



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General
4 February 2019

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 27th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 3 December 2018, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Ms. Alateibi (Vice-Chair) (United Arab Emirates)
later: Mr. Braquetti (Vice-Chair) (Monaco)
later: Mr. Remaoun (Vice-Chair) (Algeria)

Contents

Statement by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China

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

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

- (c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)
- (d) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)
- (c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)
- (g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (*continued*)
- (i) Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (*continued*)

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

- (b) Industrial development cooperation (*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), 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 25: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 26: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 27: Towards global partnerships (*continued*)

Statement by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 137: Programme planning

Organization of work

In the absence of Mr. Skinner-Kl e Arenales (Guatemala), Ms. Alateibi (United Arab Emirates), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

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

Statement by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China

1. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, during the current session, the Group of 77 and China had engaged constructively and in good faith throughout the negotiations with a view to achieving consensus on actions needed to address global economic and development challenges. The Group had considered all proposals suggested by its partners on the basis of their relevance to the issue before the Committee, even accepting proposals that were in opposition to its preferred positions when it was necessary and desirable to guarantee a consensus and chart a positive way forward. Throughout the session, the Group had upheld its obligations to preserve the Committee's work and established working methods. It had shown flexibility in considering new proposals made by partners, engaged on different language despite late submission, maintained communication channels during informal and offline discussions, refrained as much as possible from putting forward views during the no-objection period and, most importantly, accepted proposals to revert to agreed language when consensus on new language could not be reached.

2. Efforts to draft and negotiate Second Committee resolutions were not an end in themselves; they served an objective and had to be taken in cumulative perspective. It must not be forgotten that the Committee's mission was to strengthen and promote international cooperation. Member States should build on what had been previously agreed on. Unfortunately, during the negotiations, the Group had noticed attempts to rescind text to which Member States had recently subscribed. In order for the Committee and the United Nations to pursue their mission, they should focus on providing and strengthening the means to implement what they had agreed upon instead of renegotiating it. That was the only way Member States would collectively achieve their overarching goals and commitments.

3. In that regard, the purpose of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the many other relevant international instruments recently adopted was

to ensure inclusiveness for the achievement of ambitious goals at the international, regional and national levels in order to leave no country and no one behind.

4. The concepts of leaving no country and leaving no one behind were complementary to each other and by no means contradictory or mutually exclusive. Countries, which were entrusted to formulate policies, enforce laws and create an enabling environment to guarantee that the implementation of the 2030 Agenda was inclusive, must be properly assisted to ensure that no individual among their citizens was left behind. Otherwise, the ideal of leaving no one behind would face considerable challenges.

5. The Group would lend its strong support and continued engagement to efforts aimed at improving the Committee's work. It was committed to multilateralism and would continue making every effort to safeguard consensus on actions needed to transform the world into a prosperous one for present and future generations.

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

6. **Mr. Charwath** (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 the European Union and its member States were concerned that, although a solemn commitment to leave no one behind had been made by all leaders with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda in 2015, there had been a gradual and subtle movement since the seventieth session of the General Assembly towards a State-focused concept of development rather than an individual-focused one, marking a shift away from the universal approach epitomized by the Sustainable Development Goals. While the European Union and its member States fully accepted the notion of leaving no country behind as contained in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and completely supported the ambition of the 2030 Agenda that Goals and targets be met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, it believed that the language introduced in an imperfect compromise in 2017 did not accurately reflect either of those Agendas. The European Union could not accept a gradual reinterpretation of a concept underwritten by all the international community's leaders. At a time when they should be focused on fulfilling the important agreements of 2015, Committee members must resist the temptation to constantly seek to rewrite or undermine them.

7. The Second Committee should be a forum of great importance to international development, and yet its potential remained unfulfilled. People's lives and livelihoods were at stake. Every effort should be made to ensure that the Committee was as relevant as possible and to drive implementation of the 2015 agreements rather than becoming trapped in the fruitless act of renegotiating them. In negotiations during the current session, the European Union had consistently proposed alternative language for the relevant preambular and operative paragraphs which was closely based on what world leaders had agreed upon and was firmly faithful to their vision for the 2030 Agenda. The European Union and its member States regretted that those proposals had not been accepted; they regretted even more that fellow negotiators had refused to come to the negotiating table, rebuffing all attempts on the part of the European Union to find a compromise text. To better reflect the 2030 Agenda, he proposed that, in the relevant draft resolutions, the preambular paragraph which misquoted paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda be deleted, and the relevant operative paragraph 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.”

8. At a time when multilateralism and the rules-based international system were under threat, Member States must adhere firmly to the principles agreed to by their leaders in 2015, particularly in view of the forthcoming 2019 leaders' summit on the progress of the 2030 Agenda. The Secretary-General himself had recently written to Group of 20 (G-20) leaders, urging them to do more to fulfil the 2030 Agenda and its central promise to leave no one behind. The European Union sincerely hoped that Member States could find a way for the Second Committee to become a more constructive vehicle for fulfilling that ambition. In conclusion, he stressed that the concerns of the European Union and its member States were related only to the two paragraphs he had mentioned.

