

2nd Drafting Session for 3rd Financing for Development Conference

April 13, 2015

**Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of
India to the UN**

Thank you **Mr. Co-Facilitator** for giving me the Floor,

The morning session today was a useful crash course in ‘speed-reading’, or perhaps more accurately ‘speed-speaking’!

I should note however that while speed-speaking may be useful, it is neither good for the health of the interpreters, nor a substitute for a drafting exercise which we were supposed to undertake in this session.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

We warmly commend the efforts of both Your Excellencies, your teams and the Secretariat for preparing the Zero Draft.

In our view the Zero Draft is a reasonable starting point for debate.

However, we agree with the Distinguished Ambassador of Guyana that at this stage, it is more a ‘point of departure’ and substantial effort will still be needed to make it into a ‘point of convergence’.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

We welcome your effort in raising the ambition on means of implementation by building upon the OWG proposal as the floor and the attempt at achieving a balance between different interests.

We welcome the push in the Zero Draft on issues such as international public finance, international cooperation on taxation, the useful but still modest proposal on follow-up, etc.

On the debit side however, and I must confess that here the list is rather long, there are several issues which will require significant improvement.

We are not fully convinced with the logic of altering the structure of Monterrey and Doha.

The separation of private flows from domestic resource mobilization seems artificial and not fully convincing nor is the mutation of DRM into domestic resource *utilization* (DRU). The latter is the preserve of the substantive development agenda, not FfD.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

The zero draft overemphasizes the notion of a changing world, where in fact the only thing that has changed is that the world has not changed enough and that existing challenges have become even more serious.

As we have said before, FfD is about *international cooperation* for generating resources and we look forward to applying this yardstick rigorously to several proposals, which we find are over-prescriptive and restrict national policy space.

The draft also combines an inadequate level of ambition on North-South aid with excessively prescriptive expectations from South-South Cooperation, a balance that would need rectification.

We welcome the emphasis on international public finance and the need for a time bound fulfillment of ODA commitments but this could be further strengthened with the discourse on ODA brought squarely under an open, multilateral forum. At the same time, the formulation of South-South Cooperation is over-prescriptive and the proposed timelines and targets in this regard are not acceptable.

The Zero Draft fails to mention internationally agreed principles such as CBDR and seems to invent new ones, which are not only unacceptable but also barely understandable.

Mr. Co-facilitator,

We have heard comments regarding the relationship of this process with the post-2015 development agenda. In our view, it will be premature to

pass a judgment at this stage on whether FfD can provide the entire pillar of means of implementation (MOI) of the development agenda. We suggest that we deal with this draft document in its own right and integrity and consider its relationship with the development agenda later.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

The notion of universality, which has been mentioned by several delegations, in our view implies that unlike the past, this time around the developed countries will also have to be held accountable for their actions.

In the context of FfD, this would mean that developed countries would not only have to provide enhanced financial and technological support to developing countries, but also demonstrably allocate more resources for urgently transitioning their societies to more sustainable patterns of consumption.

We heard comments by some delegations today about emphasizing poverty eradication *and* sustainable development, as if these were distinct silos.

In our view, it is incorrect to characterize the Addis Ababa Conference as a *transition* from financing for development to financing for sustainable development. This is less of a transition and more of a realization of the need to pursue development holistically across its three dimensions and not merely the integration of environmental action.

We strongly support the contention of the G77 that the overarching objective of the FfD Conference must be to eradicate poverty and hunger, which is the heart of achieving sustainable development.

Mr. Co-Facilitator,

The chapter on technology is perhaps the most underwhelming portion of the Zero Draft not least because the discussions on this issue as mandated by General Assembly are yet to be held.

The proposed intention of this distinct chapter in the Addis Ababa outcome cannot be to *lower* the ambition on this issue and we expect a substantial enhancement of ambition of the outcome on this issue.

We welcome the inclusion of a gender perspective in the document. This would need to be considerably strengthened however, in order to ensure the generation and mobilization of dedicated and adequate resources for the full implementation of the Beijing Platform of Action and the ambitious gender goal under SDGs.

Finally, on follow-up, the zero draft contains a promising but ultimately inadequate proposal and this would need to be strengthened substantively.

We look forward to providing detailed and specific comments on each of the sections in the coming days.

I thank you.
