

## **U.S. Comments on Draft Report Pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 71/327**

The following comments respond to

(NV DESA-18/01473). The role of the United Nations in this area is limited and any report on this topic must acknowledge that reality. In the production of this report, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) should not overstep its own role, and should maintain impartiality.

Resolution 71/327 was adopted only after a vote, reflecting serious concerns by several member states. As such, the resolution does not reflect the consensus achieved by member states in recent fora on these issues and therefore it cannot serve as an appropriate guidepost for the report. The U.S. explanation of vote on 71/327 is attached to this input, highlighting areas that do not enjoy broad support and should be excluded from this report.

With respect to the draft outline of the report, it would benefit from focus and significant streamlining. Section II appears to duplicate existing summaries of economic conditions, global growth, and current trends in financial markets and global trade. We question the need for additional work in this area, already covered by a number of reports.

Section III ought to be eliminated in its entirety. DESA, along with any UN body, should not opine on the reform of international financial and trade institutions that have different memberships, different mandates, and different rules of procedure. We emphasize that 71/327 does not call on this report to comment beyond the relevant organizations of the UN system. UNCTAD is the only UN body with a mandate as it concerns trade, and the WTO is wholly separate from the UN system.

Section IV is duplicative and its direction is inappropriate. Development cooperation is not a form of economic governance and the implementation of 72/279 is not within the scope of 71/327. Any content related to resolution 72/279 and this topic more broadly, including that now present in the draft outline of the report, should be excluded from the report.

Section V should be eliminated in its entirety. While we recognize and appreciate that the UN is an important partner of the G20, the G20 sets its own agenda. As such, we do not see the utility of Section V part A of the report and thus suggest that it be eliminated. We caution strongly against including part B, as the G7 and the OECD are also separate fora, separate from the UN system; furthermore, the call in part C to engage with the WTO is wholly unacceptable to the United States. The UN does not have a mandate to influence the decision-making of organizations such as the WTO or the Bretton Woods Institutions. The UN ought to confine its

It would be inappropriate for the report to present options for engagement with particular member states, or particular small groups.

Recommendations under Section VI that implicate entities and organizations with different memberships, different mandates, and different rules of procedure from the UN would have no standing for the United States. Similarly, any recommendations should not presume that an expanded role for the UN is desirable, particularly in cases where expertise and authority are found elsewhere. In many situations, an expanded UN role would be duplicative and wasteful at best, and in practice would undermine good work done elsewhere. Furthermore, the implication that the endorsement of the action plan of the Group of 20 on the 2030 Agenda constitutes acceptance of the role of the United Nations in global economic governance is overreaching.

Finally, we take this opportunity to thank DESA for its work and call upon DESA to prepare this report in the most efficient manner possible, avoiding duplication and ensuring the final product is concise, fact-based, impartial, and does not prejudge or seek to influence the results of member state negotiations at the UN or any other forum.

## U.S. Explanation of Vote on General Assembly Resolution 71/327 (September 11, 2017)

Good morning. We take this opportunity to explain our vote on the UNGA resolution regarding the United Nations in Global Economic Governance. We would like to emphasize the importance of duplication and overlap. As this negotiation began, we expressed our concern that this duplication of sources, especially since these issues are addressed in other UN fora. From the onset we made efforts to achieve a short, concise resolution free of clearly-communicated redlines. We are disappointed with the outcome and hope that all Member States will consider and support a call to rationalize these processes to focus on substance and eliminate duplication and redundancy.

We are unable to accept the language in this document whereby the UN opines on the WTO, which is independent of the UN and has a different membership, a different mandate, and different rules of procedure. As we have stated on numerous occasions, it is unacceptable to the United States for UN documents to speak to ongoing or future work of the WTO, to reinterpret WTO agreements or rules, or to otherwise engage on matters that fall within the independent mandate and processes of the WTO.

With regard to paragraph four, the UN is not the appropriate venue for discussions on the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions. Rather, reform of the governance structures, quotas, and voting rights of the Bretton Woods institutions are internal governance matters for the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. We encourage countries to participate in the reform dialogue through membership and representation in the international financial institutions.

We are unable to accept the language in this resolution that calls for strengthening the role of the UN in global economic governance, including with independent institutions and fora. We do not support such a call to economic governance. In addition, we do not believe that the UN has the expertise to evaluate the degree of coherence and consistency among the international monetary, financial, and trading systems, and we do not see a role for the UN in opining further on this matter.

The United States supports the current practice of engagement between the UN and G-20. We would like to see the UN continue to engage with G-20 as a partner organization invited by G-20 discussions as a partner organization invited by G-20. As we have stated on numerous occasions, it is unacceptable to the United States for UN documents to speak to ongoing or future work of the WTO, to reinterpret WTO agreements or rules, or to otherwise engage on matters that fall within the independent mandate and processes of the WTO.