

**General Assembly**

Seventy-seventh session

**Official Records**Distr.: General  
26 January 2023

Original: English

---

**Second Committee****Summary record of the 25th meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 23 November 2022, at 9 a.m.

*Chair:* Ms. Stoeva ..... (Bulgaria)**Contents**Agenda item 16: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)(a) International trade and development (*continued*)Agenda item 18: Sustainable development (*continued*)(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*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 21: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*)Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)(c) Women in development (*continued*)Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 124: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Completion of the Committee's work

---

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 9 a.m.*

**Agenda item 16: Macroeconomic policy questions**  
(continued) (A/C.2/77/L.11/Rev.1 and A/C.2/77/L.75;  
A/C.2/77/CRP.2)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.11/Rev.1: Promotion of  
inclusive and effective international tax cooperation at  
the United Nations*

1. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/77/L.75.

2. **Mr. Abubakar** (Nigeria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the promotion of inclusive international tax cooperation was critical for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A global taxation regime under the United Nations was urgently needed to enable States to effectively mobilize domestic resources and address multiple global crises, including the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, potential economic depressions, the climate crisis and conflict. The draft resolution was a historic opportunity for Governments, especially in developing countries, to access much needed resources, in order to respond to the crises and to make progress towards achieving sustainable development.

3. African political leaders were resolute in their desire to enhance domestic resource mobilization, good governance and investment in both Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want and the 2030 Agenda. African countries were focused on strengthening tax systems in a fair and equitable manner and had undertaken many initiatives and efforts in that connection. The Group had invested heavily in tax policy and tax administration and, in so doing, had significantly increased its capacity in the preceding years, with the support of donors and international institutions. However, in the light of globalization and integration with the rest of the world, the progress made on the African continent was not enough. International progress was needed to ensure that all taxpayers paid their fair share. While African countries had also strengthened their participation in tax cooperation efforts and had made remarkable strides, more work was required to ensure an inclusive process, both domestically and internationally.

4. A common foundation was needed, to raise sufficient revenue for investments in the 2030 Agenda. The General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had repeatedly underscored the need for

international tax cooperation to focus on the unique needs and capacities of developing countries. The Conference of African Ministers of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, held on 17 May 2022, had called on the United Nations to begin negotiations on an international convention on tax matters, with a view to making tax cooperation universal. As the substantive international tax instruments and forums lacked inclusiveness, an instrument created by the United Nations would set an ambitious global standard and create a mechanism for transparency and accountability, in order to establish a globally inclusive intergovernmental tax body under the auspices of the United Nations. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) had played a role in that area, but after 10 years of attempts to reform international tax rules, there was clearly no substitute for the global, inclusive and transparent forum provided by the United Nations.

5. The Group therefore urged countries to remain committed to the development of inclusive tax instruments by the United Nations and encouraged OECD to play a supporting role in that regard. It hoped that the draft resolution would help to realize the vision of its ministers. Negotiations on the text had been extremely difficult, but all delegations were urged to support the draft resolution in moving forward, in order to build a fully inclusive and more effective international tax system.

6. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Jordan wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

7. **The Chair** drew attention to a proposed amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which had been submitted by the United States of America and was contained in document A/C.2/77/CRP.2.

8. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that paragraph 2 of the current draft resolution called for intergovernmental discussions at the United Nations on ways to strengthen international tax cooperation through a truly inclusive process. Her delegation felt strongly that it was not in the spirit of the beginning of an inclusive process to prejudge the outcomes of those discussions. The proposed amendment therefore entailed the deletion of the following phrase from paragraph 2: "including the possibility of developing an international tax cooperation framework or instrument that is developed and agreed upon through a United Nations intergovernmental process". The proposed deletion did not preclude any option from the

discussions but, rather, sought to remove all limits from the conversation.

9. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposed amendment.

10. **Ms. Joyini** (South Africa), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that South Africa supported the draft resolution. Seven years had passed since the adoption of Sustainable Development Goal 16, target 4, on combating illicit financial flows, and the issue continued to be of critical importance. For many years, developing countries had been calling for a global intergovernmental process to affectively address tax matters and the time had come to realize one of the important aspects of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, which had significant potential for scaling up domestic public resources.

11. By supporting the draft resolution, Member States would be indicating their support for an equitable and just world, and the right to development of all States. A United Nations tax convention would set global standards and create mechanisms for transparency and accountability, and the Organization was the most appropriate venue for such discussions, given its universal membership and all-inclusive nature. All Member States were therefore urged to support the draft resolution and, in so doing, recommit to strengthened international development cooperation.

12. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.2/77/CRP.2 to amend paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.11/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Suriname, Türkiye, Uruguay.

13. *The proposal was rejected by 97 votes to 55, with 13 abstentions.\**

14. **Mr. Kvalheim** (Norway) said that Norway placed great importance on the subject of international tax cooperation and had engaged constructively in the discussions, with a view to achieving a consensus. The current text made constructive suggestions for improving cooperation on tax matters. His Government considered financial transparency to be a key priority and had high ambitions of fighting tax evasion and illicit financial flows, in order to finance and implement the Sustainable Development Goals. Norway was fully committed to the Two-Pillar Solution to Address the Tax Challenges Arising from the Digitalization of the Economy put forward by OECD and the Group of 20 (G20), which was an important step forward for international taxation. At the same time, Norway acknowledged the important role played by the United Nations and the important

\* The delegation of Guinea subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote against the proposal.

milestones reached by the Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters, which had made major progress on tax cooperation under the financing for development umbrella.

15. There were several common policy areas between the work done by OECD and that done by the United Nations, with respect to taxation, anti-corruption and illicit financial flows, and Norway encouraged closer collaboration between both organizations on key issues of transparency and accountability. Norway had abstained from voting on the proposed amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Discussions on tax cooperation were still at an early stage and Norway would be abstaining from voting on potential instruments or frameworks, since any such endeavour would need to be preceded by a thorough analysis and informed by inputs from all Member States. That discussion had not yet taken place, and any process undertaken at the United Nations or elsewhere should focus on promoting synergies and avoid the duplication and overlap of efforts.

16. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom supported the efforts made by developing countries to scale up domestic resource mobilization. Significant progress had been made at OECD in recent years, and initiatives such as the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes, the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting and the Two-Pillar Solution were significant steps towards establishing a fairer international tax system for all. Those initiatives were open to all and non-OECD members could participate in them on an equal footing. Notwithstanding the foregoing, developing countries continued to have concerns, especially regarding inclusion and their capacity to engage effectively. The United Kingdom fully supported efforts to address those concerns and wanted developing countries to benefit from those important initiatives.

17. His delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendment, because the original language used in paragraph 2 prejudged new initiatives at the United Nations, which could duplicate and potentially undermine existing OECD work at a crucial point of the implementation of the Two-Pillar Solution. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and hoped that the mandated report of the Secretary-General would avoid recommending new, potentially duplicative work, and focus instead on recommendations for strengthening

OECD initiatives. The G20/OECD Roadmap on Developing Countries and International Taxation set out clear recommendations for maximizing the benefits of existing initiatives in developing countries, and should serve as a guide.

18. **Ms. Luo** (Singapore) said that Singapore supported the key objective of the draft resolution, which aimed to strengthen international tax cooperation in an inclusive manner and ensure that the interests of developing countries were taken into account. At the same time, Singapore recognized the diversity of views on how to approach the issue and was mindful of the important work being conducted in other forums. In the current climate, it was imperative, especially for delegations from small States, to avoid duplicating efforts and to maximize the limited available resources. It was in that spirit that Singapore had worked with other delegations to put forward compromise proposals that reflected the delicate balance and diversity of views on the subject. All Member States were encouraged to actively participate in the Secretary-General's consultations for the preparation of his report, which would outline potential steps for strengthening the inclusiveness and effectiveness of international tax cooperation.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.11/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

20. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and Ukraine; and the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, said that the European Union and its member States agreed on the timeliness and importance of strengthening international tax cooperation, in an effective and inclusive manner. The Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting had already brought together 141 jurisdictions that were committed to delivering a multilateral solution to address the tax challenges faced by all countries in a globalized environment. Creating a new parallel track of discussions was not the right way to meet the objective of strengthening cooperation, and would jeopardize that common objective. The focus should instead be placed on operationalizing the landmark agreement reached under the OECD Inclusive Framework, which would bring about concrete short-term benefits and more stability for all economies.

21. While recognizing the need for diversity, the European Union and its member States felt that OECD

and G20 should be encouraged to continue increasing their capacity-building efforts, in cooperation with other multilateral and regional organizations, in order to provide an implementation framework for the Two-Pillar Solution, which would be beneficial for all. Member States were therefore urged to support the work of the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting and the Two-Pillar Solution, in order to address common tax challenges, including those arising from the digitalization of the economy. Member States should also implement the Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information in Tax Matters, and support the 165-member Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes. The success of those initiatives would represent a significant multilateral achievement for all Member States, and stronger tax cooperation, while avoiding the duplication of existing processes.

22. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would create unnecessary parallel work on the same issues, and undermine the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting. The latter had become more necessary than ever before, for delivering on the agreement reached and finding a mutually agreed solution for all.

23. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but wished to clarify its position on critical issues relating to the text. The United States strongly supported the political commitment, made by 137 members of the OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Sharing, to reform the international tax architecture and stabilize the international tax system using the Two-Pillar Solution spearheaded by OECD. Such an approach would make the international tax system fairer and fit for the twenty-first century economy. The Two-Pillar Solution was a significant accomplishment for economic diplomacy that would end the race to the bottom on corporate tax rates and inbound investment incentives offered by developing countries, level the playing field for business and improve fairness for workers around the world. It had been adopted by countries representing 95 per cent of global gross domestic product (GDP), following years of detailed and intensive work and negotiations in an inclusive setting.

24. The United States therefore disagreed with the notion implied by the draft resolution that there was no highly inclusive forum working to strengthen international tax cooperation. Any decision to launch

intergovernmental discussions on strengthening the inclusiveness and effectiveness of international tax cooperation through the evaluation of additional options, including a possible tax cooperation instrument or framework outside of the Two-Pillar Solution, would be inconsistent with the latter.

25. Lastly, the United States wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, since it proposed a process that would eliminate much of the recent progress made on international tax cooperation and undermine the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting. Similarly, paragraph 3 undermined the Committee's ability to work constructively to improve international tax cooperation, and calls for the Secretary-General to prepare a new report were inappropriate. Establishing an intergovernmental committee to recommend new actions before the completion of the implementation of the Two-Pillar Solution would undermine efforts to stabilize the international tax system and help it become fit for purpose.

26. **Ms. Micael** (Eritrea), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the COVID-19 pandemic had impacted the world and changed realities more than any other crisis in recent history, and the situation had been aggravated by vulnerabilities such as climate change, armed conflicts and structural challenges. As a result, there had been widespread economic destabilization, supply chain disruptions, rising inflation and debt pressure and, ultimately, low success rates in the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, especially in Africa. The implementation of the 2030 Agenda and Agenda 2063 depended on Africa's ability to mobilize sufficient, predictable and timely financial resources, as outlined in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

27. Illicit financial flows had a significant negative impact on socioeconomic development, since they drained foreign exchange reserves, reduced domestic resource mobilization, prevented the flow of foreign direct investment, exacerbated insecurity, worsened poverty and economic inequality, undermined the rule of law and worsened macroeconomic conditions. Tax-related illicit financial flows were global problems requiring global cooperation, and the United Nations was the best multilateral forum for addressing such challenges and providing inclusive solutions. Effective international tax cooperation remained neglected in global economic governance and required concerted efforts to bridge the gap through a comprehensive and

just United Nations framework on tax cooperation that would unite developing and developed countries.

