



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 April 2020

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 22nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 16 October 2019, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Braun (Luxembourg)

Contents

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)
- (b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)
- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)
- (d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

19-17909 (E)



Please recycle



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

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (continued)

- (a) Implementation of human rights instruments (continued)** ([A/74/40](#), [A/74/44](#), [A/74/48](#), [A/74/55](#), [A/74/56](#), [A/74/146](#), [A/74/148](#), [A/74/228](#), [A/74/233](#), [A/74/254](#) and [A/74/256](#))
- (b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued)** ([A/74/147](#), [A/74/159](#), [A/74/160](#), [A/74/161](#), [A/74/163](#), [A/74/164](#), [A/74/165](#), [A/74/167](#), [A/74/174](#), [A/74/176](#), [A/74/178](#), [A/74/179](#), [A/74/181](#), [A/74/183](#), [A/74/185](#), [A/74/186](#), [A/74/189](#), [A/74/190](#), [A/74/191](#), [A/74/197](#), [A/74/198](#), [A/74/212](#), [A/74/213](#), [A/74/215](#), [A/74/226](#), [A/74/227](#), [A/74/229](#), [A/74/243](#), [A/74/245](#), [A/74/255](#), [A/74/261](#), [A/74/262](#), [A/74/270](#), [A/74/271](#), [A/74/277](#), [A/74/285](#), [A/74/314](#), [A/74/318](#), [A/74/335](#), [A/74/349](#), [A/74/351](#), [A/74/358](#), [A/74/460](#), [A/74/480](#) and [A/74/493](#))
- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued)** ([A/74/166](#), [A/74/188](#), [A/74/196](#), [A/74/268](#), [A/74/273](#), [A/74/275](#), [A/74/276](#), [A/74/278](#), [A/74/303](#), [A/74/311](#) and [A/74/342](#))
- (d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (continued)** ([A/74/36](#))

1. **Mr. Akram** (Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Right to Development) said that, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution [39/9](#), the mandate of the Working Group was now focused on the elaboration of a draft legally binding instrument on the right to development. The Working Group had commenced consideration of that topic at its twentieth session and had heard divergent views from stakeholders on the content and scope of the future instrument. Regrettably, some Member States and one group of States had declined to participate in the discussions because they did not consider a binding international standard to be the appropriate mechanism for the realization of the right to development.

2. The Working Group had recommended that the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) take measures necessary to ensure a balanced and visible allocation of resources and pay due attention to the visibility and effective implementation and mainstreaming of the right to development by

systematically identifying and undertaking tangible projects dedicated to that right. It had also recommended that the Chair-Rapporteur conduct further consultations with all Member States, international organizations, United Nations agencies, regional economic commissions and other organizations on the preparation of a draft legally binding instrument on the right to development.

3. In its resolution [42/23](#), the Human Rights Council had endorsed those recommendations, decided that the Chair-Rapporteur should present a draft legally binding instrument at the twenty-first session of the Working Group and decided that at the same session the Working Group would commence the elaboration of a draft legally binding instrument on the basis of the draft prepared by the Chair-Rapporteur, through a collaborative process of engagement. He was accordingly preparing a draft, which would be issued some time before the session of the Working Group so that Member States would have ample opportunity to examine it.

4. Member States and other relevant stakeholders had been invited to submit their comments and observations concerning various aspects of the future instrument. The responses received to date and his consultations with various groups indicated that there was some divergence of views about the content of the instrument. Moreover, while there was general support for the initiative, some stakeholders did not support the development of a binding international instrument of any kind. He urged Member States and all other stakeholders to participate constructively in the consultation process.

5. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that as the central subject of the development process, human beings should be the main beneficiary of the right to development. That right was inextricably linked to the right to self-determination, which included the full sovereignty of peoples over their natural wealth and resources.

6. At the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in July 2019, the Ministers had reiterated their commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, in particular the right to development, and stressed the universal, inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated character of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. They had also emphasized that the approach to the consideration of human rights issues at the international level should be constructive, non-confrontational, non-politicized,

non-selective, faire, objective, and based on dialogue and respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity.

