



# General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

## Official Records

Distr.: General  
11 January 2023

Original: English

---

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 22nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 21 November 2022, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Ms. Stoeva ..... (Bulgaria)

## Contents

Agenda item 17: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 18: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (a) Towards the achievement of sustainable development: implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including through sustainable consumption and production, building on Agenda 21 (*continued*)
- (b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)
- (j) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Follow-up to the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)

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

- (b) International migration and development (*continued*)

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

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

Agenda item 23: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

- (a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*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/>).



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

1. **The Chair** said that any delegations wishing to make statements on draft resolutions submitted under different agenda items could proceed to do so.

*Statements on draft resolutions*

2. **Ms. Rodríguez Mancía** (Guatemala) said that Guatemala honoured all of its international commitments, in keeping with its Constitution. As such, with regard to draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.40](#), entitled “Harmony with nature”, and draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.32/Rev.1](#), entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development”, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from references to the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean, since Guatemala was not a party to that Agreement, and was under no obligation to any commitment or mandate established therein. Her delegation called for the internal processes of each country to be respected and for the right of reservation to be exercised regarding content that contravened regulatory frameworks, without prejudice to the interests of other States.

3. Regarding draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.17/Rev.1](#), entitled “International Year of Glaciers’ Preservation, 2025”, while Guatemala was committed to the general principle of cooperation among States and recognized the importance of sustainably managing the water resources of each State, it did not agree to the term “transboundary cooperation” and disassociated itself from the respective paragraph, owing to the fact that Guatemalan legislation considered that water resources belonged to the State, and should therefore be managed and used by the competent national entities, for the benefit of the population. As such, the use of international watercourses should be subject to bilateral agreements negotiated and concluded exclusively between States.

4. Regarding draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1](#), entitled “Women in development”, her delegation supported and was committed to the spirit of the text, which conveyed a balanced vision that was representative of the Committee’s membership. However, with respect to the outcomes of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the International Conference on Population and Development, Guatemala reiterated and maintained its already expressed reservations, in keeping with its firm commitment to guarantee the protection of life, from the moment of conception. Her Government would take the

necessary measures to protect individuals and families, as provided for in the Constitution.

5. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that the United States stood with the broad community of nations that shared its vision for the future of an international order governed by the Charter of the United Nations, where the universal rights of all individuals were upheld; where the environment, air, oceans, space, cyberspace and channels of commerce were protected and accessible to all; and where multilateral institutions such as the United Nations rose to meet global challenges. His delegation was pleased with the progress made by the Committee towards achieving sustainable development, and remained committed to advancing all 17 Sustainable Development Goals, peace and prosperity for all. While the United States supported a strong and effective United Nations system, it also upheld and respected the authority, independent mandates and roles of institutions outside of that system, and welcomed efforts to ensure the independence of organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Where United Nations resolutions referred to independent institutions, his delegation preferred neutral language that “noted” or “acknowledged” their function.

6. The draft resolutions put forward by the Committee should only make reference to documents negotiated by Member States at United Nations conferences. The United States did not support references to statements of conference hosts or the inclusion of individual Member States’ foreign policy or ideology in resolutions. The latter should reflect consensus, address issues on a global scale and avoid contentious language that did not reflect the interests of the majority.

7. His delegation understood references to “geopolitical tensions and conflicts” to refer to Russia’s brutal, unjustified and unprovoked war against Ukraine, which had led to surges in food and energy prices, and exacerbated poverty and food insecurity worldwide, thereby unravelling years of progress and stability. The United States remained firmly committed to working with Member States to confront transnational threats to peace and prosperity, and get back on track towards achieving the Goals by 2030.

8. A longer version of his delegation’s earlier general statement, entitled “General explanation of position on Second Committee resolutions”, would shortly be posted on the official website of the United States Mission to the United Nations. It clarified the position

of the United States with regard to such issues as consensus documents, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, trade and technology transfer, special drawing rights, sovereign debt, concessional finance, economic sanctions, the coronavirus disease (COVID-19), disaster risk reduction and climate issues.

9. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was forced to clarify its position with regard to the references in a number of the Committee's draft resolutions to reports of the Secretary-General and to reports of the agencies of the United Nations system. Regrettably some of those reports contained an openly biased analysis of the consequences of the situation in Ukraine that did not reflect the real situation over time. Attempts to attribute all the world's problems, including failures in the fight against poverty and hunger, to events in Ukraine were not only biased but also destructive, because they led the international community away from comprehending the real causes of the global socioeconomic crises. Those reasons were complex and had been evolving over a long period, as a result of such factors as the multifaceted negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including on global value chains; the short-sighted financial policies of Western countries in combating the pandemic by creating trillions of unsecured dollars that had fuelled inflation, leading to ballooning interest rates; the interconnectedness of the global economy, which had shifted the burden to an already indebted global South; an overly forced energy transition; the detrimental impact of illegal unilateral sanctions imposed against Russia and other States by the West for years, which had led to the disruption of routes, supply chains and transactions; and the numerous long-standing conflicts in which the West was directly involved.

10. Instead of trying to shift the blame under any useful pretext, a sober look at the difficult situation in the world economy was needed alongside efforts to find common solutions. Indeed, that was the purpose of the draft resolutions adopted in recent days. They provided a much more balanced picture than some of the Secretariat's documents, particularly the reports on poverty eradication, rural poverty eradication and agriculture development. His delegation was therefore obliged to disassociate itself from all unacceptable passages from the reports taken note of by the Committee in the following draft resolutions: "Promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, building on Agenda 21"; "Towards a New International Economic Order";

"Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027)"; "Operational Activities for development of the United Nations system"; "International financial system and development"; "External debt sustainability and development"; "Follow-up to the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries"; "Industrial development cooperation"; "Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development"; "International trade and development"; "Entrepreneurship for sustainable development," "Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all"; "Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence"; "Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries"; and "Agriculture development, food security and nutrition".

**Agenda item 17: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development** (*continued*)  
([A/C.2/77/L.10](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.50](#))

*Draft resolutions [A/C.2/77/L.10](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.50](#):  
Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the  
International Conferences on Financing for Development*

11. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.50](#) had no programme budget implications.

12. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.50](#) was adopted.*

13. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and remained committed to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. However, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the reference in the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph to "no country ... left behind", since such language attempted to shift the discussion towards a narrower set of vested country interests and away from individuals and communities. The full version of the general statement made earlier by his delegation reflected its position on references to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the 2030 Agenda, special drawing rights, concessional finance and the characterization of trade and technology transfers.

14. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.10](#) was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 18: Sustainable development**

(continued) (A/C.2/77/L.17/Rev.1 and  
A/C.2/77/L.18/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.17/Rev.1: International  
Year of Glaciers' Preservation, 2025*

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

16. **Mr. Hikmat** (Tajikistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that glaciers were the main source of fresh water and their accelerated melting, when coupled with increased water consumption, could lead to negative consequences. The draft sought to raise awareness and improve international cooperation on the issue of glaciers, while giving mandates to mobilize financial resources to support their preservation. All Member States and other stakeholders were invited to observe the International Year of Glaciers' Preservation and the World Day for Glaciers, and to share best practices and knowledge on the issue of glaciers, snow and ice.

17. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bahamas, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Czechia, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Togo, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda and Yemen. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Nigeria and United Arab Emirates.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.18/Rev.1: Enhancing the  
role of parliaments in accelerating the achievement of  
the Sustainable Development Goals*

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

20. **Mr. Ibragimov** (Uzbekistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text stressed the importance of parliamentary involvement in multilateral cooperation efforts for sustainable development and called on Member States to promote the role of parliaments in achieving the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. It also called upon the United Nations to work with Member States to help strengthen the institutional capacity of their parliaments, which were uniquely capable of increasing the accountability and inclusivity of implementation processes.

21. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Belarus, Chad, China, Colombia, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, France, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Bahrain, Costa Rica, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Timor-Leste and Togo.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted.*

23. **Ms. Baños Müller** (El Salvador) said that parliaments had been recognized as key actors in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Multiple crises and their ensuing challenges had led to setbacks in the progress made towards sustainable development, but the way forward remained clear, and concrete actions were required on the part of the United Nations to identify and address those challenges. The draft resolution therefore represented a call by the General Assembly for parliaments to effectively institutionalize the 2030 Agenda, incorporate the Goals into their legislative processes and contribute to follow-up and evaluation efforts, in order to build consensus within States on the issue of sustainable development.