28. The Group stressed the need to promote tax cooperation and establish a governance structure in which all Member States could participate on an equal footing, which was not the case in existing structures. There was a need to reinforce the global fight against illicit financial flows by increasing transparency and cooperation between Governments, and by developing more coherent and less complex global tax rules, standards and structures that took into account the interests, concerns and needs of developing countries. The Group underscored the need to work together to increase the effectiveness of the global tax system and remove opportunities for international tax evasion. In that regard, the draft resolution aimed to ensure cooperation among all Member States and establish a single global system that would work for all countries, and not just a few.

29. **Mr. Oehri** (Liechtenstein) said that the strengthening of international tax cooperation had been a long-standing priority for Liechtenstein, which was committed to international collaboration to tackle tax avoidance, ensure a more transparent tax environment and strengthen the rule of law. Existing multilateral forums, such as the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes and the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting had delivered tangible results for improving international taxation standards, and all Member States were encouraged to join those initiatives and actively contribute to their work. Any new efforts to strengthen international tax cooperation should build on existing initiatives, rather than compete with them.

30. Liechtenstein had joined the consensus on the draft resolution with the firm understanding that further discussions at the United Nations on the matter would take into consideration all relevant legal instruments and forms of international cooperation, in order to avoid duplicative processes that might not necessarily be more inclusive or effective. In that regard, Liechtenstein hoped that the comprehensive report to be prepared by the Secretary-General would provide clarity on how international tax cooperation could be further promoted.

31. **Mr. Schlaepfer** (Switzerland) said that while Switzerland was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, certain aspects of its position on the text needed to be clarified. Considerable progress had been made in the preceding decade in the area of international tax cooperation and substantial reforms had been carried

out by the international community, particularly with respect to transparency and the taxation of business profits. New forums open to the participation of all States had been created, with many developing countries among their members. Current commitments aimed at reforming the international tax system required countries to allocate significant resources to such undertakings. The creation of new bodies with more or less the same objectives would increase costs, to the detriment of countries with limited resources.

32. For those reasons, Switzerland doubted that the draft resolution would lead to increased inclusiveness in the area of international taxation and questioned whether the proposed framework would lead to different or even better results, in comparison with existing frameworks. The content of any instrument establishing global standards needed to be acceptable to the entire international community, to the same extent as standards developed by other bodies. While Switzerland wished to be a constructive partner in the strengthening of international tax cooperation, it preferred to begin by strengthening existing forums, including those supported by OECD, and avoid creating duplicative structures that would undermine the relevance of established processes.

33. **Mr. Morelli** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that those delegations supported the need for international cooperation to ensure fair and effective taxation, which was an important tool for Governments to deliver essential goods and services, and support development efforts. Despite persistent challenges, institutional arrangements on taxation had considerably broadened and improved in the preceding years, to enable the effective involvement of all interested countries. Such arrangements included those initiated by OECD, which had developed new and global formats for addressing the challenges of tax coordination.

34. Under the leadership of OECD and G20, the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes had created new standards for the exchange of information between tax authorities and helped countries to implement them, in order to put an end to bank secrecy and ensure that money could not be hidden in other jurisdictions. In addition, the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting had been established to address corporate tax avoidance and harmful tax practices, while ensuring the equal participation of all interested jurisdictions in the development of base erosion and profit shifting

standards. There had been broad international support for both initiatives, and the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting was working to implement an ambitious Two-Pillar Solution in 137 countries, with the aim of ensuring a fair tax contribution from large multinational companies.

35. Since that process was well under way, there was concern that launching intergovernmental discussions at the United Nations on new tax cooperation mechanisms could undermine ongoing negotiations, which were at a critical stage, and divert scarce country resources. While those negotiations had been delicate, they had also been constructive and inclusive, with the active engagement of developing countries, including countries in special situations, in the shaping of the core rules of the Two-Pillar Solution. As such, given the possibility of duplication and fragmentation, and concerns regarding the resources required to implement the draft resolution, challenges with the implementation of a new United Nations process were anticipated.

36. Although they disagreed with some of the steps to be taken, Australia, Canada and New Zealand had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because they recognized the need for fair and effective taxation, as well as the importance of the subject, which required coordination, cooperation and compromise. They stood ready to engage in discussions and listen to the concerns of others on tax cooperation matters, with a view to building on the successes already achieved and improving the operation of existing mechanisms.

37. **Ms. Kim Yoonhye** (Republic of Korea) said that her delegation had engaged in the negotiations in good faith and had endeavoured to identify any possible common ground. Since the draft resolution would be discussed annually, her delegation wished to explain its position on the procedural aspects of the negotiation process and a multilateral approach.

38. First, intergovernmental discussions on tax cooperation required sufficient domestic discussions among relevant ministries and authorities, and proper coordination among countries. It was therefore regrettable that the zero draft had been submitted to establish a new, legally binding mechanism, without any preparatory work to accommodate different views and identify common ground. Compared to the current text, the zero draft had only referred to unrealistic promises to create a new mechanism and had ignored all relevant existing achievements, efforts and progress. In keeping with the multilateral approach of the United Nations, the process used during the current session should not

constitute a precedent for future processes, and should never be repeated.

39. Second, in presenting the zero draft, the proponents of the draft resolution had underscored the importance of a more inclusive tax mechanism. Regrettably, their experience at the current session would have proven to many delegations that the United Nations could not always guarantee inclusiveness and transparency. While all delegations had been informed that the facilitator would be conducting bilateral consultations, no further information had been provided on the process or the delegations involved. Negotiations at the United Nations were meant to be multilateral, and all consultation tracks should be made public and transparent to ensure trust for the process and mutual trust among delegations. Furthermore, information on programme budget implications had been requested several times during the negotiations, but were only considered towards the end of that process, clearly illustrating a lack of fairness in the treatment of requests from some delegations. The negotiation process needed to be stable, predictable and trustworthy, and that had not been the case during the current session.

40. Third, while the Republic of Korea agreed on the need for more inclusiveness and effectiveness in international tax cooperation, since existing mechanisms were open to all countries, it did not agree that the United Nations was the only forum that could guarantee inclusiveness. Discussions needed to be guided by a pragmatic approach, rather than a political and simplistic one, and, with consultations having been launched in such a rushed manner, there was no guarantee that the relevance of the United Nations would be advanced or that there would be genuine inclusiveness.

41. Lastly, genuine tax cooperation would only be possible if the complex realities and different priorities and interests of all countries were taken into account. While an exclusive reliance on binary views, categorizing countries as “developed” or “developing”, might be convenient, such an approach would not lead to any meaningful outcomes where tax matters were concerned. Her delegation hoped for a fair, pragmatic and meaningful review of the draft resolution during future negotiations.

42. **Mr. Kodama** (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment proposed by the United States because of its concerns about the draft resolution duplicating the efforts undertaken by OECD, which had for a long time played a central role in intergovernmental



discussions on tax cooperation. Since the launch of the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting, discussions at OECD had been fully inclusive, with the participation of non-member countries and jurisdictions. As such, Japan could not support the proposal to begin intergovernmental discussions at the United Nations and possibly develop a United Nations tax convention through an ad hoc intergovernmental committee, since that might distract from the ongoing work on the Two-Pillar Solution and its detailed set of rules, and undermine the progress already made within the framework of other initiatives. Furthermore, since the draft resolution had programme budget implications, the limited resources of the Organization needed to be used effectively and efficiently.

43. **Ms. Aondona** (Nigeria) said that the draft resolution could have been more ambitious. International tax cooperation needed to be universal in scope and approach, and most countries found it difficult to accept the legitimacy of international norms and forums that had been established without their input. There was no single globally inclusive forum on tax cooperation, and the enormous pressure placed on sovereign countries by a less inclusive international organization was regrettable.

44. The Group of African States had sought to promote a draft resolution using the platform afforded by the United Nations, which was a global organization with legitimacy, convening power and normative impact. The High-level Panel on International Financial Accountability, Transparency and Integrity for Achieving the 2030 Agenda had underscored the need for fully inclusive and effective international tax cooperation at the United Nations, and the President of the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly had circulated that recommendation to all Member States, for deliberation at the seventy-sixth session. African ministers had publicly stated their desire for a United Nations tax convention and Member States were encouraged to collectively engage on the draft resolution at future sessions.

**(a) International trade and development**

*(continued) (A/C.2/77/L.5/Rev.1)*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.5/Rev.1: International trade and development*

45. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that a recorded vote had been requested by the United Kingdom on paragraph 24 of the text.

46. *At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 24 of draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.5/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, 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, Tuvalu, 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, Oman, 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:*

Türkiye.

47. *Paragraph 24 of the draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 50, with 1 abstention.*

48. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.5/Rev.1](#) as a whole was adopted.*

49. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; and the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, said that the European Union had engaged proactively and constructively in the discussions, with the aim of arriving at a draft resolution that prioritized the challenges faced by developing countries, and accurately reflected the current global context and the state of negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO). Its support for the text was premised on a strong conviction that trade was a driving force for inclusive growth and poverty eradication, and contributed to sustainable development, structural transformation and industrialization, particularly in developing countries.

50. Multilateral rules were the best guarantee against protectionism, and promoting a universal, rules-based, transparent, open, predictable, inclusive, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under WTO was the best way to achieve meaningful trade liberalization. To ensure that the gains from trade were more widely shared, trade should be inclusive, with the active and equal participation of women as producers and traders. The least developed countries needed to be integrated into the multilateral system in order to ensure that no one was left behind. Moreover, to level the playing field, developing countries needed to have special and differential treatment, based on their individual development needs.

51. The European Union and its member States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and were pleased with the outcomes of the twelfth WTO Ministerial Conference, members' agreement to pursue WTO reform and the progress made towards a comprehensive agreement on fisheries subsidies. They also welcomed the commitment of WTO members to contribute to recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and enhance resilience against future shocks. The draft resolution acknowledged that work remained to be done by WTO members on agriculture, with a view to achieving positive results at the thirteenth Ministerial Conference, which was a high priority for

developing countries. The European Union was committed to combating trade restrictive measures, distortions and speculation, within the framework of the WTO negotiations, without calling into question legitimate measures that were compliant with WTO law. In that respect, the European Union had already largely reformed its agriculture policy in order to eliminate distorting support measures and ensure policy compliance with WTO rules. Other WTO members were invited to take similar steps.

52. The issue of food security had also been addressed in the draft resolution. Climate change and the lasting impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic had negatively affected global food systems and the people who relied on them. The European Union was making every effort to address the ongoing food security and malnutrition crises, but Russia's unprovoked aggression against Ukraine had worsened those challenges and vulnerabilities. Russia had deliberately blocked Ukrainian ports, destroyed stocks, disrupted production and imposed quota restrictions on its own exports of foodstuff and fertilizers, while attempting to shift the blame by intentionally manipulating information and spreading disinformation on European Union sanctions. European Union sanctions fully respected the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and did not target food and fertilizers or contravene the principles of the multilateral trading system. The European Union welcomed the acknowledgement in the draft resolution of the valuable contribution of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

53. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had supported the adoption of the draft resolution, which appropriately reflected the challenges facing international trade and its contribution to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, primarily for developing countries and the poorest ones. Unfortunately, many new trade measures based on unsubstantiated concepts were currently being rolled out, not to ensure the security of States but to create competitive advantages for their national operators. It was clear that international trade was becoming a hostage to unilateral economic coercive measures, which were being imposed on inconvenient States solely on political grounds. In that context, he welcomed the commitment in the draft resolution to promoting a rules-based, non-discriminatory, open, fair, inclusive, equitable and transparent multilateral trading system. Lastly, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. Domestic support for

agriculture and the use of subsidies should remain the prerogative of States and the relevant international platforms.

