



# General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
23 January 2024

Original: English

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 22nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 20 November 2023, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Amorín..... (Uruguay)

## Contents

Agenda item 16: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

- (a) International trade and development (*continued*)
- (b) International financial system and development (*continued*)
- (c) Financial inclusion for sustainable development

Agenda item 18: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (a) Towards the achievement of sustainable development: implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including through sustainable consumption and production, building on Agenda 21 (*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*)
- (g) Education for sustainable development (*continued*)
- (i) Combating sand and dust storms (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 21: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

- (b) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

- (a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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



*The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.*

**Agenda item 16: Macroeconomic policy questions** (*continued*)

**(a) International trade and development** (*continued*)  
([A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/78/L.71](#))

*Draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1](#): International trade and development*

1. **The Chair**, drawing attention to a proposed amendment to paragraph 29 of the draft resolution, which had been submitted by Spain on behalf of the European Union and was contained in document [A/C.2/78/L.71](#), said that a recorded vote had been requested on the amendment.

2. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment.*

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Colombia, Costa Rica, Japan, Mexico.

3. *The amendment was rejected by 111 votes to 48, with 4 abstentions.*

4. **Mr. Murillo Ferrer** (Colombia) said that, in view of the existential threat posed by the climate change crisis, aligning the mandate of the World Trade Organization (WTO) with the provisions of the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Sustainable Development Goals was an important objective. However, measures taken to that end must be agreed multilaterally and be consistent with the need to promote just transitions and build a fair and non-discriminatory trade system. The implementation of unilateral measures failed to acknowledge the productive capacities and circumstances of developing countries or their efforts to meet their environmental commitments. The gravity and complexity of that matter had not been fully reflected in paragraph 29 of the draft resolution: the "potential" impact of such measures was couched in terms too soft, no effort had been made to "reiterate" or "highlight" such legitimate concerns, and the suggestion was that resulting distortions had an impact only on developing countries, which failed to recognize the challenges faced by middle-income countries, including those in Latin America. His delegation therefore regretted the rejection of the proposed amendment to paragraph 29.

5. *At the request of the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 28 of draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.5/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, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia,

Ghana, Guatemala, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Mexico, New Zealand, Türkiye.

6. *Paragraph 28 of draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1 was retained by 117 votes to 51, with 3 abstentions.*

7. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, 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, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine.

*Abstaining:*

Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

8. *Paragraph 29 of draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1 was retained by 119 votes to 43, with 8 abstentions.*

9. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted as a whole.*

11. **Mr. Martín Couce** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that in proposing its amendment, as contained in document [A/C.2/78/L.71](#), the European Union and its member States had sought to incorporate language from the report of the Secretary-General on international trade and development 2023 ([A/78/230](#)) into the draft resolution. The intention had been to draw attention to the importance of measures seeking to fulfil

commitments under the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and to prioritize the needs of the least developed countries. Although the rejection of the amendment was regrettable, the European Union and its member States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

12. **Ms. Gahlot** (India) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution as a whole, but had reservations about certain paragraphs. In paragraph 9, it would have been preferable to have included language that noted with concern the prevalence of trade-distorting subsidies and reaffirmed the General Assembly's commitment to correct and prevent trade distortions in world agricultural markets. The existing language was problematic as it did not distinguish between trade-distorting and non-trade-distorting agricultural support. Regarding paragraph 21, India strongly supported the implementation of paragraph 8 of the ministerial decision on the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) (WT/MIN(22)/30), which sought to extend the decision to the production and supply of coronavirus disease diagnostics and therapeutics. That implementation would signal to lower-middle-income countries that the world was united in the fight against pandemics. As to paragraph 29, the issue of policy instruments for environmental purposes with potential trade impacts was insufficiently addressed. Such instruments must not be used as a means of arbitrary discrimination between countries nor as a restriction on international trade in disguise.

13. **Mr. Meschchanov** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution adequately reflected the challenges currently facing international trade and its contribution to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, especially for developing countries. Many new trade measures that did not comply with international law or States' obligations under WTO were being introduced to provide certain national economies with a competitive edge. Many developing countries continued to feel the negative effects of measures introduced for political or protectionist reasons. International trade was now at risk of being held hostage. His delegation noted with regret that the proposals put forward in that regard on behalf of the Group of 77 and China had not been supported by a number of States. The Russian Federation continued to uphold the principles of openness, non-discrimination, fairness, inclusiveness, equal rights and transparency of a multilateral trading system that considered the interests of the poorest countries.

14. The Russian Federation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution. The

assumption of obligations in relation to the elimination of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect should be strictly limited to the WTO framework or negotiations between international trade partners. Moreover, stating that certain forms of support for agricultural producers were harmful to nature and health was inappropriate. Given its potential for misuse in the name of protectionism, such an assertion should be included in a General Assembly resolution only once it had been carefully considered and agreed upon by WTO.

15. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the core themes of the draft resolution but wished to highlight some important concerns in relation to paragraph 28. The United States believed that economic sanctions were an appropriate, effective and legitimate tool to achieve national security and foreign policy objectives. In cases where the United States had applied such sanctions, it had done so in accordance with international law and with specific objectives, including promoting the return to the rule of law, democratic systems or respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and responding to threats to international security.

