



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

105th plenary meeting
 Tuesday, 10 September 2019, 10 a.m.
 New York

Official Records

President: Ms. Espinosa Garcés. (Ecuador)

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

Agenda item 68 (continued)

New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support

(a) New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support

Draft resolution (A/73/L.96/Rev.1)

Draft amendment (A/73/L.112)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the observer of the Observer State of Palestine, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1.

Mr. Shawesh (Palestine): On behalf of the Group of 77 and China, I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the draft resolution entitled "New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support", as contained in document A/73/L.96/Rev.1

The draft resolution highlights the progress made by African countries in the implementation of their various programmes and projects, supported by development partners. This draft resolution on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) provides insight into how far Africa has come since the General Assembly adopted the previous resolution (resolution 72/310) and places the spotlight squarely on

those areas that need support in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

In many ways, it has been a record year in terms of what Africa is achieving. The draft resolution also reaffirms the importance of international support and development. Progress on development and support for development are two vital aspects that ensure the implementation of the ambitious objectives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. They are also linked to the African Union's Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want. We believe it will ultimately empower our continent and its people to end poverty. May I take this opportunity to recall that the African Union's Agenda 2063 sets out the blueprint for development in Africa until the year 2063 and is divided into 10-year implementation plans. NEPAD and the draft resolution speak directly to that development nexus.

During the drafting of the text this year, we saw greater openness to streamlining the text and rendering it more focused. Furthermore, the Group was interested in reflecting the most important updates, including the decision of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the African Union in November 2018 to change the name of the New Partnership Planning and Coordinating Agency to the African Union Development Agency-New Partnership for Africa's Development, and the entry into force, on 30 May, of the agreement on the African Continental Free Trade Area.

A strengthened and positive balance between action by African Governments and the support of the international community was maintained in the draft

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



resolution. In that regard, there is a need to stress the role of the international community in addressing the special development needs of the continent. Instead of support for that important balance, unfortunately, we have seen what can be regarded only as a deliberate attempt to significantly weaken this draft resolution, which was adopted by consensus from 2002 until last year. The Group believes that such an approach is contrary to the sentiment outlined in the 2030 Agenda, which perfectly complemented the African Union's Agenda 2063. The draft resolution seeks to accentuate the coherent and coordinated implementation of both Agendas, which must be viewed within a single context.

I would like to add, however, that we would have liked to see more on the concerns related to official development assistance to Africa, and in particular about Africa's disproportionately low share of global trade volume. Another area that has been highlighted are explicit examples of progress, in particular through collaboration among African countries to promote innovative public-private partnerships to finance infrastructure projects. We hope that this aspect will not be watered-down in future draft resolutions. The Group hopes to see the strengthening of such examples, which prove that Africa as a whole is on the right track.

The Group's fundamental objective on this draft resolution, as with others, is to be able to reach consensus. The Group is gravely concerned that this draft resolution, which aims at enhancing African sustainable development and demonstrates the progress being made in Africa, is being subjected to a vote in the General Assembly. We call on all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the representatives from Benin, Egypt and Sierra Leone for their commendable role as coordinators on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. I would also like to thank the representative from Algeria for his role in facilitating the consultations on the draft resolution and his outstanding outreach to present a well-balanced text to be considered for adoption.

Before I conclude, allow me to make an oral revision of paragraph 46 of the draft resolution. In the sixth line, after "national priorities and plans", the comma should be replaced by a semi-colon. The phrase "and that", before "South-South cooperation", should also be deleted. This oral revision is made to adhere to the exact language of the text submitted under the

silence procedure by the facilitator, the representative from Algeria. The editor lightly modified that part of the text, which was subject to sensitive negotiation and careful drafting.

I also wish to express my thanks to all delegations for their constructive commitment, partnership and participation, as well as to the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa for its support throughout the entire consultation process.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Finland to introduce draft amendment A/73/L.112.

Mr. Tanner (Finland): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States to introduce draft amendment A/73/L.112 to draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, entitled "New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support".

The EU and its member States would like to call for the deletion of operative paragraph 42, to be replaced by the language put forward by the EU and its member States. Throughout the negotiations — in fact, already last year — the EU and its member States, supported by several other delegations, consistently voiced their concerns regarding the use of the formulation "win-win cooperation". Win-win cooperation stands for an approach that focuses on economic gains, often at the expense of the sustainable developmental needs of people and local communities.

In contrast, the EU and its States members truly believe in the vision outlined in the African Union Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want — the vision of an Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law; the vision of an Africa whose development is people-driven, relying on the potential of African people, especially its women and youth; and the vision that all the citizens of Africa will be actively involved in decision-making in all aspects of development, including social, economic, political and environmental ones.

As was outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the needs of partner countries should be placed at the heart of development cooperation policy. As such, we are not in a position to support a model of development cooperation that eschews the universal rules we have all agreed on. We call on all Member States to support the proposed amendment.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, entitled “New Partnership for Africa’s Development: progress in implementation and international support”, as orally corrected.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Ms. Ochalik (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I would like to announce that, since the submission of the draft resolution, in addition to those delegations listed in document A/73/L.96/Rev.1, Turkey has also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/72/L.96/Rev.1.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before we proceed to take action on draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, as orally corrected, in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will first take a decision on draft amendment A/73/L.112. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Brazil, Norway

Draft amendment A/73/L.112 was rejected by 45 votes to 96, with 2 abstentions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We will now take action on draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela

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

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted by 110 votes to 1, with 38 abstentions (resolution 73/335).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Turkey and Costa Rica informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on the observer of the Observer State of Palestine on a point of order.

Mr. Shawesh (Palestine): On behalf of the Group of 77 and China, we would like to know which of our partners called for a vote on the resolution.

The President: In response to the question from the observer of the Observer Palestine, the United States of America requested the vote on the resolution.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Before giving the floor to speakers in explanation of vote after the voting on resolution 73/335, may I remind delegations that explanations are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Tanner (Finland): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania, the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this statement.

At the outset, please allow me to commend the work of Mr. Dewanou Narcisse Houenouvo Tognissou, of the Permanent Mission of Benin, and Mr. Ahmed Mohamed Ismail Elmahs, of the Permanent Mission

of Egypt, as coordinators on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. I would also like to thank Mr. Mehdi Remaoun, of the Permanent Mission of Algeria, for his role as facilitator.

The European Union and its member States have aspired to put African countries at the centre of their development efforts, and we will continue to do so. The European Union and its member States provide more than half of global official development assistance. The European Union and its member States invested more than €85 billion in official development cooperation in 2017, of which a large part went to Africa, in support of projects and initiatives at the national, regional and continental levels. With regard to trade, economic partnership agreements have been designed to promote trade and development. Under the Everything but Arms programme, least developed African countries benefit from enhanced market access. The European External Investment Plan, adopted in September 2017, is also a testament to that. The EU is further enhancing the scale of its support to African countries and its neighbourhood by crowding investments from financial institutions and the private sector through a €1.5 billion guarantee and blending fund, complemented by technical assistance and support aimed at improving the investment climate. In addition to the existing investment facilities of €2.6 billion, this is expected to leverage more than €44 billion in investments by 2020.

All this illustrates how close the cooperation between Africa and Europe is — cooperation that is based on principles such as national ownership, transparency, inclusiveness and respect of human rights, as evidenced by the Joint Africa-Europe Strategy and the African Union-European Union Summits. It is because of those close ties between our neighbouring continents and the great importance we attach to sustainable development in Africa that we are deeply disappointed at the unwillingness of the Group of 77 and China to accommodate our concerns regarding the reference to “win-win cooperation”. The reason that we dissociate ourselves from resolution 73/335 is purely due to the fact that we cannot accept any reference to a concept that ignores internationally agreed principles of development cooperation and undermines the people-centred approach outlined in both the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the African Union’s Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want.

We made our position on its inclusion clear from the beginning of negotiations and proposed

alternative language to build on discussions from last year's negotiation and on several other resolutions. We expressed our disagreement last year through a clear explanation of position (see A/72/PV.113). We nevertheless joined the consensus because we trusted in the Group of 77 and China's constructive cooperation in future. Unfortunately, our concerns were ignored again this year. That is why, for the first time in the history of this resolution, we did not join the consensus. We call on the Group of 77 and China to reconsider its approach and refrain from including "win-win cooperation" in future draft resolutions, starting with the upcoming session of the Second Committee, in order to avoid similar situations in which we may not merely abstain but may have no other choice but to consider voting against draft resolutions. The EU and its member States will always engage constructively in negotiations because we value consensus. However, consensus should strengthen, rather than erode, the universal rules we have all agreed on.

In conclusion, let me reassure the Assembly of our ongoing and unwavering support for the Group of African States. The EU and its member States will continue to work towards enhanced and strengthened support to our African partner countries.

Ms. Nemroff (United States of America): Before I deliver this explanation of vote on behalf of the delegation of the United States, I would first like to extend, on behalf of the United States, condolences to all those in the Bahamas who have lost loved ones and to the communities affected by the devastation of Hurricane Dorian. The United States is supporting the efforts of the Bahamian Government to provide immediate disaster relief. Appropriate agencies and departments are supporting technical assessments of the extent of the damage on the north-west islands with the Government of the Bahamas and coordinating appropriate assistance. We stand hand in hand with our Bahamian friends and partners and have one shared goal, namely, to assist the victims of one of the strongest hurricanes ever recorded. Now is the time to come together and show what partnership means.

With regard to resolution 73/335, on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), which the General Assembly just adopted, throughout negotiations my delegation was candid about our concerns regarding the text. However, regretfully, the United States today had to vote "no" on the resolution, entitled "New Partnership for Africa's Development:

progress in implementation and international support", due to its repeated elevation of the domestic policy rhetoric of a single Member State.

The United States applauds the efforts of the African Union to realize the goals and aspirations of NEPAD. We support NEPAD's overall mission to address the critical challenges that Africa faces, and the United States shares the goal of the African Union (AU) for a stable and prosperous Africa. The United States continues to seek new areas of cooperation and collaboration with the AU through innovative initiatives that strengthen sustainable development as well as trade and investment. The Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative, for example, is the first United States whole-of-government effort to advance global women's economic empowerment. Access Africa's partnership, between the United States Trade and Development Agency and United States industry leaders, supports the development of quality information and secure communication technology infrastructure across sub-Saharan Africa. Prosper Africa and the new Continental Free Trade Area both aim to increase two-way trade and investment between the United States and Africa.

