

**8th Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development
Agenda
July 27, 2015**

**Intervention by Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India on
'Preamble and Declaration' of the Final Draft for adoption**

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

You will excuse me for thinking that we are not on the eve of July 28th but January 28th 2015. Not because that is my birthday but because to any observer it might seem that we are trying not to conclude, but start our negotiations.

We have no statement to make and our substantive points have been well covered by the statement by G77. The rest of our positions are well known and need no repetition.

We have so far been very conservative in presenting our preferred issues into the text. But if at this late stage, delegations feel compelled to bring all issues back into the text, then we would retain the right to do so too.

We hope we do not go down this path.

We wanted to merely respond to some of the comments we have heard in a spirit of interaction.

Agreed Language

We found it a bit contradictory that delegations asked for using agreed language and then proceeded to ask for deletion of agreed language from the text.

We would like to reiterate that as the Introduction to the set of SDGs, which are the heart of this agenda, the Declaration should first and foremost be faithful and consistent with the language of the SDGs. Anything contrary – if

we have two sets of language for the same issue in the same document - will send a most negative signal of policy incoherence when it comes to implementation.

To give but one example, the notion of 'developed countries taking the lead' in promoting sustainable consumption and production was challenged, even as it is consistent with target 12.1.

We also heard similar concern with language on tech transfer. I should point out that the language of 'on preferential and concessional terms, as mutually agreed' is also in the SDGs and Rio+20. We would strongly insist that it be retained.

Addis Ababa

We have no problem with using language from the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, but only when it is not inconsistent with the SDGs. We do not accept the proposition that language for the MOI/GP in the text should only be taken from the Addis Agenda. To repeat for the umpteenth time, the Addis outcome is complementary to and not a substitute for MOI/GP language in the SDGs.

If at all, there is to be a language indicating that Addis outcome constitutes an integral part of the global partnership, it must say that it is supportive and complementary to the SDGs MOI. We believe in fact that this is already referred to in the current draft.

Poverty Eradication

We do not support the changes proposed by the EU on paras 3, 8 and 10. In fact, we would strongly suggest that we maintain existing language on poverty eradication. I would not go into the details of our views on this issue, but maintenance of this language on eradication of poverty is fundamental for us.

We also do not support the suggestion by EU to change the title. In fact, in order to avoid a debate on concepts, we feel that the title could be shortened to “The 2030 Agenda for Transforming our World”.

CBDR

On CBDR, we remain perplexed that delegations are opposed to using agreed language, even that agreed to at the highest levels in the context of this agenda. On our part, we made a special effort to make a logical case for our position. We explained how this principle is not about inaction but common action, how it incentivizes the greatest participation of all countries and how it cannot apply to the silo of environment, simply because environment has ceased to be a silo. Moreover, there is no differentiation in responsibilities when it comes to the protection of human rights and gender equality. My delegation is fully and strongly committed to these high priorities and our commitment to sustainable development is second to none.

The only textual suggestion we’ll make is to request that the words ‘as set out in principle 7 thereof’ in para 13 be deleted.

Preamble

It should be clear to everyone, if it was not so far, that the Preamble is highly problematic. It is also clear that it is no more a communication tool but has now become a substantive negotiation playground in its own right. It is also over 1 and half pages, and I note that your font size is way smaller than what our leaders will be comfortable with. This is a matter of great concern to us as the ever expanding Preamble is becoming almost an alternate Declaration and will lead not to communication, but to miscommunication.

Climate Change

Like others, we feel that the para on climate change has evolved for the better. We would encourage that this closely mirror the para from Rio+20 which is also contained in the Chapeau to the SDGs. This language is not just agreed language, it is ambitious and comprehensive.

Any reference to climate change, must as always be accompanied by a reaffirmation of the Convention principles and provisions. I would like to point out that the Lima formulation did not, I repeat, did not reinterpret or undermine the Convention or the Convention principles. The formulation in Lima talks specifically to the Paris Conference and not generally to the implementation of the Convention. A reference to the principles and provisions of the Convention is therefore not incompatible with the Lima agreement. We would suggest therefore that the square brackets around the last sentence of para 31 be removed.

Lastly, listening to the comments we have heard today, we are even more convinced that the Chapeau to the SDGs must be integrated in full as part of the outcome document.

Thank you.
