



# General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
24 February 2020

Original: English

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 26th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 27 November 2019, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Niang ..... (Senegal)  
*later:* Ms. Fisher-Tsin (Vice-Chair) ..... (Israel)

## Contents

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

- (b) Women in development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*)
- (e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)
- (f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)
- (h) Education for sustainable development (*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>)



(l) Sustainable mountain development (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(d) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.*

**Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions**  
(continued) (A/C.2/74/L.4 and A/C.2/74/L.68)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.4 and A/C.2/74/L.68:  
Promoting investments for sustainable development*

1. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.68 had no programme budget implications.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.68 was adopted.*

3. **Mr. Terva** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the new draft resolution could make an important contribution to efforts to leverage more private sector investments for the accelerated achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The European Union had been at the forefront of efforts to promote sustainable growth and supported the alignment of private financial flows with a pathway towards low-carbon and climate-resilient development. The financial sector had a key role to play in reorienting investments towards more sustainable technologies and businesses, and international development assistance should support that transformation by delivering technical assistance and capacity-building and, in particular, acting as a catalyst to de-risk investments and enable more private sector flows to finance sustainable development. Discussion of the new concepts explored in the draft resolution were a good starting point for future discussions within the Committee.

4. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to make a few clarifying remarks. First, calls for enhancing, ensuring or strengthening the coherence and consistency of international financial, monetary and trading systems and policies presumed that the current level of coherence and consistency was suboptimal in some way. His delegation did not necessarily share that view. Second, it did not support the attempt to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system; those were not matters for consideration by the General Assembly. Third, regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, world trade and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, he referred the

Committee to his delegation's global explanation of position delivered at the 23rd meeting (see A/C.2/74/SR.23).

5. **Mr. Makwe** (Nigeria), welcoming the adoption of the new draft resolution by consensus and expressing appreciation to all delegations for their constructive engagement, said that stakeholders should now take the necessary steps to ensure that all investment flows, including foreign direct investment, were consistent with sustainable development pathways.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.4 was withdrawn.*

**(f) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development** (continued)  
(A/C.2/74/L.24 and A/C.2/74/L.69)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.24 and A/C.2/74/L.69:  
Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development*

7. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.69 had no programme budget implications.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.69 was adopted.*

9. **Ms. Vissers** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North 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 welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, it wished to emphasize the significant flexibility that it had shown in order to reach a consensus-based text, including by accepting language from sources that did not enjoy consensus elsewhere. Future negotiations should not raise such issues and should instead focus on the practical steps that could be taken to combat illicit financial flows.

10. It was regrettable that certain Member States viewed the inclusion of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) standards as problematic and that reference to FATF had therefore been omitted from the draft resolution in order to reach a consensus. The European Union also regretted the narrow focus on assets return in the title of the draft resolution, which did not reflect the full range of issues contained in the body of the text. Lastly, the Committee's draft resolution on illicit financial flows was a clear candidate for consideration on a biennial or even triennial basis, as many of the different topics covered by it were also addressed in the Third Committee on a biennial basis.

11. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that combating money-laundering, corruption and other related crimes was essential to common security and economic prosperity. However, the language contained in the draft resolution undermined the ability of Member States to work together constructively to address those challenges. The Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention *Against* Corruption served as the Organization's lead governing body on crime and corruption and was the appropriate venue for relevant experts to consider issues related to asset recovery and return. As the draft resolution undermined the role of the Conference of the States Parties in leading those global discussions, Member States should reconsider allowing the continuation of the discussions in the General Assembly.

12. While "illicit financial flows" had been used in prior resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the United States generally opposed its inclusion because it was a term with 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, such as embezzlement, bribery, money-laundering, other corrupt practices or other crimes. All Member States should focus more concretely on the measures that they could take at home to prevent, investigate and prosecute the underlying acts of corruption and other crimes that led to the creation of proceeds of crime in the first place, and on the measures that encouraged transparency and accountability in the use of recovered assets to ensure that they were best utilized to benefit those harmed by acts of corruption. The draft resolution did not achieve that objective.

13. The draft resolution placed too much attention on the return of confiscated proceeds of crime, while not adequately addressing the importance of the other critical parts of the asset recovery process. Effective asset recovery required detection, investigation and prosecution as well as cooperation between Member States. Unless Member States adequately implemented their own commitments to recover the proceeds of crime, discussions about the return of assets were moot.

14. The draft resolution also focused on asset return or disposition to the detriment of other critical steps in the asset recovery process. Equal attention and resources must be devoted to establishing the competent domestic legal and regulatory frameworks and institutions necessary to facilitating the proper detection and investigation of criminal proceeds and their freezing, seizure and confiscation. By focusing almost exclusively on the return of assets, and not also

acknowledging the importance of those other equally integral components of the process, the draft resolution undermined the balanced approach reflected in the United Nations Convention *Against* Corruption to successfully recover stolen assets.

15. His delegation did not believe that asset recovery should be coupled so directly with sustainable development. While those issues might be linked in some cases, the draft resolution implied that they must necessarily be connected. Instead, the focus should remain on law enforcement and fighting impunity.

16. His delegation was also disappointed that certain Member States had viewed the inclusion of internationally accepted FATF standards as problematic. Such intransigence was a puzzling effort to undermine the work of that body, given that most countries in the world belong to FATF or a FATF-style regional body.

17. Lastly, his delegation had concerns with the Committee's workload and stressed the need to address the issue of periodicity, including by considering a number of its resolutions on a biennial or triennial basis. There was not enough meaningful change on many topics to require annual consideration, including in the case of the present resolution.

18. **Ms. Oehri** (Liechtenstein) said that the draft resolution acknowledged the important role that the private sector and financial institutions could play in preventing and combating illicit financial flows. However, the United Nations Convention *Against* Corruption provided a comprehensive legal framework to address the crime of corruption. It was misleading that the draft resolution confused the carefully defined concepts of asset recovery, as contained in the Convention, and the term asset return, as used in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The narrow focus on "assets return" in the title of the draft resolution was also problematic. Her delegation would continue to advocate the integral legal framework provided by the United Nations Convention *Against* Corruption and would therefore not recognize any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention based on the present draft resolution. It also regretted the failure to agree to consider the resolution on a biennial basis, in line with the Committee's revitalization efforts.

19. **Mr. Makwe** (Nigeria) said that the draft resolution was a substantial improvement over the text adopted the previous year and was more aligned with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda. However, his delegation regretted the fact that the international community had once again missed an opportunity to agree on a definition of illicit financial flows. It was also regrettable that certain delegations had refused to accept

anything from the report arising from the high-level meeting on illicit financial flows held at the seventy-third session of the General Assembly. Lastly, he wished to emphasize that many delegations had been unable to support references in the draft resolution to FAFT, an organization that did not enjoy universal membership.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.24 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/74/L.13/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.13/Rev.1: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development*

21. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.13/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.*

23. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and had outlined its position at the Committee's 23rd meeting with respect to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement and references to climate change, the New Urban Agenda and references to trade, the characterization of trade and technology transfer, the term "inclusive growth" and references to official development assistance. His delegation also wished to recall that it was inappropriate for United Nations bodies to comment on the policies and procedures of multilateral development banks.

24. **Mr. Black** (Canada) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus, it wished to express its disappointment with the process that had led to the inclusion of paragraph 16 in the draft resolution. The paragraph had been part of a pre-negotiated, cross-cutting package that introduced new language on a politically sensitive issue without consultation with other Member States or an opportunity to negotiate its contents. While his delegation appreciated the efforts of the European Union and the Group of 77 to find solutions, that should not be done at the expense of inclusive and transparent negotiations.

