



# General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

## Official Records

Distr.: General  
6 January 2020

Original: English

---

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 24th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 26 November 2019, at 10 a.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Niang ..... (Senegal)

## Contents

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for sustainable development (*continued*)Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

- (a) International trade and development (*continued*)
- (b) International financial system and development (*continued*)
- (c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)
- (d) Commodities (*continued*)
- (e) Financial inclusion for sustainable development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: 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) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)
- (g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (*continued*)
- (i) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)
- (k) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*)

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

- (b) Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development (*continued*)

---

This record is subject to correction.Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section ([dms@un.org](mailto:dms@un.org)), and incorporated in a copy of the record.Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>)

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

**Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for sustainable development**

*(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.32 and A/C.2/74/L.70)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.32 and A/C.2/74/L.70: Information and communications technologies for sustainable development*

1. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.70 had no programme budget implications.
2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.70 was adopted.*
3. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, with regard to references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the issue of technology transfer, his delegation had laid out its position in the general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting held on 21 November 2019 (see A/C.2/74/SR.23). Furthermore, the United States interpreted the term "local content" in the draft resolution as referring to content that was customized to local needs, and not to measures that required or provided evidence for the use of domestically produced goods such as local content requirements. His delegation also wished to raise its concerns about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions were on a biennial or triennial basis. For many topics, there was not enough meaningful change to warrant annual consideration. His delegation therefore proposed adjusting the periodicity of the present resolution.
4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.32 was withdrawn.*

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

**(a) International trade and development**  
*(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.15/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.15/Rev.1: International trade and development*

5. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested by the United States.
6. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.15/Rev.1.*

*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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, 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, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 173 votes to 2.*

8. **Mr. Dreilinger** (United States of America) said that, for the third year in a row, his delegation had been forced to vote against the draft resolution because of the problematic language that it had drawn attention to on previous occasions. The United States enjoyed strong and growing trade relationships across the globe and welcomed efforts to increase economic cooperation and increase prosperity through free, fair and reciprocal trade. However, his delegation was unable to join the consensus because of attempts in the draft resolution to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system. The United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including at the World Trade Organization (WTO). The United Nations was not the appropriate venue for those discussions and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions made by the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on those issues. That included calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

9. In addition, the United States could not join the consensus on the phrase “combat protectionism” in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions against the unfair and market-distorting trade practices of others were not protectionism. The United States did not advocate protectionism and would not support veiled criticisms of its policies.

10. The United States believed that economic sanctions as an alternative to the use of force could be effective, appropriate and legitimate responses to gross violations of international human rights or other widely accepted norms and standards. Each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it would conduct trade with other countries. That included economic, financial or trade measures such as sanctions.

11. Lastly, with regard to references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the issue of inclusive economic growth, he recalled that his delegation had laid out its position in the general statement delivered at the Committee’s 23rd meeting.

12. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in

favour of the draft resolution. The European Union attached great importance to the development and strengthening of an open, transparent, universal and rules-based multilateral trading system centred around WTO. However, that system needed to be modernized. He welcomed in particular the recognition in the draft resolution of the need to strengthen WTO, with a view to ensuring the continued viability and effectiveness of its dispute settlement, negotiating and monitoring functions. WTO needed to be able to tackle tensions in the international trading system. Efforts should be made to secure new rules on industrial subsidies and State-owned enterprises so as to promote a more level playing field for workers and businesses around the world. It was important for developing countries to contribute to the debate with a positive spirit in order to combat protectionism in all its forms.

13. **Ms. Brink** (Australia) said that her country was a strong supporter of a rules-based multilateral trading system. Her delegation reaffirmed its commitments to WTO and its framework of rules, which promoted and protected the open global trading system. Australia recognized the importance of international trade as an engine for inclusive economic growth and development, as reaffirmed in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

14. Although her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 3, which contained a reference to “States” rather than “Member States”. The standard procedure was for the United Nations and its Main Committees to address resolutions to “Member States” and her delegation did not wish to see the new formulation become a precedent. Her delegation also wished to formally register its disappointment that the language had been introduced as part of a package without any opportunity for negotiation, which was not in the spirit of compromise and consensus-building that should be at the core of the Committee’s procedures.

