

**Statement by the Representative of the Russian Federation Boris Meshchanov  
at the Informal consultations to review arrangements contained in resolutions  
75/290A and 75/290B and their annexes on the strengthening of the Economic  
and Social Council and the review of the high-level political forum on  
sustainable development**

March 7, 2024

Distinguished colleagues, we thank the CF teams for the substantive work done to prepare the paper of possible elements for the draft resolution of the review of ECOSOC and HLPF. We take note of the proposal of G77 and recall in this regard that taking a technical update approach was suggested earlier this year by both Presidents of Ga and ECOSOC. If negotiated however, the document should strengthen the last iterations of both resolutions, not weaken them, considering two main objectives – reaffirming the mandate of ECOSOC and HLPF and increase the effectiveness of both bodies in terms of implementing those mandates. In this vein, let me share with you the following remarks:

1. Chapeau. We are a bit puzzled by the statement that ECOSOC serves as some accountability platform. The mandate of this body is defined in the UN Charter and in op2 of the resolution 75/209A. Bullet 3, therefore, can be reformulated accordingly.

2. Review of the ECOSOC. We have to reiterate that in the resolution, the intergovernmental nature of the Charter body needs to be reconfirmed to avoid further discrepancies. Its statutory mandate and coordinating function in the socio-economic area are to be properly reflected.

3. Identifying gaps in implementation.

Bullets 2 and 3 should be reformulated. We are not convinced of the necessity to single out mainstreaming the gender perspective in the work of ECOSOC. On the other, such developmental priorities as poverty eradication, building resilient national health systems, technology transfer, global taxation, science and digital

international cooperation – all these were not taken on board with regard to gaps implementation. ECOSOC should pay attention to the economic dimension of sustainable development, with an emphasis on ensuring economic growth and the key task of eradicating poverty.

This is on bullet 2.

On bullet 3. We don't really see lack of engagement of the CSO in the work of ECOSOC and its fora. On the contrary. It has been a concerning practice in recent years of de-facto expanding the rights of non-state actors in ECOSOC including through arbitrary interpretation of "major groups" within the HLPF. Engagement of representatives of NGOs, business and science to these formats is already sufficiently regulated and does not require additional expansion or "systematization", and the decisions of the member countries previously adopted in this regard have not lost their relevance although sometimes overlooked.

To the ends of this section, our delegation has suggested bringing more academic community from the emerging markets and developing countries to both the Council and the Forum and overall, mainstream science perspective. We hope this idea could be somehow reflected in the zero draft (perhaps within the framework of the "engagement and participation" section).

#### 4. Alignment.

Whereas our delegation supports further enhancement of cooperation with IFIs we could look into it broader and reach out as a membership through the Council to regional economic organizations and development banks. We had submitted this idea before, either.

On the alignment between ECOSOC and the ECOSOC system. Productive and systematic cooperation between subsidiary bodies would be welcomed and could become a value added of this process as a whole. We would support efforts to strengthen their coherence, exchange of information and increase their effectiveness (including practical tools such as the Technology Facilitation Mechanism). However, we are not convinced by the term "interlinkages" as conducive to mixing

the mandates and eventual duplication of work. Thus, reference to respect of the prerogatives of each of them should be included in the zero-draft.

It is most problematic for us to allow for any interventions of ECOSOC in the area of peace and security and especially, the mandate of the Security Council (bullets 1 and 2 of “strengthening alignment between ECOSOC and other UN bodies) beyond art. 65 of the UN Charter or promotion of the so called “nexus” if not based on the agreed languages from the humanitarian assistance resolutions, if needed. So these two bullets Ask for the deletion here.

5. HLPF section will need some amendments bringing the zero draft language in conformity with the agreed in the UN language, for instance deleting unclear references to “vulnerable and marginalized groups” in the “HLPF program” subsection.

At the beginning of the whole HLPF-related section will be important to include reference to the relevance of the role of the HLPF as a key platform for a global review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

We are also concerned by the gradual erosion of the central place of the forum in assessing the implementation of its individual targets as international conferences are organized and UN processes are being initiated titled as “official” review Conferences for specific goals thus undermining the integrated and interlinked nature of the Goals. This imperative as derived from the 2030 Agenda preambular, may be included in the HLPF section to strengthen the central role of the HLPF and the integrity of the Agenda itself.

In the last bullet, when it comes to ongoing dialogue between governments and other stakeholders we would again propose to include bringing perspectives from various geographic regions of the world, particularly the academic community as most relevant major group for the assessment exercise of the achievement of the Goals.

Last, the Political declaration of the HLPF is not mentioned. Member states may wish to consider strengthening this main instrument of global action on

sustainable development and put it in the resolution as intergovernmentally agreed document following the example of the FFD agreed conclusions and recommendations.

To conclude let me once again join the G77 and both GA and ECOSOC presidents to call to technical update as the most balanced decision.

I thank you.