We strongly call for a new Global Partnership that is truly inclusive and effective and based on stronger solidarity, shared responsibility and mutual accountability and respective capacities. We need to devise new strategies for working together in new ways to mobilize the actions we need from all stakeholders. This is why we support replacing the word “strengthened” with the word “new”.

The range of sustainable development actors has diversified, including innovative partnerships, business, foundations, NGOs, local actors and authorities. The engagement of all these actors will be indispensable if we are to implement this agenda.

One of the characteristics of the new agenda is the aspect of differentiation, which is integral to the Global Partnership. For us, this means: all countries are responsible for achieving these goals and therefore, as we mentioned earlier this week, the targets must be measured at a global level. Sufficient flexibility must be built in to the framework to differentiate between individual countries depending on their capacities, challenges, national contexts and levels of development.

While some countries have raised CBDR in this context, we are of the opinion that CBDR as set out in Rio Principle 7 in 1992 cannot apply as an overarching principle to a holistic agenda and does not integrate the idea of dynamic differentiation as stated in the Rio 2012: depending on realities, capacities and levels of development of countries. Moreover, it is worth recalling that Rio principle 7 has a clear limitation to environmental degradation.

A paradigm shift is necessary to move beyond the mere north-south thinking to make the most of the potential of multi-stakeholder partnerships and go towards a truly shared agenda. This paradigm shift should also embolden us to ask what policy actions are required from countries to eradicate poverty worldwide and further sustainable development, including the countries of the “North”. Changing policies, choosing the right priorities and effective incentives, as well as promoting fruitful partnerships will be key to support changing lifestyles and to transform all of our economies.

Important factors and means to implement the agenda, that can truly have a transformative impact, include capacity building, good governance, rule of law, transparency, accountability, disclosure and reporting.

We would like to highlight that part of a global partnership is also the creation of structural framework conditions that are conducive for sustainable development. These include:

- promoting an open, rules-based and development friendly multilateral trade system, while implementing the WTO 2013 Bali meeting, reducing trade distortions and increasing LDC’s
share in global trade; we would like to stress that any targets on trade should be in line with international WTO-processes, including with regards to agriculture;

- ensuring a regulated, stable and efficient global financial system
- enhance policy coherence for sustainable development;
- encouraging responsible, stable, long-term private foreign investment
- encourage inclusive finance (access to finance services),
- curbing illicit financial flows and eliminating tax havens,
- improving access to science, technology, innovation especially through access to sustainable development data.

Given the importance and overarching nature of a new Global Partnership we suggest that it could be placed more prominently. Most of the relevant means of implementation are of an overarching character which cannot be captured if they are divided up for each goal.

Finally, Mr Co-chair, a few words on **financing**: In terms of discussion in the Open Working Group, let us stress again that member states at the Rio+20 conference saw it fit to share the workload amongst the Open Working Group and the ICESDF. A parallel discussion is also taking place on the modalities for a new FfD conference. Therefore, it seems to us that we need to **clearly distinguish between work streams in order to maximize coherence and avoid duplication**. In accordance with its mandate, the Open Working Group cannot aim to deliver a complete proposal for the entire Post-2015 framework.

Nevertheless let us give some indications about our current thinking: as previously stated, our constituency supports a **broad approach** to financing, on the basis of with the Monterrey and Doha Declarations on Financing for Development. Such a vision has to go beyond Monterrey and Doha and tackle all three dimensions of sustainable development. ODA, domestic resource mobilization, innovative financing and additional financial resources from multiple sources are important in this regard. These financing sources must be used efficiently to maximize impact. One has also to recall that development effectiveness is key to poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development and that in this regard the Busan process should fully be taken into account.

**ODA**, although accounting only for a small percentage of the total flows to developing countries, **will continue to play an important role**, be it for LDCs, SIDS, states in fragile or conflict situation, or to leverage other financial flows in order to eradicate poverty.