

Statement on behalf of the European Union and its Member States 27 March 2015 - Coordination with the FFD process Draft

Co-facilitators

Thanks for organizing this exchange of views on an issue of great importance for our work in the next few weeks and for the success of both the Addis conference and the September Summit. Thank you also for circulating the draft programme on your plans for the April session on Mol. A few considerations from our side:

- As we stressed several times, this year we need to achieve an integrated, single agenda that can galvanize action.
- The Addis Conference should address the full range of means of implementation for the post 2015 agenda. The Addis outcome should directly contribute to the definition of the overarching concept of a new global partnership for the entire post-2015-agenda which is expected to underpin the implementation of the agenda. This global partnership shall be based on the guiding principles of universality, shared responsibility, mutual accountability, consideration of respective capabilities and the adoption of a multi-stakeholder and multi level approach. As such the Addis outcome should be understood as the MoI pillar of the post-2015 agenda, thereby avoiding wasteful and potentially incoherent duplication. Hence, in Addis we should craft an outcome that will enable the establishment of one, single comprehensive agenda, and strive to ensure that the Means of Implementation discussions are finalised at the July Conference.
- The Conference on Financing for Development should tackle the MoI challenges of the post-2015 agenda based on a set of guiding principles; it should not be a pledging conference. Building on the Monterrey and Doha documents, but also on the ICESDF Report, the OWG Report, and the UNSG Synthesis Report, it should be comprehensive, covering all financial and non-financial MoI including the policy context. A part of this comprehensive package should be specific deliverables and commitments from all actors.
- Addis should not aim at creating a one-size-fits-all template or promote silver-bullet solutions, but rather recognise that achieving sustainable development will require a complex set of actions by all countries and other stakeholders that will have to take account of different country situations.
- Addis should also consider the key issue of monitoring, accountability and review of the Ffd track. However, the outcome from these deliberations will need to be merged into a comprehensive post 2015 monitoring, review and accountability framework with a key oversight role of the HLPF. A single monitoring framework for all

elements of the post-2015 agenda should emerge from the September Summit avoiding duplication.

- It is also important to ensure coherence with the negotiations ongoing in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change which aim at reaching a legally binding agreement applicable to all Parties in December 2015.
- Therefore, whilst we emphasise that these are only preliminary comments having just seen the draft programme for April and reserve the right to come back with more considered views, we support the view expressed in your draft that the April sessions should be framed as a step towards further merging the post-2015 and FfD strands. As highlighted above we are engaged in a process to establish one single comprehensive agenda.
- There is clarity that the week of 13-17 April will be dedicated to substantive reactions to the zero FfD draft. The shortened week in the post 2015 track (21-24 April), which ideally would have also been shorter and not run in parallel with the second day of the ECOSOC meeting with the BWI, should deal with how the Addis outcome will relate to the September outcome and implications for the texts, under co-chairmanship by the four co-facilitators.
- We appreciate that the programme does go in this direction, however, it was with some surprise that we noted that two of eight 'building blocks' of the Addis zero draft, technology transfer and Follow up and review on FfD, will be given particular attention. In our view it would be more important to give more time for consideration on coherence between the respective outcome documents, which would be a timely discussion coming so soon after the drafting session on FfD.
- We will be reverting back with more detailed proposals on the draft programme.

Thank you.