54. **Ms. Kavaleuskaya** (Belarus) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, in view of the role played by international trade in promoting sustainable development. As the resolution reaffirmed, international trade was an engine for inclusive growth and poverty eradication and it contributed to the promotion of sustainable development, structural transformation and industrialization, particularly in developing countries. Her delegation also wished to reiterate that trade restrictions and unilateral coercive measures were unacceptable as a means of exerting political and economic pressure: such approaches were futile and counterproductive. Belarus remained committed to global efforts to promote a universal, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system within WTO. However, as Belarus was not a WTO member, it had no obligations to correct its foreign trade policy. In that regard, her delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution and did not consider itself bound by the obligations arising therefrom.

55. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said while that the United States supported the core themes of the draft resolution and was pleased to join the consensus, it wished to disassociate itself from two paragraphs following a legal review. Paragraph 17 contained a reference to “combating protectionism in all its forms”, which the United States interpreted as a veiled and inappropriate reference to the use of WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions against unfair and market distorting trade practices. In the same vein, paragraph 24 contained a reference to “unilateral economic, financial or trade measures”. Economic sanctions were an appropriate, effective and legitimate tool that could be used to achieve national security and foreign policy objectives, and the United States was not the only country to hold that view or follow that practice. The United States only applied sanctions with specific objectives in mind, including to promote a return to the rule of law, democratic systems, or respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or to respond to threats to international security.

56. Where draft resolutions referred to independent institutions, the United States preferred neutral language that “noted” or “acknowledged” their function. Language extending beyond the United Nations

mandate and into the mandates of independent entities such as WTO could be found in several paragraphs and the United States considered such language to be non-binding. While the United Nations and WTO shared common interests, they had different roles, rules and memberships. Trade language negotiated or adopted by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, or under their auspices, had no relevance for the trade policy, obligations or commitments of the United States, or for the agenda of WTO. That position also applied to calls to adopt approaches that might undermine incentives for innovation, such as technology transfers that were not both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. Her delegation’s general statement delivered on 21 November 2022 reflected the position of the United States on WTO, the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

57. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom) said that while his delegation had voted to reject paragraph 24 of the draft resolution, it was pleased to join the broader consensus on the text. It recognized that an open, transparent and predictable international trade system helped countries to grow their economies, create decent jobs, raise incomes and lift people out of poverty. The draft resolution acknowledged the progress already made at WTO on global food security, pandemic preparedness, the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and fisheries. It also included the United Kingdom’s proposal recognizing efforts to extend preferential market access to a larger number of developing countries. His Government’s Developing Countries Trading Scheme, which would come into effect the following year, aimed to support sustainable growth in developing countries by reducing tariffs, liberalizing rules of origin requirements and simplifying other conditions.

58. His delegation had voted against paragraph 24 because it could not support the inclusion of language on sanctions in the draft resolution. Like other countries, the United Kingdom used autonomous sanctions to deter, constrain and change egregious behaviours, including serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation and corruption. Such sanctions were carefully targeted and provided for exceptions to support humanitarian assistance.

59. **Mr. Morelli** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that those delegations remained committed to promoting a universal rules-based, open, transparent, predictable, inclusive, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading

system, centred around WTO. For that reason, they had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which rightly recognized the importance of a meaningful and effective rules-based international order that levelled the playing field for all, and reduced uncertainty in the global economy.

60. While the draft resolution had made progress, Australia, Canada and New Zealand opposed paragraph 24 and its reference to “unilateral economic, financial or trade measures”. Although that paragraph had not been negotiated during the current session, there remained some concerns about its mischaracterization. Sanctions were used judiciously, and were a legitimate foreign policy tool for preserving peace and the rule of law, upholding human rights and strengthening international security. Sanctions did not contravene the Charter of the United Nations, which had recognized, from its very establishment, the potential necessity of such tools, in order to address threats to global peace and security, particularly in instances where the Security Council was unable to act. Through exemptions, all sanctions had explicit carve-outs for humanitarian assistance, so as to limit the impact on the flow of food and essential items.

#### **Agenda item 18: Sustainable development** (continued) (A/C.2/77/L.16/Rev.1)

##### *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.16/Rev.1: Entrepreneurship for sustainable development*

61. **Mr. Ben Naftaly** (Israel), introducing the draft resolution, said that entrepreneurs and their micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises accounted for 90 per cent of businesses and over 50 percent of employment worldwide. In times of economic downturn, they could quickly meet market needs and address often overlooked social and environmental problems. The draft resolution highlighted the need for Governments, the United Nations system and other stakeholders to recognize the potential of entrepreneurs and develop coherent targeted policies to support them. Governments could help entrepreneurs to reach their potential and entrepreneurs could help their countries to achieve sustainable development.

62. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that a recorded vote on the draft resolution had been requested by the Syrian Arab Republic.

63. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria,

Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan and Zambia. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Cabo Verde, Congo, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea and Malawi.

##### *Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

64. **Mr. Al Nahhas** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that entrepreneurship could certainly make a positive contribution to sustainable development, but not over the dead bodies of women and children under occupation. His delegation had serious concerns about the draft resolution because of the State introducing it. Israel should not be allowed to use the Committee as a platform to trumpet its commitment to development when the Israeli occupation was the main obstacle to development in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan.

65. The draft resolution made reference to the principle of leaving no one behind, even though throughout the session, the Israeli delegation had made strenuous efforts to have the phrase “observer States” removed from all draft resolutions. Similarly, the draft resolution made reference to the role of women, even though the occupation was murdering, imprisoning and displacing hundreds of women, as had been confirmed by successive United Nations reports – most recently the report from the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) on the economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan Group (A/77/90–E/2022/66). After hundreds of resolutions and reports detailing the systematic ways in which Arabs under its occupation were deprived of a life of dignity, Israel had the effrontery to submit a draft resolution that stressed the importance of human dignity for all peoples

of the world. He called on Member States to see through the hypocrisy of Israel using the draft resolution to burnish its image when Israel itself was the primary obstacle to development for Syrians and Palestinians under its occupation. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution and called on other delegations to do the same.

66. **Mr. Hatem** (Bahrain), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that the Group recognized the importance of entrepreneurship to development and was in agreement with the content of the draft resolution. However, it did not consider Israel to be qualified to submit the draft resolution because its actions as an occupying Power were completely at odds with the noble sentiments and goals contained therein.

67. Both the ESCWA report and the report of UNCTAD on assistance to the Palestinian people: developments in the economy of the Occupied Palestinian Territory (TD/B/EX(72)/2) had shown that Israel was the primary obstacle to development in the areas under its occupation. The practices and policies of the Israeli occupation were in violation of international humanitarian law and international human rights law and affected the social and economic conditions of the people living under its military occupation. Israel, the occupying Power, was deliberately undermining such vital sectors as education, infrastructure, water, energy, agriculture, manufacturing, communications and housing. Israeli restrictions were having a negative impact on employment and the economy in general in the West Bank, while the situation was many times worse in Gaza. The policies of the Israeli occupation were impeding development and were being implemented in violation of international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

68. *At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.16/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji,

Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

*Abstaining:*

Angola, China, Maldives, Nicaragua, South Africa, Sri Lanka.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted by 145 votes to 26, with 6 abstentions.*

70. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; 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 and its member States had voted in favour of the draft resolution. While entrepreneurship played a key role in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals – by promoting inclusive economic growth, creating jobs, driving innovation and

creativity, and addressing other socioeconomic and environmental challenges – entrepreneurs and enterprises were facing many obstacles and uncertainties, due to various shocks and crises.

71. Women and girls were important drivers of entrepreneurship and sustainable development, and women needed to be empowered through increased employment and market opportunities. In the same vein, youth entrepreneurship had a key role to play in promoting sustainable economic growth, and generating innovative solutions and transformational development. The COVID-19 pandemic had accelerated digital transformation and presented new opportunities to entrepreneurs, who should be given the opportunity to fully benefit from that trend.

72. The draft resolution contained welcome references to care and domestic work, to the potential role of the social and solidarity economy in fostering inclusive, fair and sustainable development, and to the importance of creating and strengthening an enabling entrepreneurial ecosystem. The European Union wished to highlight the key role played by entrepreneurs and enterprises in promoting a resource-efficient and circular economy, since entrepreneurs were crucial for implementing innovative business models where the concept of value creation was expanded to include environmental and social values. It was however regrettable that the draft resolution had been politicized by some delegations and had once again been subjected to a vote. All delegations were urged to engage constructively in future negotiations, in order to work on a consensual adoption of the draft resolution.

73. **Mr. Erdan** (Israel), making a general statement after the adoption of the draft resolution, said that Palestinian terrorists, only a few hours earlier, had committed two brutal attacks in Jerusalem, killing one person and injuring dozens more, which could cause the situation on the ground to deteriorate. Palestinians continued to prioritize terror and hate over entrepreneurship, and all Member States were expected to vocally condemn Palestinian terrorism and the incitement spread by the Palestinian Authority. While President Abbas had told the General Assembly that he was seeking peace, he had not condemned the horrible attacks, and the Secretary-General, who was always quick to respond in other circumstances, had not rebuked the Palestinian terrorists. The United Nations was a biased institution that needed to wake up.

74. Israel was known for its creativity and bold innovation, and willingly shared its advancements and

know-how with those in need. Israel used its innovation and ambition, which were key elements of entrepreneurship, to make a positive difference in the world, by aiding developing countries to achieve new goals, assisting States struck by natural disasters, working with partners to tackle pressing global challenges and facilitating important United Nations resolutions in order to make an impact.

75. The draft resolution envisioned a future in which every individual could maximize their potential; younger generations could seek to build a brighter future for all; micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises could receive the tools they needed to thrive; sustainable food production could eradicate hunger; and innovators and stakeholders could work together to repair the planet. However, because it had been facilitated by Israel, the text had not been adopted by consensus. The fact that the Syrian Arab Republic had requested a vote on a draft resolution that would only bring prosperity to its people was not surprising, since the latter committed grave human rights abuses against its own citizens. Despite that destructive approach, Israel would continue to promote entrepreneurship, innovation and development, and would continue to develop partnerships with all willing countries.

76. **Ms. Anderson** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it emphasized the vital role of entrepreneurship, the informal economy and the private sector in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. It also underscored the need to support the economic empowerment of those most affected by social inequalities and global crises and conflicts, such as women and girls, young people and persons with disabilities. Furthermore, the text highlighted the role that youth and entrepreneurship could play in addressing the impacts of climate change and environmental challenges. The United Kingdom regretted that such an important text had become politicized, thereby precluding consensus, and looked forward to continuing discussions on the issue.

77. **Ms. Aondona** (Nigeria) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but wished to disassociate itself from the references to “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” contained in paragraph 20.

78. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that entrepreneurship played a vital role in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, and her delegation was pleased to vote in favour of the draft

resolution. With regard to references to technology transfers and geopolitical tensions and conflicts, the position of the United States was reflected in the general statement delivered by her delegation to the Committee on 21 November 2022.

