



# General Assembly

Seventy-third session

## Official Records

Distr.: General  
16 January 2019

Original: English

---

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 25th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 28 November 2018, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Skinner-Klée Arenales ..... (Guatemala)

## Contents

Statement by the Chair

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

Agenda Item 19: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)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*)
- (b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)
- (c) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)
- (h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)
- (j) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*)

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

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

---

This record is subject to correction.

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

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



*The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.*

### **Statement by the Chair**

1. **The Chair** said that action on the draft resolution on the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development, (A/C.2/73/L.33/Rev.1) and associated amendment (A/C.2/73/L.51), as well as the draft resolution on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (A/C.2/73/L.28), would be postponed until the next meeting of the Committee, owing to the late issuance of those documents.

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

2. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and, in addition, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova, said that, in adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, all leaders had expressed a solemn commitment that no one would be left behind. That agreement reflected a people-centred approach to development that focused on the dignity and rights of each individual.

3. However, since the seventieth session of the General Assembly, the European Union and its member States had grown concerned over the gradual and subtle movement towards a concept of development that focused on States rather than individuals. That was causing a shift away from the universal approach epitomized by the Sustainable Development Goals. To be clear, the European Union and its member States fully accepted that the notion of “no country being left behind” was contained in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and completely supported the ambition of the 2030 Agenda that the Goals and targets be met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society. However, the language introduced in an imperfect compromise in 2017 reflected neither the Addis Ababa Action Agenda nor the 2030 Agenda. The gradual reinterpretation of a concept underwritten by all leaders could not be accepted at a time when the focus should be placed on delivering the big agreements of 2015. The temptation to constantly rewrite or undermine those agreements must be resisted.

4. The Committee should be a forum of great importance to international development, but its potential remained unfulfilled. With peoples’ lives and

livelihoods at stake, the Committee should be as relevant as possible and focus on driving delivery of the 2015 agreements rather than allow itself to be caught in the fruitless trap of renegotiating them.

5. During negotiations in 2018, the European Union had consistently proposed alternative language for the relevant preambular and operative paragraphs, closely based on language agreed by leaders that was firmly faithful to their vision for the 2030 Agenda. It was regrettable that those proposals had not been accepted. It was even more regrettable that fellow negotiators had refused to even come to the table to discuss the issue and had rebuffed all attempts on the part of the European Union to find a compromise text that would have bridged the divergent positions.

6. Therefore, in order to better reflect the 2030 Agenda, the European Union and its member States would propose the following modifications in the relevant resolutions: First, the deletion of the repetitive paragraph in the preambular section that misquoted paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and second, the replacement of the relevant operative paragraph by:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the Goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

7. As the Secretary-General himself had noted, at a time when multilateralism and the rules-based international system were under threat, the principles agreed by leaders in 2015 must remain firm. That was particularly important given that in 2019, the high-level political forum on sustainable development would be assessing progress on the 2030 Agenda. The Secretary-General himself had just written to the leaders of the Group of 20 (G-20), urging them to do more to deliver on the 2030 Agenda and its central promise to “leave no one behind”. The European Union and its member States sincerely hoped that a way could be found for the Committee to become a more constructive vehicle for delivering that ambition and that their suggestions would be met with the support of the Committee.

8. Lastly, the concerns he had expressed were related only to the two paragraphs to which he had just referred; the European Union looked forward to joining consensus on, or voting in favour of, the rest of the text as appropriate.

**Agenda Item 19: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/73/L.17 and A/C.2/73/L.42)

*Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development* (A/C.2/73/L.17 and A/C.2/73/L.42)

9. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42, submitted by Ms. Alateibi (United Arab Emirates), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.17. Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42 contained no programme budget implications.

10. **Mr. Rios** (Mexico), facilitator, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42.

11. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42 was adopted.*

12. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States was proud to be a leader on financing for development. The scale and impact of private capital, domestic resource mobilization, philanthropy, remittances and other financial flows, and enhanced commerce and investment now dwarfed the role of official development assistance in development finance. The diversity of financing promised to increase developing countries' self-reliance. Although his delegation was joining consensus on the draft resolution, it was concerned that duplicative negotiations on financing for development at the United Nations did not advance the development agenda, instead wasting time and resources on parallel negotiations and redundant reports. The United States was extremely disappointed that almost immediately after Member States had agreed to reduce overlap and duplication within the United Nations, many Member States had insisted on upholding a duplicative resolution which added no value to the process.

13. Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42 was a prime example of the overlap and duplication between the work of the General Assembly and that of the Economic and Social Council. Each year, the Economic and Social Council held the forum on financing for development follow-up and facilitated the negotiation of an outcome document, which contained all the substantive conversation needed for such financing. His delegation wished to reiterate that the annual financing for development resolution in the Committee was unnecessary and should be eliminated. Lastly, regarding references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the

characterization of technology transfer, he wished to reiterate his delegation's concerns addressed in its general statement of 8 November 2018.

14. **Mr. Kato** (Japan) said that his delegation was of the view that the draft resolution could be improved, especially as it pertained to reporting, and concurred with the statement made by the United States. The report of the Secretary-General requested in draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.42 could be replaced with an integral and holistic report of the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. His delegation would continue to promote that option in future discussions. With regard to paragraph 7, his delegation welcomed the initial contributions made by India to the voluntary trust fund, which not only supported the participation of developing countries but also further contributed to enabling the Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters to fulfil its mandate. He wished to underscore that his country and other countries continued to support the work of the Committee in other ways, including through the contribution of human and financial resources.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.17 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda Item 20: Sustainable development**  
(*continued*) (A/C.2/73/L.13)

*Draft resolution on the oil slick on Lebanese shores* (A/C.2/73/L.13)

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

17. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the valuable time and attention of the Committee was being hijacked year after year by certain delegations for political purposes. For some brief context, her delegation wished to remind the room that the issue at the heart of the draft resolution, now an historical event, had first emerged with rockets launched from Lebanon onto Israeli towns and villages, which had caused extensive damage to civilian infrastructure as well as to forests and wildlife, not to mention the injuring and killing of Israelis. Her delegation had searched in vain for mention of that crucial background in both the draft resolution and the report, also looking for any mention of the damage to Israeli infrastructure caused by the 4,000 rockets launched into Israel from Lebanon but, of course, had found none, since the purpose of those documents was not to enlighten. In response to the oil spill and in spite of the reckless aggression launched from Lebanese territory, Israel had still offered to assist in the clean-up. It had cooperated extensively with the United Nations

Environment Programme (UNEP) and other environmental organizations, offering specialized equipment and other assistance, contributions that were not mentioned in the report or draft resolution.

18. The delegation of Lebanon was apparently immune to shame, since it should have known that those simple facts would be discussed in an open meeting. Facts did matter. The draft resolution and the report that followed it had not changed in years, not one single line. There was simply nothing more to say, at least nothing that the authors were willing to say. It seemed that from the start, the Government of Lebanon had been more interested in the ritual of blaming Israel for all that was wrong in the world than in dealing with development issues, and that that remained its priority. She hoped that the next generation would not be sitting in the conference room years later considering the same absurd draft resolution.

19. Her delegation proposed that Member States bring some pressure to bear and that the draft resolution be allowed to fade away. Israel had called for a vote on the draft resolution and for all the reasons she had set out, would vote against it. Israel urged other delegations to do the same and to help get the Committee back on track to deal with the economic, social and environmental challenges that genuinely required attention.

20. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal,

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

*Against:*

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Vanuatu.

21. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.13](#) was adopted by 161 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.*

22. **Ms. Mudallali** (Lebanon), making a general statement, said that 2018 marked the thirteenth consecutive year that the Committee had voted overwhelmingly in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Oil slick on Lebanese shores", reaffirming the international community's will to hold countries responsible for their intentionally wrongful acts. Member States knew that Israel had attacked Lebanon in 2006, killed hundreds of people, destroyed every bridge and all the infrastructure in Lebanon, and injured thousands of people. The adoption of the draft resolution reaffirmed the commitment of the Committee to upholding international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules and principles of international environmental law, as well as the commitment of the Committee to help countries achieve sustainable development, acknowledging again that environmental damage was an obstacle to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

23. The draft resolution acknowledged the adverse environmental, economic and health impacts that had been inflicted on Lebanon in July 2006 after Israel bombed the El Jiyeh electric power plant, resulting in an

oil slick that covered the entirety of the Lebanese coastline and extended beyond it to partially affect the coastlines of neighbouring countries and a significant surface area of the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. Through the draft resolution, the Committee had once again requested Israel to assume responsibility for prompt and adequate compensation to the Government of Lebanon for the damages caused, which in 2014 had amounted to \$856.4 million, as reflected in the report of the Secretary-General on the oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/73/302). In that regard, Lebanon affirmed that it would continue to mobilize all resources and use all legal means to ensure the implementation of the resolution and the full payment of adequate compensation without delay.

