



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 January 2019

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 24th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 21 November 2018, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Skinner-Klée Arenales (Guatemala)

Contents

Statement by the Chair

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

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

(k) The role of the international community in the prevention of the radiation threat in Central Asia (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

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

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

Additional statement by the Chair

This record is subject to correction.

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

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



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

Statement by the Chair

1. **The Chair** said that he was encouraged by the willingness on the part of the delegations to take the Committee's work in hand. He commended facilitators on their considerable efforts to reach consensus and acknowledged some progress in that regard. However, he was deeply concerned that a number of issues and draft resolutions remained outstanding. Should that situation persist, the Committee might be forced to take more recorded votes than ever before, in a departure from its tradition of adopting draft resolutions by consensus.

2. Of course, entrenched positions made it difficult to achieve consensus. Notwithstanding, all delegations should bring their good will and talent to bear on the last stretch of work before the Committee in a final effort to arrive at mutually acceptable solutions wherever draft language continued to encumber consensus. A persistent lack of consensus would endanger the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and poison the Committee's work in 2019. The Committee must chart a course forward for the benefit of the people the delegations were there to represent.

3. The Bureau had made considerable efforts to bridge the divides between delegations on certain draft resolutions. He was willing to consider allocating more time to those issues or draft resolutions on which there might be a chance for consensus, however slim. Extending the session to accommodate additional negotiations was not the ideal scenario, but it would be done if it was the only option. The task at hand was to unite for a better future. He urged all delegations to use the break to consider that objective with a cool head.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development

(continued) (A/C.2/73/L.35/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on entrepreneurship for sustainable development (A/C.2/73/L.35/Rev.1)

4. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.35/Rev.1](#), said that entrepreneurship played a significant role in implementing the 2030 Agenda. It was both economically and socially beneficial, creating jobs and spurring growth while fostering inclusive societies.

5. The draft resolution recognized that as inventors, entrepreneurs had the power to transform societies and economies in a way that was environmentally sustainable. However, opportunities to harness entrepreneurial talent would only emerge under the right

conditions and with the right support structure. To that end, the draft resolution featured substantive updates to promote women entrepreneurs, young entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs with disabilities; support micro-, small and medium-sized businesses; integrate entrepreneurial education programmes into formal and informal education systems; and create a culture that embraced innovation and risk-taking. She thanked all delegations that had participated in consultations and encouraged all Member States to join the diverse group of sponsors supporting the draft resolution.

6. **The Chair** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

7. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Angola, Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Republic of Tanzania had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

8. She then noted that Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, the Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritius, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe and Sierra Leone also wished to join the sponsors.

9. **Ms. Shurbaji** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that although her delegation recognized the positive contribution that entrepreneurship could make to sustainable development, it could not support 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. Reports from the Secretary-General, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had amply documented Israeli measures that impeded development, which included confiscating agricultural land, implementing a discriminatory water

policy, siphoning off natural resources, levelling and polluting the soil, burying toxic waste and drilling for oil and gas. She called on Member States to see through the hypocrisy of Israel using the draft resolution to burnish its image while continuing to administer the most vicious occupation known to history. Her delegation would vote against the resolution.

10. **Mr. Al-Kuwari** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that while there was no question that entrepreneurship could make a positive contribution to sustainable development, one had to ask if the State introducing the draft resolution practiced what it preached. Numerous United Nations reports had shown how the Israeli occupation of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, created the opposite of an “enabling environment” for sustainable development. The draft resolution called for improved education while Israel’s checkpoints prevented Palestinian students from attending their schools. The draft resolution spoke of a commercial climate conducive to innovation while Israeli policies kept the Palestinian economy dependent on Israeli imports. The draft resolution encouraged Governments to address barriers to economic participation while Israel imposed a discriminatory system that applied Israeli law to settlers and military law to Palestinians. The Group of Arab States had no quarrel with the content of the resolution, but did not feel that Israel, the occupying Power, was qualified to introduce such a draft resolution when it was working to achieve precisely the opposite of the draft resolution’s goals on the ground. The Group urged Member States to seriously consider voting no.

11. *At the request of the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Qatar on behalf of the Group of Arab States, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi,

Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam.

Against:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, Nicaragua, Pakistan, South Africa, Turkey.

12. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.35/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 137 votes to 29, with 7 abstentions.*

13. **Mr. Cadena Duarte** (Ecuador) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution in recognition of the significant role of entrepreneurship in improving the quality of life and promoting sustainable development. Ecuador agreed that it was incumbent on the State to establish policies and provide an environment conducive to entrepreneurship, in particular for youth, women and other vulnerable groups, in order to promote inclusive development. The promotion of entrepreneurship should be based on adequate conditions for the development of education, health, housing and the basic services to which everyone should have access.

14. In that connection, Ecuador called on the Government of Israel to establish policies, in accordance with the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, to enable development and foster

entrepreneurship among the Palestinian people, thereby ensuring that the aims of the current draft resolution were effectively implemented.

15. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her country was pleased to have voted in favour of the draft resolution, which recognized the critical role that entrepreneurship could play in achieving sustainable development; however, she wished to clarify several points.

16. Although the term “illicit financial flows” had appeared in prior General Assembly resolutions, the United States generally opposed its inclusion owing to its lack of an internationally agreed definition. It was therefore important to be clear about specific underlying illegal activities that might produce or contribute to illicit financial flows, such as embezzlement, bribery, money laundering or other corrupt practices or crimes.

17. The term “circular economy” also lacked a commonly held definition and might imply policies that were incompatible with innovation in the sustainable management of post-consumer materials. The Committee should avoid relying on loosely defined jargon where it might detract from the shared goal of waste reduction through recovery and recycling.

18. The United States reaffirmed its strong support for quality education in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Nevertheless, curricular and other education policies, decisions and actions in the United States would be taken as appropriate and consistent with federal, state or local authorities.

19. She referred the Committee to the statement delivered on 8 November 2018 by the United States delegation addressing concerns about the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, the Paris Agreement adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the characterizations of inclusive economic growth and technology transfer therein.

20. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that he wished to thank Israel for facilitating very constructive negotiations leading to the adoption of the draft resolution, and to reiterate the pivotal role of entrepreneurship and the private sector in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. It was regrettable that some delegations were politicizing such an important draft resolution. All delegations should engage constructively and work towards consensus on future iterations of the text.

21. **Ms. Furman** (Israel), making a general statement after the voting, said that widespread support for the draft resolution demonstrated the international commitment to empowering entrepreneurs and the conviction that doing so would advance the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals.

22. The great American inventor Thomas Edison had captured the essence of entrepreneurship when he said, “I have not failed. I’ve just found 10,000 ways that won’t work”. Entrepreneurs around the world were changing ways of thinking and solving problems previously assumed unsolvable.

23. Fear of failure was a luxury that Israel could not afford. Because its survival depended on perseverance, Israel had developed a culture of entrepreneurship and problem-solving in an environment that allowed for trial and error. Israel believed that innovation was one of the most effective tools for sustainable development. Accordingly, its practice was to share its discoveries with partners around the world, champion women and youth entrepreneurs and advocate international mechanisms to create an entrepreneurial culture of fearlessness and empowerment. Israel was proof that empowerment drove prosperity, inclusion fostered progress and forward-looking investment guaranteed sustainability.

24. Entrepreneurs did not just include those who had succeeded and achieved mass visibility. They also included the man who pushed his food cart through the streets, or the woman who got up before dawn to plant enough to bring a small surplus to market, or even the little girl who sold lemonade on a hot summer day.

25. Entrepreneurship pulled societies out of poverty, levelled the gender playing field and encouraged young people to feel invested in the future of their countries. It gave people hope and purpose.

26. Given the undeniable need to support entrepreneurship in developing countries and in the Middle East in particular, Israel was disappointed that the Group of Arab States had once again requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution. Those States had cast a vote not just against a United Nations draft resolution but against their own citizens, putting politics before people.

27. **Mr. Abdelhamid** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the State of Palestine continued to believe that States should follow and uphold the draft resolutions they presented. While all Member States had the right to submit and propose draft resolutions, they should only do so when in full compliance with the spirit and language thereof. Israel was in clear contradiction

of its own draft resolution. The State of Palestine agreed with the substance of the draft resolution but firmly believed that Israel, the occupying Power, was not qualified to present it.

28. In the draft resolution, Israel, the occupying Power, advocated inclusive and sustainable economic growth through improved global policies and initiatives, yet it had imposed its own policies and measures on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, suffocating the private sector, degrading social life and damaging entrepreneurial prospects. Both the Security Council in resolution 2334 (2016) and the General Assembly in resolution 66/225 had acknowledged and recognized ongoing violations of international law committed against the Palestinian people, society, economy and future.