15. **Mr. Black** (Canada) said that his country remained firmly committed to promoting an inclusive, universal, rules-based, open, transparent, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system centred around WTO. His delegation had once again voted in favour of 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. However, his delegation wished to express its disappointment with the process that had led to the new formulation contained in paragraph 3, which moved away from long-standing language without an opportunity to negotiate the change made or to understand its rationale. His delegation was further

concerned that, in the absence of consensus on that change during informal negotiations, the Committee had not fallen back on previously agreed language, in accordance with its standard practice.

**(b) International financial system and development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.14 and A/C.2/74/L.62)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.14 and A/C.2/74/L.62: International financial system and development*

16. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.62 had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested by the United States.

17. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.62.*

*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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, 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, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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, North Macedonia, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi

Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.62 was adopted by 177 votes to 1.*

19. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that that his delegation was disappointed to have been forced to vote against the draft resolution for the third year in a row. It objected to the use of the phrase "increasing protectionism and inward-looking policies" in the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. WTO-consistent trade remedy measures and enforcement actions against the unfair and market-distorting trade practices of others were not protectionist. The United States did not advocate protectionism and would not support veiled criticisms of its policies when others were unwilling to do the hard work necessary to deliver on free, fair and reciprocal trade. The United Nations was not the appropriate forum for such discussions, as explained in the general statement delivered by his delegation at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

20. The calls in paragraphs 2 and 10 of the draft resolution for enhancing, ensuring or strengthening the coherence and consistency of the international monetary, financial and trading systems and policies presumed that the current level of coherence and consistency was suboptimal in some way – a position that his delegation did not necessarily share. His delegation also did not support the attempt to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems that were independent of the United Nations system.

21. His delegation strongly disagreed with the encouragement in paragraph 15 to provide flexible, concessional, fast-disbursing and front-loaded assistance without regard to the financial sustainability of the institutions, the impact on development and poverty reduction, or the presence of an appropriate

macroeconomic policy framework. Concessional assistance should be determined by the governance bodies of the international financial institutions, which should allocate limited concessional resources with reference to income and creditworthiness. Furthermore, the recommendations could be read as encouraging multilateral development banks to refrain from adhering to the high social, environmental and fiduciary standards that were essential to achieving sustainable development.

22. His delegation also opposed the use, in preambular paragraph 18 and paragraph 25 of the draft resolution, of the term “illicit financial flows”, which had no agreed-upon international definition. In the absence of any common understanding of what constituted illicit financial flows, the United States understood that term to refer to money or assets derived from specific illegal activities such as embezzlement, bribery, money-laundering, other corrupt practices and other crimes.

23. Regarding unilateral economic measures, which were referred to in paragraph 40 of the draft resolution, the United States believed that economic sanctions as an alternative to the use of force could be appropriate, effective and legitimate responses to gross violations of human rights or other widely accepted norms and standards. Each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries. That included unilateral economic measures such as sanctions.

24. The United States was within its rights to utilize its trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve national security and foreign policy objectives. His delegation also wished to raise its concerns about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions, including the present resolution, were on a biennial or triennial basis.

25. Lastly, he referred the Committee to his delegation’s global explanation of position delivered at the 23rd meeting in which it had set out a number of specific additional concerns raised by the draft resolution, including with regard to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

26. **Mr. De la Mora Salcedo** (Mexico) said that while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution its content was emblematic of the challenges facing the work of the Committee, specifically the lack of alignment between the Committee’s work and the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. For example, it had proven impossible to update the draft resolution to reflect recent discussions on Sustainable Development Goal 13, on action to combat climate

change, or Goal 12, on responsible consumption and production. The work of the Committee would be more efficient if its resolutions laid out clearer guidelines for the reports of the Secretary-General, which in turn should specify both the relevant Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda and the relevant elements of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda that were covered by the resolutions concerned. Specific recommendations for advancing the 2030 Agenda would have a greater impact on the ground and would also support synergy between the work of the Committee and that of the high-level political forum on sustainable development.

