



## SUMMARY OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA: 21-24 APRIL 2015

The fourth session of intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda took place from 21-24 April 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York. The session convened as a joint meeting with the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD3) process, and was co-chaired by the Co-Facilitators for the post-2015 process, David Donoghue, Permanent Representative of Ireland, and Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya, and the Co-Facilitators for the FfD3 preparatory process, Geir Pedersen, Permanent Representative of Norway, and George Talbot, Permanent Representative of Guyana.

Delegates focused on: the deliberations during the second preparatory meeting of the FfD3 process, which had convened the previous week; a discussion with representatives from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund; proposals for the creation of a technology facilitation mechanism and other science, technology and innovation issues; the relationship between the FfD and post-2015 processes; follow-up and review on FfD and means of implementation (MOI); and coherence between the outcome documents from the two processes, outstanding issues and the way forward. An interactive dialogue with stakeholders took place on Thursday morning.

Throughout the four-day meeting, delegates discussed how they thought the two processes should relate to each other, with some saying the FfD3 process should comprise the MOI section of the post-2015 development agenda and others viewing them as distinct outcomes. Delegates noted that the ambitious proposed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set out “what” the international community would strive to achieve during the post-2015 period, while the FfD3 process would address “how” the SDGs would be implemented. At the end of the week, delegates and the four Co-Facilitators commented that it had been a productive exchange of views, as they looked towards meetings on follow-up and review and the release of negotiating texts for both processes in May.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

The intergovernmental negotiation process on the post-2015 development agenda was first mandated by the UN General Assembly (UNGA) Special Event on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in September 2013, which also decided that a Global Summit should be held in September 2015 to adopt a new UN development agenda.

**MILLENNIUM SUMMIT:** The UN Millennium Summit took place from 6-8 September 2000, at UN Headquarters in New York. Attended by 149 Heads of State and Government and high-ranking officials from over 40 other countries, the main outcome document was the Millennium Declaration. This Declaration contained a statement of values, principles and objectives for the international agenda for the 21st century. Subsequently, the MDGs were elaborated based on

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the Post-2015 Development Agenda . . .	1
Report of the Meeting . . . . .	3
Issues from the FfD Negotiation Session . . . . .	3
Discussion with the International Financial Institutions . . . . .	5
Technology Facilitation Mechanism and other Science, Technology and Innovation Issues . . . . .	6
Interactive Dialogue with Stakeholders from the Post-2015 and FfD3 Processes . . . . .	9
Relationship between the FfD and Post-2015 Processes . . . . .	10
Follow-up and Review and Means of Implementation . . . . .	13
Coherence between Respective Outcome Documents, Outstanding Issues and the Way Forward . . . . .	14
Closing Session . . . . .	14
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting . . . . .	15
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	16
Glossary . . . . .	17

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Ana Maria Lebeda, Kate Offerdahl and Lynn Wagner, Ph.D. The Editor is Pamela Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV and DG-CLIMATE), the Government of Switzerland (the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) and the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC)), and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2015 is provided by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Wallonia, Québec, and the International Organization of La Francophonie/Institute for Sustainable Development of La Francophonie (IOF/IFDD). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022 USA.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

consultations among representatives of international institutions. The UN Secretary-General presented the MDGs to the UN General Assembly in 2001, at which point UN Member States recommended that they should be used as a guide to implement the Millennium Declaration, with a deadline for accomplishing the goals set for 2015.

**UNCSD:** The international community gathered at the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20), in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 2012, agreed to launch a process to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Rio+20 outcome called for establishing an Open Working Group (OWG) that would submit a report to the 68th session of the General Assembly, containing a proposal for SDGs. The Rio+20 outcome document outlines, *inter alia*:

- the importance of remaining firmly committed to the full and timely achievement of the MDGs and of respecting all Rio principles, taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and priorities;
- the SDGs should be action-oriented, concise and easy to communicate, limited in number, aspirational, global in nature and universally applicable to all countries, and focused on priority areas for the achievement of sustainable development;
- the need to ensure coordination and coherence with the processes considering the post-2015 development agenda, and to receive initial input to the OWG's work from the UN Secretary-General in consultation with national governments;
- the need to assess progress towards the achievement of the goals, accompanied by targets and indicators, while taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and levels of development; and
- the importance of global, integrated and scientifically-based information on sustainable development, and of supporting regional economic commissions in collecting and compiling national inputs to inform this global effort.

