

**Statement delivered by H.E. Mrs. Janine Coye Felson, Ambassador, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Belize to the United Nations to the informal meetings of the plenary on stocktaking in the process of intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, pursuant to resolution 69/244 and decision 69/550**

**21 January 2015**

***Means of Implementation and the Global Partnership***

**Co facilitators,**

We appreciate the engagement with the Co-chairs of the FFD process and underscore the importance of endeavouring to maintain coherence and build synergies between the two processes particularly as the FFD process enters its next phase.

The FFD outcome will have direct relevance to Means of Implementation and the new Global Partnership of the post-2015 development agenda. For the CARICOM this component of the new agenda will similarly have direct relevance for our ability to effectively address the unique sustainable development challenges we face as small island developing states. CARICOM therefore underscores that the Means of Implementations must match the ambition and universality of our agenda and provide a framework that can address **the needs of countries at different stages of development and with distinctly diverse national circumstances.**

Given the nature and size of our economies, CARICOM Member States have struggled to advance our development priorities in the face of significant exposure to exogenous shocks and unfavourable global policies in the area of trade and finance. These vulnerabilities which the United Nations recognizes demands special consideration, particularly in the context of - how we measure progress beyond GDP, how we rationalize graduation criteria, how we allocate ODA and define access for SIDS to financing; how we treat with small vulnerable economies within the context of a multilateral trade regime; how we approach debt sustainability for such economies; and, how we advance considerations of international tax cooperation, resilience and capacity building.

We can draw from the various inputs into the FFD discussion for options on the way forward on many of these issues including:

- developing a special mechanism that addresses the debt sustainability in SIDS
- articulating special provisions for SIDS within the context of efforts to modernize ODA and measures of development finance
- reviewing the conditionalities applied to SIDS in accessing IFI technical assistance; and
- developing an integrated trade facility mechanism for SIDS (similar to the LDC mechanism)

On the global partnership, there is much that we have learnt from the experience with MDG 8; lessons that we should not repeat. We must be informed by the **significant gaps and**

**systematic shortcomings** of that goal, the **discrepancy between its initial level of ambition and its actual implementation**, its **lack of stakeholder accountability** and in some cases **measurable targets**. We wish also to avoid the **donor-recipient paradigm** perpetuated in MDG 8 and the insufficient attention to development financing other than aid.<sup>1</sup> For this new universal, integrated sustainable development agenda, **we will all be beneficiaries and therefore we need to consider the vast opportunities to be had from a renewed global partnership.**

To get this right, there are a few essential elements to revamp the partnership paradigm including:

- **Definitive arrangements for the MOI** that can effectively mobilize adequate financial and other resources, improve trade and market access, increase technology development and transfer and capacity building, including support for the modernization of data collection and statistical analysis.
- **Time bound commitments by developed countries to meet ODA targets** and the reduction of the complexity of sustainable development finance.
- **Enhanced accountability in development cooperation based on agreed principles**
- **Reduced transaction costs on remittances**
- Enhanced **voice and participation for developing countries**, including SIDS in international financial institutions
- Strengthened commitment and involvement of multilateral financial development institutions with **attention paid to concessionary financing for development**
- Effective assistance to developing countries in the area of **debt relief**
- **Reforms in global economic governance** including the maintenance of global financial stability
- **Specific provisions for the development financing needs of countries in special situations, including SIDs, and the improvement of governance at all levels.**
- Close coordination and cooperation of multi-stakeholder initiatives and partnerships with government and inter-governmental efforts in support of sustainable development

---

<sup>1</sup> 2013 MDG Gap Task Force report

CARICOM Member States also wish to underscore the importance of a global technology transfer mechanism to the means of implementation. That mechanism should serve the basic functions of:

- promoting coordination and coherence, provide information on a centralized basis, and also assist States with ensuring that stronger linkages are made between the type of technology assistance that is provided and national development priorities;
- addressing the issue of scale and appropriateness of existing technologies to specific circumstances of States; and
- rationalising and centralising approaches to capacity building in developing countries in order to facilitate technology development.

Before closing Co-facilitator I wish to address the issue of feasibility (whether the agenda will be implementable / manageable) that several Member States have raised. The question of feasibility has been raised in the respect of the number of goals and targets; it has been raised in respect of defining a communication strategy; and it has been raised in the context of calls for technical proofing.

There is no question that 17 goals are not 8. Then again there is no question that this agenda is the Sustainable Development Goals agenda not the MDG agenda. Our vision is grander and ambition greater. In coming to the realization of this new agenda, we must appreciate that the means for its implementation will necessarily be greater than what means were made available for the MDGs. Rather than backtracking to reduce the number of goals and thus curtail ambition and vision, we must work together to define how we can match that ambition with the means for action. This of course is a distinct process from how we communicate that ambition, a matter that should by and large be addressed in the Declaration.

Finally, Co facilitator, on the matter of “technical proofing”, we have heard various rationale for the purpose of “technical proofing”. Some have said it is to address feasibility/implementability; others have said it is to ensure coherence with existing international commitments; still others have said it is left over business from the OWG. At the same time, there are many unanswered questions? Who would conduct the technical review? What would it entail? How will we agree on this? How long will it take? Importantly what will we do with its outcome?

From all these varied views, there is only one conclusion to be had and that is that technical proofing is a Pandora’s box **not an elixir** to address each delegations’ reservations on the SDGs. The risks particularly for re-opening at this stage what **all have agreed** is a delicately balanced political outcome imperfect in many ways but innovative and ambitious in many others, far outweigh what a few have argued as benefits of a technical review. It is important to bear in mind what we have all agreed, that is, that the post-2015 development agenda will be a dynamic one not fixed or inflexible. Let us therefore focus our energies on the areas that will make a difference in how we take forward this agenda. It is through the means of

implementation and the review and follow-up process that we can address feasibility and/or redress shortcomings should they arise.

Thank you.