

CONSEJO PERMANENTE



OEA/Ser.G
CP/ACTA 1993/14
12 noviembre 2014

ACTA
DE LA SESIÓN EXTRAORDINARIA
CELEBRADA
EL 12 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2014

Aprobada en la sesión del 9 de julio de 2015

ÍNDICE

	<u>Página</u>
Nómina de los miembros que asistieron a la sesión	1
Aprobación del proyecto de orden del día	2
Palabras introductorias de la Presidenta del Consejo Permanente	2
Presentación del Director de la London Academy of Diplomacy sobre el tema “Diplomacia y desarrollo en un entorno global complejo”	3
Presentación del exrepresentante Permanente de Guyana ante las Naciones Unidas sobre el tema “Fomento de la capacidad de adaptación para el desarrollo sostenible en los países en desarrollo”	12
Presentación del Presidente del Instituto Dominicano de Telecomunicaciones (INDOTEL) y Presidente del Comité Directivo Permanente de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (COM/CITEL) sobre la tecnología como instrumento de combate a la pobreza y promoción de una efectiva gobernanza pública.....	19
Diálogo con los Estados Miembros	24
Palabras de la Secretaria Ejecutiva para el Desarrollo Integral de la OEA.....	51

CONSEJO PERMANENTE DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN DE LOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS

ACTA DE LA SESIÓN EXTRAORDINARIA CELEBRADA EL 12 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2014

En la ciudad de Washington, D.C., a las diez y dieciséis de la mañana del miércoles 12 de noviembre de 2014, celebró sesión extraordinaria el Consejo Permanente de la Organización de los Estados Americanos. Presidió la sesión la Embajadora La Celia A. Prince, Representante Permanente de San Vicente y las Granadinas y Presidenta del Consejo Permanente. Asistieron los siguientes miembros:

Embajador Bayney R. Karran, Representante Permanente de Guyana
Embajador John E. Beale, Representante Permanente de Barbados
Embajador Hubert J. Charles, Representante Permanente del Commonwealth de Dominica
Embajadora Jacinth Lorna Henry-Martin, Representante Permanente de Saint Kitts y Nevis
Embajador Neil Parsan, Representante Permanente de Trinidad y Tobago
Embajador Diego Pary, Representante Permanente de Bolivia
Embajador Leonidas Rosa Bautista, Representante Permanente de Honduras
Embajador Andrés González Díaz, Representante Permanente de Colombia
Embajador Stephen C. Vasciannie, Representante Permanente de Jamaica
Embajadora Sonia Johnny, Representante Permanente de Santa Lucía
Embajador Pedro Vergés, Representante Permanente de la República Dominicana
Embajadora Elisa Ruiz Díaz Bareiro, Representante Permanente del Paraguay
Embajador Juan Federico Jiménez Mayor, Representante Permanente del Perú
Embajador Marco Vinicio Albuja Martínez, Representante Permanente del Ecuador
Embajador Bocchit Edmond, Representante Permanente de Haití
Embajador Francisco Esteban Laínez, Representante Permanente de El Salvador
Ministro Consejero Breno Dias da Costa, Representante Interino del Brasil
Embajador José de Jesús Martínez González, Representante Interino de Panamá
Consejero Frank Tressler, Representante Interino de Chile
Primera Secretaria Joy-Dee Davis-Lake, Representante Interina de Antigua y Barbuda
Ministra Consejera Ardelle Lisette Sabido, Representante Interina de Belize
Embajadora Carmen Luisa Velásquez de Visbal, Representante Alterna de Venezuela
Segunda Secretaria Agnés María Alvarado Guevara, Representante Alterna de Nicaragua
Ministro Consejero Omari Seitu Williams, Representante Alterno de San Vicente y las Granadinas
Primera Secretaria Sachi Antrieka Soekhoe-Ramlal, Representante Alterna de Suriname
Ministro Néstor Alejandro Rosa Navarro, Representante Alterno del Uruguay
Ministro Consejero Luis Carranza Cifuentes, Representante Alterno de Guatemala
Segundo Secretario Jean-Luc Pilon, Representante Alterno del Canadá
Tercer Secretario Daniel Alberto Cámara Ávalos, Representante Alterno de México
Tercera Secretaria María Paula Zannini, Representante Alterna de la Argentina
Consejero Joshua Céspedes Víquez, Representante Alterno de Costa Rica
Michael J. Fitzpatrick, Representante Alterno de los Estados Unidos

APROBACIÓN DEL PROYECTO DE ORDEN DEL DÍA

La PRESIDENTA: Good morning! ¡*Buenos días!* I'm pleased to call to order this special meeting of the Permanent Council, convened to consider the items in the draft order of business, document CP/OD.1993/14.

[El proyecto de orden del día contiene los siguientes puntos:]

1. Aprobación del orden del día (CP/OD.1993/14)
2. Introducción del tema a cargo de la Embajadora La Celia A. Prince, Representante Permanente de San Vicente y las Granadinas y Presidenta del Consejo Permanente
3. Diplomacia y desarrollo en un entorno global complejo, a cargo del Embajador Joseph Mifsud, Director, *London Academy of Diplomacy*
4. Fomento de la capacidad de adaptación para el desarrollo sostenible en los países en desarrollo, Embajador Noel G Sinclair, ex Representante Permanente de Guyana ante las Naciones Unidas, Jefe de Gabinete Adjunto, Presidencia de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas (68º sesión)
5. La tecnología como instrumento de combate a la pobreza y promoción de una efectiva gobernanza pública, a cargo del señor Gedeón Santos, Presidente del Instituto Dominicano de Telecomunicaciones (INDOTEL) y Presidente del Comité Directivo Permanente de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL)
6. Palabras de la señora Sherry Tross, Secretaria Ejecutiva para el Desarrollo Integral, Organización de los Estados Americanos (OEA)
7. Diálogo con los Estados Miembros.]

Should delegations have no objection to the order of business as proposed, we shall proceed to approve it. Approved.

PALABRAS INTRODUCTORIAS DE LA PRESIDENTA DEL CONSEJO PERMANENTE

La PRESIDENTA: Esteemed colleagues, we are privileged this morning to be joined by a panel of distinguished diplomats and experts, who will engage our thoughts under the theme "Diplomacy, Development, and Governance." Our guests, to whom you will be introduced individually, have travelled from New York, the Dominican Republic, and London to engage in what I hope will be a rich discourse among us this morning. I wish to offer them a very warm welcome to the Permanent Council and to thank them for the commitment of their time and resources for this meeting.

Let me set the context of today's discussions. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, as Chair of the Permanent Council, believes that this discussion among member states on these issues is particularly important at this juncture for a number of reasons.

To start with, we recognize that the ever-changing scope of national, regional, and global issues very often goes beyond the capacity of traditional diplomacy. Given that the issues that confront countries nationally are increasingly characterized by their global and transboundary consequences, what are the new approaches that may be required for the strengthening of the intersection of effective diplomacy, development, and governance? That's one of the questions we will address this morning.

An ever-expanding set of regional and global issues with direct implications for development and governance—be they inequality, climate change, energy security, migration, cybersecurity, the rise of a more varied range of nonstate actors, and information immediacy—have necessitated a shift not only in the conceptualization of diplomacy but also the way states approach issues of development and governance. Our discussion here today should serve to reinforce and promote the opportunity for the Organization of American States to be a pioneer of a new diplomacy that champions sustainable economic development through strengthened governance, fueled by the capacity afforded us by technological advancement.

Today's discussions may perhaps be even more important in light of the current elaboration of the United Nations Post-2015 Development Agenda and a growing acceptance that sustainable development considerations will be fundamental for advancing social inclusion, economic growth, and governability. For those of our member states that fall within the categorization of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), this is of utmost importance.

Diplomacy is enabled, through governance, to bring about development and shared prosperity. Especially today, with the clear link between development and governance, it is our duty to strengthen institutions and processes in governance and diplomacy so that we can advance development. This interwoven diplomacy-governance-development paradigm will no doubt be key for overall regional and hemispheric security. We must therefore remain engaged in this work.

PRESENTACIÓN DEL DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY* SOBRE EL
TEMA "DIPLOMACIA Y DESARROLLO EN UN ENTORNO GLOBAL COMPLEJO"

La PRESIDENTA: I would like to welcome to this Council Ambassador Joseph Mifsud, who is going to make a presentation on "Diplomacy and Development in a Complex Global Environment."

Ambassador Mifsud is the current Director of the London Academy of Diplomacy, one of the world's leading institutions of higher education for diplomats, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international organizations, and those wishing to develop a career in the international field.

A former President of the Euro-Mediterranean University (EMUNI), Ambassador Mifsud was elected to that position in November 2008, after the Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean established EMUNI and Euro-Mediterranean higher education and research as one of its main priority areas.

Previously, Ambassador Mifsud served as Malta's representative on the Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG), the intergovernmental task force that coordinates the harmonization of higher education in Europe and beyond. Ambassador Mifsud is also a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Chair Professor in globalistics and globalization studies. He has lectured widely in China, Africa, Russia, the United States, and the British Commonwealth.

A recognized expert on issues of international security, diplomacy and immigration, and academic diplomacy, Ambassador Mifsud has been instrumental in creating a number of diplomatic engagements in different capitals, including the weekly diplomatic forum seminars in the city of London for diplomats from all over the world, and the annual global symposium for junior diplomats in Dubrovnik, co-organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Croatia. He is also a well-known keynote speaker and has served as an expert to the European Parliament and the European institutions, including the Council, the European Committee of the Regions, and the European Commission.

Ambassador Mifsud is considered to be one of the most experienced networked academic and diplomats in Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. He sits on the board of the prestigious Commonwealth Law Bulletin and a number of eminent global think tanks, including the G-8 preparation meetings.

Ambassador Mifsud, I'm pleased to welcome you and to give you the floor.

EL DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen! First of all, may I thank the Organization of American States and the Chair of the Permanent Council, Ambassador Prince, who introduced me so profoundly. I am very pleased to be here and to share some of the issues that we will discuss today, which I believe are extremely important for all of us.

My presentation will be focusing on two key words. I will leave governance out and speak about that at the very end, but I will be concentrating on two key words that everybody has been speaking about and perhaps looking at from various points of view.

The first word is diplomacy. I'm sure that many of you in this room love art. For those of you who appreciate art, if you go to the National Gallery in London, you will see this painting. The National Gallery has even opened up its doors to people who can take selfies with this painting. The last time I went, I took a group from a number of key new states, and they stopped in front of this painting. I'll give you one or two minutes to look at it because it's a fantastic and fascinating painting by Holbein called *The Ambassadors*.

In this painting, you can see two different types of ambassadors. One is wearing princely robes; the other is wearing clerical attire. By the way, they were related in real life.

What is more interesting is the number of instruments all around the room in which these two are featured. You can see a musical instrument, paintbrushes, and other things that are very fascinating. Why? These were the instruments that diplomats at that time had to have the skills to use. So, the painting is brilliant. In my office, I have a huge copy of this painting, which I love to admire, and anybody who comes to my office looks at it.

Why did these two ambassadors feel the need to be painted surrounded by the instruments of the trade, if I may use that word? I will come back to this because this is what I would like us to think about. These two ambassadors used the instruments of their time to ply their trade, which I believe is extremely important.

Obviously, many of you in this room, excellencies, would not use the same kind of instruments; however, you might use what we call nowadays public diplomacy or cultural diplomacy to achieve the same ends. Keep that thought on hold, because I will be coming back to it.

With respect to diplomatic interactions, we have diplomatic practice in the global world, and we have development and diplomacy. I've put them as two pillars, two foundation stones, because I sincerely believe that in today's age, even as we speak about security, cybersecurity, health, and other global issues, these two remain the rock bottom from which we can discuss diplomatic practice.

The diplomatic environment of the 21st century is marked by change and uncertainty. There has been an expansion in the number and variety of international actors, empowered by, for example, information and communications technology (ICT) and social media. Even before people leave this room, two or three might be tweeting about things that have hit their imagination or that they feel are extremely important. New actors in diplomacy are coming in, not just from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) but from other, more amorphous civil society groups on which one cannot really put a handle.

There is also the development of what I would call a new international security agenda, focusing on the security of the individual within the state and including such issues as climate change and pandemic disease. We have the whole issue in Africa of ebola, for example, which goes well beyond traditional concepts of international security or diplomacy.

I come here with not just a global perspective but also a European perspective. In Europe, we have seen the resurgence of a more traditional geopolitical agenda, which we thought had been altered after the end of the Cold War. Now, there is stronger competition for power, resources, and, sometimes, territory. In particular, there has been an expansion of what I would call regulatory diplomatic agendas, enhanced by the global financial crisis and the demands for more effective banking regulations. I believe another presenter will be speaking about this issue.

There is, however, something else that is important. Many people in the diplomatic field believe that one consequence of all of this is the continuing weakening of multilateral institutions. Now, you can agree or disagree on this. Some of you might have followed the speeches that ushered in the new European Commission in Brussels in November. The outgoing statements by the heads of political parties, for example, in the European Parliament to the Barroso European Commission were not very positive. Why? Specifically, one of the issues raised was: what happened to the development feature within the former European Union (EU) agenda?

While diplomats must now share the stage with a broad range of actors and institutions, despite much conventional wisdom regarding the impact of globalization, in my opinion, states remain extremely important actors in international affairs. So, while multilateral institutions might be weakened, or might feel that they are being weakened, the role of the state remains crucial in diplomatic discourse. Government diplomacy therefore remains a significant factor in protecting national interests, developing global governance, and—sometimes we surrogate this responsibility to

multilateral organizations—promoting international peace and security, which I believe is also within the realm of national states.

It is clear that diplomats have ceased to be the gatekeepers guarding the borders of the foreign; instead, they have become boundary spanners integrating different landscapes. This is going to be the theme of my discussion. I believe that we have moved, and I will try to explain and perhaps use some arguments for you to think about.

You know, we used to have the unipolar world; we used to have the multipolar world. I would like us to think of a new factor that goes beyond that: heteropolarity, in which things are continuously changing. For many in diplomacy, having organizations with set rules or a set rule book by which they abide is extremely helpful because you can classify things. Nowadays, in diplomacy and in development, especially where the common citizen lies, we have other actors for whom various rules do not govern the system or the ecology of the place.

The breakdown of the distinction between domestic and international affairs means that the national interests of a country now involve the whole of government; hence, the importance of coordination between government agencies. Foreign ministries, for example, see themselves as part of the national diplomatic system and consider their changing role in this light. There is also the increasing demand for regulatory diplomatic agendas, which imply increasing involvement of financial and other ministries in international policies.

We were just having a discussion before entering these chambers, and one of the things that always interests me is how governments use different kinds of actors in formulating diplomatic service and diplomatic policies. In a way, it is a good thing. Foreign ministries will remain responsible for managing their diplomatic networks. However, the demands on these networks are increasing, not decreasing. With increasing pressures on expenditure, for example, a clear prioritization of interests is vital.

There seem to be administrative hubs that reduce administrative burdens on smaller embassies. This is something that I think is important and was mentioned, for example, in terms of the Small Island Developing States (SIDS). We have a number of projects going on globally, not just within small states but even in larger states, in which there are virtual embassies, with officers combining online monitoring of countries with periodic on-site visits. This is taking place more and more.

There is a word that is currently being used—swarming—in which we use innovations in human resource management to allow the rapid concentration of necessary resources, for example, in emergencies.

There is something else that I feel is extremely important. We've been doing quite a lot of training in London on what I refer to as a "diplomatic technical reserve." What is this? It allows the cost-effective maintenance of a broad range of international knowledge or skills through networks of "reserve technical diplomats" in the academic and private sectors.

Why am I mentioning this? You saw Holbein's painting. Sometimes diplomats do not have all those instruments at hand or ready to use, or the skill to use all those instruments, but there might

be others, either within our grouping or within the country itself, who do have those skills. That's where the reserve comes in.

Development and diplomacy involve an understanding of changing patterns of diplomatic service. Foreign ministries, for example, are devising effective public diplomacy strategies, integrated fully into the policy-making machinery, which requires a sophisticated understanding of stakeholders and audiences. For example, all those candidate countries for the European Union could not sustain the *acquis communautaire*, which is the framework for becoming a member of the European Union, without the support of all the ministries concerned. It was not only the ministries of foreign affairs; the work had to be divided and shared.

Foreign ministries also must ensure that other elements of the national diplomatic system understand the centrality of development in public diplomacy and its medium- and long-term strategic purposes. Some might, for example, ignore the fact that some of the diplomacy in which we currently participate does not involve diplomatic services themselves. It goes beyond that. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) and the private areas are coming increasingly in, especially when big services are needed.