16. Trade language negotiated or adopted by, or under the auspices of, the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council had no relevance for United States trade policy, trade obligations or commitments, nor for the agenda of WTO. That included calls to adopt approaches that might undermine incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. The United Nations and WTO, while sharing certain interests, had different roles, rules and memberships.

17. Lastly, the draft resolution did not adequately capture all of the carefully negotiated and balanced language in the TRIPS Agreement or the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, instead presenting an unbalanced and incomplete picture.

18. **Ms. Kavaleuskaya** (Belarus) said that her delegation wished to reiterate its view that the application of trade restrictions and unilateral coercive measures as means of exerting political or economic pressure was inadmissible. While remaining committed to global efforts to promote a universal, open, non-discriminatory and fair multilateral trading system, Belarus was not a member of WTO and had no obligations to adjust its foreign trade policy. Belarus therefore wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 9 of the draft resolution as it did not consider itself bound by the obligations set out therein.

19. **Ms. Seror** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution noted the importance of trading arrangements that extended preferential market access for developing countries. However, the United Kingdom had concerns regarding some unbalanced elements of the text. Her delegation had voted against the retention of paragraph 28 because it could not endorse the language used therein on sanctions, which, when targeted, could be used as one part of a comprehensive and proportionate foreign policy strategy. They were imposed for specific purposes and focused on deterring and constraining serious human rights abuses and violations, breaches of international law, proliferation activities and the obstruction of peace processes. There was no inconsistency or conflict with the Charter of the United Nations. As to paragraph 29, her delegation had voted in favour of the amendment proposed by Spain on behalf of the European Union. The paragraph as currently written did not accurately capture the importance of the climate and environment-related questions in relation to trade. The distinction between policy measures that served purely environmental purposes and those that were deliberately distortive must be made clear.

**(b) International financial system and development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/78/L.7 and A/C.2/78/L.50)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.7 and A/C.2/78/L.50: International financial system and development*

20. **Mr. Hamilton** (United States of America) said that his Government was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.50 but wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 48, which contained a reference to certain unilateral economic, financial and trade measures. His delegation wished to reiterate that economic sanctions were an appropriate, effective and legitimate tool, as outlined in its previous statement.

21. His delegation also wished to reiterate that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the multilateral development banks had their own governance structure, mandates and decision-making processes that were independent of the United Nations and were essential to helping ensure that they remained fiscally solvent and able to support the objectives of their shareholders. The proper forums in which to discuss the operations of those institutions were their respective boards.

22. With respect to the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 44, he said that it was usually not the role of the official sector to intervene in the specific methodologies or practices of private credit-rating agencies. Issues related to determining sovereign

ratings should be resolved between private industry and the sovereign entities subject to the ratings. There was no clear indication that the ratings assigned by the rating agencies were not evidence- or fact-based.

23. His delegation disagreed with the inclusion in the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph of a reference to IMF quota reform without mentioning the new quota formula as a guide, as a streamlined formula was the best way, especially for the sake of simplicity and transparency, to meet the guiding principles for the quota review. Reference to the new quota formula in paragraph 29 was appreciated.

24. His delegation also disagreed with the inclusion in paragraph 12 of language stressing the need to consider an increase in concessional funding from multilateral development banks, as the level of concessional funding was already considered during replenishment negotiations conducted by those institutions' respective governance bodies. In addition, the language in that paragraph on the consideration of global financial system reform was too vague to have practical meaning.

25. His delegation further disagreed with the inclusion in paragraph 24 of language encouraging the provision of flexible, concessional, fast-disbursing and front-loaded assistance without regard for the financial sustainability of the institutions, the development impact and effect on poverty reduction of such assistance or the presence of an appropriate macroeconomic policy framework. The concessionality of assistance was determined by the governance bodies of the international financial institutions, which allocated limited concessional resources, considering income and creditworthiness. Furthermore, that language 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.

26. Regarding paragraph 33, an increase in requests for international cooperation would not lead to more investigations and prosecutions of illicit financial flows if the requests themselves were insufficient. Furthermore, what was needed was not stronger or more effective international cooperation, but rather more of it.

27. Lastly, he wished to refer the Committee to his delegation's general statement, delivered on 9 November 2023 at the Committee's twenty-first meeting (see A/C.2/78/SR.21) for further details on his delegation's position on the role and independence of IMF and multilateral development banks in the international financial system and on issues related to international financial institution reform, trade, WTO, special drawing rights, illicit financial flows, concessional

finance, debt sustainability and transparency, technology transfers and economic sanctions.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.50 was adopted.*

29. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.7 was withdrawn.*

**(e) Financial inclusion for sustainable development** (*continued*) (A/C.2/78/L.15 and A/C.2/78/L.49)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.15 and A/C.2/78/L.49: Financial inclusion for sustainable development*

30. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.49 had no programme budget implications.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.49 was adopted.*

32. **Ms. Macarena Apud** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.49 but wished to clarify that the United States viewed blended finance as an important risk-sharing mechanism for promoting sustainable development that could help to overcome barriers to inclusion. Contrary to the distinction drawn in the draft resolution, blended finance could be accomplished with any combination of developing country domestic, public and private finance, as well as external public and private finance. Her delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general statement, delivered on 9 November 2023 at the Committee's twenty-first meeting for further details on its position on illicit financial flows, trade and technology transfers, the independence of other forums and institutions and reform of the international financial institutions.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.15 was withdrawn.*

**Agenda item 18: Sustainable development**

(*continued*) (A/C.2/78/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1, A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1, A/C.2/78/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.2/78/L.34/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1: Agricultural technology for sustainable development*

34. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications.

