4th Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda

Joint Session between FfD and Post-2015 processes

April 23, 2015

Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India on Global Partnership and North-South Divide

Thank you Mr. Co-Facilitator,

We have already addressed the issue of follow-up and review and I will only reemphasize our strong belief for the need for a distinct institutional arrangement for the follow-up and review of MOI/FfD commitments. In this regard, the proposal contained in the FfD zero draft is a step in the right direction but ultimately inadequate.

I would like to address the issues of the role of the private sector in the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the North-South divide.

Turning to private sector first, let me at the outset strongly assert that coming from India, we feel that the private sector has a very important role to play – not just as a solution provider, but at an even more basic level, as the fundamental driver of economic growth and development. Through this agenda, we in India hope to unleash the creative potential and entrepreneurial spirit of our people, to give them the means to shape their own destiny.

In our view, the concern among the membership on the role of private sector is not so much with the involvement of the private sector per se, but only to the extent when this connotes an abdication of public responsibility. This impression is sometimes given by a disproportionate emphasis on the role of private sector to the detriment of international public cooperation or a tendency of over-reliance on the role and capabilities of the private sector.

As several recent examples have shown, left to itself, the commercial interests of the private sector does not in every case align themselves with the wider public interest. The example of meningitis vaccine which we shared earlier is a striking example

where even when technology was available, the private entities involved did not invest in producing the vaccine meant for poorer countries as the investment was not deemed profitable enough. In other words, research & development and investments by the private sector are not always oriented towards the problems faced by thr poor, nor will purely market based solutions always correspond to the urgency of the challenges we face.

It is, therefore, important to maintain a balance in our approach and our emphasis on the role of private sector should be as a complement to international public cooperation and not a substitute. It is equally important to stress the notion of intergovernmental oversight and the notion of private sector accountability which has been stressed by several delegations and the civil society needs to be addressed seriously.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

The other question we wish address is this notion of a changing world and the North-South divide. Has the world really changed as it is often made out to be and if so how?

To us, the very fact that all of us are sitting here in this room grappling with a development agenda would suggest that the world has not changed, or at least not as much as we would have liked it to.

We are here in many ways to finish the project we started in year 2000 – to end poverty and make this world a better place for everyone. Clearly then, the fundamental premise of this exercise, of the Post-2015 Development Agenda is that the job has not been done yet.

The notion of a world that has changed is often raised in the context of the aggregates of some large developing countries. This is not only an unfair comparison, especially for all other developing countries, but an excessive focus on aggregates of a few has a tendency to hide more than it reveals.

A mention was made yesterday by more than one delegation to how it is only about 30 odd countries who would still classify as traditional donors. But to take this very example, it is also true that the 30 odd rich countries of the world, while accounting for only 17% of the global population, still account for over 60% of the global GDP, more than 50% of the global electricity consumption and nearly 40% of global CO2 emissions.

It is also true that the average electricity consumption in OECD countries is about 16 times that of Africa and 10 times that of India; while the average consumption of energy in South Asia is about half the global average and 8 times less than that of OECD average.

The UN report on 'Inequality Matters - World Social Situation 2013' points out that in 2010, high-income countries generated 55% of global income, while Low-income countries created just above 1% of global income even though they contained 72% of global population.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

My distinguished colleague from New Zealand earlier today presented some very interesting and positive data on developing countries. We welcome this and thank her for doing so.

The rapid growth in developing countries should be a cause for celebration not trepidation.

But even here despite the relatively faster rates of growth in developing countries, international inequality has not fallen.

The UN report on inequality mentioned just now points out that excluding one large developing country, the Gini coefficient of international inequality was higher in 2010 than as compared to 1980.

Even in terms of environmental sustainability, where the conventional wisdom, or at least wisdom that is conventionally taken for granted – which is that it is the growing South which is expanding its carbon footprint to the detriment of global sustainability – the World Economic and Social Survey produced by UN-DESA shows that per capita ecological footprint in developed countries increased by 39% between 1961 and 2007, as against an increase of 28% for developing countries.

Even in terms of consumption of resources, as the UN Secretary General's High Level Panel pointed out pithily but starkly, 1.2 billion people living in extreme poverty (most if not all of whom are in developing countries) account for only 1% of world's consumption of resources, while the richest 1 billion people consume 72%.

We are conscious of the economic difficulty being faced by several developed countries. We understand their problems, not least because most developing countries continue to be almost in a state of *permanent* developmental crisis. Poverty, hunger, lack of access to water, sanitation, education and barest forms of energy, not to mention unemployment, is a fact of daily life in most developing countries, with or without financial crisis, which in any case had its worst impact on the poor.

Those who feel that the North-South distinction has disappeared could also helpfully look at the HDI rankings, which in any case present a far more comprehensive picture of development challenges – which we are seeking to overcome through this process – and in which the developing countries, including the larger aggregate ones, like my own, still occupy the bottom half of the ladder.

It is also curious that those who speak against the notion of developed and developing countries themselves wish to preserve the privileged position of a few to legislate on behalf of others. We saw this just last week, in the context of international cooperation on financial issues.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

We want to be clear. The intention is not finger pointing, even as we have often felt that finger pointed towards us. The idea is only to understand the reality better. We remain committed to working closely and constructively with all member states, North and South, East and West. This is after all a common agenda. But we will be doing ourselves a disservice if misrepresent reality. North-South is not a divide, it is a fact.

Clearly **Mr. Co-facilitator**, at least from our vantage point, the only thing that seems to have changed is that the world has not changed enough. If anything, the challenges we faced in the year 2000 have only become worse.

Yet, we are confident that by working collaboratively, by putting our differences aside and pooling our energies and resources, through this new agenda, we will change the world this time, for the better.

I thank you.