



General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 September 2015

Original: English

Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Summary record of the 8th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 26 June 2015, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Lasso Mendoza (Ecuador)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Question of New Caledonia

Hearing of petitioners

Question of French Polynesia

Hearing of petitioners

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to
Colonial Countries and Peoples

Report of the Caribbean regional seminar

Draft preliminary report

Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org).

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

15-10929 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Question of New Caledonia (A/AC.109/2015/15 and A/AC.109/2014/L.12)

Hearing of petitioners

2. **The Chair** drew attention to the working paper contained in document [A/AC.109/2015/15](#), and to requests for hearing contained in aide-mémoire 04/15, which the Special Committee had decided to grant at its second meeting, on 15 June 2015. He also said that, in line with Committee's usual practice, petitioners would be invited to take places at the petitioners' table and would withdraw after making their statements.

3. **Mr. Yanno** (President, Congress of New Caledonia) said that everyone was pleased that for a second year the Committee would hear statements from pro-independence and anti-independence speakers alike, which ended the monopoly that pro-independence partisans had held since 1986. New Caledonia was a special case in which pro-independence and anti-independence factions, though political adversaries, had been parties to the same agreement, the Nouméa Accord, for 17 years. Accordingly, there was hope that the two sides would continue to work together after 2018 to forge their common destiny.

4. Despite the allegations of electoral fraud put forward by the pro-independence leaders, all challenges to the May 2014 elections had been rejected by French courts. Nevertheless, in view of the importance of the issue of electoral rolls, the French Prime Minister Manuel Valls had convened a meeting of all the Caledonian political leaders on 5 June 2015 to discuss the sensitive issue of the electoral body, which resulted in an agreement between the French Government, the pro-independence leaders and the anti-independence leaders designed to ensure a peaceful climate for the election scheduled to take place in 2018 at the latest.

5. Pursuant to the 5 June agreement, the electoral body for the 2018 elections would be restricted to interested populations as defined by the United Nations. Even with such a restriction in place, observers of the situation in New Caledonia agreed that a majority in the Territory did not favour

independence, despite the claims of certain political leaders. Indeed, independence was not the only way for New Caledonia to be removed from the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, given that, on numerous occasions, the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the acquisition of any political status that was freely decided upon would be recognized as an act of decolonization. It was the anti-independence factions' goal to find an institutional solution that would allow New Caledonia to be recognized as a fully autonomous territory under international law while remaining decisively part of the French Republic.

6. **Mr. Wayaridri** (Committee on Education and Culture of the Congress of New Caledonia) said that it was important for the anti-independence factions, which represented the majority in New Caledonia, to be able to address the international community as the 2018 self-determination vote approached. Unlike the pro-independence partisans, young Kanaks did not see the situation of the Melanesian populations of the independent States of the region as an example to follow; rather, they believed that the economic and social progress of all Caledonians, including Kanaks, could only be guaranteed by remaining part of the French Republic.

7. For some, being Kanak meant being pro-independence. If one's respect for customs were not used for political ends, i.e., to serve the pro-independence project, there was a risk of being excluded or driven out from one's lands. For many years, the only Kanak speakers allowed to address the question of New Caledonia had steadfastly affirmed that the decolonization could only come about through independence. Yet the anti-independence Kanaks did not share that opinion and sought to show the international community, including the United Nations and the Special Committee on Decolonization, that New Caledonia could be recognized internationally as a completely decolonized territory while remaining decidedly within the French Republic.

8. The Nouméa Accord set up the basis for sharing competencies between the French State and New Caledonia, thereby allowing for the development of greater autonomy of the latter leading to self-determination. The people of New Caledonia intended to freely decide its political status when the period covered by the Nouméa Accord expired. France was not a colonial Power that forbade New Caledonia to choose independence. New Caledonia was choosing its

link with France and would continue to do so because France, a world Power, granted New Caledonia the freedom to express its cultural diversity and specificity even as it remained part of France.

