible proof of the success that we, the United Nations Member States, can achieve together when working on matters of common interest. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Secretary-General and his team for the report on tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife (A/73/947), which provides very valuable information based on extensive research. Special thanks go to United Nations

Office on Drugs and Crime Executive Director Yury Fedotov, Jorge Eduardo Rios and his team for their great work.

Gabon and Germany have for years now been raising awareness of and calling the international community's attention to the urgency of finding common ground and concerted responses in order to eradicate illicit trafficking in view of its negative impact upon our societies, national economies, ecosystems and national security. In fact, with regard to national security, illicit trafficking in wildlife boosts the activities of non-State groups as well as rebels in many regions of the world. As such, it constitutes a serious threat to stability. In addition, the growth in online trade and cybercrime in the context of illicit trafficking constitutes a new form of threat to State security, which requires innovative strategies and increased intergovernmental cooperation. With the present draft resolution, we have once again made important progress in addressing these challenges.

With regard to the Earth's ecosystem and environment, illicit trafficking leads to disparity in biodiversity and its subsequent consequences. We are facing a destructive level of species extinction and endangerment, putting the diversity in our ecosystem under threat. The draft resolution that is to be adopted today shows the link between trafficking in wildlife, protection of different species and biodiversity. As for our national economies — and Gabon has been pointing this out — this phenomenon hampers investments, notably in regions where illicit and criminal activities, such as trafficking in small arms, are being carried out.

Last but not least, illicit trafficking negatively impacts our well-being. The draft resolution therefore puts a new light on the role of wildlife protection in the creation of sustainable livelihoods and emphasizes the need to develop context-specific solutions for sustainable and resilient coexistence between humans and wildlife.

Gabon and Germany, along with the Group of Friends, encourage Member States to ratify the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species and Wild Fauna and Flora, welcome the efforts made by the Group of 20, and further commend the efforts by the African Union translated into the implementation of the African Strategy on Combating Illegal Exploitation and Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora. The adoption of draft resolution A/73/L.120

will undoubtedly strengthen the legal proceedings of our respective States as well as policies on sustainable development by exploring alternatives that would be beneficial to rural communities affected by poaching and illicit trafficking.

I would like to conclude by encouraging all Member States to efficiently cooperate with the United Nations specialized agencies in implementing the recommendations contained in the present draft resolution. Once again, Gabon and Germany, on behalf of the Group of Friends, would like to thank all delegations that actively participated in a spirit of compromise and flexibility in bringing this draft resolution to success.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions A/73/L.117 and A/73/L.120, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution A/73/L.117, entitled “International Labour Organization Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work”.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/73/L.117?

Draft resolution A/73/L.117 was adopted (resolution 73/342).

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.120, entitled “Tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife”.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that, since the submission of the draft resolution, and in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have also become sponsors of draft resolution A/73/L.120: Albania, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Haiti, Israel, Kiribati, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Panama, the Philippines, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United States of America and Zambia.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt draft resolution A/73/L.120?

Draft resolution A/73/L.120 was adopted (resolution 73/343).

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before giving the floor to delegations in explanation of position, may I remind delegations that explanations are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by the delegations from their seats.

Mr. Smith (United States of America): We would like to thank the facilitators, Belgium and Jamaica, for their leadership on the resolution just adopted on the International Labour Organization Centenary Declaration (resolution 73/342).

Today, the United States is pleased to join consensus. We agree that full and productive employment and decent work for all our key elements of sustainable development. As we noted at the Centenary Declaration’s adoption on 21 June, the United States dissociates itself from certain issues in the Declaration, and with regard to our concerns with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Addis Ababa Action Agenda as well as the term “inclusive economic growth”, we refer delegations to the general statement we delivered in the Second Committee on 8 November 2018.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the only speaker in explanation of position following the adoption of resolution 73/342.

Mr. Gonzato (European Union): The European Union and its member States are pleased to again co-sponsor resolution 73/343, on tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife. The resolution addresses a major form of trafficking that continues to be one of the most profitable forms of organized crime, with devastating effects on biodiversity and livelihoods, as well as on security and stability in some parts of the world. A year before the United Nations summit on biodiversity and the conference that will agree on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, this resolution is an important contribution to better tackling one of the many drivers of biodiversity loss. This year’s reiteration of the resolution contains updated language on important elements, reflecting findings of the United Nations report that range from the links to financial crime to the need for more research on reducing consumer demand for illegally traded wildlife products.

We particularly welcome references to the 2019 assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. While we strongly support the substance of the resolution with regard to wildlife trafficking, we would like to express our concern with regard to language such as that in the thirteenth preambular paragraph. We agree with the call for holistic and integrated approaches to sustainable development that will guide humanity to live in harmony with nature and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem, which is in line with the 2050 Vision of the Convention on Biological Diversity. However, the selective quote of the Millennium Declaration (resolution 55/2) that that would contribute to the creation of a shared future based upon our common humanity is not clear. It is partly tautological and, without the wider context of the Declaration, appears to echo politically driven language from one Member State. It is therefore inappropriate to include it in a United Nations text. The terminology does not reflect internationally agreed principles and should therefore not constitute a precedent for other resolutions.

In conclusion, we call on all Member States and relevant stakeholders to fully and swiftly implement the commitments made in the resolution and to continue international cooperation and information-sharing in order to tackle the organized criminal networks involved. For our part, we will continue to do so in line with the European Union action plan on wildlife trafficking.

Mr. Smith (United States of America): The United States is pleased today to once again co-sponsor the important resolution 73/343, on illicit trafficking. Wildlife trafficking threatens what we value, our governance structures and the rule of law. It undermines economic prosperity and the livelihoods of communities, encourages corruption, spreads disease and pushes species to the brink of extinction.

The United States is pleased to see the addition of some of today's most pressing wildlife trafficking challenges, in particular the inclusion of pangolins, the most trafficked mammal species. The United States remains committed to fighting the scourge and to stopping the criminals who profit from this illegal trade.

The United States greatly appreciates the efforts of the facilitators and Member States that actively participated in the negotiations and displayed their sincere commitment to finding a compromise and to

making progress on this important issue. However, we were disappointed that not all Member States approached the negotiations in a similar spirit of good faith and compromise. We regret that we were not able to make progress in modernizing and updating outdated language that not only lacks any connection to the topic of the resolution but which the United States and many other Member States have repeatedly made clear is inappropriate for inclusion in multilateral settings.

We join consensus today because we place great importance on combating wildlife trafficking. In the future, we hope to see a common commitment to a spirit of compromise and flexibility by our fellow Member States.

Mr. Xu Zhongsheng (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese Government has attached great importance to the protection of wildlife. We have actively participated in the international cooperation to combat illicit trafficking in wildlife. We have banned the trade in ivory, rhino, tiger and related products.

In line with United Nations resolutions and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, we have established a compliance and enforcement coordination group and the system of a trade ministers' joint meeting on combating this illicit trade. We have striven to increase domestic control and monitoring as well as international cooperation.

Combating illicit trafficking in wildlife is a common challenge facing the international community. In order to overcome the problem, we should address the root causes and strive to find effective solutions in order to identify and overcome those causes. We should also focus on poverty reduction and economic development.

While protecting wildlife and tackling illicit trafficking, in the light of the needs of developing countries the international community should help such countries to develop their economies, improve people's livelihoods and avoid providing fertile ground for the poaching of wildlife and illegal trade in flora, thereby fundamentally tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife. An uneven emphasis on market drivers and rectifying consumer behaviour addresses only the symptoms of the issue. Developed countries should provide financial, technical and capacity-building support to developing countries so as to help them better protect wildlife and actively build effective partnership.

We have just adopted by consensus resolution 73/343, on tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife. That will help to send a positive signal to the international community that we will do a better job. We are against the politicization of United Nations topics, since that will not be conducive towards enhanced cooperation on tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife on the United Nations platform. We hope that in future sponsors will leave sufficient time for consultations so that more developing countries can participate. China looks forward to increased cooperation with all relevant stakeholders and hopes that we can better tackle illicit trafficking in wildlife. We hope to build a community of a shared future for humankind that promotes harmonious coexistence among humans and nature.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position after the vote.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 14?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 15 (continued)

Culture of peace

Draft resolution (A/73/L.107)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Lebanon to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.107.

Ms. Mudallali (Lebanon): Peace be upon us all. Before I start, on behalf of Lebanon I would like to thank you, Madam President, for all your support and help in this process. I would also like to thank you for your leadership of the Assembly over the past year. You led with dignity, talent, understanding and love for the United Nations and its peoples.