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

(c) External debt sustainability and development *(continued)* (A/C.2/73/L.11 and A/C.2/73/L.50)

Draft resolutions on external debt sustainability and development (A/C.2/73/L.11 and A/C.2/73/L.50)

9. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.50](#) 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.11](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

10. **Mr. Gimenez** (Norway), facilitator, expressing his appreciation to all delegations for their constructive engagement, said that although consensus had been reached on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.50](#), the difficult substantive discussions that had led to it testified to the importance attached to that issue by all delegations. There had also been a shared sense of urgency to act in order to prevent and resolve unsustainable debt situations, bearing in mind the recent lessons learned regarding accumulated debt distress. Those efforts were in line with Member States' commitments to work towards long-term debt sustainability under the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, as well as other relevant outcome documents.

11. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.50](#) was adopted.*

12. **Mr. Kimmel** (United States of America) said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to clarify important points in the hope that the Second Committee could do better the next time the agenda item was considered. His delegation was concerned that, as it stood, the draft resolution did not sufficiently and accurately address issues such as debt sustainability and transparency.

13. With regard to the references to non-cooperative minority bondholders, his delegation noted that those bondholders' ability to obstruct a deal was permitted by law in the covenants agreed on by the issuer. Thus, it was outside the scope of a United Nations resolution to express concern about the enforceability of contracts. With regard to the references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, the Paris Agreement and the characterization of trade and technology transfer, his delegation had addressed its concerns in its general statement delivered on 8 November 2018.

14. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.11](#) was withdrawn.*

(d) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.57)

Draft resolution on the promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development (A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.57)

15. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#), submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. She drew the attention of the Committee to the amendments to draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) proposed in document [A/C.2/73/L.57](#), submitted by Austria on behalf of the States members of the European Union. Document [A/C.2/73/L.57](#) contained no programme budget implications.

16. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), introducing the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.57](#) on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 10 of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda. To address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, he proposed deleting the final preambular paragraph and replacing paragraph 10 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”.

17. **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 proposed in document [A/C.2/73/L.57](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

18. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, 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.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Turkey.

19. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.3/73/L.57 were rejected by 121 votes to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

20. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), making a general statement after the voting on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States had voted in favour of the

proposed amendment, which had been intended to revert the text to the people-centred, universal approach of the 2030 Agenda. He thanked all the delegations that had supported the amendments while regretting that consensus could not be found. The European Union and its member States were ready to engage in consultations on that issue in 2019 with a view to finding agreement prior to the seventy-fourth session.

21. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

22. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

23. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) and reconfirmed their commitment to combating illicit financial flows. While they had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, they wished to express their concern regarding the process that had led to its outcome. The European Union and its members States regretted that some of their partners had not engaged in negotiations at an earlier stage and that the Committee had once again ended up with a facilitator's text. While recognizing the importance of illicit financial flows, the European Union and its member States recalled that there was no agreed international definition of them. The Second Committee should not attempt to define them; that work should continue to be carried out by experts in relevant forums.

24. Moreover, the European Union and its member States supported the call for strengthening good practices on assets return, as they contributed to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and, particularly, target 4 of Goal 16, while at the same time fully respecting existing legal instruments in the field, including the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, which had a specialized mandate for fostering asset return. However, since illicit financial flows covered a much broader variety of phenomena than asset return, the focus should not be narrowed or limited to the latter. The European Union and its member States regretted the late introduction of the phrase "assets return" in several places in the draft resolution and in the title, which did not reflect all the issues contained in the text. It was also regrettable that the many suggestions by Member States to address those issues had not been taken into consideration during the negotiations. The European Union and its member States hoped for cooperation in tackling the matter in 2019.

25. The European Union and its member States also wished to stress the importance of coordinating with and recognizing the important work of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), which had recently addressed the issue of virtual assets. It was regrettable that some Member States had viewed the inclusion of FATF standards as problematic and that the reference to it had been omitted from the facilitator's text in order to achieve consensus. He reiterated the commitment of the European Union and its members States to revitalizing the work of the General Assembly in full support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. While the European Union and its member States were firmly committed to combating illicit financial flows, they were convinced that a draft resolution on that issue was a clear candidate for biennialization, as several issues covered in the draft resolution were taken up by the Third Committee on a biennial basis.

26. **Ms. Palazzo** (United States of America) said that combating money laundering, corruption and other related crimes was essential to the international community's common security and economic prosperity, and her delegation appreciated the opportunity to address those threats. However, it had serious concerns about the language used in the draft resolution, which, in its view, undermined the Committee's ability to cooperate constructively to address those challenges. Perhaps, most importantly, in the draft resolution, the General Assembly failed to adequately acknowledge the United Nations Convention against Corruption as the primary global legal framework for combating corruption and recovering stolen assets in the United Nations system. Unfortunately, by considering the draft resolution, the General Assembly had undermined the ability of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention to lead that global conversation on the basis of common legal obligations and the input of national law enforcement experts. The Conference of the States Parties to the Convention – where those experts were present – was the appropriate venue for the consideration of such issues. Moreover, the discussions regarding the draft resolution were attempts to undermine or sideline the Convention and the commitments States parties had made under it to effectively address corruption. Her delegation encouraged Member States to reconsider allowing the discussion on illicit financial flows to take place in the Committee and instead focus their efforts on preventing and prosecuting corruption by means of the Convention.