27. **Mr. Golroo** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 28.

28. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 28.

29. **Ms. Shurbaji** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 28.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.14 was withdrawn.*

#### **(c) External debt sustainability and development** (continued) (A/C.2/74/L.9 and A/C.2/74/L.59)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.9 and A/C.2/74/L.59:  
External debt sustainability and development*

31. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.59 had no programme budget implications.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.59 was adopted.*

33. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that although his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had a number of concerns that it hoped would be addressed in the future. The draft resolution did not sufficiently or accurately address such issues as debt sustainability and transparency. With regard to the references in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the draft resolution to non-cooperative minority bondholders, he noted that the ability of such bondholders to block a deal was permitted by law. As such, it was outside the scope of a United Nations resolution to express concern about the enforceability of contracts.

34. His delegation was also concerned about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions, including the present resolution, were on a biennial or triennial basis. For many topics, there was not enough meaningful change to warrant annual consideration.



35. Lastly, with regard to references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction for 2015–2030, the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the characterization of trade and technology transfer, he recalled that his delegation had expressed its specific concerns at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.9 was withdrawn.*

**(d) Commodities (continued) (A/C.2/74/L.21 and A/C.2/74/L.55)**

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.21 and A/C.2/74/L.55: Commodities*

37. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.55 had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested by the United States.

38. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.55.*

*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, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, 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, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, 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, North Macedonia, 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 Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.55 was adopted by 175 votes to 1.*

40. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted that it could not join consensus on the text and wished to highlight its concerns. Portions of the draft resolution that made obsolete references to the world financial and economic crisis, attributed supposed negative impacts on economic and social development to vague and sweeping references to some trade practices and trade barriers, and inappropriately called upon international financial institutions and other non-United Nations organizations to take actions that went beyond the scope of what such a draft resolution should properly address.

41. The United States enjoyed strong and growing trade relationships across the globe. It welcomed efforts to bolster those relationships, increase economic cooperation and provide prosperity to all peoples through free, fair and reciprocal trade. However, the United States would act in its sovereign interest, including on trade matters, and did not take its trade policy direction from the United Nations. The latter must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including at WTO. The United Nations was not the appropriate venue for those discussions and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions made by the General Assembly on those issues.

42. His delegation was also unable to support the blanket call, in paragraph 3, to support policy efforts to

address trade and market mispricing. The underlying supply and demand factors could provide effective pricing determination in the market. Such policy efforts could be inappropriately aimed at national governmental authorities that sought to artificially set prices or establish market-distorting price barriers. Any such efforts should be consistent with international rules and obligations.

43. In paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, his delegation could not support blaming tariffs and WTO-consistent non-tariff measures for impeding the economic diversification of certain countries. In addition, any list of factors should include the effects of exchange rates and unfavourable business environments for commerce and investment. In paragraph 9, the reference to excessive price volatility was questionable. As that term was not defined, Committee members should not be asked to support a call to address it. Moreover, policies aimed at facilitating value addition should be consistent with relevant international rules and obligations.

44. His delegation was unable to join consensus on language that spoke to ongoing and future work at WTO, that reinterpreted WTO agreements and decisions or that undermined the mandate of WTO, which was an independent organization with a different membership, mandate and rules of procedure. Consistent with that policy, it could not accept attempts to shape the agenda of WTO, which was the exclusive responsibility of WTO members. In addition, while the United States was active in the Aid for Trade initiative and supported it, the United Nations should not opine on the priorities of the WTO Aid for Trade initiative, which were set by that organization's members.

45. With regard to references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement, the Sendai Declaration, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and climate change, his delegation had laid out its position in the general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting. Furthermore, the United States did not recognize the term "implementation targets" in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution; it understood that the targets were Sustainable Development Goal targets.