I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.107, entitled “Academy for Human Encounters and Dialogue”. It is an initiative by President Michael Aoun of Lebanon designed to give Lebanon, the region and the world a new space where peace, dialogue, understanding and a culture of peace can exist and thrive. It will happen in a place that has known glory but has also known pain, that has experienced war but has learned to turn swords into ploughshares. It will flourish in a place that introduced the alphabet, cedar trees, the colour purple and Gibran Khalil Gibran to

the world. It is also sorely needed. It is happening at a time when the world is being torn apart by divisions, mistrust, hate speech and the loss of what brings us together, our humanity. This initiative offers us something that can glue us back together, that can once again tie us to human values, cooperation and multilateralism, and that is what is needed most in the world today — which is to learn to live in peace, by peace and for peace. That is the spirit that has inspired this initiative in a country with different religious and ethnic backgrounds, a garden of many beliefs and many faiths, but with one purpose under the sun. From its people’s many differences, they have learned to live together, respect one another and cherish what binds them together — their Lebanon.

The President of the Lebanese Republic launched this initiative establishing an academy from this very rostrum two years ago in 2017. Draft resolution A/73/L.107 now has more than 175 sponsors, a number that is a testament to our collective willingness to strengthen our core values. I want to thank every country that has sponsored the draft resolution, especially the member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the countries of the Group of Asia-Pacific States that have endorsed the initiative. But I also want to thank all who promised to vote in favour of the draft resolution, those who may withhold their vote and even those who will vote against it.

We are all here because we believe in peace, but we differ on the road that will take us there. I still hope that everyone will vote in favour of the draft resolution. The members’ support will be a vote for peace and a human encounter that is different from the one we see today. The members of the Assembly give us hope. The draft resolution before us today consists of 11 preambular and three operative paragraphs. It recalls all the relevant resolutions pertaining to a culture of peace and welcomes the initiative to establish the Academy for Human Encounters and Dialogue in Beirut. It encourages the Secretary-General and the relevant United Nations agencies to support, within existing resources and in accordance with their respective mandates, the efforts to establish the Academy. I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly and Member States for enriching the draft resolution with their active participation and constructive input during the three informal consultations and bilateral negotiations. I would like to add that the negotiations were conducted in a transparent and open manner.

Lebanon remains a beacon of coexistence despite its difficulties and history. We, the Lebanese people, have learned the hard way that there is no alternative to dialogue for resolving conflicts. We have learned that, and now we want to share our experience and teach it to our children and the children of the world who are interested, because peace should be taught like any other discipline. We call on everyone to support this initiative by voting in favour of this draft resolution, which seeks to further contribute to our collective efforts to achieve a culture of peace in line with the ideals promoted in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. I thank the Assembly and count on everyone to promote peace in Lebanon, our region and our world because our existence depends on it.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.107, entitled “Academy for Human Encounters and Dialogue”.

I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that since the submission of the draft resolution, and in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have also become sponsors of draft resolution A/73/L.107: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, the Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho,

Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the State of Palestine, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique,

Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/73/L.107 was adopted by 165 votes to 2 (resolution 73/344).

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

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before giving the floor to those wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting, I would like to remind delegations that explanations are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Mack (United States of America): The United States appreciates Lebanon's regional role with respect to religious freedom and diversity. While we commend its commitment to tolerance and interfaith dialogue, resolution 73/344 is problematic for a number of reasons, and unfortunately we cannot support it. The United States cannot support resolutions that highlight specific initiatives of particular Member States or leaders, as that practice detracts from the General Assembly's credibility and focus in addressing global challenges. The resolution that has just been adopted proposes the establishment of an institution in Lebanon that is endorsed by the United Nations but stands outside United Nations association mechanisms. Resolution 73/344 offers neither a precise plan of operations nor specifics regarding the mandate of the Academy for Human Encounters and Dialogue. While we appreciate the facilitator's efforts to informally

provide clarifying details, the resolution itself remains problematically vague.

Finally, we remain concerned that implementing the resolution may require resources to be drawn away from other important initiatives of the Secretary-General and United Nations specialized agencies without an appropriate budgetary or prioritization process. The United States therefore voted no on the resolution.

Mrs. Furman (Israel): The preamble to resolution 73/344 addresses the need to promote education for peace, universal coexistence among peoples, and respect for the life, dignity and integrity of human beings. Those are all values that Israel strongly supports and seeks to promote. However, it is not enough to adopt a resolution containing words such as "peace", "tolerance", "dialogue" and "diversity". Those are values that have to be lived. Lebanon, the sponsor of the resolution, acts in stark contrast to those words. To start with, it has a recognized terrorist organization inside its Government. It allows Hizbullah to turn Lebanon into a launching pad for attacks on Israel and works with Iran to develop precision-guided missiles. It is also a nation that prosecutes individuals for peaceful speech and has archaic laws that make child marriage and marital rape legal. Does that sound like a nation committed to a culture of peace and human dignity?

Unlike other Member States that work to promote a global agenda, the primary purpose of Lebanon's resolution is to promote its President. In its eleventh preambular paragraph, the resolution expresses its

"appreciation to the President of Lebanon for his efforts to strengthen the role of Lebanon as a centre of dialogue and diversity".

A centre of dialogue? Tell that to the Lebanese people, who live in a country where criticizing the President is a criminal offence punishable by up to three years in prison. As for diversity, if you believe that mixing Hizbullah terrorists and weapon caches in civilian neighbourhoods is a measure of diversity, then I suppose Lebanon is a model of diversity. It is the height of hypocrisy to introduce a resolution supporting human encounters and dialogue while at home Lebanon suppresses free speech and degrades its citizens. Israel voted against the resolution because we cannot endorse such hypocrisy and will not support wasting the time of the Assembly.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting. We will now hear statements after the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Salovaara (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States.

The European Union thanks Lebanon for presenting resolution 73/344, which we have just adopted, and for the exemplary way in which it conducted the informal consultations. Cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue are an integral part of the values of the European Union and play an important role in the promotion of human rights, tolerance and non-discrimination across the world. They are at the core of our multilateral system and are a source of stability, sustainable growth and job creation. The European Union fully supports all initiatives aimed at promoting those principles.

Mr. Beleffi (San Marino), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The resolution is designed to inform the General Assembly about the creation of the Academy for Human Encounters and Dialogue in Lebanon and to ensure its full cooperation with other structures already in place at the United Nations level. We appreciate Lebanon's long-standing efforts to promote dialogue and tolerance, and we welcome its resolve to encourage coherence on the global stage. For these reasons, the members of the EU voted in favour of the resolution.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 15?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 70 (continued)

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

The Acting President: Members will recall that, in its resolution 73/301 of 20 June, the Assembly decided that in addition to the participation of the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, the Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Messenger of Peace Ms. Malala Yousafzai, and representatives of Poland, as the initiator of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the first Member State from each regional group to have ratified the Convention, in a national capacity,

will address the high-level commemorative event to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to be held on 25 September.

In that connection, and as announced in letters from the President circulated on 4 and 13 September, the President proposes that as Ms. Yousafzai is unable to attend this high-level commemorative event, it should also feature a statement by Ms. Muzoon Almellehan, the youngest UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, and that Ms. Almellehan should speak immediately after the Secretary-General and before the Executive Director of UNICEF. In order for the Assembly to take up this proposal, it must first agree, under rule 81 of its rules of procedure, to reconsider the provision contained in paragraph 2 of resolution 73/301.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to reconsider the provision contained in paragraph 2 of resolution 73/301?

It was so decided (decision 73/562A).

The Acting President: May I also take it that the General Assembly wishes to decide that the high-level commemorative event will also feature a statement by Ms. Almellehan and that she will speak immediately after the Secretary-General and before the Executive Director of UNICEF?

It was so decided (decision 73/562B).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 70 as a whole?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 121 (continued)

Commemoration of the abolition of slavery and the transatlantic slave trade

Draft resolution (A/73/L.119)

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Jamaica to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.119.

Mr. Rattray (Jamaica): On behalf of the 14 Caribbean Community (CARICOM) member States, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.119, entitled "Permanent memorial to and remembrance of the victims of slavery and the transatlantic slave trade". The draft resolution is a procedural resolution with technical

updates, in keeping with resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly. It once again underscores the importance of continued educational outreach and public awareness of the transatlantic slave trade and slavery. It once again requests the Secretary-General to organize a series of activities on an annual basis to commemorate the International Day of Remembrance of the Victims of Slavery and the Transatlantic Slave Trade and to report thereon.

If I may, I would like to read out an oral revision to paragraph 3 to correct the name of the office administering the trust fund. “Office of Central Support Services” should be replaced by “United Nations Department of Operational Support”.

In conclusion, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all Permanent Missions and observer missions for the flexibility they displayed during the consultation meetings last week. We value the constructive engagement and spirit of compromise they showed throughout the process. I also invite delegations that have not yet done so to become sponsors of the draft resolution. CARICOM looks forward to its adoption by consensus, as in previous years.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.119, entitled “Permanent memorial to and remembrance of the victims of slavery and transatlantic slave trade”, as orally revised.

I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that since the submission of draft resolution A/73/L.119, and in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali,

Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/73/L.119, as orally revised?

Draft resolution A/73/L.119, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 73/345).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 121?

Agenda item 127

Multilingualism

Report of the Secretary-General (A/73/761)

Draft resolution (A/73/L.114)

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Romania to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.114.

Mr. Jinga (Romania) (*spoke in French*): I am pleased to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/73/L.114, on multilingualism, under agenda item 127, at the seventy-third session of the General Assembly.

