



STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA BY MR MAHLATSE MMINELE, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE JOINT SESSION BETWEEN FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT AND POST-2015 PROCESSES (New York, 24 April 2015)

Mr Co-Facilitator,

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

At the outset, the Group of 77 and China wishes to thank your esteemed selves for your efforts, including convening this meeting. We have been listening to views from others and trust that these inputs would inform our work as we prepare for both the Financing for Development, and the post-2015 development agenda meetings. It cannot be overemphasized that the two processes should be retained as separate tracks, based on their respective origins and mandates. It is important that this be understood, as we work collectively to streamline and further strengthen the good work that is being undertaken in both tracks, going forward.

It is the Group's view that the FfD process should complement and support the elaboration of the post-2015 development agenda. As such, it should provide a set of tools that will support the implementation of a universal post-2015 development agenda. When invoking this notion of universality, Member States must also recognize the critical application in this context of the Principle of Common by Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) so as to not put unwarranted and unnecessary pressure on developing countries. In recognizing the different circumstances and levels of development between countries, the notion of universality cannot stand on its own, but must consistently be understood in conjunction with the Principle of CBDR.

It is critically important that we achieve a successful outcome in Addis Ababa. Failing to achieve a high level of ambition in this regard would seriously undermine the viability of an equally ambitious post-2015 development agenda. Certainly, the process of negotiating the post-2015 development agenda is already giving guidance to what we would be agreeing to finance over the next 15 years. However, the scope of the FfD process goes beyond merely financing the SDGs and the other essential components that will make up the post-2015 development agenda, once it is finalized. In a similar manner, the post-2015 agenda will draw from the means of implementation contemplated in the FfD outcome in light of its adequacy and relevance towards the implementation of its goals and targets. However, this will not exhaust its means of implementation, which should go beyond those elaborated by the FfD outcome document. Therefore, even if they have different origins and are separate tracks, both processes should be considered interdependent and we should build on the synergies and promote essential coherence and complementarity amongst them.

Mr Co-Facilitator,

The Group of 77 and China also calls upon developed countries to agree and commit to a new phase of international cooperation through a strengthened and scaled-up global partnership for sustainable development, as stated in SDG-17, which should be the foundation for both completing the unfinished business of the MDGs and implementing the post-2015 development agenda, taking into account the lessons learnt from the gaps in the implementation of MDG-8. The international community should provide enhanced and adequate means of implementation to developing

countries, including through quantitative, time-bound financing targets in addition to those already established for ODA, debt relief and debt restructuring, trade, capacity building, technology transfer and greater participation of developing countries in global economic governance.

Mr Co-Facilitator,

With regards to the issue at hand, on "follow-up and review on FfD and Means of Implementation" The Group of 77 and China supports creating adequate follow-up mechanisms for monitoring progress and holding stakeholders accountable in the implementation of commitments to be agreed upon by Member States. Such mechanisms should also hold other relevant stakeholders accountable. The complexity of the task and the long-term commitments involved recommend formal follow-up mechanisms and institutions.

The Group holds the view that the post-2015 development agenda follow-up and review mechanism should strengthen the review of the Means of Implementation at the international level, especially the fulfillment of the commitment of ODA, technology transfer and capacity building for developing countries. At the national level, follow-up and review should be determined by national governments in accordance with national circumstances and the applicable level of development, including the participation of all relevant stakeholders in accordance with national legislative and regulatory frameworks.

It is also the Group's view that the Addis Ababa Conference should prioritize follow-up and monitoring of its own outcome. The Group suggests that the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) and the mechanisms under the General Assembly and ECOSOC should be examined among the options for monitoring the implementation of FfD commitments, in the context of the complementarity linkages of the FfD follow-up mechanisms with other related processes, including the post 2015 development agenda. As stated by General Assembly resolution 67/290, "the HLPF shall follow up and review progress in the implementation of all the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and environmental fields, as well as their respective means of implementation".

In addition, the Group believes that the proposal in the elements paper to set up a dedicated inter-governmental or expert body, inclusive of institutional stakeholders, to monitor FfD commitments at the global level needs further consideration.

Further consideration is also necessary for the proposal to strengthen the regional components of the follow-up process, through Regional Commissions, development banks and other relevant stakeholders.

I thank you.