There's something else that I think is important: to operate globally, many nation states require strong assistance in terms of how to work together. Social media is one of the big things that have come in, and I feel that this is increasingly becoming one of the biggest advantages, even for the smaller states. Nowadays, the face of a country is not only gauged by how big it is or how big the population is, but also by the image that country manages to project. The only way of arriving at this goal is through projection; for example, using the Web.

Conflicts will arise over interference in domestic affairs, which reflect a clash between new and old. For example, the new international security agenda and the ability to operate within a geopolitical area need very different mindsets. The national diplomatic system may need different diplomatic skills and even different agencies to pursue different agendas.

Fragmentation of the rules and norms underpinning international political and commercial relations will leave many actors confused and at risk. A key role for diplomats will be to understand the implications of this fragmentation. Their own governments, as well as multinational, institutional, and commercial entities, will look to them for reliable advice.

Governments will continue to place great stress on commercial diplomacy, which I think is extremely important, but diplomatic services will need to analyze vigorously what services and support firms need, and where. Diverting resources away from political work may leave diplomats ill-equipped to offer the advice firms are looking for and limit their ability to make those vital connections.

The pressure of consular work is also increasing. Migration, whether legal or illegal, is a big issue. Sometimes embassies get caught in the middle because central government kindly leaves the embassies to deal with these matters. Obviously, they find themselves overwhelmed. Diplomatic services therefore need support from central government in terms of innovating themselves structurally and in the delivery of service.

There are a number of tasks for which diplomats now need a combination of traditional skills—for example, linguistic and historical knowledge—along with newer skills, such as network facilitation and new media. The national diplomatic system as a whole must radically improve its capacity for geopolitical analysis and long-term strategic planning. In many countries, the first stage of diplomatic education is the identification and recruitment of personnel with the right profile, including social skills, for the diplomatic roles identified for today's diplomatic practice.

At the London Academy of Diplomacy, we accept around 150 candidates every year to do a one-year program. The backgrounds of many of these candidates have nothing to do with diplomacy at the initial stage. I'm not saying that it's good or it's bad. However, it is extremely interesting the kind of profile that the countries are putting forward for these people to become the future ambassadors of their countries.

Why am I mentioning this? If I had to look at the category of people who are coming in for this type of training, three areas would emerge very clearly:

1. People who have a background in security issues.
2. People who have worked very closely with civil society. There's a huge investment in many countries in this field, especially by new states or countries that have passed from being a fragile state to being a stronger state.
3. People whom many countries have adopted in the past; sometimes they call them political appointees. They are coming from business and industry.

We are positioned in the financial city of London, and the set target of many of our candidates is to engage with these kinds of entities. They see it as an extremely good gateway, as well, to development in the later stage.

To recapitulate, where does diplomacy fit in the emerging patterns of early 21st century world politics? Communication, negotiation, and the representation of interests traditionally associated with diplomacy: the world has never required these assets more than it does now. Yet, diplomacy is experiencing, in my opinion, an existential crisis, both as a set of processes for managing an increasingly complex environment and as a set of structures through which these processes operate. There is uncertainty. Political agendas are completely changing, as are the norms, rules, and roles associated with diplomacy.

Unlike much discussion regarding the current state of diplomacy, the feature that I mentioned before—heteropolarity in diplomacy—recognizes the impact of change in its form and functions, yet it acknowledges the continuities that condition its evolution and functions. This contrasts with the traditional and continuing emphasis on what I would call “new diplomacies” emerging in response to international and domestic change.

This is very important. We are looking at new and old ways of doing diplomacy and new and old ways of doing development. Global, regional, and national diplomatic systems are all working together. Actors, patterns of interaction, and norms and rules of behavior are challenged by the demands of changing global and domestic policy environments. The pre-modern, the modern, and

the post-modern structures and processes are all working together. All of these various layers interact.

In my opinion, it has become a truism to argue that world politics is marked by increased interaction between sets of issues that were once relatively separate. Now, it's everything together.

So, how does diplomacy try to work out its relationship with development in this kind of environment? Let's take trade as an example. This is an issue that does not hit the huge states. The EU, the Russian Federation, and United States foreign policies all stress that diplomacy, development, and defense are three pillars that are linked more closely due to the challenges of dealing with transnational terrorism and the problems posed by fragile states or their fragility.

I see here the Ambassador of Saint Kitts and Nevis. I had the pleasure of being in Saint Kitts, where we had a workshop on the economic resilience of small states, which is an extremely important feature. After the meeting in Saint Kitts, I was in a much bigger country, one of the world's superpowers—if there are any still left—in which economic resilience was the number one priority for discussion. So, there are issues that are not tied specifically to size, but they are tied also to the environment within which we are working. This is what I would call 21st century diplomacy. At the multilateral level, a growing issue of interconnectivity is challenging both the boundaries between functional international organizations and traditional work practices.

There is also interaction between actors. Contemporary diplomacy is engaging an increasingly wider range of actors alongside professional diplomats. The global financial crisis has reawakened long-standing concerns in terms of commercial diplomacy; hence, the relationship between diplomats and the business community. This is becoming more and more *à la mode*, even for smaller countries that have niche areas to promote.

In Europe, at the regional level, the EU post-Lisbon Treaty environment is posing a distinctive set of issues regarding the nature of appropriate structures for an expanded EU diplomacy. In November, the new European Commission team was launched. There is a new High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, but I am sure that you are aware as well that our European External Action Service (EEAS) is comprised of two sets of groups. One is made up of national diplomats; the other, of people coming from European institutions. The EU, as a group of member states, is one of the biggest contributors to development in the world. How to get these two groups of diplomats—let's call all of them diplomats—to work together is one of the crucial questions.

Some people are talking about what they call post-diplomatic processes. Who is now engaged in diplomacy? If complex networks are the watchword in managing world politics, where does this leave professional diplomats and the sets of activities in which they have been traditionally engaged?

With respect to contexts and locations, what are the parameters of the debates surrounding the nature, significance, and role of diplomacy? The word "diplomacy" itself seems to be open for discussion.

First, we are presented with conflicting images of the role that diplomacy and professional diplomats are expected to perform in world politics. Disentangling these images is an essential step

in identifying the present and future contribution of diplomacy in a densely configured international milieu. As the European Union demonstrates in the context of the development of the EEAS, the very definition of what constitutes diplomacy is open to debate.

Second, how are changes in power structures and the emergence of complex agendas spanning domestic and international policy milieus impacting the character of contemporary diplomacy?

Third, the issue of locations poses the question: where does diplomacy occur? Traditional notions of the separation of the domestic and the international, and the political and the diplomatic, are clearly challenged. How can diplomacy manage this situation?

Diplomacy seems to be existing in a state of continuous adaptation and flux. This is one of its fascinations. Simultaneously, it is the source of confusion in mapping its changing landscape. Thus, in the context of its manifestation as a key feature of the state's system, both practitioners and analysts have proclaimed its centrality as the master institution in the patterns of international politics, while expressing concerns with its deficiencies. For me, this is extremely important. The instruments and skills that one looks at in terms of diplomatic practice need to be earmarked and curtailed to the situation that we have today.

I like to use two phrases that I believe are extremely important in diplomacy and that tie in to development. Are we looking for what the World Bank calls solutions “just in case,” or are we looking for solutions that are “just in time”? This is one of the big issues. “Just in case” solutions call for acquiring a lot of skills that might or might not be needed in diplomacy, especially if they are tied to the kind of environment we're living in and which I have tried to explain, in which the various actors are completely unknown. They are like ghosts, coming in and coming out.

We have something that I think is extremely more useful and which, perhaps with the use of technology, would help us even more. I believe that the “just in time” solution for diplomacy is much more interesting and much more important at this stage. Historically, this would make sense, much more than something that might not be as useful as before.

We used to have cables in the nineteenth century. How many of these are being used now? We used to have other ways of exploring and communicating in terms of diplomacy. How many of these skills are being used now?

Let us look at three steps in analyzing the consequences of this scenario.

1. Be clear as to the assumptions on which differing images of diplomacy, and the diplomatic profession, are based.
2. Identify the parameters of the challenge that current policy environments present and the requirements they impose on diplomatic institutions.
3. Locate the ways in which the functions of contemporary diplomacy are adapting—or need to adapt—to changes that transcend traditional conceptions of the international and domestic policy domains.

What is the development garnered by diplomacy? The official measure of foreign aid is called official development assistance (ODA), the only internationally comparable measure of donor assistance. These are statements to which I would place a question mark at the end. Is it the only one reported by donor countries to official organizations, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)?

Here's a look at the past. In 1970, a UN resolution urged advanced countries to provide 0.7 percent of their national income as ODA. Only five countries achieved the 0.7 percent target, but several others did so subsequently. The EU had set ambitious ODA targets; for example, 0.33 percent by 2015.

ODA comprises official flows to or for developing countries that are provided for development purposes by the official sector (government) as public funds, grants, or soft loans. Are these the type of development aid that one would really require? What is considered to be ODA? These are questions I will leave with you. I will not go through them, but they are very interesting.

We have many agencies here to which core contributions are reported as ODA. Countries receive once they become a donor. Where would they leave? Where would they part?

But one of the most interesting things is: where does development normally go? We have looked at a number of organizations and, in terms of development, most of them tend to channel their funds through:

- Development projects, such as schools, clinics, and water supply systems;
- Emergency aid for natural or manmade disasters;
- Contributions to multilateral development agencies;
- Food aid, as well as emergency and developmental aid to refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs);
- Debt relief, outlined by the Paris Club Agreement; and
- Officially financed scholarships for students in developing countries.

Most funding for development has targeted these areas. The question remains, and perhaps we can open a discussion in this chamber later: is this the kind of development for which today's diplomacy is gearing states? Do we need this? Financial services and the private sector, which has been at the edges of all of this, have never been included in the paradigm.

I sincerely believe that one must start rethinking the areas under which development is considered. Diplomats are not able, in my opinion, to work very narrowly in a space that is no longer pertinent to the times we are living in. As I've said, it is a changing environment. Different actors and issues are coming up and taking center stage. For example, international security is not derived only through the use of arms or the invasion of territory but also via health issues, which are of major concern.

I thank you for your attention. My presentation is a bit longer, so I would suggest that it be distributed so that everybody can have a look at it. I am ready to answer any questions in terms of what we have discussed and what I have suggested.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Mifsud, for a most enlightening and engaging presentation here this morning. Congratulations! We would be very happy to receive an electronic copy of your presentation so that it can be distributed to member states. I would ask member states to hold their questions and comments and observations. We will give the other presenters the opportunity to speak, and then we would receive comments from the floor.

PRESENTACIÓN DEL EXREPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE GUYANA ANTE LAS
NACIONES UNIDAS SOBRE EL FOMENTO DE LA CAPACIDAD DE ADAPTACIÓN
PARA EL DESARROLLO SOSTENIBLE EN LOS PAÍSES EN DESARROLLO

La PRESIDENTA: I would like to introduce our next panelist, Ambassador Noel G. Sinclair, former Permanent Representative of Guyana to the United Nations and former Deputy *Chef du Cabinet* in the Office of the President of the United Nations General Assembly in its sixty-eighth session.

His Excellency Ambassador Sinclair has served in various diplomatic positions on behalf of his country, starting in 1966 when he joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Guyana. His experience spans a wide array of diplomatic assignments as well as foreign postings, including his service in 1968 at the Guyanese Embassy in Venezuela and his stint as Second Secretary at the Embassy of Guyana in Washington, D.C. from 1969 to 1972. He served as First Secretary in the Guyana High Commission in Lusaka, Zambia, and then became Chargé d'Affaires at the Permanent Mission of Guyana to the United Nations in 1978.

From 1979 to 1987, Ambassador Sinclair served as Permanent Representative of Guyana to the United Nations. More recently, as I said earlier, he served as Deputy *Chef du Cabinet* in the Office of the President of the sixty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly, under His Excellency John Ashe of Antigua and Barbuda. In this role, he was charged with special responsibility for reform of the UN Security Council and revitalization of the work of the General Assembly.

Born in Georgetown, Guyana, Ambassador Noel Sinclair holds a bachelor's degree in French from the University of the West Indies in Jamaica, which he received in 1965, and a diploma in international relations from the University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago, which he received in 1967.

His presentation today will focus on "Building Resilience for Sustainable Growth in Developing States." Ambassador Sinclair, welcome to the Council once again. You have the floor.

El EXREPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE GUYANA ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I consider it an honor to have been invited to attend and address a meeting of this institution, an institution that occupies such a revered place in the long history of our hemisphere, essentially, to strengthen the unity of action in the promotion of conditions of peace, security, and development.

Of course, for me, as a national of Guyana, the fact that, through an accident of the alphabet, I appear here today while the Council is under your chairmanship adds a special dimension to the honor that my appearance here gives me.

I'd like to assure you that I met Ambassador Mifsud for the very first time in my life this morning. I didn't even know the name. We had not spoken before. There was no coordination between us, and it is obviously to my disadvantage that we hadn't met before. As I speak, you're going to understand why I said what I said just now.

As I see it, at its heart, this special meeting of the Council is about the Organization of American States strengthening its engagement with the question of change: change in the planet; change in the relations between states, between states and people, between regions, between people and the planet on which we live; change in what responses are required and the appropriateness of the responses that are currently being made.

Diplomacy, development, and governance are issues of particular relevance in the context of the examination of our responses. I'm going to make your life a bit challenging and difficult now, asking you to keep in mind as I speak everything that Ambassador Mifsud has said.

Change is the only factor that is constant in international relations. As we approach the end of 2014, change is not only richly deserving of a place on your agenda; beyond that, change and how we adapt to it is, in fact, *the* agenda of our day.

Changes are taking place in the world today, particularly where poverty is concerned. I'm going to return to the question of poverty in a big way. We have no excuse for not being aware of poverty, its extent in our world, and its effect on human well-being in many parts of the world because it is being brought into our living rooms and our bedrooms, thanks to developments in communication. So, there's no excuse for not being aware of the pervasiveness of poverty in our world, no excuse for unawareness of the extent and the harmful and dehumanizing nature of poverty in our world.

Unfortunately, the international system created following the seismic change of the Second World War did not develop in every respect in the manner contemplated in the Charter of the Organization of American States. To be honest, in some cases, the outcomes we have witnessed could not have been reasonably foreseen by the framers of the Charter. Since you are already familiar with these outcomes and their interrelated nature, there's no need for me to describe them to you in any detail. You know them well. They are of concern to all states, individually or as a collective, regionally or internationally.

It was just short of two months ago that the general debate of the sixty-ninth session of the UN General Assembly ended. In that debate, 80 heads of state and 36 heads of government participated. The languages differed, as did the styles and the emphases, but what emerged in clear fashion is a growing acknowledgement of our world as one planetary community—and a small one, too—but unfortunately one without a spirit of community. What emerged clearly, too, is that it was not enough to tinker with the international economic status quo; what was needed was a revolution, a fundamental change in the structure of international economic life, a new system of relations among us all that was more consistent with the ethos of community and that would deal with the fundamental question of poverty and the need for its eradication.

It was at Rio+20, held in the year 2012 in Brazil—that is, 1992+20—that the international community articulated the need for a totally new conception of development. Before that, we could say that the general conception of development was trying to get the poor people in the south to come up to the standards in the north. But after Rio, there was a totally new conception of development, a new vision of what is the optimal relationship between governments and peoples, among states and peoples. That vision is described as sustainable development, and on that occasion, the international community agreed to launch a process of developing sustainable development goals (SDGs) that would have three dimensions: economic, social, and environmental.

Member states decided to put together an Open Working Group (OWG) that would develop a proposal describing what these goals might look like and submit it for consideration by our heads of government. The OWG presented a proposal that comprised 17 goals corresponding to that many issues, all of which the participants in the exercise preceding the preparation of the goals believed were essential to be addressed in the context of a Post-2015 Development Agenda. These goals touch not simply on economic development, as traditionally understood, but on the following:

1. Ending poverty;
2. Ending hunger;
3. Promoting healthy lives;
4. Ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all;
5. Achieving gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls;
6. Ensuring the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation;
7. Ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all;
8. Promoting sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth;
9. Building resilient infrastructure and promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization;
10. Reducing inequality within and among societies;
11. Making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable;
12. Ensuring sustainable consumption and production;
13. Taking urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts;
14. Conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas, and marine resources;
15. Protecting, restoring, and promoting sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems;

16. Promoting peaceful and inclusive societies; and
17. Strengthening the means of implementation and revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development.

It's quite a revolutionary approach, as you will see, to the concept of development.

The issues contained in the sustainable development goals represent what are considered to be the essential values in the relations within states: the domestic dimension of the larger question of governance, as well as among states and regions, no less than between human beings and the planet.