7. The States members of the Movement also wished to reiterate their proposal for the organization of a high-level international conference under the auspices of the United Nations on the right to development and to renew their call for the elaboration of a convention on the right to development.

8. **Mr. Zulqarnain** (Pakistan) said that the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development had provided the international community with an opportunity to establish an international consensus on the right to development and define the parameters of that right so that it could be effectively pursued. The work of the Chair-Rapporteur was extremely important and should receive the support and understanding of all Member States. The Sustainable Development Goals could not be achieved without fully understanding and alleviating the negative impact of armed conflict, foreign occupation and unilateral coercive measures. His delegation therefore requested that the Chair-Rapporteur examine those issues and identify any interlinkages with the work he had undertaken.

9. His delegation welcomed the decision by the Special Rapporteur on the right to development to focus his report (A/74/163) on the topic of disaster risk reduction, which was an integral element of social and economic development.

10. **Mr. Mazaffarpor** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that technology transfer and the fulfilment of official development assistance (ODA) commitments were prerequisites for the full realization of the right to development in developing countries. Unlawful unilateral measures preventing ODA and direct foreign investment from having a real and measurable impact on the right to development should be eliminated. His country was deeply concerned about the collective and indiscriminate punishment that such measures inflicted on civilians, in particular the most disadvantaged, which amounted to crimes against humanity. Depriving entire populations of their right to development was an appalling act of economic terrorism that should be condemned. He called for international solidarity to address the situation, which was putting the lives of millions of people around the world at risk.

11. **Mr. Driuchin** (Russian Federation) said that the right to development was one of the most important human rights and was intrinsically linked to the protection of the rights of the most vulnerable groups. The international community should continue its efforts to eliminate social stratification, poverty and discrimination; meet the basic needs of the most

vulnerable; and ensure that people in the least developed countries had equal access to opportunities and economic resources.

12. With regard to the report of the Special Rapporteur, his delegation supported the key recommendations aimed at improving the participatory processes related to the planning, monitoring and implementation of disaster risk reduction measures and policies, which would help establish a stronger legal framework for international development assistance activities and enhance the status of United Nations bodies working in that field.

13. **Mr. Cepero Aguilar** (Cuba) said that the right to development, which applied to all individuals and States, could not be enjoyed unless the right to self-determination and the full sovereignty of peoples over their natural wealth and resources were respected. His delegation fully supported the elaboration of a draft legally binding instrument on the right to development and, in that connection, welcomed the adoption of Human Rights Council resolution 42/23.

14. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that the right to development was a fundamental right in itself and also a prerequisite for the realization of other human rights. All Member States should promote people-centred development that was innovation-driven, coordinated, environmentally friendly, open and shared. Her delegation supported the elaboration by the Working Group of a draft legally binding instrument, which would lay the foundation for substantive negotiations, and hoped that consultations with all stakeholders would continue. China called on OHCHR, the treaty bodies and the special procedures to include the right to development as a priority area in their work and raise its profile within the United Nations system.

15. **Mr. Akram** (Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Right to Development) said that the issues raised by delegations, including unilateral coercive measures and disaster risk reduction, were being taken into consideration by the Working Group in its efforts to draft the universal binding instrument on the right to development. The Working Group would proceed with absolute transparency in its discussions with the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly.

16. **Mr. Alfarargi** (Special Rapporteur on the right to development), introducing his report (A/74/163), said that, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 36/9, he had invited all Member States to participate in regional consultations on the implementation of the right to development. Representatives of United Nations agencies, intergovernmental organizations, academia, civil

society and the private sector had also participated. The outcome of the consultations had been a set of practical guidelines and recommendations for designing, monitoring and assessing the structures, processes and outcomes of human rights-motivated development policies.

17. His most recent thematic report explored the explicit link between the right to development and disaster risk reduction. Natural and human-made disasters could undo years of development progress and stall future development. As reflected in the 2030 Agenda and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, disaster risk reduction was essential for the enjoyment of the right to development.

18. On the basis of information received from Member States concerning disaster risk reduction measures they had already taken, he had concluded that Governments should promote the participation of all relevant stakeholders, including disadvantaged groups, at every stage of the planning, implementation and monitoring of disaster risk reduction strategies. All States should establish multi-stakeholder risk reduction platforms at the national level, and potentially also at the regional and community levels. Women and other marginalized groups should be adequately represented in such platforms.