46. Lastly, his delegation wished to raise its concerns about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions were on a biennial basis and, in the case of the present resolution, on a triennial basis.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.21 was withdrawn.*

**(e) Financial inclusion for sustainable development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.23 and A/C.2/74/L.61)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.23 and A/C.2/74/L.61: Financial inclusion for sustainable development*

48. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.61 had no programme budget implications.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.61 was adopted.*

50. **Mr. Fogarty** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda, climate change, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the New Urban Agenda had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting. His delegation appreciated that the draft resolution recognized that the dignity of the human person was fundamental. The United States firmly believed that anti-money-laundering and anti-terrorism-financing measures were important part of ensuring financial inclusion because concerns about money-laundering and terrorism financing impacted the risk decisions of financial institutions.

51. While the United States acknowledged the increasing use of the term "illicit financial flows" within the United Nations system, it had a strong preference to use the term "illicit finance". In the absence of an agreed-upon international definition, the resolution should be clear about the specific illegal activities that contributed to the generation and movement of illicit finance, such as corruption, fraud and money-laundering, and the need for all Member States to focus more concretely on preventing and combating those crimes at home. Member States also needed to fulfil their domestic and international obligations to prevent corruption from occurring in the first place. It was much more effective to prevent the underlying crimes that led to illicit finance than to dedicate the significant time and resources needed to enforce the laws once a corrupt activity had already been committed.

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.23 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 19: Sustainable development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/74/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.2/74/L.33/Rev.1, A/C.2/74/L.34/Rev.1, A/C.2/74/L.40/Rev.1 and A/C.2/74/L.44/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.8/Rev.1: International Day of Awareness of Food Loss and Waste*

53. **Mr. Beleffi** (San Marino), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that at the same time as over 800 million

people were suffering from hunger and malnutrition, about \$1 trillion worth of food was wasted every year. The economic and environmental costs of that waste were enormous. An International Day of Awareness of Food Loss and Waste would promote public awareness and could be a catalyst for change.

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

55. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Benin, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand and Uruguay. Subsequently, the following countries also joined as sponsors: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Kenya, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Niger, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

56. **Ms. Pape** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that fighting food waste and loss was a priority for the European Union and an integral part of its strategy towards a circular economy that boosted global competitiveness, fostered sustainable growth and generated new jobs while conserving natural resources for future generations and reducing emissions. Every day around the world more food was produced, sold and prepared than actually consumed. The production and transport of unconsumed food created greenhouse gas emissions. The disposal of unconsumed food, when it was not recycled, placed additional burdens on economies and the environment. The European Union therefore supported increased awareness and public dialogue on Sustainable Development Goal 12 regarding responsible consumption and production. While it did not necessarily believe that the proliferation of international anniversaries brought the world closer to the achievement of the Goals, that issue might benefit from consideration in the context of revitalization-related discussions. As it had stated before, the European Union would support a future Second Committee resolution focused entirely on Goal 12.

57. **Mr. Fogarty** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

58. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.33/Rev.1: Sustainable tourism and sustainable development in Central America*

59. **Ms. González López** (El Salvador), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that sustainable tourism was a fundamental pillar of the process of integration of Central America and an engine of economic and social development that contributed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The draft resolution would help to ensure that sustainable tourism continued to contribute to employment, income and foreign exchange while minimizing negative impacts on the environment and cultural heritage.

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

61. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Argentina, Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Uruguay and Uzbekistan. Subsequently, the following countries also joined as sponsors: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Comoros, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia and Peru.

62. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, technology transfer and the Paris Agreement had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting. His delegation also wished to raise its concerns about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions were on a biennial or triennial basis. For many topics, there was not enough meaningful change to warrant annual consideration.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.*



*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.40/Rev.1: Cooperative measures to assess and increase awareness of environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea*

64. **Ms. Plepytė** (Lithuania), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that its sixth preambular paragraph should be amended to include recognition “of the work of” the Convention on Biological Diversity. The draft resolution reflected concerns about the potential long-term environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea, including their potential impact on human health and safety, as well as on the marine environment and resources. The practice of dumping chemical munitions at sea had started after the First World War and had continued into the 1980s. The draft resolution took into account the views expressed by Member States and relevant regional and international organizations in the report of the Secretary-General (A/74/242).