79. **Mr. Al Nahhas** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that document [A/77/90-E/2022/66](#), which had been presented to the Committee on 17 November 2022, was clear and unbiased. It had not been prepared by a government, but rather by a United Nations entity, and had clearly identified the perpetrators of crimes against humanity and other transgressions. His delegation did not wish to politicize the matter any further but, in accordance with the rules of procedure, a State sponsor was not permitted to make a statement in explanation of vote on its own draft resolution. Accordingly, the Syrian Arab Republic wished for the statement just made by the Permanent Representative of Israel to be struck from the record of the meeting.

**(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.22](#), [A/C.2/77/L.55](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.74](#))

*Draft resolutions [A/C.2/77/L.22](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.55](#):  
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*

80. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications prepared in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.55](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.74](#).

81. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.55](#) was adopted.*

82. **Mr. Blair** (Antigua and Barbuda), speaking on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said that there was a need to identify and address the key gaps of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway, and that the impacts of climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic on small island developing States should have been further elaborated in the draft resolution. In preparing the text, the sole objective of AOSIS had been to ensure that the United Nations system and other stakeholders would be ready

to help small island developing States to address the challenges brought about by multiple crises, while safeguarding development gains from future shocks and focusing on the post-2024 blueprint for those countries. The adoption by consensus of the draft resolution had paved the way for a collaborative approach.

83. The agreed language and modalities for the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States further illustrated the continued support given to those countries. That being said, AOSIS wanted a preparatory committee to be established without delay, as mandated in the draft resolution, and hoped that the issues of adequate and concessional financing and debt relief would continue to be a top priority for the United Nations system and development partners. The Conference was therefore expected to culminate in a high-level meeting with international financing institutions, development banks and major donors, in order to deliver targeted and actionable solutions for small island developing States.

84. For 30 years, AOSIS had been calling for a mechanism to address the special vulnerabilities of its membership. A mechanism that addressed the challenges facing its members that had already graduated to middle and high-income status would help those that were about to graduate from the least developed category to avoid similar challenges. As progress continued towards the adoption of the multidimensional vulnerability index for small island developing States, the draft resolution made it explicitly clear that the process needed to be concluded by June 2023. AOSIS looked forward to working with the high-level panel of experts towards the full implementation of the new index.

85. Although not mentioned in the draft resolution, AOSIS would not compromise on its high ambitions with respect to climate change. The Paris Agreement had laid the foundation for climate action, the Glasgow Climate Pact had provided the necessary steps for moving forward, and the twenty-seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had delivered a loss and damage fund. AOSIS would stand firm in its quest for sustainable development and resilience-building.

86. **Ms. Pringle** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada, said that the draft resolution was an important step forward for small island developing States, which continued to call on the international community to move from discussions to



solutions and actions. The text outlined some of the multiple challenges facing small island developing States and recognized the importance of civil society participation in both the preparatory process for and in the holding of the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States.

87. Canada, Australia and New Zealand welcomed the confirmation in the draft resolution of Member State support for the work of the High-level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States. It was hoped that the work of the Panel would be guided by the proposed definitions of vulnerability and resilience referenced in the draft resolution, and by the structure outlined in its interim report. Canada, Australia and New Zealand supported the Panel's request for additional time to complete its work and looked forward to its final report.

88. **Ms. Seror** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, which affirmed the significant challenges faced by small island developing States in accessing sufficient financing for sustainable development. Progress had been made with respect to preparations for the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States, which would be an opportunity for driving forward global action and coordination in support of the sustainable development of those countries. The United Kingdom looked forward to being a strong partner in that regard and was committed to working with Governments, civil society organizations, development partners, the private sector and multilateral development banks to scale up support for addressing the unique challenges experienced by small island developing States.

89. Her delegation was pleased that the draft resolution referenced the call to action on access to finance and the invitation to Member States to join the Group of Friends of Small Island Developing States. The United Kingdom affirmed the position set out in the Glasgow Climate Pact that vulnerability should guide decisions on the allocation of finance, and hoped that the outcome would be included in future resolutions. It looked forward to the final report of the High-level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States, which would make it possible to better target finance towards climate vulnerable countries. All partners were encouraged to adopt the principles for improved aid impact in small island developing States, which had

been developed in partnership with AOSIS, Canada, United Nations agencies and OECD.

90. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that the United States was a strong supporter and partner of small island developing States and was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. Her Government was committed to improving policies and programmes aimed at addressing the particular needs of those countries, and recognized their unique challenges, including their vulnerability to climate change. Over the period 2014–2020, the United States had provided more than \$4.5 billion in foreign assistance to over 30 small island developing States and other small island States. It had recently hosted a summit of the Americas and had launched a partnership with the Caribbean region to address the climate crisis. That partnership had established a framework for scaling up cooperation with Caribbean countries in support of climate adaptation and strengthened energy security and resilience, and was underpinned by four pillars, one of which was improved access to development financing. The United States had also hosted its first joint summit with Pacific island countries, at which it had announced over \$800 million in new initiatives and programming for the Pacific, and had launched a partnership strategy with that region.

91. The United States disagreed with the language used in paragraph 23, which called for the use of “a multidimensional vulnerability index, as criteria to access concessional finance”, since the proper forums for discussing the use of eligibility measures for concessional finance were the boards of multilateral development banks and OECD. Furthermore, international financial institutions already used factors other than per capita income to determine access to concessional resources.

92. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.22 was withdrawn.*

**(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (continued)**  
(A/C.2/77/L.31, A/C.2/77/L.69 and A/C.2/77/L.77)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/77/L.31 and A/C.2/77/L.69:  
Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind*

93. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.69 had no programme budget implications. She drew attention to a proposed amendment to paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.69, which had been submitted by the United States and was contained in document A/C.2/77/L.77.



94. **Ms. Kroeker-Maus** (United States of America), introducing the proposed amendment to paragraph 13 of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.69](#), said that the United States was seeking to safeguard a critical innovation of the 2030 Agenda, namely, that the three dimensions of sustainable development should be addressed holistically and in a comprehensive way, or in a “balanced and integrated manner”. The language in paragraph 13 did not appropriately capture that key insight and instead, provided an alternative set of principles that did not enjoy consensus. The proposed amendment drew language directly from the 2030 Agenda, in order to address that concern and facilitate a consensus. Member States were urged to vote in favour of the proposed amendment, as contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.77](#).

95. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the amendment proposed by the United States of America, as contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.77](#).

96. **Ms. Majeed** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was regrettable that an amendment had been presented with respect to paragraph 13 of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.69](#), which had been submitted by the Group of 77 and China. All delegations were urged to reject the proposed amendment and retain the original language.

97. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.77](#) to amend paragraph 13 of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.69](#).*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam,

Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, 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, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, 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.

*Abstaining:*

Costa Rica, Papua New Guinea.

98. The proposal was rejected by 111 votes to 55, with 2 abstentions.

99. **Ms. Kroeker-Maus** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to join the consensus in support of global ambition and efforts to fight climate change. However, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, since that paragraph continued to promote the domestic political priorities of one Member State, and did not include universally agreed language from the 2030 Agenda that reflected a shared position on sustainable development. Further political messaging would only undermine consensus, the work of the Committee and the latter's ability to work towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Her delegation's general statement reflected the position of the United States with regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 and technology transfers.

100. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.69](#) as a whole was adopted.*

101. **Mr. Kaspar** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, and the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, said that the European Union and its member States would go beyond their nationally determined contributions (NDCs), and had made new climate finance commitments, including for loss and damage. The European Union and the African Union had jointly announced a new initiative on climate change adaptation and resilience in Africa, and hoped that others would be willing to launch similar initiatives, since joint global action was needed to protect the planet for future generations.

102. The European Union and its member States were pleased that the text of the draft resolution had been enhanced to reflect the need to sustain reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions in order to limit global warming; strengthen joint commitments to regularly update NDCs; phase down unabated coal power and phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies while supporting the poorest and most vulnerable; double climate adaptation finance by 2025; integrate nature-based solutions, ecosystem-based approaches and other management and conservation approaches into climate planning; and highlight the links between climate change, food systems, oceans and water. Because of those improvements, the European Union and its member States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

103. Nonetheless, it was regrettable that the draft resolution contained language that was not universally agreed, despite a concrete proposal to return to consensus-based language. The European Union and its member States hoped for a return to such language in the future, since climate change required collective action, and the draft resolution provided a solid foundation for action within the framework of the United Nations.

104. **Mr. Floyd** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had entered into negotiations with the aim of safeguarding commitments made under the Glasgow Climate Pact in order to accelerate global climate action. The impacts of climate change were already being felt, especially in small island developing States and the least developed countries. His delegation was pleased that the draft resolution sought to maintain efforts to limit temperature increases to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, called for NDCs to be updated in

keeping with global temperature goals and urged countries to scale up clean power generation. The United Kingdom was also pleased with the progress made on loss and damage at the twenty-seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which built on commitments made the previous year and responded to the calls of the poorest and most vulnerable countries.

105. Urgent progress was needed with respect to mitigation commitments, in order to close the 2030 emissions gap before the end of the decade, and a clear message needed to be sent on the phasing down of fossil fuels. It was disappointing that there had been no clear follow-through in the draft resolution on the phasing down of coal, or on a much-needed commitment to reduce fossil fuels and peak greenhouse gases by 2025.

106. **Mr. Liu Liquan** (China) said that the pressing challenge of climate change to humankind required enhanced multilateralism, unity and cooperation. The international community needed to build on the momentum of the twenty-seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in order to uphold such important principles as differentiated responsibility, equity and respective capabilities, and to enhance trust between the global North and South. Developed countries needed to take the lead by drastically reducing emissions, delivering on their \$100 billion climate finance commitment and taking practical action on adaptation and financing, which were priority issues for developing countries.

107. Regrettably, certain countries had gone against the will of the international community and had politicized development issues, thereby disrupting the efforts of all countries to implement the 2030 Agenda, thwarting the global development agenda and bringing harm to international cooperation on climate change. The language used in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was based on language that had been used by the General Assembly and incorporated by consensus into other General Assembly resolutions, and it reflected the objective requirements for implementing the 2030 Agenda. China had always actively promoted international cooperation to combat climate change, and was making every effort to fulfil its carbon peak and carbon neutrality commitments. It would work with all parties to implement the Paris Agreement fully and effectively, promote the building of a fair and rational global climate governance system and accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

108. **Ms. Kroeker-Maus** (United States of America) said that the United States wished to request a vote on paragraph 13, since its proposed amendment had been rejected.

109. **The Chair** said that a vote would not be possible, since the draft resolution had already been adopted as a whole.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.31 was withdrawn.*

**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.2/77/L.3/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.3/Rev.1: Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence*

111. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that recorded votes had been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph by Czechia, on behalf of the European Union and its member States, and on the text as a whole, by the United States.

112. **Mr. Adhana** (India), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that globalization and interdependence were very important issues for his country. While India supported the draft resolution, it had reservations about the language used in the ninth preambular paragraph, which represented a worrying phenomenon of introducing language that was germane to a particular Member State, without any convincing rationale or acceptance by the wider membership. India therefore disassociated itself from the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

113. *At the request of the representative of Czechia, on behalf of the European Union and its member States, a recorded vote was taken on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.3/Rev.1.*

*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, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican

Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, 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, 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, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, 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.

*Abstaining:*

Japan, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Türkiye.

