

**Text of the intervention
of the representative of the Russian Federation
at the Informal interactive dialogue on the responsibility to protect**

Check against delivery

September 6, 2017

Mr. Moderator,

We studied carefully the latest report on “the responsibility to protect” submitted by the Secretariat.

The contents of the report once again clearly demonstrate the controversy around the concept. It does not contain a well-defined understanding of what “responsibility to protect” means, nor it refers to any examples of successful implementation thereof.

As in the case of previous reports, the report uses vague terms such as “atrocious crimes” instead of 4 separate crimes mentioned in the Outcome document of 2005. Since the entire report is built around non-existent definitions it can provoke erroneous wide interpretations of the concept. The report touches upon mechanisms that are not mandated to deal with issues of the “responsibility to protect” (in particular, the Universal Periodic Review of UNHRC) and goes into areas not covered by the Outcome document, such as issues of accountability.

This is not only a question of methodology. In recent country specific cases, the implementation of the concept has resulted in complete failure. We however cannot find in the report any honest analysis of these errors. In this regard the report unfortunately does not fully reflect the discussions that took place this year during the informal panels organized in New York and Geneva.

As the result the document makes the concept even less clear than before. On the other hand it proposes further institutionalization and formalization of the concept. We find no logic in this approach.

We consider the proposal in paragraph 46 of the report on the inclusion of the issue as an official agenda item of the General Assembly to be premature and inappropriate given mentioned circumstances. We would like to recall that back in 2009 the format of the informal interactive dialogue was chosen specifically due to the controversial character of the concept and different opinions regarding its content. This gap has only widened. The current format has not fulfilled its mandate yet.

We need to shape the interactive dialogue and panels in a way that would lead to the genuine reflection of the Member States concerns in the SG's reports. There is plenty room for this within this format.

Accordingly – we would like to make it clear - like a number of other delegations we would not be able to support – either in the General Committee or the GA - the initiatives to change this format.

Thank you, Mr.Moderator.