19. Given the importance of relevant and properly disaggregated data to risk reduction efforts, States should enhance international cooperation to build data collection capacity in developed and developing countries. States should also establish mechanisms to disseminate information concerning disaster risk reduction development policies and processes and take legislative action to guarantee the right to have access to such information. Warning communications technology should be equally accessible to persons of all genders, ages and backgrounds, and accessible information on hazards, vulnerabilities and risks should be disseminated to all concerned. Specific actions should be taken to ensure the genuine and informed participation of persons with disabilities in disaster risk reduction efforts. Furthermore, response, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction strategies must be gender equitable and universally accessible.

20. **Mr. Moussa** (Egypt) said that the time had come to adopt a binding international instrument on the right to development and all stakeholders should support the efforts of the Working Group in that regard. Efforts to promote the right to development would be fruitless without enhanced international cooperation and support for developing countries.

21. **Ms. Vieira** (Cabo Verde) said that her Government had been honoured by the Special Rapporteur's visit in 2018 and was already implementing some of his recommendations. Disaster risk reduction was key to sustainable development in small island developing States, which were both economically vulnerable and disproportionately affected by the effects of climate change. She asked the Special Rapporteur to further elaborate on the role that international cooperation should play in integrating respect for the right to development in disaster risk reduction efforts.

22. **Ms. Kalamwina** (Zambia), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that diverging interpretations of the right to development had hindered progress towards its full realization. If that right meant essential economic progress in the digital age, then there was clearly a gap between Africa and the rest of the world resulting from the failure to equitably distribute the benefits of global economic growth. The approach to development should be people-centred, focusing not only on the economy but also on social, cultural and political development. A thorough evaluation of the realization of the right to development should be undertaken to allow every country to describe the obstacles they faced. Inequalities in development continued to pose the greatest challenge in Africa and around the world. Development should be recognized as an inalienable human right, not treated merely as a political aspiration. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2030 Agenda remained essential tools for the realization of the right to development. It should also be borne in mind that development facilitated the enjoyment of all other human rights.

23. **Ms. Diedricks** (South Africa) said that her delegation looked forward to the elaboration of the draft legally binding instrument on the right to development. Disaster risk reduction was an integral aspect of social and economic development, in particular in developing countries and the global South, which were more at risk of having their development progress undone by natural or human-made disasters. She asked what more could be done to mainstream the right to development in the implementation of the Sendai Framework and other international initiatives.

24. **Ms. Brito Mancira** (Observer for the European Union) said that her delegation wished to reiterate its support for the right to development, based on the indivisibility, interdependence and universality of all human rights, the multidimensional nature of development strategies and the individual as a central subject of the development process. The right to development required the full realization of civil and

political rights, together with economic, social and cultural rights, and a mix of policies, creating an enabling environment for individuals, involving a wide range of actors at different levels. A rights-based approach to development aligned with the 2030 Agenda was essential. The primary responsibility for ensuring the right to development lay with the State.

25. States continued to have fundamentally different views on issues such as the scope of the right to development and the instruments that should be used to realize that right. The European Union stood ready to further engage in constructive efforts to identify a consensual approach to the topic, although it was not in favour of the elaboration of a legally binding international instrument as it did not believe that such an instrument was the appropriate mechanism for promoting the right to development.

26. She asked what impact the current pushback against the human rights of women and girls was having on the enjoyment of the right to development and what could be done to make the right to development a reality for all people, regardless of their gender.

27. **Ms. Gebrekidan** (Eritrea) said that her Government had worked to ensure the broad participation of citizens in its development activities. Her country's biggest asset was its human capital, but further efforts in that regard would require significant foreign investment and international cooperation. In that connection, her delegation wished to stress that development cooperation should be based on genuine support for the vision of the country in question; no attempts should be made to dictate priorities or impose conditions on other States. Global structural inequalities, including those linked to the economic and financial policies of some developed countries, continued to cause poverty and underdevelopment in the global South and must be addressed. She asked what steps could be taken to move away from the donor-recipient paradigm to one based on genuine partnerships for development.