Multilingualism, in addition to being a core value of the United Nations, is also one of the engines of multilateral diplomacy that contributes to the promotion of the values of the United Nations. It facilitates access to information, promotes unity in diversity and protects and preserves the richness of languages and cultures around the world. At the same time, multilingualism has direct and tangible effects, helping to improve the efficiency, results and transparency of our Organization.

First of all, this year’s draft resolution reiterates our gratitude for the initiatives taken under the leadership of the Coordinator for Multilingualism and

the designation of the Coordinator for Multilingualism as lead entity on multilingualism at the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination level. The draft resolution reiterates support for the ongoing development of a Secretariat-wide coherent policy framework on multilingualism, which is essential to a comprehensive and coordinated approach within the United Nations.

With regard to the role of the Department of Global Communications in multilingualism, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to ensure the full implementation of existing mandates in the area of multilingualism as they relate to information and communication, and in this regard encourages the Secretariat to explore the opportunities offered by the new information and communications technologies. At the same time, it requests the Secretary-General to ensure that any decisions made by the Department of Global Communications, including those justified by budget limitations or reductions, do not undermine the principles of multilingualism.

The text acknowledges the increasing importance of social media in order to reach the widest possible audience, and as such welcomes the growing popularity of the United Nations official social media accounts, and encourages the Department of Global Communications to continue to expand, within existing resources, its multilingual presence across outlets by providing timely updates on the work and priorities of the Organization in the six United Nations official languages, as well as in other languages.

On the same subject, the draft resolution notes the use of innovative translation technologies and encourages, within existing resources, the Secretariat to explore additional technologies for use by United Nations entities with appropriate quality controls. At the same time, it stresses that all the initiatives on leveraging technology, including those introduced on a trial basis, shall comply with the principle of parity among the official languages of the Organization.

With regard to human resources management and staff training, the draft resolution welcomes the inclusion by the Secretary-General of a managerial indicator related to multilingualism in all his compacts with senior managers, including senior managers in the field, requiring that all workplans and, where applicable, mission plans and budgets integrate multilingualism and/or language considerations.

The draft resolution also welcomes the ongoing harmonization exercise that aims to produce a United Nations language framework ensuring greater consistency in language learning, teaching and assessment, and recognizes the key contribution of the Language and Communications Programme to promoting multilingualism within the United Nations.

Finally, the draft resolution acknowledges the contribution of multilingualism to the three pillars of the United Nations: peace and security, development and human rights.

In short, the draft resolution on multilingualism that we are introducing today seeks to promote and strengthen the equality of the six official languages, as well as the recognition of the importance of non-official languages. I hope that we have succeeded in proving why that is an essential element of multilateral diplomacy.

In conclusion, I would like to express Romania's sincere gratitude to all delegations for their active and constructive engagement in the negotiation process. I count on the support of all delegations for the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. Llorenty Solíz (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is a great honour for me to make this statement on behalf of the Group of Friends of Spanish at the United Nations. After arduous negotiations on draft resolution A/73/L.114, which has brought us together today, the Group of Friends of Spanish wishes to offer its vision with regard to the status of the implementation of multilingualism within the United Nations system through the review of the various aspects related to the services and use of relevant languages, including access to information. Strengthening multilingual websites and multilingual social media to ensure equality among the official languages of the Organization bolsters the democratization of international relations and the promotion of the key values of the United Nations.

In that regard, we must underscore the context of the economic reality on the financial shortcomings that the Organization is experiencing. That has led to a trend towards monolingualism, which increasingly appears to be far from dying out, such as the almost hegemonic use of one language — English — over the other five official languages of the Organization.

The Group of Friends of Spanish believes that it is crucial to ensure the effectiveness of monitoring the controls and that the equality of the six official languages

is fully upheld. We also believe that it is crucial that multilingualism be fully implemented, which is ultimately a shared and collective responsibility, given that Member States are called upon to promote its use as a means of protecting and preserving linguistic and cultural diversity at the global level.

The protection and promotion of multilingualism as a crucial value of our Organization are linked to the goal of strengthening all its work and, of course, its continuing impact. Our Group, comprising 20 Spanish-speaking countries from three different continents, believes that the cross-cutting nature of multilingualism is the solid basis for genuine multilateral dialogue as the very essence of the United Nations based on respect, equality, the promotion of multiculturalism, inclusion, diversity and international peace.

In that context, we highlight the fact that the content of public information and communication is at the heart of the strategic vision of the United Nations. We believe that it is crucial that the improvement of communications and the culture of transparency must be a priority at all levels of the Organization so as to fully inform the peoples of the world about the objectives, activities and results achieved by the United Nations, pursuant to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, multilingualism must clearly ensure coherent communication consistent with the commitment of reflecting and equalizing linguistic and cultural diversity as an obligation of the Organization, enhancing the impact of its daily work, not only as a matter of efficiency but also as a question of global necessity, bearing in mind the demand for content in each of the official languages.

In that regard, we again highlight the importance of Spanish as the second most widely spoken language in the world and its impact on United Nations work and that it is the second most consulted language of the United Nations web page, accounting for 28 per cent of web users in 2018. However, despite such ongoing demand, only 32 per cent of the information published on the United Nations website is available in Spanish. That is why we urge the Secretariat to take measures to increase the amount of content available in our language, including through equitable distribution among the six official languages within the available resources.

We also recognize the key importance of multilingualism, which complements international cooperation by strengthening consistency among

the three pillars of the United Nations — peace and security, development and human rights — all the more so at a time when the United Nations is going through a substantial reform.

We note with concern that the recruitment and management of human resources in most departments and offices continue for the most part to be in two languages: English and French. Furthermore, in addition to generating documents in the six official languages, it is also important that existing documents be regularly updated. For example, the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management should ensure that the notes for the presiding officers of the main organs and subsidiary bodies be available in the official language of the United Nations spoken by the presiding officer of the particular meeting.

In that regard, the Group of Friends of Spanish believes it crucial to include in the current draft resolution the reference to 2019 as the International Year of Indigenous Languages, thereby serving to raise awareness of the need to preserve, revitalize and promote the use of such languages throughout the world. The Group of Friends of Spanish also recognizes the work undertaken by the Department of Global Communications to provide documents and high-quality services in the six official languages. We also underscore the role of the United Nations centres of information in that regard, given the positive impact of the use of local languages on the dissemination of information.

For all of these reasons, the Group once again reiterates its concern about the financial limitations that could affect all departments involved in this issue, in particular the provision of services in Spanish, reaffirming the trend towards monolingualism. In that regard, the consideration of drafting a strategic action plan for the reallocation of resources that prioritize the issue of multilingualism is of paramount importance and efforts to that end must be made in light of the fact that the implementation of multilingualism is a collective and shared responsibility.

In conclusion, we stress that multilingualism is an essential factor for communication among peoples, as it promotes tolerance and ensures the broader and more effective participation of society. The Group of Friends of Spanish therefore once again reiterates its commitment and readiness to strive and work constructively to constantly improve the valuable

efforts provided by the United Nations Department of Global Communications.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on agenda item 127.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/73/L.114, entitled “Multilingualism”.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that, since the submission of the draft resolution, and in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have also become sponsors of draft resolution A/73/L.114: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Jordan, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/73/L.114?

Draft resolution A/73/L.114 was adopted (resolution 73/346).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 127?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 128 (continued)

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and other organizations

(h) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Caribbean Community

Draft resolution (A/73/L.118)

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Jamaica to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.118.

Mr. Rattray (Jamaica): On behalf of the 14 Caribbean Community (CARICOM) member States, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/73/L.118, entitled “Cooperation between the United Nations and the Caribbean Community”.

Due to significant capacity and time constraints, the members of the Caribbean Community chose to present a technical update to resolution 71/329, adopted during the seventy-first session. The draft resolution before us today therefore contains only technical updates, taking note of the tenth general meeting held in Guyana on 23 and 24 July between representatives of the Caribbean Community and the United Nations system, and the joint statement issued thereafter. The draft resolution provides for the rollover of the agenda item to the seventh-fifth session of the General Assembly. In that way, we can be sure that the strong foundation of partnership between CARICOM and the United Nations can continue to be pursued vigorously, given the urgency of the needs of our small island developing States (SIDS) with regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

During the tenth meeting, the representatives of both organizations recognized the challenges and vulnerabilities of the CARICOM member States within the international system and the many priority issues relating to financing for development, including tax blacklisting and the withdrawal of correspondent banking relations. Other initiatives, such as the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean debt-for-climate swap initiative, were also highlighted.

With regard to the sustainable development challenges, the meeting recognized the need for enhanced global action and resources. While applauding CARICOM’s commitment to transforming the Caribbean into the world’s first climate-resilient zone, the meeting expressed the hope that the upcoming high-level meetings during the seventy-fourth session will result in increased support for the region. The meeting further agreed to strengthen collaboration for the full implementation of the Caribbean recovery-to-resilience facility and the joint preparation of a regional report on progress on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), using a core set of indicators developed by CARICOM. The meeting also called for the full implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change as a

necessary mechanism for achieving the SDGs. In that connection, the importance of improving the resilience of communities in support of resilient energy supplies, agriculture and food security and the sustainable use of and management of living marine resources was recognized. CARICOM looks forward to collaboration in that regard.