29. Israel, the occupying Power, was touting the importance of global entrepreneurship in the draft resolution, while simultaneously crushing sustainable Palestinian entrepreneurship by pursuing its 51-year occupation, expanding illegal settlements and committing other grave violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem.

30. The expansion of illegal settlements had significantly affected the ability of Palestine to participate in entrepreneurship for sustainable development. Meanwhile, Israel had unlawfully stalled Palestinian progress in entrepreneurship for social development by committing settlement-related violations, including the damaging and confiscation of infrastructure and property, the expansion of illegal outposts and the exploitation of resources.

31. He called upon all States to consider carefully whether the principles contained in any given draft resolution were being implemented on the ground by its presenter. Needless to say, the presenter of the current draft resolution was far from implementing the principles espoused therein, given the ongoing violations he had referred to, which were documented in many United Nations reports. He encouraged all States to reconsider accepting a draft resolution submitted by a presenter known for ignoring its own principles.

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.34/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (A/C.2/73/L.34/Rev.1)

32. **Mr. Moussa** (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.34/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the milestone United Nations Conference on Environment and Development had ushered in important international instruments and commitments that continued to guide progress in closing development gaps between developed and developing countries. In order to fully implement the 2030 Agenda – and without creating parallel processes – it would be important to benefit from and build on experiences, best practices, challenges and lessons learned from previous and ongoing agreements on sustainable development, including the Millennium Development Goals. It would be equally important to overcome silos and seek innovative and coordinated approaches to integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development.

33. In that regard, the Secretary-General was requested to submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session a report on the implementation of the draft resolution before the Committee, including an assessment of progress in the implementation of relevant instruments and commitments emanating from Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, and building on lessons learned and partnerships in advancing the 2030 Agenda.

34. **The Chair** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

35. **Ms. Lindner** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the decision by the 28 States members of the European Union to vote against the draft resolution was consistent with the position they had expressed, both formally at successive adoptions of the draft resolution in 2015, 2016 and 2017, and informally to the drafters of the current document.

36. The European Union and its member States urged their distinguished colleagues from the Group of 77 and China to refrain from submitting the draft resolution again at the seventy-fourth session of the Assembly.

37. The European Union and its member States questioned the intrinsic value added of the draft resolution, the content of which was duplicative with other processes related to the implementation, follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, or with separate, dedicated resolutions. Clearly, no “unfinished business” remained under Agenda 21. The lifespan of the draft resolution had come to an end, as had that of the two reports that it had traditionally mandated, which provided little more than a concise overview of issues pertaining to the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

38. Agenda 21 had fulfilled its purposes, having helped to shape the fundamental elements of the 2030 Agenda and many other processes related to sustainable development. The Committee should now focus its efforts on the full and effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

39. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States supported the promotion and achievement of sustainable development and maintained that the Committee should make meaningful contributions to global development priorities. However, the draft resolution before the Committee advanced neither aim. Limited time and resources should not be spent on a draft resolution that selectively reasserted past concepts. Her delegation saw no reason to continue consideration of the agenda item and had therefore decided to vote against the draft resolution.

40. *At the request of the representative of Austria on behalf of the European Union and its member States, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, 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, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, 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, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

New Zealand, Norway, Turkey

41. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted by 125 votes to 47, with 3 abstentions.*

42. **Mr. Cheshire** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Norway, said that the two countries had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. While important lessons could be learned from the implementation of Agenda 21 and from the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), their tasks had been completed. The Committee should now focus on applying those lessons to the pursuit of the 2030 Agenda. Time and resources must be devoted to the most critical issues, which did not include the draft resolution just adopted.

(k) The role of the international community in the prevention of the radiation threat in Central Asia (*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.41/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the role of the international community in the prevention of the radiation threat in Central Asia (A/C.2/73/L.41/Rev.1)

43. **Ms. Moldoisaeva** (Kyrgyzstan), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.41/Rev.1, said that it was the result of the fruitful joint work of Member States, to whom she was grateful. Environmental protection in Central Asia was a priority. The current situation in the region was the result of the ineffective economic policies of the second half of the twentieth century. The danger posed by uranium tailings, such as groundwater and river pollution across the region, had large-scale consequences for millions of people, as well as for the environment and sustainable development in the region. The Kyrgyz Republic and all the other countries of Central Asia continued their efforts in the international arena to overcome the radioactive threat of uranium tailings.