28. **Mr. Youssouf Aden Moussa** (Djibouti) said that the right to development underpinned the 2030 Agenda, and obstacles to the realization of that right continued to hamper efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. With regard to disaster risk reduction, positive steps had been taken as a result of the Sendai Framework but developing countries were still more likely than developed countries to experience disasters, including those caused by extreme climate phenomena, and to be severely affected when they occurred.

29. Djibouti supported the elaboration of a legally binding international instrument on the right to

development. His Government had been considering how best to enhance the participation of civil society in the development and implementation of emergency assistance activities to assist Djiboutians and migrants transiting through Djibouti. He asked why only 65 countries had established national platforms for disaster risk reduction and what could be done to increase that number.

30. **Ms. Mohamed Didi** (Maldives) said that her delegation welcomed the emphasis in the report of the Special Rapporteur on the particular challenges faced by persons with disabilities and women in relation to disasters. While the Special Rapporteur referred in his report to the existential threat faced by small island developing States, he had not issued any specific recommendations concerning them. Targeted strategies should be implemented at the national level to address the vulnerability of children, in particular those with disabilities. Her delegation would be interested to know what financing mechanisms were available to support such actions.

31. **Mr. Cepero Aguilar** (Cuba) said that particular attention should be given to the risks faced by children, women, older persons, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, migrants and other groups that were particularly susceptible to the negative effects of disasters. The realization of the individual and collective right to development would help to mitigate disaster risks. Cuba considered that States should promote international cooperation in that regard. He asked the Special Rapporteur to discuss the value of international cooperation, in particular with regard to technology transfer, in support of efforts to promote the right to development through disaster risk reduction.

32. **Ms. Mehdiyeva** (Azerbaijan) said that the detailed, actionable and relevant recommendations set out in the report were aligned with her Government's priorities. Cognizant that human rights and development both promoted well-being, her Government had made significant efforts in recent years to ensure that the country's economic growth had dividends for the entire population. It had increased protections for internally displaced persons in relation to housing, education, health care, employment, livelihood opportunities and social security. However, those persons must be permitted to return to their homes, properties and possessions in order for their right to development to be fully realized. Given that the Special Rapporteur had identified internally displaced persons as one of the most disadvantaged groups in society, in particular when they were affected by natural disasters, Azerbaijan encouraged him to examine the difficulties experienced

by persons internally displaced as a result of armed conflict in future reports.

33. **Ms. Savitri** (Indonesia) said that her delegation agreed with the recommendation that Governments should promote channels of participation at all stages of the planning, implementation and monitoring of disaster risk reduction policies and programmes. With natural and human-made disasters on the rise, it was crucial to assess and mitigate their negative impact on development. Her Government recognized that cooperation with civil society organizations and the establishment of people-centred mechanisms was important for the integration of the right to development in disaster risk reduction efforts. It had accordingly established a nationally owned disaster risk reduction platform of the kind described in the report of the Special Rapporteur. She asked what capacity-building and technical assistance measures were most urgently required to enhance the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies that took into account the right to development.

34. **Mr. Mozaffarpour** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that while the specific vulnerabilities of women and persons with disabilities had been highlighted in the report, poverty seemed to be the common denominator in vulnerability to disasters. Further consideration should be given to the role that States and other development partners could play in addressing the links between development and disaster risk reduction, including in relation to technology transfer.

35. Coercive measures against States were one of the challenges linked to the right to development and disaster risk reduction. Owing to unlawful unilateral coercive measures taken by the United States of America against his country, it had been very difficult for the United Nations and other humanitarian organizations to provide aid to Iranians affected by severe floods in early 2019. Would-be donors had also found it difficult to transfer funds.

36. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that development was the answer to practically every challenge faced by States. By focusing on innovation, coordination, the environment, openness and the realization of shared benefits, her Government had made phenomenal progress in relation to human rights and development. China also played an active role in helping other States to eliminate poverty and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Her delegation welcomed the decisions by the Human Rights Council to renew the mandate of the Special Rapporteur and to establish an expert mechanism on the right to development. Her delegation would continue to support the work of the

Special Rapporteur and hoped that he would cooperate closely with the Working Group and the expert mechanism.

