



# General Assembly

Seventy-third session

## Official Records

Distr.: General  
25 January 2019

Original: English

---

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 26th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 30 November 2018, at 10 a.m.

*Chairperson:* Mr. Skinner-Klée Arenales ..... (Guatemala)

## Contents

Statement by the Chair

Statement by the representative of Austria on behalf of the European Union and its member States

Agenda item 17: Information and communications technologies for development  
(*continued*)Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)(a) International trade and development (*continued*)(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind  
(*continued*)(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)Agenda item 21: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations  
Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban  
Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements  
Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed  
Countries (*continued*)(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked  
Developing Countries (*continued*)

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the  
delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section ([dms@un.org](mailto:dms@un.org)),  
and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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



Agenda item 24: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027) (*continued*)

Agenda item 25: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

- (a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)
- (b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

*The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m.*

### **Statement by the Chair**

1. **The Chair** announced that action on the draft resolution on the report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (A/C.2/73/L.49) would be postponed until the next meeting. Owing to late issuance of documents, action on the draft resolution entitled “Towards global partnership: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners” (A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1) would be postponed until the following week.

### **Statement by the representative of Austria on behalf of the European Union and its member States**

2. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that in adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with its people-centred approach to development, its focus on each individual’s dignity and rights and its Sustainable Development Goals, the international community had made a solemn commitment to leave no one behind. The European Union and its member States were concerned about an apparent gradual and subtle shift away from that universal approach since the seventieth session of the General Assembly, towards a concept of development that focused on States rather than individuals.

3. Although the European Union and its member States fully recognized that the notion of no country being left behind was contained in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and fully supported the view that the Goals and targets under the 2030 Agenda were to be met by all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, the language introduced through imperfect compromise the previous year did not accurately reflect either Agenda. A gradual reinterpretation of a concept already endorsed by all leaders was not acceptable. In its efforts to deliver on the major agreements of 2015, the international community must refrain from constantly seeking to rewrite or undermine them.

4. The Second Committee should be a forum of great importance to international development, but its potential remained unfulfilled. Since people’s lives and livelihoods were at stake, it was vital to make the

Committee as relevant as possible, and deliver on the commitments made in 2015, rather than renegotiate them.

5. During negotiations in the current session, the European Union had consistently proposed alternative language for the relevant preambular and operative paragraphs, closely based on what leaders had agreed, and faithful to their vision for the 2030 Agenda. It was regrettable that those proposals had not been accepted, and that negotiators had even refused to discuss the issue, rebuffing any attempt made by the European Union to reach a compromise text that would have bridged divisions.

6. For those reasons, in order to better reflect the 2030 Agenda, the European Union and its member States proposed that modifications be made to the relevant resolutions. Firstly, the repetitive preambular paragraph that misquoted paragraph 1 of the Addis Action Agenda should be deleted; secondly, the relevant operative paragraph in the draft resolutions should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first.”

The concerns of the European Union and its member States related strictly to those two paragraphs; they looked forward to joining consensus on or voting in favour of the rest of the text, as appropriate.

7. As the Secretary-General himself had noted, at a time when multilateralism and the rules-based international system were under threat, the international community needed to hold firm to the principles agreed by its leaders in 2015, especially in the light of the forthcoming 2019 high-level political forum on sustainable development at which progress on the achievement of the 2030 Agenda would be reviewed. She hoped that the Committee could become a more constructive vehicle for ensuring that no one was left behind, and, accordingly, support the suggestions by the European Union and its member States.

8. The statement she was delivering applied to a number of draft resolutions that would be considered by the Committee at the current meeting.

# **Agenda item 17: Information and communications technologies for development** (*continued*)

*Draft resolution on information and communications technologies for sustainable development (A/C.2/73/L.29/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.55)*

9. **Ms. Wolf** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.55](#), which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the thirty-eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 37 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

10. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.55](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. Document [A/C.2/73/L.55](#) contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested. He wished to remind delegations that, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the author of an amendment was not permitted to explain his or her vote on his or her own proposal or amendment.

11. *A recorded vote was taken*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav

Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkey.

12. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.55 were rejected by 106 votes to 45, with 11 abstentions.*

13. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the results of the vote had demonstrated the importance of upholding and preserving the work of the Committee and its working methods, including in relation to the informal processes. The proposed amendments had been made in relation to agreed language from the previous session of the General Assembly and draft paragraphs agreed to in informal consultations during the current session. The Group had therefore requested a vote on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution in order to preserve the established rules and practice of the Committee, and

in the absence of an objective justification for the proposed amendments.

14. **Ms. Wolf** (Austria), making a general statement on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, for the reasons stated at the outset of the meeting, the European Union and its member States had voted in favour of the proposed amendments to the relevant preambular paragraph and operative paragraph with a view to bringing the text back to the people-centred universal approach of the 2030 Agenda. It was regrettable that it had not been possible to achieve consensus. The European Union and its member States stood ready to engage in consultations on the issue in the new year with a view to reaching agreement ahead of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

15. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.29/Rev.1](#), submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

16. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the words “in this regard” should be deleted from the eighteenth preambular paragraph.

17. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.29/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, was adopted.*

#### **Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions** (continued)

##### **(a) International trade and development** (continued) ([A/C.2/73/21/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.56](#))

*Draft resolution on international trade and development ([A/C.2/73/21/Rev.1](#)) and proposed amendments ([A/C.2/73/L.56](#))*

18. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.56](#), which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement she had made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 21 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

19. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.56](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. Document [A/C.2/73/L.56](#) contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested. He wished to remind delegations that, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the author of an amendment was not permitted to explain his or her vote on his or her own proposal or amendment.