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

66. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine and United Kingdom. Subsequently, the following countries also joined as sponsors: North Macedonia, Portugal, Senegal and Serbia.

67. **Ms. Wacker** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that while the European Union welcomed the draft resolution, it wished express its disappointment – as it had three years previously – that the eleventh preambular paragraph, referring to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, gave cause for concern. The formulation of that paragraph was not consistent with the agreed language in the annual omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, which was and should remain the authoritative source of any reference to the Convention in resolutions of the General Assembly, namely “emphasizing the universal and unified character of the Convention, and reaffirming that the Convention sets out the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and

seas must be carried out and is of strategic importance as the basis for national, regional and global action and cooperation in the marine sector, and that its integrity needs to be maintained, as recognized also by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in chapter 17 of Agenda 21”.

68. Thus, by establishing the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, the Convention promoted stability of the law and maintenance of international peace and security. The universal character of the Convention was not only evident in its universal language and purpose and the commitment to settle all law of the sea issues on the premise that they were interrelated and needed to be considered as a whole, but primarily in its unprecedented, almost universal participation. Currently, 168 States parties, including the European Union, were bound by its provisions.

69. International jurisprudence had long accepted that the provisions of the Convention either embodied or reflected customary international law. Joining consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution would not imply agreement with the language used in the eleventh preambular paragraph or support for its use in any other resolution in the future.

70. **Mr. Yakut** (Turkey) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because his country attached importance to the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and the prevention of marine pollution of all kinds. The draft resolution would raise awareness of the environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea. However, Turkey disassociated itself from references to international instruments to which it was not a party. Those references could not be construed as a change in the legal position of Turkey with regard to such instruments. His country did not consider the reference to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the annual resolution on oceans and the law of the sea as agreed language. A vote on the draft resolution should take place every year.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.40/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.*

72. **Mr. Gnecco Daza** (Colombia) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it contained language with which his Government did not agree. In particular, the twelfth preambular paragraph contained a reference to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, to which Colombia was not a State party. His country conducted all maritime activities in strict adherence to

the international commitments that it had expressly accepted or adopted. His delegation therefore expressed its reservation with regard to the twelfth preambular paragraph and all mentions of the Convention in the draft resolution.

73. **Ms. González López** (El Salvador) said that her delegation recognized that the planning and management of coastal areas was crucial to sustainable development, and in particular food security. However, her country was not a State party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and wished to stress that resolutions, agreements or provisions emanating from the General Assembly did not create obligations upon States that were not parties to that Convention. Her delegation therefore wished to dissociate itself from the twelfth preambular paragraph.

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

75. **Mr. Golroo** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus, it wished to dissociate itself from paragraphs of the draft resolution referring to international instruments to which the Islamic Republic of Iran was not a party, and in particular the twelfth preambular paragraph, which referred to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.44/Rev.1: Agricultural technology for sustainable development*

76. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that agricultural technology had a significant role to play in achieving the 2030 Agenda. The draft resolution addressed a number of key issues, including higher-paying jobs in agriculture for youth, sustainable management of water resources, energy-efficient food systems and financial innovation for agricultural technology. It also focused on broader issues such as gender equality, empowering women and

youth, promoting a multi-stakeholder approach and building the resilience and capacity of smallholder farmers.

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

78. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and United Kingdom. Subsequently, the following countries also joined as sponsors: Angola, Bahamas, Cabo Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Turkmenistan and United Republic of Tanzania.

79. **Ms. Shurbaji** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that although her delegation supported agricultural technology for sustainable development, it could not support the draft resolution because of the main sponsor, whose brutal occupation was the primary obstacle to development in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan. Millions of Palestinians and hundreds of thousands of Syrians had been displaced from their homes and fields to make way for illegal settlements. The Israeli occupation authorities prevented Syrian inhabitants of the Golan from engaging in their primary source of livelihood, agriculture, with discriminatory water policies and restrictions on crops. Every year, reports compiled by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development documented the negative impact of the occupation on efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

80. No one would dispute the benefits of agricultural technology for sustainable development. However, Israel, the occupying Power, should not be allowed to exploit United Nations forums to trumpet fraudulent claims of commitment to sustainable development when it continued to obstruct the development efforts of others. Her delegation had therefore called for a recorded vote on the draft resolution and urged the Committee to send a clear message on the right of the

Palestinian and Syrian peoples to an end to Israeli occupation.