25. **Ms. O'Hehir** (Australia) said that paragraph 18 of the draft resolution contained a reference to "States" and not "Member States". It was standard procedure for the General Assembly and its Main Committees to address resolutions to United Nations Member States and there had been no compelling reason to break that precedent. Her delegation was disappointed that the designers of the package had not been prepared to enter into further

consultations with other Member States on that issue, an approach that was not in line with good working methods or fair procedures for the Committee. All Member States should have an opportunity to provide inputs to and shape the language of draft resolutions in an open and transparent manner. The late submission of the package language into the text, without time for consultations among delegations, was also a matter of concern. While recognizing the efforts of the Group of 77 to submit a procedural text, her delegation was concerned by the large number of substantive paragraphs now added to the text. Despite those concerns, however, her delegation had decided to join the consensus in order to demonstrate the importance that it attached to the financing for development follow-up process.

**Agenda item 19: Sustainable development**  
(*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1: Strengthening cooperation for integrated coastal zone management for achieving sustainable development*

26. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that integrated coastal zone management was a dynamic process for the sustainable management and use of coastal zones. The new draft resolution promoted and enhanced the sharing of best practices in that area and he called on all Member States to support the draft resolution. He noted that paragraph 12 of the draft resolution should be corrected to include the words "action-oriented" before "report" and should also include the phrase "within existing resources".

27. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, with regard to paragraph 12 of the draft resolution, the request for documentation would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in New York of one pre-session document with a word count of 8,500 words in all six languages in 2021. An additional requirement for documentation would arise in 2021 in the amount of \$27,200. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, that additional resource requirement would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2021 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248b and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which was resolution 72/261 of 24 December 2017, in which the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted

with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters.

28. She said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, India, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Uruguay and Uzbekistan. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Canada, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, France, Ghana, Liberia, Rwanda, Senegal and Sudan.

29. **Mr. Remaoun** (Algeria) said that his delegation had decided to withdraw its proposed amendments to paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/74/CRP.2](#).

30. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands,

South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen.

*Against:*

Colombia, Croatia, Czechia, Equatorial Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Serbia, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Cambodia, China, El Salvador, Mauritania, Niger, Syrian Arab Republic, Zambia.

31. *The proposal to retain the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 149 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.*

32. **Mr. Cuellar Torres** (Colombia) said that his delegation wished to reiterate its commitment to strengthening cooperation on integrated coastal zone management for achieving sustainable development. However, it regretted that consensus had not been reached on the text. While multilateralism was a highly valuable tool for moving forward towards common goals, it must include the different visions and interests of the Organization's Member States. The decision to include a paragraph that had not been accepted by all delegations was therefore regrettable.

33. Colombia conducted its activities in the marine environment in strict compliance with its many international commitments but had not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The adoption of the draft resolution could therefore not be interpreted as tacit or explicit acceptance by Colombia of the provisions contained in the Convention. His delegation did not share the view that the Convention provided the legal framework for all ocean activities and had voted *Against* the adoption of the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. It therefore wished to disassociate itself from references to the Convention in the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. Hajilari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had vote *In favour* of the deletion of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#). The Islamic Republic of Iran was not a State party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and was therefore not in a position to accept its provisions.

35. **Ms. González López** (El Salvador) said that her delegation was strongly committed to strengthening cooperation for integrated coastal zone management for

achieving sustainable development. However, as El Salvador was not a State party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the adoption of the draft resolution could not be interpreted as tacit or explicit acceptance by El Salvador of the provisions contained in the Convention. Her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from references to the Convention in the draft resolution.

36. **Mr. Varli** (Turkey) said that said that his delegation had vote *In favour* of the deletion of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#). Turkey was not a State party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It was of the view that the Convention was not universal and did not have a unified character. Furthermore, the Convention was not the only legal framework regulating all activities in the oceans and seas. The reasons that had prevented Turkey from becoming a State party to the Convention remained valid. Turkey supported the efforts of the international community to establish a regime for the seas based on the principle of equity that was acceptable to all States. However, the Convention did not provide sufficient safeguards for particular geographical situations. Furthermore, the Convention did not allow States to express reservations regarding its articles. Turkey therefore wished to disassociate itself from references to the Convention in the draft resolution. Those references should therefore not be interpreted as a change in the legal position of Turkey with regard to the Convention.

37. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraph 12 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the

Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Australia, Israel, Japan, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

38. *The proposal to retain paragraph 12 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 108 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.*

39. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.31/Rev.1](#) as a whole, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

40. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia and, in addition, Georgia, Iceland, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union and its member States welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and reconfirmed their commitment to enhance cooperation for integrated coastal zone management as an important contribution to making progress on a range of Sustainable Development Goals. It was regrettable that no consensus could be reached to include the agreed language from the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, however, which should remain the authoritative source for any reference to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in General Assembly resolutions.

41. By establishing the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, the Convention promoted the stability of the law and the maintenance of international peace and security. The

universal character of the Convention was evidenced by its universal language and purpose, by the commitment to consider all issues related to the law of the sea as a whole, and by the fact that currently 168 States parties, including the European Union, were bound by its provisions. In addition, international jurisprudence had long accepted that the provisions of the Convention either embodied or reflected customary international law. Joining the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole should therefore not be understood as agreement by the European Union with the language used in the second preambular paragraph or in any other future resolution.

42. **Mr. Nakano** (Japan) said that while his delegation had decided to join the consensus on the draft resolution, it deeply regretted that the oral statement on the proposed programme budget for 2021 in connection with the draft resolution had been issued and circulated by the Secretariat only one day before the scheduled adoption date. Until that time, no information on the programme budget implications had been made available. Moreover, in response to a prior query, Member States had been misled by inaccurate information provided from the Secretariat indicating that there would be no programme budget implications arising from the draft resolution. In future, therefore, important aspects such as programme budget implications should be discussed in detail during the prior consultations in the interests of transparency.

43. **Mr. Bayley Angeleri** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which dealt with important issues related to sustainable development. However, his country did not support references to international instruments to which the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was not a party. Such references in the draft resolution should not be considered as a change in his country's position. In particular, his country was not a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. For that reason, the norms mentioned in that instrument, including instruments which could be considered to constitute customary international law, were not binding on his country except insofar as its legislation explicitly recognized them.

44. **Ms. Bacher** (United States of America) said that while her delegation recognized the importance of integrated coastal zone management to some countries, the subject did not warrant a biennial resolution in an already over-burdened Second Committee agenda. The issue was better considered under existing resolutions, such as the annual resolution on oceans and the law of the sea. Consequently, the United States disassociated

itself from paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. Her delegation had outlined its position at the Committee's 23rd meeting with respect to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement and climate change, as well as reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

45. **Ms. Marinkov** (Serbia) said that her delegation had intended to vote to retain the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

46. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia) said that her delegation had also intended to vote to retain the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

**(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1: Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*

47. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

48. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1](#).*

*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, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar,

Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted by 126 votes to 2, with 49 abstentions.*

50. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union has consistently voted *Against* the present resolution in previous years, pointing out its redundancy and irrelevance in the post-2015 era, and calling for a focus of collective efforts on the implementation of the ambitious 2030 Agenda. Its calls had not been addressed until the current year, when partners had finally shown a willingness to discuss the relevance of the resolution, modernize its content and update both the reporting requests to the Secretary-General and the name of the agenda subitem. While the changes agreed were still not fully satisfactory, particularly the undue emphasis placed on Agenda 21, they were a step in the right direction, including recognition of the importance of sustainable consumption and production for the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. The changes made to the draft resolution were in keeping with the broader discussion on revitalization of the Committee's work and its closer

alignment with the 2030 Agenda. For those reasons, at the current session the European Union and its member States had been able to abstain from the vote on draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1](#).