However, we cannot support the resolution with the reference to "win-win cooperation" in paragraph 42. That phrase has been promoted by a single Member State to insert the signature policy agenda of its Head of State into United Nations documents and does not reflect the views of all Member States. No Member should support incorporating language targeted to a domestic political audience into multilateral documents. The United States and the United Nations share a commitment to transparency, good governance, fiscal responsibility and environmental and social safeguards. We recognize the important role the United Nations plays as an effective and neutral platform for pursuing sustainable development. Language that does not support sustainable development for all should not undermine that role.

We must also raise our concerns regarding the language in paragraph 43 suggesting that the United Nations is giving directions to multilateral institutions with respect to Member States trade policies, including the reference to the importance of facilitating the accession of developing countries. It is our view that the United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions

and actions in other forums, including the World Trade Organization. The United Nations is not the appropriate venue for such discussions and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions made by the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on such issues. That includes calls that undermine incentives for innovation, such as technology transfer, that is not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

Next, while the United States acknowledges the fact that the term “illicit financial flows” is increasingly utilized within the United Nations system, we continue to have concerns that the term lacks an agreed international definition. Without an agreed definition, the resolution should be clearer about the specific underlying illegal activities that produce, or contribute to, the generation and movement of illicit finance, such as corruption, fraud and money-laundering, and the need for all Member States to focus more concretely on preventing and combating those crimes at home.

Furthermore, regarding Agenda 2063, while the United States supports the overall goals of that vision and action plan, it contains language that is not aligned with United States policy. As the largest bilateral donor of assistance for women’s health and family planning, we do not recognize abortion as a method of family planning nor do we support abortion in our foreign reproductive-health assistance. The United States cannot accept the terms “sexual and reproductive health” or “sexual and reproductive health-care services”, as they do not enjoy international consensus as to the applied meaning and have accumulated connotations that suggest the promotion of abortion or a right to abortion.

With regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, we addressed our concerns in our general statement delivered on 8 November 2018. We regret that the language of one Member State has kept us from joining consensus on an important text. This is the second year that such language has been included in the text, and we remain disappointed in that outcome. We strongly urge our African friends and partners to work with us going forward to avoid the same result in the future.

Mr. Rozsa (Hungary): I, too, would like to thank the co-facilitators for their commitment. Hungary aligns itself with the explanation of vote made by the

representative of Finland, on behalf of the European Union and its member States, with regard to win-win cooperation. Hungary remains committed to promoting durable peace and sustainable development in Africa.

In that regard, we see that mitigating challenges caused by climate change, supporting development and placing an emphasis on conflict prevention are highly indispensable in areas suffering from recurring conflicts in Africa as well as elsewhere. We support a comprehensive approach to the linkages among development, climate change, the rule of law and peace and security.

However, in relation to the twenty-first preambular paragraph of resolution 73/335, entitled “New Partnership for Africa’s Development: progress in implementation and international support”, we would like to put on record the following statement in our national capacity.

Hungary voted against the endorsement of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (resolution 73/195) by the General Assembly in December 2018, will not take part in the implementation of the Global Compact and cannot accept any reference to it in international documents. We cannot share the view presented in the Global Compact that migration is the best solution for the labour market and demographic problems of countries of destination, nor is it the solution to problems of countries of origin.

Sustainable solutions can be found only if development aims are focused on creating livelihood opportunities for people in their home country. The Hungarian Government therefore prioritizes development projects in the countries of origin that contribute to establishing lasting solutions for those in need and to improving the living conditions, which in their current form often generate mass migration movements. We place an emphasis on strengthening health care, sanitation, water management and education infrastructure in African countries.

Mr. Fox-Drummond Gough (Brazil): Brazil has once again expressed its support for resolution 73/335, on the follow-up to the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, as we have done every year since the resolution was first presented in 2002.

Brazil is a long-standing partner of African countries in the pursuit of their development. In the past 20 years, we have established 6,777 technical cooperation

projects with a wide range of African partners, mainly in the areas of health care, agriculture, fishing and education. There are currently 32 technical cooperation agreements between Brazil and African countries and 78 ongoing projects. A very special interest is devoted to the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries, six of its nine members being African countries.

Our South-South cooperation approach focuses on capacity-building and on developing the immense pool of talent and potential present on the African continent. We seek a horizontal relationship, based on full respect for each country's sovereignty and development priorities, in order to foster autonomy and local solutions to local challenges.

Brazilian foreign direct investment is also very present in support of Africa's development, especially in agriculture, where we want to be part of the agricultural revolution currently taking place, through know-how, machinery and technology transfers.

Brazil therefore deeply regrets the inclusion in the resolution of the twenty-first preambular paragraph, on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.

Unfortunately, the insertion of a preambular paragraph not directly related to the resolution and that does not enjoy the support of all Member States has made consensus impossible.

Brazil disassociated from the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and believes that migration should be addressed by sovereign States on the basis of their right to adopt national policies that address the challenges emerging from their own realities. Brazil therefore disassociates itself from the language in the twenty-first preambular paragraph and considers it not to be a basis for any future negotiation.

Mr. Remaoun (Algeria) (*spoke in Arabic*): I asked for the floor because my country's delegation was the facilitator for resolution 73/335, on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). At the outset, I wish to sincerely thank all delegations that participated in the consultations, which led to the adoption of the resolution before us today.

I have two objectives in taking the floor. First, we are disappointed that a vote was requested. Secondly, the resolution concerning NEPAD has enjoyed consensus since it was first adopted by the General Assembly in 2002. However, last year, for the first time in the

history of the resolution, we saw its adoption through a vote. Today's vote a short while ago is the second one on this extremely important resolution for Africa.

We quite understand the concerns of some delegations with regard to one phrase in the text. Even years before last year, some delegations had concerns but they never requested that the resolution be put to a vote. They used different means to express their specific positions, namely, through their explanations of vote, asking for clarifications, disassociating themselves from certain paragraphs or expressing reservations on paragraphs of concern.

We hope that next year the resolution will once again find consensus, particularly because this is an extremely important resolution for States members of the African Union.

Finally, we urge all development partners and those stakeholders associated with NEPAD, including the private sector and civil society, to broaden their contributions so that we can improve the standard of living of all Africans.

Ms. González Carrillo (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile is not a party to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and therefore its content is not binding on us in any way. Chile therefore dissociates itself from the twenty-first preambular paragraph of resolution 73/335.

Mr. Annakou (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): Despite the importance of resolution 73/335 and of the New Partnership for Africa's Development, on whose content we agree, we were, regrettably, compelled to abstain in the voting due to the twenty-first preambular paragraph, which makes reference to the adoption of Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. We have an absolute reservation with regard to the Compact because it does not take into consideration our concerns as a transit country and equates the responsibilities of transit, origin and destination countries. It also mixes up legal and illegal migration and makes Libya, a victim of such migration, shoulder responsibilities that cannot be discharged.

We ask that this explanation of vote be included in the record of the meeting.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

(b) Causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa

Draft resolution (A/73/L.97/Rev.1)

Draft amendment (A/73/L.113)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the observer of the Observer State of Palestine to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1.

Mr. Shawesh (Palestine): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of 77 (G-77) and China to introduce draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa".

This draft resolution continues to be a key platform for Member States to emphasize the importance of taking concrete steps to address the root causes of conflict in Africa, in particular those related to poverty, weak State institutions, climate change, the illicit trade in, and the proliferation of, arms, especially small arms and light weapons, as well as the illicit exploitation of, and trafficking and trade in, high-value natural resources.

The Group is concerned that, unless those root causes are satisfactorily addressed, Africa will likely be unable to meet the first of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development — to eradicate poverty in all of its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty. We are pleased that the text before us acknowledges the imperative to engender sustainable peace in the continent and underscores the need to strengthen the capacity of Africa and Africans to resolve conflict in a peaceful manner. In that regard, the Group of 77 and China acknowledges positive trends and advances in ensuring durable peace in Africa and would like to emphasize the need to create the conditions required for durable peace as a prerequisite for sustainable development on the continent.

The Group recalls that African countries have taken numerous steps to address peace and security

challenges at national and regional levels, including in dealing with terrorism and instability, by establishing the Joint Force of the Group of Five for the Sahel and the Multinational Joint Task Force, among other security and peace initiatives established and implemented by Africa. The Group is certain that it was the continent's belief that adherence to the rule of law and good governance is necessary to sustaining peace that led the African Union to establish the African Peer Review Mechanism as a unique and innovative framework for promoting good governance, durable peace and sustainable development across the continent.

That commendable effort, despite the limited capacity and resources, underscores African determination to find solutions to its own security challenges. Nevertheless, the need for African partners to enhance their support for African peace and security activities in order to help build the continent's own capacity to prevent and resolve its internal conflicts cannot be overemphasized. In that connection, the G-77 and China encourages the international community and development partners to continue supporting African countries in their efforts to develop their human and institutional capacities, in particular in countries emerging from conflict. We recommend that any assistance in that regard should focus on the means of implementation, in particular financial resources, technology transfer and capacity-building.

Considering that aid remains an important source of development financing for most developing countries, including those in Africa, we encourage developed countries to fulfil their commitments to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, including with regard to official development assistance.

The G-77 and China also avails itself of this opportunity to commend and, indeed, reiterate support for the long-standing and exemplary partnership between the United Nations and Africa, including the existing cooperation between the African Union Peace and Security Council and the United Nations Security Council.

This year's draft resolution brings in new elements to advance Africa's efforts as a crucial element for reducing conflict on the continent. The text underlines the importance of the comprehensive approach to sustaining peace and preventing conflict by addressing its root causes, promoting sustained economic growth, eradicating poverty and promoting

reconciliation and unity at the national level. It also reaffirms the unwavering commitment of Member States to strengthening international cooperation so as to prevent and combat terrorism in all of its forms and manifestations and emphasizes that all acts of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable, regardless of their motivation, wherever, whenever and by whomsoever committed. The draft resolution also notes the consequences of conflict in Africa and underscores the importance of addressing the particular needs of forcibly displaced persons in Africa.

