Statement on July 20

My delegation would like to extend its sincere appreciation and gratitude to the co facilitators for producing the final draft. There are many improvements in the draft from the zero draft, and we welcome the revised draft. We are committed to constructively working with the member states to finalize the document by 31 July, under the able guidance and strong leadership of the co facilitators.

title
The title should be simple, concise, and durable. Therefore, we would prefer simpler title, for instance, the 2030 agenda for global action. As suggested by the Ambassador of Benin, in short, it can be called as 2030 agenda. In addition to that, we should stress that this is a transformative agenda, so the subtitle, transforming our world, should be appropriate.

preamble
We support the revision of the preamble, because we did not support the idea to have nine bullets. In the second sentence of the very first para, since the partners for the implementation should not be limited to countries, we suggest that the words, all people and groups, should be inserted after the word All countries.

introduction
As stated by the ambassador of Maldives and DPR of Belize this morning, and also repeated by many delegations in the previous sessions, We believe that we should clearly state that the new agenda should be people-centred. We suggest that in para 2, the words, inclusive, people-centred, should be inserted between comprehensive and far-reaching in the first sentence.

Our vision
We strongly support this section.

Our shared principles
We still have some concerns with the idea to single out a specific right and a specific principle of the declaration of an international
conference. On the issue of CBDR, I argued extensively at the last session, I do not repeat my argument here, but we still have concerns with CBDR.

We do believe that differentiation is necessary for the implementation of the new agenda, because universality does not mean uniformity, as many colleagues said.

However, one problem of CBDR is that it is based on the assumption of the traditional divide of the North and South. This binary structure is not valid anymore to the more diversified world.

Another concern of CBDR is that this notion can be used as an excuse for developing countries to take inactions, and this is not acceptable to us. We should emphasize the importance of shared responsibility among the member states based on the differentiated national circumstances and capacities.

In this connection, we strongly call for the retention of the words, shared responsibility, in para 31.

Our world today
In para 11, we believe that natural disasters should be added to the list of the challenges that humanity faces, as natural disasters instantly deprive of the fruit of the development of the countries.

We support para 14, as it clearly states the framework of the new agenda goes far beyond the MDGS. Also we strongly support the third sentence which speaks about peaceful and inclusive societies. However, we understand that the essence of the para 14 of the zero draft, namely the universality of the goals, Has moved to the para 5, but the notion that the new agenda transcends the North South divide should be maintained in para 5 as well.

On para 15, it is a traditional way of the UN to recall the past declarations of the international conferences, but we do not see much added value with this para, and we suggest that it should be deleted.

The new agenda
In para 20, there is a reference in the fourth sentence to policy space, which was a matter of the heated discussion at FFD. In order to have consistency with FFD, we suggest that the word, adequate, should be deleted, and that the words, while remaining consistent with relevant international rules and commitments, should be inserted at the end of the sentence.

At the outset, we have to keep in mind that we should not reopen or renegotiate the outcome of FFD, and in this sense I concur with the co facilitators. This part should be carefully amended to have consistency with FFD.

In our view, the most important role of this section is to endorse the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, since all the MOI targets will be reproduced in either the SDG or the MOI chapter or both. Apart from para 33, this
section should be limited in length in order to avoid duplication and confusion and also should be balanced in its substance.

Para 32 touches upon the several elements of the Means of Implementation, but they are not comprehensive and look very selective and pick-and-choose. The current language of paras 34-36 are different from both the MOi targets and the relevant paras of the FfD outcome document, both in terms of structure and also in contents.

We believe that para 33 should come first in this section, because it welcomes and endorses the outcome of FFD. Then, we should have the first sentence of para 32, and this para should be followed by the sentence stressing the importance of the national ownership, which is similar to the para 9 of FFD document. On para 34-36, the description is very selective and unbalanced, as I said earlier, and rather, we would like to suggest that those three paras should be deleted. But if most of the member states want the retention of these paras, we believe that it is absolutely necessary to draft the paras in consistency with the FFD document.

On para 37 and 38, we do not have specific comments, but we are wondering if these paras are best located in this section, implementation.

Para 39, we do not see much added value of this para, because it is a repetition, slightly modified, of SDG target 17.15. We call for the deletion of this para.