



General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
26 January 2007

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 36th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 21 December 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yousfi (Algeria)
*Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions:* Mr. Saha

Contents

Organization of work

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

*Enhancing the role of the subregional offices of the Economic Commission
for Africa (continued)*

Agenda item 118: Programme planning (*continued*)

Agenda item 124: Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)

Agenda item 129: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*)

Agenda item 130: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.



Agenda item 47: 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 (*continued*)

Agenda item 113: Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Agenda item 122: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 132: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (*continued*)

Agenda item 149: United Nations reform: measures and proposals (*continued*)

Human resources management (continued)

Comprehensive review of governance and oversight within the United Nations and its funds, programmes and specialized agencies (continued)

Procurement reform (continued)

Agenda item 144: Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*)

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (*continued*)

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Capital master plan (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Organization of work

1. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed by the Permanent Mission of Nepal that Mr. Dhakal would be unavailable to continue serving as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, and that Mr. Wagle (Nepal) had been nominated and endorsed by the Group of Asian States to fill that post.

2. *Mr. Wagle (Nepal) was elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee by acclamation.*

3. **The Chairman** thanked Mr. Dhakal for his contribution to the work of the Committee.

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations *(continued)*

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 *(continued)*

Enhancing the role of the subregional offices of the Economic Commission for Africa (continued)
(A/61/471 and A/61/544; A/C.5/61/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.18: Enhancing the role of the subregional offices of the Economic Commission for Africa

4. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.18 was adopted.*

5. **Ms. Udo** (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the relevant report of the Secretary-General (A/61/471) did not fully respond to all the provisions of General Assembly resolution 60/235. However, the African Group had joined the consensus on the clear understanding that the other recommendations contained in the resolution would be addressed in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. She stressed the Commission's crucial role in the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the support it provided to initiatives by African Governments and the need to ensure that it had adequate resources to effectively perform the actions recommended by the General Assembly with a view to enhancing the role of the subregional offices. The African Group had agreed to the language of the draft resolution in a spirit of extreme flexibility.

6. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) expressed his delegation's full agreement with the comments of the representative of

Nigeria. It would have been far better to allocate the necessary resources to the Commission without delay.

Agenda item 118: Programme planning *(continued)* (A/C.5/61/L.16)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.16: Programme planning

7. **Mr. Rashkow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had participated in the forty-sixth session of the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) with its usual commitment to making CPC a more effective body and had called for additional consideration of working methods. It was disappointed that CPC had once again been unable to reach consensus on specific meaningful steps to that end.

8. Although his delegation had not participated in informal discussions relating to the strategic framework, it had stated in formal meetings that it reserved the right to express its views on all issues addressed in the CPC report in the context of Fifth Committee deliberations. Because CPC had failed to carry out the General Assembly's instructions to improve its working methods, and given the continued underlying problems resulting from that failure, the United States had decided to dissociate itself from the consensus on the CPC report.

9. The Committee had shown a generally dismissive attitude towards the nearly 60 United States proposals suggesting modifications to 16 programmes in the strategic framework, and had accepted only one of them; some Member States had argued that, having been a member of CPC, his delegation did not have the right to seek any changes to the strategic framework during Fifth Committee discussions. His delegation wished to reiterate that every Member State had the right to put forward such reasoned proposals and comments as it believed were warranted concerning any report before the Fifth Committee. That, of course, included the report of CPC. His delegation therefore wished to dissociate itself from the consensus on agenda item 118 and to have its position reflected in the report of the Fifth Committee.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.16 was adopted.*

11. **Mr. Kozaki** (Japan) said that his delegation was not satisfied with the work and functioning of CPC and was disappointed with the draft resolution just adopted, which did not enjoy the full support of the Committee.

12. **Ms. Lock** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group attached great importance to the work of CPC and fully supported its role and mandate. It was disappointing that some CPC members had chosen to dissociate themselves from a consensus text which all sides had worked very hard to achieve. It was equally disappointing that the very same delegations that had blocked consensus in CPC on its working methods were now putting forward that lack of consensus to justify their dissociation from the draft resolution. That was not a fitting approach in an intergovernmental body whose members had been elected and should be participating and negotiating in a constructive spirit.

