

**General Assembly**

Sixty-ninth session

Official RecordsDistr.: General
20 January 2015

Original: English

Second Committee**Summary record of the 38th meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 11 December 2014, at 4 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Cardi (Italy)**Contents**Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development
(*continued*)Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002
International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review
Conference (*continued*)Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference
on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human
Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

- (a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed
Countries (*continued*)
- (b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked
Developing Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 133: Programme planning

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 Control Unit (srcorrections@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/>).

14-66729 (E)



Please recycle



Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Conclusion of the work of the Second Committee

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*) (A/69/217; A/C.2/69/L.11 and A/C.2/69/L.67)

Draft resolutions on information and communications technologies for development (A/C.2/69/L.11 and A/C.2/69/L.67)

1. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.67, submitted by Ms. Stepowska (Poland), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.11. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

2. *It was so decided.*

3. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.67 was adopted.*

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.11 was withdrawn.*

6. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on communication for development programmes in the United Nations system (A/69/217).

7. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.6 and A/C.2/69/L.65)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/C.2/69/L.6 and A/C.2/69/L.65)

8. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.65, submitted by Mr. Iziraren (Morocco), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.6. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.65 was adopted.*

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.6 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/69/309 and A/69/379; A/C.2/69/L.31 and A/C.2/69/L.64)

Draft resolutions on implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (A/C.2/69/L.31 and A/C.2/69/L.64)

11. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.64, submitted by Ms. Francis (Bahamas), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.31. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

12. **Mr. Bezerra** (Brazil), facilitator, said that paragraph 13, which referred to the reporting of the board and secretariat through the Economic and Social Council as elaborated in the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns, was not intended to change or set a precedent regarding the positioning of the high-level political forum on sustainable development vis-à-vis the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, as defined in General Assembly resolutions 67/290 and 68/1. In fact, the provisions of paragraph 13 were aimed at avoiding duplication of reporting obligations given to the board and secretariat of the 10-year framework of programmes.

13. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.64 was adopted.*

14. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.31 was withdrawn.*

15. **Mr. Ammar** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.64, but had reservations with regard to the language contained in paragraph 13, which requested the board and the secretariat of the 10-year framework of programmes to submit updated reports, through the Economic and Social Council, for the consideration of the forum in 2015. That language was inconsistent with the Council's function as a charter body, and the

interrelationship between the Council, the forum and board. He recalled that General Assembly resolution 67/290 clearly set out that the forum was to conduct regular reviews under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council.

16. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the notes by the Secretary-General on the term of the board of the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns (A/69/379) and on the reliable and stable transit of energy and its role in ensuring sustainable development and international cooperation (A/69/309).

17. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (continued) (A/C.2/69/L.15 and A/C.2/69/L.62)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (A/C.2/69/L.15 and A/C.2/69/L.62)

18. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.62, submitted by Mr. Tham (Singapore), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.62.

19. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.62 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, drew attention to the terms set out under paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.62, with regard to the third United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat III), to be held in Quito during the week of 17 October 2016. In that context, she recalled relevant decisions in General Assembly resolution 67/216 on the objective and results of the Conference, and decisions relating thereto.

20. She said that pursuant to paragraph 8 (d) of the draft resolution, the third session of the Preparatory Committee would be held in Indonesia in July 2016 for three days, and would add six meetings with

interpretation in the official languages to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, entailing additional requirements in 2016 of US\$ 63,600.

21. Furthermore, that third session would require 22 pre-session documents, 3 in-session documents and 2 post-session to be issued in all six official languages in 2016. In addition, reports would be written for all six meetings and issued in all six official languages in 2016. That entailed additional requirements of \$1,783,000 for documentation services in 2016.

22. Pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 8 (a) of the draft resolutions, it was anticipated that the Habitat III Conference would require a total of eight plenary meetings and six high-level round-table sessions with interpretation in all six languages. The 14 meetings would add to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, entailing additional requirements of \$200,700.

23. That Conference was also envisaged to require 17 pre-session documents, 7 in-session documents and 3 post-session documents to be issued in all six official languages in 2016. Reports would be written for all 14 meetings and issued in all six official languages in 2016. That would entail additional requirements of \$1,303,100 for documentation services in 2016.