9. Despite their differences, pro- and anti-independence partisans had managed to live together for over 27 years, focusing on what bound them together rather than what divided them. On 5 June, in Paris, the parties succeeded in agreeing on the modalities for the 2018 referendum on self-determination. For the citizens of New Caledonia to live together in harmony, despite their diverse communities, different religions and opposing political views, they needed to reside in the great framework of the French Republic, which would act as the guarantor of their freedoms and the equilibrium among communities.

10. **Mr. Wamytan** (Front de libération nationale kanak et socialiste (FLNKS)) said that the administering Power had slowed the process of decolonization and emancipation by using any number of methods to avoid violating its sacrosanct principle of prohibiting independence. Key among those was interference with the right to vote, the criteria for inclusion and the electoral rolls.

11. Since the Kanak people had been granted the right to vote in 1953, the problem of the electoral body remained unresolved and divisive, with the administering Power absolving itself of responsibility and procrastinating on key questions. A special meeting was held on 5 June 2015 specifically to address the electoral issue, and a political agreement was reached to, inter alia, expand access to the electoral body, engage experts to quantitatively evaluate the ongoing lawsuit on electoral fraud and improve the functioning of the special administrative commissions charged with establishing the electoral rolls.

12. It was more important than ever for the Special Committee to strengthen its oversight and involvement in the situation in New Caledonia as it developed. There was no guarantee that France and the anti-independence factions would honour their commitments made at the special session. France might not be the impartial arbiter between pro- and anti-independence groups it claimed to be. It was therefore necessary for the United Nations to become a stakeholder in the current process, especially with

respect to the implementation of the decisions of 5 June on setting up the electoral rolls and evaluating the electoral dispute, as well as on the various steering committees on the transfer of sovereign powers that would play a role in preparing the 2018 referendum.

13. It was not possible, in the light of New Caledonia's colonial history, to have confidence in France as the Territory prepared for self-determination referendum. Only the United Nations could guarantee the free and fair elections that would make the results incontestable and uncontested.

14. **Mr. Forrest** (Front de libération nationale kanak et socialiste (FLNKS)) said that, when a consensus could not be reached on the appointment of a new executive at the end of 2014, the institutional destabilization caused by the Government of New Caledonia and the pro-French parties that constituted its majority reflected an unacceptable degree of irresponsibility in local governance, especially since whenever a question of matters involving the interests of France arose, the union among the anti-independence parties was sacred. The consensus achieved at the 5 June 2015 special meeting on the electoral issue remained fragile since implementation depended on working methods that had not yet been decided. Technical assistance from the United Nations was necessary if honest and transparent electoral rolls were to be established.

15. New Caledonia possessed plentiful natural resources that would give a sovereign State the economic power to bring about a fairer and more unified society, but the absence of a national strategy prevented the exploitation of resources from benefiting the Territory's future generations. The Territory should be able to exploit its natural resources from the present until the referendum, after which a strategy favouring the sustainable development of the future Nation would be adopted.

16. The Territory had made important strides in development in such areas as education, public infrastructure, aquaculture, digitization, health, tourism, fisheries and agriculture, but more needed to be done to improve harbour and airport infrastructure in order to contribute to improving the quality of life of the people. New Caledonia's responsibility was to build its multiracial society with greater justice and fairness, respecting the Melanesian values of solidarity, sharing and humility.

17. **Mr. d'Anglebermes** (Vice-president, Government of New Caledonia) said that he sought to respond to the concerns set forth in the Committee's 2014 report, which were adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 69/102 of 5 December 2014.

18. The Territory had decided to relaunch its economy after the world economic and financial crisis through, inter alia, better control over its mineral resources, increased exports, expanded local production to reduce imports, and the development of tourism. Several ambitious reforms had been undertaken to improve social cohesion, particularly in the housing and health sectors.

19. Dialogue among all the signatories to the Nouméa Accord, the institutions and the Committee was being maintained through meetings of signatories and regular meetings of the steering committees on the institutional future of New Caledonia.

20. With regard to the situation of the Kanak people, equality was a principle in regard of which the Government would brook no compromise. Since 2011, it had worked to offer all Caledonians the same chances for success, including by implementing honours tracks in all high schools across the Territory.