13. In accordance with the Committee's practice, members of intergovernmental bodies could not call into question reports that had already been adopted by those intergovernmental bodies. That practice had not been instituted by the Group of 77 and China but rather by the very Member States now attempting to reopen discussion on the CPC report.

14. It was encouraging, however, to see that Committee members attached importance to the work of CPC and were committed to improving its work and avoiding similar impasses in future.

Agenda item 124: Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)
(A/C.5/61/L.20)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.20: Joint Inspection Unit

15. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.20 was adopted.*

Agenda item 129: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*) (A/C.5/61/L.13)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.13: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

16. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.13 was adopted.*

Agenda item 130: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*) (A/C.5/61/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.14: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

17. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.14 was adopted.*

Agenda item 47: 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 (*continued*)

Agenda item 113: Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Agenda item 122: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 132: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (*continued*)

Agenda item 149: United Nations reform: measures and proposals (*continued*)

Human resources management (*continued*)
(A/C.5/61/L.24)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.24: Human resources management

18. **Ms. Miller** (Office of Human Resources Management) said that it was the understanding of the

Secretariat that section II, paragraph 10, of the draft resolution requested the continuing use of existing rosters and that the proposed rosters of pre-screened candidates should be further elaborated and presented to the General Assembly for its consideration at the second part of the resumed sixty-first session.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.24 was adopted.*

20. **Ms. Pehrman** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Committee by concluding its discussions on human resources management during the main part of the session had recaptured the successful outcome of the negotiations that had taken place two years previously. She appreciated the constructive spirit that had prevailed during those discussions.

Comprehensive review of governance and oversight within the United Nations and its funds, programmes and specialized agencies (continued)
(A/C.5/61/L.15)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.15: Comprehensive review of governance and oversight within the United Nations and its funds, programmes and specialized agencies

21. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.15 was adopted.*

Procurement reform (continued) (A/C.5/61/L.23)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.23: Procurement reform

22. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.23 was adopted.*

23. **Mr. Menon** (Singapore) said that the comprehensive draft resolution just adopted was a response to the half-measures proposed by the Secretariat to address procurement reform. However, one issue that remained to be addressed was the decision, in January 2006, to place the Assistant Secretary-General for Central Support Services, a Singaporean national, on administrative leave on the basis of a draft Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) report on United Nations procurement in peacekeeping operations. Despite repeated requests from the Singaporean authorities for an expeditious resolution of the case, and despite the staff member's cooperation with investigators, no evidence against the Assistant Secretary-General had been brought forward and no formal charges had been filed after nearly a year of investigations. Since such investigations could take up to several years to complete, he once again called upon United Nations senior management to

either charge or reinstate the staff member without further delay.

Agenda item 144: Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*)

(b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (*continued*) (A/C.5/61/L.17)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17: Financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon

24. **Ms. Pollard** (Director, Peacekeeping Financing Division) said that the Secretariat would interpret paragraph 17 of the draft resolution as providing for one-time support to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for fuel assistance to the Lebanese Armed Forces. The full 2006/07 budget, when proposed, would include those provisions currently covered under the commitment authority, and would thus reflect an amount of \$750,000 for fuel assistance on a one-time basis. Under the terms of paragraph 17, there would be no fuel assistance or provision for material support to the Lebanese Armed Forces in the proposed 2007/08 budget.

25. *A single recorded vote was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 4, 5 and 21 of the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

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

Against:

Australia, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Israel, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

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

26. *The fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 21 of draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17 were adopted by 93 votes to 6, with 47 abstentions.*

27. *A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria,

Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Côte d'Ivoire, Israel, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17 as a whole was adopted by 142 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

29. **Mr. Raivio** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the States members of the European Union had abstained in the vote on the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 4, 5 and 21 of the draft resolution because the text contained therein was inappropriate in the context of a resolution on the financing of UNIFIL. The broader political aspects of the incident at Qana had been debated by the General Assembly in April 1996, resulting in resolution 50/22 C of 25 April 1996. The European Union had stated its position on those political aspects at the meeting at which the Assembly had adopted that resolution. The European Union wished to underline, once again, that the Committee's consultations should have been confined to budgetary issues.