24. Pursuant to paragraph 8 (b) of the draft resolutions, parallel meetings and other events, including multi-stakeholder segments, would be provided with interpretation on an "as-available basis".

25. In order to meet the requests contained in the draft resolution, \$1,378,100 would be required under section 15, Human settlements, for: (i) the continuation of staffing of the secretariat of Habitat III established in the biennium 2014-2015 for the period leading up to the Conference, and an additional three months after the conference until January 2017 (\$438,000); (ii) the services of consultants in order to provide substantive inputs to the third session of the Preparatory Committee and the conference (\$206,000); (iii) the participation of experts in the area of human settlements in the planned regional and thematic meetings to bring analytical depth to the discussion of the empirical results of the assessments, synthesized at the regional and global levels (\$421,500); (iv) the travel of the Habitat III secretariat to various expert group meetings, for political and substantive discussions, and to other ad hoc meetings organized by

the Secretary-General of the Conference (\$180,100); (v) general operating expenses, including rental and maintenance of premises and communication costs (\$124,500); and (vi) supplies, including photocopier paper, stationery and data processing supplies (\$7,200).

26. Pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution, the Habitat III conference would need to be supported through national and regional level promotional activities, including short videos and press kits; press and media coverage; and webcast streaming and storage. That would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$45,500 under section 28, Public information, for public information activities prior to and during the conference in 2016.

27. Recalling that, in accordance with paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 40/243, the Habitat III conference and third session of the Preparatory Committee should be held in Nairobi — the established headquarters of UN-Habitat — she noted that, in accordance with paragraph 5 of the same resolution, United Nations bodies may hold sessions away from established headquarters when a Government issuing an invitation for a session to be held within its territory agreed to defray the actual additional costs directly and indirectly involved. Accordingly, the Government of Ecuador to host the Habitat III conference required a disbursement from that Government to reimburse to the United Nations the actual additional costs directly and indirectly incurred as a result of the change in venue from Nairobi to Quito. Similarly, the offer of the Government of Indonesia to host the third session of the Preparatory Committee required a reimbursement by that Government of the actual additional costs incurred as a result of the change in venue of the third session of the Preparatory Committee from Nairobi to a location in Indonesia.

28. Accordingly, should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, total additional requirements of \$4,774,000 would be required in the biennium 2016-2017, including: (i) \$3,350,400 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management; (ii) \$1,378,100 under section 15, Human settlements; and (iii) \$45,500 under section 28, Public information. Those amounts would be included in the respective sections of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

29. Lastly, in connection with the general temporary assistance positions under section 15, Human settlements, there would also be additional requirements in the amount of \$72,600 under section 36, Staff assessment, to be offset by a corresponding amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

30. **Ms. Canuto** (Italy), facilitator, noted the addition of a footnote to paragraph 2, after the phrase “(Habitat III)”, in order to include a reference to the document [A/CONF.226/PC.1/6](#); and, in paragraph 11, the initial capitalization of the words “New Urban Agenda”, which referred to a specific agenda cited in [A/67/216](#).

31. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.62](#), as orally corrected, was adopted.*

32. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the world faced an unprecedented rate of urbanization, resulting in precariousness and other challenges to be addressed by relevant stakeholders in the Habitat and human settlement agenda. As a result, the responsibilities of UN-Habitat had increased substantially beyond its original mandate in recent years. There had been a notable increase in new sustainable cities and human settlements, as reflected in the UN-Habitat strategic plan for 2014-2019, which gave rise to complex challenges, including in relation to cities and climate change, urban areas and legislation, renewable energy for cities and sustainable urban transportation, as well as post-disaster and post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation.

33. He appealed to the United Nations and the international community to provide necessary, adequate and predictable resources for the programme, from the regular budget, so that it could effectively fulfil its mandate in the context of the programme budget for 2016-2017.

34. **Mr. Aulestia Valencia** (Ecuador) said that he wished to convey his Government's appreciation that the capital of Ecuador, Quito, had been approved as the host city for the third United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat III) in 2016.