The Group further appreciates that the text reiterates the call for the international community and development partners to fulfil their commitment to take further action to support areas critical to socioeconomic development on the African continent.

The text also underlines the adverse impact of climate change and natural disasters on the development of African Member States. In that context, the draft resolution welcomes the endorsement by African Heads of State and Government of the Inter-Basin Water Transfer initiative, as a pan-African project to restore the Lake Chad basin and encourages relevant United Nations entities and development partners to support such African-oriented initiatives for stabilization, recovery and climate resilience.

It is the view of the G-77 and China that if this important resolution is to be implemented in a manner that would be considered beneficial for the African continent, partners will have to show more flexibility in supporting the request of the international system — a system to be operated in a manner that creates a shared future for all. In this regard, we urge all Member States to advocate for African engagement with the rest of the world to be ensured in a timely, mutually beneficial manner. The principle of win-win cooperation is encapsulated in paragraph 18 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to which all United Nations Member States have subscribed.

In conclusion, I would like to inform the Assembly that certain minor mistakes and omissions were inadvertently made in paragraph 44 of the text before us. Since no one broke silence on the omitted word during the informal and silent procedure, I would like to propose that we reflect the exact wording that was agreed during the informal procedure and that the text should read as follows:

“Notes with concern the tragic plight of children in conflict situations in Africa, in particular the phenomena of the recruitment and use of children by parties to armed conflicts, sexual exploitation and abuse, as well as other violations and abuses committed against children, and in this regard takes note of efforts aimed at promoting education and the right to education and facilitating the continuation of education in situations of armed conflict and protected crises, stresses the need for the protection of children in armed conflicts and for ensuring that the protection and rights of children in armed conflicts are integrated into all peace processes, also stresses the need for post-conflict reintegration, rehabilitation and education, with due regard for the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and encourages the relevant parts of the United Nations system to assist the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict in the implementation of her mandate, including in Africa”.

Let me take this opportunity to extend the G-77 and China’s thanks to the representatives of Nigeria and Djibouti for their commendable role in coordinating the draft resolution on behalf of the G-77 and China. I also wish to thank the representatives of Bangladesh and Zimbabwe for facilitating consultations on the draft resolution and for their outstanding endeavour to present a well-balanced text for consideration and adoption.

The G-77 and China considers it rather unfortunate that the draft resolution, which focuses on providing assistance to African countries in addressing the causes of conflict on the continent, is being subjected to a recorded vote by countries that have most directly benefited from their relations with that continent. Such an affront clearly shows that foreign interests and interference in African affairs are also causes of conflict on the continent.

We seize this opportunity to express appreciation to all the Member States that have shown the necessary flexibility throughout the negotiation process. The Group also expresses its appreciation to the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa for its support in its capacity as secretariat for the draft resolution. We look forward to working closely with all development partners, on the basis of mutual trust and good faith, to implement the key deliverables in the draft resolution.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Finland to introduce, on behalf of the European Union, the draft amendment contained in A/73/L.113.

Mr. Tanner (Finland): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States to introduce this amendment to draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1, on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (A/73/273).

The EU and its member States would like to call for the deletion of the current paragraph 8, to be replaced by the language put forward by the EU and its member States.

Throughout the negotiations — and in fact already last year — the EU and its member States, supported by several other delegations, have consistently voiced their concern about the use of the formulation “win-win cooperation”. “Win-win cooperation” stands for an approach that focuses on economic gains, often at the expense of the sustainable development needs of people and local communities. In contrast, the EU and its member States truly believe in the vision outlined in the Agenda 2063 of the African Union — namely, the vision of “[a]n Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law”; the vision of

“[a]n Africa whose development is people-driven, relying on the potential of African people, especially its women and youth”;

and the vision that

“[a]ll the citizens of Africa will be actively involved in decision-making in all aspects of development, including social, economic, political and environmental”.

As is outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the needs of partner countries should be placed at the heart of development cooperation policy; therefore, we are not in a position to support a model of development cooperation that eschews the universal rules we have all agreed on.

We call on all member States to support the proposed amendment.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The General Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa”, as orally corrected.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Ms. Ochalik (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I would like to announce that, since the submission of the draft resolution and in addition to those delegations listed in document A/73/L.97/Rev.1, Turkey has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before we proceed to take action on draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1, as orally corrected, in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly shall first take a decision on the draft amendment issued as document A/73/L.113. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, 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, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Brazil, Kazakhstan

Draft amendment A/73/L.113 was rejected by 107 votes to 47, with 2 abstentions.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/73/L.96/Rev.1, as orally corrected. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, 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, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea,

Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/73/L.97/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted by 115 votes to 1, with 40 abstentions (resolution 73/336).

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before giving the floor for explanations of vote after the vote, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Tanner (Finland): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania; the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

At the outset, let me express the EU's gratitude to the representatives of Bangladesh and Nigeria as co-facilitators of the process of negotiations on resolution 73/336, on the causes of conflicts and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa, and the State of Palestine as Chair of the Group of 77 (G-77) and China, as well as

colleagues representing groups and Member States that participated in informal consultations. The EU and its member States were engaged constructively throughout the negotiation of this text.

The European Union and its member States have aspired to put African countries at the centre of their development efforts and will continue to do so. The EU and its member States provide more than half of global official development assistance. In 2017, the EU and its member States invested more than €85 billion in official development cooperation, of which a large part went to Africa to support projects and initiatives at the national, regional and continental levels. As regards trade, economic partnership agreements have been designed to promote trade and development. Least-developed African countries benefit from enhanced market access under the Everything but Arms programme. The European External Investment Plan, adopted in September 2017, is also a testament to this.

All this demonstrates how close the cooperation between Africa and Europe is. It is a cooperation based on principles such as national ownership, transparency, inclusiveness and respect for human rights, as evidenced by the Joint Africa-European Union Strategy and the African Union-EU summits.

It is because of these close ties between our neighbouring continents and the great importance we attach to sustainable development in Africa that we are deeply disappointed by the unwillingness of the G-77 and China to accommodate our concerns regarding the reference to “win-win cooperation”. The reason why we abstained in the voting on this resolution was purely due to the fact that we cannot accept any reference to a concept that ignores internationally agreed principles of development cooperation and undermines the people-centred approach outlined in both the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the African Union Agenda 2063. We have made our position on its inclusion clear from the very beginning and proposed alternative language to build on discussions from last year’s negotiation and in several other resolutions. Unfortunately, our concerns have been ignored again this year.

The EU attaches high importance to conflict prevention and underlines the critical need to address the root causes of conflicts. In order for the resolution to accurately reflect all causes of conflict, we wish to highlight climate and environment-related threats. The

interplay between climate, environmental degradation and security is not an abstract, theoretical risk. Failing to build resilience to these challenges already threatens lives, livelihoods and economies across the world.

The EU and its member States have been staunch supporters of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the importance of climate action for security and prosperity. The General Assembly should take into account all risks, including climate and environment-related security risks, particularly if we are to build resilience. The upcoming United Nations Climate Action Summit will be an important opportunity to underline our joint commitment to ambitious climate action. We commend the Secretary-General for his efforts in that regard.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the observer of Palestine on a point of order.

Mr. Shawesh (Palestine): On behalf of the Group of 77 and China, I would like to enquire as to which delegation called for a recorded vote on resolution 73/336.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In response to the question of the representative of the Observer State of Palestine, the United States of America requested a recorded vote on resolution 73/336.

Ms. Nemroff (United States of America): Throughout negotiations, the United States was candid about our issues regarding the text of resolution 73/336. However, regrettably, we had to vote against the resolution, entitled “Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa”, due to its repeated elevation of the domestic policy rhetoric of a single Member State.

The United States applauds the efforts of the African Union (AU) to realize the goals and aspirations of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). We support NEPAD’s overall mission to address the critical challenges that Africa faces and the United States shares the AU goal of a stable and prosperous Africa.

The United States continues to seek new areas of cooperation and collaboration with the AU through innovative initiatives geared towards strengthening sustainable development, as well as trade and investment. The Women’s Global Development and

Prosperity Initiative, for example, is the first whole-of-Government effort to advance global women's economic empowerment. The Access Africa partnership between the United States Trade and Development Agency and United States industry leaders supports the development of quality information and secure communication technology infrastructure across sub-Saharan Africa. Prosper Africa and the new continental free trade area both aim to increase two-way trade and investment between the United States and Africa.

However, we cannot support the resolution with the reference to "win-win cooperation" in paragraph 8. This phrase has been promoted by a single Member State to insert the signature policy agenda of its Head of State into United Nations documents and does not reflect the views of all Member States.

No Member should support incorporating language to target a domestic political audience into multilateral documents. The United States and the United Nations share a commitment to transparency, good government, respect for human rights, accountability, fiscal responsibility and environmental and social safeguards. We recognize the important role that the United Nations plays as an effective and neutral platform for pursuing sustainable development, and language that does not support sustainable development for all should not undermine that role.

With regard to Agenda 2063, while the United States supports the overall goals of that vision and action plan, it contains language promoting abortion that is not aligned with United States policy. Over the years and among many United Nations agencies, the phrases "sexual and reproductive health", "health-care services" and "health services" have acquired connotations that promote abortion and attempt to create a claimed right to abortion. We do not accept these terms, as they often encompass abortion as a method of planning. The United States is a stalwart defender and funder of programmes to improve the health, life, dignity and well-being of women and children, and will never waver on that support.

We regret that the language of one State Member has kept us from joining the consensus on an important text. This is the second year that this language has been included in the text, and we remain disappointed in this outcome. We strongly urge our African friends and partners to work with us going forward to avoid the same result in the future.

Mr. Rozsa (Hungary): I would like to thank the co-facilitators once again for their commitment.

Hungary aligns itself with the explanation of vote delivered by the representative of Finland on behalf of the European Union, concerning win-win cooperation. Hungary remains committed to promoting durable peace and sustainable development in Africa. In that regard, we see that mitigating challenges caused by climate change, supporting development and placing emphasis on conflict prevention are highly indispensable in areas suffering from recurring conflicts in Africa and elsewhere. We support the comprehensive approach to the linkages connecting development, climate change, the rule of law and peace and security.