35. **Mr. Ben Naftaly** (Israel), introducing the draft resolution, said that his delegation viewed it as vital for sustainable development. Its focus went beyond technology, covering innovation at all levels with a particular focus on smallholder and family farmers in developing countries. The involvement of numerous nations from diverse regions in the negotiations of the draft resolution underscored the collective commitment to its cause. Israel had some 400 agricultural technology

start-ups, allocated 4.3 per cent of its gross domestic product (GDP) to research into agricultural technology and, through its use of advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence and drones in agriculture, set a global benchmark for innovation and research.

36. His delegation was uneasy continuing "business as usual" considering the events unfolding in its region, in particular the 238 Israeli civilians being held hostage. However, as the draft resolution concerned shared efforts towards attaining the Sustainable Development Goals, his delegation had decided in favour of engaging with other delegations to work on an improved draft. His delegation expressed the hope that all countries would recognize the value of the draft resolution and, one day, join in adopting it by consensus.

37. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Eswatini, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Myanmar, Netherlands (Kingdom of), Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

38. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Iceland, Malawi, Nepal, North Macedonia, Panama and Timor-Leste.

39. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

40. **Ms. Etomzini** (Libya), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that the Group had requested a vote and that its members would be voting no. The Group of 77 and China already submitted an annual draft resolution entitled "Agriculture development, food security and nutrition". The draft resolution submitted by Israel was a waste of the Organization's limited resources.

41. In addition, Israel was responsible for the longest occupation in modern times and was the most frequent violator among Member States of resolutions adopted by

the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Human Rights Council. Its flouting of international law and the will of the international community was exemplified by its campaign of ethnic cleansing in the Gaza Strip and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. Israel should not be allowed to exploit technical development issues to cover up its violations of the Charter, principles and resolutions of the United Nations.

42. Israeli policies were actually systematically and deliberately undermining agriculture in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, as well as in occupied Lebanese territory – including the occupied Shab'a Farms, Kafr Shuba hills and the outskirts of the town of Mari, which included the expanded part of the town of Ghajar – and in the occupied Syrian Golan. United Nations reports such as the report of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia on the economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan ([A/78/127-E/2023/95](#)) had presented ample facts and figures demonstrating how Israeli policies and measures violated the most basic moral principles.

43. Even as Israel was ostensibly promoting the transfer of sustainable agricultural technologies to developing countries, it was throwing up obstacles to the Palestinian agricultural sector in the form of land confiscation, the apartheid separation wall and the theft of Palestinian water. In southern Lebanon, Israeli use of internationally prohibited white phosphorus had caused environmental, agricultural and health damage so extensive that Amnesty International had called for it to be investigated as a war crime. During the current session, the Committee had once again adopted its resolution entitled “The oil slick on Lebanese shores”, and once again, Israel had refused to acknowledge its responsibility and had tried to politicize that resolution.

44. The Group of Arab States wished to focus on the need for cessation of all Israeli military operations in the occupied Palestinian territories, including East Jerusalem, and most especially in the Gaza Strip, where immediate access should be granted for humanitarian and medical assistance. The Group rejected any attempts to forcibly displace the Palestinian people either within Palestinian territory or to neighbouring States. In the meantime, Israel should not be allowed to use the United Nations as a platform to cover up its violations of that Organization's Charter and resolutions. A vote in favour of the draft resolution would only encourage Israel to

continue policies that undermined development. The Group of Arab States called on all delegations to vote against it.

45. **Mr. Al Nahhas** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that while the Syrian Arab Republic believed in the importance of agricultural technology to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the main sponsor of the draft resolution had neither the legal nor the moral standing to introduce it. The previous 40 days had laid bare the fascist nature of the Israeli occupation, which, in addition to all its other crimes, was now systematically targeting hospitals in the Gaza Strip. The total death toll stood at 13,000 Palestinians, 70 per cent of whom were women and children. With Western support, Israel was pursuing a scorched earth policy to wipe the Gaza Strip out of existence.

46. Even as its delegation submitted a draft resolution on agricultural development, the occupying Power was preventing the population in the occupied Syrian Golan from engaging in agriculture, its main source of livelihood, by confiscating agricultural land, restricting water use, and allowing Israeli settlers to deplete natural resources. Reports from numerous United Nations agencies had shown how Israeli policies and practices undermined agricultural development on a daily basis. Israel should not be allowed to exploit the United Nations to trumpet a phony commitment to sustainable development when it was actively working to undermine development. Since the submitter lacked the necessary standing, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic would vote against the draft resolution, and urged other delegations to do the same.

47. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that her delegation wished to express its appreciation to all those Member States that had taken the principled stance of not supporting draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1](#), which had been submitted by Israel. Her delegation had no issue with the content of the draft resolution but wished to recall that over the past decades the United Nations had adopted more than 800 General Assembly resolutions and 90 Security Council resolutions, including the most recent ones adopted in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the current horrific developments in the Gaza Strip. However, Israel was yet to comply with any of them. Instead, Israel continued to breach international law, entrench its occupation and consolidate an apartheid regime over the Palestinian people.