In respect of each of these goals that I enumerated, there are a number of targets identified, representing a series of marking posts—weigh stations, if you wish—for assessing the progress being made in achieving the goals.

At the very core of these goals is the eradication of poverty, which dehumanizes in a way that nothing else does. Poverty eradication is of importance to the rich as well as to the poor.

An overarching principle of the implementation of the SDGs is the question of global partnership, because it is recognized that reaching out to all stakeholders is the only way to give ourselves the best chance of devising and implementing solutions to the challenges that we all face in common.

This brings me to what was stated so clearly by Ambassador Mifsud: the involvement of all sectors. We are accustomed to international diplomacy involving national governments, but that area of inclusion has widened considerably to include national governments, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), civil society, youth, women, and students. They all have been involved and will continue to be involved in the articulation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Now that the General Assembly has received the proposal of the Open Working Group containing the 17 SDGs, preparations are currently afoot for the meeting of heads of state and government in September 2015, at which they will agree on the final form of the global and inclusive sustainable development agenda. By a decision of the General Assembly, the SDGs will form the basis of the new sustainable development agenda.

In his statement during the general debate, the head of state of El Salvador described this upcoming event in 2015 as “the most important world summit in our history.” There's no disputing that assessment. As I said, we are faced here with a revolution in relations between states, and between states and peoples. The sustainable development goals must be transformational. We are not merely tinkering; we're not making adjustments here and there. We want something that is completely new: a new order of relations between peoples and societies.

As an indication of the importance that states attach to these goals, in the general debate to which I just referred, of the 193 state representatives who spoke, 151 mentioned the SDGs, and all of them in supportive terms. The only topic that got more mention was terrorism, which received 163 mentions, and that phenomenon itself is of concern with respect to the sustainable development goals.

Since our states are not all equal in capacity, the obligations contained in the SDGs will naturally be more challenging for some of us than for others. States in the developing world, in general, will need a capacity to bounce back and to overcome the effects of influences, either new or preexisting, that might operate to slow the implementation of the SDGs. In other words, they will need the capacity to build resilience, and to this, the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) says “amen.”

Because of our small size, our open economies, our slender resource bases, our insular nature—and this the International Monetary Fund (IMF) itself recognizes—we are immensely vulnerable to external shocks. Curiously, some of the negative influences with which we must contend are visited upon us by our development partners. I think here again of Ambassador Mifsud.

Speaking in this forum, there is no need for me to extend myself on how these countries and institutions determine our eligibility for concessionary funding. We in CARICOM have long been insisting that our inherent vulnerabilities render conventional determinations of development inappropriate. In our part of the world, hurricanes are not simply a threat; they are not simply part of our background; they are a predictable part of our yearly life. A hurricane or a flood can wipe out the entire gross domestic product (GDP) of many of our states, causing us to descend from middle income one day to no income the next—perhaps even in the space of an hour. Haiti is not unique. There was Grenada in 2004. There was my own country, Guyana, in 2005.

You will remember that just a few weeks ago, when the ebola scare was making a lot of news in the United States—and throughout the world, as a matter of fact—a cruise liner was headed to Belize, and the Prime Minister of Belize said that that boat was not welcome in Belize because if there's one case of ebola in Belize, that would have the practical effect of spelling the end of Belize's tourism industry.

Belize was not unique. A similar kind of decision was taken by CARICOM heads, and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), plus Trinidad, plus Guyana, that that is a luxury we can do without. We live on tourism, and if our tourism is going to be gutted by ebola, we can do without it. We have enough to deal with without it.

You see, the developed countries have reserves; they have buffers to protect them in times of financial crisis. They can shuffle around resources. But we in CARICOM, we don't have that flexibility. We are forced to borrow, and each time we borrow, the interest rates become higher because of outstanding indebtedness. And so our debt levels rise and rise and are, in effect, unsustainable. As I said, this is recognized by the IMF.

There is also the impact on our societies of the activities of traffickers in illicit drugs, in persons, in small arms, and in light weapons. We are caught between producers in the south and consumers in the north, and with our several miles of unprotected coastlines, we are transit points for these malefactors.

In my own country, Guyana, a few weeks ago, we found a submarine being constructed to transport drugs from the south to the north. You know well that because of the pressures being exerted on the traffickers to get their drugs to their destinations by air and by sea, meaning atop the sea, they decided to resort to the use of submarines. We didn't know that they were building a

submarine right in our country, but I'm glad that it was discovered, and I believe that that discovery would have put a dent in that procedure.

These considerations are having negative impacts on the peace, health, security, and general well-being of our societies.

A number of our countries offer financial services as means of ensuring development, but we are coming under tremendous pressure from Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries because they say that persons in their countries are trying to avoid payment of tax by hiding their money in our countries. Really, we are not the cause of the financial crisis that they are suffering. We are being scapegoated. They are requiring that we enter into a number of individual tax information exchange agreements that are so demanding and so detailed. We barely have the resources to deal with the things which we have to do for ourselves on a daily basis, but now we have to devote time, attention, and personnel to tax information exchange agreements.

Now, let us talk about implementing the Sustainable Development Goals against that background and in the context of all of these constraints, and you can see the kind of resilience we need to rebuild our countries.

At the end of the day, it is entirely possible for the effects of one or another of these factors to be so overwhelming that our states find themselves truly consumed by the relentless compulsions of the domestic agenda. After all, developing resilience is not like developing a muscle. A muscle can be developed simply by self-effort, but when disasters have the effect of undoing previous development gains, we become weaker, and building resilience becomes a Sisyphean task.

Natural disasters need to be seen not simply as climatic events but more as development disruptions deserving of a place on the agenda of international cooperation for development, not only between ourselves and developed countries but also institutions. When relations between us and them are asymmetrical, equity demands flexibility and beneficial modification. This is the message that we have been giving to our development partners regarding being able to deal with the obligations of implementing the sustainable development goals.

Madam Chair, when I say these things, I'm not reading from CARICOM's wish list. This is what heads of state and government said in June 2009 following the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and its Impact on Development:

We are particularly concerned about the impact on . . . small island developing States. . . . Our collective responses to this crisis must be made with sensitivity to the specific needs of these different categories of developing countries, which include . . . strengthened support for sustainable development, . . . and our previous international development commitments.

The Samoa Pathway, the outcome document of the recently concluded Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States, held in Samoa, states:

We reaffirm that the SIDS remain a special case for sustainable development in view of their unique and particular vulnerabilities, and that they remain constrained in meeting

their sustainable development in all its three dimensions. We recognize SIDS's ownership and leadership in overcoming some of these challenges but stress that in the absence of international cooperation, success will remain difficult.

CARICOM is naturally the region about which I feel the least unqualified to speak, but I know that other developing regions have their own narratives concerning the need to build resilience. Where Latin America is concerned, the difference between that subregion and ours is largely one of degree. We are mindful of the particular situations facing Latin America. For example, states in Central America share with CARICOM the nightmare of the drug culture. The head of state of Honduras in the general debate lamented that his country had become "a field of battle in a war which is not its war, which it didn't start, and which involves consuming countries in the north and producers in the south." CARICOM can relate to that. The President of Colombia stated that uprooting the problem of drug trafficking was at the heart of the Colombian peace process. We can relate to that, too.

What happens now? We have the report of the Open Working Group. We have the 17 SDGs. In September 2015 comes the negotiation and agreement on these goals and on the content and format of the sustainable development agenda. What happens then? What is supposed to be happening?

Right now, governments of all countries, developed and developing, are supposed to be examining and identifying the positions they will bring to the table. I know that the developed countries are giving special attention to articulating their positions. Those of us in the developing world are doing the same.

Now, we have to be mindful that whatever position the developed countries bring to the negotiating table would not necessarily represent the most enlightened thinking in their governments, because we know that their positions have to be the result of a process of consensus and of balancing of interests. While this or that government may be very enlightened and progressive in terms of how it should respond to the challenges of sustainable development, it has to deal with political parties, some of which can be very uncooperative and fractious. Those governments have to deal with interest groups that can make life very difficult for the government, for all sorts of reasons.

I'm not saying that it's better not to have to deal with these elements because even when a government will take decisions by itself, regardless of what others feel, at the end of the day, that could come back to haunt us. So, as we in the developing world prepare for the negotiations, we have to be mindful of this.

As Ambassador Mifsud said, this is a total, all-of-state, all-of-country involvement. We have to keep in mind the appropriateness of reaching out to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). After all, some NGOs span the whole planet. We do have many areas of common interest, and this is an opportunity for developing countries to strengthen their relations among NGOs on a broader scale.

Also, governments cannot proceed on the sustainable development goals without the support of their people, and if they're to get the support of their people, their people have to know and understand the SDGs and be made to see what is at stake for them. It is primarily a responsibility of government to make sure that people understand what they SDGs are about, but it's not a responsibility that governments need to discharge alone. NGOs in individual countries can help.

Civil society can help. The private sector can help in terms of providing job opportunities to reduce poverty. This is the multilevel diplomacy that Ambassador Mifsud spoke about. There needs to be a growing involvement of all sectors in society behind and in support of sustainable development.

Another crucial aspect for us is to make sure that governments lead with firmness and conviction, including the following consideration: the positions adopted by governments must be rock solid. We don't want to find as we proceed with implementing the SDGs that one government says: "Well, when this country signed on to those sustainable development goals, we were in opposition; we had no part of it. We don't think that the government should have signed on to it, and so we don't want to have anything to do with it. We don't want that to happen."

Our commitments to sustainable development need to be elections-proof. The positions we take now must be good because I'm assuming that these positions are taken, considering not only what is in our interest but what is in the interest of our children and of their children. So, we want to be proceeding with one set of principled positions down the road.

I'm going to end now, Madam Chair. Please permit me to express the hope, speaking in the intimacy of this regional familial relationship, that as we unite our emotional and intellectual energies in pursuit of the vision of the planet as one single community, we not only strengthen but give greater substance to the vision of this region—Latin America and the Caribbean—as a single community. This effort needs to go beyond symbolism. I'm not knocking symbolism. Symbols are definitely very important, but we must not forget what they are: symbols. They must not make us complacent or relaxed in the pursuit of substance or in the purposefulness of our procedures. If we refuse to be complacent or relaxed, we are all twice winners.

I say this to you and your colleagues, Madam Chair, and I'm saying the same thing to my colleagues in the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries in the United Nations (GRULAC) in New York. This is not reserved for you; I am saying this also to them.

Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you so very much, Ambassador Sinclair. We are privileged to have received these special insights from you, seeing that you have served in the Cabinet of the President of the UN General Assembly. I want to especially thank you for your taking the time to come to Washington, D.C. to make this presentation. I do recall that when we reached out to invite you, you were already overcommitted, so we appreciate your presence here today.

PRESENTACIÓN DEL PRESIDENTE DEL INSTITUTO DOMINICANO DE
TELECOMUNICACIONES (INDOTEL) Y PRESIDENTE DEL
COMITÉ DIRECTIVO PERMANENTE DE LA COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA DE
TELECOMUNICACIONES (COM/CITEL)
SOBRE LA TECNOLOGÍA COMO INSTRUMENTO DE COMBATE A LA POBREZA
Y PROMOCIÓN DE UNA EFECTIVA GOBERNANZA PÚBLICA

La PRESIDENTA: Let us welcome our next panelist, Mr. Gedeón Santos, President of the Dominican Telecommunications Institute (INDOTEL) and Chair of the Permanent Executive Committee of the Inter-American Telecommunication Commission (COM/CITEL). Mr. Santos is

going to make a presentation on “Fighting Poverty and Promoting Effective Public Governance through Technology.”

Mr. Gedeón Santos was born Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic and is the author of *The Dominican Liberation Party (PLD) against Poverty and Aware of Globalization and Global System in Crisis*, as well as many other books related to economics, politics, and international business.

Mr. Santos graduated from the *Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo* with a bachelor’s degree in social communication and a master’s degree in economics and international relations. He is a former teacher at the Diplomatic and Consular School of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic, a college professor, and a domestically and internationally recognized speaker at multiple fora.

A journalist, he has been a columnist for several newspapers, has published dozens of research papers, and has served as a panelist and a guest on many radio and television programs.

As a politician, Mr. Santos joined the Dominican Liberation Party (PLD) at the age of 15 and has occupied many leadership positions. He has also been a member of the secretariats of international affairs, and press and advertising, as well as manager and then director of the *Vanguardia del Pueblo* newspaper.

As a civil servant, Mr. Santos served as Vice Minister for Economic and Administrative Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 1996 to 2000; Deputy to the *Parlamento Centroamericano* (PARLACEN) from 2004 to 2013; and now President of the *Instituto Dominicano de las Telecomunicaciones* (INDOTEL). As Chairman of the Board of INDOTEL, he is no stranger to the OAS, because he is currently serving as Chairman of the Permanent Executive Committee of the Inter-American Telecommunication Commission (COM/CITEL) for the period 2014-2018.

Señor Santos, bienvenido otra vez. Le ofrezco a usted la palabra.

EL PRESIDENTE DEL INSTITUTO DOMINICANO DE TELECOMUNICACIONES (INDOTEL) Y PRESIDENTE DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO PERMANENTE DE LA COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA DE TELECOMUNICACIONES (CITEL): Distinguida señora La Celia A. Prince, Presidenta del Consejo Permanente y Embajadora Representante de San Vicente y las Granadinas; distinguidos embajadores y Representantes Permanentes de los Estados Miembros de la Organización de los Estados Americanos; señora Sherry Tross, Secretaria Ejecutiva para el Desarrollo Integral; invitados especiales:

Agradezco sinceramente la invitación de la Embajadora La Celia Prince para dirigirme a ustedes con ocasión de la sesión extraordinaria del Consejo Permanente de la OEA, dedicada a la diplomacia, desarrollo y gobernanza. Es para mí un honor dirigirme a ustedes portando la voz de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL).

Nuestra región ha realizado las reformas económicas necesarias para asegurar un crecimiento sostenible y con equidad. La región, además, le ha asignado una alta prioridad a combatir la pobreza, invirtiendo recursos significativos en mejorar la calidad de vida de los sectores más rezagados, lo que se ha traducido en una mejora significativa en la reducción de las tasas de pobreza y mejoras de la clase media.

Pero sigue siendo preocupante la proporción de personas pobres y en grupos vulnerables. Cuarenta millones de latinoamericanos han salido de la pobreza en la última década, pero aún hay un 25% de la población pobre y un 37.8% en situación de vulnerabilidad en los países de América Latina y el Caribe. Y aunque también ha habido progresos en la reducción de la desigualdad, el 20% de los hogares con menores ingresos o más pobres, recibe en promedio 5% de los ingresos totales, mientras que el segmento más rico captura el 47% del ingreso. Sin embargo, el desarrollo tecnológico ha creado una nueva forma de pobreza y de exclusión que se deriva de la incapacidad de una persona para acceder, dominar y disfrutar de las tecnologías de la información y el conocimiento, conocidas por sus siglas TIC.

Debido a lo anterior, hoy en día ya no se discute sobre la oportunidad o no de adoptar políticas que fomenten el uso de las nuevas tecnologías sino, más bien, sobre cuáles son las medidas más beneficiosas para lograr la plena implementación de las nuevas tecnologías en la sociedad. Las TIC constituyen el sistema tecnológico del nuevo paradigma digital; son la expresión de un profundo y poderoso proceso de convergencia que nos ha cambiado la forma en que vivimos, en la que nos relacionamos unos con otros y en la gestión de nuestras instituciones, basados ahora en un modelo en red que nos permite actuar desde lo local a lo global y viceversa, y que viene transformando nuestro mundo en sociedades de información y conocimiento.

Las TIC son el resultado de un proceso de fusión de tres grandes sectores: el de las telecomunicaciones, es decir, telefonía, cable coaxial, satélites y dispositivos inalámbricos; el de computación, es decir, computadoras, *software* y servicios; y el de los contenidos, quiero decir: publicaciones, entretenimiento e información.

A lo largo de la década del 2000 empezamos a darnos cuenta del poder que tenían estas tecnologías como instrumentos para impulsar el desarrollo económico y social. Nuevos tipos de actividad económica y oportunidades de empleo y una ampliación del alcance de las prestaciones de salud y educación, entre otros beneficios.

Del mismo modo, las TIC empezaron a demostrar su potencial para elevar el nivel de interacción entre la población y el gobierno; facilitando servicios públicos en línea, promoviendo mayor transparencia, rendición de cuentas, y participación ciudadana, a lo cual se le ha llamado 'gobierno electrónico'. Queda claro la dimensión del cambio paradigmático que ha traído las tecnologías de la información y de la comunicación.

