

Intervention by Mr. Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Deputy Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the UN at the 11th Session of the OWG on SDGs under Focus Area 15: Means of implementation and Production and Focus area 16: Peaceful Societies and Capable Institutions and Rule of Law.

Mr. Co-Chair,

My delegation associates its intervention made by Bolivia on behalf of G 77 & China and Benin on behalf of LDCs. Before we comment on the specific targets on our national capacity, let me make a general comment on Focus area 15. Many delegations have suggested goal-specific MOIs as well as a stand-alone goal on this. We subscribe to this position. The way we see it, specific commitments under a stand-alone goal would necessitate commensurating MOIs. Such should be factored in under each of the Focus Areas, as they would appear relevant. We don't see this as duplication, rather complementary.

Mr. Co-Chair,

We are happy that LDCs have been specifically mentioned under different action areas. As we all know, this is the most vulnerable countries lacking necessary resources and capacity. The group consists of the most impoverished nations of Africa, Asia, many of them are LLDCs and SIDs. We are indeed pleased to see continued support and solidarity expressed for this group.

Under MOIs cluster 'Trade', we support action point (a) to (c). We would suggest addition of 'and Istanbul Programme of Action' at the end.

As for the sub-head: Technology transfer, technological capabilities, we consider this cluster is crucial and would prove to be decisive for the success of the transformation agenda that we all are talking about. We generally agree with the ones proposed.

Action point (f) should have a reference of UN Global Technology Support Mechanism. (g) should have, 'particularly LDCs, after 'developing countries'.

On the cluster on Financing, and debt sustainability, we underscore the need to align it with the Rio outcome paragraph 258 and 259. Nonetheless, we generally support the target areas as proposed. These may require minor adjustments.

Action point (i) should read as: 'full realization of implementation by the developed countries of their ODA commitments, on an agreed timetable and agreed principles'.

Cost of remittances is included under target (j). We propose a separate target on this to be read as, "Reduce overall costs in migration process and minimize transaction cost of remittances across the chain." We have heard a number of interventions supporting this position.

The proposed target (k) should be reformulated as: “Explore and facilitate flow of new, additional, long-term, predictable financing and strengthen and scale up the existing ones; and earmark at least x% of such financing for the LDCs.”

On (l), we suggest to add: “...including dedicated investment regimes for the LDCs” at the end. On target (n), we consider it would be better placed under Global Partnership.

We fully recognise the importance of target (o) – applicable to all countries. But, the way it is captured under financing, may suggest it as conditionality on the developing countries. This should be clarified in the subsequent version of the document.

Under cluster capacity building, we support all action areas. Action point (t) should also add trade related capacity building. In this regard, we subscribe to the comments made by CARICOM.

On ‘Strengthened global partnership for sustainable development’, we would stress on the need for robust, specific articulation of elements of ‘global partnership’. We find this part rather sketchy, with just few elements captured under two targets. It requires further strengthening.

On global partnership, we would re-emphasise the principles based on which we should frame a transformative framework for the next 15 years. For instance, common but differentiated responsibility – which categories of countries would assume which of the targets. We have similar framework already in the OECD DAC, courtesy their peer review or in the Istanbul Plan of Action.

As for the proposed targets, while in essence target (u) is OK, it lacks specificity and measurability. In our view, it needs further precision. Target (v) talks about implementation review. It is about modality. Clearly, this is more of a Post 2015 framework issue than what we expect as a clear, transformative, measurable target under global partnership.

In addition, we would propose to incorporate suitably the following under global partnership:

- Ensuring conducive macro-economic policies at the global level, including through the global platforms and institutions.
- Supporting development of conducive regulatory and fiscal systems and institutions in the developing countries, particularly in the countries with difficult circumstances.
- Broadening participation of the developing countries in international economic decision-making and norm setting; and reform of the governance of those institutions in order to make those credible, participatory, inclusive, accountable and legitimate.
- Enhance global cooperation to facilitate orderly, safe, responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and managed migration policies.

Mr. Co-Chair,

In general, we recognize a number of elements related to migration and mobility under Focus area 15. We would suggest clustering of all migration related elements under a sub-heading

‘migration and mobility’. In this regard, we support the comments made by the distinguished Ambassador of Mexico.

On Focus area 16: Peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law and capable institutions, you are aware of the position of my delegation. Without getting into the same arguments once again, I would like to briefly state that we are striving to come up with a concise, actionable, achievable, measurable set of goals and targets under the SDG framework. In order to adopt a concise document, we have to focus mainly and principally on the development oriented goals and targets that are truly transformational. We can leave the enablers for the narrative part of the Post 2015 agenda. Moreover, some elements of the proposed goal can be captured under other goal areas as relevant.

If we go point by point, we will see that action point (a) is not quite relevant as these are way beyond development paradigm, though importance of the issues can not be denied. Moreover, some of these issues are already incorporated under focus area 5.

Action point (b) and (c) can well be captured under FA 1 (Poverty), 8 (Economic Growth), 9 (Inequality); and again, it is something of ‘sufficient condition’ or enablers for development.

As for action point (d), we fully accept and highly regard need attainment of a culture of non-violence. But, it is a normative element and not measurable in national contexts. Action point (e) should be moved and consolidated under Global Partnership - FA 15.

On Rule of law, capable institutions: the elements of ‘capable, effective institutions’ can be captured under the section on ‘Capacity Building’.

On action point (a), we propose to add, ‘economic and financial’, before ‘institutions ...’. Action area (d) should be re-formulated as, ‘improve access to public and private finance, public and private procurement and on the implementation of corporate policies and national development plans’.

Action point (e) and (f) should be deleted. The reasons have been explained many times in the past and repeated by many today. These are absolutely non-developmental in nature and should not find a place in this development framework.

I thank you.