81. **Ms. Al-halique** (Jordan), speaking on behalf of Group of Arab States, said that the Group had requested a vote on the draft resolution, and its member States would abstain as they had in past sessions. Israel, the occupying Power, continued to disregard numerous resolutions from various international bodies calling on it to desist from its illegal practices and repeated violations that affected all aspects of economic and social life in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan. Numerous reports from United Nations agencies described how the policies and daily practices of Israel systematically undermined agricultural development. The Group was in favour of cooperation for the development of agricultural technology. However, until Israel honoured its obligations as a member of the United Nations and complied with the Organization's resolutions, it had no credibility or standing to submit resolutions of any kind.

82. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.44/Rev.1.*

*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, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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:*

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

*Abstaining:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 147 votes to 3, with 28 abstentions.*

84. **Mr. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that there was no question that agriculture was an essential foundation of sustainable development, a major source of income for developing States, and an important means of empowerment for vulnerable societies. Agricultural development had the potential to bring about improvements in employment, health and numerous other sectors. That was as true for Palestinians as any other people. However, Israel, the occupying Power, was working systematically to prevent Palestinians from making optimal use of their agricultural resources. United Nations reports had demonstrated how Israel monopolized land and water, and imposed import restrictions on saplings and other essential agricultural needs, while its settlers burned and uprooted existing trees, including some olive trees that were older than the people of Israel themselves. Israeli fishing boats restricted Palestinian fishermen to within a few miles of their coast. It was high time for the United Nations to take deterrent measures against a State that viewed itself as above the law and violated the Organization's resolutions with impunity.

85. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Declaration, the Paris Agreement and language related to climate change and technology transfer had been set out in its general statement delivered at the

Committee's 23rd meeting. The United States was also concerned about stand-alone references to agroecology. The advancement of agroecological principles should not come at the expense of other practices that produced food safely, sustainably and efficiently.

86. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of a draft resolution that directly addressed progress towards a number of the Sustainable Development Goals, notably Goal 2 on zero hunger and Goal 12 on responsible consumption and production. The European Union and its member States particularly welcomed the draft resolution's strengthened focus on the impacts of climate change and its recognition of the urgent need to step up efforts to address biodiversity loss. The draft resolution also highlighted the importance of the circular economy, which was the key to more sustainable consumption and production.

87. **Mr. Danon** (Israel) said that agriculture was at the heart of the 2030 Agenda. It provided livelihoods for up to 40 per cent of the world's population and accounted for up to 30 per cent of the gross domestic product of developing countries. His country's soil and climate had forced its farmers to innovate; as a consequence, they had invented technologies that had improved the lives of millions of people around the world. It was unfortunate that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus. Ironically, the very countries preventing consensus were among those that would benefit the most from the draft resolution. Agriculture was an issue that ought to transcend petty politics. By pooling resources and knowledge, the international community could use agricultural technology to feed hungry children, lift farmers out of poverty and bring hundreds of millions of people closer to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.34/Rev.1: International Day of Clean Air for blue skies*

88. **Mr. Cho Hyun** (Republic of Korea), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that it marked the first time that the Committee had considered improving air quality as a stand-alone issue. Scientific evidence continued to accumulate about the negative impacts of air pollution. Some 7 million people around the world faced premature death due to indoor and outdoor air quality,

and 9 out of 10 people breathed air that did not meet the air quality guidelines of the World Health Organization. The United Nations Environmental Assembly had recognized air pollution as the single greatest environmental risk to human health and one of the main avoidable causes of death and disease globally. Nevertheless, air pollution was often treated as a local or regional issue. An International Day of Clean Air for blue skies would help to raise public awareness and promote action.