Todo lo anterior ha hecho que los gobiernos emprendan programas y estrategias para intentar cerrar la brecha entre conectados y no conectados. Cerrar la brecha digital en América Latina es hoy en día una necesidad imperiosa. Solo por poner un ejemplo, cifras de la Unión Internacional de Telecomunicaciones (UIT) indican que los hogares conectados a Internet oscilan entre el 14% y un 83% en la región. Igual pasa con el porcentaje de personas conectadas, cuyas cifras van desde el 13.5% a un 84%; por supuesto, con los Estados Unidos y el Canadá con los indicadores más elevados. Pero el resto de la región con cifras muy diferentes de estos dos países. La Comisión Económica para Latinoamérica y el Caribe (CEPAL) ha estimado que el quintil de mayor ingreso tiene, en algunos países de la región, una tasa de uso de Internet hasta cinco veces mayor que la del quintil de menores ingresos.

Desde el lado de la oferta, la universalización de la banda ancha constituye el principal desafío en la región. Sin embargo, la reducida infraestructura, entre otros factores, obliga a fijar

precios elevados para acceder a la banda ancha, lo que disminuye la demanda e impide generar suficiente capital o rendimiento de las inversiones para muchos países en desarrollo. Por el lado de la demanda son varios los obstáculos.

Quizás la principal limitante para la expansión del uso de las TIC es el nivel de educación de los potenciales usuarios; lo que se puede compensar a través de acciones de capacitación, información, motivación y apropiación. Pero no debemos olvidar las dificultades de los potenciales usuarios para pagar el acceso a las TIC y los problemas propios de la era digital. Por ejemplo, el fraude en línea, el pirateo, el robo de identidad y la invasión de la privacidad.

El acceso a las TIC, en particular a Internet, como bien lo señala la CEPAL, es herramienta que contribuye a, y cito:

...al desarrollo de capacidades en muchas dimensiones: permite multiplicar opciones de aprendizaje, acceder a información y a la producción de conocimiento útil para la vida personal, potencia los recursos para participar en redes de relaciones con distintos objetivos (por ejemplo: comunicación, gestión, deliberación, trabajo conjunto, e intercambio de conocimientos, entre otros). Asimismo, la destreza en el manejo de estas tecnologías capacita para acceder a empleos y generar ingresos. Además, la comunicación en red democratiza el acceso a las posibilidades de tener voz, interlocución, visibilidad pública y, por lo mismo, poder debatir, presionar e incidir en decisiones políticas.

Las innumerables oportunidades se extienden igualmente a mayor acceso a las instituciones educativas y médicas, así como a los servicios públicos en línea. Asimismo, las redes de banda ancha abren la puerta a una explosión del crecimiento empresarial, la expresión cultural y artística, a los intercambios de las comunidades virtuales y contribuyen activamente al desarrollo de una nueva generación de trabajadores con estudios y conocimientos en tecnología.

La disponibilidad de redes de banda ancha ubicuas y asequibles a las que tengan acceso los proveedores de servicios permitirá el crecimiento de la computación en nube que podría dar lugar a enormes ahorros en costos y potenciar la innovación a nivel de los gobiernos, las empresas y los usuarios.

La Internet es considerada como una infraestructura básica para el desarrollo de nuestros países, como lo son las carreteras, los puentes, los tendidos eléctricos y el transporte, entre otros bienes públicos, por lo que la intensificación del acceso y uso de esta importante herramienta para la promoción económica y social de los pueblos debe ser una prioridad fundamental en las políticas públicas.

Esta dualidad entre oportunidades y desafíos es el tema principal de esta época en que vivimos. La heterogeneidad socioeconómica y de tamaño de los países que conforman la región dificulta la toma de decisiones. Sin embargo, a través de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones de la OEA se propiciará un diálogo fluido entre autoridades, operadores, usuarios de servicios y expertos de instituciones académicas y organizaciones internacionales y regionales multilaterales, la adopción de recomendaciones y mejores prácticas que promuevan temas en beneficios de los usuarios de los servicios de telecomunicaciones. Se debe evitar innecesarias duplicidades, buscando metas comunes y, sobre todo, utilizando experiencias adquiridas de otras instituciones.

El cierre de la brecha digital requiere inversiones muy significativas en los próximos años que se estiman en cuarenta y cuatro mil millones de dólares como promedio anual para el período 2011-2020. Con el fin de lograr un futuro sostenible se necesita crear un ambiente de más colaboración, cooperación y entendimiento mutuo entre operadores de telecomunicaciones, proveedores de servicios en la red, gobiernos y reguladores para favorecer la inversión en infraestructura y el desarrollo de más y mejores servicios competitivos basados en Internet, especialmente en zonas rurales. Es esencial tener un marco regulatorio razonable, estable y transparente que garantice una rentabilidad adecuada de las inversiones y que permita consolidar un círculo virtuoso de competencia sustentable.

Hoy, todos los estudios indican que un país puede ser subdesarrollado, pero es más subdesarrollado cuando no está conectado; un gobierno puede tener deficiencias, pero es más deficiente si no está conectado; una persona puede ser pobre, pero es más pobre cuando no está conectada; un ciudadano puede estar educado, pero se considera rezagado y desactualizado si no sabe de computación o de Internet. Estar conectado significa formar parte de una nueva civilización sin barreras, sin fronteras, sin distancias donde solo quedan excluidos los que se resistan a dar el salto hacia el fascinante mundo de la información y el conocimiento.

Señoras y señores: las TIC están demostrando que bien encaminadas sí tienen impactos positivos para mejorar las vidas de las personas, ayudan a las empresas a ser más productivas y a buscar nuevos mercados, y a los gobiernos a ofrecer servicios públicos en líneas accesibles y amigables, y a ser más transparentes y rendir cuentas en nuestra región.

Pero para lograr las metas anteriores y otras por venir, necesitamos una CITEI robusta, con capacidad de liderazgo; como un verdadero centro de creación de políticas en telecomunicaciones, como un soporte imprescindible de los Estados Miembros para el trazado y la ejecución de sus planes de telecomunicaciones. Sabemos que el sistema interamericano está en una etapa de cambio y transición, que la propia OEA necesita un nuevo impulso que le devuelva el liderazgo y la credibilidad de sus años de gloria; pero si queremos un sistema interamericano sólido y creíble, necesitamos comenzar por transformar los órganos que lo componen.

Sin embargo, siento que en el seno de la OEA no se le ha dado a la CITEI la importancia que ella se merece, pues se piensa que el tema de las telecomunicaciones es un tema técnico que nada tiene que ver con la política, que quizás otros organismos multilaterales regionales deberían llevar este tema, entre otras conjeturas. Pero los que así piensan están perdiendo de vista que al convertirse las telecomunicaciones en un problema económico y social, también, por vía de consecuencias, es un tema político tan importante que muchos Estados están dándoles categoría de ministerios a los organismos rectores de las telecomunicaciones en nuestra región.

Con el apoyo necesario, la CITEI puede ayudar a la OEA a revolucionar pues el tema de las TIC es el único que puede ligar a esta institución con la juventud y con los pobres que son todavía las grandes mayorías de nuestras sociedades. No hay un ciudadano en nuestros países que no tenga un teléfono celular, que no desee conectarse a Internet, o que no desee recibir un servicio de televisión por cable. A los jóvenes de hoy les interesa más chatear por las redes sociales o ver una película por *Netflix* que las observaciones electorales o los temas de la seguridad hemisférica. Disminuir la brecha digital o darle acceso a nuestras poblaciones a las tecnologías del futuro, genera más democracia y más desarrollo que muchos de los temas que se manejan en la agenda de este órgano hemisférico.

La OEA necesita ser redescubierta por nuestros ciudadanos, necesita conectarse con los temas del presente, con las necesidades de la juventud y la CITELE tiene todo para hacer ese *link*, para ser el eslabón que una a la OEA con el presente y el futuro de los ciudadanos de nuestra América.

Sirvan estas reflexiones de motivación y alerta para que nuestros gobiernos y la OEA emprendan políticas puntuales en tecnologías de la información y la comunicación de manera que no nos quedemos rezagados frente al más importante cambio tecnológico que está experimentando la humanidad, y así poder de una vez y por todas, emprender el sendero del desarrollo como lo soñaron los padres creadores de la idea de una integración hemisférica fuerte, democrática y con justicia social.

Muchas gracias.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Mr. Santos, for your very enlightening presentation. In fact, I found one of the last comments that you made about the importance of the Inter-American Telecommunication Commission (CITELE) to the Organization of American States to be very interesting. It comes at a time when we're looking at the Strategic Vision of the Organization and management modernization, so thank you very much for that observation.

DIALOGO CON LOS ESTADOS MIEMBROS

La PRESIDENTA: Distinguished representatives, we have come to the end of the presentations. The order of business was approved as is, but if you would permit me, I wish to invert the order of items 6 and 7. I would now open the floor for observations, comments, and questions from delegations; after that, the Executive Secretary for Integral Development will speak. So, delegations that wish to speak at this time, please indicate.

Venezuela, you have the floor, please.

La REPRESENTANTE ALTERNA DE VENEZUELA: Gracias, señora Presidenta.

Primero para felicitarla por haber traído estos interesantes temas a la atención del Consejo Permanente. Y más que una pregunta, tal vez esto es una sugerencia para el Profesor Mifsud, Director de la Academia Diplomática de Londres, visto que muchos de los temas o ejemplos que usted planteó tienen que ver mucho más con las experiencias de Europa. Sin embargo, escuchándolo hablar venía a la memoria de esta Delegación lo visionario que fue el Presidente Hugo Chávez, porque justamente, el Presidente Hugo Chávez hablaba de la necesidad de una nueva geopolítica internacional, donde se construyera un mundo multiétnico y pluripolar, entendiendo la presencia de diferentes actores y la necesidad de empoderar al pueblo para que participara y ejerciera la ciudadanía.

Muchos de los elementos de análisis que usted nos presenta sobre esa nueva diplomacia están planteados en el documento denominado "Plan de la Patria", de Venezuela; documento que tal vez tenga usted oportunidad de revisar. Ahí están incluidos muchos de estos elementos desde el punto de vista conceptual y de visión, de futuro, de lo que es la nueva diplomacia, va inclusive mucho más allá, hasta la necesidad de tener, además, un mundo multiétnico y pluripolar, esto, para permitir un equilibrio del universo y garantizar la paz planetaria, una paz planetaria basada justamente en la necesidad de la preservación de la vida en el planeta y en la salvación de la especie humana.

Algunos de los elementos que el Embajador Sinclair también ha planteado. También hablaba el Presidente Chávez del tema de cerrar las brechas digitales. O sea, de ahí el impulso que hizo con el lanzamiento del satélite Simón Bolívar. Es decir que más allá de las diferencias ideológicas, políticas que se podrán tener, cada vez es más evidente y es de reconocer y de estudiar la visión que tuvo el Presidente Chávez de este nuevo mundo, de la necesidad de nuevos actores y de la necesidad que, efectivamente, los pueblos recuperen la soberanía y participen más en las decisiones en sus países.

Así que a los tres presentadores, muchísimas gracias por toda la información que han compartido con nosotros.

Y a usted, Presidenta, de nuevo, gracias.

La PRESIDENTA: Please give the microphone to Ambassador Mifsud.

El DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: Thank you very much for your intervention. I fully agree. Obviously, we have been following the words of wisdom wherever they come from, and this is one of the most important. I also believe that with the changing winds—it's like being in a world that is completely changing—everybody has a role.

One of the things that was mentioned—and I thank the previous speakers; the two of them mentioned this—is the idea of using information technology to give a voice to different types of people. One speaker mentioned the use of technology; the other one mentioned the investment that we need to make in young people. I believe that diplomacy is no longer only the realm of governments but also of individuals. Venezuela did that very well by giving a voice to anybody who could be an “ambassador” for his or her country, which is something that the two speakers mentioned.

I come from Europe, but although I am a European, I also come from the smallest state in the European Union (EU), which is Malta. We had to win our small battles and big battles by trying to come up with ideas that are a bit different from the rest. Sometimes diplomacy needs those kinds of voices. This is something that is extremely important. Perhaps they are voices in the desert, as they say, but at a certain point in time, the desert voices become the most important.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador. I'm pleased to give the floor to Honduras.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE HONDURAS: Gracias, Presidenta. Un breve comentario general y después un comentario sobre los temas.

Nos congratulamos que nuestra joven Presidenta del Consejo Permanente abra este espacio de reflexión tan pertinente sobre cómo estamos enfrentando los cambios constantes a los que estamos expuestos y haciéndonos un llamado a que más que reactivos seamos proactivos en nuestros esfuerzos por lograr el desarrollo consciente de su eje central, el ser humano, y lo que además nos ha permitido escuchar y recibir con atención y agradecimiento las exposiciones que nos han hecho el señor Mifsud, el señor Sinclair y el señor Santos.

El comentario tiene que ver con un evento que, como todos saben, ha sido aprobado por los mecanismos correspondientes de la Organización de los Estados Americanos. En el 2015, se realizará en mi país, Honduras, la Reunión de Ministros y Altas Autoridades de Desarrollo Integral del Hemisferio; un momento importante para seguir dialogando, proponiendo y actuando sobre

integración, interconexión, globalización, innovación, creatividad, competitividad, conexión, conectividad. Son todas palabras que están en nuestro vocabulario de uso ordinario y que no simbolizan más que la interdependencia que naturalmente existe entre nuestros países, especialmente los que pretendemos avanzar firmemente en la escala del progreso. Vocablos que a su vez crecen y se fortalecen en su contenido por medio del multilateralismo.

Estamos en la ruta para construir una visión estratégica de la OEA, en cuyos objetivos hemos afirmado la solidez de nuestra institución en sus cuatro pilares fundamentales e interdependientes. El desarrollo, en consecuencia, quizás el menos favorecido por la publicidad, deberá recuperar su escenario debido para un producto equilibrado de seguridad, democracia, y derechos humanos. Cada país tendrá algo para proponer o recibir al sentarnos en la mesa y sostener un diálogo que potencie los temas que nos unen: el comercio, la educación, la cultura, nuestra diversidad biológica, que en muchos casos recorre el Hemisferio, y asumir como región los desafíos que enfrentamos a diario para lograr el desarrollo sostenible que pretendemos. Recuerdo el eslogan de una campaña para recaudar fondos en mi país que reza “Nadie es tan rico como para no necesitar, ni nadie es tan pobre para poder ofrecer algo”.

Cuestión de seguridad. El desarrollo sostenible es una lucha de años en cuyo empeño debemos considerar de manera inevitable y consustancial la realidad de un mundo cambiante, como se ha expresado, en que hoy vivimos, pero lleno de oportunidades fundadas en el conocimiento, la imaginación, y la inversión productiva y la tecnología en “zona naranja” como se llama hoy a la inversión e innovación productiva.

Una dedicación permanente para superar la desigualdad, la pobreza, la degradación ambiental, incluida la violencia; sin lugar a dudas constituyen parte importante de la agenda u hoja de ruta entre los tantos factores que deben considerar los Estados en la gestión pública moderna.

La gobernabilidad democrática requiere llevar a cabo una gestión responsable de los asuntos públicos, como elemento fundamental para el desarrollo sostenible de los Estados. Con este propósito, en la construcción de una profunda gobernabilidad democrática, Honduras, como Presidente de la Comisión Interamericana de Desarrollo Sostenible (CIDS), ha propuesto que seamos el primer Hemisferio que tenga un enfoque programático para la implementación de los llamados – por su siglas– ODS: Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible; es decir, nuestra propia agenda interamericana.

Este enfoque nos permitiría, entre otras cuestiones, cumplir con los compromisos adquiridos en el plano multilateral y a la vez promover los derechos económicos, sociales y culturales como elementos fundamentales para el crecimiento con equidad y la consolidación de la democracia en los Estados del Hemisferio. Tal y como lo hemos dejado consignado en nuestra Carta Democrática Interamericana y estamos desarrollando en nuestra Carta Social de las Américas y en la nueva visión estratégica.

Es indudable que la tecnología continúe evolucionando. Las economías se diversifican y cambian. El medio ambiente se modifica, e igual modificación consustancial a su existencia aplica al ser humano, forzado a modificar sus actitudes y aptitudes para este mundo que se transforma ante sus ojos, por lo que debemos enfrentar los cambios, entre otras muchas formas, con fórmulas a nuestro favor aprovechando la excelente plataforma que tenemos aquí en la OEA para el intercambio de experiencias, para el diálogo político y la cooperación, pero siempre con el propósito de dar paso

firme para alcanzar el desarrollo sostenible de nuestros pueblos. Y así lograremos democracia, paz, seguridad y dignificación de la persona humana en nuestro continente.