21. New Caledonia was working towards the greatest possible political integration with the rest of Oceania. Although the Territory was an active member of all Pacific regional technical organizations as well as the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, the regional commission of the Economic and Social Council, its application to join the Pacific Island Forum, which it fervently hoped to do, remained at a standstill.

22. Pursuant to an observation made after the Committee's March 2014 visit to New Caledonia, the Government was exploring the possibility of sending public servants to France to be trained in areas where they lacked qualifications.

23. On the electoral issue, an important step had been taken to settle the long-standing dispute between the pro- and anti-independence partisans with the reaching of a political agreement in Paris on 5 June 2015.

24. It was crucial that the people of New Caledonia should be given the means to understand what was at stake in the concept of self-determination. To that end, the educational system broadly covered the institutional history of New Caledonia, and the

Caledonian media were giving increasing attention to the issue.

25. Finally, with respect to ownership of natural resources, the mining and metallurgy sectors reflected some of the most important transfers of competency in the history of the Territory's institutional development. Efforts to obtain greater value from natural resources were needed, as great amounts of raw ore were being exported at weaker prices than if it had processed. Reflection upon a new strategy that would benefit the entire country and future generations was necessary.

26. **Mr. Napolitano Martinez** (France) said that France had cooperated with the Special Committee on the issue of New Caledonia for many years and had worked in full transparency with the United Nations. It was a committed partner of New Caledonia and would continue to play its role as arbiter and ensure full implementation of the Nouméa Accord.

27. On 5 June 2015, at the request of New Caledonians, the Government of France had held a special meeting of the Committee of Signatories of the Nouméa Accord to discuss the draft law on New Caledonia adopted by the Council of Ministers on 8 April 2015. The main purpose of the draft law was to prepare the electoral roll which would serve as the basis for the referendum on self-determination. However, the draft law would also improve the functioning of the special administrative commissions that were responsible for establishing and reviewing the electoral roll. After 12 hours of negotiations, the partners had agreed on a series of amendments to the draft law, including provisions to allow for the automatic inclusion on the electoral roll of individuals born in New Caledonia who had already been included on the electoral roll for the provincial elections, and the automatic inclusion of certain persons born after 1989. In addition, the partners had agreed to appoint an independent expert to act as an observer in the administrative commissions, which would be chaired by a French judge. Lastly, a local working group had been established to prepare an amendment stipulating the composition of the advisory commission of experts.

28. **Mr. Koroma** (Sierra Leone) said that the referendum due to be held in New Caledonia in 2018 was crucial and the people of New Caledonia had the right to choose their destiny. However, the referendum must not lead to a final victory of one part of the population over another, and there was a need for unity

at that critical stage. The people of New Caledonia must have a common destiny and needed to live in a nation in which every race and every person was treated equally and lived in peaceful coexistence. Democracy meant that people could hold different political views but the love of the nation must prevail.

29. The issues that united the people of New Caledonia were greater than the issues that divided them, and diversity should be seen as a strength and not as a source of weakness. The people of New Caledonia should seek dialogue on all issues. The end of the Nouméa Accord marked an end to a historical responsibility of all political actors, and every effort must be made to avoid a repetition of the ugly events of the 1980s.

30. The guns and light weapons that were finding their way into New Caledonia posed a serious security threat, especially as the referendum approached. His delegation commended the proactive steps taken by the Government of France to control the illegal flow of weapons into the territory. It was also grateful to the Government of France and the people of New Caledonia for their efforts to hold successful municipal and provincial elections in May 2015.

31. The ongoing discussions on the law that would allow people to vote in the referendum were crucial and the Government of France should make every effort to resolve that issue peacefully as it was critical to the final outcome of the referendum. The people of New Caledonia should put an end to the political stalemate that had left the Territory without a president for a significant period.

32. His delegation welcomed the close cooperation established between the Government of France and the Melanesian Spearhead Group in the area of climate change, which posed a significant challenge to New Caledonia. The Government of France should host another summit for the leaders of the Pacific Island Countries to highlight the challenges created by climate change. That Government should also continue to transmit information on New Caledonia to the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations.