30. **Mr. Poulin** (Canada) said that a consensus resolution on the financing of UNIFIL had once again been prevented by the addition of inappropriate paragraphs on which a separate vote had been requested. Those paragraphs undermined a long-held understanding that political considerations had no place in resolutions of a technical nature. Resolutions on the financing of peacekeeping operations must be neutral, procedural texts. Because neutrality was a core aspect of peacekeeping, every attempt to politicize such operations should be vehemently opposed. Moreover, in the case in question it was inappropriate

to target one party for criticism and non-compliance with United Nations resolutions. He urged the proponents of the language in question to withdraw it from future resolutions on UNIFIL.

31. **Mr. Traystman** (United States of America) said that the United States strongly supported UNIFIL, but the use of a General Assembly resolution on funding to pursue claims against a Member State was procedurally incorrect. His delegation opposed the current and previous resolutions, which had not been adopted by consensus and required Israel to pay costs stemming from the 1996 Qana incident. The correct procedure, which dated back almost to the Organization's inception, was for the Secretary-General to pursue settlement of the Organization's claims against a State or States. Using a resolution on financing to legislate such a settlement was inappropriate and politicized the work of the Committee. That practice should be avoided in the future.

32. **Mr. Fluss** (Israel) said that although delegations had been reminded that it was not the practice of the Committee to target any one Member State, Israel was consistently singled out for criticism in the Committee. While Israel reiterated its support for UNIFIL, it had been forced to vote against the draft resolution because of that criticism. The purpose and mandate of UNIFIL under consideration had been set forth in Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) and thus differed from those of the previous UNIFIL. Paragraphs applicable to the previous UNIFIL had already been discussed during the second part of the resumed sixtieth session; Israel regretted that those paragraphs were again the subject of a vote in the Committee.

33. A single Member State had never before been held solely responsible for costs incurred when armed groups endangered United Nations peacekeeping forces. In the past, such expenses had been met through the application of collective responsibility. Israel had been dragged into a conflict with Hizbollah terrorists during the summer of 2006 after the Government of Lebanon had irresponsibly allowed that group to become a "State within a State". A robust UNIFIL was critical to preserving stability and security on the ground, but divisive language such as that contained in the paragraphs in question undermined efforts to fully implement resolution 1701 (2006).

34. **Mr. Stone** (Australia) said that Australia had long been a firm supporter of UNIFIL and that it supported the expanded mandate set out in Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). Australia had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17 because the text did not appropriately focus on budgetary issues. Politicizing the resolution and singling out Israel were not helpful to the overall Middle East peace process or to the important work required of UNIFIL.

35. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon) said that his delegation greatly appreciated the role played by UNIFIL in southern Lebanon and welcomed the increase in its size and area of operation under Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). Lebanon had always supported all the Secretary-General's related budget requests in order to ensure the mission's success. It was his delegation's understanding that paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17 did not prejudge or predetermine the outcome of the current negotiations between the Lebanese Government and UNIFIL on a memorandum of understanding outlining the framework for the support which UNIFIL would provide to the Lebanese Armed Forces in the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006).

36. His delegation recognized that the Organization's expenses should be shared by its Member States. However, that principle did not contradict the principle of State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts. Lebanon wished to reiterate its thanks to all States members of the Group of 77 and China and all other friendly countries that had supported draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.17.

37. His delegation had not intended to raise political issues upon the adoption of the draft resolution, but felt compelled to do so, in the circumstances. The history of the Middle East region sufficed to explain why Israel had been singled out, and in that regard he recalled that Hizbollah had existed neither in 1978, when Israel had first invaded Lebanon, nor in 1982, when it had invaded for the second time. Hizbollah was a popular response to Israel's occupation of Lebanon. Moreover, it was not useful for Israel's representatives to speak of terrorism, particularly as two of Israel's former prime ministers had been considered terrorists by the British police.

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Capital master plan (continued) (A/C.5/61/L.19)

Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.19: Capital master plan

38. **Mr. Sach** (Controller) said that in the process of informal consultations, certain understandings had been reached with respect to the interpretation of the wording of the draft resolution, and that he had been asked to provide clarifications in that regard.