27. While the United States acknowledged that the term "illicit financial flows" had been used in prior General Assembly resolutions, it generally opposed

inclusion of a term which had no agreed-upon international definition. In the absence of any common understanding of what constituted illicit financial flows, it was important to be clearer about the specific, underlying illegal activities that produced or contributed to that threat, including embezzlement, bribery and money laundering, among others. Her delegation also disagreed with the implication in the draft resolution that developing countries were more affected by illicit financial flows than developed countries, many of which had significant financial sectors that could be adversely affected by criminal activity.

28. In that regard, all Member States should focus more on domestic measures they could take to prevent, investigate and prosecute the underlying acts of corruption and other crimes that led to the generation of illicit proceeds, as well as measures that encouraged transparency and accountability in the use of recovered assets to ensure they benefited those harmed by acts of corruption. The draft resolution did not achieve that objective and, instead, placed an extreme focus on asset return or disposition to the detriment of other critical steps in the asset recovery process which were just as important to efforts to combat corruption. While the eventual return or disposition of stolen assets to requesting States, prior legitimate owners and crime victims was a key goal of asset recovery under the Convention, it was only one part of the equation. Equal attention and resources must be devoted to establishing competent domestic legal and regulatory frameworks and institutions necessary to facilitate the proper detection and investigation of criminal proceeds and their freezing, seizure and confiscation.

29. By focusing almost exclusively on the return of assets and not acknowledging those equally integral components of the process, the draft resolution undermined the balanced approach reflected by the Convention, which was necessary for countries to successfully recover stolen assets. Furthermore, the United States did not believe that asset recovery was a tool of sustainable development. While those issues might be linked in some cases, the draft resolution implied that they must necessarily be connected. Asset recovery traditionally served a number of purposes, law enforcement and fighting impunity being the most prominent.

30. Her delegation referred the Committee to its 8 November 2018 statement pertaining to its concerns about the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and trade. In addition, the United States and Japan wished to make a joint statement stressing the importance of coordination with and recognition of the important work of the Financial Action Task Force.

Given that FATF had recently addressed the issue of virtual assets, it was unacceptable that those developments were not addressed in draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) The United States and Japan were disappointed that certain Member States viewed the inclusion of FATF standards as problematic and viewed that intransigence as an effort to undermine that body's work. Given that most countries belonged to FATF or a similar regional body, such intransigence was particularly puzzling.

31. **Mr. Bolaji** (Nigeria) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution just adopted. Ongoing efforts to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen asset return were in line with the 2030 Agenda and target 4 of Sustainable Development Goal 16. Unless international cooperation was strengthened, Member States' efforts would not yield much success and the 2030 Agenda might not be properly implemented. His delegation had supported the draft resolution in view of its relevance to addressing international challenges related to illicit financial flows, and particularly the difficulty associated with the timely recovery and return of identified illicit assets to their countries of origin.

32. International cooperation in combating illicit financial flows was arguably a work in progress that must continue to be pursued by all Member States. However, Nigeria had noted the challenge associated with the deliberate denial of the definition of the term "illicit financial flows" and its various components during the negotiation process. Like many other subjects of discussion at the United Nations, the term did not yet have an agreed definition of illicit financial flows. However, it was generally used to refer to cross-border movements of money streaming from corrupt practices, criminal activities and fraudulent commercial activities that was illegally transferred and/or utilized.

33. To resolve some of the issues that had arisen during the negotiation process, his delegation looked forward to the convening, in a timely manner, of the requested high-level meeting of the General Assembly to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen asset return to foster sustainable development and, pending a decision on the date of the high-level meeting, encouraged all delegations to prepare adequately and stand ready to constructively engage. The text the Committee had just adopted was a substantial improvement over the previous year's resolution on the issue. As the coordinator of the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, Nigeria had constructively participated in the negotiations in a spirit of utmost flexibility. Regrettably, after more than six rounds of intense informal consultations, consensus had

seemed elusive. His delegation thanked all the delegations that had stood behind draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.19/Rev.1](#) and supported its evolution as an annual process on the agenda of the Second Committee in the macroeconomic cluster. It was the reference to FATF, an organization that did not enjoy universal membership, in paragraph 8, and the refusal to add a qualifier after it in a show of flexibility that had made it difficult for Nigeria to support inclusion of that body's name in the draft resolution. Nigeria looked forward to engaging more constructively in future.

34. **Mr. Sparber** (Liechtenstein) said that his country had a long-standing commitment to preventing and combating illicit financial flows and had made consistent and substantive efforts, both politically and financially, to fight such flows in line with its obligations under international law, in particular the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

35. His delegation had also engaged constructively in intense negotiations leading to the adoption of the draft resolution, stressing throughout that it was imperative that the draft resolution be consistent with the existing legal framework, most importantly the Convention against Corruption, and for it not to undermine internationally agreed documents, including the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. It had been a disappointment to witness, once again, attempts to that effect. Lack of transparency in the negotiation process, in particular failure to disclose sources of language proposals and attempts to alter agreed language, had unnecessarily prolonged negotiations and undermined the assumption of good faith, a necessary condition for any constructive multilateral negotiation.