The issue of human mobility is also an area of growing opportunities for collaboration. CARICOM member States could greatly benefit from capacity-building on the international protection of human rights principles, migration governance, labour mobility and disaster risk reduction, given that there are opportunities to do more before disasters strike in order to reduce the risk of displacement.

For CARICOM, achieving gender equality and ensuring the development of young people and children are top priorities. We appreciate the support rendered to the ongoing development of a regional gender-equality strategy and the development of a youth mainstreaming strategy for multisectoral planning, as well as action to realize youth and child development outcomes in CARICOM member States, including the revision and strengthening of the CARICOM youth development action plan.

The Georgetown Declaration: Towards 2022, adopted at the closing of the 2018 least developed countries (LDCs)/SIDS Trust Fund workshop for the Caribbean region, sets out courses of action for continued engagement between CARICOM and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights through the LDCs/SIDS Trust Fund and the United Nations Human Rights Council. CARICOM looks forward to the operationalization of those initiatives to support our continued capacity-building, which will ultimately redound to all our peoples' enjoyment of human rights.

CARICOM and the United Nations continue to collaborate in major areas of health, HIV and non-communicable diseases and pandemics with a view to strengthening the public health system in the Caribbean, improving its impact at the country level and advancing regional development. In addition, the support of the United Nations in advancing the regional security agenda continues to provide increasing dividends for citizen security. CARICOM and the United Nations are also seeking new areas of collaboration. They include the advancement of

cultural development at the national and regional levels in order to increase the contribution of culture to the sustainable development of the region. Another area for collaboration is in the aviation sector, especially given the importance of air connectivity and transportation to CARICOM's socioeconomic growth and development.

When next we take up consideration of the cooperation between the United Nations and the Caribbean Community, CARICOM looks forward to a full report and a comprehensive resolution that will cover the implementation of those areas of collaboration and identification of other areas that can be leveraged to optimize the crucial partnership our region enjoys with the United Nations.

In conclusion, I would like to express our sincere gratitude to all Member States. We valued the constructive engagement and spirit of compromise that they showed throughout the usual and fast-tracked consultation process. We also invite delegations that have not yet done so to become sponsors of the draft resolution. CARICOM looks forward to its adoption by consensus, as in previous years.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.118, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Caribbean Community".

I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that since the submission of draft resolution A/73/L.118, in addition to those delegations listed in the document, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Canada, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Costa Rica, Dominica, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, South Sudan, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/73/L.118?

Draft resolution A/73/L.118 was adopted (resolution 73/347).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (h) of agenda item 128 and agenda item 128 as a whole?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 34 (continued)

Prevention of armed conflict

(b) Strengthening the role of mediation in the peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this sub-item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. In connection with this item, the President has received a letter dated 24 June 2019 from the Permanent Representatives of Finland and Turkey to the United Nations, as the Chairs of the Group of Friends of Mediation, requesting the inclusion of this sub-item in the provisional agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to defer consideration of this sub-item and to include it in the draft agenda of its seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/563).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 34?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 37

Zone of peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. In connection with his item, the President has received a letter dated 6 September 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations requesting that the item be included in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

May take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to include this item in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/564).

The Acting President: May take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 37?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 41

The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. In connection with this item, the President has received a letter dated 14 August 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations requesting that consideration of this item be deferred to the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

I give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): My delegation would like to dissociate itself from the decision to include agenda item 41 on the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to defer consideration of this item and to include it in the draft agenda of its seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/565).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 41?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 42

Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in its agenda on the understanding that there would be no consideration of the item by the Assembly. In connection with the item, the President has received a note verbale dated 16 April 2019 from the Permanent Mission of the Comoros to the United Nations requesting the inclusion

of this item in the provisional agenda of the seventy-fourth session.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to include this item in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/566).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 42?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 67 (continued)

The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine

Letter dated 17 April 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine addressed to the Secretary-General (A/73/840)

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. In connection with the item, a letter dated 17 April 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General has been issued as document A/73/840, in which it is requested that the item be included in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to include the agenda item entitled “The situation in the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine” in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session?

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make statements of position.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): My delegation has taken the floor in order to explain to the members of the General Assembly our position of principle with regard to the proposal of the Ukrainian delegation to once again introduce this politicized item into the agenda of the next General Assembly session.

What the Ukrainian delegation is really trying to promote in the General Assembly is not an agenda item but rather its own biased and falsified interpretation of the events that have taken place in their country since 2014. And yet its initiators are not the least embarrassed

that in order to do so they have to create a split within the General Assembly on the eve of the opening of its new session, and it is being proposed that this decision be taken at the last minute without due consideration. We would like to remind the Assembly that the 2014 coup d'état led Kyiv into an internal armed conflict with its own population in its eastern regions, which refused to support the new regime's discriminatory policy aimed at undermining fundamental rights and political freedoms. The Russian Federation has nothing to do with this apart from providing services as a mediator in establishing a direct dialogue between the Ukrainian parties within the framework of the Minsk Contact Group. We particularly want to draw attention to the fact that this destructive undertaking by the Ukrainian delegation contradicts and undermines the only internationally recognized mechanism for settling the crisis in Ukraine, that is, the package of measures for implementing the Minsk agreements, which was endorsed by Security Council resolution 2202 (2015). As the Assembly is aware, that unanimously adopted resolution makes no reference to any temporarily occupied territories.

The Russian Federation is more interested than anyone in ensuring that its neighbour's conflict is resolved through peaceful means in full accordance with the Minsk agreements affirmed by the Security Council. We consider it unacceptable that the aim of the Ukrainian initiative is the opposite, and that instead of establishing direct dialogue and trust-based communication with its own people in Donetsk and Luhansk, Kyiv and its initiatives are only making the prospects for a settlement less likely. If the General Assembly succumbs to Ukraine's provocative proposal, it will amount to its condoning the non-implementation of the Minsk agreements. That is why we oppose the inclusion on the agenda of the new item proposed by the Ukrainian delegation and why we are requesting a vote and calling on all delegations to vote against it.

Mr. Madriz Fornos (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Nicaragua would like to state that with respect to this issue, the only internationally recognized format for resolving the situation in Ukraine is the Minsk agreements, which were endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 2202 (2015), and the words “occupied territories” appear nowhere in those agreements. The inclusion of this item in the agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly is therefore highly politicized and does not have consensus. That

is why my delegation does not support the inclusion of the item on the situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine in the agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. Al Arsan (Syrian Arab Republic): My delegation has taken note of the letter of the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the Secretary-General, issued as document A/73/840, as well as the explanatory memorandum issued in the annex to document A/73/193. However, my delegation reiterates its position with regard to the request for the inclusion of the agenda item entitled “The situation in the temporary occupied territories of Ukraine”. We consider it a clearly politicized step that hampers our efforts here in the General Assembly to guarantee consensus on its agenda items during the coming seventy-fourth session. Based on that, we want to express our opposition to the item’s inclusion.

For some time now my delegation has noted with deep concern that some delegations have requested the inclusion of items in the agenda of General Assembly sessions for the purpose of exploiting the platform it provides and for reasons that are merely political, in a manner that undermines the fundamental principles and purposes of the United Nations, not to mention attempting to clog up the General Assembly’s schedule. Our legal understanding is based on the fact that the situation in the areas in question is subject to the provisions of the Minsk agreements, which were endorsed by Security Council resolution 2202 (2015), together with all its annexes, and by the Security Council’s presidential statement S/PRST/2018/12. My delegation believes that the implementation of the Minsk agreements and resolution 2202 (2015) requires the genuine political will of all the parties to restore security and stability in Ukraine.

The introduction of an artificial term such as “temporarily occupied territories” does not change the fact that this issue falls within the purview of the Security Council. On that basis, and in accordance with Article 12 of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly has no mandate to take action on the matter, since the Security Council is still working on this agenda item.

Finally, and in conclusion, my delegation calls on the General Assembly to consider these facts and to take appropriate action by refraining from including this item in the agenda of the General Assembly at its

seventy-fourth session, since it would have negative repercussions for the Assembly’s work.

Mr. Yelchenko (Ukraine): As delegations have already been informed, at its 3rd meeting under the presidency and guidance of the current President, the General Assembly decided to include in the agenda of the current session a new item entitled “The situation of the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine” (see A/73/PV.3). I would like to emphasize that the decision was adopted by a recorded vote, the result of which became self-explanatory. An absolute minority — only 13 Member States — voted against its inclusion, thereby attempting to impede the General Assembly’s special authority. Today we are seeing a repetition of that attempt to undermine the Assembly’s particular responsibility to consider an issue brought to it by a member of the United Nations.