33. It was important to educate the Kanak people to prepare them for the referendum and possible self-government, and the education provided should be in professional fields such as medicine, law, accounting and engineering. His delegation was very concerned at

the conditions in prisons in New Caledonia and urged the Government of France to investigate that issue, which bordered on a human rights issue, and to implement the recommendations made by the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples.

Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.12: Question of New Caledonia

34. **Mr. Sarufa** (Papua New Guinea), introducing draft resolution [A/AC.109/2015/L.12](#) on behalf of his country and the co-sponsors, said that colonialism had no place in the twenty-first century and that the international community must work collectively to eliminate that scourge. His delegation welcomed the continued progress made in the self-determination process in New Caledonia, including the transfer of powers from France to New Caledonia, the review of the electoral roll, and economic rebalancing and development within the Territory to eliminate social inequalities. However, it was concerned at the continuing fragile situation in the Territory and the political impasse in the territorial Government until April 2015, which had affected the administration and management of the Territory.

35. The conclusions and recommendations contained in the Report of the United Nations mission to New Caledonia, 2014 (AC.109/2014/20/Rev.1) must be implemented, including urgent measures to address the shortcomings of the existing electoral roll for the provincial election and particularly for the referendum. The composition of the electoral roll had been a subject of intense political and legal debate, and had caused tension between supporters and opponents of independence. Given that the referendum to decide the future status of New Caledonia was only three years away, there was no time to lose. The referendum must be held on time as mandated under the Nouméa Accord and the process of holding that referendum, including the electoral roll, must be credible, fair, just and transparent.

36. His delegation noted that a group of experts might be established to examine the electoral disputes relating to the special electoral roll for the provincial elections and sought further information on the methods that would be used to revise the special electoral roll. The expert group must be independent to ensure credible, transparent work. Given the importance of the electoral roll, the Government of France should share information with the Organization

concerning the outcome of its recent meetings, and the Special Committee and the United Nations in general should remain vigilant and closely monitor the situation in New Caledonia.

37. The cooperative relations established by the Melanesian Spearhead Group demonstrated that providing opportunities to the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories at the regional and international level not only built bridges of friendship and constructive engagement in shared areas of mutual interest, but also facilitated capacity-building and equipped them with leadership and decision-making skills that were imperative to their future destiny.

38. *Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.12 was adopted.*

Question of French Polynesia (A/AC.109/2015/16 and A/AC.109/2015/L.16)

39. **The Chair** drew attention to aide-memoire 06/15 containing a request for hearing on that item. He took it that the Special Committee wished to accede to that request in accordance with its established practice.

40. *It was so decided.*

41. **The Chair** said that in line with Committee's usual practice, petitioners would be invited to take places at the petitioners' table and would withdraw after making their statements.

Hearing of petitioners

42. **Mr. Tuheiava** (Union pour la démocratie) said that Member States should fully implement all General Assembly resolutions concerning decolonization in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. In particular, they should prepare the Non-Self-Governing Territories for full self-government as required under Article 73 *b* of the Charter of the United Nations, and should transmit accurate information to the Organization as required under Article 73 *e*, which had not been done for French Polynesia. Countries must not be allowed to pick and choose which parts of the Charter of the United Nations they implemented, and any attempt to do so would make their aggressive claims of adherence to the international rule of law in other circumstances ring particularly hollow.

43. There was ongoing denial that the current political status of French Polynesia was non-self-governing. A recent independent assessment of its level

of self-government had shown that the status of the Territory was inconsistent with international principles of self-government, and his delegation urged the Special Committee to have the updated assessment published as a document of the General Assembly.

44. His delegation was concerned that General Assembly resolutions on decolonization had not been implemented 25 years on from the beginning of the first International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. Repeated calls had been made for a case-by-case programme involving administering Powers to facilitate implementation of the decolonization mandate. In the case of French Polynesia, the administering Power had failed to comply with its obligations under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations and it would likely also fail to comply with a case-by-case programme. His delegation therefore requested the Special Committee to return to the language of earlier resolutions by adopting a case-by-case approach that did not require an initial role for the administering Power.