Additionally, with regard to paragraph 19 of resolution 73/336, "Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa", we would like to make the following statement in our national capacity.

Hungary voted against resolution 73/195, on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, in December 2018, will not take part in the implementation of the Compact and cannot accept any reference to it in international documents. We cannot share the view presented in the Compact that migration is the best solution to the labour market and demographic problems of countries of destination or that it is the solution to the problems of countries of origin.

Sustainable solutions can be found only if development aims are concentrated on creating livelihood opportunities for people in their home country. The Hungarian Government is therefore prioritizing development projects in countries of origin, which can contribute to establishing lasting solutions for those in need and improving the living conditions, which, in their current form, often generate movements of mass migration. We are placing emphasis on building health-care, sanitation, water-management and education infrastructure in African countries.

Mr. Fox-Drummond Gough (Brazil): Once again, Brazil expressed its support for the resolution on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa, as it has done since the very first time the annual resolution was presented in 1998.

Without repeating the facts and figures of our intervention after the vote on resolution 73/335, on the New Partnership for Africa's Development, allow me to reaffirm that our relation with African partners and our commitment to African development constitute a long-standing priority of Brazilian foreign policy, speaking also to how Brazilian society perceives its national identity and its place in the world.

In a growing number of debates at the United Nations, we are finding overwhelming support for an important innovation in our collective contribution to peace efforts in Africa — a shift from a crisis-oriented approach to more continuous engagement in longer-term efforts to build lasting peace. The increasing attention accorded to resolution 73/336 is a reflection of that trend.

We are confident that the new focus on the long-term can prove instrumental to really contributing to the definitive silencing of the guns in Africa. We strongly encourage all Member States and the relevant United Nations agencies to redouble their efforts in assisting African countries in implementing their own priorities in terms of peace and development.

Brazil therefore regrets the addition of language on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration — an initiative that is not directly related to the resolution and that does not enjoy the consensual support of all Member States. Brazil does not adhere to the Global Compact and reiterates its position that migration issues should be addressed by individual Member States under their sovereign prerogatives to rule over their own territories and adopt policies that speak for their unique national realities and priorities. Brazil therefore disassociates itself from the language in paragraph 19 and does not consider it as the basis for future negotiations on this subject.

Mr. Nakano (Japan): I would like to deliver an explanation of vote on resolution 73/335, entitled “New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support”, and resolution 73/336, “Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa”.

At the outset, Japan would like to thank the delegations of Algeria and Bangladesh in their capacity as co-facilitators of the negotiations; Nigeria and Benin

in their capacity as co-facilitators of the Group of 77 and China; and colleagues representing the Group's member States that participated in the informal consultations.

Japan aligns itself with the explanations of vote delivered by the representative of the United States and the representative of Finland, on behalf of the European Union, with regard to the references to “win-win' cooperation”, in paragraph 42 of resolution 73/335, and to “the spirit of win-win cooperation and to create a shared future”, in paragraph 8 of resolution 73/336. Japan regrets that the amendment proposal of the European Union was not adopted.

As reiterated at the seventh Tokyo International Conference on African Development held last month, Japan reaffirms its commitment to living up to its ambitions and responsibilities towards future generations of African countries through its full support for the African Union Agenda 2063, as well as all peace and stability efforts on the continent.

Ms. González Carrillo (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile does not subscribe to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration as its language precludes debate. For that reason, Chile disassociates itself from paragraph 19 of resolution 73/336.

Mr. Annakou (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): Despite the importance of resolution 73/336, on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa, and the fact that we agree with most of its provisions, we were regrettably compelled to abstain in the voting, owing to paragraph 19, which welcomes the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.

My country, Libya, has reservations concerning the entire Compact, which conflates legal and illegal migration and fails to properly define the two issues. It also ascribes equal responsibilities to countries of origin, transit and destination, and makes my country, which is a victim of large illegal migration flows, shoulder responsibilities that it cannot discharge.

Mr. Xu Zhongsheng (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): In 2015, the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which was a major commitment on the part of world leaders to standing as one behind multilateralism and to supporting the status of the United Nations and the role it plays in firmly advancing humankind's course of sustainable development. The

2030 Agenda sounds a clarion call, in no uncertain terms, that all parties work together through win-win cooperation so that the benefits of development can accrue to all countries in all parts of the world.

Pursuing win-win cooperation is a consensus reached and a solemn pledge made by Member States in the 2030 Agenda. It is also an important cornerstone for the effort to enable all parties to close development gaps and help developing countries, in particular African countries and countries in special situations, to achieve development and realize the Sustainable Development Goals. It is also a basic principle guiding the process.

At present, unilateralism and protectionism are on the rise around the world and the rules and institutions of multilateralism are under attack, much to the detriment of the interests of some countries engaged in international cooperation and trade. That fact is a case in point. It shows us the importance and value of upholding the concept of win-win cooperation.

We find it unacceptable that a small minority of countries deliberately misrepresents the concept of win-win cooperation and goes so far as to water down and undermine it under all manner of pretexts. It is a total departure from the 2030 Agenda and other international consensus. Who is placing their national interests above international interests? The answer is self-evident. In time, history will prove that not only will that practice fail to promote multilateralism and international cooperation, but will also harm their own interests.

China firmly supports the New Partnership for Africa's Development, the realization of durable peace, development and prosperity on the African continent, and the adoption of resolutions 73/335 and 73/336 by consensus in the General Assembly. We deeply regret that recorded votes were requested on them.

China has always been supportive of African countries in developing new partnerships with all parties. We have consistently adhered to the principles of sincerity, practical results, affinity and good faith and the concept of upholding the greater good, while pursuing shared interests. China has stood in solidarity and unity of purpose with African countries to pull together and forge ahead, hand in hand.

In September 2018, China and African countries jointly held the Beijing Summit of the Forum on the China-Africa Cooperation. At the Summit, whose

theme was "China and Africa: Toward an Even Stronger Community with a Shared Future through Win-Win Cooperation", Chinese and African leaders held in-depth exchanges, consulted with each other on major cooperation plans and decided to jointly implement eight major actions in the areas of the promotion of industry, infrastructure, connectivity, trade facilitation, green development, capacity-building, health care, cultural and people-to-people exchange, and peace and security. They agreed to bring the Belt and Road Initiative in close alignment with the 2030 Agenda and the Agenda 2063 of the African Union and the national development strategies of African countries, thereby injecting a new impetus into win-win cooperation and shared development between China and Africa.

At the Beijing Summit, President Xi Jinping said that China respects, loves and supports Africa. That is our long-standing position and sentiment. We are consistently committed to the five noes: no interference in African countries' pursuit of development paths that cater to their national realities; no interference in the internal affairs of African countries; no imposition of our will on African countries; no attachment of political strings to assistance to Africa; and no seeking of political self-interest in investment and financing cooperation with Africa. It is China's hope that other countries will also follow the principle of the five noes in their interaction with Africa. They should support African countries in following the development paths of their choice, which cater to their national realities and priorities, while achieving autonomous development and help the people of Africa lead a happy and better life.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 68 and agenda item 68, as a whole?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 114

Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations

Note by the Secretary-General (A/73/300)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): As members are aware, in accordance with the provisions of Article 12,

paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and with the consent of the Security Council, the Secretary-General is mandated to notify the General Assembly of matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security that are being dealt with by the Security Council and of matters with which the Council has ceased to deal.

In that connection, the General Assembly has before it a note by the Secretary-General circulated in document A/73/300. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the note by the Secretary-General contained in document A/73/300?

It was so decided.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 114?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 31

Report of the Security Council

Report of the Security Council (A/73/2)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the President of the Security Council, His Excellency Mr. Vassily Nebenzia, to introduce the report of the Security Council.

Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation), President of the Security Council: Let me begin by thanking you, Madam President, on behalf of all members of the Security Council, for your service as President of the General Assembly at its seventy-third session and for arranging today's meeting.

As President of the Security Council for the month of September, Russia has the honour to introduce the annual report of the Council (A/73/2), which covers the period from 1 January to 31 December 2018.

The Charter of the United Nations entrusts the Security Council with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Over the past year, with the support of the United Nations membership, the Security Council has sought to discharge its responsibilities actively, while urging the peaceful resolution of conflicts and undertaking a series of peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities all over the world.

In keeping with recent trends, the activity of the Security Council increased during the reporting period. During the period under review, the Council held 288 formal meetings, of which 275 were public. The Council adopted 54 resolutions and 21 presidential statements and issued 87 statements to the press. During the reporting period, the Council conducted three missions.

In 2018 the Council continued to focus on a number of serious unresolved conflicts, in particular in the Middle East and Africa. The impact of those conflicts on civilians was severe. Large-scale humanitarian crises persisted, and in some cases worsened, and large flows of displaced people, within and across borders, continued as a result of conflict. Divisions in the Council prevented it from taking effective action on some key conflicts. However, there were also several positive developments in 2018.

In Africa, countries of the Horn of Africa were able to make progress in resolving long-standing bilateral disputes, the United Nations Mission in Liberia concluded its work, and a peace agreement was signed in South Sudan. In Asia, the level of tension on the Korean peninsula decreased as a result of dialogue between the parties. In the Middle East, the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, also known as Da'esh, was driven out of Iraq and lost control of most of the territory that it held in the Syrian Arab Republic. Progress was made in the peace process in Colombia, and elections in various countries, including Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq and Lebanon, made important contributions to political stability.

The Council remained convinced of the vital role that the United Nations and the multilateral system should play in preventing and resolving conflicts on its agenda, as set out by all Council members during an open debate on the subject in November (see S/PV.8395). The Council took advantage of a wide range of tools to that end, including mediation, the deployment of peacekeeping and special political missions, and the use of targeted sanctions and arms embargoes. Some Council members consistently underlined the importance of taking action at every stage in the conflict cycle and focusing on sustaining peace. Council members also stressed the need to respect international law and maintain the international non-proliferation regime.