39. Responding to a request made by the representative of Pakistan, he said that in order to keep the project within budget it was important to control the timetable. It was the Secretary-General's firm objective to complete the capital master plan by mid-2014, and every effort would be made to achieve that goal through scope control, expeditious relocations, and intensive monitoring of the time schedule for each activity.

40. With respect to a request made by the representative of Japan, he said that paragraph 14 of the draft resolution provided for a mixed assessment option of either a one-time assessment or equal multi-year assessments over five years. Member States would advise the Secretariat of their preference within 60 days of the issuance of the relevant notification by the Secretary-General. The resolution also provided that if Member States did not do so, they would be placed on the multi-year plan. However, that would not preclude a Member State from advising the Secretariat, after the expiry of the 60-day period, that it wished instead to be assessed on a one-time basis.

41. Responding to a request from the representative of Brazil, he said that in the context of the implementation of paragraph 32 of the draft resolution, contributions for the capital master plan would be recorded as having been paid on the date on which a cheque was received by the Contributions Service, subject to recourse, or the date on which an electronic transfer was received in a United Nations account.

42. Addressing a request from the Russian Federation, he said that paragraph 32 provided for a mechanism to ensure that those Member States which paid their assessed contributions for the capital master plan in full and on time would not bear any financial liabilities as a result of any drawdown under a letter of credit facility. The mechanism involved determining the amount of the charges levied each month and then

calculating, for those Member States with outstanding contributions due and payable, their share of those charges by prorating each Member State's outstanding contributions against the total of such capital master plan contributions outstanding. Those calculations would be made in accordance with the average of the opening and closing monthly balances of the outstanding contributions due and payable each month by each Member State.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.5/61/L.19 was adopted.*

44. **Ms. Lock** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, recalled that it had taken nearly six years to approve the capital master plan. Although it had been expected that Member States would need to conduct a thorough review and assessment of the relevant reports, action had been considerably delayed as a result of the changing assumptions underpinning the project, particularly the search for alternative swing-space options. The draft resolution provided for further negotiations aimed at securing the best possible financial arrangements for the implementation of the project and also envisaged further consultations with the host country Government on the renovation of the Headquarters complex, bearing in mind its responsibility as the host country. The Group of 77 and China expected that the project would be implemented on schedule and as efficiently as possible.

45. **Ms. Pehrman** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that since the beginning of the Committee's discussions on the capital master plan, in 2000, the European Union had continuously stressed the need to renovate the building and to bring it into line with safety regulations. Over the last six years the Committee had engaged in complex negotiations on the project, which would only run efficiently and within budget if it was funded in a timely manner. All Member States should therefore pay their contributions to the plan in full, on time and without conditions.

46. **Ms. Rodríguez Abascal** (Cuba) said that each Member State must honour its commitment to provide the necessary funds for the timely completion of the work. Despite the positive results achieved, it was very regrettable that the host country had not offered the United Nations an interest-free loan for the project, which was the least it could have done to express its thanks for the considerable benefits it derived from the Organization's presence in its territory, as well as those

that it would derive from the implementation of the project itself.

47. **Ms. Shah** (United States of America) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which represented the culmination of many years of discussions. Her delegation had on many occasions expressed its concern at the current state of United Nations Headquarters, and was therefore very glad that agreement had been reached on financing arrangements for the capital master plan. It looked forward to receiving annual progress reports on the project.

48. **Ms. Taylor-Roberts** (Jamaica) recalled that in the early stages of consultations, some delegations had said that consideration should be given to the further utilization of the temporary swing-space building to be constructed on the North Lawn, which must be fully sustainable, with proper security and other logistics such as interpretation facilities, in order to accommodate meetings of the General Assembly and other bodies. The plan to demolish the building after the completion of the project should be reviewed, and serious consideration should be given to ways in which the building might be further utilized.

49. **Mr. Ng'ongolo** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation would be grateful if the Secretary-General could inform all Member States of the impact, in terms of the status of their contributions, of making either a one-time payment or equal multi-year payments.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.