35. Ecuador, one of the smallest countries in South America, possessed some of the richest biodiversity in the world, a cultural heritage dating back millennia. Its

capital, Quito, was the best reflection of its ethnically diverse population and traditions, and was one of the first sites to have been declared a UNESCO cultural World Heritage Site, in 1978.

36. His Government had proven that it was able to govern while bearing in mind the population's well-being. Ecuador was among the countries of the world that had made the most progress in human development in recent years. It hoped that the conference would achieve a shared vision for the North and the South, and would build a new urban agenda, giving priority to the rights of citizens, who were the main driving force behind public policy. That meant democratizing cities, and giving priority to human beings over capital. The Government and people of Ecuador were committed to making the 2016 conference a success.

37. **Mr. Devanlay** (Observer for the European Union) said that, although the European Union was committed to a successful Habitat III, his delegation was dismayed at the programme budget implications of the resolution and the unclear process that led to them. Particularly puzzling were the estimates concerning the number of documents, consultancy and travel supposedly required, but more importantly the delay in the distribution of the oral statement to delegations: budgetary figures should be provided during the negotiation process, not one hour before adoption.

38. The estimates presented at the current meeting did not prejudice the Secretary-General's submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the proposed budget for the 2016-2017 biennium. Those estimates should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States.

39. **Ms. Onishi** (Japan) said that her country joined the consensus on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.62](#) and welcomed the modalities for Habitat III, the Preparatory Committee and the conference itself. Her delegation was opposed to the Secretary's oral statement and was disappointed that Member States had not had sufficient time to review the budget estimates, which should not prejudice the Secretary-General's submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions or future discussions on the 2016-2017 biennium in the Fifth Committee, and which should not be perceived as being endorsed by Member States.

40. **Ms. Wierenga** (Canada) said that her country was pleased to join the consensus on the resolution. However, her delegation echoed concerns about the delay in making the Secretariat's budget statement available to Member States, which had not had sufficient time to review its content. It therefore reserved the right to comment at a later date. The Secretariat should also have provided greater clarity on budgetary matters during the informal consultations, as had been requested by Member States. The figures presented should be considered only as estimates and did not prejudice discussions by Member States in the Fifth Committee, nor should they be perceived as being endorsed by Member States.

41. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that it was critical to ensure the broadest possible stakeholder participation in addressing the challenges of a world that was urbanizing at an unprecedented rate. Improvements to UN-Habitat operations and the mainstreaming of gender perspectives were also welcome. However, her delegation was extremely concerned about the failure of the Secretariat to provide an oral budget statement to Member States in time to allow for sufficient review before adoption. For the third year in a row, her Government had been obliged to express dismay at last-minute budget estimates. Her Government had concerns about oral statements that related to budget resources for the next biennium. Those estimates should not prejudice the submission by the Secretary-General to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for the purpose of discussions by Member States on the 2016-2017 biennium in the Fifth Committee, nor should they be perceived as being endorsed by Member States.

42. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.15](#) was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (continued) ([A/C.2/69/L.26](#) and [A/C.2/69/L.60](#))

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries ([A/C.2/69/L.26](#) and [A/C.2/69/L.60](#))

43. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.60](#), submitted by Mr. Tham (Singapore), Rapporteur of the Committee,

on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.26](#).

44. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.60](#) in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that, pursuant to paragraphs 19 and 20 (a) of the draft resolution, a comprehensive high-level midterm review of the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011-2020 (Istanbul Programme of Action) would be held in Antalya, Turkey, for a period of three days in June 2016. The review would require 10 meetings with interpretation in all six languages, constituting an addition to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for 2016 which would entail additional requirements amounting to \$111,400. The Government of Turkey would have to defray the additional costs. The review would also require one post-session document to be issued in all six languages in 2016, constituting an addition to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for 2016 which would entail additional requirements amounting to \$101,400 for documentation services in 2016.