37. **Mr. Alfarargi** (Special Rapporteur on the right to development) said that he considered that he had given due consideration to gender issues in his report. Women and girls were among those most affected by disasters and particular attention should be given to their situation in disaster risk reduction activities. However, States had much more power to improve the situation of women through the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. Funds provided for disaster relief were limited and often earmarked, but there was an enormous amount of international cooperation and financing taking place in relation to the 2030 Agenda and States had much more leeway to use those funds to further their national priorities. Similarly, while he would continue to take the needs of small island developing States into account in his work and would be willing to produce a specific report on the topic if he were asked to do so, the climate change issues affecting them could not be adequately addressed through disaster risk reduction strategies; they required a range of initiatives to be implemented under the 2030 Agenda. He suggested that States in particular situations establish regional platforms to focus on the specific challenges they faced.

38. He encouraged all States and stakeholders to support the Working Group's efforts to draft a legally binding international instrument on the right to development. Since being left behind in the context of disasters often meant death, he urged all States to communicate clearly with affected communities and involve them in disaster risk reduction efforts; establish national disaster risk reduction platforms; and collect relevant disaggregated data. Broad participation was also a pivotal factor in the crucial task of building resilience to disasters.

39. He would consider other issues that had been raised by delegations and looked forward to further dialogue at the international, regional and bilateral levels. Disaster risk reduction was essential but had a limited scope and was not a universal solution to development problems. In that connection, he encouraged Member States to refrain from suggesting that disasters were the source of all their economic challenges or turning the focus of discussions on the topic to important but tangential issues, which could detract attention from the crucial task of reducing the risk of disasters.

40. **Mr. Sewanyana** (Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international

order), introducing his report on the topic of public participation and decision-making in global governance spaces and its impact on a democratic and equitable international order (A/74/245), said that intergovernmental, multisectoral and private global governance forums played a significant role in developing the framework and functioning of the international order, in parallel to the United Nations system. However, they remained largely inaccessible to the public despite having an obligation to respect the basic principles of democratic governance in their decision-making.

41. His consultations with Member States and other stakeholders had made it clear that the decisions taken by global governance forums, which concerned matters ranging from global economic priorities to trade, peace and security and terrorism, affected not only their members but also the populations outside of their territories. All such forums should ensure public participation in their work so as to contribute to a democratic and equitable international order. The meaningful participation of civil society actors in global governance would ensure that their expertise was taken into account and that decisions were informed by a wide range of actors, including the marginalized populations that were most vulnerable to the consequences of decisions. Moreover, policies developed on the basis of participatory processes were likely to be more effective and sustainable because they would have been vetted by affected populations and independent experts. However, most civil society organizations did not seem to have a thorough understanding of global governance spaces or the role that civil society could play in their decision-making processes. A number of civil society organizations that had engaged with global governance bodies had expressed the view that the outcome documents of such forums lacked substance and seemed to be largely rhetorical.

42. Meaningful public engagement at the global governance level required safe environments for public engagement at the national level. Furthermore, States had a responsibility to investigate any allegations of reprisals against civil society actors that engaged with global governance forums.

43. Public participation not only enhanced the transparency, legitimacy and credibility of global governance forums but also contributed significantly to the achievement of their goals in an effective, sustainable and inclusive manner. The views of marginalized groups must be taken into account in decision-making processes. A democratic and equitable international order could be achieved only if global

governance spaces consented to becoming people-centred.

44. **Ms. Marin Sevilla** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the establishment of a peaceful and prosperous world and a just and equitable world order, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, had always been at the centre of the priorities of the Non-Aligned Movement. The States members of the Movement wished to reiterate their deep concern at the growing tendency to resort to unilateralism and unilaterally imposed measures, which undermined the Charter of the United Nations and international law. They also reiterated their commitment to the promotion, preservation and strengthening of inclusive multilateralism and multilateral decision-making processes under the auspices of the United Nations.

45. At the most recent Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Ministers had reiterated that democracy was a universal value based on the freely expressed will of the people to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural system and had reaffirmed that democracy, development and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms were interdependent and mutually reinforcing. They had also reaffirmed their support for the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the continuing relevance of the fundamental principles set out therein. Strong and democratic political and economic institutions were needed to meet the needs of the peoples. The Movement accordingly called for the democratization of all international governance systems.