20. *A recorded vote was taken.*

#### *In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

#### *Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Equatorial Guinea, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uzbekistan.

21. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.56 were rejected by 108 votes to 46, with 14 abstentions.*

22. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, in the interest of time, he would not repeat the statement he had made on the proposed amendments to the previous draft resolution on which the Committee had taken action; however, that statement also applied to the current and all other proposed amendments that would be considered during the meeting.

23. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), making a general statement on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, like the representative of Egypt, she would refrain from re-reading the relevant statement she had made earlier, which also applied to the proposed amendments just voted on and would continue to be applicable throughout the meeting.

24. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.21/Rev.1](#), submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

25. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore), making a general statement before the voting on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.21/Rev.1](#) and speaking also on behalf of a cross-regional group of like-minded countries, including Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), reaffirmed those countries'

joint commitment to the multilateral trading system in a global economy. The United Nations had a mandate to address global economic and financial governance issues, including the multilateral trading system and its impact on sustainable development. In that regard, it was important to develop and strengthen the multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization (WTO), which was universal, rules-based, open, transparent, predictable, inclusive, non-discriminatory, and equitable.

26. WTO provided an invaluable framework and rules which fostered international trade and development, facilitated the peaceful settlement of trade disputes and served as a bulwark against protectionism. WTO had contributed to the strength, predictability and stability of the global economy; the multilateral trading system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and economic development. International trade was an engine for inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction, and contributed towards the promotion of sustainable development, as recognized in the 2030 Agenda. It was important for everyone to benefit from the opportunities generated by the multilateral trading system.

27. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

28. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya,



Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, 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, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, 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:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

29. Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.21/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 172 votes to 1.

30. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that the United States had had to vote against the draft resolution for the second consecutive year because of problematic language that her delegation had highlighted the previous year and which remained in the text just adopted. The United States enjoyed strong and growing trade relationships across the globe, and welcomed efforts to bolster those relationships, increase economic cooperation and drive prosperity to all of the world's peoples through free, fair and reciprocal trade. However, her delegation had been unable to join consensus on the attempt by the United Nations, in operative paragraphs, to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system.

31. As her delegation had noted in its general statement of 8 November 2018, the United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums,

including at the World Trade Organization. The United Nations was not the appropriate venue for such discussions, and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions made by the General Assembly on those issues. That included calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

32. Nor could her delegation join consensus on the reference to "combat protectionism" in paragraph 10. WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions taken to protect economies from the unfair and market-distorting trade practices of others were not protectionist. The United States did not advocate protectionism and would not accept veiled criticisms of its policies.

33. Regarding unilateral economic measures, her delegation believed that economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force, and that each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, including restricting trade in certain circumstances. Member States were all within their rights to use their trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve national security and foreign policy objectives.

34. She drew the Committee's attention to the general statement her delegation had made on 8 November 2018, which covered a number of additional concerns, including with regard to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and inclusive economic growth.

35. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union and its member States had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of a multilateral trading system under WTO that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based; however, to be preserved and fostered, that system would need to be modernized. To that end, she welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution of the need to strengthen WTO and to ensure the continued viability and effectiveness of its dispute settlement, negotiating and monitoring functions. WTO must also be able to address current tensions in the international trading system. To that end, special efforts should be made to secure new rules on industrial subsidies and

state-owned enterprises, so as to promote a more level playing field for workers and businesses around the world. It was important for all countries to contribute to that debate in a positive spirit, with a view to reinforcing all existing efforts to combat protectionism in all its forms.

**(b) International financial system and development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.12/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution on the international financial system and development (A/C.2/73/L.12/Rev.1)*

36. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.12/Rev.1 contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

37. *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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands,

South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, 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:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 176 votes to 1.

39. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that while the European Union and its member States had voted in favour of the draft resolution, they had concerns regarding the process and outcome of a resolution which could potentially have high relevance within the macroeconomic cluster of resolutions. An annual resolution should at least reflect new developments as well as relevant major challenges. Despite the fact that the European Union and its member States had sought to ensure that the draft resolution on the international financial system and development was balanced and updated, the current text mainly contained agreed language from the previous year. Despite the extensive time and effort invested by the European Union and others, significant proposals had not been taken into account, including highly-relevant climate-related language that the European Union and its member States had proposed during negotiations and which had been accepted at the draft stage, but ultimately removed from the final text. In view of the explicit aim of the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to make finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development, the Committee had missed an opportunity to send a clear message on the importance of sustainable finance. There were many other such examples.

40. In the light of that outcome, the European Union and its member States believed that the draft resolution



on the international financial system and development should be considered biennially, and that its content must be thoroughly reviewed. They looked forward to discussing the issue of periodicity of macroeconomic resolutions during preparations for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

41. **Ms. Maniscalco** (United States of America) said that the United States had sought to return to consensus on the draft resolution just adopted and regretted that the Committee had had to vote on it for the second consecutive year. A significant number of the concerns highlighted by her delegation the previous year remained in draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.12/Rev.1](#), owing to the inflexibility of the Group of 77 and China. For example, the Group had not seriously considered the biennialization of a draft resolution which would have been the most fitting candidate for that in the light of calls to reduce overlap and duplication. Her delegation was unable to agree to language that called for “enhancing”, “ensuring” or “strengthening” of the coherence and consistency of international financial, monetary and trading systems and policies, since such language presumed that the current state of coherence and consistency was suboptimal in some way, a view which it did not necessarily share. Nor was her delegation able to join consensus on the attempt by the United Nations, in paragraphs 2, 9 and 20, to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system, as those were not matters on which the General Assembly should opine. Regarding unilateral economic measures, her delegation believed that economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force, and that each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, including restricting trade in certain circumstances. Member States were all within their rights to use their trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve national security and foreign policy objectives.