45. Pursuant to paragraph 23 of the draft resolution, a four-day preparatory meeting of experts would be organized in March 2016. It was anticipated that interpretation services would be provided on an “as available” basis on the understanding that the dates of the meeting would be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management and would not, as such, entail any additional resource requirements. Furthermore, the meeting was expected to require two pre-session documents, three in-session documents and one post-session document to be issued in all six languages in 2016, constituting an addition to the documentation workload of the Department that would entail additional requirements amounting to \$133,500 for documentation services in 2016.

46. Pursuant to paragraph 31 of the draft resolution, a one-day special thematic event would be organized in early 2016. That event was expected to require two meetings with interpretation in all six languages, constituting an addition to the workload of the Department that would entail additional requirements amounting to \$21,900.

47. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.60](#), additional requirements amounting to \$368,200 would be included in the proposed programme budget for the 2016-2017 biennium.

48. **Mr. Çubukcu** (Turkey), facilitator, said that cooperation and flexibility had enabled the Committee to reach a consensus on the resolution. His country looked forward to hosting the midterm review of the Istanbul Programme of Action in June 2016.

49. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.60](#) was adopted.*

50. **Mr. Poulsen** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union and its member States were pleased to join the consensus on the resolution. However, the oral statement by the Secretariat merely contained estimates that did not prejudge the Secretary-General’s submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee regarding the proposed budget for the 2016-2017 biennium.

51. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.26](#) was withdrawn.*

52. **Mr. de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil) said that he would welcome clarification of the implications of the systematic reservations made by certain countries on the basis of rule 153 of the rules of Procedure of the General Assembly. In the view of his delegation, once a resolution had been adopted by consensus and the programme budget implications had been read out, the Secretariat had an obligation to include the provision of resources in the budgetary proposal and in general Member States were committed to funding the adopted mandate.

53. **The Chair** said that any delegation could make a statement following the adoption of a resolution and indicate the position it might take in negotiations in another committee.

54. **Mr. de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil) said that the rules that applied in those circumstances should be made clear in order to avoid giving the impression that mandates had been adopted but would not subsequently receive funding.

55. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the statements in question were position statements that would be included in the official record of the meeting and the Secretariat had an obligation to take note of them. The financial aspect was the remit of

the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and of the Fifth Committee, which would consider the figures in greater detail. At the current stage, the figures provided were merely estimates. The Second Committee had pronounced itself and the General Assembly would in turn pronounce itself at the time it considered the reports of the main Committees before the plenary.

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.43 and A/C.2/69/L.66)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (A/C.2/69/L.43 and A/C.2/69/L.66)

56. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.66, submitted by Mr. Tham (Singapore), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.43. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.66 was adopted.*

58. **Mr. Katota** (Zambia), speaking on behalf of the 32 landlocked developing countries, said that the resolution was the result of the adoption of the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries for the Decade 2014-2024, and the related political declaration made by Heads of State and Government and their representatives at the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries held in Vienna. The Vienna Programme of Action reflected a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by landlocked developing countries and drew on lessons learned from the Almaty Programme of Action, including in the context of the Millennium Development Goals.

59. The Vienna Programme of Action contained realistic and time-bound targets that would address the challenges arising from the geographical constraints faced by landlocked developing countries, such as high transit costs and long transit times. It also acknowledged emerging challenges, including climate change, external shocks and structural constraints such as low productivity and a lack of competitiveness. The success of the new Programme of Action would be dependent on existing and new partnerships, including with transit neighbours, in the context of North-South,

South-South and triangular cooperation, as well as on support from the private sector and multilateral institutions.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.43 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 133: Programme planning

61. **The Chair**, recalling that the Committee had decided to keep agenda item 133 open until the conclusion of its work, said that the Secretariat had informed him that no matters required the Committee's action under that item. He took it that the Committee decided that no action was required under agenda item 133.

62. *It was so decided.*

The meeting was suspended at 5.35 p.m. and resumed at 7.40 p.m.

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.2/69/L.40/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/69/L.39/Rev.1)

63. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.39/Rev.1, submitted by Mr. Llorenty Solíz (Plurinational State of Bolivia), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

64. *It was so decided.*

65. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.39/Rev.1 contained no programme budget implications. He informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

66. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador,

Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Korea (Democratic People's Republic of), Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tanzania (United Republic of), Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Norway, United States of America.