24. El Salvador was deeply concerned by the difficulties that had arisen during negotiations on the draft resolution, with respect to the fundamental role of parliaments in the adoption of urgent measures to combat climate change and its impacts. Parliaments had played a critical role in the response to climate change, by translating international agreements into national and regional legislation, allocating resources and establishing monitoring mechanisms. Accordingly, the General Assembly needed to address the role played by parliaments in the realization of the Goals, recognize the value of their contributions and encourage further efforts, given the scope of the three dimensions of sustainable development and the linkages between those dimensions.

25. In terms of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, the draft resolution recognized the importance of promoting the participation of women in parliaments and parliamentary procedures, and encouraged the adoption of legislation and parliamentary working methods seeking to address gender issues and combat all forms of violence and discrimination against women. Insufficient progress had been made towards ensuring equal gender representation in national parliaments, despite the fact that the 2030 Agenda recognized the full, equal,

effective and significant participation of women in decision-making and policy formulation as a crucial requirement for the achievement of the Goals. One of the obstacles faced by women in that connection was the prevalence of gender-based violence, which limited their access to leadership positions and their capacity to fulfil electoral mandates. The international community had a responsibility to acknowledge that violence against women parliamentarians seriously undermined the effectiveness of parliaments.

26. **Ms. Kavaleuskaya** (Belarus) said that, in the face of multiple global challenges and threats that were unprecedented in their complexity, non-politicized and mutually respectful dialogue, including through parliamentary diplomacy, was perhaps the only means to achieve compromise, show solidarity and reach agreement. It was important to deepen and broaden cooperation and partnerships among the United Nations, national parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union for the effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

27. The contribution of parliamentarians to the strengthening of democracy and to the maintenance of peace and security was undeniable. In that context, the use of any kind of sanctions against parliamentarians was absolutely unacceptable. Her delegation called on partners to refrain from taking any unilateral measures against members of national parliaments and, in the interests of multilateralism, to ensure the unhindered participation of parliamentarians from all Member States at international events, including those involving interparliamentary cooperation, on a non-discriminatory basis.

28. National parliaments played a leading role in accelerating the achievement of sustainable development. Her country stood ready to continue to actively participate in the work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and to develop and strengthen cooperation between national parliaments on a bilateral basis in order to give an impetus to efforts to promote the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

**(a) Towards the achievement of sustainable development: implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including through sustainable consumption and production, building on Agenda 21**  
(continued) (A/C.2/77/L.19/Rev.1, A/C.2/77/L.21 and A/C.2/77/L.44)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.19/Rev.1: Promoting zero-waste approaches to advance the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

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

30. **Mr. Keçeli** (Türkiye), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text aimed to contribute to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the New Urban Agenda, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal. It also sought to build on the work carried out by the United Nations and its partners, without duplicating any current programmes or projects. To that end, the text promoted inter-agency cooperation within the United Nations systems, and with relevant global and regional platforms.

31. All activities proposed in the draft resolution would be covered by voluntary contributions, including the following initiatives: the establishment by the Secretary-General of an advisory board to promote local zero-waste initiatives through the dissemination of best practices; the convening of a one-day high-level event to facilitate dialogue on Sustainable Development Goal 12, including local and national zero-waste initiatives; and the declaration of 30 March as the “International Day of Zero Waste”.

32. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Angola, Belize, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Maldives, Oman, Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Sweden, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zambia. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Central African Republic, Namibia, Saint Lucia and Timor-Leste.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted.*

34. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and supported all efforts to promote environmentally sound waste management. Zero-waste approaches would help to improve waste management and the efforts of the General Assembly in that regard were highly appreciated. The full version of his delegation’s earlier general statement reflected the position of the United States on references to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda.

35. **Mr. Gambert** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine; and, in addition, Monaco, said that the European Union and its member States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and called for its implementation to adhere



strictly to the agreed modalities. The adoption of the draft resolution should not lead to the duplication of existing work and the text did not give a new mandate to the United Nations system with respect to zero waste. The work of the proposed board should therefore be strictly limited to advocacy for the promotion of local and national initiatives. Zero-waste initiatives could contribute to a more circular economy, allow for more sustainable management of natural resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The European Union welcomed the progress made during negotiations in that connection.

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.21 and A/C.2/77/L.44: Promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, building on Agenda 21*

36. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.44](#) had no programme budget implications.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.44 was adopted.*

38. **Mr. Gambert** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and Ukraine; the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia; and, in addition, Monaco, said that the consensus reached on the draft resolution underscored the universal relevance of sustainable consumption and production for the sustainable transformation of economies, and for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. After two years of limited negotiations, the Committee had undertaken to update the draft resolution, in order to reflect recent commitments made by Member States and the United Nations system.