51. **Ms. Mayes** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, said that their delegations had abstained from the vote on draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.36/Rev.1](#) and looked forward to continuing to work with all delegations to enhance its relevance to the shared objective of implementing the 2030 Agenda.

52. **Mr. Black** (Canada) said that the renaming of the agenda item and efforts to streamline and modernize the resolution were a step in the right direction. However, more progress was needed to ensure that the resolution brought added value to the Committee's work. His delegation looking forward to discussing that issue further in the context of the revitalization efforts under way. In recognition of the efforts made to date, however, Canada had voted to abstain from voting on the draft resolution at the current session.

53. Mr. Lawrence (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the achievement of sustainable development and maintained that the Second Committee should make meaningful contributions to global development priorities. However, the resolution on Agenda 21 advanced neither goal and the Committee could better spend its limited time and resources elsewhere. Therefore, even with the changes made, his delegation saw no reason to continue consideration of the agenda item or the resolution and had therefore voted against it.

54. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group believed strongly in the relevance and importance of the resolution, both in its collective efforts to achieve sustainable development and to advance a meaningful agenda in the Second Committee. While the Group was committed to fully implementing the 2030 Agenda, that could not be achieved in a vacuum. It was necessary to recognize the sustainable development journey made over the last few decades and to build on the shared history, experiences, best practices and lessons learned.

55. In that context, it was deeply regrettable that consensus could not be achieved on the draft resolution. The Group had engaged constructively in the negotiations from the outset and had made significant changes to the text to ensure that it was updated and relevant. It had also accommodated, as far as possible, the concerns of various delegations throughout the process. The Group had recognized the importance of

new elements that could add value to the text and had secured broader buy-in from the membership, such as regarding sustainable consumption and production. It had made difficult concessions because consensus-building was the hallmark of the Committee's work.

56. While consensus had not been reached at the current session, the positive movement shown by all delegations sent a strong and positive signal for future engagement, both in terms of the present resolution and the Committee's overall work. The Group looked forward to building on that progress at future sessions.

#### **Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues** (*continued*)

##### **(b) Women in development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.2/74/L.73, A/C.2/74/L.74, A/C.2/74/L.75 and A/C.2/74/CRP.5)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1: Women in development*

57. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#) and the proposed amendments thereto, as contained in documents [A/C.2/74/L.73](#), [A/C.2/74/L.74](#), [A/C.2/74/L.75](#) and [A/C.2/74/CRP.5](#), had no programme budget implications.

58. **Mr. Verdier** (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Namibia, Peru, South Africa and Uruguay, said that draft resolution dealt with very important topics and cross-cutting issues. The need to vote on proposed amendments to the draft resolution was deeply regrettable. Their delegations would vote in favour of retaining the concepts outlined in draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#), which was previously agreed language. The attempt to upset the existing consensus and undermine long-standing rights was extremely regrettable. For those reasons, their delegations would vote against the proposed amendments and called upon all other delegation to do the same.

59. **The Chair** said that Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova had become sponsors of the proposed amendment to paragraph 8 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.74](#).

60. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), introducing the amendment contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.74](#) on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the proposal entailed inserting the phrase "as well as the outcomes of their reviews" at the end of paragraph 8 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#).

61. **Ms. Compston** (United Kingdom) said that the amendments submitted by the European Union and its member States to paragraphs 8, 17 and 19 of the draft resolution sought to reinstate previously agreed language from the text initially proposed by the Group of 77 and China that had been included in the women in development resolution of 2017. That consensus language was the product of many years of negotiations and had brought the international community closer to a collective understanding on sexual and reproductive health. It would be highly detrimental to adopt a text that reversed those rights. She urged all Member States to vote in support of the proposed amendments to paragraphs 8, 17 and 19.

62. **Ms. Mugodo** (Kenya), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote in favour of the amendments proposed by the European Union and its member States, which reflected the most recently agreed language from the seventy-second session.

63. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libya, Maldives, Mauritania, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, Equatorial Guinea, Malaysia, Trinidad and Tobago.

64. *The amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States was adopted by 118 votes to 37, with 7 abstentions.*

65. **The Chair** said that Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova had become sponsors of the proposed amendment to paragraph 17 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.73](#).

66. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), introducing the amendment contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.73](#) on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the proposal entailed inserting the word “services” after the word “health-care” in paragraph 17 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#). That change was consistent with the terminology “health-care services” in the draft resolution and in General Assembly resolution [72/234](#). He called on all delegations to vote *In favour* of the amendment, which was also in line with agreed language in the 2030 Agenda, the New Urban Agenda and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, among other documents.

67. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark,

Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libya, Mauritania, Nauru, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Zambia.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Colombia, Equatorial Guinea, Uganda, United Arab Emirates.

68. *The amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States was adopted by 130 votes to 26, with 5 abstentions.*

69. **The Chair** said that Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova had become sponsors of the proposed amendment to paragraph 19 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.75](#).

70. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), introducing the amendment contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.75](#) on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the proposal entailed inserting the word “services” after the word “health-care” in paragraph 19 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#). That change was consistent with the terminology “health-care

services” in the draft resolution and in General Assembly resolution 72/234. It was vitally important to retain the reference to services, which encompassed medical tests, counselling and health-related information. For the almost 40 million people living with HIV/AIDS, those services were life-saving. He called on all delegations to vote *In favour* of the amendment.

71. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Comoros, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libya, Mauritania, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan,

Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Colombia, Equatorial Guinea, United Arab Emirates.

72. *The amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States was adopted by 136 votes to 25, with 4 abstentions.*

73. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), introducing the amendments contained in document [A/C.2/74/CRP.5](#), said that her delegation’s proposal entailed the deletion of the word “services” and the expression “including in the area of sexual and reproductive health” in paragraph 18 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#); and the deletion of the expression “including sexual and reproductive health” in paragraph 19 of the draft resolution.

74. **Mr. Peña Argilagos** (Cuba) said that paragraphs 18 and 19 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#) contained agreed language and common positions for Member States over several years. The proposed amendments would weaken those paragraphs and their adoption would be a vote against multilateralism. All delegations should therefore vote against them.

75. **Ms. Wegter** (Denmark) said that promoting and protecting the right of women to make informed decisions about their own bodies was crucial for their well-being and dignity and, as repeatedly documented, key to sustainable development and economic growth. It was therefore regrettable that a delegation had found it necessary to introduce amendments to delete references to health-care services and sexual and reproductive health in the draft resolution. Those amendments ran directly counter to the Sustainable Development Goals and several specific targets. Furthermore, they challenged agreed language and sought to undermine universal standards for health and rights. For those reasons, her delegation could not support the amendments put forward and called on all delegations to reject them.

76. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendments proposed by the United States of America.*

*In favour:*

Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United States of America, Yemen.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia,

Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Colombia, Djibouti, Gambia, Ghana, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

77. *The amendments proposed by the United States of America were rejected by 119 votes to 18, with 16 abstentions.*

78. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraphs 18 and 19 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic

People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Bahrain, Burundi, Kuwait, Libya, Mauritania, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United States of America, Yemen.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, Equatorial Guinea, Jamaica, Russian Federation.

79. *The proposal to retain paragraphs 18 and 19 of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 136 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.*

80. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.28/Rev.1](#) as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted.*

81. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that equality between women and men was one of the organization's founding values. The European Union was a strong supporter of the human rights of women and girls, their empowerment and the full realization of gender equality. Those values had informed the participation of the European Union in the consultations on the women in development resolution at the current session.

