

**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
the Relationship between Post-2015 D.A. and Financing for Development**

Thank you **Mr. Co-Facilitator**,

We align ourselves with the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of G77. We wish to share our views on the admittedly complex question of the relationship between the FfD and the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

We have also listened carefully to the views expressed by member states today on issues such as the difference between global partnership and partnerships, the notion of a changing world, fair share of countries, a new versus a renewed global partnership etc and we will share some views on these issues tomorrow.

We endorse the view expressed by several developing country groups and delegations that the Financing for Development outcome and the Post-2015 development agenda should be coherent and mutually re-enforcing but at the same time they must also be understood for their own respective integrity and *distinct* identities.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

In our view, the linkage between the Post-2015 and FfD processes must be seen through the lens of 'complementarity' and not 'subsidiarity'.

While there is a partial overlap between the two, Financing for Development is a process in its own right, meant to track in a holistic and coherent manner the progress in financing for development and tackling international systemic issues. Moreover, We expect the FfD track to continue even after the Post-2015 Development Agenda has been adopted.

Even as we are happy that our ambition under FfD is to address all MOI comprehensively, the objective of the FfD Conference is not to replace the Means of Implementation segment under the Post-2015 Development Agenda as some

delegations have contended, but to *complement* it.

When we address this question, we also need to bear in mind that now we have a standalone component of means of implementation contained in the proposal of the Open Working Group.

This component should not be left behind while integrating the outcome of FfD.

It is imperative therefore, that FfD should not undermine or replace the outcome on MOI contained in the SDGs. SDG Goal 17 should be seen as a floor, and FfD must provide a set of policy tools to implement and enhance the ambition of SDGs and their targets.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

Discussions in FfD also should not preclude discussions on MOI under the PDA track.

The issue of technology is one example.

It is *not* our understanding that including a separate section on technology, capacity building and innovation would mean that we simply migrate all technology related issues to the FfD track to their exclusion under the Post-2015 track.

We rather support the notion expressed by Brazil that while FfD will look at the wider systemic issues related to STI, our effort under this track should be to elaborate modalities for the technology facilitation mechanism. This way we can be truly complementary.

In terms of follow-up, as has been emphasized by CARICOM and several developing countries, in our view there must be a *distinct* framework for follow-up of means of implementation and FfD.

A distinct identity to this follow-up is in fact extremely important to ensure that adequate attention and resources are devoted to the follow-up of MOI/FFD, taking into account the lessons learnt from MDG-8; implementation of which languished in the absence of a dedicated follow-up mechanism.

In any case, we should focus more at this stage on getting an ambitious outcome

from the FfD Conference rather than any a priori agreement on its relationship with the PDA process.

The notion that several delegations have spoken about – that of FfD conference providing a comprehensive set of means of implementation commensurate with the ambition of the development agenda – is self-evident. This is precisely why developing country delegations insisted on this Conference to be held before and not after the agenda is adopted.

However, given that we have not yet seen the nature of outcome of this Conference, it is premature to pass a judgment at this stage on whether FfD can provide the entire pillar of means of implementation (MOI) of the development agenda.

We suggest that we deal with the FfD zero draft in its own right and integrity and consider its relationship with the development agenda subsequently. We have already suggested how in our view, this could be done.

Finally **Mr. Co-Facilitator**, we have heard some interesting comments on the importance of ‘Universality’ in the new agenda.

We agree that the notion of universality – no it is not a principle – is what makes this agenda different and unique. We strongly endorse the idea that this ambitious agenda should be a call for action by all and it should mobilize each of us to do more.

For us, universality implies that unlike the MDGs, this time around, developed countries will also have to be accountable for their actions, with particular emphasis to areas related to environmental sustainability and rationalizing unsustainable consumption patterns.

However, in our view, the notion of universality is a complement to the principle of differentiation, and a balance of both is well captured in the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. In other words, the notion of universality does *not* stand on its own, but must invariably be seen in conjunction with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

We would also of course add that the principle of CBDR does not mean – and has never meant – that developing countries will not take action on issues of collective importance. On the other hand, evidence indicates that developing

countries are already doing far more than developed countries even on issues of environmental stewardship and their increasing contribution to the global partnership through South-South solidarity is in contrast to the persistent negative trends in North-South Aid.

Universality of the agenda does not translate into uniformity of its application. Given the amount of inequality and developmental diversity in the world, a universal agenda can and indeed must be a differentiated one.

I thank you.