114. *The ninth preambular paragraph was adopted by 118 votes to 48, with 5 abstentions.*

115. *At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.3/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

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, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

116. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted by 134 votes to none, with 47 abstentions.*

117. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, and the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic

of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the States members of the European Union had voted against the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole. The European Union was disappointed that the zero draft submitted by the Group of 77 and China had included a reference to “win-win cooperation”, despite the fact that the European Union and several other delegations had opposed that formulation throughout previous negotiations. During the current negotiations, the European Union had expressed its concerns about the language used, and regretted that its position was not reflected in the final text submitted by the Group of 77 and China.

118. The European Union and its member States were fully aware that the phrase “win-win cooperation” had been included in the 2030 Agenda, but the balance it represented in that instance was not reflected in the draft resolution. The European Union therefore objected to the use of language that excluded important elements of agreed international standards and best practices for sustainable development, such as the rule of law, human rights, transparency, equity, accountability and leaving no one behind. As it was reflected in the draft resolution, the concept could be understood to be calling for mutual economic gains to take precedence over the sustainable needs of countries. The inclusion of the formulation was especially disturbing at a time when the global food, energy and finance crises, the COVID-19 pandemic and conflicts were having a devastating impact, especially on low-income countries.

119. The ongoing crises had prompted reflections on how globalization could better foster resilient societies, while building on the Sustainable Development Goals. The draft resolution could be updated to better reflect the integrated approach of the 2030 Agenda and acknowledge the need for inclusive global partnerships. In looking forward to constructive cooperation at future sessions, the European Union and its member States called on all its partners, and the Group of 77 and China in particular, to reconsider their approach and refrain from including references to “win-win cooperation” in future draft resolutions, without the proper contextualization provided in the 2030 Agenda. The European Union and its member States would continue to engage constructively in negotiations, because they truly valued consensus. However, consensus should strengthen and not erode universally agreed rules and values, for the good of all people and the planet.

120. **Mr. Liu Liquan** (China) said that, owing to many risks and challenges, the international community was struggling to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals on schedule. As such, there was a need for genuine multilateralism, and greater solidarity and cooperation to overcome difficulties and build a better future. In that context, the role of the United Nations as the core of the multilateral system had become more critical, as had the significance of the draft resolution. China supported an adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, and deeply regretted that certain countries had requested votes on the ninth preambular paragraph and on the text as a whole.

121. The spirit of win-win cooperation was fully in line with the theme of the draft resolution, and had become necessary as countries worked together to address global challenges and achieve development. The 2030 Agenda clearly stated that all countries should pursue global development and win-win cooperation, which could bring significant gains to all countries, in all parts of the world. Certain individual countries with narrow political interests had fostered ideological confrontation, rejected the consensus of the international community and repeatedly called for a vote on consensual General Assembly language. Those countries had stated that they respected the consensus-based language of the 2030 Agenda, yet they seemed to be opposed to the use of very same language in the draft resolution, in a clear demonstration of their consistent double standards.

122. The politicization of development issues had considerably contaminated the cooperative atmosphere of the United Nations and was bound to gain little support. The General Assembly had adopted the draft resolution and the relevant formulations by an overwhelming majority at successive sessions, thereby reflecting the international community's universal recognition of the 2030 Agenda and the concept of win-win cooperation. Those individual countries should cast aside their outdated cold war mentalities and make their due contributions to developing countries, instead of provoking meaningless confrontations, which would only hinder global development and human progress.

123. **Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America) said that the United States could not join the consensus on the draft resolution and had several concerns with the text. The ninth preambular paragraph contained a reference to "win-win cooperation", which had been promoted by a single Member States in order 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. The use of that language continued to undermine the consensus-based work of the Committee. Similarly, while the United States supported a strong and effective United Nations system, the reference in paragraph 3 to a "multilateral system, with the United Nations at its centre" was a mischaracterization promoted by a single Member State. Many international legal agreements and organizations governed and influenced international behaviour, and not all of them were centred around the United Nations system.

124. With respect to the reference to "trade-restrictive measures" in the twenty-third preambular paragraph, WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions were necessary to ensure free, fair, open and reciprocal trade, and the United Nations was not an appropriate venue for such discussions. Furthermore, the United States interpreted the reference to protectionism in paragraph 8 as a veiled and inappropriate reference to the use of WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions against unfair and market-distorting trade practices. With regard to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, trade, technology transfers and commentary on the independent institutions comprising the international financial systems, the position of the United States was reflected in the general statement delivered by her delegation to the Committee on 21 November 2022.

125. The United States had some concerns about the workload of the Committee and believed that Member States would be able to address important issues more thoughtfully and effectively if some draft resolutions, including draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.3/Rev.1](#), were considered on a biennial or triennial basis.

#### **Agenda item 21: Groups of countries in special situations** (*continued*)

##### **(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries** (*continued*) ([A/C.2/77/L.36](#), [A/C.2/77/L.52](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.76](#))

*Draft resolutions [A/C.2/77/L.36](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.52](#):  
Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on  
Landlocked Developing Countries*

126. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications prepared in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.52](#), as contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.76](#).



127. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.52 was adopted.*

128. **Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to join the consensus and wished to make a few clarifying remarks. With regard to paragraph 14, her delegation emphasized the catalytic role of official development assistance in mobilizing resources from other sources and clarified that blended finance could use both concessional and non-concessional public finance to partner with private finance experts. Concerning paragraph 28, the term “debt relief” implied debt cancellation, which the United States did not support. Its inclusion was inappropriate in the context of the Common Framework for Debt Treatments beyond the Debt Service Suspension Initiative, which determined the type and size of debt restructuring on a case-by-case basis. Furthermore, the paragraph appeared to encourage heavily indebted countries to take on more debt financing. Her delegation also noted that trade language negotiated by or under the auspices of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had no relevance for the trade policy, obligations or commitments of the United States or for the WTO agenda. That included calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

129. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.36 was withdrawn.*

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

### **(c) Women in development (continued)** (A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.2/77/L.71, A/C.2/77/L.72 and A/C.2/77/L.73)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1: Women in development*

130. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1 and the proposed amendments thereto, as contained in documents A/C.2/77/L.71, A/C.2/77/L.72 and A/C.2/77/L.73, had no programme budget implications.

131. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), introducing the proposed amendments to the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the proposal in document A/C.2/77/L.71 entailed inserting a new paragraph 7 bis on the implementation and follow-up of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development, which were key documents that guided the work of the United

Nations system and other stakeholders. At the same time, the paragraph was a core paragraph of the resolution on women in development and had been included in its previous version, General Assembly resolution 74/235.

132. The proposal in document A/C.2/77/L.72 entailed replacing paragraph 17 on HIV and AIDS to retain the language agreed in paragraph 19 of General Assembly resolution 74/235. That essential paragraph focused on providing services to women and girls living with HIV and AIDS, and the weakened language could not be accepted.

133. The proposal in document A/C.2/77/L.73 entailed amending paragraph 31 to reinsert elements that had been deleted from the draft resolution, including references to coastal areas and multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. The latter was agreed language that had been adopted by consensus in both 2017 and 2019. It was regrettable that all references to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination had been deleted in the zero draft of the text. The removal of core language agreed upon by consensus in a number of resolutions could not be accepted. She hoped that all delegations would support the amendments.

134. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would first take a decision on each of the proposed amendments.

### *Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

135. **Mr. Imanuel** (Indonesia) said that his Government was committed to safeguarding the indispensable role that women played as agents of development. Through the Group of 77 and China, his delegation continued to engage constructively in discussions on that issue. Despite efforts to draft a balanced and comprehensive consensus text, the deliberation process had been disproportionately focused on divisive issues. The references to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and the outcomes of the reviews of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development did not contribute directly to the true purpose of the draft resolution. Since the proposed amendments contained references that were not universally agreed by States, his delegation would vote against them.

136. **Ms. Ríos Serna** (Colombia), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, the

Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras, Morocco, Peru and Uruguay, said that the resolution on women in development communicated the position of the United Nations and the actions that Member States were willing to take to address the challenges faced by all women and girls. As a result, the draft resolution must not fall short on ambition, particularly since women and girls remained those most affected by the multifaceted crises experienced around the world.

137. Acknowledging the divergent views and complex positions expressed throughout the process, their delegations had demonstrated flexibility in an effort to reach consensus without jeopardizing the progress made in previous resolutions on the same topic. The draft resolution should be adopted by consensus to honour the political message that the Committee ought to be able to send in support of women's empowerment and gender equality. Their delegations would have preferred to adopt the text presented by the co-facilitators, which had balanced the positions expressed by all delegations during informal consultations. As a result, they would vote in favour of the proposed amendments, which reinstated that version of the text.

138. **Ms. Narváez Ojeda** (Chile) said that her Government was committed to achieving formal and substantive equality for women in all their diversity and eliminating all forms of violence and multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. Gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls were crucial to achieving sustainable development for all and yielded significant economic benefits. Given the current global crises, failing to thoroughly explore that connection was a lost opportunity to advance the collective agenda to leave no one behind. Although it was unfortunate that a vote was necessary, the proposed amendments to the draft resolution maintained the delicate balance achieved in previous years and prevented setbacks on issues that were incredibly relevant to sustainable development as a whole.

139. **Mr. Abdelaal** (Egypt) said that the draft resolution should focus on development issues based on the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. It should not delve into divisive issues that were not part of the Committee's work. His delegation rejected the proposed amendments.

140. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.71](#): Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein,

Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America. She then noted that Georgia and Serbia also wished to become sponsors.

141. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.71](#) to amend paragraph 7 bis of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen.



*Abstaining:*

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Grenada, Guyana, Kuwait, Maldives, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates.

142. *The proposal was adopted by 95 votes to 53, with 16 abstentions.*

143. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.72](#): Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America. She then noted that Georgia and Serbia also wished to become sponsors.

144. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.72](#) to amend paragraph 17 of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi,

Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cambodia, Ecuador, Guyana, Kuwait, Maldives, Qatar, Suriname.

145. *The proposal was adopted by 91 votes to 62, with 14 abstentions.*

146. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.73](#): Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America. She then noted that Georgia and Serbia also wished to become sponsors.

147. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.2/77/L.73](#) to amend paragraph 31 of draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1](#).*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated

States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guyana, Kuwait, Maldives, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Suriname, United Arab Emirates.

148. *The proposal was adopted by 90 votes to 62, with 16 abstentions.*

149. **Ms. Alomair** (Saudi Arabia) said that her delegation had engaged proactively in the negotiations over the draft resolution because of its belief in the importance of empowering women to contribute to development. The draft resolution should not distract from that focus by inserting divisive language. Her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from terms that were not agreed upon and referred to concepts that were inconsistent with her country's national legal frameworks and cultural values. That included the term "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination".

150. **Ms. Juárez Argueta** (Guatemala) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendments, which balanced Member States' widely varying viewpoints. Nevertheless, her Government maintained its reservations concerning the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development, in line with its firm commitment under the Constitution of Guatemala to guarantee and protect human life from the time of its conception.

151. **Mr. Abdelaal** (Egypt) said that the draft resolution should focus on development issues based on the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals and not delve into divisive issues. His delegation expressed a reservation about the term "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination", whose meaning was not clear, unlike the expression "all forms of discrimination", which was an agreed-upon formulation.

152. **Ms. Aondona** (Nigeria), speaking also on behalf of Algeria, Eritrea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, the Niger, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, said that their countries would join the consensus on the draft resolution as a demonstration of their firm commitment to empowering women in the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The results of the votes clearly demonstrated that the delegations expressing concerns about the inclusion of controversial elements in the text were not merely a small group of sovereign Member States. It was therefore deeply regrettable that the amendments sought to insert controversial notions into United Nations documents and further polarize discussions. As the only General Assembly resolution dedicated specifically to the economic empowerment of women, the resolution on women in development should focus on moving women from the informal to the formal economy, encouraging their financial inclusion and improving access to quality education, training and skills development to boost their economic potential. The negotiation process should not be dominated by debates on controversial terminology.