45. The international community had made historic efforts to end the scourge of nuclear testing, which included the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Those efforts were directly relevant to French Polynesia since its people had been the victims of 193 atmospheric and underground nuclear tests over a thirty-year period, which continued to have devastating humanitarian consequences. The report of the Secretary-General on the environmental, ecological, health and other impacts of the 30-year period of nuclear testing in French Polynesia (A/69/189) was far from comprehensive and was merely a compilation of replies from just two United Nations agencies out of some 22 requests for information. In addition, the report contained references to outdated studies which had since been proven to be incorrect. More attention should be given to the substantive quality of such reports, since that report failed to address the impacts experienced today by thousands of people in French Polynesia who had yet to be given reparatory justice for that blatant disregard of their humanity.

46. More recent, more accurate studies should be published as documents of the General Assembly so that they could be properly considered by Member States. In addition, given the clear evidence of the impact of nuclear testing in the territory, French Polynesia should be included in the programme of

work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. In addition, the Special Committee should amend its working methods to allow for the question of French Polynesia to be considered in the first week of its session to ensure that relevant information could be shared in time to be reflected in the text of draft resolutions.

47. The working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/2015/16) omitted numerous developments, including the historical adoption of a resolution by the elected members of the Assembly of French Polynesia in November 2014, in which they called upon France to acknowledge the colonial nature of its nuclear testing programme during the thirty years of military occupation of the atolls of Moruroa and Fangataufa. The resolution also established an expert committee to assess the financial damages caused by the occupation.

48. Numerous General Assembly resolutions had confirmed that the ownership, control and permanent sovereignty over natural resources, including marine resources, lay with the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories as part of their heritage. The exploitation and plundering of those resources by foreign economic interests was in violation of United Nations resolutions and was a threat to the integrity and prosperity of those Territories. Resolutions had further emphasized that any administering Power that deprived the peoples of those Territories of the exercise of their legitimate rights over their natural resources violated the solemn obligations that it had assumed under the Charter of the United Nations.

49. Even though the rules of international law were clear, the administering Power continued to usurp the marine resources of the people of French Polynesia under the aegis of its successive organic laws unilaterally applied to the Territory. The rights of the people of French Polynesia over their exclusive economic zone were illegally under the full control of the administering Power, which claimed the Territory's mineral resources as part of the French maritime zone. The unilateral exploitation by the administering Power extended to other domains including airline and airspace fees paid to the French Treasury instead of to the Territory. Under its political status as a dependency, the Territory was unable to control its borders, as that function was under the control of the administering Power. As a result, the Territory had no authority even to issue visas to enhance its tourism industry. Many other revenue-generating competencies were controlled

by the administering Power in a political status that it characterized inaccurately as autonomy when it was in fact the essence of contemporary colonialism. The Special Committee should begin a case-by-case work programme for French Polynesia to allow the people to realize their inalienable right to self-determination.

Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.16: Question of French Polynesia

50. **The Chair** introduced draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.16.

51. *Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.16 was adopted without a vote.*

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.9: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

52. **The Secretary** drew attention to the statement submitted by the Secretary-General on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.9 (A/69/966).

53. *Draft resolution A/AC.109/2015/L.9 was adopted without a vote.*

Report of the Caribbean Regional Seminar (A/AC.109/2015/CRP.1)

54. **The Chair** drew attention to conference room paper A/AC.109/2015/CRP.1, containing the conclusions and recommendations of the Caribbean Regional Seminar, which had been held in Managua, Nicaragua, from 19 to 21 May 2015.

55. **Mr. Henderson** (Dominica) said that the Caribbean people had been enslaved and oppressed by colonial powers in the past and still faced challenges in the present. As a result, the Caribbean region was an ideal location for the discussions, and his delegation welcomed the leadership shown by the Government of Nicaragua in hosting the regional seminar. His delegation noted that the report before the Special Committee was not the same as the report on the Committee's website and wondered whether the report before the Committee was merely the conclusions and recommendations or whether it would supersede the version on the website.

56. **The Chair** said that the document circulated was merely the conclusions and recommendations, since the first part of the report of the Seminar, which comprised paragraphs 1 to 27 inclusive, had already been approved in Nicaragua.

57. **Mr. Henderson** (Dominica) said that the document before the Committee should therefore be referred to as the conclusions and recommendations, and not as the report of the seminar, because that was what had been circulated.