Solo un comentario adicional después de escuchar al doctor Mifsud, son las características del diplomático; creo que aquí tenemos una cantidad de compañeros que las reúnen eficientemente y que pueden contribuir al éxito del plan.

Muchas gracias, Presidenta.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Rosa Bautista, for your comments and observations. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Neil Parsan of Trinidad and Tobago.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE TRINIDAD Y TOBAGO: *Muchísimas gracias, señora Presidenta.* Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, let me begin by commending you for convening this special meeting of the Council on issues that are of tremendous relevance to the work we have committed to pursue at the Organization of American States, in the interest of our own national agendas and of the Hemisphere, cognizant of the global environment within which we operate.

To our guest speakers, welcome to Washington D.C. and thank you very much for your insightful and important presentations.

Madam Chair, a few years ago, the then Minister for Europe in the U.K. Foreign Office, Peter Hain, published a book titled *The End of Foreign Policy*. He made the point then that it is more and more difficult to differentiate between foreign policy and home policy and that there are decreasing chances of distinguishing between "we are here" and "you are there."

In today's complex global environment, with more than six billion people dependent on connections, interrelations, and interactions outside of the control of any one state, a development paradigm for any one country or region demands global responses and solutions that are often multifaceted in nature, beyond the confines of the state. One only has to think about climate change, global health issues, organized crime, and other problems that require global solutions for survival.

The world today and development today demand a shift and a new way of thinking to a diplomacy that responds to the dynamics of a globalized environment. This diplomacy must be extended to the three constituent parts of sustainable development—economic, social, and environmental—but at the same time, this diplomacy holds true for the struggle against terrorism, poverty, and borderless epidemics. Today's ebola virus's scale, speed, and nimbleness have outpaced and outfoxed our collective efforts at isolation, observation, and canvassing.

Madam Chair, we are all aware that economic growth was for a long time the central focus of the study of development. It is only in the latter decades of the 20th century that the multiple and close connections of economic growth to social and political aspects of development came increasingly to the fore, just as did citizen security, education, the environment, health, human rights, and participation by citizens in political and economic activity, all in an effort to reduce social inequalities. The focus of development became human development.

Economic growth and resilience remain central to our societies and to our hemisphere, but economic growth takes place, or fails to take place, in the political context of governance, characterized by competent public management, democratic accountability, protection of human rights, and respect for the rule of law, among other aspects.

With the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) concluding at the end of 2015, as was indicated earlier, the Post-2015 Development Agenda is being negotiated by several actors to end poverty and hunger, improve health and education, make cities more sustainable, combat climate change, and protect our environment.

In our hemisphere, the OAS has continuously advocated that the nexus of the pillars of integral development, democracy, human rights, and security is fundamental to the development of our region. Sustainable development, human development, and social and economic development, under the OAS's rubric of integral development, constitute the essence of the draft Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Nearly every single draft goal is directly or indirectly related to the work of the Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI). I believe that apart from defining a post-2015 hemispheric sustainable development agenda, the OAS, through SEDI, can play a critical role in the intergovernmental processes that are in train to address building resistance for sustainable development.

As a multilateral organization, the OAS is central to realizing the vision of a peaceful and socially inclusive hemisphere by means of its unique and effective instruments and programs that work to promote development and governance. These include the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Social Charter of the Americas, and all the inter-American programs geared toward development in all sectors, as well as a complement of successful networks on themes related to social protection and sustainable development. However, we should caution ourselves not to raise the "mission accomplished" banner too high or too fast.

There are two broad factors that have been at the core of the development progress— inclusive growth and good governance. All countries that have achieved sustainable development have relied on these two factors, which are mutually dependent and mutually reinforcing. The issue of equity and equality of opportunity merits special attention. "No soldier left behind" should be absolute, not conditional.

Madam Chair, I wish to conclude by stating that a consensus has emerged that development comes primarily from within a society in order to achieve inclusive economic growth and participatory good governance. Summits, goals, and agendas have emphasized the limitations of traditional diplomacy and have highlighted that diplomacy has to be extended to the wider concern of global sustainability for human survival. Human security, well-being, and dignity everywhere depend on inclusive economic growth and good governance.

There has been a hemispheric, if not international, effort to prop up the anemic economic recovery post-2008 that is still very fresh in our national memory. The challenges we face as a hemisphere require approaches based on global linkages, recognizing natural limitations, and embracing global responsibility and enhanced governance. We need to wrestle control of this strategically important golden triangle of diplomacy, development, and governance.

I thank you, Madam Chair.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Parsan. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Laínez of El Salvador. You have the floor, please.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE EL SALVADOR: *Thank you very much, Madam Chair.*

Quisiera agradecer a la Presidencia del Consejo Permanente por la feliz iniciativa de convocar a la presente sesión extraordinaria para tratar el vínculo entre la diplomacia, el desarrollo y la gobernanza.

Quisiera también agradecer al Embajador Joseph Mifsud, Director del *London Academy of Diplomacy*, al Embajador Noel Sinclair, ex Representante Permanente de Guyana ante la Organización de las Naciones Unidas, y al señor Gedeón Santos, Presidente del Instituto Dominicano de Telecomunicaciones.

Creemos que las opiniones vertidas el día de hoy nos demuestran la importancia del nexo entre el desarrollo con inclusión social y gobernanza, lo cual es sumamente importante para que nuestros países puedan seguir desarrollándose adecuadamente.

En este momento yo tengo una pregunta y un comentario para el Embajador Mifsud, porque me llamó muchísimo la atención su comentario cuando él decía "*the need to integrate change and continuity*".

Creo que es importantísimo lograr ese balance. Pero yo quisiera consultar si él pudiera elaborar un poco más sobre cómo lograr ese balance entre el cambio y la continuidad para que los países puedan llevar adecuadamente su misión diplomática.

Muchas gracias.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador. Before I yield the floor to Saint Kitts and Nevis, I would invite Ambassador Mifsud to reply. If any of the other panelists wish to respond to any of the comments, please indicate so that you can be given the floor.

Ambassador Mifsud, you have the floor. Thank you.

El DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: Madam Chair, thank you. Ambassador, thank you for your question. It is a most difficult question that you've asked.

I think the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago mentioned the importance of having diplomacy not restricted only to the ministry of foreign affairs. Why? Due to the changes that are taking place nowadays, it is extremely difficult for a diplomatic corps of one country to have all the skills and the subskills to put into play to cope with change and continuity. Many diplomats find it very easy to continue with the way that things have been in the past. However, I must emphasize that the work has completely changed.

I like the expression "the nimble way." It is unfortunate but it is true, "the nimble way" in which, for example, the ebola health scare has come in. I'm just back from Angola, a country that is close but not there, but boundaries are being set up so that workers are not being permitted to enter.

My colleague, Ambassador Sinclair, mentioned tourism. Now, countries that are in delayed development and that need, for example, labor for their workforce, are placing restrictions. How can this be controlled? Can this be controlled only through the diplomatic missions? No. So the idea of working together and bringing more people together is extremely important.

The new diplomatic training must focus on those two phrases that I mentioned before. Shall we have diplomats who have only “just in case” skills, or shall we have diplomats who have an idea that they can use “just in time” skills? This is continuously changing. At the London Academy of Diplomacy, we try to give our candidates the possibility of being on top of the job while understanding the past and history.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Mifsud. I’m pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Henry-Martin of Saint Kitts and Nevis.

La REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE SAINT KITTS Y NEVIS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and let me join my colleagues in expressing the appreciation of the Delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis for the opportunity afforded us to interact in this way with the distinguished panelists.

My delegation, of course, would like to record its appreciation and to thank the distinguished panelists for the information shared with us this morning.

When all is said and done, diplomatic engagement is as critically important to a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) like Saint Kitts and Nevis as it is to the global giants with which we must be in constant dialogue on issues of shared interest and, indeed, on a diversity of other matters that have the capacity to debilitate our best efforts at working towards sustainable economic growth and development and even to end poverty. Many of those issues were pointed out by Ambassador Sinclair in his presentation.

Indeed, Saint Kitts and Nevis, mindful of the imperative for small states like ours to effectively engage, has crafted a new foreign service policy. This new policy is a multipronged approach to strengthening diplomatic outreach, including optimizing the possibilities inherent in regional, bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral frameworks. It also calls for using our presence to support calls for increased effectiveness in the organizations in which we hold membership, including the Organization of American States and the United Nations; organizational modernization; reform; and change management.

Saint Kitts and Nevis embraces the newly evolving rules of engagement that demand that our states add to the strategic pursuit of the fundamental values of freedom, democracy, basic human rights, and the rule of law with proactivity on any front that articulates on climate change and that advocates a binding legal instrument that espouses respect for the environment and an appropriate emissions-reduction target to mitigate the impact of sea-level rise and other debilitating effects on vulnerable economies, such as ours.

The new rules of engagement broaden the scope of our diplomatic outreach and challenge our states to anticipate channels for connecting with interested cause agents and allies and to respond to new and emerging actors and issues. However, there are significant challenges for small states. Digital diplomacy—even with the broad scope of social media engagement to shape public opinion,

to network, to invite, and to respond to potential investors—is still, even at this stage, one of the elements that has not taken absolute root in our capitals and small missions.

Notwithstanding our states' best efforts, we are often forced to create an aggressive and cohesive nexus between the development agenda of our small states and ongoing diplomatic engagement to address the vagaries of one country's national policies in defense of its interests in the advancement of the broad development of our states. Small island states, by their very nature, possess limited natural resources and must look to their national strength and inherent human capital skill sets to grow possibilities for job creation and the underpinning of the national economy.

I have a question for the panel. My delegation would value your take on the regulatory diplomatic agendas and instituted policies of larger, more powerful states. These policies and agendas have impacted many of our small states, particularly in the realm of extraterritorial impositions in relation to the financial services sector, food and agriculture, and, more recently, rum. The associated demands for information and action are turning out to be a very costly exercise that our states can ill afford, and such demands constrict national efforts to find sustainable ways to provide for our people. Is this the new trend in regulatory diplomacy, and what are small states with no geopolitical power to do when negotiation is a one-way street?

Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Well, Ambassador! Are any of the panelists keen on taking this question? Ambassador Mifsud, please go ahead.

El DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: First of all, thank you very much. It's nice to see you again here.

To react to what you are saying, I can vouch for what your country has been doing because I was present in Saint Kitts and Nevis at an event at which not just diplomatic personnel were present but people from other sectors, including industry and the private sector, which was very interesting.

Regulatory diplomacy, as you rightly called it, is very much a topic of discussion, not just here but in larger states as well. To give you an example, inside the European Union (EU), there is a lot of discussion among member states on what kind of regulatory frameworks should be negotiated—I'm going to be less diplomatic here—or perhaps imposed on third countries, in the sense that they can understand the issues. You mentioned, for example, food, which is one of the biggest issues that have been discussed.

I can give you a European perspective here, and as a person who is following European issues, I believe that the new European Commission (EC) will be a bit different from the rest. This is something that one would hope for, especially in dealing with small states. The small states' agenda is very crucial. The new head of the European External Action Service (EEAS) does not come from a big country and has in her mind the idea of developing something that is more tactfully useful, a win-win situation for both sides, which would be extremely helpful. Obviously the EU is not the world; it's just one player among many.

I would like to add one other thing. Regulatory frameworks are sometimes imposed. There doesn't seem to be one voice coming out in terms of negotiation when this happens. There seem to

be single voices that come up, but it's not a hand that is put together. There needs to be more coordination in terms of diplomacy and diplomatic practices among small states in order to be more powerful in what they say.

Another thing that is extremely important is how the case is presented. It cannot be presented only by one country or one small state, but by a number of small states together. It is crucial that countries not cut a deal but come together in a holistic approach.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador, and thank you for your question, Ambassador Henry-Martin. I believe that Ambassador Sinclair was interested in addressing your question as well. He's had to excuse himself for a while, so maybe later on we will get back to the topic, if he wishes to speak on it.

I'm pleased to give the floor to the Ambassador of Dominica at this time.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE DOMINICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. My delegation is pleased to congratulate you and the management of the Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI) on this important initiative.

Madam Chair, the presentations that we have heard this morning are most welcome. They raise and treat a few key questions. How should we define development? Where should development feature in the long list of priorities and challenges that face the majority of our member states? And, more importantly, how much score should we attach to international collaboration and to the use of technology in the resolution of these development challenges?

Though the center of the debate on these matters has been at the United Nations, I am pleased that we at the Organization of American States have also been engaged in these matters, particularly within the framework of the discussion on the new Strategic Vision of the OAS.

In large measure, Madam Chair, there is no major area of divergence between the OAS and the UN as far as the principal goals of development are concerned. Certainly, the Social Charter of the Americas is fully in sync with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

We know, for example, that we must redouble our effort at social inclusion in all its guises. We know that to realize this inclusive goal, we need to strengthen economic growth, which itself relies on resilient agriculture, resilient human settlements, sustainable use of the oceans, etcetera. These are goals that are listed on the human development agenda. More importantly, Madam Chair, we know that we must strengthen and revitalize international partnerships for development. That, of course, was one of the old Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

This is precisely where Professor Mifsud's comprehensive presentation comes in. We have no difficulty with the thrust of his argument that diplomacy is central to the push for a more equitable sharing of the world's resources and a more inclusive definition of the goals of economic development. The implications of this argument for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are clear. The complexity of the environment within which we must function demands that we continue to pay attention to capacity-building at the national level to manage change, but to do so in a manner that enables us to straddle the various political and economic blocs that continue to dominate our world.

We do so by giving greater impetus to strengthening the state, and we agree with the view that the state has to be the principal focus, at least the base focus, of our endeavors.

We agree that we must focus on “just in time” skills. We do so through strengthening our relationships with the United Nations and, certainly, within our hemisphere, with the OAS. We will continue to value, Madam Chair, our membership with the OAS and other multilateral bodies. We realize Professor Mifsud suggests continuing to work towards plurilateralism. More importantly, we must seek to interact with and empower our citizens for engagement in diplomacy. This new idea of citizen diplomacy is something to which we have to give much more attention.

Madam Chair, the training towards this new diplomacy and to greater access to technology about which our panelists spoke about so cogently will have to be primary items on our agenda. We have no doubt that the OAS will continue to partner with the Commonwealth of Dominica and other small states in these processes.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador Charles. Jamaica was next in line, but it is now further down the list. Ambassador, did you punch your button? I’m going to ask the technicians to please give the floor to Jamaica at this time.

EI REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE JAMAICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I’m grateful to you for organizing this special meeting, and I’m grateful to the presenters for the focus on development issues that has been apparent here today. Sometimes, diplomats may well feel that as we go about our work, we are doing more and more and achieving less and less, and this is particularly true in the area of development. So, it is valuable that the speakers today have given enlightening presentations that help us to understand our complex international environment.

There are a few issues that I would like to raise as a result of the presentations. I’ve put them in the form of questions.

Ambassador Mifsud has reminded us of the presence of fragmentation within global, regional, and national systems. I was wondering whether he believes that fragmentation is necessarily a bad thing or a good thing. It is certainly not new, because states go about their business in particular ways to maximize their interests, so I was wondering about his overall perspective on fragmentation, especially in the context of development efforts.

I also have a question for Ambassador Mifsud about how states may organize their foreign policy bureaucracies to become more commercial. The emphasis in the presentations has been on ambassadors needing to be more commercially-oriented, but doesn’t it go beyond that to the actual states’ systems themselves?

I have to say that I share in all respects Ambassador Sinclair’s vision for fundamental change. I also share his assessment of some of the challenges faced by Small Island Developing States (SIDS), including those of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), such as issues relating to disaster preparedness; the drug scourge; and climate change. SIDS often face a significant capital shortage and a high debt burden, so I was wondering whether Ambassador Sinclair has any thoughts on the approaches that developing countries may take with respect to the promotion of investment within

their jurisdictions and with respect to the reduction of the debt burden. These are two immediate problems that we face.

In addition, I wonder whether Ambassador Sinclair could kindly comment on whether he sees a role for a greater linkage between the work of the United Nations in development and the work of the OAS in development. For instance, other than today's efforts, I think this is the first time that we have had this kind of connection with the UN's development work in the last two years. So, I was wondering whether there are ways in which we could develop linkages so that (a) we don't reproduce the wheel, and (b) we learn from each other as to particular initiatives that are in place.

Finally, with respect to Mr. Santos' presentation, I am wondering whether there are specific ways in which the OAS could help developing countries enhance access to information and communications technology (ICT) for individuals. It's important to press for enhanced access, but are there specific initiatives that Mr. Santos thinks that we might undertake in order to bring this about? Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador Vasciannie. I am pleased to give the floor first to Ambassador Mifsud, then to Ambassador Sinclair, then to Mr. Santos.

El DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: Ambassador, thank you very much for your question. I will start with the fragmentation part. I am not advising one-size-fits-all. I am very allergic to that concept because, obviously, there are differences. Even when two countries are neighbors, they might have strategic policies or visions that are not exactly the same. Why, then, should we use the same kind of measure for the same things? However, the ocean in which small fish swim sometimes is the same, so the same kind of elements might be there and can be obstacles to development in the same manner. However, the solution should not be the same.

In relation to one-size-fits-all, I did not mention the elephant in the room for many countries represented here. It's the issue that you mentioned: the idea of capacity building in terms of brain drain or brain circulation. This is a huge area. Development aid is being given in terms of work, but most of the focus is: how does it end? A lot of investment is made, even by the countries themselves, to try to have the capacity. You mentioned that it's not only the work of the ambassadors or the diplomats to do economic diplomacy; it's the work of many others. However, many of these "others" who have been trained to do so are captured by larger countries during the course of their professional lives.

The issue of the state is crucial, as the former speaker mentioned. One of the areas to which diplomacy must pay attention is that the state must invest, but the state must get back as well. Otherwise, all the ideas about brain circulation that one could think of are lost in terms of brain drain.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador Mifsud. Ambassador Sinclair, you have the floor, please.

El EXREPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE GUYANA ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS: Thank you very much. I don't think Ambassador Mifsud wants to give the impression that he was just talking theory. What he has talked about in terms of the involvement of many sectors

of society at the same time is happening right now. It is reality right now at the United Nations, and that is how the structure of sustainable development is being pursued. That is how the construction of the theory of sustainable development is proceeding right now, as we speak.

At the top of that structure, there's the Secretary-General, who has his own initiatives—his thoughts and ideas—which are made available to member states, to the delegates in New York, to people in capitals. Then, there's his High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on sustainable development who, at his request, have made their own thoughts available as to how we should be approaching sustainable development, and he has made that available to member states and to diplomats in New York. So, you see, it is a circulation of ideas from different sources.

There's also the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), which is the agency in the Organization that has specific responsibility for development. It gives its input in the construction of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Then there's the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), a global network that comprises academia, professors, scientists, teachers, ordinary people—whoever has something to say. You just go online and make your contributions and thoughts known about how we should proceed on the sustainable development agenda. All of that in turn is fed back to the representatives in New York, the diplomats, the youth, and people in various capitals.

There's the Open Working Group (OWG), which is a creation of the UN General Assembly. For months, the OWG has been discussing contributions of member states themselves, and of course the member states would have been taking into account contributions received from other sources.

Then there's youth. We had a special activity in which we invited contributions from youth, women, and civil society. They all had a chance to have their say as to the extent to which they need to be taken into account, what can be their contributions, and what is the best way that their contributions can be given effect.

So, what Ambassador Mifsud spoke about is happening right now. This kind of diplomacy is in effect right now.

I'd like to go on to the question posed by Dominica. What is the definition of development, and how will sustainable development rank in relation to the development priorities that we are otherwise pursuing?

As I said, the sustainable development effort represents nothing less than a revolution. I use the word “transformational.” We are creating a totally new definition, a totally new conceptualization of development. It is not simply bringing the poor up to the level of the rich.

I remember saying that sustainable development has three dimensions. From 2015 on, when we use the word “development” or when we use the phrase “sustainable development,” we are referring to a concept that will have an economic dimension, a social dimension, and an environmental dimension. These three have to be seen together and pursued together because if one falls down, the other two will fall down.

For example, let us take the goal of ending hunger, achieving food security, and improving nutrition. I can do the same for other goals, but I'll just take this one. If people anywhere, but in developing countries in particular, cannot satisfy their desire for food, and if they don't have energy to work, they will go hungry, and they could die of malnutrition. They would be affected in terms of providing for their families. They wouldn't enjoy health. If, in the pursuit of this goal, they have to go searching for food—in certain parts of Africa, where the soil is so overworked, they have to spend more and more effort to get more and more out of the soil, but to the extent that the soil has been degraded over the years, that not only contributes to the continuation of their hunger but to global warming and climate change, and it stands as an obstacle to enjoying their social rights—there is inequality between them and that section of the population that has food to eat. That kind of inequality in terms of access to food is unsustainable.

So, the sustainable development agenda tries to capture a set of goals, a set of programs, a set of actions that will be at once economic, social, and environmental in their focus. These goals are to be pursued as one set of activities under the umbrella of sustainable development. There is no question of choosing among priorities. They have to be pursued all together. Sustainable development is the priority.

Sustainable development also includes peace. Peace is the overarching condition, because if you have to worry about bombs falling over your head, how can you go to work? How can you go and look for food? How can you look after your health? So there's a connection between peace and security and development needs. If you have to worry about terrorists coming into your country overnight and decapitating you, if you have to be careful how you go to your fields to get your food, or how you take your child to the doctor. . . Everything is connected. Everything is connected. So there's no question of establishing priorities among the sustainable development goals. We have to accustom ourselves to a whole new concept of development.

The question was asked as to what role there might be for a link between the work that the UN is doing in the area of development and what the OAS is doing. Let me say, first of all, that all of us sitting here in this room, from Saint Vincent and the Grenadines all the way around the room back to Saint Lucia, are represented in the UN, so our ambassadors in New York are part of the effort toward a sustainable development.

A first and obvious link is through capitals. As our ambassadors in New York report to the capitals in the normal way, the capitals would make known to you. At any rate, among yourselves here in Washington, you have close contacts with your colleagues in New York, so in addition to the contacts with the capitals, there are mission-to-mission contacts here in New York. So the activities and the exertions of the UN in the area of sustainable development are common to all. They are, or should be, well-known to all of us.

This is not to say that we could not do something like what Ambassador Prince has done now, which is to invite someone from the United Nations to come and keep you informed. Whatever happens in terms of your relationship with capitals, this is something that should be pursued. I would be happy to be part of the effort of communicating with you, physically coming to speak to you to let you know how the idea of sustainable development is growing.

Before the end of the year, the Secretary-General is going to be presenting a synthesis report, which is going to be very critical. In a sense, it brings me back to the earlier point I was making

about Ambassador Mifsud, because what the Secretary-General is going to be doing is pulling a number of strands together. All those contributors to whom I referred—the High-level Panel, the UNDG, the SDSN, the OWG, youth, civil society, women—the Secretary-General is going to be pulling all of their contributions together into one document so that when we begin to prepare for the negotiations in 2015, we have a one-stop document before us. We see all the ideas, all the inferences, all the thoughts, all the pros, all the cons. We have everything there.

The presentation of that report by the Secretary-General might be an appropriate or valuable opportunity for someone to come from New York and sit with you and say: “Ladies and gentlemen, this is where it’s at. This is what we’re going to be giving the capitals. This is going to serve as the basis upon which capitals will begin to make their preparations and decide on their negotiating positions.”

Right now, you might be confused. You might say: “Well, what about all these processes? How can we. . . ?” Not to worry; the Secretary-General is going to do all of that for you. He’s pulling them all together in one document. That could be an opportunity for a direct link, like we have today, between New York and yourself.

The question from Saint Kitts and Nevis, I didn’t understand. I asked for it to be. . . I propose that you go on to another question while I think.

[Ocupa la Presidencia el Representante Permanente de Guyana.]

El PRESIDENTE: I would like to thank Ambassador Sinclair for that enlightenment and for his commitment to remain engaged. For an additional response, I’m pleased to give the floor to Mr. Gedeón Santos.

EL PRESIDENTE DEL INSTITUTO DOMINICANO DE TELECOMUNICACIONES (INDOTEL) Y PRESIDENTE DEL COMITÉ DIRECTIVO PERMANENTE DE LA COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA DE TELECOMUNICACIONES (CITEL): Muchas gracias.

El desarrollo de las telecomunicaciones ha generado una nueva forma de analfabetismo. Hay también una nueva forma de exclusión y de división: los conectados y los no conectados. Antes, el sistema educativo se basaba en un maestro que lo sabía todo y treinta o cuarenta estudiantes que iban a aprender del maestro. Hoy, ese maestro que era el genio, ha sido sustituido por el genio *Google*, o el genio *Wikipedia*. Y los maestros se están quedando como organizadores, tutores y guías de la clase.

Resulta que para poder acceder a todo este conocimiento que la humanidad tiene en las redes, se necesitan cuatro cosas:

1. el despliegue de redes fibra óptica en todas nuestras naciones, como condición básica física para acceder a ese conocimiento;
2. ordenadores que puedan conectarse a esa red de fibra óptica y a ese conocimiento global;
3. educación digital para poder enseñarles a nuestros ciudadanos a manejar los ordenadores y a manejar el lenguaje digital; y

4. aprendizaje de los contenidos y de los programas que se manejan en los ordenadores.

Felizmente, la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL) ha desplegado una serie de programas, de instructivos, de manuales, que permiten a los países tener un marco claro de qué hacer para conectar a sus ciudadanos. La CITEL está a disposición de cualquiera de los Estados para servirle de consultor, de guía, de cómo lograr el desarrollo digital de cada una de nuestras naciones. De lo contrario, la diferencia entre desarrollo y subdesarrollo no solo será por el producto interno bruto de cada nación, sino que será entre quién haya logrado una conectividad profunda y quién no. Los rezagados se quedarán atrás, los que logren conectarse podrán acceder al futuro.

Muchas gracias.

[Vuelve a ocupar la Presidencia la Representante Permanente de San Vicente y las Granadinas.]

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Mr. Santos. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador González of Colombia.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE COLOMBIA: *Thank you, Madam Chair.* Señora Presidenta, mil gracias por propiciar esta reflexión y mil gracias a los ilustres embajadores visitantes.

Sin duda alguna, el primer aspecto que debe llevarnos a transitar hacia ideas adicionales en la elaboración de nuestras políticas públicas es la obvia necesidad de acompañar, de armonizar nuestras academias diplomáticas, nuestros operadores de diplomacia, con las nuevas realidades y desafíos en la modernidad de las relaciones internacionales.

Es obvio que mientras el mundo actual tenga Estados como actores sustanciales –pero no solamente Estados sino otros actores internacionales, muchos de ellos de la sociedad civil, pero a su vez, un conjunto de actores en una red cada vez más compleja– pues, obviamente, quienes ejercen la diplomacia y las relaciones internacionales deben acomodarse inteligentemente a esa realidad porque la diplomacia, también como la guerra, es otra forma de expresión de la política y se trata, pues, de formarse apropiadamente para ello.

En ese sentido, quisiéramos resaltar que va a ser muy útil que se intercambien experiencias sobre la mejor formación. Tenemos, por ejemplo, opciones de educación superior muy interesantes. Las alianzas que hay hoy entre el *London School of Economics; Sciences Po*, en París; *Columbia University* y varias de nuestras universidades en América muestran cómo hay un punto de vanguardia en esta materia. Y sería muy útil, precisamente, evaluar cómo se están formando nuestros operadores de diplomacia.

No cabe duda que si hay una mejor formación, una búsqueda de la excelencia en este tema, pues habrá cada vez mejores relaciones internacionales. Simplemente agregaría, Presidenta, que precisamente en la Séptima Cumbre de las Américas que tendrá lugar en Panamá, donde va a haber un encuentro de universidades, sería una oportunidad interesante para hacer también un encuentro de facultades de relaciones internacionales, de academias diplomáticas, para ver en qué estamos, cómo estamos y dónde se está innovando con alta calidad en esta materia.

Pero, en fin, hay que acomodarse a esa complejidad, que es obvia. Uno ve ministerios de comercio exterior al lado de las cancillerías; ministerios de defensa, que obviamente tienen que operar en relaciones internacionales, pero mientras la humanidad siga con Estados, pues obviamente los Estados deberán buscar esa coordinación entre lo político, la sociedad civil y las funciones de la diplomacia.

Es muy importante ahondarnos. También estamos en la materia, en estas fronteras del desarrollo, en la Organización de los Estados Americanos, y yo quisiera simplemente subrayar cómo precisamente el último período de sesiones de nuestra Asamblea General fue sobre eso. Tuvo lugar una gran reflexión sobre el desarrollo, sobre la inclusión, y sobre eso girarán igualmente las deliberaciones durante la próxima Cumbre de las Américas. Y en este tema tendremos mucho que aportar al mundo, tendremos mucho que reencontrar en los distintos rincones de desarrollo y es por ello tan útil esta reunión, este encuentro, y escuchar las distintas perspectivas.

Sobre el tercer aspecto, Presidenta, quisiera agregar que para nosotros es de la mayor importancia. Precisamente hace unas semanas, con el Ministro de Comunicaciones pudimos exponer en este foro sobre la relevancia de la conectividad. Hemos logrado ya un 90%, y más, de fibra óptica; pero el punto está, como lo señalaba el doctor Santos, en cómo acompañar la conectividad con la lucha contra la pobreza. Precisamente en este punto hay que llamar la atención sobre los desarrolladores de contenidos y de *software* para que se produzcan instrumentos que sirvan para combatir la pobreza; para llegar a la base de la pirámide.

El ejemplo típico es cómo lograr productos que le sirvan al pequeño tendero, a nuestras pequeñas empresas. Ya tenemos las más sofisticadas herramientas en esta materia en las grandes plataformas para las grandes y modernas empresas, ahora hay que crear contenidos, productos, herramientas para los pequeños, los que están en la base de la pirámide, que es nuestro problema en América.

En ese orden de ideas, quisiéramos aprovechar para invitarlos, precisamente a instancias de la OEA, de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL), a las reuniones que a finales de este año tendremos y que son la Tercera Reunión Ministerial de Gobierno Electrónico y la Octava Reunión de la Red de Gobiernos Electrónicos de América y el Caribe que se realizarán los días 3 y 4 de diciembre en Cartagena. Va a ser una oportunidad muy importante para que los distintos países lleven fórmulas de gobierno electrónico, así como alternativas de tecnología a ser aplicadas en la lucha contra la pobreza. En esa ocasión habrá un encuentro no solamente de gobiernos, no solamente de Estados, sino de empresas de productores de contenidos de todo el Continente para que se puedan evaluar estos temas y fijar perspectivas.

Gracias, Presidenta.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador González, and for giving us an early reminder of the meetings that will take place later in Colombia. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Pary of Bolivia.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE BOLIVIA: Muchas gracias, Presidenta. Permítame saludar a los colegas Representantes Permanentes, Observadores, a todas y todos los presentes en esta sesión.

Agradezco a usted Presidenta y a los expositores por las importantes presentaciones realizadas el día de hoy, las que nos permiten reflexionar sobre la diplomacia, el desarrollo, y la tecnología, y el rol que cumplimos cada uno de nosotros.

Sin duda alguna, durante la construcción histórica de las diferentes sociedades se ha evidenciado la efectividad de la diplomacia como un mecanismo de diálogo, de comunicación y de solución de diferencias entre Estados. A pesar de que las prácticas de la diplomacia tienen un pasado antiguo y a veces oscuro, la diplomacia institucionalizada tiene una historia reciente y se puede describir como una práctica social que tiene un alcance mayor que el Estado y su política exterior.

Las presentaciones realizadas el día de hoy también nos permiten visibilizar las diferencias sustanciales en las formas y las prácticas de la diplomacia entre las diferentes regiones y países. En este proceso de construcción de la diplomacia, junto a los procesos de fortalecimiento de las democracias, transitando hacia las democracias participativas, también se han creado nuevas formas y una nueva conceptualización de la diplomacia.

En el caso de Bolivia, se impulsa la diplomacia de los pueblos, que consiste en facilitar el diálogo y trabajo para todos, priorizar los intereses de las naciones, promover y facilitar no solo el relacionamiento entre Estados sino también entre pueblos y para valorizar el respeto de los derechos humanos y principios de la vida sobre criterios exclusivos de mercado y capital. Así, supone que los pueblos del mundo se relacionen entre sí para complementarse y alcanzar de forma concertada y sin imposiciones los acuerdos que permiten proteger la vida y el planeta. Por esto se contraponen a toda forma de imposición y violencia de un pueblo contra otro, que amenace o destruya la vida.

La diplomacia de los pueblos marca una diferencia sustancial con la diplomacia clásica. Primero, porque la diplomacia no es exclusiva de los gobiernos sino también los pueblos son capaces de asumir responsabilidades de Estado y llegar a acuerdos con otros pueblos. Segundo, porque incorpora un nuevo enfoque que toma en cuenta nuevos conceptos como el vivir bien, la pluriculturalidad, la plurinacionalidad, la complementariedad, la madre tierra, entre otros. Tercero, porque los actores de la diplomacia no solo son los grupos privilegiados o actores clásicos, sino que se incorporan nuevos actores como los indígenas, los jóvenes, los líderes sociales, las mujeres, entre otros.