39. While the consensus reached did not fully meet all the desired outcomes, considerable progress had been made. The European Union welcomed the reference to the decision of the Board of the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns to approve the Global Strategy for Sustainable Consumption and Production 2023–2030, as well as references to key decisions taken by the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme. However, the draft resolution did not yet fully reflect the focus on sustainable consumption and production and Sustainable Development Goal 12, and still contained many general paragraphs and retrospective considerations. The text needed to be further streamlined, and its forward-looking and action-oriented aspirations needed to be strengthened.

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.21 was withdrawn.*

**(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (continued)**  
([A/C.2/77/L.23](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.43](#))

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.23 and A/C.2/77/L.43: Towards the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations*

41. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.43](#) had no programme budget implications.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.43 was adopted.*

43. **Mr. Fidoe** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. With regard to the language used in the ninth preambular paragraph, on the scope and applicability of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the United Kingdom considered that all references to international, regional and national legislation and policies should align with the latter, and supported the language in the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea as the authoritative source of any reference to UNCLOS in General Assembly resolutions.

44. **Ms. Banerjee** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which highlighted some of the unique vulnerabilities and urgent economic challenges facing the Caribbean region, and hoped that its adoption would encourage Member States to partner with the Caribbean to bolster the latter's resilience to climate-caused natural disasters. In reference to the twentieth preambular paragraph, the United States noted that debt swaps could be useful tools for supporting certain policy goals, including climate adaptation, but wished to clearly distinguish between the use of debt swaps to achieve policy goals and the use of debt swaps to address debt sustainability issues. Debt swaps tended to be inappropriate for addressing fundamental debt sustainability issues and could not resolve large-scale debt crises nor replace programmes and treatments designed to restore debt sustainability in specific cases. The United States did not support the use of debt swaps to address debt sustainability issues and did not recognize the language as being indicative of such support. The full version of her delegation's earlier general statement reflected the position of the United States on references to technology transfers, trade and WTO.

45. **Ms. İstemil Aydil** (Türkiye) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and welcomed its adoption. While it firmly supported the efforts of the Association of Caribbean States to develop and implement regional initiatives to promote the sustainable conservation and management of coastal and marine resources, Türkiye disassociated itself from the references made in the draft resolution to UNCLOS, which should not be construed as a change in its legal position with respect to the latter.

46. **Mr. Gambert** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine; the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia; and, in addition, Monaco, said that the European Union welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, particularly its reference to declarations calling for urgent action to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 14 targets. It was also crucial that the text underscored the cumulative human impacts on oceans and the role played by healthy ocean ecosystems.

47. However, the language used in the ninth preambular paragraph was not consistent with the agreed language of the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, which should remain the authoritative source of any reference to UNCLOS in General Assembly resolutions. UNCLOS promoted stability of the law and the maintenance of international peace and security. The universal character of UNCLOS was evidenced in its language and purpose, and its commitment to settle all issues pertaining to the law of the sea on the basis that they were interrelated and needed to be considered as a whole. Joining consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution did not imply agreement with the language used in the ninth preambular paragraph nor support for its use in any future resolution.

48. **Ms. Marin Sevilla** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined in approving the draft resolution for the purposes of achieving consensus, but wished to express its reservations with respect to the contents of the ninth preambular paragraph. Venezuela was not a State party to UNCLOS and, as such, the latter's norms were not applicable to Venezuela, under conventional law or international custom, except when expressly recognized, or if recognized in the future, by the Venezuelan State, through inclusion in national legislation. The reasons preventing Venezuela's accession to such instruments continued to exist.

49. **Mr. Hajilari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to disassociate itself from the references made to UNCLOS in the text.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.23 was withdrawn.*

**(j) Combating sand and dust storms (continued)**  
(A/C.2/77/L.42/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.42/Rev.1: Combating sand and dust storms*

51. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that a recorded vote had been requested by Israel.

52. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States supported efforts to combat sand and dust storms, which had different causes, in different places, at different times. However, due to language used in the final text that reflected bias against a single Member State, the United States would have to vote against the draft resolution. The full version of his delegation's earlier general statement reflected the position of the United States on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and technology transfers.