46. **Mr. Ahmed** (Maldives) said that his delegation was encouraged by the potential for valuable public participation in global governance spaces described in the report of the Independent Expert. The peaceful conduct of presidential elections in Maldives in 2018 had reflected his country's commitment to democracy and an equitable world order. A truly democratic and equitable international order must take into consideration the particular needs of small island developing States. Specifically, international investment structures must establish viable mechanisms to enhance monetary support to those States in the context of the changing global financial architecture. He asked what could be done to enable small island developing States to participate fully in multilateral decision-making processes.

47. **Mr. Driuchin** (Russian Federation) said that public participation in global governance was important, and constructive dialogue between Governments and civil society promoted a collective approach to global problems. However, there appeared to be an undue focus in the report on the vulnerability to acts of intimidation and reprisals faced by civil society actors and groups that were marginalized or discriminated against. He asked why the Independent Expert had devoted so much of his report to that issue and how it related to his mandate.

48. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that the establishment of a democratic and equitable international order was an arduous task in an era of great change and instability, and with unilateralism and protectionism on the rise. In the context of global governance on human rights issues, States should abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of other States, refrain from intervening in the affairs of other States and eliminate politicization and double standards in the consideration of human rights issues. Disagreements on human rights matters should be addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation, and assistance should be provided only with the consent of the country in question. Developed countries should fulfil their commitment to assist developing countries in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and refrain from imposing their development models on other States. Moreover, States should not adopt unilateral coercive measures that undermined human rights in developing countries. The United Nations human rights mechanisms should devote more of their resources to matters concerning economic, social and cultural rights, which were of great interest to developing countries, and developing countries should be given a stronger voice in global human rights governance. All stakeholders should work together to promote a new system of international relations based on mutual respect, equity, justice, cooperation and shared benefits.

49. **Mr. Cepero Aguilar** (Cuba) said that all people had the right to live under an international order that respected their human rights and fundamental freedoms. Cuba was concerned about the erosion of the will to establish a truly democratic and equitable international order. The United States was undermining multilateralism and efforts to establish a democratic and equitable international order by withdrawing from international agreements such as the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, refusing to take part in negotiations on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular

Migration, failing to accept language and documents agreed by consensus and ruthlessly imposing illegal unilateral coercive measures. The impact of those practices should be examined as a matter of urgency.

50. Cuba considered that the Independent Expert should have produced a report pursuant to paragraph 22 of General Assembly resolution [73/169](#), by which the Assembly had invited him to undertake research into the impact of financial and economic policies pursued by international organizations and other institutions on a democratic and equitable international order.

51. **Mr. Sewanyana** (Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order) said that unilateral coercive measures posed a threat to multilateralism and had no place in a democratic and equitable international order. He had received many testimonies from citizens of affected Member States confirming the view that such measures had a negative impact on societies. He encouraged Member States to take concerted action to reduce the use of unilateral coercive measures and place greater emphasis on multilateralism. Enhanced collective action would also address the concerns expressed by Maldives; small States would be heard and have their concerns taken into account if States were truly working together democratically. Global governance spaces were responsible for many positive developments, but their benefits must be reaped with the participation of all.

52. He had examined the question of reprisals in his report because they undermined democratic participation. If national Governments were threatening groups of people or organizations, it would be difficult to achieve democracy at the global level. In response to the comments made by China, he expressed the hope that developing and developed countries would work together to reduce all threats to the establishment of a democratic and equitable international order.

53. With regard to General Assembly resolution [73/169](#), he hoped to enhance understanding of his mandate through constructive dialogue and ensure that he addressed all issues that threatened the realization of a democratic and equitable international order. The starting point for an effective analysis of the impact of the financial and economic policies of international institutions on efforts to establish such an order was the consideration of democratic participation.

54. The proliferation of non-United Nations global governance spaces on the geopolitical, economic and financial stages had had a considerable impact on the framing and functioning of the international order. The Group of 7, the Group of 20 and, to a lesser extent, certain other bodies had become so powerful that they

were posing a threat to the United Nations system. In order for global governance forums to have a positive impact they should be accountable, and the outcomes of their work should feed into the work of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.