44. General Assembly resolution 68/218 on the role of the international community in averting the radiation threat in Central Asia had provided further impetus for international organizations and donor countries to initiate and implement various projects and programmes aimed at reducing that threat. The United Nations, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and other international and regional organizations and partners had made essential contributions to improving the security of materials, in particular uranium tailings, associated with former uranium mining activities in Central Asia. Since 2017, Kyrgyzstan had advocated for greater international coordination and cooperation, regularly expressing the need to update resolution 68/218. It had also held international events to raise awareness about the issue, with essential support from partner countries and international organizations.

45. She hoped the draft resolution before the Committee would enjoy similar support and further encourage international cooperation to assist Central Asia in the reduction of risks associated with uranium tailings. She thanked countries that had sponsored the draft resolution and called upon all other Member States to become sponsors.

46. **The Chair** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

47. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Hungary,

Iceland, Latvia, the Republic of Moldova and Turkey had become sponsors of the draft resolution. She then noted that Armenia, Lithuania, Qatar, Spain and the United States of America also wished to join the sponsors.

48. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to highlight several key themes in the draft resolution. The Strategic Master Plan for environmental remediation at the sites of former uranium facilities in Central Asia was important, as was keeping the public informed in a timely manner when conducting work on the prevention of the radiation threat. There were ongoing serious social, economic and environmental problems that continued to be associated with former uranium mines and tailings ponds in Central Asia, despite efforts to remediate them. A coordinated approach that included multilateral initiatives was required in efforts to remediate former uranium production facilities.

49. The views of the United States on the right to life remained unchanged; the United States did not interpret the right to life as entailing a State obligation to protect life from all foreseeable threats, including environmental threats. The views of the United States on related issues addressed in the draft resolution also remained unchanged. She noted, however, that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in article 2, paragraph 1, provided that each State party undertake to take steps with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized therein.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.26)

Draft resolution on international migration and development (A/C.2/73/L.26)

51. **Mr. Moussa** (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.26 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that since the intergovernmental negotiations on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration had provided a platform for comprehensive discussion, the draft resolution was streamlined while building on previous biennial resolutions. He highlighted the important and complex interrelationship between international migration and development as well as the need to strengthen synergies between them. If the draft resolution was adopted, a high-level debate on migration and

development would be convened in the first half of 2019 to provide input to the high-level political forum.

Agenda item 24: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution entitled on the promotion of sustainable tourism, including ecotourism, for poverty eradication and environment protection (A/C.2/73/L.20/Rev.1)

52. **Mr. Hilale** (Morocco), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.20/Rev.1](#), said that several relevant recommendations from the Secretary-General's report and from participating delegations had been incorporated in the draft resolution. Those included mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector and in climate change plans and strategies, intertwining the economic, social and cultural circumstances of each country; enhancing institutional coherence policy that supported funding mechanisms and initiatives for poverty eradication projects, including initiatives from community-based organizations, small cooperatives and private-sector entities, which would create more jobs for women and youth; promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns in the tourism sector, and alternative models of renewable energy and products with longer life cycles; ensuring responsible resource management, addressing the negative impacts of unbalanced tourism; and respecting the sociocultural and environmental capacities of local citizens and communities in each country.

53. Morocco and many other countries were a testament to the potential of artisanal, local products such as argan oil to improve peoples' socioeconomic situation, especially women and youth, when they cooperated to export the fruits of their labours. Attention must now be turned to the protection of flora and fauna, and there were many examples of such efforts, always with the aim of preserving development. Ecotourism was one result of those considerable efforts.

54. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.20/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

55. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Australia, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guatemala, Iceland, Latvia, Malta, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Sweden, Ukraine, Uruguay and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors. She then noted that Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Botswana, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, the Congo, the Federated States of

Micronesia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Liberia, Lithuania, Maldives, Mauritius, the Netherlands, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone and Togo had also joined the sponsors.

56. *Draft resolution* [A/C.2/73/L.20/Rev.1](#) was adopted.

Additional statement by the Chair

57. **The Chair** said that the work of the Committee was ongoing and would conclude on 29 November. Considering the issues that remained open, he appealed to all delegations and each delegate to make all efforts to reach agreement on outstanding texts in the best interests of the Committee. Reaching consensus in order to forge a better future was the main interest of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.