



General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
3 February 2022

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 10th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 23 November 2021, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Frazier (Malta)

Contents

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(f) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind

(l) Strengthening cooperation for integrated coastal zone management for achieving sustainable development

Agenda item 122: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Agenda item 139: Programme planning

Completion of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction.Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), 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/>).

21-17258 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions
(continued)

(a) International trade and development
(continued) (A/C.2/76/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.16/Rev.1: Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries

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

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

2. **Mr. Walter** (United States of America) said that the United States would again oppose the draft resolution, and it urged other States to do so as well. Sanctions were an appropriate, effective, peaceful and legitimate tool for addressing threats to peace and security. They could be used to promote accountability for those who abused human rights, undermined democracy or engaged in corrupt activities. In cases where the United States had applied sanctions, it had done so with specific objectives, including the promotion of democratic systems, the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or to respond to security threats. His country would continue to take measures to minimize the unintended economic, humanitarian or political consequences of sanctions and to support the flow of legitimate humanitarian goods and assistance.

3. **Mr. Moncada** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine, said that unilateral coercive measures of an economic or political character had become the favourite tool of certain States for bending the sovereign will of States to their own advantage. The use of unilateral coercive measures was a clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, which designated the Security Council as the sole body with the authority to impose sanctions. Furthermore, because of their broad scope and extraterritorial nature, such measures had a negative impact on the enjoyment and realization of all human rights, including the right to development, which had been further threatened by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic.

4. Their respective countries strongly encouraged States to refrain from imposing coercive unilateral economic, financial or trade measures and to lift any such measures already in place, especially in light of the ongoing pandemic.

5. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.16/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Comoros, 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, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic

of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey.

6. *The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 6, with 47 abstentions.*

7. *Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

8. **Ms. Česarek** (Slovenia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote despite deep disappointment with the revised text, which pushed the Member States even further from consensus. During the negotiation process, language favoured by the proponent of the draft resolution had been accepted with minimal discussion, while proposals from other groups had been rejected out of hand.

9. The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

10. States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

11. Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. Moreover, the European Union had stepped up efforts to provide practical support and guidance to humanitarian organizations on their rights and responsibilities under the different European Union sanctions regimes and to promote dialogue between all parties involved in humanitarian assistance.

12. The draft resolution misrepresented the original intent of the Secretary-General when he had encouraged Group of 20 leaders to facilitate access to food, essential health supplies and COVID-19 medical support. Furthermore, the draft resolution incorrectly implied that the Bridgetown Covenant contained provisions on the use of unilateral coercive measures. The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate.

13. The European Union was ready to engage in substantive discussions on the entire draft resolution and hoped that other delegations would prove open to working towards a more balanced text. If the same inflexibility and unwillingness to consider European Union proposals persisted during future negotiations, it might change its pattern of voting.

14. **Mr. Romero Puentes** (Cuba) said that in the context of complex global crises compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic, developing countries faced escalating inequality, increasingly unsustainable debt burdens, capital flight, falling revenues and insufficient access to financial markets. For many, the situation was aggravated by an unprecedented and unacceptable intensification of unilateral measures as a means of political and economic coercion. Unilateral coercive measures directly threatened the sovereignty, equality and political independence of States. They violated the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and hindered development and the full enjoyment of human rights. They were designed to create economic and political difficulties for the targeted States, without any real distinction between the government and the people. Cuba rejected the use of unilateral coercive measures against any country as incompatible with the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of the basic norms of the multilateral trading system.

15. Cuba was the victim of the harshest and most prolonged unilateral coercive measures in history, imposed by the United States of America, whose economic, commercial and financial embargo created severe hardships for the Cuban people and constituted the main obstacle to Cuban development. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, the noose had been tightened despite appeals from the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights for a temporary lifting of sanctions.

16. As long as countries continued to impose unilateral coercive measures, the Sustainable Development Goals would remain unattainable. It was time to strengthen

mutually advantageous international and multilateral cooperation and to establish a more just, equitable and inclusive international order. Unfortunately, the delegation of the United States had once again opposed the draft resolution, in blatant disregard of the appeal of developing countries for uncoerced and unconditional economic relations.

17. **Ms. Taremba** (Zimbabwe) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Unilateral coercive measures went against the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and multilateralism, as well as the norms of international cooperation. They prevented the full enjoyment of human rights by severely impeding the socioeconomic advancement, stability and prosperity of developing countries.

18. As a consequence of its land reform programme, Zimbabwe had suffered under unwarranted and unjustified sanctions for 20 years. In the preliminary findings of her recent visit to Zimbabwe, the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights had confirmed that those sanctions were inhibiting the international cooperation necessary to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. In view of their grave impact on the people of the targeted countries, especially in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Zimbabwe called for the immediate and unconditional lifting of the unjust and illegal sanctions imposed on it and other sister nations.