42. With respect to paragraph 14, her delegation strongly disagreed with the encouragement to provide “flexible, concessional, fast-disbursing, and front-loaded assistance” without regard to the financial sustainability of the institutions, the development impact and effect on poverty reduction of such assistance or the presence of an appropriate macroeconomic policy framework. That recommendation was not financially sustainable. The concessional nature of assistance should be determined by the governance bodies of the international financial institutions, which should allocate limited concessional resources with reference to income and

creditworthiness. Furthermore, that recommendation could be read as encouraging multilateral development banks to refrain from adhering to the high social, environmental and fiduciary standards that were essential to achieving sustainable development.

43. The United States also generally opposed the use of the term “illicit financial flows”, which was vague and had no agreed-upon international definition. In the absence of any common understanding of what constituted illicit financial flows, the United States understood that term to refer to money or assets derived from specific illegal activities such as embezzlement, bribery, money laundering, other corrupt practices and other crimes.

44. Her delegation could not join consensus on the reference to “increasing protectionism and inward-looking policies.” WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions taken to protect economies from the unfair and market-distorting trade practices of others were not protectionist. The United States did not advocate protectionism and would not accept veiled criticisms of its policies when others were unwilling to do the hard work necessary to deliver on free, fair and reciprocal trade. As had been indicated in her delegation’s statement to the Committee on 8 November 2018, the United Nations was not the appropriate venue for a discussion of that nature. Her country’s November statement also provided details on a number of additional concerns over the language of the draft resolution, including with regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and the characterization of trade and technology transfer.

#### **Agenda item 20: Sustainable development** (continued)

##### **(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind** (continued) ([A/C.2/73/L.28](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.43](#))

*Draft resolutions on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind*  
([A/C.2/73/L.28](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.43](#))

45. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.43](#), submitted by Mr. Remaoun (Algeria), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.28](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

46. **Mr. Dewar Viscarra** (Mexico), facilitator, introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.43](#), said that because Mexico was highly vulnerable to climate

change, its foreign policy had consistently addressed that scourge as a top priority. Even before the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Cancun in 2010, Mexico had advocated for ambitious, binding and flexible climate governance. In that regard, it remained firmly committed to the implementation of the Paris Agreement at the national and international levels. The draft resolution maintained the ambition that the international community had set out in combating climate change. It included references to the special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the need to complete the work programme of the Paris Agreement at the twenty-fourth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the climate summit to be convened by the Secretary-General in 2019. The process leading up to the adoption of the draft resolution had been complex, and the text reflected a very delicate balance that could not have been struck without the frank dialogue that had taken place, and the constructive spirit and utmost flexibility shown by Member States.

47. At the request of the Group of 77 and China, paragraph 19 of the draft resolution should be deleted, in line with the communication dated 27 November 2018, in which the Government of Brazil had informed the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change of its decision to withdraw its offer to host the twenty-fifth session of the Conference of the Parties, owing to current financial and budgetary constraints.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.43, as orally revised, was adopted.*

49. **Ms. Wein** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union had been pleased to join consensus on the draft resolution. As the twenty-fourth session of the Conference of the Parties would start in a just a few days, the draft resolution sent a timely and important signal in urging the completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement, highlighting the importance of the Talanoa Dialogue process to take stock of collective efforts, and recognizing the need for more collective ambition in forthcoming nationally determined contributions. In that regard, she informed the Committee that that week, the European Union had published its strategic long-term vision for a climate-neutral Europe by 2050.

50. While the European Union and its member States had hoped to see stronger language in various parts of the draft resolution, in particular regarding the special

report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C, the recent developments in the context of the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization, and the importance of shifting financial flows towards green and sustainable investments, it acknowledged and welcomed the consensus around a topic that was essential to humankind as a whole, and an achievement in itself. The following week's important climate-related events in Poland; the high-level event of the President of the General Assembly; the 2019 high-level political forum review of Sustainable Development Goal 13, particularly during the ministerial week of the General Assembly; and the climate summit to be convened by the Secretary-General could all help to build the political momentum that was urgently needed to enhance the collective ambition of climate action. The European Union and its member States stood ready to work closely with the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, their staff, and all delegations in preparation for those important events.

51. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States affirmed its support for promoting economic growth and improving energy security while protecting the environment. Although his delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution, he wished to make important points of clarification. The language on climate change in draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.43](#) and other draft resolutions adopted during the current session of the General Assembly was without prejudice to the positions of the United States. With regard to the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and climate change, he referred the Committee to the concerns his delegation had raised in a general statement delivered on 8 November 2018. His Government had announced its intention to withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as it was eligible to do so, consistent with the terms of the Agreement, unless suitable terms for re-engagement were identified.

52. With respect to the reference to the special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in the draft resolution just adopted and in others addressed during the current session of the General Assembly, he said that, as the United States had stated at the forty-eighth session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, held on 6 October 2018, acceptance of the report and approval of its Summary for Policymakers by the Intergovernmental Panel did not imply endorsement of the specific findings or underlying contents of the report by the United States. In addition, references to provisions of the United

Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or the Paris Agreement and decisions by their parties did not change or interpret the meaning or applicability of those instruments and decisions. As a global leader in innovation, the United States stood ready to continue to work with others on those important issues.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.28 was withdrawn.*

**(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (continued)**  
(A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.51)

*Draft resolution on the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development (A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.51)*

54. **Ms. Wein** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution as contained in document A/C.2/73/L.51, which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the thirty-ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 35 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

55. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document A/C.2/73/L.51 before taking action on the draft resolution. Document A/C.2/73/L.51 contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested. He wished to remind delegations that, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the author of an amendment was not permitted to explain his or her vote on his or her own proposal or amendment.

56. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

57. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.51 were rejected by 110 votes to 45, with 11 abstentions.*

58. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on [A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1](#).

59. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1](#) in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that under paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to convene a summit on biodiversity at the level of Heads of States, within existing resources, before the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2020. It was understood that the issues related to that summit, including the date, format and scope, were yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the summit, it was not yet possible to estimate the potential cost implications of the requirements for support services, including the meeting and documentation. Upon the decision on the modalities of the summit, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs of such requirements in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

60. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1](#) would not give rise to any budgetary implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019.

61. With regard to the reference to existing resources in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, she drew the Committee's attention to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution [45/248 B](#) of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which was resolution [72/261](#) of 24 December 2017, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies, with a view to ensuring full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

62. **Ms. Palazzolo** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that the United States was pleased to join consensus on the draft resolution, and wished to clarify several points. Her delegation dissociated itself from paragraph 6, which called for a summit on biodiversity in 2020. Since, according to the draft resolution, the summit would be convened within existing resources, the United States expected that, as plans for that summit

developed, any budgetary impacts of that high-level event beyond existing resources would be fully taken into account in consultation with Member States in the appropriate forums. The timing of such a summit – at the very end of a two-year preparatory process – meant as a practical matter that a summit would have no meaningful impact on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework expected to be adopted at the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

63. Moreover, since there had been no discussion about the expected outcomes or to develop any sense of the duration or extent or character of such a summit, it was impossible to determine how realistic it was to expect that the summit could be accomplished within existing resources; her delegation had serious concerns that the summit would, in fact, likely be very costly. Lastly, she referred the Committee to the statement her delegation had delivered on 8 November 2018, which addressed its concerns regarding the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and the characterization of trade, technology transfer and inclusive economic growth.

64. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

65. **Ms. Wein** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union had been pleased to join consensus on the important draft resolution. With regard to the main thrust of the text, the European Union welcomed the vision developed in the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration for the pathway towards a strong post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and called upon all Governments and all stakeholders to engage fully in that process. She welcomed in particular the decision to convene a high-level biodiversity summit at the level of Heads of State and Government in 2020, ahead of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, to be held in China, in order to highlight the urgency of action at the highest level. That summit would be an important occasion to strengthen the political visibility of biodiversity and its vital contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement, and to trigger momentum for an ambitious outcome of the Conference of the Parties.

**Agenda item 21: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (continued)** ([A/C.2/73/L.4/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.61](#))



*Draft resolution on the implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (A/C.2/73/L.4/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.61)*

66. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, in the seventeenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.4/Rev.1](#), in order to correct one change made by the editors which had not been approved, the phrase “as appropriate” should appear between commas after the words “frameworks at” and before the words “the global, regional, national, subnational and local levels”, so that the paragraph read: “Aware that the effective implementation of the New Urban Agenda requires enabling policy frameworks at, as appropriate, the global, regional, national, subnational and local levels [...]”.

67. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.61](#), which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement she had made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 15 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

68. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.61](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. Document [A/C.2/73/L.61](#) contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested. He wished to remind delegations that, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the author of an

amendment was not permitted to explain his or her vote on his or her own proposal or amendment.

69. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

70. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.61 were rejected by 111 votes to 45, with 12 abstentions.*

71. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on [A/C.2/73/L.4/Rev.1](#), as orally corrected. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

72. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.4/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

### **Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations** *(continued)*

#### **(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries** *(continued)* ([A/C.2/73/L.31](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.47](#))

*Draft resolutions on follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries* ([A/C.2/73/L.31](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.47](#))

73. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.47](#), submitted by Ms. Alateibi (United Arab Emirates), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.31](#).

74. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.47](#) in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that under the terms of paragraphs 42, 43 and 44 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would:

- (a) Recall paragraph 157 of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020 on holding a Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in order to make a comprehensive appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action and to decide on subsequent action, and decide to convene the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries at the highest possible level, including Heads of State and Government, in 2021 for a duration of not more than five working days, with a mandate to:
  - (i) undertake a comprehensive appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action by the least developed countries and their development partners, share best practices and lessons learned and identify obstacles and constraints encountered as well as actions and initiatives needed to overcome them; (ii) identify effective international and domestic policies in the light of the outcome of the appraisal as well as new and emerging challenges and opportunities and the

means to address them; (iii) reaffirm the global commitment to addressing the special needs of the least developed countries made at the major United Nations conferences and summits, including in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030; and (iv) mobilize additional international support measures and action, in addition to domestic resources, in favour of the least developed countries and, in that regard, to formulate and adopt a renewed partnership between the least developed countries and their development partners, including the private sector, civil society and governments at all levels; (b) Decide to convene, towards the end of 2020 and/or early in 2021, an intergovernmental preparatory committee, which would hold no more than two meetings for no more than five days each; and (c) Also decide to take a decision on the organizational aspects, date and venue of the Conference and on the venue, duration and dates of the preparatory committee meetings at its seventy-fourth session”.