36. Throughout the negotiations, Liechtenstein had continuously underscored that illicit financial flows were not limited to stolen assets, but could also encompass proceeds stemming from organized crime, trade misinvoicing or undeclared offshore wealth. It was deeply regrettable therefore that the title of the draft resolution had been amended to link the concept of illicit financial flows to that of asset recovery, creating deliberate confusion over a topic that was carefully addressed in the relevant provisions of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Liechtenstein was fully committed to implementing its legal obligations under the near-universal Convention and would not recognize any interpretation of its provisions on the basis of the draft resolution.

37. Furthermore, Liechtenstein acknowledged the potential of virtual assets, including cryptocurrencies, to spur financial innovation and efficiency and to improve financial inclusion as a contribution to sustainable

development. It was therefore regrettable that the draft resolution included only a negative assessment of virtual assets, limited to their risks and challenges.

38. In procedural terms, Liechtenstein regretted that despite the many hours of negotiations and best efforts of the facilitator to accommodate the concerns of all delegations, consensus could not be reached. The approach chosen by the proponents of the draft resolution had led to a suboptimal result, deepening the divide among States on a question on which they should be united; improved international cooperation was therefore essential. Such divisions could put collective efforts to fight illicit financial flows at risk.

39. The negotiation process and its outcome had once again proven that the Committee should consider the biennialization of the draft resolution. That could enable further development of the draft resolution based on the resolutions and decisions of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Convention's biennial authoritative policymaking body. It would also enable the Committee to take into account relevant developments in the field as reflected in the biennial resolution of the Third Committee entitled "Preventing and combating corrupt practices and the transfer of the proceeds of corruption, facilitating asset recovery and returning such assets to legitimate owners, in particular to countries of origin, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption". Such an approach would lead to greater efficiency within and coherence between relevant United Nations bodies.

40. **Ms. Han** Minyoung (Republic of Korea) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, which exemplified a spirit of cooperation and compromise. Based on her country's experience as an active member of the Financial Action Task Force, and in light of rapid changes in the international financial market, including developments related to virtual assets, new efforts to combat illicit financial flows, money laundering and terrorism financing should be duly reflected in future draft resolutions to ensure the continued relevance of those resolutions to the evolving realities of the international financial market.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (continued)**(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (continued)**
(A/C.2/73/L.14 and A/C.2/73/L.53)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (A/C.2/73/L.14 and A/C.2/73/L.53)

41. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.53](#), 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.14](#).

42. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that under the terms of paragraph 35 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, by 2020 and within existing resources, to ensure the allocation of adequate resources required to respond to the expanding mandates in support of the sustainable development agenda of the small island developing States, and looked forward to the update by the Secretary-General on the repositioning of the United Nations development system and the alignment of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs with the 2030 Agenda.

43. The resources in support of the sustainable development agenda of the small island developing States would be assessed in the context of the preparation of the forthcoming proposed programme budget for the year 2020.

44. She drew the attention of the Committee 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 [70/247](#) of 23 December 2015, in which the General 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 policies in that regard.

45. **Ms. Monteiro** (Cabo Verde), co-facilitator, said that she welcomed the support the co-facilitators had received from all delegations. Their flexibility and spirit of compromise had enabled consensus to be reached.

46. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.53](#) was adopted.*

47. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.14](#) was withdrawn.*

(c) Disaster risk reduction (continued)
(A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.59)

Draft resolutions on an effective global response to address the impacts of the El Niño phenomenon (A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.59)

48. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendments to draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1](#) proposed in document [A/C.2/73/L.59](#). Document [A/C.2/73/L.59](#) contained no programme budget implications.

49. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States were disappointed that stronger and agreed language from other Second Committee draft resolutions on climate change was not included in the text of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1](#), particularly as no Member States had come forward on those paragraphs during the no-objection period. Climate change was highly relevant, as it was likely to magnify the effects of El Niño; tackling it would help to effectively address the impacts of the phenomenon.

50. Moreover, as explained in detail in the statement he had made at the beginning of the meeting, the European Union and its member States were concerned that the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 19 of the draft resolution did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the people-centred, universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda. In order to address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph should be deleted and the wording of paragraph 19 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”.

51. **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.59](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

52. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, 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, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Turkey.

53. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.59 were rejected by 117 to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

54. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1](#) contained no programme budget implications.

55. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.6/Rev.1 was adopted.*

56. *Mr. Briquette (Monaco), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.*

(c) Disaster risk reduction (continued)
([A/C.2/73/L.15/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.58](#))

Draft resolution on disaster risk reduction (A/C.2/73/L.15/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.58)

57. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendments to draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.15/Rev.1](#) proposed in document [A/C.2/73/L.58](#). Document [A/C.2/73/L.58](#) contained no programme budget implications.

58. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States were concerned about the twenty-first preambular paragraph and paragraph 44 of the draft resolution, in that they failed to correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the people-centred, universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda.

59. In order to address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the twenty-first preambular paragraph should be deleted and the wording of paragraph 44 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”.