19. **Ms. Dix** (United Kingdom), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada and Ukraine, said that sanctions were a legitimate tool to preserve peace and the rule of law, uphold human rights and strengthen international security. Their delegations had voted against the draft resolution after many years of abstaining. As revised, the text further mischaracterized the potential role of sanctions as part of a wider policy approach and failed to acknowledge the mitigating effect of humanitarian exemptions.

20. Australia, Canada, Ukraine and the United Kingdom imposed carefully targeted and proportionate sanctions designed to prevent serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation, terrorism and other situations of international concern. They were transparent, allowed for due process protections and were neither inconsistent nor in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations.

21. **Mr. Liu Liqun** (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. In recent years some developing countries and regions had experienced instability fuelled by external interference. The

imposition of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion seriously undermined the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international relations. It also hindered social and economic development and post-pandemic recovery. The international community should take urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral economic, financial or trade measures against developing countries.

22. China had always advocated respect for the right of countries to choose their own social systems and development paths. It firmly opposed the use of military, political, economic and other means to impose unilateral measures on other countries. It also opposed interference in the internal affairs of other States as well as practices that hindered development. Bullying certain States would not solve anything, and China urged the countries imposing unilateral sanctions to lift them immediately and completely in order to facilitate COVID-19 control and prevention, humanitarian assistance and post-pandemic recovery. With less than 10 years to deliver on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, all States should put people at the centre and work together in the spirit of true multilateralism to achieve sustainable development and build a community of shared future for humanity.

23. **Ms. Micael** (Eritrea) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Unilateral coercive measures violated international law, undermined the rule of law and weakened multilateralism. While such measures were often portrayed as narrowly targeted and not destabilizing, the people of the targeted countries faced untold hardships. She called on the States persecuting developing countries to refrain from unilateral coercive financial and political measures, which had a devastating impact and hindered the very development the Committee strove to advance.

24. **Mr. Hajilari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the imposition of coercive measures by one State or a group of States was illegal under international law, contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and a clear violation of the right to self-determination. Indeed, the use of such measures to destroy the economy and living standards of another State constituted an act of war. Even when unilateral coercive measures did not apply to food or medical supplies, by excluding a country from international trade and the international banking system, they deprived it of the ability to acquire those supplies through normal commercial mechanisms. At a time when the international community was struggling to

combat COVID-19, a few States continued to impose unilateral coercive measures on countries gravely affected by the pandemic. Countries maintaining such measures during the pandemic had undeniably caused the death of innocent people, crossing the red line from economic terrorism to crimes against humanity. Member States should unite in rejecting universal coercive measures and work together on the basis of human values and moral principles.

(f) Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development (A/C.2/76/L.28/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.28/Rev.1: Promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows and strengthen good practices on assets return to foster sustainable development

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

26. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.28/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela

(Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Turkey.

27. *The proposal was adopted by 116 votes to 42, with 7 abstentions.*

28. **Mr. Walter** (United States of America) said that the United States firmly believed that combating money-laundering, the financing of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, corruption and other related forms of criminal activity was essential to global security and economic prosperity, and his delegation strongly supported the 2030 Agenda, including its emphasis on issues such as transparency and the rule of law. However, his delegation was compelled to disassociate itself from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution because it undermined the ability of Member States to address those issues by overstating the role of the United Nations Convention against Corruption as a general tool of asset recovery and understating or ignoring the roles of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention, the United Nations Office on Drugs and the Convention review mechanism.

29. The United States also remained concerned about the endorsement of the report of the High-level Panel on International Financial Accountability, Transparency and Integrity for Achieving the 2030 Agenda (FACTI), as it had not been adopted by consensus and was not a United Nations document. Furthermore, the report and its recommendations were inconsistent with existing obligations under the United Nations Convention against Corruption and with global standards such as those of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

30. Regarding the draft resolution as a whole, some of its language undermined the ability of States to work together constructively to address money-laundering, corruption and other related crimes, and the United States encouraged the Member States to reconsider

allowing discussion of that issue to continue in the plenary. In addition, the text was not sufficiently clear about the specific underlying illegal activities involved and the role of Member States in preventing, investigating and prosecuting them.

31. Lastly, the draft resolution overemphasized the return of the confiscated proceeds of crime and failed to mention the importance of transparency and accountability in ensuring that recovered assets benefited those harmed by acts of corruption. In that connection, the United States did not believe that asset recovery should be coupled so directly with sustainable development. While development issues might be linked in some cases, the focus should remain on law enforcement and fighting impunity. The position of the United States on the term “illicit financial flows” had been explained in his delegation’s general statement, delivered on 18 November 2021 (see [A/C.2/76/SR.7](#), paras. 30 to 39).