75. In that connection, pursuant to the request contained in paragraphs 42 and 43 of the draft resolution, it was currently envisaged that the meetings to be held in New York would include: (a) a five-day meeting for the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in 2021 consisting of 18 meetings, inclusive of parallel meetings, with interpretation in all six languages; (b) a five-day meeting of the intergovernmental preparatory committee towards the end of 2020 consisting of 10 meetings with interpretation in all six languages; and (c) a five-day meeting of the intergovernmental preparatory committee towards the end of 2021 consisting of 10 meetings with interpretation in all six languages. Those would constitute an addition to the meetings workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2020. The additional requirements for meeting services would arise in 2020 and 2021 in the amounts of \$84,000 and \$168,000, respectively.

76. Furthermore, the requirements for documentation arising from paragraphs 42 and 43 of the draft resolution would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management. It was currently envisaged that for the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in 2021, there would be four pre-session documents (total of 18,000 words), three



in-session documents (5,000 words) and one post-session document (20,000 words) in all six official languages. For the meeting of the intergovernmental preparatory committee in 2020, there would be one pre-session document (1,000 words), one in-session document (1,000 words) and one post-session document (5,000 words) in the six official languages. For the meeting of the intergovernmental preparatory committee in 2021, there would be three pre-session documents (5,000 words), one in-session document (1,000 words) and one post-session document (5,000 words) in the six official languages. The additional requirements for documentation services would arise in 2020 and 2021 in the amounts of \$22,700 and \$169,100, respectively.

77. However, in accordance with paragraph 44 of the draft resolution, if the organizational aspects, date and venue of the Conference, and the venue, duration and dates of the preparatory committee meetings, were to change upon the decision by the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs of the requirements in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

78. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.47](#), additional resource requirements currently estimated in the amounts of \$106,700 and \$337,100 would be included in the proposed programme budgets for 2020 and 2021, respectively, under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management.

79. **Ms. Crabtree** (Turkey), facilitator, introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.47](#), said that 2018 had been an important year for the least developed countries because the triennial review of the list of least developed countries had been conducted as part of the twentieth plenary session of the Committee for Development Policy. In that context, it was important for the draft resolution to take into account the fact that a number of countries that had been recommended for graduation were still facing problems. The current year had also seen the Secretary-General's first report on implementation, effectiveness and added value of smooth transition measures and graduation support ([A/73/291](#)).

80. The draft resolution before the Committee contained new and stronger language on three key issues for least developed countries: climate change, the cross-cutting matter of resilience and gender empowerment. As explained in the oral statement on programme budget implications relating to the draft

resolution, the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries to be held in 2021 would be another important element, as the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020 would draw to a close in 2020. The draft resolution helped to set the stage for that forthcoming event, and to decide on the mandates. That event would also provide a good opportunity to align the priorities of least developed countries with the 2030 Agenda since 2021 would also mark the first year of the final decade of the 2030 Agenda.

81. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.47](#) was adopted.*

82. **Ms. Maniscalco** (United States of America) said that the United States acknowledged and appreciated the significant effort that had gone into the draft resolution, as well as the importance of the Programme of Action. Nevertheless, it wished to emphasize the importance of ensuring that scarce resources were invested in addressing the structural and other challenges that least developed countries faced, instead of the conference services and other support that meetings required. Her delegation thus wished to highlight the elements in paragraphs 43 through 47 that called for the necessary preparatory meetings to be conducted in the most efficient and effective manner possible, including by conducting the meetings in conjunction with already scheduled meetings, such as the regular meetings of the relevant regional economic commissions.

83. Lastly, she drew the Committee's attention to the national statement her delegation had delivered on 8 November 2018, which addressed its concerns regarding the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and characterizations of inclusive economic growth, trade and technology transfer.

84. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.31](#) was withdrawn.*

**(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries** (*continued*) ([A/C.2/73/L.30](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.48](#))

*Draft resolutions on follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries* ([A/C.2/73/L.30](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.48](#))

85. The Chair invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.48](#), submitted by Ms. Alateibi (United Arab Emirates), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.30](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

86. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) made four oral corrections to draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.48](#) in order to restore language which had been submitted and agreed to in informal consultations: Firstly, in the tenth preambular paragraph, “Noting” should be replaced by “Taking note of”. Secondly, in paragraph 10, the phrase “invites Member States that have not yet acceded to the existing conventions to consider the possibility of doing so” should be replaced by “invites Member States that have not joined the existing conventions to consider the possibility of accession”. Thirdly, in paragraph 25, “of utmost relevance to” should be replaced by “very relevant for”. And, fourthly, in the second half of paragraph 26, “there” should be deleted and “ensuring” should be replaced by “helping to ensure”.

87. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.48](#), as orally corrected, was adopted.*

88. **Mr. El Ashmawy** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group had participated in the negotiations on the draft resolution in a spirit of utmost flexibility in order to garner consensus on the text. He emphasized the Group’s position with respect to the modalities for the midterm review of the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries for the Decade 2014–2024, particularly with regard to the participation of stakeholders in that review. In that regard, the Group welcomed the appointment by the President of the General Assembly of Austria and Bhutan as co-facilitators to lead the intergovernmental process with a view to finalizing an outcome document. He noted that the outstanding organizational arrangements for the midterm review needed to be finalized through an intergovernmental process before the start of the consultations for the outcome document, including with regard to the modalities for the participation of relevant stakeholders, such as civil society and the private sector. That should be done in consultation with Member States, and the President of the General Assembly could then draw up a list of relevant stakeholders to participate in the review. That list should be submitted to Member States for their consideration on a no-objection basis.

89. While the draft resolution settled many elements of the modalities for the midterm review, the outstanding arrangements needed to be finalized in full transparency and in accordance with the established practices of the General Assembly.