153. While their delegations were committed to combating all forms of discrimination, they regretted the inclusion of controversial phrases such as "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination", which appeared in four 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. Their delegations therefore

wished to disassociate themselves from references to that phrase and its applicability in their national contexts. With regard to paragraph 7 bis, their delegations also disassociated themselves from the insertion of the phrase “as well as the outcomes of their reviews” and any obligation arising from it. That phrase could include controversial and non-consensual reviews that were not adopted by the General Assembly, particularly those that sought to redefine the International Conference on Population and Development.

154. Their delegations were disappointed that the co-facilitators’ text had departed from the constructive and balanced text presented by the Chair of the Group of 77 and China, disregarding clearly identified red lines and reintroducing contentious paragraphs that were not supported by the wider United Nations membership. Their delegations would continue to support all efforts to fulfil global objectives to empower all women and girls in line with the 2030 Agenda and other relevant United Nations outcome documents that had been agreed by consensus and were consistent with their national views, laws and development priorities.

155. **Mr. Paredes Campaña** (Colombia) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution and had negotiated in favour of retaining language adopted in 2019 related to unpaid work, menstrual health and the meaningful participation of women in policymaking and decision-making. The co-facilitators had negotiated a number of compromises to arrive at a text that respected the varying viewpoints.

156. The phrase “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” referred to the convergence of various types of discrimination, which produced substantially different experiences. Some delegations had argued that the notion was controversial and did not pertain to development. However, the international community would never be able to address inequalities if it did not understand how they were produced or recognize that the various characteristics of discrimination could not be addressed in isolation. In Colombia, development could be achieved only through a truly transformative lens that responded to the needs of those who faced multiple obstacles, including as a result of their origin.

157. It was regrettable that amendments had been required to return to the language agreed upon in previous versions of the resolution on women in development, which was intended to recognize the difficulties faced by millions of women and girls in the world. His delegation would continue to support and

vote in favour of that language. He hoped that the text of the current draft resolution would serve as the basis for future negotiations so that efforts could focus on continuing to strengthen its content, with a view to achieving an ambitious text that benefited all women and girls in all their diversity.

158. **Mr. Al-shaikhli** (Iraq) said that his country was committed to the economic empowerment and financial inclusion of women, particularly to facilitate a resilient and sustainable recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. While his delegation reiterated its support for the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77 and China, it wished to disassociate itself from certain references that had shifted the text away from its primary focus. It interpreted the term “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” as referring only to categories of discrimination prohibited under his country’s domestic laws and not to any non-consensual concepts. With respect to paragraph 7 bis, his delegation disassociated itself from the phrase “as well as the outcomes of their reviews” and any obligations arising from it and expressed concern that the phrase could include controversial and non-consensual reviews.

159. **Mr. Mezang Akamba** (Cameroon) said that his delegation aligned itself with the statement made by Nigeria and wished to disassociate itself from the amendments. It also understood the term “gender” as referring to men and women. The draft resolution should have focused on putting the world on track to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Unfortunately, consensus could not be reached on the issues within the Committee’s mandate that really mattered: the unfulfilled promises to provide 0.7 per cent of gross national income for official development assistance, mobilize \$100 billion per year for climate finance and meet the commitments under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. His delegation remained concerned that new divisive and controversial scholarly concepts were added to the draft resolution every year, which pushed the United Nations to become more of an elitist academic institution rather than a common space to foster development and peace. It had expected a concrete outcome in favour of women and society as a whole that outlined results-oriented actions for technology transfer and financing for climate action, development, resilience-building, infrastructure, vocational schools and women’s economic empowerment. Instead, most of the negotiations had centred on references to the terms “all women and girls in all their diversity”, “gender-based violence”, “comprehensive sexual education” and “multiple and

intersecting forms of discrimination”. Regrettably, delegations had forgotten about the millions of women who were unable to provide food and water for themselves and their children. His delegation expressed concern over the shift away from the priorities of the 2030 Agenda towards a non-consensual human rights agenda. Although stable, adequate and predictable funding was needed for poverty eradication and climate action, his delegation feared that some development agencies might agree to provide funding only for the promotion of certain agendas, such as sexual rights, comprehensive education or women and girls in all their diversity.

160. Women were resilient, brave, innovative, smart, wise and strong; they did not need the Second Committee to discuss topics such as menstrual health issues and sexual education. They needed the Committee to determine which global issues were most pressing and should be tackled by all States together. In that spirit of mutual respect, consensus, multilateralism, strength, solidarity and partnership, the international community could free the human race from the tyranny of poverty and protect the planet.

161. **Ms. Majeed** (Pakistan) said that her Government was fully committed to the empowerment of women in the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – in line with Sustainable Development Goal 5. While her delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, some references gave cause for concern. Although it remained strongly committed to eliminating all forms of discrimination against women and girls, her delegation disassociated itself from all references to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination, which was an ambiguous term with possible interpretations that could not be endorsed. With respect to paragraph 7 bis, her delegation disassociated itself from the phrase “outcomes of their reviews”, which was vague and could include outcomes that were not intergovernmentally agreed and had not been adopted by the General Assembly.

162. It was regrettable that the Committee had not been able to reach consensus on each paragraph of such an important draft resolution. The issue would persist as long as attempts were made to incorporate non-agreed concepts from other committees and forums. Nevertheless, her delegation would continue to support all efforts to fulfil the global objective of empowering all women and girls, in line with the 2030 Agenda, and stood ready to engage constructively with all

delegations in the future to find a common, consensual vision for the resolution on women in development.

163. **Ms. Hamdouni** (Morocco) said that she had served as a co-facilitator for the resolution on women in development, which was the Committee’s only text directly related to Sustainable Development Goal 5. Discussions on the draft resolution had come at a critical moment, as multiple global crises were disproportionately affecting women and girls and hindering efforts to promote their leadership, empowerment, integration and full, effective and meaningful participation in policymaking and decision-making. The draft resolution also represented the first opportunity for the Committee to present an ambitious and balanced text that sent the right political message in support of the empowerment of all women and girls in the post-pandemic context.

164. She and her co-facilitator had made every effort to undertake the drafting process in good faith and with a constructive spirit. The negotiations had not been easy, and they thanked all delegations for engaging constructively in the process and demonstrating a willingness to be flexible and achieve consensus. She and her co-facilitator had acknowledged the sensitive issues and divergent viewpoints on certain aspects of the draft resolution and had sought to present balanced proposals. Regrettably, however, consensus had not been achieved.

165. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

166. **Ms. Kafková** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine; the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia; and, in addition, Andorra, said that the European Union strongly supported gender equality, the empowerment of women and girls and the full enjoyment of all their human rights. Her delegation had hoped that the draft resolution would reflect a strong commitment by all Member States to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 5 and help women and girls in developing countries who faced unprecedented challenges stemming from the interlinked crises. Instead, her delegation had been forced to defend consensual language from previous years, and progress had not been made on the current issues constraining women and girls in development.

167. Her delegation was dismayed that the Committee had updated a number of other resolutions to reflect the outcomes of relevant intergovernmental deliberations but had failed to do so for the resolution on women in development. It had expected the draft resolution to reflect the strong consensual outcome on Goal 5 recognized in the ministerial declaration of the 2022 high-level political forum on sustainable development and to draw on language from the sixty-sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women, which had focused on the detrimental impact of climate change and biodiversity loss on women and girls. It was also regrettable that the draft resolution once again failed to include a reference to Sustainable Development Goal target 5.6, since the report of the Secretary-General on women in development (A/77/243) had highlighted the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on women's physical and mental health, including their sexual and reproductive health, owing largely to disruptions to access to health-care services and overwhelming stresses from paid and unpaid care work.

168. Her delegation had hoped that the spirit of consensus would be restored and had expressed a desire to work constructively with all delegations to that end. Although the zero draft had crossed several red lines for the European Union, the co-facilitators' text had allowed her delegation to join consensus in the spirit of compromise. Regrettably, the silence procedure (no-objection procedure) had been broken, and the text had been further weakened. As a result, her delegation had been forced to submit amendments to reintroduce agreed language, including a core paragraph on the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the outcomes of their reviews, which appeared in several other consensual texts.

169. The difficulties that had arisen during negotiations reflected the stark differences in delegations' positions on issues related to women's rights and gender equality. It was unfortunate that the topic was so divisive. The Committee should reflect on how to engage with the issue of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in a way that added value to the implementation and follow-up of the 2030 Agenda and truly supported women and girls in development. The 2022 high-level political forum had demonstrated that it was possible to achieve consensus on that issue.

170. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that the Russian Federation attached great importance to the

participation of women in development and upheld its commitments in that area. Given the importance of the draft resolution under consideration, his delegation had maintained the consensus but noted with regret that a well-known group of States was increasingly shifting the focus of the document away from the participation of women in development processes to elements that, while important, were not directly related to the topic. Furthermore, those elements were explicitly dealt with in detail in the relevant resolutions of the Third Committee.

171. His delegation was also disappointed by the appearance in the text of language that had not been adopted by consensus or agreed upon in an intergovernmental setting, in particular "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination" and references to a "gender-responsive" approach. Furthermore, it interpreted the meaning of the term "inequalities" in the fifteenth preambular paragraph exclusively through the lens of Sustainable Development Goal 5 of the 2030 Agenda.

172. **Ms. Alomair** (Saudi Arabia), speaking also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates in their capacities as the States members of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC), said that the delegations of the States members of the Council had supported the draft resolution because of the importance they attached to the role of women in development in their countries. However, the GCC States wished to draw attention to the draft resolution's use of the term "sexual and reproductive health-care service", which they would interpret in a manner consistent with their cultures, social frameworks and national laws.

173. **Ms. Mendoza Elguea** (Mexico) said that the co-facilitators had led constructive, transparent and inclusive negotiations. It was therefore surprising that the Chair of the Group of 77 and China had decided not to support their text. In addition to establishing a negative precedent, it had caused delegations to question the value of engaging in consultations.

174. For Mexico, achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls impacted all issues examined by the General Assembly. Meaningful equality for women undoubtedly stimulated sustainable development. Her delegation therefore expressed concern about the insistent narrative that the Committee should not examine women in development and gender more broadly. It also expressed concern that attempts had been made to remove intergovernmentally agreed

language that had previously appeared in the resolution on women in development and other United Nations resolutions adopted by consensus. Such attempts sought to undermine the progress made in protecting the rights of women and girls.

175. Women and girls around the world continued to be subjected to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination, marginalization, violence and harmful practices and were denied the full realization of their human rights. Safeguarding their rights in all areas and at all levels did not undermine development. On the contrary, the active contribution of over half of the population would encourage progress; it was not controversial. As a result, Mexico had voted in favour of the amendments put forward by the European Union and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

176. **Mr. Imanuel** (Indonesia) said that his Government reiterated its strong commitment to the empowerment of women within the development agenda. Indonesian women played a central role in driving the economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and in shaping development policies. His delegation had been optimistic about the negotiations on the draft resolution and had hoped that the discussion could unite States in addressing the real challenges facing women in development. Regrettably, however, negotiations continued to be used to impose references that were not universally agreed, thereby undermining the constructive spirit of multilateralism and the willingness to pursue meaningful consensus. In that regard, Indonesia would distance itself from references to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and the outcomes of the reviews of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development. It would implement the resolution in accordance with its national context, policies, regulations and priorities.