Throughout 2018, Council members continued to focus on the implementation of the Council's thematic resolutions in the context of the conflicts on its agenda, including the need to consider the role of women in preventing and resolving conflict. At the end of 2018, almost 90,000 peacekeepers were deployed in 14 missions in support of Council mandates. A total of 98 peacekeepers were killed in 2018. Council members note with appreciation the contribution of United Nations peacekeepers to supporting international peace and security and pay tribute to the 98 peacekeepers who sacrificed their lives in 2018.

In conclusion, consistent with usual practice, the introduction to the report was prepared by the delegation of the United Kingdom, which held the presidency of the Security Council in August 2018. Members of the Council also contributed to the preparation of the report. I extend thanks to the Secretariat for compiling the report and to all those involved in producing it. I look forward to this morning's discussion of the report by Member States and will convey the views of members of the General Assembly to my colleagues in the Security Council.

Mr. Favre (Switzerland): I am pleased to take the floor on behalf of members of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) group, namely, Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, Ireland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Sweden, Uruguay and my own country, Switzerland. We welcome the annual report (A/73/2) of the Security Council to the General Assembly and thank the Russian presidency of the Council for the month of September for presenting the report to us today, as well as the delegation of the United Kingdom for leading the drafting process of the report's introduction.

The ACT group promotes a more transparent and efficient United Nations. Achieving adequate interaction between the Security Council and the General Assembly and greater transparency and accountability regarding the work of the Security Council towards the wider United Nations membership is a priority of the group. The Security Council discharges its mandate on behalf of the United Nations membership, and is therefore accountable to the Assembly. The submission of the annual report of the Security Council and its subsequent transmission to the General Assembly is an obligation of the Council vis-à-vis the General Assembly under

Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations. The consideration of the annual report by the General Assembly is an equally important exercise for ensuring adequate transparency and accountability by offering a thorough overview of the Council's activity during the year under review and allowing Member States to comment on the activities of the Council.

We are disappointed that the process leading to the consideration of the 2018 annual report of the Council by the General Assembly has fallen short of those requirements and objectives. The report was formally adopted by the Council on 20 August (see S/PV.8597), and today's debate is taking place during the very last days of the current session of the General Assembly, when Member States are already focused on the preparation of the upcoming session. It is the third consecutive year that such a situation has arisen. We are deeply troubled about the signals that this unfortunate situation sends regarding how seriously the Security Council is taking its obligations towards the General Assembly. We would also like to recall that the Security Council has committed itself through several presidential notes, including the most recent note S/2017/507, to clear deadlines to ensure that the annual report is presented during the spring of the session following the reporting year. Failing to respect those modalities weakens the ability of the wider United Nations membership to engage in an adequate manner in the discussion of the report. It risks jeopardizing the progress achieved over the years towards making this process more transparent and effective.

Ensuring a substantive discussion in the General Assembly on the annual report of the Security Council is a priority for our group. We congratulate delegations for their active and substantive participation today. This is a clear sign that, in spite of the challenges, the membership considers the report and its discussion as a key driver to guarantee adequate interaction among relevant United Nations bodies on peace and security matters. In that respect, the ACT group encourages the Russian presidency to report back to the Security Council on the comments and suggestions made during this debate, in line with paragraph 138 of note 507, and to make available a summary of the discussions today in the General Assembly and of the briefing of the Security Council.

Looking ahead to 2020, we call on the Security Council to explore ways of strengthening the process through rigorous adherence to the time frame agreed to

by the Council in note 507, starting with the completion of a draft introduction of the 2019 annual report, under the lead of the Russian Federation, by 31 January 2020. We encourage the Russian Federation and the Security Council members in charge of future annual reports to make full use of the consultative process envisaged in paragraph 129 of note 507. We also request that the President of the General Assembly ensure that the forthcoming meeting on the 2019 annual report of the Security Council be held by June 2020, at the latest, and not rushed to the General Assembly in late summer.

(spoke in French)

Allow me now to make a statement in my national capacity.

Switzerland welcomes today's debate on the annual report of the Security Council for 2018 and the possibility it provides to all members of the General Assembly to participate in the work of the Council in accordance with the obligations enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. In addition to the procedural concerns highlighted in the statement that I delivered earlier on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group, I would like to speak on three issues related to the 2018 annual report that are of particular importance to Switzerland.

First, in 2018, the sustaining peace agenda was further consolidated, including through the high-level briefings held in April and December, the adoption by the General Assembly and the Security Council of a new set of twin resolutions — resolution 72/276 and resolution 2413 (2018), respectively — as well as several presidential statements. In that regard, Switzerland especially welcomes the reiteration that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

Switzerland welcomes the fact that the Council has taken into account human rights parameters and indicators in its monitoring of country situations and in the tailoring of its response, for example, in South Sudan. With respect to Yemen, the Council was able to swiftly react and endorse the Stockholm Agreement, with resolution 2451 (2018), and therefore fulfilled its commitment to enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in supporting conflict resolution in practical terms. In other situations, however, the Council regrettably failed to take action, such as in the case of Syria. The Council did not adopt resolutions that would have established mechanisms to investigate

reports on the use of chemical weapons in the town of Douma in April 2018 and allocate responsibility.

Secondly, Switzerland also welcomes the significant developments in the Council's protection of civilians agenda in 2018. The unanimous adoption of resolution 2417 (2018), on 24 May 2018, which addresses the link between armed conflict and violence and conflict-induced food insecurity and the threat of famine, is of crucial importance. Switzerland, in its role as Chair of the Group of Friends on the Protection of Civilians, together with the Netherlands, helped to pave the way the adoption of that resolution. The majority of the largest food crises in the world are conflict related; the issue unfortunately remains highly relevant.

The humanitarian situation, including food security for civilians and respect of international humanitarian law, in contexts such as Yemen and South Sudan, are deeply worrisome and must be further addressed by the Council as a matter of priority. With respect to its commitment to the protection of civilians, Switzerland submitted a proposal to amend the Rome Statute to the Secretariat last week to designate as a war crime the starvation of civilians used as a method of warfare, punishable before the International Criminal Court, when committed in non-international armed conflicts.

Thirdly, Switzerland welcomes the ongoing efforts to improve some aspects of the working methods of the Council and to contribute to the effectiveness and transparency of its work in 2018. In addition to today's discussion, the now annually held open debate on the working methods of the Council and wrap-up sessions of its presidencies, even if they are not yet a regular fixture, are essential tools to enhance the Council's interaction with the wider United Nations membership.

However, the current difficult discussions within the framework of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions have shown that challenges remain to be overcome. Switzerland commends Kuwait and the other elected members for the positive role that they have played and will continue to support their progress constructively. One of our priorities is to strengthen due process procedures with regard to the Council's sanctions regime, on which we can build upon the positive experiences with the Ombudsperson mechanism, established 10 years ago.

Lastly, in line with the ACT group statement that I had the honour of reading out earlier, Switzerland also

looks forward to the 2019 annual process on the report of the Security Council being marked by rigorous adherence to the time frame agreed to in the note by the President of the Security Council of 2017 (S/2017/507).

Mr. Srivihok (Thailand): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the 10 members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), namely, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam and my own country, Thailand.

The Security Council plays an important role in maintaining international peace and security on behalf of all the States Members of the United Nations, as per Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. The annual report of the Security Council (A/73/2) is therefore an important tool for the Council to uphold its accountability and transparency towards the wider membership by keeping them informed of its activities. In that regard, ASEAN welcomes the report of the Security Council for 2018. We also note that there were efforts to improve the narrative of the introduction of the report, following the issuance of the note by the President of the Security Council of August 2017 (S/2017/507).

The consideration of the Council's report by the General Assembly is a critical exercise. It is a fundamental aspect of the relationship between the Security Council and the wider membership. It is an opportunity for all Member States to examine and comment on the work of one of the United Nations most important organs. If done in a meaningful fashion, the debate on the Council's report could help strengthen the credibility of the Security Council and the effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole.

The preparation of the report took much longer than required by note 507. Its late adoption pushed the General Assembly to consider it at the very end of this session, which is a late stage. For the third year in a row, we find ourselves discussing the report in September, just weeks before the closure of the session, although the period covered by the report is now from 1 January to 31 December, according to note by the President of the Security Council dated 10 December 2015 (S/2015/944). It is not credible that an eight- or nine-month gap exists for the General Assembly to discuss the work of the Council. More can be done in terms of timeliness in order to preserve the importance of that report and of

the process. In that vein, ASEAN would like to make the following suggestions to improve our consideration of the report.

First, it is important that the Security Council adhere to the important element of timeliness in note 507, which states that the submission of the report should take place no later than in the spring. For the sake of clarity, spring can be defined as no later than the month of April, which could be made clearer in note 507.

Secondly, in order to have a meaningful and substantive debate, Member States should be given sufficient time to carefully study the report. We note that the report was initially due to be considered by the General Assembly on 30 August, barely a week and a half after the publication of the report. We appreciate that more time was ultimately given and would appreciate a window of at least three weeks between the adoption of the report and the debate on it in future. That would ensure sufficient time to prepare substantively for the debate. An informal briefing on the report for the broader membership prior to its adoption would also be a valuable complement to the process.

Thirdly, we see the value of incorporating into the report more regular feedback and assessments on the work of the Council. The monthly wrap-up sessions at the end of each Security Council presidency offer a useful platform in that regard.

It is imperative that the Security Council maintain the highest standards of accountability and transparency. It is ASEAN's hope that the Security Council and the wider membership continue to ensure meaningful participation in this debate, and that we collectively take steps to strengthen the functioning of the Council.

Mr. Yelchenko (Ukraine): I thank you, Madam President, for having convened this meeting. We would first like to express our appreciation to Ms. Karen Pierce, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, and her team for preparing the introduction to the Security Council report for 2018 (A/73/2). We also thank the Secretariat for producing the factual part of the annual report of the Security Council.

The report is an excellent reference source for all the documents that were sent to and from the Security Council, as well as records of the meetings held throughout the year. To have all that information

compiled in one document is very useful. On the other hand, the report gives very limited insight into the substantive nature of the Council's actual work. For example, an inexperienced or casual reader will see what was discussed and when and which documents were adopted but questions as to why or how it happened will remain unanswered.