The UNGA endorsed the outcome document, titled *The Future We Want*, in resolution 66/288 on 27 July 2012.

**UNGA SPECIAL EVENT TO FOLLOW-UP EFFORTS TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE MDGs:** This Special Event took place on 25 September 2013, at UN Headquarters in New York. The Outcome Document called for, *inter alia*: a single framework and set of goals that are universal in nature and applicable to all countries, and that promote peace and security, democratic governance, the rule of law, gender equality and human rights for all; intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 agenda; the Secretary-General to release, by the end of 2014, a synthesis report on all post-2015 development agenda inputs; and adopting the new agenda at a summit in September 2015.

**OWG:** The OWG on SDGs held its first eight meetings, also referred to as the “input” or “stocktaking” phase, between March 2013 and February 2014 at UN Headquarters in New York. In February 2014, the Co-Chairs, Macharia Kamau (Kenya) and Csaba Kőrösi (Hungary), released a “stocktaking” document, reviewing the discussions to date, and a “focus areas” document, outlining 19 focus areas as the basis for further discussion. Prior to each of the subsequent five sessions, the Co-Chairs released revised documents for OWG delegates' consideration.

A document considered the “zero draft” of the goals and targets was issued on 2 June 2014, containing 17 proposed goals and 212 targets. After two sessions held primarily in informal consultations, at the conclusion of the 13th session of the OWG, on 19 July 2014, the Group adopted by acclamation a report containing 17 proposed SDGs and 169 targets, and agreed to submit the proposal to the UNGA for consideration and action at its 68th session.

**SYNTHESIS REPORT OF THE UN SECRETARY-GENERAL:** The UNGA called on the UN Secretary-General, in resolution 68/6 of September 2013, to synthesize inputs on the post-2015 development agenda in a report before the end of 2014, as an input to the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon released an advance version of “The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet” on 6 December 2014 and formally presented it to UN Member States on 8 January 2015. The report proposes an integrated set of six essential elements: dignity, people, prosperity, planet, justice, and partnership.

**UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY:** A number of UNGA resolutions have established and set parameters for the post-2015 development agenda negotiations and related processes. On 30 June 2014, the UNGA adopted resolution 68/279, titled “Modalities for the third International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD3),” by which it decided to hold FfD3 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 13-16 July 2015, and, *inter alia*, emphasizes the need for effective coordination with the preparations for the summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda.

On 10 September 2014, the UNGA adopted resolution 68/309, by which it: acknowledged the conclusion of the work of the OWG; welcomed its report; and decided that the proposal of the OWG contained in its report shall be the main basis for integrating the SDGs into the post-2015 development agenda, while recognizing that other inputs will also be considered in the intergovernmental negotiating process in 2015.

On 29 December 2014, the UNGA adopted resolution 69/244 on the organization of the UN Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda, which will take place on 25-27 September 2015 in New York with the 70th session of the UN General Debate beginning on 28 September. The Summit will be convened as a High-level Plenary meeting of the UNGA and include plenary meetings concurrent with interactive dialogues. The rules of procedure and established practices of the UNGA will apply, unless otherwise decided.

On 16 January 2015, the UNGA adopted draft decision A/69/L.46 on modalities for the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda. The decision states, *inter alia*:

- the proposal of the OWG on SDGs will be the main basis for integrating the SDGs into the post-2015 development agenda, while other inputs will also be taken into consideration;
- “every effort shall be made” to ensure effective coordination between the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda and the preparatory process for FfD3, and other relevant UN intergovernmental processes;

- the outcome document for adoption at the Summit “may include” as main components: a declaration; the SDGs and targets; means of implementation and global partnership for sustainable development; and follow-up and review; and
- the initial draft of the outcome document shall be prepared by the Co-Facilitators “on the basis of views provided by Member States,” as well as “taking into account substantive discussions in the process of intergovernmental negotiations,” and issued by May 2015.