60. **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.58](#) before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

61. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, 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, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, 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, Switzerland, Turkey.

62. *The amendments proposed in [A/C.2/73/L.58](#) were rejected by 121 to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

63. **The Chair** then invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.15/Rev.1](#). The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

64. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Armenia, the Russian Federation and Switzerland wished to join the sponsors.

65. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.15/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

(g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (continued) ([A/C.2/73/L.36](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.49](#))

Draft resolutions on the report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme ([A/C.2/73/L.36](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.49](#))

66. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.49](#), submitted by Mr. Remaoun (Algeria), Vice-Chair, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.36](#). He drew the attention of the Committee to the programme budget implications contained in document [A/C.2/73/L.68](#), which had been submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

67. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that all delegations, including the Russian Federation, had shown flexibility during the consultations on the draft resolution. While his delegation highly valued the work of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), it wished to note that a technical mistake had been made in the programme budget implications contained in document [A/C.3/73/L.68](#). Lengthy discussions had been held with delegations on the extent to which an additional burden should be placed on the regular budget. He was grateful to all delegations and the facilitator for the compromise reached, namely that a combined range of instruments should be considered. The Secretary-General had therefore been requested to submit a relevant proposal on the programme budget or even to propose the establishment of an additional fund. His delegation very much supported UNEP and was surprised by the way in which the negotiating process had been interpreted by the Secretariat in document

[A/C.3/72/L.68](#). Consequently, additional consultations would be needed with delegations and the Secretariat. He therefore requested that action on the current draft resolution be postponed until 5 December 2018.

68. **The Chair** said that if he understood correctly, the proposal by the representative of the Russian Federation was to postpone consideration of the draft resolution until 5 December 2018. He invited delegations to comment on the proposal.

69. **Mr. Remaoun** (Algeria), Vice-Chair, said that he had been under the impression that the current meeting would be the last of the session.

70. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that, unfortunately, the programme budget implications in document [A/C.2/73/L.68](#) did not reflect the agreement reached. While his delegation understood the desire to complete the Committee's work at the current meeting, it also understood that there had been an agreement to extend the Committee's work until 5 December 2018. It should therefore be technically possible to take action on the draft resolution on that date.

71. **The Chair** said that what the representative of the Russian Federation had said was correct and was technically possible. However, he wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that if the Committee reconvened on Wednesday, 5 December, that would be an extension of the Committee's work and would entail a significant cost for the use of the interpreters and translators.

72. **Mr. Remaoun** (Algeria), Vice-Chair, said that if the representative of the Russian Federation could make his amendment orally, the Committee could vote on it immediately and there would be no need to extend the session.

73. **Mr. Padilla Durán** (Costa Rica), speaking also on behalf of his co-facilitator, the representative of Estonia, said that he wished to clarify the point related to the agreements made during informal consultations. The commitment set out in the draft resolution, especially in paragraph 9, entailed the need to address a systemic issue brought forward by the United Nations Environment Assembly. The language used to settle the issue had led to the discussion in question because it referred to the Fifth Committee and a process that began with a proposal put forward by the budget office. As he understood it, there was no absolute certainty as to what proposal would be put forward by the budget office, but it seemed that the proposal would be submitted for the consideration of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee, which in turn would decide whether funding

would be accepted, rejected, increased or decreased in a discussion to be held at a later date by the Member States in the appropriate forum. That discussion might even touch on alternative mechanisms should a budget be denied. He wished to clarify that at no time had it been said, at least during informal consultations, that the budget office would produce a list of means of financing beyond what was budgeted, nor had anything specific been said about what its proposal might be; it had simply been said that a proposal by the budget office would be the first step in taking those matters to the Fifth Committee for consideration.

74. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee would only be able to take action on the basis of the draft resolution and the programme budget implications submitted. As those bodies could not make substantive amendments, such an approach would not take into account his delegation's serious concerns that the negotiations held had not been appropriately reflected. In line with the suggestion by the representative of Costa Rica, his delegation wished to propose an oral amendment to paragraph 9 of draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.49](#): the inclusion of the phrase “, including with the United Nations programme budget and voluntary contributions” after the words “as appropriate”.

75. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the wording in the negotiations had been very carefully balanced in the paragraph in question, and to change the wording at such a late stage was very difficult. His delegation would have to coordinate with the other States members of the European Union on the wording.

76. **The Chair** suggested that the adoption of the draft resolution be postponed until the end of the meeting to enable colleagues, groups and the Secretariat to speak with the representative of the Russian Federation and clarify matters.

77. **Mr. Edress** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group would have to consider the proposed change in wording, as it was a new development. He requested a suspension of the meeting before the adoption of the draft resolution to enable the Group to coordinate.

78. **The Chair** said that he hoped postponement of action on the draft resolution until the end of the meeting would serve that purpose. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to his proposal.

79. *It was so decided.*

(i) Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
(continued) (A/C.2/73/L.40/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.60)

Draft resolution on ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (A/C.2/73/L.40/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.60)

80. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.40/Rev.1 proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.60, submitted by Austria on behalf of the European Union and its member States. Document A/C.2/73/L.60 contained no programme budget implications.

81. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, as explained in detail in the statement he had made at the beginning of the meeting, the European Union and its member States were concerned that the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 28 of the draft resolution did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the people-centred, universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda. In order to address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph should be deleted and the wording of paragraph 28 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”.

82. **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 proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.60 before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

83. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, 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.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Turkey.

84. *The amendments proposed in A/C.2/73/L.60 were rejected by 122 votes to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

85. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.40/Rev.1 contained no programme budget implications.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.*

87. **Mr. Chumakov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had demonstrated flexibility during the negotiations but nonetheless wished to make a statement and would be speaking also on behalf of Algeria and Turkey. The Russian Federation, Algeria and Turkey had supported the draft resolution. However, they were disappointed that its text fell short of recognizing the role of different energy resources in a balanced manner. The International Energy Agency and other specialized organizations had clearly indicated that despite the significance of renewable energy resources, fossil fuels would continue to account for 70 per cent of the global energy mix, even in 2040. In order to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 7, the effective application of clean energy technologies in the utilization of fossil fuels would have to be considered, as would a balanced form of exploitation of all energy resources, including coal, oil, natural gas and nuclear energy, in a clean, safe and sustainable manner. That would send the right signal to both Governments and investors and contribute to the modernization of the energy sector and efforts to combat climate change. The Committee should accurately reflect the objective reality in the global energy sector and strive to ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all in the context of poverty eradication as the utmost priority.

88. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution based on its traditional support for the Group of 77 and China. However, in keeping with its position regarding the “The future we want” and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Venezuela could not support the references in the draft resolution to the Sustainable Energy for All initiative of the Secretary-General, which had been created without the mandate of States and had not been conducted through a proper process of consultation and approval by Member States. Similarly, the initiative had ignored the negotiation process conducted by Governments on those topics and had proposed strategies that were at odds with sovereignty and could lead to market distortions that created barriers to the sale of oil and petroleum products.

89. Her delegation had reservations regarding the references to a modern energy system, which implied the use of new technologies without the required evaluation of their application and of technology development priorities in a national context. In addition, as stated upon the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, and consistent with both the outcome document of the third International Conference on Financing for Development and the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of

Venezuela, any reference to the elimination of subsidies for fossil fuels interfered with the public policies of the Sustainable State. Venezuela also rejected the reference to low-carbon economies. She reiterated that Venezuela would not accept any type of evaluation, monitoring, reporting or review of its national energy policies, or any measures that implied any infringement of national sovereignty. Furthermore, the paragraph encouraging that departed from and made substantive changes to the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Development.

90. **Ms. Maniscalco** (United States of America) said that her country recognized the importance of access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy. However, the United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions and was exceeding its mandate in calling for Governments to engage in technology transfer that was not conducted voluntarily and on mutually agreed terms. The United States wished to reaffirm that strong protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights helped to incentivize the innovation that was needed in order to address health, environmental and development challenges.

91. In accordance with its long-standing posture, the United States did not support the references to technology transfer in the seventeenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 20 of the draft resolution and continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. The United States did not support language that promoted technology transfer that was not conducted on mutually agreed terms and voluntarily and it underscored that such language would have no standing in future negotiations. United Nations resolutions were not the appropriate vehicle for pronouncements of that kind; such language was an attempt to prejudice current or anticipated negotiations in other, more appropriate forums.

92. She referred the Committee to the statement delivered on 8 November 2018 in which her delegation had addressed its concerns about the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and trade.

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

(b) Industrial development cooperation
(*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.10/Rev.1 and
A/C.2/73/L.63)

Draft resolution on industrial development cooperation (A/C.2/73/L.10/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.63)

93. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.10/Rev.1 proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.63, which contained no programme budget implications.

94. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), introducing the proposed amendments on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, as explained in detail in the statement he had made at the beginning of the meeting, the European Union and its member States were concerned that the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 39 of the draft resolution did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda.

95. To address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, he proposed deleting the final preambular paragraph and replacing paragraph 39 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”.

96. The facilitator’s proposal following the conclusion of the negotiations and the revised version of that proposal had both included the proposed language. It was regrettable that the final draft did not reflect what the facilitator had considered to be a balanced compromise.

97. **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 A/C.2/73/L.63 before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

98. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, 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.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Turkey.

99. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.63 were rejected by 120 votes to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

100. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.10/Rev.1](#), which contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

101. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, 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, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, 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, 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, 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.

102. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.10/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 177 votes to 1.*

103. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his country had withdrawn from the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in 1996, having concluded that it lacked a clear purpose and was generally ineffective.

104. As indicated in its general statement delivered on 8 November 2018, his delegation was of the view of that the United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other institutions and processes, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including the World Trade Organization (WTO). The United Nations was not the appropriate venue for those discussions, and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions taken by the General Assembly on those issues, including calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as for technology transfer that was not conducted voluntarily and on mutually agreed terms.

105. His delegation had addressed its concerns about the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the New Urban Agenda, the Paris Agreement, climate change, and inclusive economic growth and industrial development in its general statement delivered on 8 November 2018.