Lo mencionado en párrafos previos también nos lleva a pensar en el desarrollo. Para mi país, la visión de desarrollo es el vivir bien que significa pensar en un desarrollo con visión propia, respetando la relación natural existente entre la naturaleza y el ser humano y respetando el desarrollo cultural de los pueblos y su decisión del tipo de desarrollo que desean.

Finalmente, la tecnología es un elemento que ha transformado la vida y las formas de relacionamiento en nuestras sociedades. Hoy ya no es posible no considerar la tecnología en cada una de nuestras acciones. Por ello su contribución es importante en los diferentes ámbitos, entre ellos, para el combate a la pobreza. Pero creo que lo fundamental está en cómo aprovechar la tecnología de la manera más eficiente para vivir bien y no que la tecnología nos utilice como un instrumento de dominación, por lo cual el desafío está en que la democratización del acceso a la tecnología, debemos generar las condiciones necesarias para que todos tengan acceso a la tecnología en el ámbito que les corresponde, en igualdad de condiciones y oportunidades.

Estas son algunas de las ideas que queríamos compartir en esta Sala, Presidenta, muchas gracias por habernos escuchado.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Pary, for sharing your perspectives.

I wish to inform the Council that Mr. Santos had to leave because he has another commitment. He has offered his apologies that he would not be here to answer some of the questions or to respond to some of the observations that would have been put to him. It is already after 1:00 p.m.

With that, I give the floor to the Representative of Brazil. Minister Counselor Dias da Costa, you have the floor.

El REPRESENTANTE INTERINO DEL BRASIL: Obrigado, Senhora Presidente.

Antes de mais nada, gostaria de parabenizá-la pela decisão de trazer este debate para o Conselho Permanente. Parece-me também fundamental que tenhamos a oportunidade de discutir temas que são muito importantes para todos nós. E os três palestrantes, de fato, trouxeram contribuições importantes, não apenas em termos de conceitos, mas em termos de ideias também para debate aqui.

O primeiro palestrante, o Embaixador Mifsud, por exemplo, mencionou uma questão que para mim é muito interessante, que é a questão da *Official Development Assistance* (ODA), a Assistência para o Desenvolvimento, que é um tema bastante conhecido, mas considero que é pouco debatido, especialmente quando pensamos nos efeitos da ODA, que muitas vezes podem ser bastante positivos, mas, por outro lado, muitas vezes, essa assistência mascara interesses específicos dos próprios doadores, ou seja, é importante também que se debata o tipo de assistência que é prestada aos países no nosso Hemisfério.

Todos nós sabemos, por exemplo, dos problemas criados com as políticas impostas pelo Fundo Monetário Internacional (FMI) nas décadas de 70 e 80, sobretudo, que vinculavam a assistência ao cumprimento de uma série de pré-requisitos que trouxeram graves consequências para os países da nossa região. Muitas vezes, pagamos um preço muito alto para contar com a assistência de organismos financeiros internacionais.

E isso me leva ao mencionado pelo Embaixador Noel Sinclair, que trouxe também um conceito que é muito importante, o de desenvolvimento sustentável. Esse é um conceito relativamente recente, tem 20 e poucos anos, mas é um conceito que é muito caro para o Brasil. Esses três aspectos mencionados pelo Embaixador Sinclair do econômico, do social e do ambiental agregam um peso muito forte a essa questão do desenvolvimento. Sem dúvida alguma, acho que a partir da reunião Rio-92, nós tivemos uma ruptura na maneira como nós encaramos o desenvolvimento e a própria assistência ao desenvolvimento. Acho que a introdução desse conceito do desenvolvimento sustentável muda a perspectiva dessa questão e traz aspectos que hoje se comprovam muito corretos e muito eficientes na discussão desse tema.

Da mesma forma, o comentado pelo Senhor Gedeon Santos a respeito das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação (TICs), que é um aspecto também fundamental, se nós pensamos no que é necessário aos nossos países, especialmente aos países em desenvolvimento, para que, de fato,

possam almejar algum dia atingir um nível de desenvolvimento que lhes permita viver com dignidade. E o meu colega, o Embaixador da Bolívia, mencionou aqui o *buen vivir*, que é realmente essa noção de viver, mas não simplesmente sobreviver, mas viver com dignidade. Isso é algo que é importante.

Senhora Presidente, eu teria mais alguns comentários a fazer, especialmente porque originalmente estava previsto um palestrante brasileiro para falar em desenvolvimento, inclusive governança, e eu tinha preparado alguns pontos aqui para comentar, mas dado o adiantado da hora, vou poupar os meus colegas desse sacrifício de ter de me ouvir mais alguns minutos.

Então, agradeço e parablenizo uma vez mais a Presidência pela ideia dessa discussão e obrigado a todos os palestrantes também.

Obrigado.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Minister Counselor Dias da Costa. I'm pleased to give the floor to the distinguished Representative of Uruguay.

El REPRESENTANTE ALTERNO DEL URUGUAY: En primer lugar, deseo agradecer a los distinguidos panelistas invitados por sus muy interesantes y bien elaboradas presentaciones. Con relación a ello, nuestra Delegación hará algunos comentarios sobre estos temas: adaptación para el desarrollo sostenible en los países en desarrollo, diplomacia y tecnología; esa triada.

Con relación al medio ambiente y al desarrollo sostenible, el Uruguay es parte de las principales convenciones internacionales en la materia y al mismo tiempo que ha puesto énfasis a la importancia de la cooperación internacional, también ha subrayado siempre la responsabilidad individual de cada Estado de proteger activamente el medio ambiente en su territorio y en sus aguas, así como ha valorado la participación vigilante de la sociedad civil en esta materia.

Ya que la Delegación de Brasil hablaba de la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo realiza en 1992, desearía referirme a Río+20, la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre Desarrollo Sostenible, en cuanto a que en esa oportunidad se conversó sobre lo que se dio llamar economía verde. En nuestra opinión no debería ser solamente una herramienta de mercado que privilegie los aspectos de comercialización de tecnología avanzada frente a la búsqueda de soluciones adaptadas a las diversas realidades de los países en desarrollo. También debe ser un enfoque para el desarrollo sostenible que contribuya a la transformación de las economías, a la erradicación de la pobreza, a la inclusión social y que, naturalmente, no resulte un obstáculo para el comercio.

Dada la preocupación justificada y creciente sobre el cambio climático, se deben desarrollar otras formas diferentes para hacer crecer las capacidades para el uso de los recursos naturales. En este sentido, nuestro país decidió trabajar en un proyecto modelo como prototipo de desarrollo de economía verde que fue aprobado por el Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (FMAM), cuyo elemento central aborda la identificación de todos los residuos que producen las cadenas agroindustriales del país –del sector primario– en el campo, hasta la más elaborada a nivel industrial abarcando todas las cadenas agroindustriales y productivas que generan naturalmente muchos residuos.

Aquí juega la tecnología, uno de los temas que nos convocó hoy. Entre los proyectos puede mencionarse la cadena de la carne, lana, leche, alimentos y biocombustibles. Se pretende identificar cuáles son las mejores tecnologías y desarrollar prototipos que transformen en energía todos los residuos que existan; es decir, un modelo de economía verde para gestión de residuos ambientales.

El Uruguay reitera en todos los foros en los que participa su ineludible compromiso con la protección del medio ambiente como derecho humano y como pieza fundamental para el logro de un verdadero desarrollo sostenible, poniendo énfasis en la integración y equilibrio de los tres pilares que ya se han hecho referencia en esta sesión: el social, el económico y el ambiental.

En este sentido y en consonancia con la intervención del Uruguay en el sexagésimo noveno período ordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General de la Organización de las Naciones Unidas este año, pensamos que se debe seguir creyendo en el multilateralismo porque es el instrumento fundamental para seguir tratando de empujar, influir para lograr una construcción ética colectiva para otorgarle soluciones a la gente. Una construcción colectiva capaz de integrarnos en la diversidad, de liberarnos con la democracia y la participación, de manera que cada vez más, en forma creciente, se generen derechos para más personas.

Para finalizar, creemos que este es el rumbo, el que acabo de referir, para que la figura compuesta por desarrollo sostenible, diplomacia y tecnología, de alguna manera como lo mencionó hace algún rato la Delegación de Trinidad y Tobago, pueda enfrentar con éxito importantes retos en nuestro hemisferio.

Muchas gracias, señora Presidenta.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Uruguay. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Albuja of Ecuador.

EL REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DEL ECUADOR: Muchas gracias, señora Presidenta. Agradezco a usted por traer a los ilustres expositores a este recinto. Ahora me queda mucho más claro, después de oír al estimado diplomático maltés, en cuanto a los nuevos conceptos de hacia dónde va la diplomacia y cuál es su relación con el desarrollo. Europa tiene una visión diferente de aquella que estamos discutiendo en nuestros países.

La diplomacia es una herramienta más de los pueblos para lograr su desarrollo. La diplomacia es soberanía y dignidad. La diplomacia es de sustancial importancia para romper el modelo actual en lo económico, social, cultural, político, científico, y pasar a un nuevo modelo de igualdad y de equidad.

Nuestros Estados no pueden limitarse a incorporar a la diplomacia únicamente a los empresarios y comerciantes, quienes tienen sus propios intereses y los defienden. Debemos estar conscientes de que la diplomacia debe alimentarse de sectores que piensen en el interés general; en el interés de la población del país, de su región y de este hemisferio; que no trabajen para el bien particular sino para el bien común. Desde luego, existe una diversidad de empresarios y comerciantes y son necesarios como herramientas del cambio, pero también hay que incorporar a todos los sectores para tener la integralidad de la representación social.

Visiones distintas. Nosotros caminamos por la diplomacia directa en la que los presidentes y presidentas, los y las cancilleres se comunican y deciden en línea fraternalmente; es decir, al momento de suscitarse un diferendo o iniciativa. Caminamos por la diplomacia ciudadana en la que no solo las y los ciudadanos intervienen como representantes de sus países en todo el mundo y en todo lugar. Sino, y sobre todo, en la integración sin límites ni discriminación de etnias, edades, géneros, religiones o culturas de la población dentro de la diplomacia activa, dentro de la carrera diplomática.

Nosotros caminamos con la diplomacia digital, que permite la interacción global, la información instantánea y las decisiones bien documentadas y argumentadas desde lo real y no solo desde lo supuesto. La utilización de la tecnología en beneficio de las relaciones internacionales es un tema por el que ya transitamos varios países, consiguiendo resultados impresionantes tanto en lo bilateral como en lo multilateral. La diplomacia debe ser para el desarrollo sostenible, buscando el bien común conforme a las necesidades, capacidades y especificidades de cada uno de nuestros países. Tenemos objetivos comunes pero somos distintos. La diplomacia, además de ser una herramienta de comunicación de intereses y, claro, un instrumento para aprovechar oportunidades, tiene que ser ciudadana y debe responder a la búsqueda del bienestar de cada uno de nuestros pueblos con sus especificidades.

Respecto a la cooperación, me parece que también hay matices y visiones de fondo que debemos equilibrar. La cooperación no debe ser enfocada todavía como entrega de limosna o imposición de condiciones. La cooperación se fundamenta en una relación entre iguales y su base es la transferencia de experiencias, tecnología y recursos económicos para alcanzar el desarrollo social y económico de los pueblos, de las personas y del planeta. Para ello partimos de las necesidades locales de cada país, no de imponer modelos de desarrollo que distorsionan las realidades de cada entorno.

La diplomacia en todos los niveles debe entonces buscar fuentes de cooperación que no pretendan imponer reformas culturales en nuestros países a cambio de recibir dinero, consultorías o contratos de servicios y obras para temas que no son prioritarios para nuestros pueblos. En la nueva visión de cooperación las prioridades sobre las necesidades de cada país las ponen los propios Estados, no los cooperantes, sean agencias, bancos o países.

Muchas gracias.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador. I'm pleased to give the floor to Ambassador Karran of Guyana. Ambassador, you have the floor.

El REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE GUYANA: Thank you, Chair.

Chair, my delegation would like to congratulate the speakers for their very stimulating presentations today on these critical issues. They have certainly provoked a rich discussion on the interrelation among integral development, growth, resilience, poverty, and governance with questions of diplomacy and democracy.

My delegation fully subscribes to the idea proposed by ambassadors Mifsud and Sinclair about the need for a new conception of development and for a revolution in the ways in which development programs are applied. My delegation would like to echo the notion that achieving resilience for sustainable growth will not become a reality unless it solves the problem of

vulnerability. Likewise, solutions have to be sought for the other major constraints to achieving the sustainable development goals (SDGs) posed by multidimensional security threats. These vulnerabilities and threats include, but are not limited to, the drug trade, climate change, natural disasters, and economic shocks. Energy and food security are further impediments, as is the lack of access to development financing.

Ambassador Sinclair's emphasis on the vulnerability of small states was of particular interest to my delegation. Indeed, during this year's debate at the United Nations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, many Caribbean Community (CARICOM) leaders proposed that a vulnerability index be included as a further measure to give a more complete panorama in assessing the status of national development of our respective countries. It would be useful for us here at the Organization of American States to discuss this issue further.

Chair, the question of climate change is a crucial one. It is of overriding importance for Small Island Developing States (SIDS), not only from the point of view of security but also funding for development. It is necessary that the burden of this problem be shared fairly and equitably and that the commitments made be adhered to.

My delegation was particularly interested in Ambassador Sinclair's deduction that there is an insufficient sense of global community in dealing effectively with the global development agenda. Fortunately, this is a difficulty that we in the hemisphere can probably face with more optimism than most. We have fashioned an Inter-American Democratic Charter through which we have entered into shared commitments to strengthen democracy, along with fighting poverty, promoting integral development, improving education, and promoting the areas of integral development that impact the strengthening of democracy. We have now buttressed the Democratic Charter with the Social Charter of the Americas. In addition, we're equipped with the organ of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development (CIDI) to implement the necessary initiatives, as the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago has detailed.

This is a good opportunity for us to bear in mind the Strategic Vision exercise in which our Organization is now engaged. Our discussion today is, if anything, a reaffirmation of the equality and interdependence of the four pillars of the OAS and of how critical is the question of development and its importance to the other pillars. Hopefully, we can build on the excellent proposals we have heard expressed by the presenters here this morning as we go forward with implementing the provisions of our Democratic and Social charters and other guiding instruments.

I close by thanking and congratulating the presenters once again, Chair, but I reserve my utmost praise and thanks to you for convening such an important and useful discussion. Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador. I'm pleased to give the floor to the distinguished Representative of Antigua and Barbuda.

La REPRESENTANTE ALTERNA DE ANTIGUA Y BARBUDA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Antigua and Barbuda offers you its profound gratitude for convening this special meeting of the Permanent Council with such a distinguished panel. Each panelist today referenced the eradication of poverty as a foremost preoccupation of the 21st-century diplomat. Antigua and

Barbuda is in full agreement, and we wish to highlight one issue related to our development, which is access to special financing.

A major thrust of my delegation's diplomacy has been advocacy within the international financial institutions (IFIs) and other international fora on this issue. Antigua and Barbuda believes that the small, vulnerable, highly-indebted middle- and high-income countries of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) should be allowed access to concessional financing that addresses our particular vulnerabilities. These vulnerabilities, as pointed out by Ambassador Sinclair, are due to the open nature of our economies, the dependency on exports of limited commodities, susceptibility to external shocks, and the frequency of national disasters.

Antigua and Barbuda supports the presentation made by Ambassador Sinclair in the sense that international organizations should be restructured to offer responses appropriate to our particular developmental needs. Madam Chair, my delegation therefore welcomes ongoing discussions here at the Organization of American States and in all relevant institutions as we await concrete options that contribute to our sustainable development.

Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Antigua and Barbuda. I'm pleased to give the floor to the United States.

La REPRESENTANTE ALTERNA DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Due to the lateness of the hour, I'm not going to use the prepared text that I have, but I'm going to make a few brief remarks on some of the issues that have been brought up this morning.

On the issue of the diplomat of the future, the United States has long held the opinion that our diplomats must represent the U.S. population and not just a privileged few. We have heavy involvement by civil society in all aspects of bringing people into the diplomatic corps. We always have public members in the committees that interview, those that examine, and those that give promotions to people within the Foreign Service. We also have many programs that bring in people from disadvantaged groups, finance their education, and bring them into the Service. We think that this results in a diplomatic corps that reflects what we look like, what we think, and all walks of life in the United States. As such, we're very interested in seeing how some of the things that we've been doing in our diplomacy dovetail with what we've been talking about here today.