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

90. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined the sponsors: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Israel, Republic of Moldova, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United States of America and Uzbekistan. Subsequently, the following countries also joined as sponsors: Armenia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Georgia, Guatemala, Paraguay, Sao Tome and Principe and Sierra Leone.

91. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.*

92. **Ms. Vissers** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union and its member States had joined consensus on the draft resolution despite serious reservations concerning its title. Poor air quality was the number one environmental cause of premature death in Europe. Air pollution crossed national borders and was a matter of international concern that deserved attention at the United Nations. It was therefore regrettable that the title contained the term "blue skies", which lacked definition. The European Union and its member States also did not necessarily believe that the proliferation of international anniversaries brought the world closer to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. That issue might benefit from consideration in the context of revitalization-related discussions.



**(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 (A/C.2/74/L.18 and A/C.2/74/L.60)**

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.18 and A/C.2/74/L.60: 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*

93. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.60 had no programme budget implications.

94. **Mr. Budhu** (Trinidad and Tobago), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.60 on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that, in its ninth preambular paragraph, the words “of the Samoa pathway” should be added after the words “paragraph 22”.

95. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.60, as orally amended, was adopted.*

96. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. Regarding references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the New Urban Agenda, the Paris Agreement and the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, her delegation had laid out its position in the general statement delivered at the Committee’s 23rd meeting.

97. With regard to paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, her delegation did not support the creation of new financial instruments with unproven effectiveness. With regard to paragraphs 12 and 13, per capita income and creditworthiness should be the primary criteria for assessing graduation readiness. It was not the United Nations but rather the boards of the multilateral development banks that were the appropriate forum for determining eligibility criteria and the allocation of foreign aid. Concessional finance should be focused on those countries most in need and least able to access other sources of financing.

98. However, her delegation reiterated that it did not support the development of multidimensional eligibility criteria for official development assistance, as any measure beyond per capita income could be subject to manipulation and politicization. The United States had a long history of working with small island developing States and understood the unique circumstances facing

those countries. It was committed to working together to tackle global and regional challenges, including promoting regional security and stability, advancing sustainable growth, addressing environmental challenges, responding to natural disasters and strengthening people-to-people ties.

99. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.18 was withdrawn.*

**(c) Disaster risk reduction (continued) (A/C.2/74/L.42 and A/C.2/74/L.57)**

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.42 and A/C.2/74/L.57: Disaster risk reduction*

100. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.57 had no programme budget implications.

101. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.57 was adopted.*

102. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.42 was withdrawn.*

**(g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (continued) (A/C.2/74/L.10 and A/C.2/74/L.52)**

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.10 and A/C.2/74/L.52: Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme*

103. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.52 had no programme budget implications.

104. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.52 was adopted.*

105. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus of the draft resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Sendai Framework and the Paris Agreement had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee’s 23rd meeting.

106. **Ms. Juul** (Norway) said that the world was facing complex challenges that should not be treated as separate problems and required integrated solutions. Her delegation was committed to contributing to the ongoing preparations for the fifth United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme, scheduled to take place in Nairobi in 2021.

107. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.10 was withdrawn.*



**(i) Harmony with Nature** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/74/L.47/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.47/Rev.1: Harmony with Nature*

108. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested by the United States.

109. **Ms. Oropeza** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that climate change, loss of biodiversity, deforestation and numerous other challenges were facing the planet. There were a number of instruments and resolutions that addressed those problems individually. However, it was necessary to understand Mother Earth was a whole. Normally, the draft resolution was adopted by consensus. However, in the present case, a vote had been requested for reasons of periodicity. She invited the delegations that had requested the vote to engage in constructive dialogue and to attend the meeting on the occasion of the commemoration of International Mother Earth Day, and hoped that a vote would not be requested in the future.

110. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.47/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, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

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

111. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with 44 abstentions.*

112. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania and Montenegro; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that while they were committed to global cooperation to protect the environment, the European Union and its member States had abstained from voting because the current draft resolution did not add value to the Committee's work or to existing multilateral environmental initiatives. Some of its content could have been included in other relevant resolutions, which would have helped to streamline the Committee's agenda. The European Union had requested deletion of the paragraph deciding to include the item on the agenda of the Committee on an annual basis and requesting the Secretary-General to submit an annual report. It also regretted that the draft resolution requested the President of the General Assembly to convene a meeting on the occasion of the commemoration of International Mother Earth Day. He urged the Group of 77 and China to consider the relevance of such meetings and would welcome future cooperation in that regard.