90. **Ms. Palazzolo** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join consensus on the draft resolution, and wished to make several clarifying points on the final text. Regarding the

reference to “enabling policies,” because of the openness of her country’s services market, her delegation did not believe that that provision pertained to the United States. However, it could support others’ efforts at further market liberalization. Concerning the reference to the International Think Tank for Landlocked Developing Countries, her delegation believed it was not appropriate to mention a private organization in the context of the draft resolution.

91. In addition, her delegation disassociated itself from references to the technology bank that encouraged financial assistance to the bank and characterized technology transfer that was not clearly indicated to be both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations.

92. Lastly, she referred the Committee to the national statement her delegation had delivered on 8 November 2018, which addressed its concerns regarding the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement, and characterizations of inclusive economic growth, trade and technology transfer.

93. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.30](#) was withdrawn.*

#### **Agenda item 24: Eradication of poverty and other development issues** (*continued*) ([A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#))

*Draft resolution on eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* ([A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#))

94. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#), submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

95. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#) in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that it was understood that the new report on the status of the implementation of and follow-up to draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#) in order to identify the gaps and challenges faced in rural poverty eradication, especially in developing countries, as requested in paragraph 16, would be developed during 2019 and presented at the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, and would be non-recurrent. In order to implement that request, a number of activities and resources would be required in 2019 including: (a) A three-day expert group meeting on eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda, consisting of approximately 14 experts

from different regions. The travel of two staff members would also be required to service the meeting, in addition to operating costs to hold the meeting. That would entail additional resource requirements in 2019 for section 9, Economic and social affairs, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019, in the amount of \$47,900; (b) General temporary assistance at the P-3 level for six months, which would allow for the research needed, consultation with relevant United Nations system stakeholders on the preparation of the draft report, serving as the focal point for such consultations and collection and analysis of inputs, including through the organization of an expert group meeting; for drafting the report of the Secretary-General; and for supporting intergovernmental deliberations. That would entail additional resource requirements in 2019 for section 9, Economic and social affairs, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019, in the amount of \$75,500; (c) Conference services for the processing and translation of the new report into six languages, which would entail additional resource requirements in 2019 for section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, of the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019, in the amount of \$26,000.

96. The total requirements in the amount of \$149,500 for the year 2019 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, and section 9, Economic and social affairs, had not been included under the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019. However, the Secretariat would make efforts to meet those additional requirements within the approved appropriation, including through extrabudgetary funding. Accordingly, the adoption of the draft resolution would not give rise to any budgetary implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019.

97. **Mr. Elkhishin** (Egypt), making a general statement on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that poverty remained the primary obstacle and biggest challenge hindering efforts towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, and its eradication was the most urgent challenge for developing countries to address. Regrettably, three years into the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, poverty eradication, especially in rural areas, remained a serious problem, as nearly 80 per cent of the world's extreme poor lived in rural areas. By contrast to those living in non-rural areas, the rural population faced many special difficulties relating to, *inter alia*, infrastructure, education, health, health care, financial services and social security. The increasing frequency of natural

disasters and extreme climate change had made rural poverty reduction all the more serious to address, as the rural population could not be left behind.

98. The Group had submitted the draft resolution to promote the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, had always taken an open and transparent approach when participating in consultations, and was committed to forging consensus on the important issue of rural poverty reduction. Regrettably, however, over the past rounds of informal consultations, consensus had seemed elusive. In the revised draft, the Group had taken on board, to the greatest possible extent, the substantive amendments from its partners, and hoped that all delegations could vote in favour of the draft resolution.

99. Going forward, the Group of 77 and China stood ready to continue its engagement and dialogue on rural poverty eradication with all delegations and to work jointly to respond to common challenges facing humanity.

100. **The Chair** said that Azerbaijan wished to join the sponsors. A recorded vote had been requested.

101. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and, in addition, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the largest segment of the world's poor were people living in rural areas. Many of the rural poor were family farmers, subsistence producers or landless agricultural workers with limited access to productive means. Eradicating rural poverty was indeed an integral part of the Committee's work towards the objective in the 2030 Agenda to leave no one behind and to reach the furthest behind first, and as the representative of Egypt, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, had indicated, more should be done to improve the lives of the rural poor; however, the manner in which the issue was being introduced in the Committee was disappointing.

102. Despite the fact that the draft resolution had been submitted on very short notice, the European Union and its member States had engaged constructively throughout the informal consultations, and had, from the beginning, clearly laid out principles of engagement, which had been shared by sponsors after explanations of vote. On the matter of consensus, the European Union and its member States had made it clear that, instead of pursuing national interests, the issue should be addressed in a way that enabled all to rally behind the common goal of improving the lives of people in rural areas. On the matter of revitalization, the European

Union and its member States had stated that any deliberations on the topic must be in line with the revitalization process that had been agreed to by all, including the decision that there should be no additional programme budget implications, and no duplication of existing processes, which would only divert resources and energy.

103. Turning to the issue of substance, she said that the European Union and its member States had expressed the view that any discussion on rural poverty must not undermine, renegotiate or involve cherry-picking from the 2030 Agenda or be based on national concepts. On the basis of those principles, various proposals had been made on ways to take the issue forward and find a compromise enabling all delegations to join the consensus. Those proposals had included highlighting the challenges of rural poverty in the already existing resolution on the implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty, or agreeing on a short procedural resolution during the current session and setting up a constructive process to prepare for a more substantive discussion during the seventy-fourth session. Those offers had been reiterated in all informal consultations, and the principles for engagement set out by the European Union and its member States had been shared transparently with all delegations.