53. **Mr. Arnj** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had actively participated in the negotiations, and had called for a vote on the draft resolution, in the light of its extreme importance. The draft resolution contained factually incorrect references to the identity of participants in the high-level interactive dialogue on sand and dust storms held at the United Nations Headquarters on 16 July 2018. Although his delegation and others had highlighted the matter during negotiations, some delegations had ignored the facts and insisted on distorting events. Israel would not be coerced into accepting the language of the text and would continue to vote against the draft resolution, until the drafters decided that promoting sustainable development was more important than inserting a narrow political agenda into the work of the Committee. His delegation called on others to vote against the draft resolution and hoped that more attention would be paid to sustainable development in the future, so that the text could be adopted by consensus.

54. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.42/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

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, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Australia, Papua New Guinea.

55. *The draft resolution was adopted by 174 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

**Agenda item 19: Follow-up to the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (continued)** (A/C.2/77/L.39 and A/C.2/77/L.49)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.39 and A/C.2/77/L.49: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)*

56. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.49 had no programme budget implications.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.49 was adopted.*

58. **Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, since helping human settlements recover after conflicts and disasters was part of the mandate of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). In that connection, it was disappointed that the text did not recognize the impact of Russia's war against Ukraine and other conflicts causing urban infrastructure, development and environmental damage. The full version of her delegation's earlier general statement reflected the position of the United States on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.39 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence (continued)** (A/C.2/77/L.2 and A/C.2/77/L.46)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.2 and A/C.2/77/L.46: Towards a New International Economic Order*

60. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.46 had no programme budget implications and that a recorded vote had been requested.

61. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States would vote against the draft resolution and urged other to do the same. His delegation had numerous concerns with the text, including language that sought to prescribe actions for independent institutions, such as IMF and the World Bank, and a problematic reference to "unilateral economic, financial or trade measures". The draft resolution also called for technology transfers, but not on a voluntary basis or on mutually agreed terms, and contained an unacceptable reference to "foreign occupation".



62. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.46.*

*In favour:*

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, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, 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, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, 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, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Armenia, Türkiye.

63. *The draft resolution was adopted by 124 votes to 50, with 2 abstentions.*

64. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the States members of the European Union had voted against the draft resolution in its current form. The latter had participated in good faith in the negotiations, but had not been able to reach a consensus, because of two divergent positions. The voting pattern was in line with the European Union position on previous resolutions on the New International Economic Order, and the arguments remained the same. The European Union remain convinced that resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1974 did not provide a contemporary framework for addressing the multiple challenges of the current globalized world. Referencing concepts from the mid-1970s could send an inaccurate message about the inability of the United Nations to help solve current problems and risked marginalizing the Organization's role in global economic governance.

65. As explained at previous sessions, the draft resolution continued to address substantive issues already covered in other General Assembly resolutions. The text also addressed work covered by the Economic and Social Council forum on financing for development follow-up, and, while the work of the Committee was very important, duplications of work should be avoided. The outcomes of the United Nations conferences concluded in 2015, the Sendai Framework, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement provided the framework for addressing current issues. Due consideration should also be given to the debates and outcomes of other relevant institutions and forums, such as the Bretton Woods Institutions, the Group of 20 and WTO. The European Union stood ready to engage in discussions aimed at enhancing global economic governance, with a view to a strong, coherent, inclusive and representative international architecture for sustainable development, while respecting the mandates of respective organizations.

66. When speaking of increasing concessional funds and the allocation of special drawing rights, the European Union considered that Member States should only be called upon to fulfil their official development assistance (ODA) commitments. Questions relating to increased donations to international financial institutions were negotiated by the governors of each institution, within the frameworks of their financial capacities. Furthermore, the draft resolution contained unacceptable language on unilateral coercive measures and called for technology transfers that were not on mutually agreed terms.

67. Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.2](#) was withdrawn.

**(b) International migration and development**  
(continued) ([A/C.2/77/L.12](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.48](#))

*Draft resolutions [A/C.2/77/L.12](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.48](#):  
International migration and development*

68. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.48](#) had no programme budget implications.

69. Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.48](#) was adopted.

70. **Mr. Cimino** (Italy) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, as it had done in previous years. Italy had, for numerous years, been partnering with many countries of origin and transit to address the root causes of forced migration, while hosting and supporting several diaspora communities. The current text of the draft resolution contained additional references to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and to the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum. The adoption of the draft resolution did not change Italy's stance on the Global Compact, as stated both at the time of its adoption in 2018 and on the occasion of the adoption of the Progress Declaration.

71. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, his delegation wished to clarify its views on several elements of the text. The United States had outlined its understanding of the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum in May 2022, and that understanding remained applicable to the paragraphs of the draft resolution that were drawn from the Declaration. The United States had issued a Revised National Statement on the Adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, which contained certain clarifications and limitations, and that Statement continued to reflect its position on the references made to the Global Compact in the text of the draft resolution.

72. His delegation endorsed the vision contained in the Global Compact, and remained committed to working with other countries to manage migration in ways grounded in human rights, transparency, non-discrimination, the sharing of responsibilities and State sovereignty. The Global Compact was an aspirational document that did not create or change rights or obligations under international or domestic law. Similarly, the draft resolution outlined non-legally binding commitments, which the United States aspired to meet, where consistent with its domestic law and international obligations. His delegation interpreted references to due process and other protections to be

consistent with the international legal obligations, laws and practices of the United States.

73. The abbreviated references to certain human rights contained in the Progress Declaration were understood to be abbreviations of the more accurate terms used in applicable treaties. The United States maintained its long-standing positions on specific rights and on the territorial scope of its obligations under the treaties to which it was a party. It further recognized that neither the draft resolution nor the Progress Declaration required States to implement provisions of international instruments to which they were not a party, and remained concerned about the equating of speech and ideas with violence. The position of the United States on other issues covered in the draft resolution was contained in the full version of his delegation's earlier general statement.

74. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation welcomed the adopted of the draft resolution, which had been possible thanks to the constructive efforts of all delegations. The draft contained a number of new and important elements, such as avoiding the so-called "brain drain" and highlighting the link between migration and regional integration processes. While the draft resolution noted that highly trained, skilled and professional workers from developing countries continued to emigrate at an increasing rate to certain countries, it also recommended specific national and international measures to reverse that trend, optimize the "brain gain" in countries of origin and harness the demographic dividend.

75. It was noteworthy that the draft resolution also called for the elimination of all forms of discrimination, including racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, stigmatization, hate speech, hate crimes targeting migrants and diasporas as well as negative stereotyping and misleading narratives that generated negative perceptions of migration and migrants. Unfortunately, migrants of some nationalities and with certain religious beliefs continued to be subjected to unjustified pressure and even persecution in countries of destination. It was unfortunate therefore that the wording proposed by one delegation, calling on States to save migrants' lives and prevent harm from being done to them, was not included in the final draft.

76. **Mr. Ebner** (Austria) said that although some of the paragraphs in the text were in conflict with the Austrian national position on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, as it had done previously when the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum had been

adopted. Austria had abstained from voting on the Global Compact in 2018, and while it had not objected to some paragraphs in the draft resolution, its general position on the Global Compact had not changed.

77. **Mr. Gaal** (Hungary) said that Hungary had voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in 2018 and had not taken part in its implementation since then. Accordingly, it could not accept any references to the Global Compact in internationally negotiated documents. His delegation did not believe that migration could or should be the answer to developmental challenges, but rather, that the focus should be placed on development projects in countries of origin, aimed at establishing lasting solutions and improving living conditions. The overall approach of the draft resolution remained fundamentally different from Hungary's general position on migration, and Hungary therefore disassociated itself from the entire text of the draft resolution.

78. **Mr. Bisseswar** (Netherlands) said that the consensual adoption of the draft resolution was a positive development, and the Netherlands would continue to support the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration as the leading framework for international migration management. The Netherlands would also seek to advance the implementation of the recommendations of the International Migration Review Forum, in collaboration with the United Nations Network on Migration. In that regard, the position of the Netherlands remained as expressed at the time of adoption of the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum.

79. **Ms. Ozolina** (Latvia) said that while Latvia had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had noted that several paragraphs of the text made reference to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and its implementation. Latvia had not voted for the Global Compact in 2018, and did not apply its provisions, nor those of the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum.

80. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia) said that while Czechia had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in 2018. As such, neither the Global Compact nor the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum established any legal obligations for Czechia, and neither should lead to the emergence of customary international law. Furthermore, those documents should not serve national or international courts as points of reference for the

interpretation of any legal provisions in the area of migration.