Does the report give an idea of what is happening on the ground? Does it provide a context as to why a specific issue is brought to the attention of the Security Council? Does it provide any explanation as to why a specific document is adopted or rejected? Those are the questions against which the value of the report should also be measured.

We all know that there are agenda items that the Security Council discusses on a regular basis. There are also issues about which Council members feel particularly strongly. They therefore initiate the respective discussions, usually during the month of their presidency. In addition, there are requests for urgent or unplanned meetings in response to concrete developments in a specific country or a region. Can one deduce from the report which meeting is which? That is hardly so, although the distinction may be quite important and quite telling.

We recognize the effort to give a more analytical and substantive character to the introductory part. For example, it is useful to have specific references to resolutions that were not unanimously adopted. In our opinion, in such cases it would be even more useful to have a short explanation as to which aspects of the proposed documents were viewed differently by the Council members.

Then there is the issue of draft resolutions that were not adopted due to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council or a failure to obtain nine votes in favour. Apparently, such cases deserve more attention than just a mere mentioning of voting outcomes without any details about the substance of issues.

What about procedural votes? Their holding indicates that Council members attach an extremely significant importance to the issue at hand. Despite the fact that there were four instances in 2018 when a procedural vote was called for, in the introduction we read about only one such case. In our view, that is rather a glaring omission.

Finally, my delegation considers as utterly inadequate the presentation in the report the introduction of the consideration by the Council of the issue of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, which formally falls under the agenda item "Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Council (S/2014/136) and the letter dated 13 April 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Council (S/2014/264)".

What is the value in giving an account of the substance of presidential statement S/PRST/2018/12, while neglecting to mention at least how many open meetings were held during the year — the number is four, in case Members are wondering — as well as who initiated respective discussions and why. After all, there is no established reporting cycle or agreed schedule for such meetings, which means that they are called for only when something extraordinary happens.

How is it that the meeting at which the most serious escalation of the situation was discussed, held on 26 November 2018, following an armed attack by the Russian Navy in international waters on Ukraine's three navy vessels, with their subsequent seizure and the illegal detention of their crews, is not to be found, even in the footnotes to the introduction?

The answer is rather obvious given the fact that the introduction has to be agreed by consensus and that, for a well-known permanent member of the Council, it has long been a matter of policy to suppress, cover up and distort publicly important information.

Still quite fresh from its Council membership in 2016-2017, Ukraine recognizes that all the above-mentioned shortcomings are not for lack of trying on the part of the overwhelming majority of Council members, including permanent ones, but rather the outcome of institutional deficiencies in the Council's composition and established working methods. In that regard, we encourage Council members to continue to explore new ways and approaches in order to further improve the preparation of the annual report to the General Assembly.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): The importance of today's debate can hardly be overstated. The annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly (A/73/2) is a key mechanism of accountability established by the Charter of the United Nations to

govern the relationship between two Charter organs with carefully crafted mandates and clear provisions for cooperation. The fact that we hold this debate literally at the last possible moment, after only little time to review the report itself, submitted late for the third year in a row, is not a good sign. It illustrates disrespect by the Security Council for its own mandate, its working methods and, most importantly, the Assembly. Like other speakers, we call on the Security Council to take its responsibility seriously and to submit its report to the General Assembly no later than April. We also call on the President of the General Assembly to set a date for the report's consideration that is conducive to the broadest participation.

The Security Council discharges its mandate on behalf of the United Nations membership and is therefore accountable to the Assembly. We elect States to the Council and expect them to make a difference there. We applaud the efforts of Kuwait and the other elected members to improve conditions in that regard, for example by establishing a system of co-penholdership and fair burden-sharing in the chairing of committees. The elected members have created a positive momentum and initiated healthy discussions on better working methods within the Security Council. They can be assured to represent the collective will of the membership, as numerous past debates on working methods have shown. At the same time, we are disappointed by the lack of response from the permanent members, who should share the goal of making the Council a more effective body but are taking a collective defensive stance on working methods issues.

The present lack of accountability is compounded by the fact that the Council falls significantly short of its Charter mandate to maintain international peace and security, with the most severe consequences for the people whom it is supposed to protect. The annual report is illustrative mainly not in what it says but in what it leaves out. The Council has continued its long failure to address the situation in Syria; accountability is still not part and parcel of the political process nominally led by the United Nations. There was no progress towards a referral to the International Criminal Court, called for by so many States and by the Secretary-General. The International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed

in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011 (IIIM) continues to be a lone beacon of hope for justice among the important steps that individual States have taken to prosecute war criminals.

On Myanmar, the Council, for the most part, even refused to discuss the situation, let alone take measures to address and remedy the grave injustice against the Rohingya people.

On Yemen, a fragile political process has emerged — one is tempted to say, in spite of Security Council procrastination. Meaningful and decisive support for peace efforts would be very much needed to solidify political progress.

With regard to Libya, the Council is unable to end the violence and increasingly lets outside influence determine the country's fate, undermining efforts to unify the country under joint institutions and prospects for a better future.

In the Sudan, Liechtenstein welcomes the recently signed peace agreement. However, the Security Council risks to let the best opportunity pass to ensure justice for the victims in Darfur — justice that the Council itself has mandated the International Criminal Court to provide yet has consistently failed to support the Court's many efforts to that effect.

While the Secretary-General and other authoritative voices, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, report record numbers of violations of international humanitarian law and failures to protect civilians, we see today that the Security Council has very little to report on what it has done to address and reverse those trends. Most telling are the many instances where the Council disregards ongoing and serious violations of its own resolutions, be it on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran or the Middle East.

Those shortcomings are systemic, to some extent, and therefore constitute an underlying risk to the United Nations as a whole, one the Assembly has a responsibility to address. The Assembly needs to reaffirm its role, which is narrow in practice, but not by law. The IIIM is an important case in point for what the General Assembly can achieve when the Security Council fails to do its work.

The use of the veto significantly increased over the past decade. Its paralysing effect of anticipatory obedience has had enormous negative consequences

on the performance of the Security Council. The veto power must be checked by the membership, in particular as it is increasingly used in violation of the very purposes and principles of the Charter. The Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group code of conduct, now supported by 119 States — and we would like to thank Armenia for its accession just yesterday — is an important commitment by a large majority of Member States against the abuse of the veto in cases of mass atrocity crimes.

Mr. Yelchenko (Ukraine), Vice-President, took the Chair.

We need to do more work on the veto. Liechtenstein is of the view that the General Assembly should discuss any use of the veto in a formal meeting, as a measure of accountability. Such a discussion should take place without prejudice to any possible outcome and independently of the substance of the draft resolution subject to a veto. The Council should be invited to contribute to the discussion in the General Assembly with a special report, in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter. We invite all interested delegations to work with us to create the basis for such a discussion here in the Assembly in the coming weeks. We consider it an important contribution to strengthening the United Nations as the most important embodiment of inclusive multilateralism.

An overwhelming majority of States wants the United Nations to succeed in its mission to bring peace and security, sustainable development and fundamental rights and freedoms to the peoples. We will continue to help strengthen the voice of that majority. The Charter provides ample ground, and the Security Council report before us provides ample reason to do that.

Mr. Gafoor (Singapore): I wish to associate myself with the statement made by the Ambassador of Thailand on behalf of the 10 member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

I also thank the President of the Security Council, the Ambassador of the Russian Federation, for presenting the report of the Security Council (A/73/2) on behalf of all Council members.

Let me begin by saying that this plenary meeting is one of the most important meetings on the calendar of the General Assembly. Today members of the General Assembly have the very important responsibility of considering the annual report of the Council.

As we consider the annual report, a basic question arises — why is the General Assembly considering the annual report of the Security Council? The short answer is that the annual report is a requirement of the Charter of the United Nations. It is, in fact, the Security Council's only clear obligation to the General Assembly under the Charter. That obligation is highlighted in not just one, but two, Articles — 15 and 24. Let me cite Article 15, paragraph 1, which states,

“The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.”

In addition, Article 24, paragraph 3, states,

“The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.”

In other words, the submission and consideration of the annual report is about fulfilling a Charter responsibility. If we are serious about the Charter of the United Nations, then it is important that every Member State carefully consider the report of the Security Council and give its views on the activities of the Council. I am therefore very pleased to see that many Member States are inscribed in the list of speakers for today's debate.

At the root of today's debate is a more fundamental question — what is the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council? In considering the roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council, we have to look at Article 24 in its entirety. Paragraph 1 of Article 24 states,

“In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.”

It is clear from Article 24 that the Security Council acts on behalf of all Members. And because the Security Council acts on behalf of all Members, it has a corresponding duty and responsibility to report back to the General Assembly. From that perspective, the meeting today is fundamentally an exercise in

accountability, transparency and legitimacy. Let me elaborate on what I mean by transparency, accountability and legitimacy.

The annual report is one of the means of bringing greater transparency to the work of the Security Council. The report catalogues all the documents and decisions of the Security Council. That makes it a useful reference document for all Members. More important, the consideration of the annual report allows the General Assembly to hold the Security Council accountable for its actions, or lack of actions. Through an open discussion here in the General Assembly, the Security Council gains legitimacy for its work and for its role as an important organ of the United Nations. That is the reason that the debate today is fundamentally an exercise in accountability, transparency and legitimacy with regard to the Security Council.

I have carefully read the annual report, which outlines the activities of the Security Council for the period 1 January to 31 December 2018. I also listened carefully to the report presented by the President of the Council earlier this morning. As members of the General Assembly, each one of us has the duty to carefully scrutinize the Council's report and ask ourselves some basic questions. Did the Security Council fulfil our expectations? Did the Security Council act swiftly to resolve international crises, or was the Security Council too paralysed by politics to respond to international issues? How many vetoes were cast by the permanent members, and over what issues? How did the elected members discharge their responsibilities in the Council? Those are the kind of questions that we need to ask ourselves and members of the Council as we consider the annual report.

In considering the annual report, it is also important to keep in mind the importance of note S/2017/507, issued by the President of the Council on 30 August 2017. In the note, the members of the Council expressed their commitment to implementing a set of measures to enhance the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work. Paragraph 125 states,

“[t]he Security Council will take the necessary action to ensure the timely submission of its report to the General Assembly”.