I believe, as has been stated by the United Nations membership on numerous occasions, that as the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of our Organization, the General Assembly is entrusted by the Charter of the United Nations with a duty to discuss questions related to the maintenance of international peace and security. The Assembly is well aware that due to the military aggression in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol in Ukraine in 2014, the General Assembly, by its resolution 68/262, entitled “Territorial integrity of Ukraine”, affirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. Since then, in three subsequent resolutions in 2016, 2017 and 2018, the General Assembly has condemned the ongoing temporary occupation of parts of the territory of Ukraine (resolutions 71/205, 72/190 and 73/263). I therefore want to underline that the foreign occupation in Ukraine that continues to this day is not a new topic for the General Assembly. The inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled “The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine” has given the Assembly a much-needed framework and venue for considering the issue comprehensively and in all its complexity, encompassing its political, security, humanitarian, social, human rights, gender and other dimensions.

The consideration of the item in plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 20 February 2019 demonstrated the international community’s significant and close attention to the issue of the ongoing unlawful military actions against Ukraine, which continue

to undermine international peace and security (see A/73/PV.67 and A/73/PV.68). The positions of 46 States Members of the United Nations were clearly expressed during the meetings. The Assembly's close attention to this international conflict has had a positive impact on the quest for peace, as it presents the international community as a whole with a unique opportunity for supporting existing peace initiatives and exploring possible new ones. For instance, I am confident that the constant awareness of the conflict on the part of the entire United Nations membership facilitated the successful return on 7 September to Ukraine from the Russian Federation of 35 detainees, and that has become the first important step in the quest for further ways of solving the conflict. That is why close attention to this issue and its consideration by the General Assembly has to be consistently maintained until the territorial integrity of Ukraine is fully restored within its internationally recognized borders, and until all detained Ukrainian citizens are released and returned to Ukraine.

In conclusion, I want to underline that retaining this agenda item is by and large a procedural step aimed at maintaining a framework and streamlining consideration of the issue of foreign occupation in Ukraine in the General Assembly in all its aspects. I call on all Member States to support the inclusion of the item entitled "The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine" in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly and to vote yes.

Mr. Hoeseb (Namibia): Namibia encourages the resolution of conflicts through dialogue. We are heartened by the recent positive developments between the Russian Federation and Ukraine, which showed that substantive negotiations on the future of eastern Ukraine are under way. Including an additional item on the situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine in the agenda could inflame the situation, and for that reason Namibia will vote against its inclusion in the agenda of the Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. It is Namibia's sincere hope that the Russian Federation and Ukraine will find a mutually acceptable solution through negotiations very soon.

Ms. Millard (United States of America): The United States supports retaining this item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. It is entirely appropriate that the General Assembly continue debating and deliberating on this important

matter. We ask all Member States to vote in favour of including the item on the agenda of the seventy-fourth session.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain our vote before the voting on the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda for the coming session of the item entitled "The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine". We are of the view that debating multifaceted issues of a highly political and controversial nature will not be very helpful in furthering efforts to achieve workable solutions to an issue that has been already agreed on in the Minsk agreements of 2015, endorsed by Security Council resolution 2202 (2015).

When there is an agreed international mechanism in place supported by the Security Council, inserting this dispute into the General Assembly's agenda could emphasize existing differences and sow division among Member States rather than bridging them. It could even undermine the internationally recognized agreed framework for a settlement in Ukraine. It would be wise to give the already agreed-on mechanism more time and refrain from taking hasty decisions. Iran's principled position supports a peaceful resolution of the dispute between Ukraine and Russia, and we firmly believe that the issue primarily concerns the two States involved. A solution reached outside that framework will not work unless it is endorsed by both States. The Islamic Republic of Iran does not support the inclusion of any supplementary item entitled "The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine" on the agenda of the seventy-fourth session of General Assembly. We think it has adverse implications for the internationally agreed modalities and format for reaching a settlement of the dispute that are represented by the Minsk agreements, as endorsed by resolution 2202 (2015).

Mr. Salovaara (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this explanation of vote before the voting.

The European Union reaffirms its resolute support for Ukraine's independence, sovereignty and territorial

integrity within its internationally recognized borders. We reiterate that we do not recognize, and continue to condemn, the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol by the Russian Federation, which is a violation of international law. It remains a direct challenge to international security, with grave implications for the international legal order that protects the unity and sovereignty of all States.

The EU continues to call for full compliance with international human rights standards in the Crimean peninsula. All pending cases of human rights violations and abuses, such as forced disappearances, torture and killings, should be thoroughly investigated. International human rights observers must be granted full, free and unhindered access to the whole territory of Ukraine, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol. The EU would like to recall resolutions 68/262, of 27 March 2014, 73/194, of 17 December 2018, and 73/263, of 22 December 2018, and calls for their full implementation, including the Russian Federation's fulfilment of its obligations under applicable international humanitarian law.

The EU reaffirms its full support for the endeavours of the Normandy format, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), including the work of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine, and the Trilateral Contact Group. The EU stresses the importance of enhancing negotiating efforts aimed at the sustainable and peaceful resolution of the conflict in view of the full implementation of the Minsk agreements by all sides and of measures aimed at rebuilding confidence, while underlining the responsibility of the Russian Federation in that regard. For all of those reasons, the member States of the European Union and countries aligned with it will vote in favour of including the item entitled "The situation in the occupied territories of Ukraine" in the regular agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session.

Mr. Mikeladze (Georgia): My delegation welcomes the inclusion of the item entitled "The situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine" in the agenda of the General Assembly. The debate on this item in February (see A/73/PV.67 and A/73/PV.68) gave the United Nations membership an opportunity to deliberate on a topic of critical importance to both regional and global peace and security. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of retaining this item on

the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session.

The Acting President: A recorded vote has been requested on the proposal to include agenda item 67 in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Philippines, Russian Federation, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, India, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

The decision to include agenda item 67, entitled "The situation in the temporarily occupied

territories of Ukraine”, in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session was adopted by 65 votes to 17, with 54 abstentions (decision 73/567).

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): We asked for the floor to explain our vote on the inclusion of agenda item 67, on the situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. We reiterate our position that a comprehensive and lasting settlement to the conflict can be achieved between the parties concerned through negotiations within the established formats and the implementation of mutually agreed arrangements. Armenia continues to believe that there is no alternative to an exclusively peaceful settlement of the conflict. We would like to stress the importance of building on the positive developments in order to create an environment conducive to a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Mr. Hoeseb (Namibia): My delegation requests that we withdraw the statement that we made earlier.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 89

Request for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the consequences of legal obligations of States under different sources of international law with respect to immunities of Heads of State and Government and other senior officials

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session.

In connection with the item, the President of the General Assembly has received a note verbale dated 5 September 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations, as Chair of the Group of African States for the month of September, requesting that the item be included in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to include the agenda item entitled “Request for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the consequences of legal obligations of States under different sources of international law with respect to immunities of Heads of State and Government and other senior officials” in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/568).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 89?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 117 (continued)

Appointment of members to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(g) Appointment of members of the Board of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns

The Acting President: The General Assembly will now turn to the appointment of members of the Board of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, in order to replace those members whose term of office expired on 15 September 2019.

Members will recall that by its resolution 67/203, of 21 December 2012, the Assembly decided to establish the 10-member Board, consisting of two members from each United Nations regional group.

Members will also recall that by its resolution 69/214, of 19 December 2014, the Assembly decided that the duration of subsequent terms for members of the Board shall continue to be two years, starting on 16 September of every second year, and that United Nations regional groups may renominate one of their existing two members of the Board for one consecutive term, while ensuring that no Member State is eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms and taking into account the importance of ensuring continuity and rotation in the work of the Board. In that regard, the Secretariat has received the nomination of Switzerland.

I would like to note that Switzerland has already served one term, from 2017 to 2019, and that it has been renominated by the Group of Western European and

other States for another term, from 2019 to 2021. In that connection, may I take it that the General Assembly wishes to appoint Switzerland as a member of the Board of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns for a term beginning on 16 September 2019 and ending on 15 September 2021?

It was so decided (decision 73/423).

The Acting President: In the absence of any other candidates, it is my understanding that it would be desirable to include this sub-item in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly to allow the regional groups additional time to nominate candidates for the remaining nine seats on the Board.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to include sub-item (g) of agenda item 117 in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/569).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (g) of agenda item 117 and of agenda item 117 as a whole?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 122

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations

The Acting President: Members will recall that, at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. It is my understanding that it would be desirable to include this item in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to include the agenda item entitled "Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations" in the draft agenda of its seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/570).

The Acting President: May I also take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 122?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 156 (continued)

Financing of the United Nations Mission in East Timor

The Acting President: Members will recall that, at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session. It is my understanding that it would be desirable to defer consideration of this item to the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to defer consideration of agenda item 156 and to include it in the draft agenda of its seventy-fourth session?

It was so decided (decision 73/571).

The Acting President: May I also take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 156?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 168 (continued)

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

Note verbale dated 5 September 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Denmark to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly (A/73/995)

The Acting President: Members will recall that at its 3rd plenary meeting, of 21 September 2018, the Assembly decided to include this item in the agenda of the seventy-third session.