48. Any Member State that wilfully breached international law and refused to abide by its obligations under the Charter, including cooperating with the United Nations and respecting its resolutions, should not be

allowed to continue to exploit the benefits and privileges of membership. Israel was undermining the organization and attacking its agencies, its Secretary-General and indeed any person or country speaking the truth and demanding respect for international law. Israel's impunity had reached outrageous new levels amid the unlawful war against the Palestinian people, whose territory it had been brutally occupying for decades, inflicting an unspeakable scale of death and destruction. Israel was systematically pursuing its plans to diminish, if not erase, the presence of the Palestinian people in Gaza and Occupied Palestine. The open bragging by Israeli officials about such plans, including the "voluntary migration" of Palestinians, was deplorable. Failure to hold Israel accountable had allowed the Israeli war machine to continue, indiscriminately targeting civilians, destroying civilian property and destroying the very foundations of life in Gaza, including its agricultural sector. And yet, at the United Nations, Israel was still treated by some as a normal, democratic and law-abiding State. In reality, Israel was behaving, and being treated, as though it was above the law.

49. It was beyond time to stand up for international law and the human rights of all peoples in all places and circumstances, including in Palestine. A clear and strong message must be sent: there would be no tolerance for continued Israeli violations and war crimes in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. That message must manifest at the Second Committee in the refusal to allow Israel to proceed with "business as usual". If not held accountable, Israel would only be further emboldened in its depravity against the Palestinian people.

50. *At the request of the representative of Libya on behalf of the Group of Arab States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 27, with 9 abstentions.*

52. **Mr. Keane** (United States of America) said that the United States remained committed to promoting agricultural development as a means of achieving sustainable development and was pleased to support the draft resolution.

53. With respect to its position on the reference in the draft resolution to escalating interest rates, the United States noted that inflation pressures appeared to be easing globally. Many central banks had kept policy rates on hold recently or, in the case of some emerging markets, had begun to ease policy rates.

54. His delegation wished to reiterate that trade language negotiated or adopted by, or under the auspices of, the General Assembly had no relevance for United States trade policy, trade obligations or commitments, nor for the agenda of WTO. That included calls to adopt approaches that might undermine incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer that was not both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. The



United Nations and WTO, while sharing certain interests, had different roles, rules and memberships.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.20/Rev.1: Sustainable and resilient tourism and sustainable development in Central America and the Dominican Republic*

55. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.20/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

56. **Ms. Barahona Figueroa** (El Salvador), speaking on behalf of the Central American Integration System and introducing the draft resolution, said that Central America, owing to its location and geological and hydrometeorological characteristics, was vulnerable to the effects of climate change, natural disasters and extreme weather events. As a result, its collective efforts to eradicate poverty and attain economic development and environmental protection were significantly impeded. The draft resolution underscored the importance of encouraging sustainable and resilient tourism as a means of achieving sustainable development in the Central American Integration System, including through social inclusion, decent employment, entrepreneurial opportunities, inclusive economic growth and the promotion of climate resilience, environmental sustainability, and disaster risk management in tourism activities and destinations. In addition, the draft resolution encouraged support for cooperatives, community organizations and micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises. Her delegation called on the international community to support sustainable and resilient tourism initiatives, including by enhancing support for the World Tourism Organization.

57. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Georgia, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mexico, Singapore, Suriname, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

58. She then noted that Chile and the Philippines also wished to become sponsors.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1: Cooperative measures to assess and increase awareness of environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea*

60. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

61. **Mr. Paulauskas** (Lithuania), introducing the draft resolution, said that the disposal of chemical weapons into the sea was a matter of global concern owing to its

potential to pose significant environmental and health risks. Safeguarding the health of the ocean and sea environments into which chemical weapons had been discarded was a task that was complex owing to a combination of factors, including natural processes, high levels of economic activity and the increasing use of sea transportation. The issue was therefore not only environmental in nature, but also economic and social.

62. The draft resolution, which was based on General Assembly resolution [74/213](#), offered a response to those challenges, which included encouraging efforts to build on the discussions held at the Special Sessions of the Conference of the States Parties to Review the operation of the Chemical Weapons Convention of 2018 and 2023. In the draft resolution, the Secretary-General was also invited to further explore the possibility of establishing a database containing voluntarily shared information. It was important to note that the implementation of the draft resolution would contribute towards the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Goals 13 and 14.

63. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden and Ukraine.

64. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Serbia, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu.

65. **Mr. Segura Aragón** (El Salvador) said that his delegation wished to outline its national position in relation to draft resolutions [A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.2/78/L.40/Rev.1](#). While recognizing the importance of protecting the environment, including coastal zones and the oceans, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the paragraphs in those draft resolutions containing mention of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a legal framework for ocean activities because El Salvador had not ratified the Convention and was therefore not a State party thereto. In addition, it was important to emphasize that, as set out during the 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, measures adopted to attain Goal 14 should complement and

strengthen existing legal instruments, not duplicate or undermine them. Lastly, his delegation wished to state that participation in the negotiations on the aforementioned draft resolutions did not affect the legal position of those States that were not party to the Convention or other related agreements.