81. **Mr. Malinauskas** (Lithuania) said that Lithuania welcomed States' sovereign authority, within their jurisdiction, to distinguish between regular and irregular migration. That distinction could have been more clearly mainstreamed throughout the text of the draft resolution. While social security and welfare rights were issues of national competence solely, all migrants were entitled to safe access to basic services. Effective migration management should be based on a comprehensive approach, covering both possibilities and responsibilities. Countries of origin, transit and destination should cooperate on all aspects of that comprehensive approach and, in particular, effective border management, the fight against smuggling and human trafficking, and addressing the root causes of migration, without giving rise to unreasonable expectations for the legalization of irregular migration flows.

82. **Mr. Lages** (Portugal) said that his delegation welcomed the alignment of the draft resolution with the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, which was a comprehensive and holistic framework for discussions on international migration. The text had been updated to take into account the Progress Declaration of the International Migration Review Forum, and its content had therefore made decisive strides in the right direction. Portugal also welcomed the consensual adoption of the draft resolution, after several years of adoption by vote, which sent a strong political signal of the international community's determination to harness the contribution made by migrants to sustainable development.

83. **Ms. Garbacz** (Poland) said that while Poland had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, the text contained many references to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and to the International Migration Review Forum, neither of which was supported by Poland. Joining the consensus on the draft resolution did not change Poland's position on those instruments.

84. **Mr. Gatev** (Bulgaria) said that Bulgaria had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, despite having abstained from voting on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. Bulgaria's position in that respect remained unchanged.

85. **Monsignor Murphy** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation welcomed the consensual adoption of the draft resolution, which helped to identify and respond to socioeconomic challenges faced in the context of international migration, and set out concrete

measures for leveraging the opportunities presented by well managed international migration. In that regard, the Holy See welcomed the strengthening of the text's operative part and the inclusion of the recommendations made by the International Migration Review Forum. Nonetheless, his delegation regretted that the recommendation focusing on the overall protection of migrants' right to life was the only one omitted, and hoped that it would be included whenever the draft resolution was next considered. With regard to the term "gender", the Holy See expressed the reservation that the term was understood by his delegation to be grounded in biological sexual identity and difference, referring therefore to either male or female.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.12 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/77/L.15/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.15/Rev.1: Promotion of sustainable and resilient tourism, including ecotourism, for poverty eradication and environmental protection*

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

88. **Ms. El Hilali** (Morocco), introducing the draft resolution, said that tourism was one of the sectors that was hardest hit by the COVID-19 pandemic, which had jeopardized between 100 and 120 million jobs, primarily in small and medium-sized enterprises. International cooperation was needed to facilitate a sustainable recovery in the tourism sector, which, in addition to being a crucial source of revenue for developing countries, also helped to strengthen supply chains, increase the productivity of local businesses and generate jobs, especially for women and young people, while being a potential lever for development. Tourism played an important economic role for local communities, and sustainable tourism practices helped to create wealth and preserve cultures and natural heritage. Discussions on the draft resolution had highlighted the need to build traveller confidence, understand and monitor new market trends and develop more resilient and inclusive tourism sectors.

89. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Czechia, Estonia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Nepal, Netherlands, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Suriname, Tunisia, Turkmenistan

and Zambia. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Bahrain, Colombia, Eswatini, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Myanmar, Namibia, North Macedonia, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, South Africa and Uzbekistan.

90. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

91. **Ms. Mamesah** (Indonesia) said that the tourism industry contributed significantly to the economies of many countries and had been negatively impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Her delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution contained a reference to the report on World Tourism Day 2022, entitled "Rethinking Tourism: From Crisis to Transformation". The draft resolution clearly reflected a common desire to strengthen cooperation for the promotion of a sustainable and resilient tourism sector.

**(a) Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027)** (*continued*) (A/C.2/77/L.24 and A/C.2/77/L.54)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.24 and A/C.2/77/L.54: Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027)*

92. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.54 had no programme budget implications.

93. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.54 was adopted.*

94. **Mr. Curran** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and Ukraine; the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia; and, in addition, Andorra and Monaco, said that because the eradication of poverty had been further hindered by the COVID-19 pandemic, the triple global crisis and the impact of geopolitical tensions and conflicts, the draft resolution took on a renewed importance for accelerating achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. It identified the need for a sustainable approach to all aspects of recovery, and emphasized the relevance of food and nutrition security, and education, for poverty eradication. The text stressed the importance of health services, social protection systems, sustainable industrialization and sustainable jobs, while acknowledging the link between poverty eradication and the empowerment of women and girls. The draft resolution underscored the importance of building resilience and was a commitment to leave no one behind on the path to recovery.