**(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.24/Rev.1)**

*Draft resolution on the midterm comprehensive review of the implementation of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Sustainable Development, 2018–2028" (A/C.2/73/L.24/Rev.1)*

24. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had become sponsors of the draft resolution. She then noted that Brunei-Darussalam, Guinea Bissau, Rwanda, and the United States of America had also joined the sponsors.

25. **Mr. Hikmatov** (Tajikistan), facilitator, said that in the third line of paragraph 5, the word "Goals" should be lower-case. In the fifth line of paragraph 7, the words "preparatory process" should be replaced with "preparations" as agreed by the Member States.

26. He looked forward to the continued cooperation of all delegations in fulfilling the mandate of the draft resolution, in particular in convening the high-level meeting to promote the implementation of the water-related Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda in 2021 to support the Decade, and, in March 2023, the United Nations Conference on the Midterm Comprehensive Review of the Implementation of the Objectives of the

International Decade for Action, "Water for Sustainable Development", 2018–2028.

27. The International Decade for Action, "Water for Sustainable Development", 2018–2028 created a solid platform for coordinated and integrated actions aimed at furthering sustainable management of water resources, and for the achievement of the water-related goals and targets, including those contained in the 2030 Agenda. He invited Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, financial institutions, private-sector and other relevant stakeholders and donors to support the preparations for the Conference, and to assist developing countries in participating fully and effectively in the review and implementation of the Decade.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.24/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

29. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union was joining consensus on the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States looked forward to working with partners on preparations for the two forthcoming events in 2021 and 2023 to help accelerate progress towards the achievement of the urgently needed water-related Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda. The International Decade for Action, "Water for Sustainable Development", 2018–2028 was an important communication tool and instrument that the European Union and its member States fully supported.

30. Following the negotiations and compromise reflected in the final text, he wished to make important clarifications. The European Union remained firmly committed to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and its water-related Goals and targets, in particular Sustainable Development Goal 6. It was essential to acknowledge interlinkages across the 2030 Agenda in order for all the Goals to be achieved. The 2030 Agenda was the guiding framework of development actions; accelerating progress towards its implementation must be the focus of attention. It was therefore regrettable that some parties felt unable to include explicit references to Sustainable Development Goal 6 and other water-related Sustainable Development Goals in a draft resolution that would have a direct impact on them.

31. Furthermore, capacity-building efforts should focus on supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which reflected the agreement of the international community on priority areas for action, including water. The European Union and its member States understood the wording "internationally agreed



water-related goals and targets, including those of the 2030 Agenda” in that spirit.

32. Urgent action was needed to scale up and accelerate progress towards the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 6 and other water-related goals and targets, as highlighted by the *Sustainable Development Goal 6 Synthesis Report on Water and Sanitation, 2018*. That was the objective of the high-level meeting to be held in 2021, which had been proposed by the European Union and agreed to in the draft resolution just adopted.

33. Governments alone could not achieve the Sustainable Development Goals; strong stakeholder engagement was essential, as acknowledged in many documents. It was therefore important that stakeholders from civil society, academia and the private sector were enabled to fully participate in discussions at related events. For the 2023 United Nations Conference on the Midterm Comprehensive Review of the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Decade for Action, “Water for Sustainable Development”, 2018–2028, the modalities resolution to be negotiated at the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly would provide an occasion to agree on the necessary arrangements. The European Union and its member States would engage with the President of the General Assembly to ensure the same for the 2021 high-level meeting.

34. Regarding United Nations decades, the European Union and its member States remained of the view that midterm reviews did not usually warrant a United Nations conference, and considered the conference agreed to in the draft resolution an exception related to the great need for accelerating progress on the water-related Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda. For that reason, their stance on extending the scope of the Conference was explicitly mentioned in all rounds of informal consultations. Similarly, the European Union and its member States remained of the view that, as a rule, United Nations conferences should conclude with a negotiated outcome recognized in the ministerial declaration of the high-level political forum. With regard to both points, the compromise in the draft resolution did not reflect a change of position and should not constitute a precedent for future cases.