66. **Ms. Ríos Serna** (Colombia) said that her delegation, aware that marine pollution was one of the primary threats to marine biodiversity, jeopardizing the well-being and livelihoods of coastal communities, food security, human health and ecosystem health, had taken the decision to sponsor the draft resolution. However, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from the fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1](#), the content of which it did not accept. Colombia had not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and therefore did not submit to its principles or provisions, except for those that Colombia had explicitly accepted. In addition, Colombia did not consider the Convention to be the only legal framework for ocean activities.

67. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.25/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

68. **Ms. İstemil Aydil** (Türkiye) said that her delegation had sponsored the draft resolution but wished to disassociate itself from the references made therein to international instruments to which Türkiye was not party. Her delegation's sponsoring of the draft resolution must not be construed as a change in the legal position of Türkiye towards those instruments. In addition, Türkiye did not consider the language relating to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea used in the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea to be agreed language and therefore asked for the draft resolution to be revisited on an annual basis.

69. **Mr. Gambert** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Georgia; and, in addition, Monaco, said that his delegation wished to express its disappointment that it had not been possible to include the language relating to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea used in the 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. The Convention, which established a legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, promoted stability: its language and purpose were universal, it represented a commitment to settle all issues relating to the law of the sea on the basis that they were interrelated and needed

to be considered as a whole, and, above all, it enjoyed almost universal participation. To date, 169 parties, including the European Union, were bound by its provisions. In addition, international jurisprudence had long accepted that its provisions either embodied or reflected customary international law.

70. Lastly, his delegation wished to clarify that sponsoring the draft resolution did not imply support for the continued use in future resolutions of the language in its twelfth preambular paragraph.

71. **Mr. Momeni** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the fourteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution because the Islamic Republic of Iran was not party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

*Draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.34/Rev.1](#): Central Asia facing environmental challenges: fostering regional solidarity for sustainable development and prosperity*

72. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.34/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

73. **Mr. Eshkobilov** (Uzbekistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that Central Asia, like all regions, was facing environmental degradation and climate change, which were hampering the region's ability to attain the Sustainable Development Goals. The dire consequences of the desiccation of the Aral Sea, once the fourth largest lake in the world, stretched far beyond the region itself. The draft resolution set out tangible action and targets for countries in Central Asia to work together with the support of the international community to address such challenges.

74. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cabo Verde, China, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Kiribati, Malaysia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Singapore, Suriname, Switzerland, Tonga, Tunisia, Türkiye and Viet Nam.

75. She then noted that El Salvador, Kenya and Panama also wished to become sponsors.

76. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.34/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

77. **Ms. Ríos Serna** (Colombia) said that her delegation, coming from a megadiverse country that was highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, understood the environmental challenges faced by countries in Central Asia and extended its solidarity to all regions suffering from drought, soil degradation, glacial loss, water stress, flooding, heat waves, forest

fires and other extreme climate events. Her delegation welcomed the initiatives in the draft resolution to strengthen regional cooperation to address such challenges, but wished to clarify that draft resolutions referring to specific groups of countries could not be construed as modifying or reinterpreting the decisions and mandates of relevant multilateral environmental agreements, including those in relation to categories of countries under special circumstances such as those agreed under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement, or the mandates of financial mechanisms and funds such as the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund.

78. **Ms. Upell** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. Her Government supported regional cooperation to tackle environmental challenges in Central Asia and the promotion of socioeconomic development and adaptation to climate change. The United States welcomed the leadership and initiative demonstrated by each Central Asian country in concretely addressing international and regional climate issues. Regarding references in the draft resolution to international financial institutions, disaster risk reduction and climate change, her delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general statement delivered on 9 November 2023 at the Committee twenty-first meeting.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.27/Rev.1: Strengthening the links between all modes of transport to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*

79. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.27/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

80. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan) said that safe, reliable and sustainable transport played a fundamental role in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and was essential for a sustainable future. The draft resolution would provide more opportunities to strengthen and further develop all forms of such transport, including by inviting the Secretary-General to consider convening the third United Nations Global Sustainable Transport Conference and encouraging Member States to indicate their interest in hosting the Conference. In addition, the draft resolution decided to proclaim the United Nations Decade of Sustainable Transport for the 10-year period beginning on 1 January 2026 and encouraged all Member States to work closely with the relevant United Nations entities in preparing an implementation plan for the Decade.

81. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Georgia, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Singapore, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Türkiye and Viet Nam.

82. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guinea, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Panama, Philippines and Timor-Leste.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.*

84. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. The general explanation of position of the United States regarding independent mandates for international financial institutions, such as multilateral development banks, IMF and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, had been posted on the official website of the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations.

**(a) Towards the achievement of sustainable development: implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including through sustainable consumption and production, building on Agenda 21**  
(continued) ([A/C.2/78/L.22](#) and [A/C.2/78/L.51](#))

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.22 and A/C.2/78/L.51: Promoting sustainable consumption and production patterns of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, building on Agenda 21 (continued)*

85. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.51](#) had no programme budget implications.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.51 was adopted.*

87. **Ms. Allet** (Switzerland) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution. However, that consensus had come at a price. Regrettably, the draft resolution contained no mention of food or food systems despite their significant impact on sustainable production and consumption. Food systems were mentioned in almost half of the policies aimed at achieving sustainable production and consumption under the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns. Making fundamental changes to the production, processing, transportation and consumption of foods

was essential to achieving sustainable development. Moreover, Sustainable Development Goal 12 was one of the most cross-cutting of all of the Goals. Her delegation therefore failed to understand the reluctance to make a connection with Goal 2, which included food systems.