177. **Mr. Black** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Andorra, Australia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, said that an overwhelming majority of Member States, including their delegations, had been ready to join consensus on the basis of the co-facilitators' text. Regrettably, votes had been required to return to that version of the text, which nevertheless fell short of the commitments and actions required to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls.

Their delegations remained deeply concerned that negotiated language on the issue across the Committee appeared to favour a status quo or even backslide in terms of support for women and girls, failing to acknowledge their critical role in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

178. Once again, key issues in the 2030 Agenda had not been recognized, including universal access to sexual and reproductive health, reproductive rights and access to family planning information. Some delegations had also sought to remove references to the 2021 Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS: Ending Inequalities and Getting on Track to End AIDS by 2030, which had been supported by 165 Member States. Regrettably, it had not been possible to build on the consensus-based ministerial declaration of the 2022 high-level political forum, which had reviewed Sustainable Development Goal 5. Member States had also failed to reaffirm the need for gender-responsive COVID-19 recovery measures and to acknowledge that the COVID-19 pandemic had intensified instances of sexual and gender-based violence and domestic violence and had affected access to essential sexual and reproductive health care. Women, girls and adolescents around the world continued to be subjected to discrimination, marginalization, violence and harmful practices and denied the full realization of their human rights. Those issues were relevant to the Committee's work and must be discussed. It would not be possible to achieve sustainable development if half of humanity continued to be denied their full human rights and opportunities.

179. Member States must move beyond repetitive and siloed debates that hampered progress. The 2030 Agenda explicitly stated the crucial role of gender equality in achieving sustainable development and recognized the interlinkages among sustainable development issues. The collective commitment to leave no one behind must include women and girls in all their diversity, especially those exposed to or at risk of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. In that regard, their delegations welcomed the call for gender-responsive programmes and instruments for migrants and their families, as well as the new stand-alone paragraph on Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous women.

180. Negotiations on the draft resolution had been unnecessarily challenging. Unfortunately, amendments had been required merely to arrive at a text that was similar to the 2019 resolution, which should have served as the starting point for negotiations. Such working

methods would not facilitate the full, equal, effective and meaningful participation of women and girls across the spectrum of development efforts. In that connection, their delegations were calling for more ambition, greater political will and reform across the United Nations and around the world to ensure that institutions and actions were fit for purpose. The same standards should be established for the resolution on women in development and for the achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls.

181. Speaking in his national capacity, he said that his delegation acknowledged the sensitivity of the issue and was prepared to engage with Member States on related topics, such as health. For example, it was important to understand menstrual health in the context of development, particularly as it affected adolescent girls and women, and to defer to women in finding solutions. Multilateralism began with listening to one another, but it also involved respect for collective commitments. As a result, his country sometimes supported resolutions or programmes of action that did not fully align with its interests out of respect for the sense of community demonstrated by the participating States. When returning to discussions on a particular issue, previous resolutions and programmes of action must serve as a baseline.

182. **Ms. Mozgovaya** (Belarus) said that Belarus was committed to the empowerment of all women and girls and recognized their undeniable contribution to the achievement of all Sustainable Development Goals and targets. Amendments that upset the delicate balance achieved during the negotiations had regrettably been introduced to the text of the draft resolution. It was unacceptable to use non-consensual terminology in the text of resolutions and her delegation had therefore voted against the amendments that had been introduced. In order to achieve the lofty goals of the resolution, it was necessary to seek compromise solutions and strive to combine efforts, rather than focusing on divisions. While Belarus had supported the adoption of the important resolution without a vote, her delegation was compelled to distance itself from the paragraphs that had been incorporated into the text as a result of the votes on the amendments.

183. **Ms. Barak** (Israel) said that, in 2019, many delegations had been disappointed with the lack of will to update the language in the resolution on women in development and had hoped for a more ambitious text in the future. It was therefore unfortunate that after three years, in the midst of a pandemic and many new

challenges, the international community found itself in a similar position. Her country attached great value to the draft resolution and could not overemphasize its importance to the Committee's work. Although women and girls accounted for over half of the global population, they continued to face inequalities and suffer from violence and discrimination, including multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. In Israel, gender-responsive policies and programmes to guarantee the full, equal, effective and meaningful participation of women and girls had advanced sustainable development, since women and girls were central drivers of the economy.

184. Her delegation was pleased with the progress made on some issues, including references to sexual and gender-based violence, mental health and psychosocial support, and the role of women in achieving climate goals. Nevertheless, much more needed to be done. Regrettably, the complexity of negotiations had left no room to discuss additional elements, such as the inclusion of language that recognized the importance of universal access to comprehensive sexuality education.

185. Israel had fully supported the amendments put forward by the European Union, which represented a minimum standard, given that they reflected global commitments agreed to over 25 years earlier and reiterated in the 2030 Agenda. The outcomes of the review processes of relevant programmes and platforms were fundamental to advancing gender equality and holding States accountable for their commitments. The amendments also sought to reinstate previously agreed language on universal standards for health and rights. Attempts to remove references to universal access to sexual and reproductive health challenged the safety and well-being of every woman and girl, as well as their ability to participate as equals in all spheres of life. Her delegation hoped that the Committee would be able to bridge the divides and adopt an ambitious and comprehensive text in the future.

186. **Ms. Krocker-Maus** (United States of America) said that the United States was committed to empowering women and girls in all their diversity and promoting their role as agents of transformation in the development of their societies, and therefore the world. Advancing gender equity and equality worldwide remained a top priority. Her delegation underscored that General Assembly resolutions were non-binding documents that did not create rights or obligations under international law, nor did they imply that States must join or implement obligations under international



instruments to which they were not a party. 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. Nevertheless, her delegation welcomed the opportunity to develop such an understanding with Member States. Furthermore, each country must determine for itself whether special measures intended to achieve parity for women and girls were appropriate. The best way to improve the situation of women and girls was through legal and policy reforms that ended discrimination and promoted equal access to opportunities. Her delegation regretted that sexual and reproductive health and rights had not been adequately emphasized in the draft resolution. Lastly, the position of her delegation on references to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda had been explained in its general statement of 21 November 2022.

187. **Ms. McArdle** (United Kingdom) said that the text put forward by the co-facilitators had represented the best path to consensus following a difficult negotiation process. It was therefore regrettable that the no-objection procedure had been broken by a small minority of Member States. Her country remained committed to fulfilling every girl’s right to quality education; empowering women socially, economically and politically; ending violence against all women and girls; and championing sexual and reproductive health and rights. The draft resolution had presented an opportunity to demonstrate a collective commitment to make progress on gender equality and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 5.

188. Regrettably, some States had opposed efforts to strengthen the text and align it with the evidence detailed in the report of the Secretary-General on women in development ([A/77/243](#)). Her delegation also lamented the persistent backlash against the rights of women and girls from a small minority. The term “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” was important agreed language; people did not experience sexism, racism and ableism separately. To truly tackle inequality, it must be depoliticized.

189. Her delegation welcomed the approval of the amendments submitted by the European Union, which had allowed it to join a consensus. Nevertheless, her delegation questioned the merit of adopting a text every two years when it did not accelerate the achievement of gender equality. It hoped that future Committee discussions would reflect the actual situation of women

and girls around the world and the urgency with which action was needed to achieve Goal 5 by 2030.

190. **Monsignor Murphy** (Observer for the Holy See) said that advancing women’s equality was a crucial component of sustainable development. However, setbacks in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic had increased many challenges facing women. The Committee’s work was therefore essential to ensuring that women were fully included in development efforts. In that regard, his delegation welcomed the inclusion of language on the role of social protection systems in eradicating poverty and promoting opportunities for women, as well as the recognition that motherhood and childhood were entitled to special care and assistance.

191. Despite the numerous positive aspects of the text, the resolution on women in development was increasingly losing its development focus, which was specific to the Committee’s mandate and unique among the resolutions concerning women. The inclusion of elements known to be controversial had prolonged and complicated discussions. It was therefore regrettable that the text included ambiguous and contentious terminology related to discrimination and violence. His delegation hoped that the development focus would be restored and controversial aspects would be avoided the next time the issue was examined. In addition, discussions had been based on a compilation of proposals rather than a revised text, which had impeded meaningful progress and resulted in extended informal consultations.

192. The Holy See understood all terms related to sexual and reproductive health, health-care services and rights as applying to a holistic concept of health. It did not consider abortion or access to abortion or abortifacients as a dimension of those terms. In addition, the term “gender” was understood to be grounded in biological sexual identity.

**Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition** (*continued*) ([A/C.2/77/L.25](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.56](#))

*Draft resolutions [A/C.2/77/L.25](#) and [A/C.2/77/L.56](#): Agriculture development, food security and nutrition*

193. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/77/L.56](#) had no programme budget implications.

194. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. In the face of the global food

insecurity crisis, the international community must strengthen global food systems, provide emergency food aid to those in need and help countries develop the capacity to produce their own food, with a view to preventing new crises and building resilience to further shocks. Since February 2022, the United States had provided over \$10.5 billion to combat hunger and strengthen food security worldwide. It was also consistently the largest donor to the World Food Programme (WFP), providing over half of all contributions.

195. At the outset of 2022, over 190 million people had been driven into acute food insecurity as a result of conflicts, the COVID-19 pandemic and the climate crisis. According to WFP, the brutal war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine could add an additional 70 million people to that statistic. The actions of the Russian Federation, which included weaponizing food and dramatically reducing grain and food production and exports, had exacerbated those trends and had resulted in a dramatic rise in global food insecurity. His delegation was therefore disappointed that the draft resolution did not recognize the Russian Federation as one of the major drivers of global food insecurity, decreased agriculture production and declines in nutrition. The United States once again demanded that the Russian Federation cease hostilities, withdraw its troops from the entire territory of Ukraine and respect the State's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. Such actions were essential to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and ending global hunger.

196. His delegation also underscored that trade language negotiated by or under the auspices of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had no relevance for the trade policy, obligations or commitments of the United States or for the WTO agenda. That included calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

197. Lastly, Member States should refer to his delegation's general statement of 21 November 2022 for the position of the United States on the characterizations of trade, WTO, technology transfer and the war by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and its impact on agriculture development, food security and nutrition.

198. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.56 was adopted.*

199. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Bosnia and

Herzegovina, Canada, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mongolia, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and, in addition, the European Union and its member States, said that their delegations engaged constructively and in good faith in the Committee's work to address the most pressing global challenges, with a view to sending a strong message of multilateralism and international solidarity. Its work was especially important at a time when multiple interlinked challenges had reversed hard-fought development gains and disproportionately impacted developing countries.

200. Unfortunately, the international community's ability to address those challenges had been further undermined by the war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, which was a blatant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a driver of the deteriorating global outlook. On 2 March 2022, 141 Member States had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution [ES-11/1](#), on aggression against Ukraine, in which they had expressed their concern about the potential impact of the conflict on increased food insecurity globally.

201. The Committee and the international community must clearly identify all root causes of backsliding on the Sustainable Development Goals. Their delegations condemned the fact that one Member State was responsible for further global deterioration in a world already grappling with life-changing global challenges, including the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change. The continued war by the Russian Federation against Ukraine was of immediate relevance and consequence to matters before the Committee, namely global development, food, nutrition and energy security. However, the Committee's draft resolutions did not specifically name the Russian Federation or hold it to account, but instead contained broad references to geopolitical tensions and conflicts.