#### FIRST SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA:

This session convened from 19-21 January 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York to conduct a “stocktaking” of governments’ views on the agenda. This was the first of eight scheduled sessions to prepare the outcome of the UN Summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda in September 2015. On the basis of this session, the Co-Facilitators prepared an Elements Paper for discussion at the next session.

#### SECOND SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA:

This session convened from 17-20 February 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York. The session focused on the declaration component of the outcome that will be adopted at the Summit of Heads of State and Government on the post-2015 development agenda in September 2015. The session also included an interactive dialogue with Major Groups and other stakeholders and a briefing with the Director of the UN Statistics Division.

#### THIRD SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA:

This session convened from 23-27 March 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York. The meeting focused on: a proposed timeline and roadmap for the UN Statistical Commission to create an indicator framework for the SDGs; country experiences in implementing sustainable development; and arrangements for a joint meeting with the FfD3 preparatory process during their April session. The session also included an interactive dialogue with Major Groups and other stakeholders.

### REPORT OF THE MEETING

On Tuesday, 21 April 2015, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator David Donoghue opened the meeting and explained that the joint meeting of the negotiators for the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and the post-2015 development agenda would ensure the effectiveness and coherence of both processes. He underlined two “headline adjectives” to describe their work: universality and ambition. Linking these two concepts together, he said, this meeting would discuss how Member States are willing to back-up their political will with real changes in policies, institutions and resources.

Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Macharia Kamau offered delegates a “reality check” by reading them newspaper headlines regarding tragedies that resulted from inequalities and violence between and within countries. He reminded delegates that they are dealing with “very real challenges and issues,” as they attempt to end poverty, reduce inequality and protect the planet. He referred to a recent statement by Turkey, as this year’s host of the G20

meeting, which noted that the G20 countries are implementing more than 1,000 structural policy reforms. In this light, he called on countries to “never again question” the feasibility of having 17 SDGs and 169 targets.

FfD3 Co-Facilitator George Talbot explained that the FfD3 zero draft aspires to build a framework for financing sustainable development and to provide a platform for specific deliverables, and he invited delegates to think about the actions that need to be taken “to make a paradigm shift.” He added that investments in infrastructure, agriculture, small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), social protection, energy, health, and education are “critical, potential transformative investments” for the SDGs.

FfD3 Co-Facilitator Geir Pedersen stressed the urgency of the task and reminded Member States they have only 12 weeks to finish their work. He noted that the International Financial Institutions have expressed their will to contribute to the implementation of the agenda and called for delegates’ support in devising the necessary policy framework.

#### ISSUES FROM THE FFD NEGOTIATION SESSION

South Africa, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), noted that FfD3 should complement and provide a set of tools that support the post-2015 development agenda, but added that FfD3’s scope goes beyond MOI for the post-2015 development agenda. He added that: climate finance should be separate from official development assistance (ODA); priority should be given to SDG 17 and the other MOI; and the High-level Political Forum for Sustainable Development (HLPF) should play the “central role” in the follow up and review of the post-2015 development agenda, including commitments made in FfD3.

The European Union (EU) said the FfD3 outcome should: be the MOI pillar of the post-2015 development agenda; mark the shift from business as usual to financing for sustainable development; and achieve a balance between the 17 SDGs. He called for a single monitoring and review framework and proposed that the FfD3 outcome could be integrated into the post-2015 development package by either including the full FfD3 text or “endorsing” the FfD3 outcome as the MOI section, rather than reproducing the text in the post-2015 development agenda outcome.