Paragraph 132 states,

“The Secretariat should submit the draft report to the members of the Council no later

than 15 March, immediately following the period covered by the report, so that it may be discussed and thereafter adopted by the Council in time for consideration by the General Assembly in the spring of that calendar year.”

I wish to make several observations about both the content of the report and the process of considering the report here in the General Assembly.

First, we are disappointed. We are disappointed that the annual report was submitted very late. In that sense, we share and echo the earlier expressions of disappointment made by other delegations. The report covers the period January to December 2018, but comes eight months after the period under review. If the annual report comes after eight months, can we really say it is timely? Why does it take eight months to prepare the annual report? We did some research, my delegation looked at previous reports, and we note that, in the period from 1993 to 2015, the average time to produce the annual report was four months. Why does it take eight months now when it previously took only four months? From our point of view, there is definitely room for improvement by Council members in terms of the timely submission of the annual report to the General Assembly.

Secondly, we are very disappointed. We are very disappointed that the Security Council has not made an effort to respect the timeline in note 507, which clearly says that the annual report should be adopted by the Council in time for consideration by the General Assembly “in the spring of that calendar year”. We are well past spring, we are well past summer and are into autumn, the leaves are falling. That raises a related question. Did the Secretariat submit the draft report to the Council by March 15, as required under note 507? If not, why not? I would like that specific question answered by the Secretariat at some point.

Thirdly, we note that it has become a trend in the past few years for the annual report to be submitted late and rushed to the General Assembly in late August or early September. That does not allow for proper debate and discussion of the report in the General Assembly. It is not appropriate to rush through an important report such as this during the past few days of the session. In particular, late August is not suitable, as many mission staff are away from New York. Likewise, early September is a busy period for missions, because we are all deep in preparation for the high-level week. We

therefore have to take a serious look at changing the timeline for the consideration of the annual report by the General Assembly.

Fourthly, I would like to comment on the monthly assessments referred to on page 78 of the annual report. The issue of monthly assessment is also addressed in paragraph 136 of note 507. We are disappointed to note that in 2018 seven members of the Security Council did not submit their monthly assessment of their presidency. Why is that so? In previous years all Council members submitted their monthly assessment. However, we note that in recent years more and more of them are not submitting their monthly assessment. We would like to know why that is the case. Is it the case that Council members think that members of the General Assembly do not consider their monthly assessment reports to be important? On the contrary, I would like to underline that all members of the General Assembly regard the submission of the monthly assessment report as a very important exercise. I hope the President of the Security Council will feed that back to the members of the Council and can also shed some light as to why 10 members of the Council have not yet submitted their monthly assessment. I also want to say that we will be waiting for the submission of the remaining 10 reports in due time.

Fifthly, I note that the preparation of the report appears to have become a ritual exercise. There has been little effort at wider consultations. Paragraph 129 of note 507 states that the drafter of the report may consider “organizing, where appropriate, interactive informal exchanges of views with the wider membership”. We understand that the drafter of this report was the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom. We have not seen such consultations in recent years. There also appears to be a lack of consultation on the report even within the Council. The only time all 15 Council members made interventions during the adoption of the report was in 2002, a long time ago (see S/PV.4616). We would request that the Council member charged with drafting the report engage in an exercise to reach out to members of the General Assembly, before the report is finalized and submitted to the General Assembly.

Finally, I would like to comment on the content of the report. The key part of the report is the introduction. The first-ever introduction to be included was in the 2002 report (A/56/2), and it contained a good, concise analysis of the Security Council’s work. But the level of analysis has varied since then. While recent

introductions are much improved on those of previous years, we think there is room for improvement and have a few specific suggestions with regard to the content of the report.

First, we think that the annual report should give a summary of the vetoes used during the year and the voting positions of Council members on all procedural and substantive votes taken in the Council during the period under review.

Secondly, the annual report should give more details on the issues discussed with regard to improving the working methods of the Council.

Thirdly, the annual report should provide an analysis of the statistical trends concerning the Council’s products or outcomes in terms of statements or resolutions.

In addition to those three suggestions, my delegation would like to make three specific requests.

First, we request that all members of the Security Council fulfil their responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations by submitting the annual report in a timely manner, and to do so no later than the month of April every year.

Secondly, we request all members of the Security Council to review note 507 as it relates to the annual report of the Security Council. In particular, we request that paragraph 132 of note 507 be amended to indicate clearly that the annual report of the Security Council should be submitted to the General Assembly no later than the month of April of the following year.

Thirdly, we request that the President of the General Assembly give adequate time to delegations to consider the annual report before scheduling the plenary meeting thereon. After the submission of the report to the General Assembly, we think that delegations should be given three to four weeks to read the report, consult their capitals and prepare statements. If the report is to be submitted by April, we think that the meeting of the General Assembly should be held in the months of May or June, and certainly not in August or September.

Let me conclude with a few final observations.

The submission of the annual report of the Council and its consideration by the General Assembly is an important and serious matter. The timeliness of the report must be taken seriously. If timeliness is compromised, then we risk compromising the

transparency, accountability and even legitimacy of the Security Council.

I am aware that members of the Security Council face tremendous pressures and have a very demanding schedule. I have every sympathy for their position, however, it is important to improve our work and our way of doing things.

It is equally important for the Security Council and the General Assembly to work together and to support each other in order to achieve our common vision of peace and stability around the world.

It is in that spirit of improving our work and making the United Nations better that I have made this statement. I apologize for taking more time than I should have.

Mr. García Moritán (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): It will not be easy to address the General Assembly following the excellent statement just delivered by the Permanent Representative of Singapore.

I wish to thank the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation for presenting the report of the Security Council for the year 2018 (A/73/2).

Argentina has historically advocated for the need for ongoing efforts to improve the transparency, inclusiveness, openness, democratization and efficiency of the work of the Security Council. In that connection, we are guided by the conviction that, without affecting the effectiveness of its decision-making, the Council can and should be more transparent and democratic in its relationship with the broader membership, given that the Charter of the United Nations establishes that the Council acts on its behalf.

But the Security Council can be transparent and democratic — a widespread demand not only here in the Assembly but among civil society and the general public — only if it honours, at the very least, those measures of accountability already established in the Charter and in presidential note S/2017/507, issued in 2017. Those include the presentation not only of annual reports but also the Presidents' monthly reports of the presidencies and publicizing official meetings. Therefore, as we understand it, it is of fundamental importance that the Security Council ensure that it adopts its annual report by the deadline set out in note 507 in order to allow adequate time for Member States to study it and formulate observations.

Under Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, Argentina is in favour of the General Assembly taking note of the Council's report and that, in a plenary meeting, delegations may make statements regarding the report's content, even if they cannot intervene in compiling or editing the report, as that mandate is entrusted to the Council. Argentina supports a more effective implementation of the relevant provisions of the Charter regarding the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council. In that connection, the General Assembly must exercise its authority when necessary, including on matters related to international peace and security. That issue has been highlighted numerous times within intergovernmental negotiations on the reform of the Security Council.

Allow me to now refer to the report itself. With regard to procedures, we regret that the timelines established in note 507 were not complied with yet again, although we understand that efforts were made to improve when it comes to the date on which the report is presented to the Assembly. Although the compiled material, spanning pages 23 to 225, is extremely extensive — and despite the fact that those documents were published in a timely manner by the Secretariat — their thematic order invites us to consider them all with fresh eyes. However, we consider it necessary for the introduction to include more analytical content.

Furthermore, we would like to draw attention to a statement made in the introduction to the report. In paragraph 2, it is stated that, “[d]ivisions in the Council prevented it from taking effective action on some key conflicts.” We believe that assertion, which is a welcome act of sincerity, fully reflects one of the greatest challenges facing the Security Council, namely, the credibility of the Organization and multilateralism in general.

Under the item “The situation of the Middle East”, one of the issues identified in the report as being central to the work of the Council in 2018, we found that three draft resolutions did not garner the majority of votes required for their adoption, while another three were vetoed by two permanent members. In cases that concern both chemical weapons in Syria and the Palestinian question, it seems that the Council is unable to find a way to reach a compromise solution that would break the deadlock it is currently experiencing. The broader membership of the Organization, on behalf of which the Council is expected to act, often does not feel represented in terms of the way those conflicts are

managed. The highly complex international context demands that we do not stand idly by but instead support proposals that can reverse such a situation, for example, the suggestion made by the representative of Liechtenstein that the Assembly hold a debate every time a permanent member uses its veto.

Argentina is convinced that the veto restricts, curtails and limits the action of the Council. We are therefore in favour of its abolition. Inasmuch as that is not yet possible, Argentina adheres to the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group code of conduct regarding Security Council action in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, as well as the Franco-Mexican initiative on restraint in the use of the veto. Furthermore, we in the Uniting for the Consensus group are convinced that a future increase in members of the Security Council in the non-permanent category alone could further discourage the use of the veto, as well as increase the representation of currently underrepresented regions, enrich the debate and provide a wider variety of perspectives on conflict resolution.

I would like to conclude my statement by reiterating my country's commitment to achieving a more transparent, inclusive, democratic and efficient Security Council. We believe that this morning's meeting confirms that we must not stray from that goal.

Mr. Bermúdez Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Uruguay attaches great importance to the annual report (A/73/2) of the Security Council to the General Assembly, which provides information on the activities carried out during a year of intensive work. The report before us today covers the year 2018. It is the most recent report since the end of Uruguay's term on the Council during the period from 2016 to 2017.

Unfortunately, as in the past, the annual report was not presented in a timely manner, despite the clearly established timeline in the latest version of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2017/507), of August 2017, on the methods of work of the Security Council. In future, the provision for presenting it in the spring of every calendar year must be respected — that is, before 21 June — which, moreover, already provides ample time for its preparation.

Furthermore, it does not seem appropriate that, as today is the last week of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly and as all the delegations are currently preparing for the opening of the seventy-fourth session in several days' time and the subsequent

high-level week, we are only now getting around to discussing the report. It also does not seem reasonable or realistic that the membership should dedicate a special meeting of the General Assembly to considering a report that includes and lists situations and activities from 2018, nine months since the end of that year. Most of what is reported has either been resolved or is no longer relevant.

