Intergovernmental Negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda
Stock-taking: means of implementation, global partnership and follow up/review
21 January 2015

Statement by Mr. Takeshi Osuga, Ambassador,
Deputy Director-General for International Cooperation and Global Issues

Mr. Co-facilitator,

I would like to share Japan's views on MOI, global partnership and follow up and review.

First, as I emphasized in my statement on the first day, Japan strongly believes that duplication between this process and that of FfD should be avoided and that the negotiation on MOI should take place mainly under the FfD track. The post-2015 process should build on the outcome of the 3rd FfD meeting in Adis.

Compared to MDGs, SDGs have universal nature and cover much broader range of issues. This has made MOI of the SDGs converge on the wide variety of resources covered by the Monterrey consensus.

International environment around development has greatly changed since the time of the Millenium Declaration. Although global ODA reached an all-time high in 2014, there is a clear tendency in recent years, as pointed out in the ICESDF report, whereby the share of traditional ODA is decreasing and the domestic resources, private finance and South-South cooperation are playing larger part in development financing. As we recognize the universality of the post-2015 development agenda, all relevant stakeholders should demonstrate ownership and shoulder the fair share to achieve it.

Countries have the primary responsibility for development. National governments should endeavor to mobilize domestic resources which are essential for sustained growth. Countries should also work to improve domestic investment environment, key element for promoting private sector investment. International public financing, including ODA and public-private partnership should be used effectively, efficiently and in a strategic manner to scale up quality investments that are inclusive, resilient and sustainable.

On technology, the need for cutting-edge technology to cope with the environmental sustainability is more than evident. However, simply creating a new mechanism will not lead to dissemination of environmentally sound technologies. We should carefully consider what the UN system can do to address the technological gap.

Important thing to start with is to make full use of existing initiatives to promote dialogue at all levels, improve access to information and educational activities. In doing so, we should fully take into account the market needs, good environmental policies and practices by countries to incentivize innovation and to enhance capacity of human resources. Creation of a new mechanism should not be seen as an objective in itself.

I would also like to underline that in order for the technologies to contribute to sustained, healthy growth, intellectual property regime should be respected.

Let me now turn to the subject of global partnership.

Players in the international development have diversified over the years. Not only the traditional donors but emerging countries, private sector and others are increasingly playing the important role. Multi-stakeholder approach needs to be encouraged. South-South cooperation and the triangular cooperation are effective modality to strengthen partnerships and share practical know-how. They should be promoted further.

It is crucially important to build a global partnership encompassing a widest possible stakeholders from countries, private sector, civil society etc. As was pointed out by Niger on behalf of LLDC, effective mobilization and use of resources is key. Effective ways to mobilize resources from a variety of sources are being discussed under the framework of Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC). We believe there is a good room to pursue effective coordination between GPEDC and the UN-led post 2015 process to avoid duplication and create synergy.

Lastly, I have few comments on follow up and review.

As others have already stated, Japan believes that the ideal structure for monitoring at the global level would be to see the High-level Political Forum (HLPF) at the top of the pyramid and to have regional and country level mechanisms linked beneath HLPF in a flexible manner.

During the last two days' discussion, we heard several voices that at the global level, MOI should be reviewed. In Japan's view, the global review under the authority of HLPF will naturally include MOI, but should not be limited to MOI. The global review should be on the state of implementation of overall goals and targets and on the ways to achieve them effectively.

The monitoring process within this structure should not be one way, but in both directions, bottom-up and top-down in an interactive manner. The state of implementation should be captured at the country level, or ultimately at the local community level, and aggregated at the national, sub-regional and regional levels to be reviewed finally at the global level. In doing so, countries and regions are expected to share good practices and lessons and learn from each other to improve implementation.

Conceptually, this should be the ideal mechanism for the follow-up and review. In reality, it make no sense to establish a new global structure from scratch. There is no one-size-fits-all that can apply to every country and region. Therefore, we should make full use of existing frameworks such as African Peer Review Mechanism, OECD/DAC, GPEDC and learn from respective experiences. Limited membership in respective fora should not be the reason to prevent ourselves or refrain from making use of them. International organizations will continue to play important roles in monitoring the goals and targets under their respective mandates.

We should avoid creating duplications and further fragmentation in the follow-up mechanism, and try to build effective and efficient network of existing frameworks and fora. Japan will not support any new mechanism which only imposes additional reporting and financial burden on the member states.

Thank you very much.