Belize, for the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), said the UN Statistical Commission should consider indicators for all targets, including on MOI, and FfD3 should address the mobilization of resources across the three components of sustainable development, and provide policy guidance so that financial flows are aligned with the SDGs. She also called attention to the special case of small island developing states (SIDS). She said the FfD3 outcome should address the mobilization of climate finance, which needs MOI beyond development objectives, and there should be distinct, complementary follow-up processes for FfD3 and the post-2015 agenda.

Ecuador, on behalf of Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), said, all targets need to be measurable and partnerships should involve all Member States, including transparency and intergovernmental oversight,

among other factors. He recalled that the creation of a possible Technology Facilitation Mechanism (TFM) is one of the unfulfilled outcomes of Rio+20.

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said the needs of SIDS should be given attention in both the FfD3 and post-2015 processes. He said these include: the need for social services to maintain high levels of development; their high debt levels; and the need for assistance to build institutional capacity. He called for distinguishing between climate finance under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process and ODA.

Benin, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), called for a “significant” amount of additional resources to realize the agenda, and said its credibility will be judged on “the concrete improvements” that will occur in LDCs. He looked forward to “making headway” in three categories: a global consensus on allocating .25% of gross national income (GNI), 50% of ODA, 50% of aid for trade, and duty-free market access for LDCs; dedicated investment in an infrastructure facility and technology bank for LDCs; and institution-building and systemic reforms.

Tonga, for Pacific SIDS, said FfD3 and MOI for post-2015 must be considered as connected, but distinct. He stressed that FfD3 is suited to support the MOI of a number of goals and targets, but has little to say on others, such as environmental goals. He called for countries in special situations to be included in the agenda and a standalone chapter on MOI in the post-2015 agenda.

Zambia, for the Land-Locked Developing Countries (LLDCs), called for both processes to recognize the special needs of countries in special situations. She said FfD3 is one of many components of the post-2015 agenda, and should fit between the components of the Declaration and MOI. Assistance for the needs of LLDCs should be increased, timely, predictable, and balanced, she said, with increased foreign direct investment and technology transfer.

Brazil said SDG 17 and the MOI-specific targets for each goal must not be left behind, and the MOI platform must be built around two elements: a clear understanding of the MOI needed for each goal; and concrete policies on how they will be provided. He said the FfD3 outcome should offer concrete provisions on and complement MOI, and the follow-up and review process should encompass MOI commitments under FfD3, and be a joint process under the HLPF.

Nigeria said FfD3 should address both enabling policy frameworks and the effective mobilization of resources, and promote ecologically-friendly industrialization in the South. She underlined that the global partnership should be transparent and inclusive, built on good governance, rule of law, and the active engagement of the private sector, civil society and philanthropy.

Mexico stressed the need for investment in infrastructure and science, technology, and innovation (STI), and for developed countries to make sure that ODA is available to catalyze domestic resource mobilization (DRM).

The Republic of Korea said the FfD3 outcome should constitute the MOI pillar of the post-2015 development agenda. He stressed the need for: setting an enabling environment for all development actors; sound institutional frameworks; better

allocating ODA to play a catalytic role in mobilizing other resources; engaging with the private sector; and respecting the principle of country ownership.

Lebanon said an enabling environment implies good governance, national accountability based on the rule of law, and gender equality. Noting that “tackling humanitarian crises through the narrow channel of humanitarian assistance has proven ineffective,” he stressed the need to also consider the issue of humanitarian crises.

The US noted that all Member States have the same overarching purpose: to end extreme poverty and promote sustainable development. He called attention to issues including the importance of DRM and combating illicit financial flows, and emphasized the need to mobilize all sources of finance, while promoting inclusion and gender equality.

Canada said the outcome of the FfD3 process should become an integral part of the post-2015 development agenda as the MOI pillar. He suggested that, if there are specific concerns that are not included in the FfD3 outcome, they should be identified this week so the Co-Facilitators can include them in their draft.