Abstaining:

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

67. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted by 114 votes to 7, with 44 abstentions.*

68. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation was deeply disappointed that the draft resolution had been put to a vote, especially after a consensus version of the text had been reached, and had voted against it, out of serious concern about some delegations' efforts to impose unilateral mandates on the United Nations development system and the tactics they employed to that end. That approach to push for

certain issues at all costs had undermined the work done in good faith by nearly all participants in the negotiations, and was an inappropriate way to determine the use of United Nations resources. It damaged the consensus Member States had built over the past several years through General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review, as well as Economic and Social Council resolution 2014/14, and the decision of the High-level Committee on South-South Cooperation, the latter two having been adopted only a few months earlier.

69. The United States had long advocated for sensible reform towards development and remained interested in enhancing the performance and accountability of the United Nations development system.

70. Her delegation had thus joined the consensus decision of the Economic and Social Council in July 2014 to begin a balanced and responsible dialogue on the issue, under the auspices of the Council and culminating in the 2016 review. That decision had laid out a clear process to balance the needs of donors and programme countries, align the work of development agencies with country priorities and harmonize budget and strategic planning processes with a view to providing efficient and effective support to country-owned and -led development efforts. The aim had been to ensure that the United Nations development system could make a real contribution towards the post-2015 development agenda.

71. The fracturing of that consensus was thus regrettable, particularly just a few days away from planned discussions of significant issues. Her delegation was concerned about the potential for severe, damaging consequences for the development work of the United Nations and its beneficiaries.

72. As it was clear that a significant portion of the General Assembly membership disapproved of taking such a negative path, Member States, the Secretariat, and development agencies must continue to implement the carefully constructed consensus for the benefit of the entire United Nations development system and the people it served.

73. **Mr. Stokes** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, expressed deep regret over having had to vote against the draft resolution. The decision to make the comprehensive policy review a quadrennial process had been an important decision by the General

Assembly, as it had allowed the review to contribute to harmonized, four-year strategic plans for the funds, programmes, and specialized agencies. The quadrennial nature of the review, and the mandates contained therein, enabled the United Nations system to undertake critical reforms, and Member States to adopt a comprehensive approach, and to tackle a vast number of detailed, technical policy issues more carefully than was possible on an annual basis.

74. A major concern for both delegations was the extent to which the present draft resolution strayed from the practice of a procedural text, which was the customary approach adopted in the years between review years. The present draft resolution contained many elements which were repeated from the quadrennial comprehensive policy review or from previous General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions, without justification or added value. The result placed unbalanced emphasis on some elements of the quadrennial review, without reference to many other important issues, thereby weakening the overall comprehensive nature of the instructions given to the United Nations development system over a four-year period.

75. The two delegations were concerned about what appeared to be a gradual undermining of the integrity of the quadrennial process that had been agreed to years ago, and the possible undermining of the unique role of the Economic and Social Council in monitoring and follow-up, putting in place a parallel and duplicative process in the General Assembly. He noted that there was a clear distinction to be made between the role of the Assembly and that of the Economic and Social Council.

76. Australia and Canada were disappointed over the changing of the parameters set by the Council in 2014 with regard to the transparent and inclusive dialogues on the longer-term positioning of the United Nations development system. They were also greatly disappointed at the decision by the Group of 77 and China to introduce a version of the text that could not attract consensus, since the Committee could not work without clear instructions from Member States on the basis of consensus.

77. Both delegations looked forward to the forthcoming Economic and Social Council dialogues, which were a critical part of the preparatory process for the 2016 quadrennial review, and to the upcoming

operational activities segment of the Council, which would be a key opportunity to address all the issues from the 2012 review more completely.

78. **Mr. Yuh Chang Hoon** (Republic of Korea) said it was regrettable that the draft resolution had been put to a vote. Noting that the number of resolutions on which a vote had been taken during the present session had increased threefold as compared to the previous year, he said the trend was unfortunate, especially given the Committee's tradition of adopting most draft resolutions by consensus. His delegation was also concerned about the undermining of the division of labour between the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which was laid out in the Charter of the United Nations and related resolutions, including that on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review.