113. **Mr. Dewar Viscarra** (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Negotiations had become more complicated because neither the draft resolution nor the report had indicated how harmony with nature would help to achieve sustainable development. Unfortunately, his delegation's proposal to include such explanatory

language had not been taken into account. Multilateralism meant compromise, not imposing the majority position. He hoped that in future years the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

114. **Mr. Walter** (United States of America) said that while his delegation recognized that the concept of harmony with nature was important to several Member States, it also noted that the resolution changed little from year to year, and that its function was to set a theme for an interactive dialogue, which should not require an annual resolution.

115. His delegation also wished to raise its concerns about the ever increasing workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions, including the present resolution, were on a biennial or triennial basis. For many topics, there was not enough meaningful change to warrant annual consideration. His delegation therefore proposed adjusting the periodicity of the present resolution.

116. His delegation's position regarding references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the right to development, women and girls, inclusive economic growth and leaving no country behind had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

**(k) Combating sand and dust storms**  
(A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1: Combating sand and dust storms*

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

118. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that since the start of negotiations, the European Union had believed that considering the resolution on a triennial basis would adequately reflect new initiatives and strengthen its substance. The European Union would even have accepted the resolution on a biennial basis, but unfortunately, certain delegations had broken the silence procedure and efforts to reach a compromise had failed. He therefore proposed an amendment to paragraph 17 to make the draft resolution biennial. The amended paragraph would now read as follows: "Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-sixth session a report on the implementation of the present resolution, and decides to include in the provisional agenda of its seventy-sixth session, under the item entitled "Sustainable development", the sub-item entitled

"Combating sand and dust storms", unless otherwise agreed".

119. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to amend paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, 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 Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Turkey, Vanuatu.

120. *The proposal to amend paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1 was rejected by 103 votes to 55, with 2 abstentions.*

121. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole had been requested by Israel.

122. **Mr. Danon** (Israel) said that the draft resolution contained language intended to deliberately misrepresent a previously adopted resolution and was an attempt to set a precedent. Such political hijacking with a view to rewriting history reduced the value of all the Committee's work.

123. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, 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, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic,

Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, 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, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Australia.

124. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 171 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

125. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to raise its concerns about the workload of the Committee. There would be greater opportunity to devote more thoughtful consideration to issues if certain resolutions, including the present resolution, were on a biennial or triennial basis. For many topics, there was not enough meaningful change to warrant annual consideration. Although some progress had been made in the negotiations on both periodicity and references to technology transfer, unfortunately certain delegations had broken the silence procedure and the final text did not reflect the result of the negotiations.

126. Her delegation's position regarding references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, technology transfer, the Paris Agreement and the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

## **Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence**

### **(b) Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development (A/C.2/74/L.27 and A/C.2/74/L.58)**

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/74/L.27 and A/C.2/74/L.58: Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development*

127. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.58 had no programme budget implications.

128. **Mr. Dewar Viscarra** (Mexico) said that the final text reflected the flexibility that had characterized the negotiations.

129. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.58 was adopted.*

130. **Mr. Fogarty** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft

resolution and recalled that its position on references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, technology transfer and the Paris Agreement had been set out in its general statement delivered at the Committee's 23rd meeting.

131. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel) said that that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. Achieving the 2030 Agenda would require harnessing science, technology and innovation not merely as tools, but as a mindset and a guiding framework for action. Governments had a major role to play in creating an environment conducive to that end. In particular, they should work to remove any barriers to women pursuing careers in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Her country, along with Ghana, would be co-chairing the 2020 multi-stakeholder forum on science, technology and innovation for the Sustainable Development Goals. Science, technology and innovation had the potential to make numerous contributions during the final decade of the push to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

132. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/74/L.18](#) was withdrawn.*

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*