88. In future draft resolutions on the matter, it would be important to include a reference to the need for a holistic approach to food systems wherein production and consumption were connected and all sectors and actors involved in the food value chain were taken into consideration.

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.22 was withdrawn.*

**(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (continued)**  
(A/C.2/78/L.23, A/C.2/78/L.45 and A/C.2/78/L.72)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.23 and A/C.2/78/L.45: 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*

90. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications prepared in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.45, as contained in document A/C.2/78/L.72.

91. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.45 was adopted.*

92. **Ms. Bartley** (Samoa), speaking on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States, said that small island developing States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but wished to state their disappointment in what they had witnessed: backsliding and a general lack of solidarity and appreciation for the difficulties that they were facing. The Charter of the United Nations presupposed a collective interest in safeguarding the development of all. There must be credible reform to the international financial architecture, the gaps and challenges of which were all too clear, and ambitious climate action was long overdue. Many States were accruing debt at a pace that outstripped their ability to cope. Small island developing States had fought for over three decades for an acknowledgement that responses must be targeted and based on realistic and comprehensive measures that took into account their multidimensional vulnerability. They would not retreat

from that position. Outdated measures should neither preclude their access to necessary finance nor conclude how deserving they were. Small island developing States would carry that approach with them into the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States. A place in which the tendency was to forgo the collective interest for the sake of the individual position was one in which small island developing States did not wish to remain.

93. **Ms. Vaea** (Tonga), speaking on behalf of the members of the Pacific Islands Forum with a presence at the United Nations, said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. It served as an important step in the lead-up to the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States and complemented the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent. Her delegation also welcomed the report of the High-Level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States, which was a crucial first step towards reaching an agreed definition of vulnerability. Her delegation looked forward to working on implementing the recommendations contained in the report and further developing the High-Level Panel's work on key development issues, such as how to measure the contribution of gender equality to vulnerability and resilience; how to measure vulnerability to future climate impacts; and how to facilitate interaction between the Index, which focused on structural vulnerability, and other measures of vulnerability, such as fragility and inequality. Having revitalized the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration, the Pacific Islands Forum would be pleased to share its lessons and experience on gender equality.

94. **Mr. Murillo Ferrer** (Colombia) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but wished to emphasize that Member States, having created the Multidimensional Vulnerability Index, must send the right message to the international community regarding its scope, applicability, limitations and correct use. The Index must not, like GDP, become an additional filter that penalized progress and further inhibited the already severely limited access of developing countries, particularly middle-income countries, to financing for development. It must instead facilitate the effective distribution of financing for developing countries, taking into account the unique challenges they faced. Past approaches that had focused on providing assistance on the basis of the categorization of countries had proven ineffective and had not allowed for nuance or multidimensionality. Calls for the application of the Index within the United Nations system and international financial institutions

without first informing Member States about its proper use was not only inappropriate but also sowed uncertainty and increased the risk of the Index falling into the same patterns as GDP.

95. **Ms. Marks** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. The United States was committed to improving policies and programmes to address the particular needs of small island developing States, including access to development and climate finance, and recognized their unique challenges and vulnerability to climate change. The fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States would be a critical opportunity to recommit to establishing policies, systems and partnerships to strengthen resilience and promote long-term growth. The United States encouraged all stakeholders to commit to an ambitious, balanced, strategic and achievable programme of action and looked forward to participating in the intergovernmental follow-up on the work of the High-Level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States.

96. In relation to the recommendations presented in the final report of the High-Level Panel, her delegation said that the effective application of the Index was dependent on the use of strong, credible, objective and evidence-based indicators. It was equally important that the Index should include indicators for which there were credible and widely available data. Donors and other users would thus be able to compare and contrast vulnerabilities across small island developing States and other developing countries.

97. Her delegation wished to clarify that its support for the draft resolution should not be understood as endorsing any action by the Secretary-General or the United Nations that would undermine the independent mandates of international financial institutions or objective assessments of debt sustainability.

98. Lastly, her delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general explanation of position, as posted on the official website of the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations, for information with respect to international financial institution independence and debt, as well as official development assistance, climate change and technology transfer.

99. **Ms. Seror** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which affirmed the significant challenges that small island developing States faced in relation to gaining access to sufficient financing for sustainable development, including concessional and climate

finance. The United Kingdom continued to support the position agreed by the global community in the Glasgow Climate Pact, namely that providers of finance should consider vulnerability in their decision-making. In that vein, her delegation welcomed the release of the report of the High-Level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States. The United Kingdom was pleased to support the preparations for the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States, including by co-chairing a task force, contributing £500,000 and providing technical expertise. Her delegation wished to encourage all relevant partner to engage with the principles of improving development impact in small island developing States launched in Geneva in December 2022 to improve the quality and effectiveness of aid to such States.