82. While welcoming the strengthened language in the text on the central importance of the 2030 Agenda, in

particular with respect to climate, biodiversity, social protection, violence *Against* women, sexual harassment and participation, it was particularly disappointing that reference to the sixty-third session of the Commission on the Status of Women and its agreed conclusions had been omitted from the draft resolution. Indeed, it was unfortunate that delegations were so starkly divided on the issue of women rights and gender equality. Rather than shy away from those differences, however, Member States should come together to find common ground within the framework of the United Nations. With the approval of the amendments introduced by the European Union, the draft resolution now at least met the absolute minimum health standards that were required.

83. In future sessions, he hoped that the Second Committee could provide a forum for updating the text of the women in development resolution in a manner that reflected the fundamental needs and rights of women and girls most at risk of being left behind. He also hoped that a spirit of consensus would be restored to the work on the resolution.

84. **Mr. Black** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Mexico and New Zealand, said that their countries were strong supporters of gender equality and women's economic empowerment. Gender equality was not only a fundamental human right but also a necessary foundation for a peaceful, prosperous and sustainable world, as recognized in the 2030 Agenda. Gender equality led to better development outcomes for all, hence the importance of the draft resolution on women in development at the current session.

85. A discussion on women in development would be incomplete without reference to sexual and reproductive health and access to health services. Terminology such as "sexual and reproductive health" had been used to encompass a wide range of perspectives. Since the mid-1990s all countries had agreed on the importance of sexual and reproductive health, and in the 2030 Agenda all countries had committed to ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services. It was deeply unfortunate that, throughout the negotiations on the draft resolution, there had been an attempt to upset the existing consensus and balance on those issues. Australia, Canada, Mexico and New Zealand had therefore been pleased to join the European Union, Norway, Iceland, Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova in submitting amendments to return the text to the previously agreed language.

86. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that had her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and that the United States was committed to advancing the status of women and promoting their role

as agents of transformation in the economic development of their countries, and therefore the world.

87. The United States defended human dignity and supported access to high-quality health care for women and girls across their lifespans. It did not accept references to "sexual and reproductive health", "sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights", "safe termination of pregnancy", or other language that suggested or explicitly stated that access to legal abortion was necessarily included in the more general terms "health services" or "health care services" in particular contexts concerning women.

88. The United States believed in legal protections for the unborn and rejected any interpretation of international human rights to require any State party to provide safe, legal and effective access to abortion. Each nation had the sovereign right to implement related programmes and activities consistent with their laws and policies. There was no international right to abortion, nor was there any duty on the part of States to finance or facilitate abortion. Furthermore, consistent with the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action and the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and their reports, the United States neither recognized abortion as a method of family planning nor supported abortion in its global health assistance. In addition, reference in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution regarding the International Conference on Population and Development should only include documents that were adopted by the General Assembly. For those reasons, the United States disassociated itself from paragraphs 8, 17, 18 and 19 and did not recognize that language as "consensus" text for any purpose going forward.

89. The term "right to development" was not recognized in any of the core United Nations human rights conventions and did not have an agreed international meaning. Any related discussion needed to focus on aspects of development that related to human rights, which were universal rights held and enjoyed by individuals, and which every individual might demand from his or her own Government.

90. States did not have obligations to achieve universal access to health care. Governments and public institutions should strive to improve access to quality universal health care and do so in accordance with their national contexts and policies. The United States would continue to work to improve access to quality health care while also recognizing the necessary role of partnerships with the private sector and other non-governmental stakeholders.

91. Her delegation had joined the consensus on the understanding that the United States would continue to address the goals of the draft resolution in a manner that was consistent with the current law of the United States and the federal government's authority. With respect to paragraph 31, her delegation understood the references to full employment to refer to the importance of productive employment, with "full employment" referring to the state of an economy rather than the employment situation of individuals. With respect to the "temporary special measures" mentioned in paragraph 32, each country must determine for itself whether such measures were appropriate. The best way to improve the situation of women and girls was often through legal and policy reforms that ended discrimination against women and promoted equality of opportunity.

92. Lastly, regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, she referred the Committee to her delegation's global explanation of position delivered at the 23rd meeting.

93. **Ms. Eneström** (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of Iceland and Norway, said that leaving women and girls behind, or even excluding them, would not benefit anyone and their inclusion was a precondition for progress and development for all. The backlash against gender equality worldwide, in particular with regard to sexual and reproductive health and rights, was a deeply worrying regressive trend that needed to be stopped as it was detrimental to the lives of women and girls everywhere. Without decision-making power over their own bodies, the rights of women and girls could not be achieved. What had just been witnessed was an attempt to undermine universal standards governing the health and rights of women and girls, and globally agreed commitments to that end.

94. **Mr. Molina Linares** (Guatemala) said that his delegation was fully committed to promoting and protecting the fundamental rights of women and girls. With regard to references and interpretations relating to sexual and reproductive health, health-care services and reproductive rights, the Constitution of Guatemala established that the State guaranteed and protected human life from the time of its conception, as well as the integrity and security of the person. That fundamental human right was protected without any discrimination whatsoever. Abortifacients, however, were not included in sexual and reproductive health.

95. **Ms. Udida** (Nigeria), speaking also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Burundi, Djibouti, Egypt, the Gambia, Iraq, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, the Niger, Pakistan,

Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yemen, said that their countries had joined the consensus of the draft resolution as a demonstration of their commitment to the empowerment of all women and girls in the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. While their delegations were committed to combating all forms of discrimination, they regretted the inclusion of the controversial phrase "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination" in certain paragraphs of the draft resolution. That ambiguous concept sought to include a particular set of ideas that did not enjoy consensus in international human rights instruments and their delegations had consistently resisted all attempts to introduce it into the resolutions of the other committees. Their delegations therefore wished to disassociate themselves from all references to that controversial phrase and its applicability in their national contexts. Their delegations also wished to disassociate themselves from the amendment introduced at the end of paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, namely the insertion of the phrase "as well as the outcomes of their reviews". That additional phrase was vague and could include controversial and non-consensual outcomes agreed outside of the United Nations framework. For that reason, their delegations wished to disassociate themselves from that reference and any obligations arising from it.

96. **Mr. Elmaghur** (Libya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to maintain the international consensus. However, some delegations had sought to take advantage of that flexibility by inserting controversial language into the text, such as "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination". Libya supported all efforts to empower women and girls within the framework of the 2030 Agenda but wished to disassociate itself from such non-consensus language.

97. **Mr. Ghorbanpour Najafabadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the statement just delivered by the representative of Nigeria.

98. **Monsignor Hansen** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution placed a focus on the significant issues at the heart of the topic of women in development, including ensuring women's equal access to quality education, decent work and financial resources; empowering women, in particular rural women, to address their own food and nutritional needs and those of their families; promoting the reconciliation of work and family

responsibilities; eradicating rural poverty; and enhancing agriculture and rural development.

99. However, in order to advance the work of the General Assembly and facilitate its broader revitalization, the six Main Committee must remain focused in their discussions and draft resolutions. It served neither the General Assembly nor the Committees if there was a duplication of topics or if controversial issues impeding progress in one Committee were introduced into other Committees with the same predictable results. The importance of respecting universal human rights and dignity in the fight to eradicate poverty and in the promotion of integral human development could not be overstated. Doing so fostered the advancement of fair and inclusive economic and financial systems in the world and helped to avoid the fragmentation of the development agenda. At the same time, specific consideration of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the meaning of rights, should be left to discussions in the Third Committee.

100. His delegation reiterated that it understood the term “sexual and reproductive health” as applying to a holistic concept of health. The Holy See did not consider abortion, access to abortion or access to abortifacients as a dimension of that term. In addition, the Holy See understood gender and its related terms to be grounded in biological sexual identity and difference.