95. **Ms. Banerjee** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and wished to clarify its position on certain parts of the text. With regard to paragraph 19, her delegation underscored that trade language that was negotiated or adopted by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, or under their auspices, bore no relevance to the trade policy, obligations or commitments of the United States, or to the WTO agenda. The same position applied to calls to adopt approaches that could undermine incentives for innovation, such as technology transfers that were not both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

96. In paragraph 36, her delegation understood the reference to scaled up ODA to refer to ODA support for fiscal capacity, and not as a generic call for scaling up ODA. With respect to paragraphs 29 and 37, the United States recognized as precedent the language on ODA commitments and targets used in paragraph 51 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and reiterated in the Committee's 2022 draft resolution on financing for development. The United States understood the language in those paragraphs to refer to commitments made by each country, and had not committed to a particular ODA-to-gross national income target. The position of the United States on trade, WTO, concessional finance and technology transfers were contained in the longer version of her delegation's earlier general statement.

97. **Mr. Gaal** (Hungary) said that Hungary was entirely committed to the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals and to the eradication of poverty, and wished to play a more prominent role in addressing the biggest challenges facing the international community. Hungary therefore prioritized the implementation of programmes and projects in several fields, in an effort to foster sustainable development and eradicate poverty. While his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, the enumeration of vulnerable groups inside the text was not in line with the position of Hungary. A more general reference to vulnerable groups and people in vulnerable situations would have been preferred.

98. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.24 was withdrawn.*

**(d) Human resources development (continued)**  
(A/C.2/77/L.27 and A/C.2/77/L.47)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.27 and A/C.2/77/L.47:  
Human resources development*

99. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.47 had no programme budget implications.

100. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.47 was adopted.*

101. **Mr. Sellars** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution with the express understanding that references to the taking of measures on various aspects of education had been made in terms that were mindful of and consistent with its own national, federal, State and local governance frameworks for education. The full version of his delegation's earlier general statement reflected its position on technology transfers.

102. **Mr. de La Maisonnette** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Andorra and Monaco, said that the European Union and its member States were pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, which was more important than ever before, given the many significant challenges that had arisen since the adoption of the preceding resolution on the subject. The development of human capital was a critical element for overcoming those challenges. The European Union and its member States therefore considered human resources as a priority and were the main providers of ODA, through innovative financial instruments, in keeping with their commitment to support global efforts to overcome shocks, challenges and obstacles. In that regard, education, health and digitalization were key levers of human resource development and catalysts for the accelerated achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

103. **Mr. Gaal** (Hungary) said that despite the importance of the draft resolutions and its goals, Hungary could not support the paragraphs relating to migration, since migration was not the solution for addressing challenges in countries of origin. Instead of promoting departures from countries of origin and facilitating migration, the focus should be placed on providing assistance so that people could stay in their own countries in peace and prosperity. Hungary therefore disassociated itself from paragraphs 16, 18 and 42 of the draft resolution.

104. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.27 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 23: Operational activities for development (continued)**

**(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (continued)**  
(A/C.2/77/L.37 and A/C.2/77/L.45)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.37 and A/C.2/77/L.45:  
Operational activities for development of the United Nations system*

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

106. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.45 was adopted.*

107. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and drew attention to the full version of his delegation's earlier general statement for its position on cross-cutting issues contained in the text, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

108. **Mr. de La Maisonnette** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Norway, said that the European Union and its member States supported the consensual adoption of the draft resolution, given that the reform of the United Nations development system was in a crucial phase. The text reflected important priorities and would significantly contribute to preparations for the upcoming operational activities for development segment of the Economic and Social Council. However, it was disappointing that the Committee had failed to reach a consensus on evoking the precarious funding situation of the resident coordinator system and the need for the latter to be adequately, predictably and sustainably funded.

109. There had also been some confusion surrounding the language used in relation to the funding compact. The European Union and its member States supported having the operational activities segment of the Economic and Social Council as the main governing body of the United Nations development system. Discussions had clearly highlighted the need to strengthen and take full advantage of the Council's operational activities segment and his delegation looked forward to constructive discussions on that matter in the near future.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.37 was withdrawn.*

*The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.*