In connection with the item, a note verbale dated 5 September 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Denmark to the United Nations, also on behalf of the Permanent Missions of Guatemala, the Netherlands, Romania, Rwanda, Ukraine and Uruguay to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the General Assembly, has been issued as document A/73/995, in which it is requested that this item be included in the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to make statements of position on the proposed inclusion of this agenda item in the General Assembly's draft agenda.

Mr. Al Arsan (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would once again like to express its surprise and concern about certain delegations' insistence on having this item on the responsibility to protect included in the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. We have concerns about the procedure, formulation and substance related to this repeated request for the item's inclusion.

Members will recall that two years ago, two delegations asked for this item to be included in the agenda and assured the Assembly that it would be a one-time occurrence, not to be repeated. The same scenario happened the following year, when other States joined in the request for including the item, also as a one-time occurrence not to be repeated. Regrettably, in doing so they blocked the possibility of convening non-formal interactive dialogue meetings on the subject. This year, other States are now once again making the same request, using the same exclusionary method for including this item in the agenda. The request is not in keeping with the rules of procedure but is, rather, a manipulative one that undermines the good practices that we have established in the General Assembly in order to ensure consensus on the agenda of each of its sessions.

The States that made the request this year continue to insist, in a rather non-transparent way, on ignoring the intrinsic and deep divisions that exist among Member States regarding what is called the concept of the responsibility to protect, and on which, as I said, there continue to be irreconcilable and deep-rooted divisions regarding its third controversial and serious pillar. All those present in this Hall, including the staff of the Secretariat, are aware that we have so far been unable to develop genuine foundations and limitations that can prevent certain Member States from the misuse of the concept of the responsibility to protect. When I say misuse, I think everyone understands what is meant — one example being how some States invoked the responsibility to protect in order to destroy Libya.

My delegation and those of many other Member States continue to be unconvinced of the need to include this item on the agenda of the Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. We believe it will not be useful to conduct discussions collectively and freely on the concept of the responsibility to protect. As I said, we have so far not given this concept a real opportunity for discussion by holding interactive informal dialogue meetings in order

to overcome the divisions among Member States on this controversial and serious concept and its third pillar.

All of us here are aware that disastrous consequences, even war crimes on the part of the Governments of certain States, have resulted from distorting the principles of international law and invoking the responsibility to protect, individually and without an international mandate. Those same States have frequently carried out acts of military aggression or occupation, thereby undermining other States' sovereignty and independence, and have used the responsibility to protect as a pretext for their behaviour. As I just said, Libya, with all its concomitant tragedies and disastrous consequences for the Libyan people, is a case in point.

To be clear, what we are talking about in principle is not really the responsibility of States to protect their own citizens. There can be no doubt about the importance of the role of the United Nations in preventing wars and conflicts through action based on the genuine and positive concept of preventive diplomacy, and on strengthening early-warning systems so as to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. However, we cannot accept certain States' ongoing attempts to distort and exploit that concept and its noble humanitarian objectives in order to justify military aggression, occupation and interference in States' internal affairs. The States that have once again asked for this item's inclusion on the agenda are therefore responsible for deepening the divisions among the States Members of the United Nations. Above all, they undermine the consensus among Member States on the agenda of each of the General Assembly sessions.

In conclusion, and as a matter of principle, we oppose the inclusion of this item in the agenda for the seventy-fourth session. We ask the President to provide clarifications regarding the legal basis, underpinned by the Charter of the United Nations and our rules of procedure and established practices, for considering the note verbale before us, taking into account what I have pointed out concerning States' pledges last year and the year before that their requests were for a one-time inclusion only.

Mr. Salovaara (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States.

The European Union supports the rollover of agenda item 168, on the responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, to the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. Preventing the item's rollover would send a negative message about the role of the Assembly, which is the most representative organ of the United Nations and the best place to address differences and forge consensus. The Assembly voted in favour of including the responsibility to protect on the formal agenda of its seventy-second and seventy-third sessions. The two highly attended formal debates that took place in 2018 and 2019 (see A/72/PV.99 and A/72/PV.100 and A/73/PV.93 et seq.) offered Member States an opportunity to share their views and promote better understanding on all sides. It is essential that we continue on that positive path and allow all Member States to forge consensus on that issue. For that reason, the EU member States support the rollover and call on other States Members of the United Nations to do the same.

Ms. Guardia González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba's delegation is taking the floor with regard to the request to include in the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session the item on the responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

In that connection, Cuba reiterates its determination to combat the horrendous crimes that beset humankind. However, we also support the statement of the Syrian delegation, and we reject the inclusion of this item on the Assembly's agenda for the seventy-fourth session, since, as many delegations expressed during the most recent debate on this topic in this Hall (see A/73/PV.93 et seq.), this item was intended to be included on the agenda for one session only, as its advocates made clear at the time.

We are concerned about some delegations' insistence on undermining the practices and regulations of the General Assembly in ways that seek to disrupt consensus in the adoption of the programme for each session, while also ignoring the deep divisions among numerous Member States on the concept of the responsibility to protect. In that regard, we note that including the item on the Assembly's agenda does not guarantee that we will reach consensus. On the contrary, as we have seen, it can worsen the division and disagreement on the responsibility to protect. We

therefore believe that at the moment it is not viable for the Assembly to continue to keep the responsibility to protect on its formal agenda, and we propose that the issue be discussed in an informal interactive dialogue.

Mr. Bayyapu (India): My delegation is taking the floor to request a clarification on the rules for the inclusion of agenda items for General Assembly sessions. We understand that rules 12, 13, 14 and 15 of the Assembly's rules of procedure pertain to the inclusion of agenda items. However, we do not understand how any of those rules allow the inclusion or rollover of an agenda item, thereby circumventing the General Committee process. We realize that there are specific time frames prescribed for the referral of the inclusion of agenda items, through provisional or supplementary lists, to the General Committee. However, in our view, the current scenario seems to be an attempt to bypass the Committee's consideration of the item in question. With regard to some items, the provisional agenda for the seventy-fourth General Assembly notes,

"This item, which has not yet been considered by the General Assembly at its seventy-third session, remains under the agenda of that session. Its inclusion in the provisional agenda of the seventy-fourth session is subject to any action the Assembly may take on it at its seventy-third session." (A/74/50, p. 4)

We want to understand the meaning and interpretation of the word "action" during a session. In that regard, before proceeding further, we should see a detailed explanation or clarification from the Office of Legal Affairs on the dual positions on the issues that my delegation is raising. Such a clarification is very important, as it will generate a common understanding and interpretation among Member States on the General Assembly's rules of procedure regarding the inclusion of an agenda item.

Ms. Wegter (Denmark): Denmark fully aligns itself with the statement just made on behalf of the European Union.

Denmark, together with Guatemala, the Netherlands, Romania, Rwanda, Ukraine and Uruguay, has requested the inclusion of agenda item 168, on the responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. As this is a procedural

request, we will limit our remarks in our national capacity to our two main arguments for that request.

First, we believe that it is important for the General Assembly to debate the issue of the prevention of the most serious crimes and our shared, unanimously agreed responsibilities in that regard. The Assembly has done so for two consecutive sessions (see A/72/PV.99 and A/72/PV.100 and A/73/PV.93 et seq.), and we have found the results encouraging. In both years, statements were made on behalf of more than 100 Member States, providing an overwhelming number of national, regional and international examples of best practices and recommendations on how to prevent such crimes.

Secondly, during both debates, numerous calls were made for keeping the item on the Assembly's agenda. During the debate held during this session, more than 70 States made such appeals. Questions about the value of the item and critiques were also raised during the debate, and we listened carefully to every statement. We are not convinced, however, that ceasing to share examples of prevention or look for opportunities for the international community to work together on prevention will help to prevent the most serious crimes. By requesting a rollover of this agenda item, we are providing Member States with an opportunity to continue to share best practices, and we urge all States to support its inclusion.

As for the question of whether this item was introduced with a view to discussing it on a one-time basis, we would like to clarify that when it was included in the agenda for the seventy-third session, the proponents of its inclusion made the clear point in the request that after the debate Member States would be provided with an opportunity to continue to debate the issue of the prevention of the most serious crimes. That is what we are considering here today, in a fully transparent manner and in accordance with relevant procedures.

The President returned to the Chair.

Regarding the procedure here today, we note that requesting the President of the General Assembly to include items in the draft agenda of future sessions is a fully legitimate and common practice in the Assembly that has been used on numerous past occasions when there was not full agreement among Member States.

Mr. Pérez Ayestarán (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Venezuela is firmly

committed to respecting and protecting all human rights and fundamental freedoms. We therefore condemn crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide and ethnic cleansing, and affirm the role of States as guarantors of the security of their peoples at all times. We also express our support for the pursuit of justice whenever such crimes are committed.