104. Regrettably, those efforts to reach a consensus had been ignored, and the Committee was faced with a draft resolution that was the opposite of all the principles she had just outlined, especially that of not undermining the revitalization of the Committee's work. The European Union and its member States would therefore vote against the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States remained committed to fighting poverty in all its forms and dimensions. It was the biggest provider of development assistance worldwide, and invested those resources in accordance with the development effectiveness principles of country ownership, sustainability, transparency, multi-stakeholder partnerships and mutual accountability. It remained open to substantive discussions on how to improve the lives of people in rural areas, which should be guided by a rights-based approach to development cooperation, encompassing all human rights. The aim should be to promote inclusion and participation, non-discrimination, equality and equity, transparency and accountability. The European Union and its member States would continue to play a key role in ensuring that no one was left behind, regardless of where people lived and of their ethnicity, gender, age, disability, religion, beliefs or other factors. That included addressing the multiple forms of discrimination faced by people in

vulnerable and marginalized situations, especially in rural areas.

105. **Mr. Kimmel** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States aligned itself with the statement just made on behalf of the European Union and its member States. The United States was a leader in efforts towards alleviating and eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions. The largest provider of official development assistance (ODA), it had delivered over \$34.7 billion in ODA around the world in 2017, of which 42 per cent had gone to countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South and Central Asia and to small island developing States. In addition, the people of the United States had built strong bonds with people in developing countries over many decades, working together to improve their daily lives at the grass-roots level.

106. The United States, together with many other leading donor countries, would be voting against the draft resolution because it undermined the international community's good work to eradicate poverty, both as a result of serious process considerations and because of its content. It was regrettable that, despite his delegation's clear communication of possibilities for reaching common ground that would allow for consensus, the drafters of the text had chosen to move forward unilaterally. He urged all Member States to vote against the draft resolution and to seek out consensus in order to drive truly sustainable development.

107. The draft resolution wasted United Nations resources. At a time when Member States had agreed to make the Organization work more efficiently and effectively, as set out in resolution [72/313](#) on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#) created a duplicative mandate which, in the years to come, would inflate an already bloated General Assembly agenda and suck precious resources away from the Organization's important work to benefit those most in need. In addition, the draft resolution sought to advance a single Member State's domestic policy, to the detriment of the wider anti-poverty agenda of the United Nations. As his delegation had explained on numerous occasions, one issue of particular concern for many was the incorporation of language meant to target a domestic political audience into multilateral documents. None of the Committee members should support that blatant misuse of United Nations resolutions and documents.

108. His delegation was concerned over the bad faith with which the draft resolution had been presented: the fifteenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 3, 5 and 14 reflected domestic slogans, policy messages and

priorities but the drafter of the text misleadingly claimed that the language had been drawn from multilateral agreements. Rather, the language reflected a set of policies that included forced relocations, internment camps for the “political re-education” of ethnic and religious minorities and destructive environmental and labour practices. That was no way to frame discussion in the General Assembly, and could only undermine truly sustainable development. Accordingly, his delegation rejected such content, particularly since those policies would not contribute to the long-term economic health and sustainable development of developing countries or the eradication of rural poverty.

109. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany,

Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Turkey.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 49, with 2 abstentions.*

111. **Mr. Xu Zhongsheng** (China), making a general statement after the voting, said that China supported the statement that Egypt had made on behalf of the Group of 77 and his country before the voting. He also took note of the explanations given on behalf of the European Union and its member States and by the United States of America. The draft resolution was important to the Group of 77 and China, as it underscored the important matters of basic infrastructure and the elimination of the digital divide in the use of information and communications technologies, inclusive finance and financial and social security, as well as the empowerment of women and girls. China hoped that the international community could reach consensus on the eradication of rural poverty, and advance implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which was now in its third year. It also hoped that the international community would move away from empty rhetoric and take action in order to ensure that achievements towards the eradication of rural poverty were more visible and substantive, and in order to bring genuine benefits to those who were left behind, alleviating their predicament and suffering.

**(a) Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027) (continued) (A/C.2/73/L.9/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.62)**

*Draft resolution on the implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027) (A/C.2/73/L.9/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.62)*

112. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document A/C.2/73/L.62, which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement she had made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address



the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the thirty-sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 42 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

113. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.62](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. Document [A/C.2/73/L.9/Rev.1](#) contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

114. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

115. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.62 were rejected by 110 votes to 45, with 12 abstentions.*

116. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.*

## **Agenda item 25: Operational activities for development (continued)**

### **(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (continued)** ([A/C.2/73/L.8/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.64](#))

*Draft resolution on operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/73/L.8/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.64)*

117. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.64](#), and reiterated strong support for the Secretary-General's ambitious reform process and its aim of making the United Nations better able to meet the challenges of the day. She said that the amendments had been explained in detail in the statement she had made at the beginning of the meeting: In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision



of the 2030 Agenda, the wording of paragraph 6 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

118. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.64](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. Document [A/C.2/73/L.8/Rev.1](#) contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

119. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian

Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

120. *The amendments proposed in document [A/C.2/73/L.64](#) were rejected by 107 votes to 45, with 12 abstentions.*

121. **Ms. Velichko** (Belarus), making a general statement before the decision, said that her country had always been a reliable partner of organizations involved in United Nations operational activities for development and firmly believed that the Organization's development assistance resources should be used as effectively as possible. In that context, her delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.8/Rev.1](#), which reflected such important provisions as the need to ensure full achievement of efficiency gains from the repositioning of the United Nations development system and the need for the relevant organizations of the United Nations system to ensure that no country was left behind.

