

Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

6th Session, NY, 22-25/6.

Global Partnership and Means of Implementation

Intervention by Brazil

Mr. Co-facilitators,

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of G-77 and China. I would like to present additional comments in my national capacity.

Means of implementation are an integral part of the SDGs and a requirement for their achievement. The Addis Accord complements SDG 17 and the MoI specific targets, providing the policy framework for the goal and the targets contained in OWG proposal.

The Addis Accord should be integrated into our Agenda in its entirety as an addendum to SDG 17 and the MoI-specific targets.

The Global Partnership constitutes a cross-cutting aspect of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. Goal 17 and the MoI-specific targets will be monitored on the basis of global indicative indicators to be developed by the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDGs (IAEG-SDGs). Furthermore, we recall that the mandate of the HLPF, as established in Rio+20 and the Resolution 67/290, includes monitoring the MoI of the new agenda.

The FfD outcome document is supposed to articulate a narrative and set out a global policy framework to achieve the SDGs. Furthermore, the follow-up and review section of the Post-2015 should clearly reflect the integration of the follow-up and review of FFD into the overall arrangement under the HLPF.

The Global partnership underpins our endeavor. While the Addis Outcome may provide the framework, it does not exhaust all the tools and mechanisms to implement, monitor and review the revitalized partnership.

As negotiations on the Addis Accord are still to define some fundamental pending issues, it would be premature to make an overall assessment of its contribution to the implementation of our Agenda.

We congratulate the work done by FfD co-facilitators, Ambassadors George Talbot, from Guyana, and Geir Pedersen, from Norway, for their leadership in moving the process forward.

We underscore, however, a number of shortfalls and limitations of the latest FfD draft. The question of the upgrade of the tax committee to an intergovernmental body is a case in point. This is a measure that would greatly contribute to the mobilization of resources for development.

The arrangements for follow up and review of Financing for Development still seem insufficient to meet the needs of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The Technology Facilitation Mechanism, on the other hand, was a positive development. The Mechanism resulted from a compromise text which was made possible because of the flexibility shown by negotiators and the open mindedness of all sides, allowing us to achieve a meaningful outcome in such a complex and politically sensitive topic.

[CBDR]

Allow me to say a few words on the question of CBDR in response to comments made by some delegations over the last few days.

As one of the foundations of sustainable development international agenda since 1992, the principle of CBDR will also be key in the discussions for the Post-2015 Development Agenda, as indicated in the outcome document of the Special Events on MDGs and the proposal of the Open Working Group on SDGs.

Developed countries still question the validity of the principle on the basis that it does not reflect the changes of the last 20 years ó an argument, I must say, not applied in other òforaö of the United Nations, such as the Security Council, to say nothing of the International Financial Institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank.

In our view, CBDR will still provide the conceptual basis for the global partnership for sustainable development beyond 2015, balancing needs and responsibilities,

according to historical responsibilities and respective capabilities of developed and developing countries.

The principle of CBDR embodies the premise that justice should be a compulsory part of international sustainable development agenda. Differentiation serves to the purpose of “**substantive equality**” at the international level, questioning the formal argument of equality between different States parties in international agreements.

Many international agreements, including trade-related ones, embody differentiation in their provisions even though the principle of CBDR is not spelled out. In many cases, differentiation is used to address special needs of countries prone to natural disasters (UNFCCC), or African country parties, in light of the particular situation prevailing in that region (Convention on Desertification).

In other cases, such as in the Multilateral Trading System, differentiation takes the shape of the principle of less than full reciprocity and, more broadly, the provisions on Special and Differential Treatment for Developing Countries (S&D) contained in practically all the agreements of the World Trade Organization.

I wish to conclude by making a reference to the legal definition of the concept of equality, widely accepted in many legal systems around the world and incorporated in numerous international agreements: Equality means treating differently those that are differently situated or in different circumstances, and treating equally those that are similarly situated or that are in like circumstances.

Thank you.