32. **Ms. Quantrill** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation was disappointed that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution still contained language that not all Member States could accept. When the delegations met to discuss the text in 2022, she hoped that they would negotiate in a greater spirit of consensus, which was the main strength of the Committee.

33. Since 2006, the United Kingdom had frozen, confiscated or returned over 1.1 billion pounds sterling in assets that had been stolen from developing countries. It had been the first in the Group of 20 to establish a public register of the beneficial owners of companies, and it had led subsequent efforts to secure global commitment to beneficial ownership transparency. The United Kingdom was also a global leader in helping developing countries to implement tax standards and strengthen domestic revenues.

34. Because of its strong commitment to countering illicit financial flows, the United Kingdom did not support the language in paragraph 3 on the FACTI report and the report by the Secretary-General. It did not consider any of the initiatives or language in that paragraph to have been agreed upon and therefore disassociated itself entirely from the paragraph.

35. It was not appropriate for the Second Committee to engage substantively on the recommendations of FACTI, which did not have an official United Nations mandate, and several of its recommendations would not strengthen the collective ability of States to tackle illicit finance. Moreover, many of those recommendations were not even supported by all of the members of FACTI itself and had subsequently been challenged by other independent experts. For those reasons, the United

Nations should not take any steps to implement the recommendations as a whole.

36. Furthermore, the language in paragraph 3 threatened to weaken support for several international institutions that were critical to tackling illicit finance. For example, the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption – the correct and legitimate United Nations forum for dealing with asset recovery issues – would meet in a few weeks. Generating recommendations on asset recovery via a parallel process would only create duplication and confusion. Furthermore, the United Kingdom recognized the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and FATF as the international standard setters on tax, anti-money-laundering and counter-terrorism financing. Many of the tax-related recommendations in the FACTI report undermined similar provisions or activities of existing mechanisms, which was in no one’s interest.

37. **Mr. Woerz** (Liechtenstein) said that combating financial flows from illegal activity was a long-standing priority for Liechtenstein, and his delegation regretted that the many hours invested in negotiations had not resulted in a more balanced text. For the second year in a row, Liechtenstein wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on FACTI, which did not have an intergovernmental mandate and whose recommendations were not supported by all of its members or endorsed by the Member States. Furthermore, the report requested from the Secretary-General would duplicate or compete with the work of the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and that of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, among others.

38. As in previous years, Liechtenstein was troubled by the confusion of the carefully defined legal term “asset recovery” with the term “asset return”. Moreover, the title of the draft resolution unduly limited the fight against so-called illicit financial flows to the issue of asset return. Liechtenstein would continue to advocate for the integrity of the comprehensive legal framework provided by the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

39. Lastly, in support of the Committee’s revitalization effort, his delegation would engage with other delegations on the biannualization or triannualization of the draft resolution at the next session of the General Assembly.

40. **Mr. Tomlinson** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that their delegations were concerned about future trends in

negotiations on the draft resolution and disappointed that it had been necessary to vote on paragraph 3. They had abstained from voting owing to concerns about both the substance of the paragraph and the process of its negotiation. Their delegations had entered those negotiations on the basis of the Committee's agreed modalities of work for the seventy-sixth session, and they were troubled by the recent addition of substantive elements not permitted under those modalities and without sufficient assessment and deliberation. In particular, they were concerned about the request for the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the draft resolution, which duplicated the request to the secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and about the reference to giving further consideration to the FACTI recommendations, which in some cases not only exceeded the mandate of FACTI but also went beyond agreed international standards. The Committee's work of the Committee should respect existing mandates and compliment that of other agencies and bodies, and a more appropriate text could have been achieved if the agreed modalities had been followed.

41. **Mr. Frey** (Switzerland) said that his delegation did not agree with all the recommendations in the FACTI report. "Illicit financial flows" was a broadly defined term that encompassed flows arising from corruption, drug trafficking, organized crime, money-laundering and tax avoidance. The need for differentiated responses had already been addressed in existing international agreements and standards, and creating new coordinating bodies or mechanisms would not improve their implementation. His delegation also could not support the request for the Secretary-General to submit a report on illicit financial flows, which would overlap with the report on the same subject already requested from the secretariat of UNCTAD, as well as with the report of the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. His delegation regretted that less effort had been made to reach a consensus on the draft resolution than in previous years. It would continue to approach the text in a spirit of compromise and hoped that a consensus could be re-established.

42. **Ms. Aondona** (Nigeria) said that illicit financial flows undermined national security, inhibited sustainable development and caused huge economic damage. The global architecture should be redesigned and revitalized to combat them effectively and promote financial integrity. Establishing an ecosystem of laws, norms, standards and institutions would undoubtedly improve consistency with the principles and standards of the 2030 Agenda.