For that reason, although my country believes that all the issues listed in the report are important, its discussion will briefly focus on only a few of them, while providing the necessary updates to ensure that this meeting is more realistic and meaningful.

As we participated in several Security Council missions, we highlight their importance with regard to the various States on the Council's agenda. That practice must be continued, given the possibility of access to quality information through direct contact with the authorities and civil society and the opportunity that such missions provide on the ground in terms of a better understanding of the situations under consideration and decision-making.

With regard to Yemen, it is imperative to strengthen channels for dialogue, comply with the fragile agreements that have been reached and minimize or eliminate neighbouring countries' intervention in the conflict. The suffering of Yemeni citizens has already passed the critical point.

With regard to Haiti, as a Latin American State, Uruguay would like to see the strengthening of Haitian institutions and the country return to the path leading towards progress. It is worthwhile to recognize the progress made during the mandates of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti and the United Nations Mission for Justice Support in Haiti to realize a society marked by less tension. We highlight the work of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti of the Economic and Social Council and its potential to work in cooperation with the Security Council. We hope that President Moïse will be able to enjoy the full spectrum of governance that he deserves.

We appreciate the host resolutions and measures adopted by the Security Council in three priority areas for Uruguay, namely, children and armed conflict, the protection of civilians in armed conflict, and women and peace and security. The protection of women, children and, in general, all civilians deserves special attention by the Security Council. No one should be

targeted in conflicts, and, whenever they are involved in conflicts, we must support the work of Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the relevant humanitarian agencies working to alleviate physical suffering, hunger and adverse psychological effects.

Concerning Myanmar, in relation to what I said earlier, on a human scale, we must strive to find a solution for the hundreds of thousands of Rohingya refugees and guarantee that they enjoy their right to nationality and identity.

With regard to the situation in Libya, it is probably the Security Council agenda item that enjoys the least amount of unity, but it is the use of doublespeak that is most troubling. Some Member States say that they support the process of a political solution and negotiations supported by the United Nations and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, but lack resolve with regard to condemning the actions of a military rebel leader who is adding to increased political, economic and social chaos in the country.

It is imperative to lift Libya out of the social deterioration that it is experiencing. Chaos and insecurity provide fertile ground for mafia-like groups, who are profiting from selling humans — the slave trade of the twenty-first century. And the dream of exhausted migrants looking to move to Europe to restart their lives is fading. The Security Council should provide unified and water-tight support for the Government of National Accord in Tripoli. The military rebel, in our view, is nothing more than a warlord vis-à-vis the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

Concerning the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, although we shall be brief, we would be remiss if we did not take this opportunity to reaffirm our support for the work of Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process Mladenov. It is necessary that both parties adopt concrete measures to de-escalate tensions and, in the short- and medium-term, help establish forums for carrying out direct negotiations. We continue to believe that the two-State solution is the best one, and we offer our good offices to bring together both parties for its achievement.

Ms. Ioannou (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

In conclusion, we believe that, given its inherent value, the peacekeeping system at our disposal today

must receive the Security Council's necessary attention through the timely renewal of the mandates of its missions. We welcome the progress made in 2018 with regard to the Action for Peacekeeping initiative. We will continue to promote fulfilling its commitments and implementation, as well as the triangular dialogue among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries.

Mrs. Rugwabiza (Rwanda): Let me start by thanking the members of the Security Council and the Secretariat for producing the annual report of the security Council (A/73/2). I also thank the President of the Security Council, the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, for presenting the report this morning.

The Charter of the United Nations — in Articles 15 and 24, to be specific — provides for this important opportunity for the General Assembly to consider the work that the Security Council has accomplished in a given year. Therefore, Rwanda reaffirms the importance of the essential task of the General Assembly to have an occasion to comment on, and review the work of, the Security Council.

It is a vital exercise in ensuring the transparency, accountability — and I will add — legitimacy of the Security Council. It can enhance the symbiotic relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council if exercised effectively and seriously. For that to be possible, the timely submission of the annual report is essential to allow Member States adequate time to study it and prepare and deliver substantive feedback.

The current report was made available to all of us on 22 August, leaving us very little time to go through the 200-plus-page document and prepare our reaction and contribution. That has been the trend for a number of years now. It does a disservice to Member States and to the Security Council itself, which could gain beneficial feedback. My delegation therefore calls on the members of the Security Council and the President of the General Assembly to work together and ensure the timely submission of the report and better scheduling of the plenary meeting to consider the annual report. In particular, we request the Security Council to adhere to its own provisions in presidential note S/2017/507 to submit its annual report to the General Assembly in the spring of a given calendar year.

We would like to emphasize the need to improve the content of the annual report, taking it from a purely activity-based report to also include analytical elements. Given the broad range of important topics covered by the Security Council, it would be beneficial to have an analytical assessment of the manner in which the Council handled the issues in a given year.

With regard to specific issues covered in the annual report of the Security Council for 2018, let me touch on a few important thematic issues for my delegation. With regard to the issue of strengthening peace and security in Africa, let me express Rwanda's appreciation for the Council's continued support for enhanced partnerships between the United Nations and the African Union. Partnerships between the United Nations and regional organizations, as well as regional economic communities and mechanisms, have become an increasingly important avenue for addressing complex peace and security challenges. We saw the impact of such partnerships in 2018 and earlier this year.

In 2017, the United Nations and the African Union signed the Joint Framework for Enhanced Partnership in Peace and Security, which provides the basis for enhanced organization and cooperation in conflict analysis, preventive diplomacy and mediation and in conducting peace operations and peacebuilding. The United Nations-African Union Partnership Framework should capitalize on regional peace frameworks and mobilize further support for regionally led peace processes and initiatives. We will encourage candid and sustained cooperation in that direction going forward.

We also take note of and commend the Council's work on highlighting issues of strengthening performance and accountability in peacekeeping operations. That is one of the key themes of the Action for Peacekeeping initiative. We would like to see the Council focus a bit more and share with us its candid assessment of the impact of funding shortages and unpredictable funding on the performance of peacekeeping operations.

We appreciate that the Council reflected in its report the importance of the women and peace and security agenda. It is a very important agenda for moving from exclusive to democratic decision-making, from gender inequality to gender justice and from conflict and violence to sustainable peace.

My last specific point will be on the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals. We take

note of the positive step by the Council in recognizing a number of delegations' concerns with regard to the Mechanism's approach to the early release of persons convicted by tribunals, including recommending that the Mechanism find an appropriate solution, such as putting in place conditions for early release. Such measures will ensure that the Mechanism, in which we invested so much, does not lose credibility.

Finally, Rwanda emphasizes the importance of today's meeting in fulfilling the Security Council's obligations of accountability and transparency to the General Assembly, under the Charter of the United Nations. It is only by fulfilling those obligations, seriously and in a timely manner, that the Security Council will strengthen the legitimacy of the mandate it serves on behalf of all Members.

Mr. Kickert (Austria): We thank the members of the Security Council for providing us with its annual report (A/73/2). We would also like to express our appreciation for the work of the Secretariat in providing all the relevant statistical information and lists of documents contained in the report.

Austria aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Switzerland on behalf of the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency (ACT) group. We would like to add the following remarks.

First, we take note of the introduction to the report, which provides an overview of key developments on the regional and thematic issues discussed at the Security Council during the reporting period. We encourage the members of the Security Council to make further good use of that introductory section and strengthen its analytical character.

Secondly, like other delegations, we also note that part 1, section XIV, of the annual report provides an overview of the monthly assessments by former Presidents of the work of the Security Council. We are surprised that only five out of 12 such reports have been submitted for 2018 so far. We encourage Security Council members to make all of those monthly assessments available to the wider membership as soon as possible.

As we all know, the submission of the annual report is an obligation that the Security Council needs to fulfil to the General Assembly under Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations. It is therefore an instrument of accountability, which, in our view,

deserves substantive discussion. We regret that, year after year, the General Assembly is faced with a situation that the annual report is finalized and circulated very late in the summer, thereby seriously restricting the opportunity for a sensible and constructive interaction with Member States. That not only ignores repeated calls by Member States, including those of the ACT group, it also contradicts the commitment made by the Security Council itself in its presidential note 507.

Note 507, as already cited by the representative of Singapore, states clearly that

“[t]he introduction shall be completed no later than 31 January” (*S/2017/507, para.130*)

and that it should be

“discussed and thereafter adopted by the Council in time for consideration by the General Assembly in the spring of that calendar year.” (*Ibid., para. 132*)

We are concerned about the implication that non-fulfilment of the relevant deadlines has for the state of the relationship between the Security Council and the wider United Nations membership. Moreover, we also regret the signal it sends with regard to Security Council’s dedication to improving its working methods. We call on Security Council members to fully implement all measures laid out in presidential note 507 and explore new ways of making the work of the Security Council more accountable, more coherent and more transparent. In that context, we commend the work done by Kuwait as the Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions in the elaboration of a series of draft presidential notes on various topics connected to the working methods of the Council. We hope that substantive progress on those issues can be made in the near future.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item for this meeting. We shall hear the remaining speakers on the morning of

Thursday, 12 September, here in the Hall, following our consideration of the items already scheduled for that meeting.

The exercise of the right of reply has been requested. May I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply and limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by the delegations from the seats.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation.

Mr. Boguslavskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Honestly, today’s discussion of the report (A/73/2) of the Security Council has given us a strange feeling. Rather than talking about the substance and content of the document, some colleagues, especially from the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group, focused on the calendar for preparing the report. The timing, from the very beginning, for the discussion of the report was planned for 30 August, and we postponed it to today at their request. Now they are saying that today’s date is also not suitable for them either. We are not quite clear, then, on what they really want to see happen. Perhaps such meetings are only to be used as an opportunity to criticize the Security Council?

We accept their wish to say that it would have been optimal to provide the report earlier. We will endeavour to do so. But, to speak frankly, three weeks seems excessive for reading a document of 12 pages in length. The majority is in the introduction of the document. All of the rest of the information it contains is open access and easy to find. I would like to call on colleagues to take a constructive approach in their work on such important topics as the relationship between Security Council and General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.