100. **Mr. Kaspar** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, Türkiye and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Georgia, and, in addition, Andorra and Monaco, said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and remained committed to supporting small island developing States in a spirit of friendship and cooperation at the United Nations, working in partnership to address the specific challenges they faced. His delegation greatly appreciated the work done by the High-Level Panel on the Development of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for Small Island Developing States in its final report. The European Union would strive to retain the report's integrity as it was advanced by the General Assembly. Its methodologies ought not to be reopened or relitigated. Instead, the General Assembly must decide how best to implement and effectively operationalize the Index as a tool to support the sustainable development needs of small island developing States.

101. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.23 was withdrawn.*

**(g) Education for sustainable development**  
(continued) (A/C.2/78/L.41 and A/C.2/78/L.46)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.41 and A/C.2/78/L.46:  
Education for sustainable development in the  
framework of the 2030 Agenda for  
Sustainable Development*

102. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.46 had no programme budget implications.

103. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.46 was adopted.*

104. **Ms. Sharma** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and strongly supported the realization of the right to education. As educational matters in the United States were determined primarily at the State and local levels, her delegation understood calls in the draft resolution on States to strengthen various aspects of education to be responded to in terms consistent with States' respective federal, State and local authorities. Regarding references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, technology transfer, international financial institutions, gender equality, disaster risk reduction, climate change and human, economic, social and cultural rights, her delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general statement delivered on 9 November 2023 at the Committee's twenty-first meeting.

105. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.41 was withdrawn.*

**(i) Combating sand and dust storms (continued)**  
(A/C.2/78/L.43/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.43/Rev.1: Combating sand and dust storms*

106. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.43/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications.

107. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.43/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania,

Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), 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 Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, Nauru, United States of America.

108. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted by 178 votes to 3.*

109. **Mr. Ben Naftaly** (Israel) said that his delegation had called for a vote on the draft resolution and had voted against, as it had done on previous iterations of the draft resolution, not because it did not see the value of a draft resolution combating sand and dust storms but because the text contained a false statement of fact. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which contained false assertions regarding participation in a high-level interactive dialogue on sand and dust storms in 2018. The inclusion of that misstatement was political and had nothing to do with the topic of the draft resolution. Stating a falsehood repeatedly year after year would not make it correct.

110. As sand and dust storms were a global challenge demanding global solutions, every nation deserved a seat at the table, particularly those most vulnerable, including Israel. Regrettably, inclusion in critical dialogue had not always been an option for Israel, as had been the case with two conferences on sand and dust storms held in Tehran. The issue at hand was not simply technical, but one of principle. An entity focused on exporting its revolution, which was essentially terrorism that undermined the very values upheld in the United Nations, was unlikely to prioritize development. To effectively combat climate change and the rising threat of sand and dust storms, leaders who fostered cooperation among all nations were needed. Holding

conferences under the auspices of a divisive authority would only serve to exacerbate existing problems and distance nations from the unity and collaboration that were essential for meaningful progress. His delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 8 of the draft resolution. That disassociation reflected his delegation's commitment to principles that fostered inclusion and productive dialogue, which were both essential for addressing such global challenges.

111. **Mr. Momeni** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in exercise of the right to reply, said that his delegation had hoped that the representative of the Israeli regime would remain focused on the issue at hand. Unfortunately, he had hoped in vain and, as expected, the representative of the regime had failed to do so and instead, as per their standard approach, played the victim card while making false, unfounded and baseless accusations against others, including the Islamic Republic of Iran. It was ironic that a regime famous for unlawful acts, including apartheid policies and war crimes that had been documented by the United Nations, should allow itself to accuse other countries in such a manner.

#### **Agenda item 19: Globalization and interdependence** (continued)

##### **(a) Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development** (continued) (A/C.2/78/L.12 and A/C.2/78/L.48)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.12 and A/C.2/78/L.48: Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development*

112. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.48](#) had no programme budget implications.

113. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.48 was adopted.*

114. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution did not adequately capture all of the carefully negotiated and balanced language in the TRIPS Agreement or the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, instead presenting an unbalanced and incomplete picture of that language. For a full explanation of the position of the United States on trade and technology transfer in United Nations General Assembly resolutions, his delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general statement posted on the official website of the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nation.

115. **Ms. Seror** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which set out ambitions that were vital to

successfully facing the multiple escalating and interlinked global crises. The United Kingdom would continue to harness innovation and new technologies, science and research to achieve the greatest and most cost-efficient development impact in order to end extreme poverty, tackle climate change and biodiversity loss and accelerate sustainable economic growth. The United Kingdom had been proud to host the Artificial Intelligence Safety Summit 2023, in which it had facilitated dialogue between the world's leading powers on artificial intelligence with a commitment to safely harnessing that technology. Successfully handling the challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence and other emerging innovations was critical to achieving sustainable development.

#### **Agenda item 21: Eradication of poverty and other development issues** (continued)

##### **(b) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development** (continued) (A/C.2/78/L.30/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.30/Rev.1: Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

116. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.30/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

117. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.30/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, 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, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, 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, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint

Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Türkiye.

118. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 126 votes to 50, with 1 abstention.*

119. **Mr. Martín Couce** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Georgia; and, in addition, Iceland, Japan, Monaco, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, said that poverty eradication was a major priority for the European Union and its member States, which worked closely with developing countries to promote the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and ensure that no one was left behind. As evidenced during the Sustainable Development Goals Summit, progress on Goal 1 was lagging and rural populations were disproportionately affected, and their delegations remained committed to accelerating efforts to redress that issue. However, they also remained concerned about several fundamental elements of the draft resolution.