122. While the draft resolution was of a procedural nature, it regrettably remained as unbalanced as in the previous year. For its part, her delegation had participated both actively and constructively in the negotiations on the draft resolution and had proposed wording about the basic principles of operational activities, without which they could not exist. Belarus had also considered that proposal to be procedural, since the main principles governing the functioning of operational activities had already been agreed by all Member States and there was no need to change the existing wording. Rather, the matter primarily under discussion was the principle that operational activities for development should be undertaken in line with national development priorities. Unfortunately, the language proposed by Belarus in that regard was not included in the draft resolution, despite the flexibility shown by her delegation with respect to every single proposal made by the other delegations.

123. Her delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution. However, a negotiating process that undermined the value of agreement by consensus and the principle of multilateralism could hardly be called transparent or neutral.

124. Accordingly, Belarus reserved the right to implement the draft resolution in full compliance with the principle of national ownership.

125. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**(b) South-South cooperation for development**  
(continued) (A/C.2/73/L.22/Rev.1 and  
A/C.2/73/L.65)

*Draft resolution on South-South cooperation*  
(A/C.2/73/L.22/Rev.1) and proposed amendments  
(A/C.2/73/L.65)

126. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, introduced proposed amendments to the draft resolution, as contained in document A/C.2/73/L.65, which, she said, had been explained in detail in the statement she had made at the beginning of the meeting. In order to address the concern that paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not correctly reflected in the draft resolution, which created a risk of rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, and the wording of paragraph 4 should be replaced by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

127. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would take a decision on the amendments contained in document A/C.2/73/L.65 before taking action on the draft resolution. Document A/C.2/73/L.65 contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

128. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia,

Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

129. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.65 were rejected by 110 votes to 45, with 11 abstentions.*

130. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.22/Rev.1. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

131. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted.*

### **Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly**

132. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to the process of reviewing the Committee's agenda and working methods, which had begun during the seventieth session of the General Assembly in 2016, and had culminated in a report by the Chair of the Committee at that time. He said that although no formal outcome had emerged from that process, broad agreement had nevertheless been reached on a number of points, particularly relating to working methods. Since that seventieth session, a number of steps had been taken to improve the Committee's working methods, and since his election as Chair in June 2018, he had been working with the other members of the Bureau to continue implementing a number of measures, including initiating the preparations for the session and early agreement on a programme of work; reducing the number of side events; compressing the general discussions of all items in the first three weeks of the session; and strictly adhering to and implementing time limits. Those measures had freed up time to concentrate on informal consultations on the draft resolutions before the Committee. In addition, the Bureau had worked diligently to identify facilitators in a timely manner, and had organized a comprehensive schedule of informal consultations on all the draft resolutions, which he believed had increased the predictability and transparency of the informal consultations and could be repeated in future sessions.

133. On the basis of discussions in the Bureau and in consultation with Member States, the Committee had set realistic deadlines for the submission of draft resolutions, including staggered deadlines for those falling under item 20, under which 16 of the 40 draft proposals before the Committee had been issued. All draft resolutions had been submitted in accordance with the agreed deadlines. In many cases, advance, unedited versions of draft resolutions had been made available before issuance of "L" documents in all languages, which had facilitated early consideration of the drafts.

134. The anticipated conclusion of the Committee's work, on Monday, 3 December, after being granted only one extension by the plenary, was one of the Committee's earliest concluding dates in recent history. That was no small accomplishment given its late starting date of 8 October, allowing only eight weeks in total for the Committee to meet. It was thanks in great part to the flexibility, good faith and commitment of all delegations that that had been possible. While negotiations had been challenging, it seemed that overall a positive and

collegial atmosphere had prevailed among delegations during the current session, both in the formal meetings and during the long hours of informal consultations. He thanked all Member States for their constructive participation and the facilitators for their dedication and efforts in pursuing agreement on the draft resolutions. It seemed that a large majority of the 39 draft resolutions expected to be adopted would be adopted by consensus. In that regard, he underscored the importance of efforts to preserve the Committee's traditional practice of adopting the large majority of proposals before it by consensus. The failure to find a formulation acceptable to all delegations of the paragraphs in many draft resolutions referring to the nature of the 2030 Agenda was regrettable; he hoped that that matter could be resolved going forward.

135. He referred Committee members to paragraph 31 of General Assembly resolution [72/313](#), which stated: "Requests the President of the General Assembly at its seventy-third session to identify proposals, through consultations with all Member States and the President of the Economic and Social Council, as well as through the convening of the General Committee, aimed at addressing gaps and duplication in the agenda of the Assembly as they relate to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, taking into account the report on the strategic alignment of future sessions of the Assembly and other relevant inputs, for the consideration of Member States during the seventy-third session of the Assembly".

136. Since the intensive nature of the Committee's work during the main session had left no time to discuss revitalization in any way or in any detail, he intended to convene a number of informal meetings of the Committee in early 2019 in order to discuss lessons learned and ways in which the Committee's work could be improved. He hoped that those informal meetings would enable a frank exchange of experiences and views and an open discussion with a view to reaching a more consensual agenda in the Committee. As a basis for that work, and in order to prepare the discussion, the Bureau could prepare a conference room paper to be circulated in advance. Those informal meetings would not produce a formal outcome. Rather, the Chair would prepare a summary of discussions to be shared with the incoming Chair and Bureau of the Committee for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, and, as appropriate, with the co-facilitators appointed by the President of the General Assembly on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly. Those informal consultations would probably be convened in February.

137. He took it that Committee members were in agreement with his proposal to organize informal

meetings in early 2019 in order to discuss revitalization of the work of the Committee.

138. *It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12:40 p.m.*