

Oral Statement – 47th Commission on Population and Development, April 11, 2014
Delivered by Annie Franklin

On behalf of the Family Rights Caucus, we respectfully express concerns with the current negotiations. As per resolution A/RES/65/234, “the special session for the assessment of the status of implementation of the Programme of Action” paragraph 4: “there will be no renegotiation of the existing agreements contained therein.”

Member States **had** agreed that ICPD would **not** be reopened for negotiation. The CPD bureau subsequently announced they would release a draft to be negotiated that would be **only procedural**, with no substantive provisions. A zero draft produced by the bureau not only reopened ICPD, but also went beyond it with language endorsing the highly controversial regional outcome review documents, among other things.

We are especially concerned by aggressive attempts to pressure delegations to adopt an endorsement of the regional review documents advancing controversial sexual rights that Member States would never have accepted had they been openly negotiated here in New York by experts who fully understand the terms being inserted into these documents.

UNFPA’s review “ICPD Beyond 2014” being aggressively promoted in the current negotiations goes too far beyond ICPD with more than 500 highly controversial references:

391 references to “sexual,”
25 references to “sexual orientation,”
6 references to “sex workers,” the euphemism promoting prostitution
17 references to “transgender,”
2 references to “LGBT,”
18 references to “comprehensive sexuality education,”
44 references to “sexual and reproductive rights,”
and 173 references to “abortion”

One could ask then, is sustainable development only about sex and abortion? Why is the emphasis so distorted? Ironically the UNFPA report and the regional reviews are focused on controversial issues that are **nowhere** to be found in ICPD.

We also register grave concerns about opposition to the inclusion of the **Principle 1 of ICPD** (1994) the provision calling for respect of national sovereignty, national laws, development priorities, religious and ethical values and cultural background. We deplore this as an intentional disrespect for this well-established principle of sovereignty by those seeking to impose provisions running counter to countries’ religious and cultural values.

We respectfully call upon UN Member States and the CPD bureau to comply with resolution A/RES 65/234 by adopting a truly procedural text that does **not** reopen ICPD and to reject the forcible demands to recognize the highly controversial regional outcome review documents and the ICPD Beyond 2014 review report. Thank you.