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

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*) ([A/C.2/73/L.54](#))

Draft decision on draft provisional rules of procedure and provisional agenda of the second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation ([A/C.2/73/L.54](#))

106. *Mr. Remaoun (Algeria), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.*

107. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft decision [A/C.2/73/L.54](#) contained no programme budget implications.

108. *Draft decision [A/C.2/73/L.54](#) was adopted.*

Agenda item 26: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)
(A/C.2/73/L.7/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.66)

Draft resolution on agriculture development, food security and nutrition (A/C.2/73/L.7/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.66)

109. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.7/Rev.1 proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.66, which contained no programme budget implications.

110. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), introducing the proposed amendments on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, as explained in detail in the statement he had made at the beginning of the meeting, the European Union and its member States were concerned that the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 41 of the draft resolution did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked rewriting the people-centred universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda.

111. To address that concern, and to bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the final preambular paragraph should be deleted and paragraph 41 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”.

112. **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.66 before taking action on the draft resolution. A recorded vote had been requested.

113. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, 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, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, 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, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, 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, 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.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Turkey.

114. *The amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.66 were rejected by 119 votes to 44, with 8 abstentions.*

115. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.7/Rev.1, which contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

116. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain,

Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, 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, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, 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, 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, Turkmenistan, 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.

117. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted by 180 votes to 1.*

118. **Mr. Charwath** (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 the European Union and its member States had voted in favour of the draft resolution. While they regretted that their proposals on the people-centred approach to development and the "leave no one behind" provision of the 2030 Agenda had not been included in the text, they welcomed the improvements in the draft resolution and looked forward to further improving its substance during the seventy-fourth session.

119. The European Union and its member States attached the utmost importance to the development and strengthening of a multilateral trading system centred around WTO that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based. To that end, they fully supported the trade-related language in the draft resolution just adopted.

120. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States remained committed to promoting agricultural development, food security and nutrition worldwide. Indeed, his country was the single largest bilateral donor to programmes aimed at reducing hunger and promoting global food security. However, the draft resolution went beyond addressing those needs and far exceeded the appropriate role of the General Assembly.

121. The United States supported the universal right of everyone to an adequate standard of living, including food, as recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It pursued domestic policies that promoted access to food, which it also sought to achieve worldwide, but it did not treat the right to food as an enforceable obligation. The United States did not recognize any change in the current state of conventional or customary international law pertaining to food-related rights.

122. The United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Accordingly, it interpreted the references in the draft resolution to the right to food with respect to States parties to that Covenant in the light of its article 2, paragraph 1. The United States also construed the references in the draft resolution to Member State obligations regarding the right to food as applicable only to the extent that States had assumed such obligations.

123. The United States could not support language that sought to shape or otherwise prejudice discussions in independent organizations such as WTO. United

Nations resolutions should not call for increased or improved market access, which required negotiations on tariffs or non-tariff measures and were the purview of WTO. The United States could not accept attempts to reshape the negotiating agenda of WTO by a body external to that organization. Furthermore, language on market access could implicate his country's trade preference programmes, which were the purview of the United States Congress.

124. In addition, the United States was unable to join consensus on the attempt in the draft resolution to prescribe the characteristics of WTO, which was not a matter on which the General Assembly should opine. Nor could the United States support language calling for greater cooperation and coordination between United Nations agencies and international trade organizations. WTO was an independent body and its agenda was set by its members.

125. The United States recognized and supported the desire of Governments to pursue policies that contributed to the food security of their populations, and it believed strongly that to be successful, those policies must be consistent with relevant international rules and obligations. The United States had consistently supported many important goals of Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want and continued to work closely with the African Union and its member States to support agriculture development and improve food security and nutrition. However, his country was concerned about language calling for reducing food imports, which could have a negative impact on food security and might not be consistent with the trade obligations of African members of WTO. He hoped to hold further discussions with the African Union on that matter.

126. He expressed regret that the draft resolution included language on climate change that greatly exceeded the scope of its subject matter, and reiterated the concerns of the United States regarding language on the Paris Agreement and on climate change addressed in its general statement of 8 November 2018. The language on climate change in the draft resolution just adopted was not a precedent for language in other resolutions in the General Assembly or other forums.

127. The United States was also concerned about the stand-alone reference to agroecology in the draft resolution. Focusing on the advancement of agroecological principles should not be seen as preferential to or come at the expense of other practices for producing food safely, sustainably and efficiently.

128. He referred once again to the general statement delivered by his delegation on 8 November 2018, which outlined further concerns in respect of the 2030 Agenda,

the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, technology transfer and trade.

Agenda item 27: Towards global partnerships
(continued) (A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1)

Draft resolution entitled "Towards global partnerships: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners"
(A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1)

129. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1](#) on behalf of the European Union and its member States and the other sponsors listed in the document, said that informal discussions over the past weeks had demonstrated that with open exchange and joint ownership across regions and groups, important steps could be taken towards the common plan of action for – in the words of the 2030 Agenda – people, planet and prosperity. It was encouraging to see that most of the principles guiding partnerships for sustainable development were universally shared.