#### **Agenda item 19: Sustainable development**

*(continued)*

##### **(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind** *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.37/Rev.1 and A/C.2/74/CRP.4)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.37/Rev.1: Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind*

101. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

102. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), introducing the amendment contained in document A/C.2/74/CRP.4, said that her delegation’s proposal was to replace the contents of paragraph 9 of the draft resolution with the following language: “Reaffirms the commitment to achieve sustainable development in its three dimensions – economic, social and environmental – in a balanced and integrated manner”. The amendment was intended to ensure that the three dimensions of sustainable development were addressed holistically and in a comprehensive way. The current language contained in paragraph 9 did not appropriately reflect

that key insight and deflected from the key idea of the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda. She urged all delegations to vote *In favour* of the amendment.

103. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the United States of America.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Mexico, Rwanda, San Marino, Turkey.

104. *The amendment proposed by the United States of America was rejected by 50 votes to 106, with 4 abstentions.*

105. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.37/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, 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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, 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, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Norway, San Marino, Switzerland, Turkey.

106. *The proposal to retain paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 46, with 5 abstentions.*

107. **Ms. Vissers** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein and the Republic of Moldova, said that the European Union and its member States had joined the consensus of the draft resolution and welcomed the strong signal of support that its adoption had sent by reaffirming the Paris Agreement and demonstrating the commitment of all Member States to address climate change with enhanced ambition.

108. However, stronger language in the draft resolution regarding the urgent need for action through nationally determined contributions would have been preferable. Unless the international community significantly stepped up its carbon reduction and mitigation efforts, the goals of the Paris Agreement would not be achieved, and disastrous consequences would be unavoidable for humanity and nature. The year 2020 would be critical to demonstrate global ambitions through new or updated nationally determined contributions and long-term strategies. All Member States should aim for the highest possible mitigation ambitions. The European Union was committed to do so with additional binding legislation and through the implementation of its strategy to become the first major climate-neutral economy.

109. In addition to the important language in the draft resolution on scientific findings and the need to enhance mitigation ambitions, the European Union welcomed the additional language in the draft resolution on adaptation. It also welcomed the new language on the links between climate action and sustainable consumption and production. Similarly, important new language had been included on the links between climate change and biodiversity loss. It was regrettable, however, that more ambitious language had not been included referring to the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Maritime Organization, as both aviation and shipping were very relevant industrial sectors for climate action. A more comprehensive reference was also needed to the concept of a just transition to climate-neutral economies in order to address its social impacts.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.37/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

111. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that while her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution it was disappointed by the inclusion of

language in paragraph 9 promoting the domestic political priorities of a single Member State. Regrettably, such language detracted from the fundamental approach of the 2030 Agenda, which reflected a shared position on sustainable development. Her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from that paragraph and called for future iterations of the resolution to advance the interests of all Member States and eschew narrow political messaging that undermined the ability to collectively achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

112. The United States affirmed its support for promoting economic growth and improving energy security while protecting the environment.

113. The United States had submitted formal notification of its withdrawal from the Paris Agreement to the United Nations on 4 November 2019. The withdrawal would take effect one year from the delivery of the notification. Therefore, references in the draft resolution to the Paris Agreement and climate change were without prejudice to the positions of the United States.

114. With respect to the references in the draft resolution to the special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United States had indicated that acceptance of such reports and approval of their respective summaries for policymakers did not imply endorsement by the United States of the specific findings or underlying contents of the reports. References to the special reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change were therefore also without prejudice to the positions of the United States.

115. With regard to references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Sendai Framework, she referred the Committee to her delegation's explanation of position delivered at the 23rd meeting. Furthermore, 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.

**(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa**  
(continued) (A/C.2/74/L.41/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.41/Rev.1: Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa*

116. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

117. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted.*

118. **Ms. Bacher** (United States of America) said that while her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to clarify several points. First, she referred the Committee to her delegation's statement at the 23rd meeting regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, technology transfer, the Paris Agreement and climate change, as well as reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

119. Second, the United States was concerned that some language in the draft resolution did not accurately reflect decisions made in September 2019 by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. In other instances, text replicated instructions to the parties or the secretariat, reading as if the General Assembly were directing actions in the Convention. The General Assembly did not have the authority to give or reiterate instructions to the Conference of the Parties or the secretariat about how to implement the parties' decisions or the Convention – that was the sole purview of the Conference of the Parties. Rather than restaging old debates and introducing confusing and inconsistent language, any future resolutions related to the Convention should accurately reflect the will of the Conference of the Parties by recognizing and utilizing their agreed language. Moreover, in the instances in the draft resolution where the language diverged from the relevant text decided upon by the Conference of the Parties, the United States would only be guided by the relevant text.

120. Lastly, her delegation had concerns with the Committee's workload and stressed the need to address the issue of periodicity, including by considering a number of its resolutions on a biennial or triennial basis. There was not enough meaningful change on many topics to require annual consideration, including in the case of the present resolution.

**(f) Convention on Biological Diversity** (continued)  
(A/C.2/74/L.35)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.35 and A/C.2/74/L.66: Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development*

121. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, with regard to paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 of the draft resolution, it was understood that issues related to the

summit to be held before the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, in 2020, including the date, format and scope, were yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the summit, it was not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of meetings and document requirements. Following a 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. Accordingly, at the current time, the adoption of draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.35](#) would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

122. **Mr. Córdova Chabla** (Ecuador), facilitator, said that while the date, format and scope of the summit were yet to be determined, the common interest to increase the political visibility of biodiversity as an issue was clear. Ecuador would continue to work constructively with others to protect biological diversity.

123. **Ms. Mayes** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada and Norway, said that their delegations welcomed the fact that the draft resolution went some way towards establishing certainty about the preparations for the upcoming summit. They particularly welcomed the request for the President of the General Assembly, in close collaboration with the secretariat of the Convention and in consultation with all States, to propose options and modalities at an early date for conducting the summit. However, they were disappointed that it was not possible for Member States to agree on a specific date and location for the summit. Setting the date during the high-level week of the General Assembly would help to ensure that smaller delegations were not excluded from participating in discussions on issues that particularly affected them.

124. **Ms. Zeitler** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Monaco, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the global biodiversity crisis was real and must be addressed in order to achieve the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Sustainable Development Goals. The upcoming year, 2020, was pivotal to halt the decline. Political leadership and guidance at the highest level would be needed to reach agreement on a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The draft resolution set out an ambitious timeline to agree on the modalities on the summit to be held before the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. However, it was regrettable that agreement could not be reached on the specific date and venue for

the summit. Time was running out for a preparatory process towards a meaningful summit. The only option that credibly implemented the mandate for a summit of Heads of State and Government was one held in New York during the high-level week of the General Assembly. No other date or venue offered the same chance for a large number of leaders to address the issue of biodiversity loss.

125. **Ms. Locatelli** (United States of America) said that while her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to clarify several points. First, she referred the Committee to her delegation's statement at the 23rd meeting regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the New Urban Agenda, technology transfer, the Paris Agreement and climate change, as well as reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

126. Second, with regard to the calls for the General Assembly to convene a summit on biodiversity in 2020, any budgetary impacts of that high-level event beyond existing resources must be fully taken into account in consultation with Member States in the appropriate forums. The timing of the event – at the very end of a two-year preparatory process – also meant that the summit would have no meaningful impact on the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

127. Third, the United States was concerned that language in the draft resolution did not accurately reflect decisions made at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in November 2018. Such an approach did a disservice to the implementation of the Convention. Any future resolutions related to Convention on Biological Diversity should accurately reflect the will of the parties to the Convention by recognizing and utilizing their agreed language. Moreover, in instances where the language in the draft resolution was inconsistent with relevant text decided by the parties to the Convention, the United States would only be guided by the relevant text.