We have now what are called regional hub officers in an area that handles environment, science and technology, and health, with the understanding that some of these issues cross borders and that it is useful to have a regional diplomat handling these issues. One of the persons who used to be in our delegation is now doing that hub out of Peru. Taking what he learned at the Organization of American States about multilateralism diplomacy has been particularly useful in developing some other programs in that region.

So, yes, we think that diplomacy needs to evolve with the new challenges that we have, and we're hoping to keep up with those challenges, but as somebody who is a dumb user of a smart phone, we're going to need our young people to keep us current, as we've been in diplomacy too long.

Madam Chair, I think that in the OAS, we're uniquely poised to do some of the things that we've been talking about. The United States believes that it is important for member states to partner with our local government and communities, other countries, international organizations, the private sector, and civil society to advance our collective and respective development goals. We are very much aware that no one government or donor can move the needle on diverse development and governance challenges confronting our countries. Only by engaging the widest cross-section of capable partners will all of our work be truly enduring.

Integral development is the backbone of the OAS. Integral development contributes directly to the success of the democracy, human rights, and security pillars. Without it, our goals in the other pillars would be much more difficult to achieve.

The Inter-American Council for Integral Development (CIDI) offers a unique opportunity for the ministers of education, science, labor, culture, social development, tourism, and sustainable development to meet to discuss their own domestic policies and to consider areas of cooperation that they could develop. I think that the venue is very useful, and U.S. domestic agencies value very much their contacts and the work that they do with their partners in the rest of the Hemisphere.

So, we consider diplomatic representation to be multilateral, whole-of-government representation and not just for foreign ministries. We're here to facilitate, we're here to learn, and we're here to impart what our people want to learn from us. As such, we're very interested in what you have said here today and how we can continue to work along those lines to improve what the OAS does for its member states.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, United States. Mexico, you have the floor, please.

El REPRESENTANTE ALTERNO DE MÉXICO: Muchas gracias, señora Presidenta. Muy buenas tardes a todos los presentes.

La Delegación de México quisiera primero agradecerle, señora Presidenta, por convocar esta sesión extraordinaria del Consejo Permanente en la que se han abordado temas que no son solo de vital interés para nuestros Gobiernos y para nuestros pueblos sino que además incitan al diálogo y a la reflexión. Queremos también agradecer a nuestros ponentes el Embajador Joseph Mifsud, el Embajador Noel Sinclair y el Presidente de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL), señor Gedeón Santos por su participación y comentarios en esta sesión.

Señora Presidenta, hoy más que nunca todos los países tienen un fuerte interés en enfrentar los desafíos del desarrollo integral sustentable porque en la edad del conocimiento, caracterizada por la globalización y la inescapable interdependencia, el desarrollo ha dejado de ser viable de manera aislada. Ya durante el proceso de construcción de la visión estratégica de la Organización de los Estados Americanos se definió la igualdad de la interdependencia de los pilares: democracia, derechos humanos, desarrollo integral y seguridad. De todos ellos creemos que el desarrollo es, por definición, el tema más global y el más interdependiente.

Es una aspiración de todos los Estados y la razón de ser de nuestros Gobiernos y de innumerables instituciones. Como ya lo mencionaron aquí los expositores, son innumerables los factores y sectores llamados a converger nacional e internacionalmente para superar los desafíos del desarrollo integral sustentable. Los esfuerzos individuales, aun si están bien encaminados hacia el objetivo del desarrollo integral, no pueden ser suficientes porque este objetivo impone la concurrencia de quehaceres de todos los entes concernidos.

Esto, señora Presidenta, dice mucho respecto del papel diplomático. Creemos que el gran desafío es evitar la apropiación de la acción a la que suelen conducir procesos de negociación únicamente entre especialistas o representantes sectoriales. Es preciso asegurar frente a la interdependencia de los temas, una visión de conjunto y de integralidad. En este tema, señora Presidenta, México considera que está uno de los grandes desafíos de la diplomacia y, por supuesto, consideramos que es un tema y es un debate que se debe seguir alimentando y que debemos seguir teniendo los representantes en nuestros países.

Muchas gracias, señora Presidenta.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Mexico. I'm pleased to give the floor to the Representative of Saint Lucia. Ambassador Johnny, you have the floor.

La REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE SANTA LUCÍA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, I'll be very brief because it's late, but let me thank the presenters—and, of course, you—for such a very productive and interesting meeting.

From as way back as the 1980s, when we were young diplomats, we in the Caribbean countries were told that the focus of our diplomacy must be development. At many international organizations, we have tried to make development our focus. We have even been criticized heavily by some countries for making that a focus in some international organizations. However, we have prevailed.

In order to make development the focus of our diplomacy, we have tried to work very closely with development professionals in our country, with a view to advancing our country's core interests. Increasingly, we thought of the question: how do we make diplomacy and development coordinated, complimentary, and mutually reinforcing? You may have answered some of that question, but we need to continue the discussion on this crucial theme.

Increasingly, global challenges call for a mix of development and diplomacy, and for a more holistic approach to the way we do business as diplomats. In fact, Madam Chair, I want to say here that, for a number of the Caribbean countries, being a modern diplomat calls for us to operate as a chief executive officer (CEO) of a multiagency mission and for us to be adept at connecting with audiences outside of our governments, such as the private sector and civil society. We have found this role to be very fruitful and very successful. Two of the presenters mentioned the importance of connection outside of government.

Madam Chair, it is with great pleasure that I recommend that this discussion continue, so that we may be able to put a little more oomph into some of the discussions we've had here today. We've

had problems, yes, but we need to put out a little more realism and make it very practical. A number of ideas have been proposed, and I think we need to follow through on them.

Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Johnny. I'm pleased to give the floor to the Chief of Staff of the Secretary General, Ambassador Hugo de Zela.

El JEFE DE GABINETE DEL SECRETARIO GENERAL: Muchas gracias, Presidenta.

Tomaré solamente un par de minutos del tiempo del Consejo Permanente, pero no podía dejar de unir la voz de la Secretaría General para felicitarla por la iniciativa que tuvo de realizar esta sesión extraordinaria del Consejo Permanente. Y al mismo tiempo para agradecer a los ponentes: al Embajador Mifsud, al Embajador Sinclair, al Presidente de la Comisión Interamericana de Telecomunicaciones (CITEL) por sus extremadamente valiosas opiniones, comentarios, sugerencias.

En la Secretaría General pensamos que esta iniciativa que tuvo usted, señora Presidenta, es de particular utilidad en momentos en que nos encontramos, por decisión de nuestros países miembros, en el proceso de construcción de una visión estratégica de esta Organización de los Estados Americanos para el siglo XXI. Visiones como las que hemos recibido hoy, que vienen de personajes como los que han integrado el panel, creo que pueden ser de gran utilidad para el proceso que todavía queda por delante a los países miembros para terminar de construir y poner en práctica la visión estratégica. Y en consecuencia, reflexiones como las escuchadas, estoy seguro, pueden enriquecer el debate que todavía tenemos por delante.

Así que, en síntesis, Presidenta, felicitaciones muy calurosas a usted, y agradecimiento a los ponentes por sus valiosos comentarios.

Muchas gracias.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador de Zela. In light of the lateness of the hour, I'm going to offer to the panelists who are still here with us two minutes each for any final thoughts they may wish to share with us before we head towards the next speaker on the list. Ambassador Sinclair?

El EXREPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE GUYANA ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for these two minutes.

I specifically wanted to respond to the question of the Representative of Saint Kitts and Nevis. I'd like to begin this response by repeating what was said by the head of state of El Salvador in New York. He sees the September 2015 UN Summit to adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda as the most important world summit in our history.

You know, we need to think carefully about that. It is, indeed, the most important world summit in our history. We have never had an engagement that is as transformational as this summit is going to be. It is much more so than even the conference in 1945, when the UN Charter was adopted. What we are about to do is to create a completely new system of relations among member states, which is to be good for all member states: developed, developing, and in between. It's a new order of relations for all of them.

The Representative of Saint Kitts and Nevis referred to certain peculiarities of the relationship between small countries, especially those of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and certain international organizations, and she has asked whether this kind of regulatory diplomacy is the new normal.

Well, when it comes to what is or is not going to be the new normal, I would like to quote here from a statement made by the President of the Assembly, my boss, on September 10, on which occasion the General Assembly adopted the report of the Open Working Group (OWG) containing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). He said the sustainable development agenda “must represent our collective commitment to end poverty and ensure that sustainable development becomes the norm for all nations, societies, and economies.”

So, this event is truly transformational. Out of it will come what will be the new norm for all.

Of course, if you're going to have anything that is so transformational, so profoundly significant, you naturally want to know that you can make sure that those who commit to it stay with their commitments. In this regard, I would like to draw to your attention a statement made by the members of the High-level Panel whom the Secretary General had asked to prepare some thoughts on the SDGs. They have stressed that globalization must work for all the world's people, but then they went on to set forth five principles that must guide the implementation of the SDGs, and one of these principles is multistakeholder monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

It is not enough that we simply have the sustainable development goals; we have to have a set of mechanisms for accountability and for monitoring. These mechanisms will apply not only to member states but also to all participants in the dialogue, including the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

So, accountability mechanisms are one of the things that we have to think about. How do you make the SDGs accountable? We must bring our ideas to the table in September 2015.

Thank you.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Sinclair. Ambassador Mifsud, please.

El DIRECTOR DE LA *LONDON ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY*: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, I would like to thank you and the Organization of American States for this opportunity for interaction. I believe the objective of today's meeting has been very well received, based on the comments made. We might not agree on everything, which is very important, but I think that is the part that diplomacy plays.

I'm also very pleased to hear a number of key words that I feel are extremely important. I am not a theoretical person myself, although I'm an academic. I believe that I have dirtied my hands—let's put it this way—in terms of diplomacy itself. One of the things that was mentioned today and that I will take away from this meeting is—I will make my own translation of it—ethical collegiality. This is, I believe, extremely important. Ethical collegiality is a key for further discussion of your perspectives in terms of development and diplomacy.

I studied what the Organization of American States has been doing in terms of projecting itself. What came out very clearly is the way in which you are trying to work together in an integrated manner. “Integration” or “integrative development” feature in terms of what you communicate, and if we tie that to ethical collegiality, they could form the basis of a real partnership in terms of development.

My opinion is that there is no one-size-fits-all in terms of development, and in terms of diplomacy as applied to development. Each state has its own way of arriving at its goals, and none is better than the other because you can buy a very beautiful suit, but if the size does not fit you, you will look like a clown.

One of the things that I believe is crucial here is the type of training that is done. Training was mentioned, I believe, by the Ambassador of Colombia. There is the International Forum on Diplomatic Training (IFDT), with which all of the countries here have, or have had, some kind of relationship. This is where all the academies of diplomacy meet and discuss pedagogy and training.

Madam Chair, you mentioned that I organized, for example, with the Government of Croatia, a forum every summer in Dubrovnik, one of the most historic cities in Europe. This year, it will feature training for diplomats in development, and I’ve already contacted your colleague ambassadors and high commissioners in London, asking them to send students to this forum. I think it is extremely important because it specifically ties in with the idea of sharing, always within a perspective of what I call ethical collegiality.

So, thank you again, and thank you for having me here.

La PRESIDENTA: Thank you, Ambassador Mifsud.

PALABRAS DE LA SECRETARIA EJECUTIVA PARA EL DESARROLLO INTEGRAL DE LA OEA

La PRESIDENTA: We move swiftly to the final speaker, who will be the Executive Secretary for Integral Development, Ms. Sherry Tross.

La SECRETARIA EJECUTIVA PARA EL DESARROLLO INTEGRAL: Thank you, Chair, and lest our audience begin to get a bit concerned, I’m not going to be making a presentation. This is just an opportunity being provided by the Chair of the Permanent Council for me to share a few words.

When Ambassador Prince first approached me a few weeks ago about this particular idea of putting together this panel and wanting to have this discussion within the context of the Permanent Council, I thought it was a brilliant idea. We were very pleased with the responses that we were able to get from all of the speakers whom we approached.

A I listened to the panelists, as well as to the responses from members during the course of this dialogue, four things stuck out in my mind.

First, there clearly is a great degree of interdependence and inseparability of these issues.

Second, we're in a process of evolution and adaptation. We're seeing changing forms of diplomacy and new ways of looking at governance and development. Quite frankly, as the international landscape changes—and we're talking a lot about that here at the Organization of American States—we're seeing that developing countries in particular, as Ambassador Sinclair mentioned, are now called on to take on a more active and leading role in their own development.

When I meet Professor Mifsud for the first time some months back, he was taking part in a session in which I was also participating, and we kind of agreed on several conceptual issues. Today, I noted that he said that political relations have changed as more confident emerging states are increasingly asserting their own values and roles. Within the context of our hemispheric space, we certainly see that, particularly in terms of the expanding levels of south-south and horizontal cooperation and the ways in which countries are relating to each other.

The third point that jumps out at me is one of convergence. We heard from all of the speakers and from you, Permanent Representative, that this discussion really speaks to the all-of-government approach that we tend to emphasize here at the OAS. But beyond the all-of-government approach, there is also an all-of-community, all-of-society approach in talking about all of the various actors who now have to be integrated and who really have become a key part of the discussions, so that the appropriate input is received and there is buy-in from all sectors of the population as we go about the process of policymaking and implementing decisions.

Fourth is the concept of transformation and, in some ways, redefinition as we develop a forward-looking agenda that challenges traditional definitions and understanding and really begins to lay out the framework for the reformulation of relationships and the ways in which we work.

I would like to close by reiterating something that the Chair of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development (CIDI), the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago, mentioned—he stepped out. He likes to put forward this concept of “golden triangles.” He's used it before, and I heard him use it again today. But the point of all that, I think, is layout, that all of these different parts come together in a powerful, coherent, and cohesive whole.

A couple of weeks ago, I had an ambassador in my office, and we were talking about the development agenda, the OAS in general, and the four pillars that we always emphasize. He said something to me that kind of stuck. He said, maybe we need to move away from talking about the four pillars and look at them as interwoven strands that are completely inseparable and work together. It's not just about building on these pillars; it's now really about looking at the DNA of the inter-American system, closely woven together, to really have in the OAS the kind of organization that we want and to have an inter-American system that functions as a whole.

So, in closing, thanks again to all of the speakers and to our Chair of the Permanent Council for putting together this excellent meeting and for giving me an opportunity to be a part of it!

La PRESIDENTA: And thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

Distinguished permanent and alternate representatives, I believe that today, we have benefitted from a unique opportunity to be guided by new perspectives and to learn from the wealth of experiences that our illustrious panelists have represented to us today, coming from their various

fields. It is a reminder to us here at the Organization of American States of the work that awaits our attention and the opportunities we have for making an impact in that regard.

The countries of this hemispheric region must redouble our efforts to advance development, strengthen governance, and secure a stable hemisphere. Our efforts must be comprehensive and all-encompassing so as to include diverse sectors and support public-private partnerships (PPPs) at the national and regional levels. These efforts, channeled through technology-driven communication mechanisms and globally-minded investment prospects, will bridge gaps and will take us to our sustainably defined development destinations.

Our experiences have shaped our understanding of what it takes to advance development. We know that development requires local, national, and regional political will that can only be assured through governance. We know, too, that receptive, efficient, and accountable diplomatic avenues will afford wide-ranging opportunities for progress. Securing and ensuring this type of enabling environment will be imperative for any sustained development. We must continue thus with the various forms of energetic engagement reflected here at the OAS. This is our region, this is our era, so this is our job.

I wish to thank all delegations for your presence here today and for your participation, which enriched this dialogue. Certainly, it has exceeded my expectations.

I cannot close this meeting without acknowledging the work of Executive Secretary Tross and her team in helping the Chair of the Permanent Council organize today's meeting and for the guidance and support she has given to me. Madam Secretary, you have heard many delegations say that they think that we have basically rolled the crease for further dialogue. Perhaps this is an opportunity for the Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI) to continue working with the Permanent Council so that we have more discussions in this regard.

Ambassador Sinclair, Ambassador Mifsud, our guest speakers, once again, you have our profound gratitude for coming here today to share your experiences and insights with us and to challenge our thinking. I think you have succeeded in doing just that. We wish you continued success in your various fields of endeavor, and we also wish you a safe return to your homes.

I know that the hour is late. We have a regular meeting of the Council scheduled to begin just about now, but it would have to be pushed back to 2:45 p.m. The Chair apologizes for taxing you so very heavily today. Unfortunately, we've had to compress all our meetings into one day because the calendar of the OAS is very tight at this time. I hope to see you back at 2:45 p.m.

Thank you very much again to everyone. This meeting stands adjourned.

ISBN 978-0-8270-6439-3