130. The draft resolution was more than a simple reminder that partnerships were critical to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, as stressed in both the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. It went much further than the 2030 Agenda, with the aim of using partnerships to effectively mobilize the additional human and financial resources, expertise, knowledge and technology that were so urgently needed to achieve the Goals and targets in time.

131. However, the United Nations system, Member States and all involved stakeholders must use their resources wisely by forging partnerships that lasted, that followed a clear strategy, that were focused on clearly defined results, that brought forward new and innovative solutions to well-known challenges and that brought together all necessary stakeholders from the private sector, civil society, including non-governmental and philanthropic organizations, and academia and science.

132. With the draft resolution came a renewed and strengthened focus on long-term, strategic, innovation-based, multi-stakeholder partnerships with the aim of maximizing their impact. Government efforts towards sustainable development should be complemented by making the most of the resources, ingenuity and creativity of the private sector, civil society and the scientific and academic communities.

133. To that end, he reaffirmed the commitment of the European Union and its member States to a principle-based approach to partnerships. Meaningful

partnerships needed to adhere to the principles and values of the United Nations as laid out, inter alia, in the Guidelines on a Principle-based Approach to the Cooperation between the United Nations and the Business Sector, the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework and the ten principles of the United Nations Global Compact.

134. The European Union believed that the international community could and should have gone even further to strengthen the people-centred and human rights-based approach of the 2030 Agenda, also in the context of collaboration with the private sector, civil society and other relevant stakeholders, while acknowledging that results-oriented partnerships should also be consistent with the national development strategies and priorities of the countries where they were implemented. Those were not contradictory propositions, as some seemed to fear, but should go hand in hand.

135. The transparency and accountability of all actors continued to be key to ensuring adherence both to United Nations values and national priorities. The draft resolution addressed the need to better align responsible business practices and regulatory frameworks and incentives with the Goals, while also pursuing an increasingly coherent approach to partnerships throughout the United Nations system.

136. United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes needed to be able to facilitate long-term, strategic, multi-stakeholder partnerships and be fit for the job. The draft resolution therefore recognized that more needed to be done to strengthen the capabilities of the United Nations as a facilitator of multi-stakeholder partnerships at the global, regional and country levels and to strengthen cooperation and coordination throughout the United Nations. He expressed appreciation for the active and constructive engagement of all delegations participating in the discussions on the draft resolution and the hope that it would be met with broad support

137. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1](#) contained no programme budget implications.

138. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Armenia, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and San Marino had become sponsors of the draft resolution. She then noted that Australia, Guinea, Guyana, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Monaco, Morocco, Switzerland and Togo also wished to join the sponsors.

139. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.32/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

Statement by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

140. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), making a general statement, said that she wished to remind the Committee of the reservations and clarifications of position her country had expressed with regard to certain points and elements of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. Those reservations should be applied to all of the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee wherever they contained references to either document.

Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (continued) ([A/C.2/73/L.67](#))

Draft decision on the draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly ([A/C.2/73/L.67](#))

141. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, contained in draft decision [A/C.2/73/L.67](#), and to conference room paper 1 ([A/C.2/73/CRP.1](#)), available in the meeting room in English only, which provided a detailed overview of the provisional timetable and was intended to serve as a basis for the draft programme of work and timetable of the Committee to be prepared by the Bureau of the seventy-fourth session. The draft programme of work contained no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee wished to approve the draft programme of work for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly as contained in draft decision [A/C.2/73/L.67](#) and the timetable as contained in document [A/C.2/73/CRP.1](#).

142. *It was so decided.*

143. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States had joined consensus on the draft programme of work and were looking forward to engaging constructively in discussions during the seventy-fourth session. However, they disapproved of the inclusion of item 7 (d) on eradicating rural poverty and reiterated their disappointment about how the issue was being introduced in the Committee.

144. The European Union, together with many other Member States, including some from the Group of 77, had voted against the associated draft resolution ([A/C.2/73/L.18/Rev.1](#)), making it clear that while they

supported the aim to improve the lives of people in rural areas, that aim would not be served by ignoring the concerns of a large group of Member States and expanding the Committee's already very extensive agenda. Rather, that text would undermine the revitalization efforts agreed to by all, waste financial resources, duplicate existing processes and divert attention and energy. Rather than repeating the many constructive proposals that had been made during the negotiations to reach consensus on that draft resolution, he referred the Committee to the explanation of vote that his delegation had delivered at that time on behalf of a wider group of States.

145. The European Union and its member States would reserve the right to decide at a later stage if and how they would engage on the item. For the time being, they were ready to engage in the consultations that the Chair had announced on measures to revitalize the work of the Committee, to be held early in 2019, and would continue to support the Bureau in all its efforts.

Agenda item 137: Programme planning

146. **The Chair** reminded the Committee that the General Assembly had decided on 21 September 2018 to allocate agenda item 137, "Programme planning", to all the Main Committees and the plenary of the General Assembly in order to enhance discussions on the evaluation, planning, budgeting and monitoring of reports. No action was currently expected under that item.

The meeting was suspended at 12.45 p.m. and resumed at 1.05 p.m.

Organization of work

147. **The Chair** announced that consideration of agenda item 20 (g), "Sustainable development: Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme", would resume at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.