128. Lastly, her delegation had concerns with the Committee's workload and stressed the need to address the issue of periodicity, including by considering a number of its resolutions on a biennial or triennial basis. There was not enough meaningful change on many topics to require annual consideration, including in the case of the present resolution.

129. **Ms. Piazza** (Switzerland) said that the forthcoming summit should be transparent and inclusive, allowing for the participation of all stakeholders. Only by holding

the summit during the high-level week of the General Assembly in New York would it be possible to create the strong political momentum needed in the run up to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to be held in China in 2020.

130. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.35 was adopted.*

131. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.66 was withdrawn.*

**(h) Education for sustainable development**

*(continued) (A/C.2/74/L.48/Rev.1)*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.48/Rev.1: Education for sustainable development in the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

132. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

133. **Ms. Bialik** (Israel), speaking in explanation of the vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution deliberately deviated from agreed language and was formulated with the knowledge that it would jeopardize consensus on a draft that should have enjoyed universal support. Her delegation was therefore obliged to call for a vote on the retention of paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, which had been introduced as part of a package deal. The delegation involved in that package had shown no flexibility, willingness to compromise or desire to achieve consensus. Her delegation had engaged in the negotiations in a constructive manner, in keeping with the spirit of the Committee. In future, the Committee's work should be conducted with transparency and fairness, and important topics such as education should be given the respect that they deserved.

134. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.48/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Japan, Papua New Guinea.

135. *The proposal to retain paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted by 162 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

136. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.48/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

137. **Ms. Locatelli** (United States of America) said that the United States was firmly committed to providing equal access to quality education. States had a wide array of policies and actions that might be appropriate in striving to provide quality education for all girls and boys, and the present non-binding resolution should not try to define the elements of or requirements for a quality education. The call upon States to strengthen various aspects of education would therefore be interpreted in ways that were appropriate for and consistent with the respective federal, state and local authorities of the United States.

138. Regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, she referred the

Committee to the remarks delivered by her delegation at the 23rd meeting. Furthermore, the United States understood any reference to “reaffirming” an instrument as reaffirming it only to the extent to that it was affirmed in the first instance.

139. **Mr. Nakano** (Japan) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution as a means to deliver sustainable development for all and said that the Japan prioritized education as a foundation for social transformation and responsible global citizenship. His country had been pioneering and promoting education for sustainable development by hosting a number of events and was also shaping its holistic role by highlighting the linkages among the Sustainable Development Goals. His Government was committed to supporting education for sustainable development, including through its trust fund and other official development assistance, in collaboration with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

140. **Monsignor Hansen** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation welcomed the content of the draft resolution. Education was a key enabler to the achievement of sustainable development and played a fundamental role in helping each person to discover his or her talents and potential for serving the common good.

**(I) Sustainable mountain development** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/74/L.50/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.50/Rev.1: Sustainable mountain development*

141. **Mr. Morini** (Italy), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of Kyrgyzstan, said that the text of the draft resolution presented for adoption substantively showed how the promotion of sustainable mountain development should be central to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Stable, sustainable and durable economic and social development in mountain regions could not be achieved without a scientifically based, action-oriented and concrete commitment to combating environmental degradation and protecting biodiversity and natural resources. The successful outcome of the negotiations on the draft resolution demonstrated that the co-drafting of resolutions by members of different constituencies was a best practice that could and should be replicated in the future. Its triannual adoption, decided during the seventy-first session, was indeed a concrete step towards streamlining the work of the Second Committee, in line with the principles that should be guiding the ongoing revitalization process.

142. *Ms. Fisher-Tsin* (Israel), *Vice-Chair*, took the Chair.

143. **Mr. Naemi** (Afghanistan) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

144. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

145. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegation had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uzbekistan. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Central African Republic, Chad, Costa Rica, Jordan, Mali, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Sierra Leone, North Macedonia, Tunisia and Ukraine.

146. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted.*

147. **Mr. Messenger** (United States of America) said that his delegation’s position with respect to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the right to development, women and girls, references to the special reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the Paris Agreement, the Sendai Framework, inclusive economic growth and leaving no country behind had been outlined at the 44th meeting of the Third Committee and at the 23rd meeting of the Second Committee during the current session.

**Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence**  
(*continued*)

**(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1 and A/C.2/74/CRP.6)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1: Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence*

148. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications.

149. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), introducing the amendment contained in document A/C.2/74/CRP.6 on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the proposal was to delete the ninth preambular paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. Throughout the

negotiations the European Union and its member States, supported by several other delegations, had consistently voiced their concerns over the use of the formulation “win-win cooperation”. They could not accept any reference to a concept that ignored internationally agreed principles of development cooperation and the people-centred approach outlined in the 2030 Agenda.

150. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, 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, Venezuela

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

*Abstaining:*

Japan, Norway, Republic of Korea, Turkey.

151. *The amendment proposed by Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States was rejected by 113 votes to 46, with 4 abstentions.*

152. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, 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, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia,

Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

153. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 45 abstentions.*

154. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union and its member States had abstained from the vote on draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.26/Rev.1](#). It was regrettable that their concerns over the formulation “win-win cooperation” had not been reflected in the final text adopted. That concept, which had not been universally agreed upon in the context of international relations and multilateralism and, furthermore, undermined the internationally agreed principles of development cooperation, had become a development cooperation tool that called for mutual economic gains to take precedence over the sustainable development needs of the receiving countries. Such an understanding was a substantive change from the reference to “win-win cooperation” in the 2030 Agenda and therefore undermined the people-centred approach outlined in that guiding document for development efforts at the United Nations. The Group of 77 and China should thus refrain from including the concept of “win-win cooperation” in future resolutions in order to avoid further abstentions on, or even rejections of, its proposed texts.

155. Lastly, in the context of the efforts to revitalize and modernize the Committee’s work, the invitation in the draft resolution for the President of the General Assembly to consider convening a high-level meeting was regrettable. The Group of 77 and China should reconsider the relevance of such a meeting.

156. **Mr. Messenger** (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted that it could not vote in favour of the draft resolution and wished to highlight its concerns. First, with regard to the references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, characterizations of inclusive economic growth, trade and technology transfer, his delegation’s concerns had been highlighted in its general statement of position delivered at the Committee’s 23rd meeting.

157. Second, the United States could not support the reference to “win-win cooperation” in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. That phrase had been promoted by a single Member State to insert its core political ideology and signature foreign policy agenda into United Nations documents and did not reflect the views of all Member States. With that language included in the paragraph, the agenda item continued to undermine the Committee’s consensus-based work. The United States also rejected any attempt to interpret the language in that paragraph to promote State ownership in the economy or to suggest that Governments might deprive private interests of wealth or resources without compensation under international law or might otherwise fail to observe a State’s legal obligations.

158. Third, the United States could not support the reference to a “surge in trade-restrictive measures” in the eighteenth preambular paragraph. Trade remedy measures consistent with the World Trade Organization and enforcement actions taken to protect the economy from the unfair and market-distorting trade practices of others were necessary to deliver on free, fair and reciprocal trade. 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 recommendations made by the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on those issues.

159. Lastly, his delegation had concerns with the Committee’s workload and stressed the need to address the issue of periodicity, including by considering a number of its resolutions on a biennial or triennial basis. There was not enough meaningful change on many topics to require annual consideration.