Nevertheless, the concept of the responsibility to protect is one that many States, including Venezuela, are concerned about, not only because of the lack of agreement on its definition and scope, but also because in practice the concept has been used to promote interventionist agendas and invasions that have resulted in suffering, death and destruction and have never protected the peoples involved. Instead, they have merely been a pretext for inciting unconstitutional changes in Governments and looting the resources of sovereign States.

A certain nefarious notion that in the beginning may have had good intentions has now forfeited all legitimacy because it uses such pretexts to interfere in the internal affairs of States and undermine their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, as it is now attempting to do in my country. We therefore reject the inclusion of the concept as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, since it is clear that differences remain on the issue. Proceeding any further with it would destroy any of the consensus that may have existed on it between 2005 and 2017.

Mr. Chekeche (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe is grateful for this opportunity to articulate its concerns about the inclusion on the General Assembly's agenda of an item on the responsibility to protect in order to enable Member States to continue exchanging ideas on the modalities for that important principle's application. We are convinced that the United Nations needs to seek the broadest possible conceptual, political and operational consensus on the responsibility to protect in order to gather support from all Member States on its implementation.

That broad consensus currently remains elusive. We want to stress that the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity is the primary responsibility of individual Member States, not a pretext for interference in the national affairs of Member States by some members of the international community. That was the fundamental understanding

and spirit of the 2005 World Summit, and that is why we are concerned about the premature elevation of the responsibility to protect from concept to concrete action before we have a mutual understanding on its objectives, justification and transparent application.

If preventive and protective intervention is to become a global policy, an appropriate international legal framework will be needed in order to discourage the propensity to use military force against Member States in the name of the responsibility to protect. The current efforts being made in the name of the responsibility to protect are highly interventionist rather than focusing on ending hostilities through diplomacy, mediation and other capacity-building tools. We therefore continue to support the call for more dialogue on the issue and reiterate the importance of holding open, sincere and transparent dialogue in order to bridge existing conceptual gaps among member States. We believe that we have yet to reach a way forward that we can agree on for that important principle.

Mr. Seifi Pargou (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation disagrees with the inclusion of the concept of the responsibility to protect as an item in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, not because we oppose the basic ideas of the concept, but rather because we want to draw the attention of member States to the fact that a formal discussion at the General Assembly is not an appropriate way to arrive at an acceptable conceptual framework for its implementation.

We would like to underline that the lack of an intergovernmental agreement on the scope of the application and the definition of this initiative will increase uncertainties around the responsibility to protect and the risk of its biased interpretation and application. Discussions on the issue should therefore be devised in a way that properly addresses the legal uncertainties and existing conceptual differences among Member States. Formal discussions in the Assembly will only deepen the existing divisions. In our view, continuing the informal interactive dialogues on the subject, as agreed in 2009, is a more appropriate way to address those differences.

Mr. Zambrana Torrelío (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the request for including the concept of the responsibility to protect as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, Bolivia believes that it should

not be included, given that the item does not have the consensus of all States necessary for its formal discussion, and because the way in which the issue is being considered does not meet the criteria established in the rules of procedure, which stipulate the ways and time frames in which such issues should be considered.

The responsibility to protect is exclusively an obligation of States to their own peoples. However, beyond that notion, there is no agreement on its conceptual framework, methodology or scope. Given that, and until its substantive elements are duly analysed, clarified, agreed on, accepted and acknowledged by all States, the issue should not be included as an item on the Assembly's agenda. Not to mention the fact that without those elements, there is every likelihood that the concept could become a tool for interfering in the affairs of States and could be selectively employed for political purposes.

Mr. Guo Jiakun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): First of all, China commends you, Madam President, for your achievements during your tenure. We congratulate you and thank you and your team for your endeavours.

This is the second time that the General Assembly has discussed whether the responsibility to protect should be included in its draft agenda. Members explicitly stated their positions during a previous vote and in the plenary on the issue in June (see A/73/PV.93 et seq.). It appears that no consensus has been reached on the definition of the concept or the criteria for defining it, and there are even greater differences on its implementation. Many developing countries are very concerned about the possibility that the concept could be expanded or even abused in its interpretation. It is deeply regrettable that certain countries are abusing the Assembly's rules of procedure and attempting to force the inclusion of the concept as an item on the agenda of the Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, despite their knowledge of countries' differences on the issue.

China is deeply concerned about this issue. Such an approach will serve only to exacerbate existing differences, poison the atmosphere in the Assembly and undermine mutual trust among member States. It is not conducive to consensus-building. China will therefore vote against the inclusion of the subject of the responsibility to protect as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. We urge the parties concerned to apply the outcome document of the 2005 World Summit as a basis for returning to

informal channels in the Assembly for discussing the issues concerned. We also call on them to give due regard to all countries' legitimate concerns and to reduce differences through dialogue and consultation so as to build consensus incrementally.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The source of the concept under discussion was the consensus outcome document of the 2005 World Summit (resolution 60/1). However, since then, States have been unable to agree on a common interpretation of the meaning of its provisions.

Moreover, references to the application of the concept with regard to the situation in Libya have seriously undermined its authority and led to further polarization. The concept has begun to be associated with attempts to bring about the violent overthrow of lawful Governments and other forms of unlawful interference in the internal affairs of States.

In order to eliminate such negative associations and seek common ground, it would be productive to hold discussions through an informal dialogue. Instead of that, in the autumn of 2017, a group of States forced a vote in the General Committee and then in the General Assembly to include the corresponding agenda item on that body's agenda. In 2018, the agenda item was once again included by means of a vote. That has only led to further confrontation. In this way the States promoting the concept are taking it further and further from the consensus of 2005. One could say that that consensus no longer exists, which is regrettable. The debate held in the General Assembly in June of this year on the topic (see A/73/PV.94) had basically no added value. We believe that returning to the tested format of an informal interactive dialogue would help to improve the existing situation. In view of that, we believe that including an agenda item on the responsibility to protect would be counterproductive.

In conclusion, we regret that we arrived at this meeting a little late, but I would like to recall that the Syrian and Indian representatives asked a procedural question, as I understand it, and requested certain explanations and clarifications from the Secretariat. I would be very grateful if you, Madam President, could assist and help us get the answer to that question.

Mr. Moussa (Egypt): My delegation takes the floor regarding the request to include on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session the item entitled "The responsibility to protect and the

prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity". Yet again, we are left perplexed and somewhat dismayed by the incessant persistence of some delegations to hastily push for an item that gives rise to much controversy and clearly does not garner the full support of the international community to be included on the official agenda of the General Assembly.

We note that the debate now taking place dispels any conceptions or illusions that there is consensus on the notion of the responsibility to protect (R2P) or how to move forward in that regard. We would once again like to reiterate Egypt's steadfast and unwavering commitment to the noble call for the protection of civilians in armed conflict when executed in the proper channels and forums.

In 2016, during our presidency of the Security Council, along with a group of countries Egypt drafted and successfully adopted resolution 2286 (2016), on the protection of health care in armed conflict. The resolution was a milestone document, which sent a strong and clear message from the international community that attacks targeting hospitals and medical workers were unacceptable and would not in any way be tolerated.

However, we believe that the notion of R2P as it now stands still contains a number of political and legal gaps, which, if left unaddressed, would do more harm than good with regard to its universal acceptance. Such gaps first need to be addressed and consensus reached on the conceptual framework of the notion before any further steps are taken to mainstream the notion of R2P across the United Nations system.

In a similar vein to the request made by the representative of India, we ask for clarity as to whether or not the rules of procedure allow for a rollover to take place and whether or not the General Committee can be bypassed in that regard.

Moving forward, we ask for the presenters of this proposal to abide by their continuous promises, which they took upon themselves, namely, that the decision to include the agenda item would not be brought forward following the General Assembly's prior considerations of the item.

Ms. Hutchinson (Australia): Today's General Assembly debate on the responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic

cleansing and crimes against humanity has been extremely helpful in exploring the challenges involved by sharing different experiences and perspectives. There is significant value in ongoing dialogue on such issues, especially the responsibility to protect and its implementation, precisely because there are differing views among Member States. Australia will vote in favour of including the item on the General Assembly agenda at its seventy-fourth session.

Mr. Kim In Ryong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The responsibility to protect (R2P) people from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity is the sovereign right of a State. As Member States are aware, there has not yet been global consensus on the R2P concept mentioned in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). It involves many issues that are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Differing views still exist among Member States. The most preferable approach is to continue informal negotiations in order to reach consensus instead of discussing it at the General Assembly.

The R2P concept to protect civilians has been abused by some countries to undertake a collective armed invasion against sovereign developing countries in order to interfere in another's internal affairs and ultimately overthrow or change the independent Government. The collective intervention revealed as a collective armed invasion conducted under the pretext of protecting civilians in developing countries in recent decades showed the danger of the R2P concept.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reiterates once again its opposition to the proposal to include the dangerous concept of the responsibility to protect on the formal agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session.

Mr. Simonoff (United States of America): The United States supports the inclusion of the responsibility to protect on the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. Debate in this Hall of this important issue is healthy. If there are differences of view and a lack of consensus, they can be discussed here in this Hall.