202. Many Governments in the global South lacked the fiscal space to assist their people in coping with rising food and fertilizer prices, which had been accelerated by the war. In 2021, approximately 2.34 billion people had experienced moderate or severe food insecurity, representing an increase of over 350 million since 2019. According to WFP, up to 345 million people were experiencing acute food insecurity in 82 countries; that number had more than doubled since the outset of the pandemic. The actions of the Russian Federation, which

included weaponizing food in its war against Ukraine and dramatically reducing grain and food production and exports, had exacerbated those trends and had resulted in a significant rise in global food insecurity. Its persistence in waging war would lead to further backsliding in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Their delegations therefore demanded once again that the Russian Federation cease hostilities, withdraw its troops from the entire territory of Ukraine and respect the State's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders.

203. **Ms. Mozgovaya** (Belarus) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the resolution, given the importance of sustainable agricultural production and food security in eliminating poverty in all its forms and manifestations. A comprehensive approach was needed to address the deteriorating food security situation, without shifting the responsibility for food shortages and increased food insecurity to one State. Unfortunately, the draft resolution did not take into account one important factor that had a serious impact on the world food situation, namely, unilateral economic, financial and trade measures. Sanctions imposed on major producers of fertilizers and grains hampered the logistics of supply, significantly undermining food security and efforts to eradicate hunger in vulnerable countries. In June 2021, the European Union had in fact imposed sanctions against Belarus, including on the transit of some of its fertilizers. Belarus had repeatedly stressed that the use of unilateral coercive measures as a means of exerting political and economic pressure on countries was contrary to the basic principles of international law. Such practices must cease.

204. **Ms. İstemil Aydil** (Türkiye) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, which was a strong sign of the international community's commitment to end hunger by 2030 and its determination to address global food insecurity through solidarity, unity and multilateral cooperation. Failing to do so would have significant social, economic and political implications. The United Nations system played a fundamental role in coordinating a comprehensive global response to mitigate global food insecurity. To that end, her delegation was pleased to note that the draft resolution included a reference to the Initiative on the Safe Transportation of Grain and Foodstuffs from Ukrainian Ports (Black Sea Grain Initiative), under which nearly 500 ships had carried over 11 million tons of grain and

foodstuff to approximately 40 countries in four months. The impact of the Black Sea Grain Initiative extended far beyond immediate ports of arrival. Wheat prices had dropped by 8 per cent, and the Food Price Index of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had fallen by 9 per cent, which was the biggest decline since 2008. Türkiye would continue to support the Joint Coordination Centre in Istanbul, which was closely monitoring operations.

205. **Mr. de La Maisonnette** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, and the potential candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, said that acute food insecurity and nutrition challenges had arisen in 2022 and Sustainable Development Goal 2 continued to be reversed as a result of conflicts, the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change. His delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, which demonstrated the steadfast global commitment to achieving zero hunger and leaving no one behind. It was pleased to note that the draft resolution recalled General Assembly resolution [76/264](#) on the state of global food insecurity and called for the implementation of voluntary commitments made at the 2021 United Nations Food Systems Summit. The European Union also welcomed the recognition of key linkages with climate, the environment, the ocean, global health and water. Regrettably, the draft resolution did not clearly reflect the commitments made in Security Council resolution [2417 \(2018\)](#) on conflicts and hunger.

206. The Russian Federation and Belarus pretended that the former's war of aggression against Ukraine had no meaningful consequences for sustainable development, the global economy or the livelihoods of hundreds of millions of vulnerable people. They alone promoted an alternate reality, contrary to the facts that demonstrated a direct link between the war and increasing vulnerability, hunger and poverty, which were often provided by the international organizations to which they belonged. Nevertheless, the Russian Federation refused to bear responsibility for its actions in Ukraine and intended to continue acting with impunity. European Union sanctions had never targeted exports of food supplies, fertilizers or other agricultural products from the Russian Federation. Although overcompliance with ethical standards could have indirect effects, such cases were being addressed as soon as they were reported. It was worth noting that Russian

fertilizer exports had remained at historic levels over the past month, according to FAO.

207. The international community had attempted to address the global consequences of the war through the Black Sea Grain Initiative, brokered by the United Nations; the European Union-Ukraine solidarity lanes initiative; and the provision of food assistance. However, only the withdrawal of Russian troops from Ukrainian territory and the cessation of Russian aggression would enable Ukraine to produce and export the quantities of agricultural products urgently needed. President Zelensky of Ukraine had stated that his country was ready for peace. In response, the Russian Federation had increased its missile attacks on civilian infrastructure. Food should never be used as a weapon.

208. *Draft resolution A/C.2/77/L.25 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 124: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.2/77/L.53 and A/C.2/77/L.68)**

*Draft decision A/C.2/77/L.53: Revitalization of the work of the Second Committee*

209. **The Chair** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.

210. *Draft decision A/C.2/77/L.53 was adopted.*

211. **Ms. Mendoza Elguea** (Mexico), speaking also on behalf of Andorra, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and, in addition, the European Union and its member States, said that despite the limitations of the Committee's agreed working methods, it had made progress on key issues thanks to efficiency measures, which included circulating documents in an editable format and beginning negotiations during the first informal consultation. Their delegations had voiced strong concerns about draft resolutions that still did not align with the landmark agreements of 2015, particularly the 2030 Agenda, and they had expressed support for merging draft resolutions, adapting the periodicity of draft resolutions to allow sufficient time for issues to develop and considering co-authorship. With the decade of action and delivery for sustainable development well under way, it was time to make the 2030 Agenda and the other landmark agreements of 2015 the foundations of the Committee's work.

212. Collaboration and discipline had allowed the Committee to complete its work within the allotted time frame that year, and that same collaboration and

discipline could be used to make the Committee truly fit to deliver a sustainable, inclusive and resilient recovery in order to get back on track to implement the 2030 Agenda and focus on the most vulnerable. Their delegations looked forward to continuing the revitalization process by building on recent efficiency measures, promoting the meaningful participation and constructive engagement of all delegations and anchoring the Committee's work in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

213. **Mr. Morelli** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that their delegations appreciated the return to normalcy following the disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic; however, Member States must not lose sight of the efficiency measures achieved in recent years with regard to the Committee's working methods, such as limiting the number of draft resolutions introduced, circulating documents in editable formats and beginning negotiations during the first informal consultation.

214. In 2022, the Committee had considered over 40 draft resolutions, for which virtual negotiations had been required. As a result of the ever-increasing and unsustainable volume of negotiations, the dynamics of the Committee were shifting in the wrong direction. There had been an increase in attempts to undermine the 2030 Agenda and efforts to protect the status quo or drive back progress on key issues such as gender equality. At the same time, a number of the resolutions that consistently required a vote were not on a clear path back to consensus. That situation was unacceptable and highlighted the need for revitalization. In order to create the conditions for fruitful negotiations, creative solutions to bridge gaps in positions should be commonplace, facilitator proposals should be a last resort, greater time should be spent in in-person discussions, and negotiation schedules and no-objection procedures should allow sufficient time for consultation. The common goal to achieve consensus was the responsibility of all Committee members.

215. The Committee must continue to adapt its work to current realities and challenges. The delegations of Australia, Canada and New Zealand had voiced strong concerns about draft resolutions that did not align with the landmark agreements of 2015, particularly the 2030 Agenda. They had expressed support for merging draft resolutions, adapting the periodicity of draft resolutions to allow sufficient time for issues to develop and considering co-authorship. Unfortunately, attempts had been made in recent years to undo the limited progress



achieved in that regard. Collaboration, adaptation and discipline were required to achieve tangible progress and ensure that the Committee could deliver a sustainable, inclusive and resilient recovery and get back on track to implement the 2030 Agenda.

*Draft decision A/C.2/77/L.68: Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-eighth session of the General Assembly*

216. **The Chair** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.

217. *Draft decision A/C.2/77/L.68 was adopted.*

### **Completion of the Committee's work**

218. **Mr. Li Junhua** (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Committee's work had returned to its previous scope and ambition following a two-year disruption as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Against the backdrop of conflicts, economic uncertainties and the impact of climate change, Member States had achieved excellent results but must work to regain lost ground in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

219. Some of the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee had echoed concerns about the great finance divide that curtailed the ability of many developing countries to invest in a sustainable and transformative recovery. That included draft resolutions on financing for development, debt and countries in special situations. The Committee had recognized actions taken in response to the pandemic that suspended debt service payments and encouraged long-term debt sustainability. It had also encouraged the use of digital financial technologies, agreed on a date for the possible Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development and paved the ground for advances in tax cooperation.

220. The Committee had reiterated its call for integrated and coherent poverty eradication policies and had achieved consensus on scaling up anticipatory approaches to respond to the ongoing food security crisis. It had also recognized multilateral organizations' efforts in that regard, including the Global Crisis Response Group on Food, Energy and Finance created by the Secretary-General. In addition, the Committee had welcomed efforts to coordinate a comprehensive global response to mitigate global food insecurity through the implementation of both the Black Sea Grain Initiative and the memorandum of understanding between the Russian Federation and the Secretariat of

the United Nations on promoting Russian food products and fertilizers to the world markets.

221. In the macroeconomic cluster, the Committee had provided detailed guidance on policy interventions that would help the world to rebuild in a more inclusive and prosperous manner following the pandemic. It had also stressed the importance of enhancing the capacity of the multilateral trading system. At the same time, the Committee had continued to provide policy guidance on the challenges faced by countries in special situations. It had provided guidance on preparations for the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States, to be hosted by Antigua and Barbuda in 2024. The Committee had also agreed on the modalities for convening the third United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries, to be held in Kigali in 2024. It had called for strengthening support to the least developed countries, pushing ahead with the Doha Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries and paving the way for the second part of the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in 2023.

222. With regard to sustainable development, the Committee had worked on biological diversity, desertification, coastal zone management and sustainable consumption and production. Three new draft resolutions had been adopted by consensus, on glaciers, zero waste and the role of parliamentarians in sustainable development. The Committee had also recognized the increasing interlinkages between agenda items under sustainable development and those under macroeconomic policy and development finance. In that connection, it had expressed its appreciation for the advanced work on a multidimensional vulnerability index and looked forward to receiving proposals on measures of progress that complemented or went beyond GDP. For development finance to be truly transformational, special vulnerabilities must be considered. He thanked Member States for their commitment and efficient work during the Committee's session and looked forward to preparing for the high-level events on the least developed countries, water and disaster risk reduction, as well as the high-level political forum.

223. **The Chair** said that the Committee had returned to its usual workload after two years of limitations stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic. The draft resolutions adopted reflected the current state of complex agenda items, most of which had been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, geopolitical

tensions, the global economic situation and multiple ongoing crises. The Committee's draft resolutions would contribute to accelerating the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Despite challenging negotiations, Member States had managed to preserve an atmosphere of collegiality, constructiveness and compromise. The Bureau had striven to provide all negotiating groups with the space needed to reach conclusions that were acceptable to all. Although all differences could not be settled, the best possible results had been achieved given the circumstances.

224. The draft resolution on financing for development included references to the multidimensional vulnerability index under development; the 2023 session of the Economic and Social Council forum on financing for development follow-up; the Resilience and Sustainability Trust; a new Sustainable Development Goal indicator under target 17.3; and consultations to identify a measure of progress on sustainable development to complement GDP. In addition, the draft resolution on small island developing States referenced the new instrument on plastics, for which negotiations were ongoing.

225. She declared that the Second Committee had completed its work for the main part of the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.*