160. **Mr. Xu Zhongsheng** (China) said that the phrase “win-win cooperation” was contained in the 2030 Agenda and that language had first been introduced in documents adopted at the time when Kofi Annan, as Secretary-General, had proposed the concept as a way of requesting inclusive partnerships. As a concept, “win-win cooperation” was in fact about people-centred development, not leaving the weakest behind and ensuring ownership by programme countries. Member States should respect the development paths taken by all countries in accordance with their own national characteristics and priorities. The concept of “win-win cooperation” also made sense in the context.

161. During discussions on draft resolutions, colleagues should consider whether had they truly engaged in the consultations in a substantive manner or whether they had merely reiterated their previously

stated positions regarding resources and language. The Committee's working methods would need to improve in order to improve future outcomes and accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

**Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues** (*continued*)

**(d) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.22/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.22/Rev.1: Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

162. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

163. *At the request of the representative of Finland on behalf of the European Union and its member States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.22/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, 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, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, 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, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Palau, Turkey.

164. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 49, with 2 abstentions.*

165. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Australia, Canada, Georgia, Japan, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that their delegations were disappointed that once again consensus could not be achieved on the text submitted at the current session. The European Union and its member States had engaged constructively throughout the first part of the informal negotiations because they shared the analysis of the Group of 77 and China that more must be done to improve the lives of the rural poor. They had made clear the principles on which the negotiations should be based, including the need for consensus and revitalization of the Committee's work. In terms of substance, they had also underlined that any discussion of rural poverty must not cherry-pick from, undermine or renegotiate the 2030 Agenda or be based on national concepts. On that basis, extensive proposals had been made to find ways forward that would allow all delegations to reach a consensus. Only when it became clear that there was no readiness on the part of the proponents of the draft resolution to take those proposal on board had the European Union and its member States decided to disengage from the negotiations.

166. The concept of "win-win cooperation" had in fact changed substantively from the time that it was first inserted in the 2030 Agenda. It had now become a development cooperation tool that called for mutual economic gains to take precedence over the sustainable development needs of the receiving countries. It therefore undermined the people-centred approach

outlined in the 2030 Agenda, which should be the guiding document for development efforts by the United Nations. That position had been made clear from the start of the negotiations and the alternative language proposed in a spirit of compromise had unfortunately been rejected. The Group of 77 and China should therefore reconsider its approach and refrain from including the concept of “win-win cooperation” in future resolutions. Furthermore, the issue of rural poverty should be considered more holistically as part of poverty eradication. It was too specific an issue to justify inclusion as a priority for an annual moment at the start of the general debate of the General Assembly.

167. Discussions of how to improve the lives of people in rural areas should be guided by a rights-based approach to development that encompassed all human rights. The aim should be to promote inclusion and participation, non-discrimination, equality, equity, transparency and accountability. No one should be left behind, irrespective of where people lived and regardless of ethnicity, gender, age, gender, age, religion, beliefs or other factors. That approach included addressing the multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination faced by people in vulnerable and marginalized situations, especially in rural areas.

168. **Ms. Locatelli** (United States of America) said that her delegation was also disappointed with the outcome of the draft resolution and the approach that had led to an entirely avoidable vote. Throughout the negotiations, the United States had been candid about its issues regarding the text. However, the constructive suggestions that it and other partners had offered in order to bring the language of the draft resolution into line with other United Nations resolutions were unfortunately rebuffed. Consequently, her delegation had joined the European Union and others in rejecting the draft resolution. The document undermined the international community’s good work focused on eradicating poverty and injected unnecessary political distractions into its important conversation on that issue.

169. It was precisely because the rural poverty eradication was so important that discussions must not be compromised by the unnecessary inclusion of politicized language. Indeed, her delegation was concerned by much of the language in the document. Paragraphs 4, 7, 13 and 17 of the draft resolution reflected the domestic policies and, more troubling, the core domestic political slogans of an individual Member State. The United States could not support the reference to “win-win cooperation” in paragraph 17. That phrase had been promoted by a single Member State to insert its core political ideology and signature foreign policy agenda into United Nations documents and did not

reflect the views of all Member States. Because that language was included in the draft resolution, the agenda item continued to undermine the Committee’s consensus-based work and, thereby, its ability to collectively achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

170. In addition, the outcomes in the document wasted the time and resources of the United Nations. The Secretary-General produced an annual report that analysed progress on the eradication of poverty holistically. Rural poverty should not be considered in isolation; instead, it should be included as a part of one of the existing resolutions and reports on eradicating poverty, including the reports on the progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. Considering rural poverty separately distracted from and diluted the important work already under way.

171. Moreover, at a time when Member States had agreed to make the work of the United Nations more efficient and effective, the draft resolution created a duplicative mandate that, in the years to come, would inflate an already bloated General Assembly agenda and take precious resources away from the Organization’s important work to benefit those who were most in need. Her delegation also did not believe that it was appropriate for the “annual moment” included in the draft resolution to be placed on a par with that for the Sustainable Development Goals.

172. Lastly, she recalled that her delegation’s position with respect to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, the New Urban Agenda, technology transfer and inclusive economic growth had been set out at the Committee’s 23rd meeting.

173. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, for all people everywhere, remained the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. Nearly 80 percent of the extreme poor lived in rural areas and worked in agriculture, and the extreme poverty rate in rural areas was three times higher than in urban areas. In contrast to those living in other areas, the rural population faced many special difficulties in infrastructure, education, health care, financial services, information and communications technology and social security. The increasing frequency of natural disasters and extreme climate change had increased the need to reduce rural poverty. Those rural population left behind were becoming increasingly harder to reach.

174. It was thus of vital importance for the international community and the United Nations development system to continue to treat rural poverty eradication as the highest priority and to take targeted measures to eradicate it. The Group had therefore renewed the resolution in order to address the seriousness of the situation, calling for collective efforts and efficient solutions and means to address the problem.

175. In the draft resolution, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other relevant international organizations were invited to draft a report, together with the Secretary-General, to identify the progress achieved and the remaining gaps and challenges faced in rural poverty eradication, especially in developing countries, as well as the means to address the issue more clearly and comprehensively.

176. It was regrettable that the draft resolution could not be adopted by consensus. Going forward, the Group stood ready to continue its engagement and dialogue with all delegations on rural poverty eradication so that they could work together to respond to the common challenges facing humanity and ensure that no one was left behind.

177. **Mr. Xu Zhongsheng** (China) said that improvements had been made to the draft resolution submitted at the current session in terms of the reporting requirements so that a fuller picture of rural poverty eradication could be provided. The language in the draft resolution referred to as being specific to one delegation was in fact agreed language contained in United Nations documents and resolutions adopted over the past few years. The Group of 77 and China would continue to strive to improve the language in each and every resolution moving forward. All delegations should come together to improve the Committee's working methods and thereby better implement the 2030 Agenda.

**Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.64)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.64: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition*

178. **Mr. Elmahs** (Egypt), speaking also on behalf of Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic, said that their delegations had joined the consensus on the draft resolution owing to their firm belief in the crucial role played by agricultural activities in the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development. Furthermore, they fully acknowledged the importance of multilateral efforts to address the nutritional gap and attain food security, especially in developing countries.

179. The draft resolution contained 11 references to water in conjunction with the concepts of water conservation, development, management, sanitation and harvesting. Their countries were developing policies for better water resources management in order to mitigate the effects of the severe scarcity of water resources. However, their countries wished to state that access to water was a basic human need that took precedence over all over water-related activities and was fundamental to the enjoyment of the human rights to life. Their countries wished to make that position clear as they were suffering from severe water scarcity that might affect the access of their populations to safe drinking water in the near future.

**Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.72)

*Draft decision A/C.2/74/L.72: Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly*

180. **The Chair** recalled that at an informal briefing to the Committee held on 16 September 2019, the attention of delegations had been drawn to relevant paragraphs of General Assembly resolution [73/341](#) on the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, in particular, paragraphs 26, 27 and 29. At the Committee's organizational meeting held on 2 October 2019, reference had also been made to the letter dated 26 August 2019 addressed to the Chair of the Second Committee at the seventy-third session of the General Assembly and the non-paper prepared by the Bureau at that session summarizing the discussions and recommendations of the Committee's informal dialogues on possible improvements to its work.

181. Taking into account discussions in the Bureau and comments from Member States during the current session, she understood that there was agreement to carry on the discussions on revitalization of the Committee's work in the coming months. A number of informal dialogues of the Committee would therefore be held in December 2019 and in the first months of 2020 to discuss lessons learned and ways in which the Committee could improve its work. As a basis for that work and in order to prepare for the discussions, the Bureau would prepare a paper for circulation in advance. It was also proposed that the Committee would hold one additional plenary meeting in the first months of 2020 to consider the outcome of the informal dialogues.

182. **Mr. De La Mora Salcedo** (Mexico), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia,

Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, said that the time had come for their countries to clearly and openly express their concerns about the Committee's work. In 2015, Heads of State and Government had adopted the 2030 Agenda and, as many Governments had already based their economic, social and environmental policies on that universal framework, it should be the anchor of the Second Committee's work.

183. The universal composition of the Committee was its most important value and its 193 Member States all needed to work together to address their different realities. When they collectively engaged in true negotiations, they could reach solutions through dialogue and understanding. However, the overloaded programme of work posed a particular challenge for small delegations. During the current session, 47 draft resolutions had been considered – the largest number in recent years. It was clear that the Committee continued to discuss issues that were no longer relevant, at the expense of effectively addressing contemporary challenges.

184. Their countries had a preference for quality over quantity in the Committee. That meant engaging in thorough, substantive and evidence-based negotiations. They called on the Committee to learn to transform itself as the world changed. When new draft resolutions were presented, the Committee should try to find synergies with current agenda items. Many delegations had questions new items added to the agenda at the current session out of a genuine desire to focus on enriching the overall discussion. Creating space for emerging issues was a common responsibility and, as tipping point had now been reached, a lack of progress on revitalization was no longer acceptable.

185. In order for the Committee to reach its full potential, it must advance in tandem with the Secretary-General's ambitious pursuit of reform of the United Nations, including its development system. The Organization must be fit for purpose in order to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. For that reason, their delegations commended the proposal to hold serious discussions on the need for revitalization of the Committee's work in order to guide the adoption of the programme of work.

186. The many existing efforts to streamline the agenda should be built upon to ensure successful sessions in the years to come. Their delegations would fully support the revitalization of the Second Committee's work and were ready to engage constructively in that much-needed conversation over the coming months. To that end, the Chair should work constructively with all Member States.

187. **Ms. Stern** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that the current session had presented new and unique challenges. The time had come to reflect on what had worked and to make a course correction to stop certain trends established over the past few years from becoming bad habits. One such trend was the exponential growth of the Committee's agenda. During the seventy-first session, 37 draft resolutions had been negotiated. By the current session that number had increased to 47 – so many that the Bureau had struggled to find willing and able facilitators. Delegations were forced to triage their coverage of priority resolutions. On a number of occasions, negotiators had found themselves running between three clashing negotiations. While unique time limitations had played a role in the chaos, if the current trajectory continued there would be 57 draft resolutions negotiated by the seventy-seventh session. Because it was far preferable to engage meaningfully with few draft resolutions than to merely skim the surface of many, the present trend could and must be reversed.

188. The first step must be to determine whether existing resolutions remained timely and relevant. The guiding principle must be alignment with the landmark agreements of 2015. Resolutions that did not pass that test should be replaced, or their periodicity adapted accordingly. New resolutions should be methodically assessed for relevance against the landmark agreements, particularly the 2030 Agenda.

189. Other small steps must also be taken to align the Committee's working methods with the ongoing process of revitalization of the General Assembly. Many of those steps were simple good practice; the Committee must be held to the highest standards of procedural integrity. Some of the issues observed during the current session included the following examples: silence procedures of very short duration – a particular challenge for delegations whose capitals were in other time zones; resolutions with different text than that placed under silence procedure; and facilitators failing to engage with all delegations that had broken the silence procedure and instead submitting resolutions without further negotiations.

190. Nevertheless, the current session had seen some gains in the Committee's working methods. The commitment made to starting and ending all plenary meetings on time had been a simple but effective signal that the Committee functioned best when guided by respect for proper procedure. The Bureau's innovative practice in establishing a shared calendar for all negotiations had also helped delegations to plan for the coverage of the enormous number of draft resolutions.

191. For some delegations, the year ahead would be a litmus test of the Committee's ability to remain effective and pertinent. The engagement of Australia, Canada and New Zealand would be guided by whether their voices and positions were reflected in the draft resolutions adopted, whether the Committee's working methods were fit for purpose, and whether it was possible to inject relevance into the Committee's agenda. They looked forward to working with all delegations to ensure positive outcomes.

192. **The Chair** took it that there was agreement in the Committee to adopt the following decision: "The Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly that, recalling its resolution [73/341](#), the Assembly decides that the Bureau of the Second Committee will convene informal dialogues to discuss revitalization of the Committee's work in December 2019 and in the first months of 2020. The Committee further recommended to the Assembly that it decide that the Second Committee will convene a plenary meeting following the dialogues to take stock of the deliberations and, as appropriate, take action on any recommendation(s), for subsequent approval by the Assembly, to allow any change to come into effect ahead of the seventy-fifth session.

193. *It was so decided.*

194. **The Chair** said that the draft decision contained in document [A/AC.2/74/L.72](#) had no programme budget implications.

195. *The Committee adopted the draft decision contained in document [A/C.2/74/L.72](#).*

196. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group had engaged constructively and in good faith throughout the negotiations during the current session with a view to achieving consensus on the actions needed to address global economic and development challenges. It had considered all proposals suggested by partners on the basis of their relevance to the issues under consideration. At times, the Group had also accepted proposals that went *Against* its preferred positions in order to bridge the gap towards reaching a

consensus. Throughout the course of its work, the Group had sought to uphold the Committee's established working methods and tradition of adopting resolutions by consensus.

197. The Group wished to emphasise that the full and effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda was of the utmost importance to its work in the Committee. A special focus on the eradication of poverty in all its forms and dimensions remained the highest priority in the pursuit of the 2030 Agenda. The achievement of the ambitious goals of the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other relevant instruments required inclusiveness at the international, regional and country levels. Inclusivity was a long-term objective of the United Nations system and a central promise enshrined in the 2030 Agenda.

198. The Group's coordinators had done excellent work in protecting the interests of developing countries and had also worked tirelessly to ensure that poverty eradication, sustainable development and inclusivity were well placed in the agenda of the United Nations moving forward.

199. The Group wished to stress that it had accepted the release of unedited versions of draft resolutions submitted by the Group at the current session on an exceptional basis, owing to the liquidity crisis affected the United Nations. However, that did not set a precedent for future sessions.

200. Furthermore, the Group supported the efforts of the Chair and the Bureau to ensure that the Committee would collectively strengthen the international goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda. In that regard, the Group wished to reiterate its commitment to multilateralism and to stress that it would do its best to safeguard consensus in order to transform the world into a prosperous one for present and future generations. It was highly important to build on the Committee's success to strengthen multilateralism and the work of the United Nations for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

*The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.*