Regarding the procedure, I would note that several other agenda items were included on the provisional agenda. That was done by consensus this very morning. It is entirely appropriate to do the same with regard to this item. Our understanding is that this is

a decision with respect to inclusion of the item on the provisional agenda in that it will not bypass the General Committee. The General Committee will consider the recommendation with respect to this item at its meeting on Wednesday, 18 September. The General Assembly again can make a final decision with respect to the inclusion on the actual agenda on Friday, 20 September, of this week. We call on all States to vote in favour of the inclusion of this item on the provisional agenda.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat to clarify precisely the procedural questions that were asked by several Member States.

I must say that the representative of the United States delegation already made the point and he was right.

Mr. Nakano (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): The General Assembly has before it the proposal to include this item on the draft agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly. That was requested by the delegation of Denmark in document A/73/995, which contains a note verbale from that delegation. Similar requests were made and then considered and approved by the General Assembly at today's meeting, including on sub-item (b) of agenda item 34, concerning strengthening the role of mediation in the peaceful settlement of disputes, as well as agenda items 37, concerning a zone of peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic, 41, concerning the situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan, and 89, concerning the situation in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine.

If the General Assembly decides to include this item, like all of the items I just mentioned, in the draft agenda for the seventy-fourth session, the whole draft agenda will be considered on Wednesday by the General Committee, which will make recommendations one way or the other for the Assembly's consideration at its 2nd plenary meeting, on Friday.

The President: I thank the Secretariat for the clarification.

In the absence of a request for a recorded vote, may I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to include the agenda item entitled "The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity" in the

draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session?

The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked for the floor.

Mr. Al Arsan (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I should like to draw attention to this touching moment for all of us in this Hall. My colleagues and I are saddened, Madam, that this is your last day on this rostrum as President of the General Assembly, and we wish you every success in your professional, political and diplomatic endeavours, which you fully deserve.

Regarding the issue before us today, the responsibility to protect, no one has so far requested a vote for its inclusion, as the President indicated. Like others, however, my delegation was frankly and openly not convinced by the legal explanations provided either by certain delegations or, with all due respect, by the Secretariat. We therefore call for a vote against the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. We urge Member States to resolutely support respect for the Charter of the United Nations and consensus among us all, and therefore to support a debate on this item through informal interactive dialogues.

As the Assembly is aware, I mentioned previously that informal interactive dialogues have not been given the opportunity that they deserve. Two years ago, certain countries cut off the opportunity to hold such discussions when they surprised everybody by submitting the request that led to adopting a non-exclusionary method for dealing with the agenda of the General Assembly. Before voting, I would like to remind the Assembly of two facts. First, a report of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon on the responsibility to protect (A/69/981) explicitly noted that the conduct of certain States in Libya showed that the implementation of the responsibility to protect was not optimal and continued to be far from free of politicization and interests. The report made it clear that the Secretariat had concerns about certain States' implementation of the principle of the responsibility to protect.

Secondly, the concept of the responsibility to protect itself is controversial, especially its third pillar. The fact is, we all know that ideals and good intentions have no place in addressing controversial issues. When we address such a controversial issue what we need is political realism. The Assembly is well aware

that there are Governments that in the past, present and future have wanted and will continue to want to exploit the responsibility to protect simply because they possess the necessary political, military and economic influence both within and beyond the United Nations. They will continue using it in order to impose military interventions and unilateral economic measures on various peoples of the world, including countries with which they have political disagreements. What is therefore really at stake here is not the protection of civilians. Those Governments simply invoke the concept whenever they have political differences with one country or another.

This is why we have resisted and will continue to resist the inclusion of a controversial concept such as the responsibility to protect on the Assembly's agenda, because we still believe that the United Nations, our Organization, must not become a party that accedes to the legitimization of military aggression or punitive economic and political measures against certain peoples of the world. To do so would blatantly run counter to the responsibility of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security. I therefore call on all States to oppose the inclusion of this item on the Assembly's agenda and to once again give informal interactive dialogue a chance. We do not oppose the responsibility to protect in itself, but rather its exploitation by certain States for political and selfish reasons that are well known to us all.

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the proposal to include agenda item 168, entitled "The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity", in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall

Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Mali, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Serbia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Viet Nam, Zambia

The decision to include agenda item 168, entitled "The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity", in the draft agenda of the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session was adopted by 92 votes to 15, with 27 abstentions (decision 73/572).

The President: I now give the floor to delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. Koba (Indonesia): I would like to join others in expressing our thanks to you, Madam President, for your stewardship and leadership of the General Assembly during this session.

Exactly two years ago, we gathered in this same Hall to consider the same question of whether to include the subject of the responsibility to protect as an agenda item of the General Assembly. Two years ago, we voted yes on this question. For Indonesia, the responsibility to protect all people is an unquestionable obligation of the State. It is enshrined in our Constitution. However, we are fully cognizant of the efforts since the 2005 World

Summit, when leaders first considered this subject, and of the fact that there has been no agreement on its definition or implementation. For those reasons, we believe that at this time, devoting an agenda item to the responsibility to protect would help advance discussion on the subject, in order to provide a venue for sharing best practices on how States can strengthen their ability to uphold their primary responsibility to avoid atrocities, genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We have done that.

We now have a better understanding of the differing perspectives among Member States on its implementation. In the understanding that there are divergent views regarding the modalities surrounding this concept and whether it should stand as an agenda item at all, my delegation reiterates its belief that deliberations on the topic should be based on consensus, so that any process we may choose to advance is one that has collective support and ownership and is not imposed by a few or even a majority.

Having said that, my delegation abstained in the voting on decision 73/572. Cognizant of the universal principle of consensus and the collective ownership of all States Members of the United Nations, we share the firm belief that pursuing a constructive engagement with all Member States is key to ensuring the effectiveness of our discussion of this agenda item in the forthcoming session.

Mr. Pye Soe Aung (Myanmar): My delegation voted against decision 73/572 based on the following position. First, we have been engaged in intense debate on the concept of the responsibility to protect for more than a decade. The interpretation of the concept so far has failed to reach consensus on how to translate it into practice. It is therefore premature and inappropriate to include the subject of the responsibility to protect as a formal and regular agenda item of the General Assembly.

Secondly, the primary responsibility to protect against immediate threats and atrocities rests with States. The measures taken by States should include, but not be limited to, the peaceful resolution of conflicts, the strengthening of the rule of law, the promotion of human rights, the building of peace and harmony among citizens, and socioeconomic development. Regional and international communities should render assistance or necessary expertise to countries that need to strengthen their domestic capacities for fulfilling

that responsibility. The capacity to protect must come before the responsibility to protect.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 168?

It was so decided.

The President: I should like to remind delegations that the following agenda items remain open for consideration during the seventy-third session of the General Assembly: 9, 16, 18, 18 (d), 19, 20 and its sub-items (a), (b), (d) and (h), 22, 22 (b), 23, 23 (b), 25, 31, 34, 34 (a), 35, 36, 38, 39, 44 to 50, 65, 66, 71, 71 (a), 74, 74 (b), 75, 75 (a) through (c), 78, 78 (a), 101 and its sub-items (a) through (oo), 109, 116 and its sub-items (a), (b) and (e), 119, 120, 125, 125 (a) and (b), 126, 129, 131, 134 to 155 and 157 to 166.

As Member States are aware, those items have been included in the provisional agenda of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, with the exception of sub-item (b) of agenda item 22, entitled “International migration and development”; sub-items (j), (l), (o), (s), (t), (u), (y), (z), (cc), (dd), (ff), (gg), (ii) and (mm) of agenda item 101; sub-item (b) of agenda item 116, entitled “Election of members of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law”; sub-item (e) of agenda item 116, entitled “Election of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme”; sub-item (b) of agenda item 125, entitled “Central role of the United Nations system in global governance”; agenda item 144, entitled “United Nations

pension system”; and agenda item 149, entitled “Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations peacekeeping operations”.

In connection with agenda item 16, entitled “The role of the United Nations in promoting a new global human order”, members will recall that the President of the General Assembly received a letter dated 1 November 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Guyana to the United Nations requesting that the item be removed from the agenda of the General Assembly, in keeping with the ongoing efforts of the Assembly to streamline its agenda and enhance the efficiency of its work. I reiterate my congratulations to Guyana for its initiative in that regard.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration at the current session of agenda items 9, 16, 18, 18 (d), 19, 20 and its sub-items (a), (b), (d) and (h), 22, 22(b), 23, 23(b), 27, 31, 34, 34 (a), 35, 36, 38, 39, 44 to 50, 65, 66, 71, 71 (a), 74, 74 (b), 75, 75 (a) through (c), 78, 78 (a), 101 and its sub-items (a) through (oo), 109, 116 and its sub-items (a), (b) and (e), 119, 120, 125, 125 (a) and (b), 126, 129, 131, 134 to 155 and 157 to 166?

It was so decided.

The President: I would also like to inform Member States that as announced in today’s *Journal of the United Nations*, the closing of the seventy-third session will be held this afternoon at 3 p.m. I will see you all there.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.