**(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/73/L.27/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution entitled “Towards the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations” (A/C.2/73/L.27/Rev.1)*

35. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Romania had joined the sponsors.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.*

37. **Ms. Crabtree** (Turkey) said that Turkey had joined consensus on the draft resolution as it addressed important issues with respect to the sustainable development of the Caribbean region. Her delegation fully supported the efforts of the Association of Caribbean States to develop and implement regional initiatives to promote sustainable conservation and management of their coastal and marine resources. However, her delegation dissociated itself from the references in the draft resolution to the international instruments to which Turkey was not a party. Accordingly, such references could not be construed as a change in the legal position of her country with regard to those instruments. Her delegation also did not consider the wording concerning the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the resolution on oceans and the law of the sea as agreed language, and it therefore called for a vote on that resolution each year.

38. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution, which dealt with important issues related to the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea. It also supported the views expressed by the Group of 77 and China, and initiatives by Caribbean States in particular. However, her country did not support the references to international instruments to which the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was not a party. Those references should not be considered as a change in her country’s position. In particular, her country was not a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. For that reason, the norms mentioned in that instrument, including instruments which could be considered to constitute customary international law, were not binding on her country except insofar as it explicitly recognized them.

39. **Ms. Carlier Gonzalez** (Colombia) said that Colombia was a nation with coastline on both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and a wealth of biodiversity in its marine and coastal ecosystems thanks to its geography. Colombia was committed to the conservation, protection and sustainable development of those resources through the implementation of policies, plans and programmes that recognized their importance at the national, regional and global level. Her country had robust institutions for marine and coastal issues and

subscribed to a holistic view whereby the sea, the coast and their resources were fundamental to the sustainable development of the country.

40. Her country conducted all maritime activities in strict adherence to the international commitments it had expressly accepted or adopted. However, Colombia was not a State party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, whose provisions were therefore neither enforceable nor binding on her country, except for those it had expressly accepted. Her Government believed that the Convention was not the only policy framework that regulated the oceans. The draft resolution and her country's participation in its adoption by consensus could not therefore be construed or interpreted as implying either express or tacit acceptance by Colombia of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

**(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa**  
(continued) (A/C.2/73/L.38 and A/C.2/73/L.44)

*Draft resolutions on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa* (A/C.2/73/L.38 and A/C.2/73/L.44)

41. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.44, submitted by Mr. Remaoun (Algeria), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.38. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

42. **Ms. Sigurdardóttir** (Iceland), co-facilitator, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.44 and said that the constructive engagement and positive spirit of the delegations participating in the 2018 negotiations were highly appreciated and had resulted in a strong and meaningful draft resolution on a very important issue.

43. **The Chair** commended all delegations for their cooperation and, particularly, for the flexibility shown during the informal consultations.

44. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.44 was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his country was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution but wished to clarify several points. With regard to the tenth preambular paragraph, the United States supported the aims of the United Nations strategic plan for forests 2017–2030, but disassociated itself from the language on the transfer of technology,

referring delegations to its statement on that plan. His delegation did not accept that language and would not consider it as a basis for future discussions.

46. Paragraph 2 misquoted the text of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa with regard to, inter alia, linkages and Sustainable Development Goals. Language inconsistent with the outcomes of the thirteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention was used, including in paragraphs 6, 9 and 12. It was the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and not the General Assembly which, through its decisions, guided the parties in their implementation of the Convention.

47. As a result, when a discrepancy existed between a General Assembly text and the decisions of the Conference of the Parties, only the text of the Convention was considered. Any future resolutions concerning the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa must accurately reflect the will of the parties by recognizing and accurately reflecting agreed language. He referred Committee members to his country's statement on 8 November 2018, which addressed its concerns regarding the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and characterizations of trade, technology transfer and inclusive economic growth.