43. Given the need for collective action, it was unfortunate that a vote had been called on such an important component of the draft resolution. Her delegation appreciated the flexibility shown by the Group of 77 and China on the inclusion of a reference to FATF in the text, since it did not enjoy universal membership and would not normally be mentioned. It was distressing to see fractures in the global community apparently widening over recommendations aimed at filling gaps in the international system for combating illicit financial flows, which affected millions of people and deprived countries of needed resources. Indeed, recovering and returning the proceeds of illicit financial flows could generate enough capital to finance the measures required to achieve climate change adaptation and mitigation in sub-Saharan African by 2030. The recommendations were timely and evidence-based, and they deserved the support of Member States.

44. **Mr. Kim Sungjun** (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation regretted the lack of consensus on the draft resolution. Despite concerns over many parts of paragraph 3, his delegation had abstained from voting because it attached great significance to combating illicit financial flows and appreciated the good faith and spirit of cooperation demonstrated by most delegations, which had almost resulted in an acceptable compromise.

45. Regarding FACTI, the prevailing agreement among the Member States had been that when a process did not have a United Nations mandate, its outcome was regarded as informal. As the work of independent external experts with no formal United Nations mandate, the report and recommendations of FACTI should be placed on a par with other such independent reports and recommendations.

46. Regarding the request to the Secretary-General to "strengthen international coordination" in relation to illicit financial flows, that reference was too vague to be operationalized, potentially outside the purview of the Secretary-General and based on the incorrect perception that commitments and mechanisms were lacking. In fact, the international community already had in place the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Inclusive Framework on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting, the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative and FATF, which had made real progress on tackling illegal financial flows related to tax issues, corruption and criminal activities, including a breakthrough agreement that addressed the tax challenges of the digital economy.

47. Regarding yet another request for a report by the Secretary-General, any such report should focus on how to mobilize efforts to improve the implementation of

existing mechanisms and should respect the independent mandates and expertise of such mechanisms and bodies.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted.*

49. **Ms. Česarek** (Slovenia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that the European Union considered financial integrity and combating illicit financial flows essential for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and believed that discussions on that issue should reflect the various existing views on the subject. It had voted against paragraph 3 of the draft resolution for two reasons.

50. First, FACTI did not benefit from an intergovernmental agreement and was not as inclusive as the European Union would have hoped. The European Union and its member States strongly believed that any work on financial integrity and illicit financial flows must be closely linked to the United Nations bodies concerned with those issues, including the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and FATF. The report of FACTI only reflected the views of its members, who had not even agreed among themselves on the recommendations. For those reasons, the decision to give further consideration to its recommendations should be the prerogative of United Nations Member States.

51. Second, paragraph 3 threatened to divert resources to the proliferation of reports and, more importantly, to weaken support for existing bodies and instruments. Rather than duplicating or replacing existing internationally agreed standards, more effort should be made to support their implementation by providing technical assistance, capacity-building and support for mutual evaluation processes.

52. Meaningful progress on tackling illicit financial flows could be achieved only if there was space for the engagement of the wider United Nations membership on the basis of transparency and consensus. The European Union and its member States would remain strongly engaged in future discussions on the draft resolution and hoped that all parties would demonstrate continued commitment to a balanced and consensual text.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (continued)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (A/C.2/76/L.19/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.19/Rev.1: Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind

53. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A proposed amendment to paragraph 10 of the draft resolution had been submitted by the United States of America and issued as document A/C.2/76/CRP.3. In accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would first take a decision on the proposed amendment.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

54. **Mr. Gambert** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that as a global leader in climate action, the European Union would join in the consensus on the draft resolution despite what it considered major deficiencies in the text, which would have benefited from technical updates in several paragraphs following the end of twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Regarding substantive issues, the European Union regretted that paragraph 2 had not built on the ambition of the previous year's text, and for paragraph 10, it supported the proposed alternate text, which was closer to agreed language.

55. Lastly and most importantly, the European Union deeply regretted that the important outcomes of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change were not fully reflected in the text. Three vital breakthroughs were not mentioned: consensus on the phase-down of coal power and phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies; agreement on the importance of limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius and, therefore, of reducing global carbon dioxide emissions by 45 per cent by 2030 relative to 2010 and to net zero by around mid-century; and acknowledgement of the urgency of making financial flows consistent with low greenhouse gas emissions. The logical place to include those outcomes would have been in paragraph 13, but the sponsors had decided to leave them out. In the view of the European Union, the resulting text was unbalanced

and did not reflect the ambition, spirit and commitments of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties.