79. Throughout the negotiations, the role of the Economic and Social Council to provide coordination guidance to the United Nations development system had been continuously ignored, whether through the repetition of language from the Council's resolutions without providing any added value, or the use of language that was inconsistent with the Council's resolutions, which had been adopted by consensus a few months earlier.

80. In the light of the important tasks facing the Committee, including the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda and its limited time and resources, it was critical to avoid duplication of efforts and to enhance coordination among United Nations bodies. General Assembly resolution 68/1 on strengthening of the Economic and Social Council also urged avoiding duplication between the respective work of the Council and the General Assembly, particularly the Second and Third Committees. His delegation hoped that the Second Committee would aspire to those principles in its future work.

81. **Ms. Piccioni** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the quadrennial review remained a unique tool and a milestone in collective efforts towards ensuring that the United Nations development system delivered coherent, effective and efficient development results. Since its adoption by consensus in 2012, the European Union and its member States had been concerned with the extent to which General Assembly resolutions on operational activities for development had strayed from

the agreed practice of adopting texts of a largely procedural nature in the years between review years.

82. The draft resolution contained many elements which were repeated from the review or previous General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions without justification or added value. That had led to unbalanced emphasis on selective elements of the quadrennial review, without reference to many other important issues. The draft resolution contained elements on governance reform that went against the carefully negotiated consensus reached a few months earlier within the context of the Economic and Social Council resolution 2014/14.

83. The European Union and its member States had thus abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, even though it had engaged constructively and in good faith during the negotiations, proposing substantive ideas with a view to achieving consensus. It regretted that consensus could not be reached, and was concerned about the message being sent to the United Nations development system and the consequences for the work of the funds and programmes in partner countries.

84. The European Union and its member States continued to attach great importance to the review and to United Nations operational activities for development. It looked forward to the dialogue being convened by the Economic and Social Council on the longer-term positioning of the United Nations development system. The European Union remained committed to a transparent and inclusive, in-depth discussion on the key elements agreed for that dialogue, to culminate in the review in 2016.

85. **Mr. Momita** (Japan) said that it was unfortunate that the resolution had been put to a vote. The effective functioning of the Committee required established practices to be followed. The resolution was part of a broader process within the framework of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review, which had been built on a series of consensus decisions. Voting might undermine the entire process. It was therefore regrettable that the Group of 77 and China had presented a non-consensual draft. For that reason, his delegation had been obliged to vote against the resolution. He hoped that, in future, resolutions would once again be adopted by consensus.

86. **Ms. von Steiger Weber** (Switzerland) said that her delegation, both in its national capacity and as the facilitator, regretted that it had not been possible to

reach a consensus even though delegations had agreed on most issues following constructive discussions. However, the process had demonstrated that, on certain important issues, greater mutual understanding was needed. In the coming months, it would be important to hold discussions outside the formal processes in order to build trust and arrive at a common understanding of how to advance issues of system-wide importance and ensure that the United Nations system contributed more effectively to sustainable development.

87. **Mr. Vestrheim** (Norway) said that the failure to reach a consensus might weaken partnerships and support for United Nations development activities. The draft resolution contained a list of paragraphs that merely repeated selected parts of the resolution on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review and previous General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions, without adding any value. Instead, they had a distorting effect on the careful balance found in those previous resolutions. The resolution also weakened the role of the Council in the monitoring and follow-up of operational activities, while duplicating processes in the General Assembly and the Council. It was unacceptable that the resolution should attempt to pre-empt the outcomes of upcoming dialogues convened by the Council to consider the longer-term positioning of the United Nations development system. Reforms of the governing structures of the funds and programmes of the United Nations required further discussion.

88. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (the Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the resolution underlined the need to reflect the multidimensional nature of development and poverty as well as to develop a common understanding among Member States and other stakeholders in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. The resolution reflected the importance of the contribution of operational activities for development to national capacity-building. However, if two thirds of the Member States were not consulted regarding the needs and priorities of the United Nations, then something was amiss. Consensus was valuable at the highest level but it was sometimes necessary for the majority of Member States to highlight the many issues that partners needed to take into account. The only non-consensual issue in the resolution related to the composition and functioning of the governing structures of United Nations funds and programmes. Two thirds of United

Nations Member States believed that reform of those governance structures should be a priority.