120. It had been disappointing that, in contrast to the previous year, when efforts had been made in good faith to come to a consensus, almost no progress had been made on recurring issues that had impeded consensus on the draft resolution and its previous iterations for five years. Their delegations welcomed the fact that the draft resolution reaffirmed collective commitment to

multilateralism, international cooperation and to the United Nations, promoted full access to land ownership, decent work and economic opportunities and participation in decision-making for rural women and emphasized that digital, information and communications technology, science, technology and innovation cooperation should be on mutually agreed terms.

121. However, their delegations could not support the draft resolution's overall approach to poverty eradication, as it represented duplicated efforts and undermined Member States' agreement to revitalize the work of the Second Committee. The Secretary-General drafted an annual report analysing progress on poverty eradication, and it was in that report that the issue of rural poverty should be addressed. Their delegations still supported the inclusion of rural poverty as part of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027), which had been adopted by consensus. Poverty was multidimensional and could therefore be eradicated only when approached in a holistic way.

122. It had also been disappointing that the draft resolution still contained problematic ideological language. Paragraphs 3, 4, 8, 18 and 22 reflected the national policies and political ideology of a single Member State and did not belong in the draft resolution. Similarly, they did not accept references to “win-win cooperation” or to “building a shared future for humankind” and opposed the use of language that excluded important aspects of international standards and best practices for sustainable development that were adopted under the 2030 Agenda, such as the rule of law, human rights, transparency, equality, equity, accountability and leaving no one behind. Moreover, the meaning of a community of nations was already given in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be reinterpreted.

123. The fight against poverty should be guided by people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership. The fact that the draft resolution also failed to mention the three dimensions of sustainable development was a matter of concern and would undermine the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 1.

124. More than a quarter of the members of the Second Committee had voted against the draft resolution for the sixth year running. Their delegations expressed the hope that consensus might be achieved the following year.

125. **Ms. Mendoza Elguea** (Mexico) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as Mexico, a nation with high levels of rural poverty, welcomed any measure promoting tangible action to support all persons and leave no one behind. However,



it was surprising that changes had been made to the nineteenth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs, which had not been the subject of contention and had included language that was important to Mexico. For instance, the twenty-first preambular paragraph had originally contained a reference to leaving no one behind, which had then been removed without consulting delegations and without offering any explanation as to why it had been removed. It was not possible to emphasize the importance of eradicating rural poverty while at the same time removing the fundamental principle of the 2030 Agenda.

126. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that, in addition to the joint explanation delivered by the representative of Spain, his delegation wished to refer the Committee to its general statement delivered on 9 November 2023 at the Committee's twenty-first meeting and its long-form version posted on the official website of the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations regarding its position on trade and technology transfer, gender equality and the 2030 Agenda.

127. **Mr. Liu Liqun** (China) said that the number of people living in multidimensional poverty was higher in rural than in urban areas. Paying special attention to and taking comprehensive and precise measures to eradicate rural poverty was of great significance to accelerating the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

128. China expressed its profound regret that a few countries had once again asked for a vote on the draft resolution, thereby disregarding the wishes of the majority. The so-called concern of those countries was nothing but another farcical attempt at politicizing the issue of development and impeding development cooperation. "Win-win cooperation" and putting people at the centre of "a shared future for humankind" were agreed language featured in such landmark documents as the 2030 Agenda and the declaration on the commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. A few countries not only refused to fulfil their commitments and continued to reduce their input on funding cooperation but also used consensus when it suited them and dismissed it when it did not. Such countries promoted double standards and jeopardized unity among countries, actions with ran counter to Member States' efforts to accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The outcome of the vote had shown once again that efforts to genuinely promote development cooperation would win broad support while attempts to politicize development issues and engage in bloc politics were unpopular.

## **Agenda item 22: Operational activities for development** (*continued*)

### **(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system** (*continued*) (A/C.2/78/L.38 and A/C.2/78/L.47)

*Draft resolutions A/C.2/78/L.38 and A/C.2/78/L.47:  
Operational activities for development of the United Nations system*

129. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/78/L.47](#) had no programme budget implications.

130. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.47 was adopted.*

131. **Mr. Kaspar** (Representative of the European Union, in its capacity as observer), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; the potential candidate country Georgia; and, in addition, Andorra, said that the European Union and its member States welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution in the lead-up to the quadrennial comprehensive policy review in 2024 and also welcomed the time-bound intergovernmental consultative processes on the resident coordinator system and the funding compact launched by the Chair of the United Nations Sustainable Development Group. The United Nations development system played a vital role in the development space; ensuring that it had adequate means to engage purposefully was key.

132. It was therefore disappointing that it had not been possible to achieve consensus on the inclusion in the draft resolution of references to predictable and sustainable funding. Such funding was crucial to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Indeed, it was for that reason that such references had been included in the political declaration of the high-level forum on sustainable development convened under the auspices of the General Assembly. In particular, mention of the Joint Sustainable Development Goals Fund in the draft resolution would have been valuable, given the Fund's importance for the achievement of the Goals at the country level. Reference in the draft resolution to the current funding compact would also have been welcome.

133. *Draft resolution A/C.2/78/L.38 was withdrawn.*

*The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.*