56. **Mr. Walter** (United States of America) said that it was important to safeguard a critical innovation of the 2030 Agenda: that the three dimensions of sustainable development should be addressed in a balanced and sustainable manner. However, the language in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution proposed an alternative set of principles that did not enjoy consensus. His delegation had put forward an amendment that drew language directly from paragraph 2 of the 2030 Agenda, and he urged Member States to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

57. **Mr. Liu** Liqun (China) said that developed countries should provide developing countries with funding, technology and capacity-building support to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change, and they should fulfil their \$100 billion climate finance commitment without delay. China had consistently and actively promoted international cooperation on tackling climate change, and it would work with all parties to implement the Paris Agreement.

58. Regrettably, the United States had proposed an amendment to paragraph 10 of the draft resolution and had requested a vote on it. The language in that paragraph was consensus language, given that it appeared in many General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. Some countries falsely claimed that it undermined the ability of Member States to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, when in fact it accurately described the requisite approach. What did undermine that ability was the practice of politicizing development issues.

59. According to the Committee's modalities of work for the current session, substantive consultations were allowed on no more than two paragraphs of a draft resolution. Some countries had ignored those modalities out of self-interest, in complete disregard for the desire of Member States to maintain consensus and strengthen cooperation on tackling climate change. China firmly opposed such conduct, and it called on the members of the Group of 77 and other Member States to vote against the proposed amendment.

60. **Mr. Conte** (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group opposed the proposed amendment and all members of the Group should vote against it.

61. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.2/76/CRP.3 to amend paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.19/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Haiti, Jamaica, Lebanon, Maldives, Philippines, Uganda.

62. *The proposal was rejected by 84 votes to 62, with 11 abstentions.*

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

63. **Mr. Blair** (Antigua and Barbuda) said that his delegation had hoped that the outcome document of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to

the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change would provide a basis for the Committee to achieve consensus on the draft resolution. His delegation attached great importance to agreed language, which should continue to form the basis of consensus-building when delegations were unable to find common ground. Given that both paragraph 10 and the proposed amendment to that paragraph used agreed language, his delegation had abstained from voting on the amendment. However, Antigua and Barbuda supported the overall content of the draft resolution, and he hoped that the Committee would be able to reach consensus on the text in 2022, especially given the importance of addressing climate change.

64. **Ms. Dubey** (India) said that, regrettably, one delegation had used the draft resolution to attempt to propagate its political ideology by promoting a different approach to sustainable development than the one enshrined in 2030 Agenda. The phrase “environmentally sound, open and shared manner” had no clearly agreed meaning or relevance in the context of sustainable development. Her delegation regretted that there had been no constructive engagement on the paragraph in question and had voted in favour of the proposed amendment because it contained consensus language from the 2030 Agenda.

65. The draft resolution must not be allowed to become a dead letter. The developed countries were not even meeting their mitigation obligations, let alone their adaptation and financing obligations. India wished to see progress on climate finance tracked alongside progress on mitigation, and it called on the developed countries to provide \$1 trillion in climate finance urgently.

66. **Mr. Cordano Sagredo** (Chile), speaking also on behalf of Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama and Peru, said that the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was the global forum for multilateral discussions on climate change. Their delegations would join in the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that the outcomes of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties were unaffected and would guide the response to climate change. Paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, which welcomed those outcomes, including the Glasgow Climate Pact, should guide the understanding of the draft resolution as a whole.

67. Their delegations regretted that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on the draft resolution on climate change, which was a challenge that should unite all countries. However, they saw the Committee’s difficulties as an unintended and exceptional

consequence of its temporary modalities of work, which did not allow delegations to react properly to the outcomes in question. They would continue to work towards a consensus text that fully reflected the determination of the international community to address climate change and its impact.

68. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.19/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Haiti, Honduras, Maldives.

69. *The proposal was adopted by 96 votes to 51, with 9 abstentions.*

70. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/76/L.19/Rev.1](#) as a whole was adopted.*

71. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that the package of decisions adopted at the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was designed to ensure the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement. The priority should now be to build a consensus around climate issues, to step up individual and joint efforts in that regard and to adhere to the agreed arrangements. The Russian Federation had therefore joined the consensus in adopting the draft resolution. However, it was of the view that the text should have more clearly reflected the role of all types of forests in achieving a balance with respect to anthropogenic emissions, the absorption of greenhouse gases and adaptation to climate change. The absence of such a key component in the text of the draft resolution was regrettable, as was the fact that the text only took note of the Glasgow Leaders' Declaration on Forests and Land Use.

72. Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, as in the previous year, reflected a one-sided approach to overcoming the current crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The recovery should be sustainable in nature, which was a broader concept than focusing exclusively on the climate and on the environment. A comprehensive approach to overcoming the pandemic had indeed been reflected in the conference papers at the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties, which had recognized "the importance of ensuring a sustainable, resilient and inclusive global recovery". During the informal consultations on the current draft text, his delegation had proposed an amendment to paragraph 2, which had been taken into account by the facilitator of the negotiating process. The Russian Federation had understood that its proposed amendment had been acceptable to all delegations and regretted the fact that the text subsequently submitted by the authors for consideration by the Committee, without any prior discussion and contrary to the outcome of the informal consultations, did not include that amendment. Accordingly, the Russian Federation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 2 of the draft resolution and did not consider itself bound by those provisions. It called on all countries in the future to work

in a spirit of consensus and to take into account each other's mutual interests and concerns.

73. **Mr. Walter** (United States of America) said that while his delegation was pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, it disassociated itself from paragraph 10. It was disappointed that a country had broken silence on the facilitator's text for the paragraph, which, as adopted, continued to promote the political priorities of that country. His delegation also disassociated itself from paragraph 13, which inaccurately represented global priorities on climate change, including the outcomes of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Regarding references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, he referred Member States to his delegation's general statement of 18 November 2021.

74. As the draft resolution itself underscored, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was the appropriate forum to negotiate on issues related to climate change. Given that the Committee's negotiations often overlapped with the annual sessions of the Conference of the Parties, the United States called for a re-evaluation of its approach to the draft resolution just adopted.

75. **Ms. Compston** (United Kingdom) said that the Committee's work would benefit from the constructive spirit demonstrated during the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The United Kingdom was pleased that the draft resolution contained agreed finance-related language from that session, as well as a reference to the Glasgow Climate Pact and a commitment to implement all of the outcomes of the session. Unfortunately, given the strict modalities governing negotiation, it had not been possible to include the new language on mitigation, adaptation and loss and damage contained in the Glasgow Climate Pact. Furthermore, since the full text of the draft resolution had not been negotiated for two years, most of it was sorely out of date and unbalanced. The United Kingdom looked forward to working with other delegations in 2022 to ensure that the text was based on the outcomes of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties.

76. **Mr. Frey** (Switzerland) said that his delegation attached equal importance to all the agreements reached at the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the

Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It regretted that the draft resolution did not reflect them more accurately, especially since some required action in 2022. All parties to the Paris Agreement that had not yet communicated their new or updated nationally determined contributions should do so as soon as possible. Indeed, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should have prompted them to update their 2030 targets by the end of 2022 in line with the temperature goal of the Paris Agreement. They should communicate their long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies by the fourth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.

77. Switzerland fully supported the phase-down of coal and the elimination of subsidies for fossil fuels, and it recognized that limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius would require strong, rapid and sustained reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Welcoming the launch of talks on a new collective quantified climate finance goal, which should be consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development, his delegation called on all parties to speed the adoption of policies and the development, deployment and sharing of technologies for transitioning to low-emission energy systems.

78. **Ms. Ayotte Rivard** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Iceland, New Zealand and Norway, said that that their delegations were disappointed that, despite the efforts and flexibility of many members, the Committee had been unable to avoid a paragraph vote on the draft resolution. Conscious of the risks of inaction on climate change, they had engaged in the negotiations in a spirit of compromise and had been ready to join a consensus on the facilitator's text. The Member States had been able to reach an agreement in Glasgow less than 10 days earlier, and they needed to be able to set aside their differences and do so in New York as well. Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand and Norway looked forward to carefully and thoroughly updating the draft resolution on the basis of the Glasgow Climate Pact at the next session of the General Assembly, and they would also constructively engage to ensure consistent and sustained commitment to meet the objectives of the Glasgow Climate Pact, the 2030 Agenda and the Sendai Framework.

(I) Strengthening cooperation for integrated coastal zone management for achieving sustainable development

Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.38/Rev.1: Strengthening cooperation for integrated coastal zone management for achieving sustainable development

79. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, with regard to paragraph 14 of the draft resolution, the request for documentation would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in New York of one pre-session document with a word count of 8,500 words in all six languages in 2023, which would entail additional non-recurrent resource requirements in the amount of \$27,100 in 2023. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, that amount would be presented in the context of the proposed programme budget for 2023 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management. Additional resource requirements in the amount of \$3,300 would be included in the proposed programme budget for 2023 under section 36, Staff assessment, which would be offset by an equivalent increase under income section 1, Income from staff assessment.

80. The Committee's attention was also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which was resolution 75/252, in which the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and had reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

81. She said that Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Eswatini, Fiji, the Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Maldives, Mali, Nigeria, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu and Zambia had become sponsors of the draft resolution. She then noted that Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Botswana, El Salvador, Guinea, India, Liberia, Libya, the Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania also wished to become sponsors.

82. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that integrated coastal zone management was a dynamic process for the sustainable management and use of coastal zones. The

draft resolution promoted the sharing of best practices and experiences, recognized the efforts and actions of Member States and emphasized international and regional cooperation. He encouraged all Member States to support it.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/76/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted.*

84. **Mr. Kaspar** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova, said that the European Union and its member States welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and reconfirmed their commitment to enhanced cooperation for improved integrated coastal zone management. Noting the call in the draft resolution to address the problem of marine litter, including plastic litter and microplastics, he urged the resumed fifth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly to launch negotiations on an intergovernmental agreement to end plastic pollution. The European Union looked forward to the 2022 United Nations Conference to Support the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development.

85. While the European Union had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, he wished to reiterate its position on the second preambular paragraph, which had not been open to negotiation at the current session. In its view, the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea should remain the authoritative source for any reference to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in General Assembly resolutions.

86. **Mr. Amaya Piñeros** (Colombia), reaffirming the commitment of Colombia to strengthen cooperation on integrated coastal zone management, said that his Government had recently expanded the protected marine areas in the East Pacific in support of the international effort to protect at least 30 per cent of the world's land and ocean by 2030. Given that preambular paragraph 2 had not been open to negotiation under the agreed modalities of work, his delegation had joined in the consensus despite its opposition to that paragraph. He wished to reiterate that his country had not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and did not consider it the only legal framework for ocean activities, as the second preambular paragraph implied. It therefore wished to disassociate itself from that reference.

87. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that the United States strongly supported the sustainable use and management of coastal zones and marine ecosystems. While his delegation was pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, it referred Member States to its general statement of 18 November 2021 regarding its position on references to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

88. **Mr. Nakano** (Japan) said that while his delegation had decided to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, it deeply regretted that the oral statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution had been issued after the final informal consultation without any prior information-sharing. In the future, programme budget implications should be shared and discussed in depth during informal consultations in order to ensure transparency.

89. **Mr. Floyd** (United Kingdom) said that integrated coastal zone management was a topic of particular interest to the United Kingdom as the leader of the Global Ocean Alliance. As the second preambular paragraph had not been open to negotiation or amendment, he wished to reiterate the position previously expressed by his delegation. The United Kingdom did not support the second preambular paragraph as it stood and would prefer that it refer to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the long-agreed language of the General Assembly resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, as found most recently in the seventh preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 75/239.

90. **Ms. Fidan** (Turkey) said that while Turkey had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution and supported efforts to strengthen cooperation on integrated and sustainable coastal zone management, it was not a party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea for valid reasons. It did not consider the Convention to be the only legal framework regulating all ocean activities and wished to disassociate itself from any references to that Convention in the draft resolution, which should not be interpreted to change the legal position of Turkey with regard to the Convention.

91. **Ms. Aliabadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that while her delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran was not a party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea and wished to go on record as disassociating itself from all references to it in Second Committee draft resolutions, including the reference in the second preambular paragraph of the current text.

92. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco) said that the issue raised by the representative of Japan would receive due

consideration when the draft resolution was renegotiated in 2024.

Agenda item 122: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.2/76/L.61)

93. **Ms. Vissers** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein and the Republic of Moldova, said that a revitalized, fit-for-purpose Committee was essential to address new and emerging challenges effectively and efficiently. Bound by the current modalities of work, her delegation had not attempted to make further progress on revitalization during the negotiations. However, it remained convinced of the urgent need for such revitalization and of the importance of keeping it on the agenda. The most recently adopted draft decision on revitalization of the work of the Second Committee (A/C.2/75/L.63) would serve as a good basis for negotiating a new, more ambitious draft decision at the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly.

94. The European Union would continue to focus on making the 2030 Agenda the driving force behind the Committee's agenda, including by ensuring that discussions of agenda items contributed directly to the implementation of the decade of action to deliver the Sustainable Development Goals. The Committee's work could be improved by refocusing, merging, discontinuing or widening the periodicity of some draft resolutions in order to allow the Committee to focus on more critical issues. In that context, the Committee should examine the possibilities of co-authorship of zero draft resolutions and co-facilitation of draft resolutions. The European Union would continue to carefully assess the need for every draft resolution to call for a report, and it would look closely at the possibility of joint reports on agenda items of a similar nature.

95. Although the Committee's current modalities did not set a precedent for future sessions, consideration should be given to using genuine technical rollovers for some draft resolutions, in order to save time for more topical issues. In discussing the revitalization of its work, the Committee should focus on improving efficiency and building trust, and it should strive to preserve its consensual character.