48. *Resolution A/C.2/73/L.38 was withdrawn.*

**(h) Harmony with Nature** (continued)  
(A/C.2/73/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.2/73/L.52)

*Draft resolution on Harmony with Nature* (A/C.2/73/L.39/Rev.1) and proposed amendments (A/C.2/73/L.52)

49. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.39/Rev.1, submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. He drew the Committee's attention to the proposed amendments to the draft resolution, contained in document A/C.2/73/L.52, submitted by Austria on behalf of the European Union and its member States. The latter document contained no programme budget implications. According to rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would first take a decision on the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/73/L.52. A recorded vote had been requested

50. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), introducing amendments to the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the

European Union and its member States were concerned about the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, which did not correctly reflect paragraph 1 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and risked re-writing the people-centred, universal approach enshrined in the 2030 Agenda. To address that concern and bring the text closer to the vision of the 2030 Agenda, the European Union and its member States had proposed deleting the thirty-fourth preambular paragraph and replacing paragraph 13 with a paragraph that read:

“Calls upon all stakeholders to implement the present resolution as a means to deliver the comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda, in which the dignity of the human person is fundamental, the goals and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, no one is left behind, and we endeavour to reach the furthest behind first.”

51. **Mr. Lauber** (Switzerland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation regretted that draft resolutions were not being adopted by consensus that afternoon. Switzerland had no fear of voting and was accustomed to doing so. Voting constituted an important aspect of any democratic process. However, his delegation remained convinced that multilateralism was sustained by the search for collective solutions to collective problems, which emerged following what were often long and trying negotiations. From time to time, achieving a solution entailed concessions. His country called on all Member States to pursue their work with that in mind.

52. During the current session, however, Committee members had not managed to reach a consensus on the concept of “leaving no one behind”. His delegation deeply regretted that and was disappointed that a vote had had to be taken on draft resolutions which, in the past, had been adopted by consensus. While the position of Switzerland on the 2030 Agenda was well-known – namely, that on its adoption, Member States had pledged to channel their energy into ending poverty, combating inequalities and climate change and leaving no one behind - that regret had led it to abstain from voting. His delegation hoped that that commitment would remain firm and unequivocal over the next 12 years and beyond. Its abstention was therefore a call to compromise. In 2019, it would do its utmost to find a solution which all Member States would support and which would remain valid until at least 2030. The explanation of vote he had just given would be applicable to all forthcoming votes on the matter.

53. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, 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, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

*Abstaining:*

Iceland, Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Switzerland, Turkey.

54. *The amendments contained in document A/C.2/73/L.52 were rejected by 45 votes to 108, with 12 abstentions.*



55. **Mr. Gad** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the results of the vote just taken had demonstrated the importance of upholding and preserving the work of the Second Committee, including on agreements reached during informal consultations. The Group had requested a vote on the amendments to the draft resolution, which had been prepared on the basis of language agreed upon by the General Assembly and paragraphs agreed upon during the informal consultations held during that session with a view to preserving the established rules and practices of the Committee's work, and in the absence of an objective justification for the requested amendments or deletion, which was equally important.

56. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that, further to the vote just taken, his country disassociated itself from all language in the Second Committee resolutions of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly referring to "leave no country behind". The 2030 Agenda stated that "no one will be left behind". His delegation believed that altering the original 2030 Agenda language eroded the people-centred focus of that agreement, distracted from the many multifaceted and multi-stakeholder efforts to advance sustainable development and constituted an effort to shift the discussion towards a narrow set of vested country interests and away from those who had the most to gain from sustainable development: the people.

57. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), making a general statement on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendments, which had been intended to bring the text of the draft resolution back to the people-centred, universal approach of the 2030 Agenda. He thanked all delegations which had supported the amendments while regretting that consensus could not be reached. The European Union and its member States were ready to engage in consultations on the issue in 2019 with a view to finding agreement ahead of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly.

58. **The Chair** then invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.39/Rev.1](#), submitted by Egypt on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

59. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.39/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

**(j) Combating sand and dust storms** (*continued*)  
([A/C.2/73/L.16](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.45](#))

*Draft resolutions on combating sand and dust storms*  
([A/C.2/73/L.16](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.45](#))

60. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.45](#), submitted by Mr. Remaoun (Algeria), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.16](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

61. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.45](#) was adopted.*

62. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.16](#) was withdrawn.*

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

**(b) International migration and development**  
(*continued*) ([A/C.2/73/L.26](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.46](#))

*Draft resolutions on international migration and development* ([A/C.2/73/L.26](#) and [A/C.2/73/L.46](#))

63. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.46](#), submitted by Mr. Braquetti (Monaco), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.26](#). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

64. **Ms. Angelova** (Bulgaria), facilitator, introduced draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.46](#) and said that the negotiating process had not been easy, but delegations had been able to come to a welcome agreement. Although the draft resolution would be voted on, the text agreed to was a clear indication that international cooperation should be the basis for the way forward.

65. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation objected to the draft resolution for a number of reasons, including, particularly, its overarching focus on the Organization's role in advancing the global governance of migration and development, which impinged upon State sovereignty and should be strictly reserved for Member States. While her country honoured the contributions of its immigrants, it did not support processes that imposed international guidelines, standards and commitments which might constrain its ability to make sovereign decisions in the best interests of the American people. The United States disagreed with the draft resolution's calls to reaffirm documents it did not support, including the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, which committed to "strengthening global governance" for international migration and contained a number of

goals inconsistent with United States law and policy. The United States intended to withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as it was eligible to do so, unless suitable terms for reengagement were identified. Therefore, the language related to the Paris Agreement and climate change in those resolutions was without prejudice to United States positions. Her delegation reaffirmed its support for promoting economic growth and improving energy security while protecting the environment.

66. The United States did not support the creation of a Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and objected to the references to it in the draft resolution. Given that her country had not participated in the related negotiation process and would not endorse the Global Compact, it was not bound by commitments or outcomes stemming from the Compact process or contained in the Compact itself. Decisions regarding whom to admit for legal residency and to whom citizenship would be granted were the most important sovereign decisions a country could make, and were not subject to negotiation in international instruments or forums. Her Government maintained the sovereign right to facilitate or restrict access to its territory in accordance with its national laws and policies and its existing international obligations.

67. *A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia

(Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

*Against:*

Hungary, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

68. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/73/L.46](#) was adopted by 177 votes to 3, with no abstentions.*

69. **Ms. Csizsár** (Hungary) said that her country had been committed to the integrated approach of the 2030 Agenda from the very beginning. It had presented its first voluntary national review at the 2018 high-level political forum and was committed to achieving long-term sustainable development in partnership with stakeholders. Her delegation had decided to disassociate itself from the negotiations on, adoption and implementation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and would therefore not participate in the December 2018 Marrakech conference. Its proceedings, as well as the subsequent adoption of the Global Compact by the General Assembly, should have no implication for her country. Given the draft resolution's widespread references to the Global Compact process, including its follow-up and review, Hungary was unable to agree with it and wished to disassociate itself from the entire text.

70. **Mr. De La Mora Salcedo** (Mexico) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution on migration and development, which was relevant to the work of the Committee precisely because of the strong links between international migration and sustainable development. However, it was disconcerting that there

were voices within and outside the Committee that refused to acknowledge reality. His delegation therefore wished to explain the reasons for which it had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

71. International migrants represented 3.3 per cent of the global population but produced almost 9 per cent of the world's wealth. There were 258 million people who produced \$6.7 trillion through their work.

72. In the 2030 Agenda, countries had made a commitment to having properly managed policies in place for safe, orderly and regular migration. In the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, countries had made a number of commitments to assist large groups of refugees and migrants on the move, acknowledging that they had rights and obligations and were development actors who benefited both their countries of origin and destination.

73. Those processes had led to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, which would be adopted in Marrakesh on 10 December 2018. The Global Compact was the result of an intergovernmental preparatory process that had lasted nearly two years, and had been mandated by the General Assembly and led by the Member States with the full participation of other relevant stakeholders.

74. The content of the Global Compact was based on reality, not on perception and much less on false narratives arising from xenophobia and intolerance. In the Global Compact, the multidimensional and inherently transnational nature of migration was acknowledged and a framework for international cooperation was presented to ensure that, rather than being irregular, migration could be safe, orderly and regular.

75. The Global Compact did not impose obligations on any Member State, because it was clearly a non-binding document, as was the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Far from promoting migration, the Compact acknowledged that migration was a reality that could and must be managed. Control over borders clearly remained in the hands of States. The Global Compact did, however, set out best practices for more efficient and coordinated border management for the benefit of both States and migrants.

76. It was valid to debate and disagree with the positions of other Member States. However, precisely because there were different points of view and different priorities, international cooperation was the only way forward on a decidedly international issue that no country could manage on its own. Mexico called for international cooperation between countries of origin,

transit and destination as a driver of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

77. On that basis, Mexico would actively negotiate the next draft resolution on mechanisms during the International Migration Review Forum, which would provide an opportunity to share good practices and promote international cooperation through the implementation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.2/73/L.26 was withdrawn.*

*The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.*