58. **Mr. Antoine** (Grenada) asked whether the report before the Committee was being adopted in addition to or instead of the report already adopted in Nicaragua.

59. **The Chair** said that the first part of the report was procedural and that part had already been adopted in Nicaragua. The second part of the report was the conclusions and recommendations, and it had been agreed in Nicaragua that the second part of the report would be adopted in New York.

60. Some delegations had requested the deletion of certain sections of the first part of the report. However, the first part of the report had already been adopted in Nicaragua and to make changes now would be a clear violation of the rules of the Organization established by Member States themselves.

61. **Mr. Forés Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that his delegation had listened to the statements made by all participants in the Caribbean Regional Seminar and there had been no objections to the language used in the first part of the report. The report could not be amended, as it was an accurate reflection of the facts and events at the Seminar. In addition, the report followed the practice adopted by the Committee for many years.

62. **Ms. Rodríguez Silva** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that some delegations had asked to reopen discussions on paragraphs already agreed upon, which would create a negative precedent in the Committee and would have a detrimental effect on its working methods and procedures. The Committee should support good practices in that regard.

63. **Mr. Arancibia Fernández** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that Members should support the decision made by the Chair because he was acting in full transparency. The rules, practices and policies of the United Nations had been followed and the language of

the first part of the report was in line with General Assembly resolutions.

64. **Mr. Hermida Castillo** (Nicaragua) said that at no point during the Regional Seminar had any objections been made concerning the content of the first part of the report and that part of the report had already been adopted. His delegation urged Members to proceed with the meeting by adopting the second part of the report as circulated. Changes could not be made to a document already adopted.

65. **Mr. Cousiño** (Chile) said that the first part of the report had been approved paragraph by paragraph during the Regional Seminar. It was unacceptable and unethical to put pressure on the Chair to make changes to that part of the report because it was a report of the Special Committee, not a report of the Chair, and because documents could not be amended once they had been adopted.

66. **Mr. Hamed** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that Members must continue following the applicable rules. The first part of the report had already been approved and was procedural not substantive.

67. **Mr. Debbagh** (Saint Lucia) said that the Special Committee should adopt the conclusions and recommendations as circulated. However, his delegation had reservations about the procedure that had been followed given that it had not seen the document.

68. **Mr. Alnaqshabandi** (Iraq) said that his delegation fully supported the text of the report, including the first part adopted in Nicaragua. However, the first part should not have been adopted in Nicaragua and should instead have been adopted in New York so that all Members could have considered it.

69. **Mr. Kadiri** (Observer for Morocco) said that his delegation was very concerned at the opaque way in which the draft report of the Seminar, especially the procedural part, had been prepared and presented. The approach taken was completely against the spirit of consensus and dialogue that had marked previous Seminar reports.

70. His delegation was categorically opposed to the procedural part of the report and had expressed that view both in Managua and in New York on several occasions. That part of the report was not neutral and was null and void for his delegation. The Chair was fully responsible for the repercussions of the report,

which would have a negative impact on the work of the Special Committee and the Regional Seminar.

71. During the Seminar his delegation had repeatedly explained the need to respect the format of previous reports and it was unacceptable that that had not been done. The report had been presented without consultation of Members and some Members had not even been aware of the report until they had arrived in New York. The programme of work of the Seminar had not mentioned the adoption of the report and had merely indicated that the draft report would be presented by the Rapporteur.

72. The report did not include the comments made by delegations, and his delegation did not understand how an incomplete report could be adopted. In addition, the draft report was only available in English even though it was required to be available in all official languages in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. As a result, its adoption was invalid. Several delegations had reiterated their objections to the content of the report both during and since the Seminar.

73. **Mr. Bessedik** (Observer for Algeria) said that his delegation supported the efforts of the Chair to ensure transparency.

74. **Mr. Debbagh** (Saint Lucia) said that his delegation objected to the adoption of anything preceding chapter five of the report.

75. **The Chair** said that Members were not considering the part of the report before chapter five; they were instead considering the conclusions and recommendations.

76. *The conference room paper [A/AC.109/2015/CRP.1](#) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.