96. **Mr. Black** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Andorra, Australia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, said that despite the limitations of the Committee's agreed working methods,

it had made progress on key issues, thanks to efficiency measures. The Committee must continue to adapt its work to current realities and challenges. Their delegations had voiced strong concerns about draft resolutions that still did not align with the landmark agreements of 2015, particularly the 2030 Agenda, and they had expressed support for merging draft resolutions, adapting the periodicity of draft resolutions to allow sufficient time for issues to develop and considering co-authorship. With the decade of action well under way, it was time to make the 2030 Agenda and the other landmark agreements of 2015 the foundations of the Committee's work.

97. Collaboration and discipline had allowed the Committee to complete its work within the allotted timeframe that year, and that same collaboration and discipline could be used to make the Committee truly fit to deliver on the 2015 landmark agreements and focus on the most vulnerable.

98. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that his delegation was pleased at the progress made on revitalizing the work of the Committee in the past two years. The recently adopted draft decision on revitalization of the work of the Second Committee would serve as a good basis for further progress, which was absolutely necessary. Time that should be spent on emerging challenges was wasted on minor modifications to recurrent draft resolutions and on overlapping agenda items. Possible solutions might be to require delegations to submit a "justification of need" with each draft resolution and to adjust the periodicity of draft resolutions to create space for emerging issues. The delegation of the United States remained open to all new and creative ideas for improving delivery on the Committee's important work.

Draft decision A/C.2/76/L.61: Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly

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

100. *Draft decision A/C.2/76/L.61 was adopted.*

101. **The Chair** said that, given the agreement to hold up to two informal meetings during the resumed seventy-sixth session of the Committee to discuss working methods and the decision of the General Assembly to follow up on the implementation of decision 75/548 B at its seventy-seventh session, it was not the intention of the Committee to arrive at a negotiated outcome on its working methods during the current seventy-sixth session. She proposed that the Committee should adopt an oral decision in that regard,

to read as follows: “The General Assembly recalls its resolution 75/325 on revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, in particular the provisions relating to working methods, as well as its decisions 75/548 B and 73/537 B on revitalization of the work of the Second Committee; decides to convene up to two informal meetings of the Second Committee in early 2022 to discuss the working methods of the Committee, and requests the Bureau of the Committee to update the conference room paper on Second Committee working methods following those discussions.”

102. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 139: Programme planning

103. **The Chair** said that the General Assembly had decided to allocate agenda item 139, “Programme planning”, to all the Main Committees and the plenary of the General Assembly to enhance the discussions on the evaluation, planning, budgeting and monitoring of reports. Following statements made at the organizational meeting of the Committee on 1 October 2021 and subsequent consultations, a general discussion of item 139 had been held on 10 November 2021. On 19 November 2021, she had transmitted a summary of that discussion to the Chair of the Fifth Committee to be taken into account by the Fifth Committee during its deliberations.

Completion of the Committee’s work

104. **Ms. Spatolisano** (Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development and Chief Economist of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs) said that every draft resolution adopted by the Committee had included new policy recommendations providing relevant and appropriate guidance. The Committee had recognized that, despite its devastating impact, the COVID-19 pandemic offered an opportunity to put forward policies for an inclusive and sustainable recovery, and it had continued to underline the importance of integrated and coherent policy frameworks in shaping poverty eradication efforts.

105. In the macroeconomic cluster, the Committee had provided detailed guidance on policy interventions that would help the world rebuild in a more inclusive and prosperous manner. Among other actions, it had stressed the importance of enhancing the capacity of the multilateral trading system and had recognized measures taken to relieve the debt burden in the context of the pandemic and promote long-term debt sustainability. It had also encouraged the use of digital financial technologies and the promotion of financial innovation as a tool for financial inclusion.

106. In addition, the Committee had continued to provide policy guidance on the challenges faced by countries in special situations. It had called for the convening of a fourth international conference on small island developing States in 2024, and it had welcomed the potential development of a multidimensional vulnerability index for small island developing States. It had also requested the Secretary-General to develop a mapping exercise that would provide a detailed overview of the support currently available to middle-income countries.

107. The Committee was also providing guidance on preparations for the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in January 2022. The joint meeting of the Committee with the Economic and Social Council had contributed to those preparations, and informal consultations were ongoing.

108. Following up on the United Nations Food Systems Summit, the delegations had agreed on a comprehensive set of guidelines that would further promote sustainable practices and balanced, inclusive and resilient food systems. The Committee had provided further guidance on many important topics for sustainable development, including biological diversity, coastal zone management and sustainable consumption and production patterns. Lastly, in the short time left following the conclusion of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the delegations had done their best to incorporate its outcomes into their recommendations.

109. **The Chair** said that the Second Committee had completed its work for the main part of the seventy-sixth session.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.