

Japan

Jul 24, 2015

At the outset, I would like to stress that in Addis Ababa there is an agreement that we will have a dedicated follow-up and review for the FfD outcomes as well as the MoI of the post 2015 development agenda, which is integrated with the post 2015 follow up and review process, as expressed in para 131.

To this end, as agreed in para 132 of Addis Ababa Action Agenda, we will have an annual ECOSOC forum on financing for development follow-up. In para 68 of this draft, we should clarify the linkage between this forum and the follow-up process of the new Agenda, and we would suggest that para 68 should be amended as follows:

" The dedicated follow-up and review for the FfD outcomes as well as all the MOI of the post 2015 development agenda, which was agreed in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, is a key and integral part of the follow-up and review of the post 2015 development agenda at the global level. HLPF will be informed by the conclusions and recommendations of the ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development follow-up."

Furthermore, I would like to stress we should avoid duplication of the follow up and review processes. From this point, we have the following comments.

On para 57 b, the words "including the means of implementation" are redundant as we have an agreement in Addis Ababa, and these words should be deleted.

On para 57 e, we should maintain the words "avoid duplication. "

On para 58, in the fourth sentence, the words "including for means of implementation" should be deleted.

On para 58, we have concerns with the process to develop indicators, like EU and France. Although I heard the explanation from Ambassador Donohue, our point I, We should avoid the politicized negotiations on the indicators, as the indicators should

be developed by the technical experts.

Para 59 is almost identical to para 43, and we do not see the value added here. We suggest the deletion of this para.

Para 63, we highly regard the roles of the UN regional commissions, but the roles of regional commissions are different from one to another in the follow up and review process, we do not support the change from the zero draft. We would like to propose to reinstate the phrase "using existing regional mechanisms including UN regional commissions where possible.", which was used in the zero draft.

Para 65, we do not fully understand the difference of an annual SDG Progress Report and the Global Sustainable Development Report, which is mandated by Rio plus 20, and we would like to have clarification of the difference of the two reports.

Since this is my last statement of this week, I would like to reiterate our main points.

This new agenda should be transformative, universal and people-centered, and we fully support the notion of leaving no one behind.

The declaration should be concise, clear and readable.

We have significant concerns with the inclusion of CBDR as shared principles.

We do not need the repetition of the MOI targets in chapters 2 and 3.

We do not need the chapeau of the OWG report.

We support the minimum and technical revisions of the targets.

We should not reopen or renegotiate the outcome of Addis Ababa conference.