Draft resolution on South-South cooperation for development (A/C.2/69/L.40/Rev.1)

89. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.40/Rev.1](#), submitted by Mr. Llorenty Solíz (Plurinational State of Bolivia), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

90. *It was so decided.*

91. **The Chair** said that draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.40/Rev.1](#) contained no programme budget implications. He informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

92. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Korea (Democratic People's Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tanzania (United Republic of), Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Georgia, Kazakhstan, Korea (Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Switzerland.

93. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.40/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 113 votes to 45, with 7 abstentions.*

94. **Ms. Hentic** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, said it was regrettable that her delegation and the delegation of Australia had had to vote against the resolution not only because of procedural concerns but also as a result of budgetary implications. The changes made by the Group of 77 and China had made it impossible to adopt the resolution by consensus.

95. **Mr. Momita** (Japan) said that his delegation had been obliged to vote against the resolution. His Government attached great importance to South-South cooperation as well as to consensus. It was therefore unfortunate that the resolution had been put to a vote because the Group of 77 and China had presented a non-consensual draft resolution. Such voting might undermine work in the area of South-South cooperation. He expressed the hope that, in future, resolutions would once again be adopted by consensus.

96. **Ms. Canuto** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that South-South and triangular cooperation, with the support of the European Union, unquestionably had the potential to contribute to poverty eradication and sustainable development. There was a need for constructive dialogue in areas such as technical assistance, capacity-building and financing for development, and for better tools to measure its impact and thereby inform the discussions

on the post-2015 development agenda and the global partnership for development. It was therefore regrettable that her delegation had had to vote against the resolution owing to institutional and budgetary issues that prevented adoption by consensus. The rapidly changing international development landscape meant that it was time to move beyond traditional cooperation to incorporate South-South and triangular cooperation perspectives into the post-2015 development agenda.

97. **Ms. Ortega** (Mexico) said that the role of the United Nations system cut across the standard-setting and operational aspects of South-South cooperation, in which her country was an active participant. The United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation had an important coordinating role and its position within the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) ensured that it was linked to activities in the field. Her delegation had noted the proposal to strengthen that Office and had accordingly voted in favour of the resolution. However, although such strengthening needed to be based on a solid analysis, there was insufficient information to define the direction of change. The Secretary-General, UNDP and other actors should propose multiple options to help Member States make well-informed decisions. Consensus was essential, especially in areas related to development. It was regrettable that the current outcome had been reached in the way it had, and her delegation hoped that there would be a return to consensus in future discussions.

98. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that although her delegation valued operational activities for development, it had voted against the draft resolution because it seemed that some delegations had impeded a good faith negotiation when consensus had been within reach.

99. In its present form, the draft resolution contained issues that had posed difficulty for her delegation, including: the intersessional meeting to be held in 2015, at a time when all delegations would be in the midst of the post-2015 development agenda and financing for development processes, and which would not add great value; the unbalanced request to devote more resources to the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation, without specifying where those resources would come from; the unbalanced language on technology transfer; and the fundamental issue of importing language from decisions made by a separate

body and repeating it as General Assembly mandates. Although those were serious issues, her delegation had seen possibility for consensus on all of them; it was regrettable that that had not been possible. As the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications, it was clear that associated costs must be absorbed within the existing budget for the current biennium.

100. **Mr. Vestrheim** (Norway) said that his delegation, too, deeply regretted that consensus could not be reached on the draft resolution. His Government was a strong supporter of South-South and triangular cooperation, and had contributed to such efforts bilaterally and multilaterally. Nevertheless, it had concerns with regard to paragraph 12, concerning funding of the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation: such budgetary matters should be considered and adopted by the UNDP Executive Board and not by the General Assembly. He hoped that Member States would endeavour to reach consensus in the future.

101. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, recalled that South-South cooperation was not a substitute for, but a complement to North-South cooperation, and was a manifestation of solidarity among peoples and countries of the South that contributed to their national well-being, national and collective self-reliance and to the attainment of internationally-agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals. He emphasized that South-South cooperation and its agenda must be determined by countries of the South, and should continue to be guided by the principles of respect for national sovereignty, ownership and independence, equality, non-conditionality, non-interference in domestic affairs and mutual benefit. The Group of 77 and China had approached the negotiations on the draft resolution in good faith; it was a pity that consensus could not be reached because some delegations had not considered it as a priority.

Agenda item 118: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.68)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventieth session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/69/L.68)

102. **The Chair** drew attention to the Committee's tentative programme of work for the seventieth session

of the General Assembly as contained in document [A/C.2/69/L.68](#). He would take it that the Committee wished to approve the draft programme of work.

103. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventieth session of the General Assembly was adopted.*

Conclusion of the work of the Second Committee

104. **Mr. Hanif** (Director, Office for Economic and Social Council Coordination/United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs), speaking on behalf of Mr. Wu Hungbo, Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and Secretary-General for the third International Conference on Financing for Development, said that the Committee had met at the cusp of a number of transformative, high-level events that would take place in 2015 — on financing for development, on a new and universal post-2015 development agenda, and on climate change — that would shape the United Nations policy framework for years to come. The Committee had had a vigorous debate on some of the key elements of the post-2015 development agenda, and, naturally, negotiations on some of the resolutions it had adopted were influenced by a sense of urgency.

105. Member States had collectively struck a careful balance between the need to set new and ambitious milestones for the post-2015 era while ensuring institutional readiness, and ensuring that negotiations for a framework on key events in 2015 should not be pre-empted.

106. Referring to the Secretary-General's synthesis report on the post-2015 sustainable development agenda ([A/69/700](#)), which had provided new impetus for the upcoming post-2015 negotiations, he said that the current structure of the intergovernmental bodies was preparing to accommodate a new universal agenda that would require effective monitoring and review. The Economic and Social Council was extending its expertise to provide cutting-edge and timely advice on statistical indicators.

107. **The Chair** said that the Committee should reflect on the setback of having adopted two crucial resolutions through a recorded vote rather through consensus, especially at a time when discussions were under way on the post-2015 agenda. He would welcome input from Member States on the Committee's working methods, with a view to ensuring

that all Committees could work more efficiently. He noted nevertheless, that the decision to take the votes had been made by Member States, in the Committee's best interest.

108. The Committee had had a very important and strategic session, and had adopted both substantive and procedural resolutions, a two-track approach which was necessary to ensure that deliberations complemented rather than pre-empted the many critical processes under way in the United Nations system for 2015.

109. He drew attention to the side events held on various issues, which had helped to reinvigorate the Committee's work by bringing in new ideas and engaging external partners, ensuring that the Committee's deliberations were rooted in sound, up-to-date analysis and information, and helping to support its work with innovative ideas.

110. The Committee would be highly involved in shaping the post-2015 agenda and deliberating its financing in the coming year, and he was confident that a spirit of cooperation would prevail.

111. **Mr. Poulsen** (Observer for the European Union) said that it was in a spirit of compromise and consensus that the Committee had met to negotiate the issues at hand. While it had failed in some instances to find common ground, the European Union and its member States recognized the efforts made by the Chair and Bureau to that end, requesting delegations to show flexibility and calling for procedural drafts as much as possible in light of the parallel processes to define the post-2015 development agenda. It welcomed the Chair's suggestions on ways to improve the Committee's working methods; the initiative presented earlier in the week addressed many of the challenges highlighted by delegations in the Committee's discussion of working methods at its sixth meeting of the current session, and in previous debates and non-papers. He encouraged the Chair to proceed with the ideas he had developed in dialogue with the Chairs of the other Main Committees.

112. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China were firmly committed to the United Nations system. Improving the system — including through revitalization of the General Assembly or Security Council reform — was very important to strengthening the Organization as a whole. While consensus among the membership made

the system strong, so did taking into account the views of the two-thirds majority of membership.

113. After an exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared that the Committee had completed its work for the sixty-ninth session.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.