Costa Rica recognized that the two processes are interdependent but “share a close relationship,” and highlighted that the success of one is linked to that of the other. She said the FfD3 ambition must be at same level as the post-2015 development agenda, and called attention to the needs of middle-income countries (MICs).

Switzerland said coherence between the two processes is critical, and questions of MOI should be addressed in the FfD3 process. He said the principle of universality demands a partnership in which all countries contribute according to their circumstances, and emphasized the need for successful multi-stakeholder partnerships and a framework to align private sector decisions with sustainable development. He also emphasized the need for integrated and coherent monitoring and follow-up.

Australia said the FfD3 outcome must be practical and policy-relevant, balancing a focus on financing inputs with the delivery of sustainable development outcomes. She stressed that the FfD3 outcome should form the MOI element of the post-2015 framework, and should reflect the important role played by a range of actors to harness their innovation and expertise.

Nepal said country ownership is important, along with a careful balance of ODA, trade and capacity building. He called for climate change funding to be separate from ODA.

Nicaragua said the two processes should be complementary, as neither can replace the other, and the negotiations on post-2015 and FfD3 are opportunities to strengthen international cooperation for development and create change in the financial system.

New Zealand suggested addressing development gaps through partnerships, and said they should be country-led and have clear targets, planned outcomes, specific timelines, and concrete outputs.

Japan said FfD3 should provide a policy framework for resource mobilization and enabling environments, highlighted country ownership as a prerequisite, and cautioned against prioritizing any targets or goals.

Niger, for the African Group, said there is no substantial difference between the scopes of FfD3 and the SDGs, but FfD3 should not constitute the MOI pillar for the post-2015 development agenda because it is weak on concrete targets and timelines, and imprecise in identifying roles and responsibilities. He supported separate follow-up mechanisms for commitments under FfD3 and on post-2015 targets.

Peru said the level of ambition should remain high in FfD3, to match the high standard of the universal agenda in the SDGs. He called for an analysis of the 70 SDG targets that speak to MOI, and possibly packaging them in categories that speak to their implementation.

Bahrain, for the Arab Group, said synergies between post-2015 and FfD3 should not be confused with a “merger,” as these are separate processes. She stressed that FfD3 should not prejudice the agreements on MOI in the post-2015 or climate processes, and should avoid the double- and triple-counting of aid. Any private sector finance mobilized must be additional, she explained, without backsliding on current commitments.

Luxembourg, for the Group of Friends of Children, said investing in children is the smartest investment that can be made for social cohesion and inclusive economic growth. She called for increasing the resources to provide basic services most important to children, and for improving the capacity and disaggregation of data to monitor the most marginalized.

Paraguay called for emphasis on the special needs and challenges of LLDCs in the post-2015 development agenda. He said the public sector, civil society, private sector, and academic community must be involved in a strengthened partnership for development.

Pakistan stressed the need to promote self-reliance and the use of indigenous resources at the national levels. He called for the fulfillment of ODA commitments and its use as a catalyst to mobilize other resources, adding that climate finance must not be double-counted as ODA.

Sudan called for: building the FfD3 outcome on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR); increasing ODA to at least 1% of GNI; supporting countries that have emerged from conflict; and lifting economic sanctions and avoiding unilateral actions.

Stressing the need to raise the level of ambition, the UK highlighted the need to identify partnerships to support domestic resources mobilization. He explained that universality implies that the responsibility of implementation is shared by all actors and moves away from the North-South divide, and called for a unified monitoring mechanism for the post-2015 development agenda and FfD3.

The Netherlands called for raising the level of ambition of the FfD3 outcome by “going further” than the level of ambition of the MOI in the SDGs, welcomed cross-regional initiatives, and stressed the importance of gender equality.

The Philippines said: the critical structural and systemic issues set out in the Monterrey Consensus need to be addressed; there is a need for more partnerships in the agriculture sector; there should be efforts to reduce costs for remittances; concrete, binding timelines should be annexed to the outcome document; and climate finance must be “over and above ODA.”

Argentina stressed respect for the balance between the economic, social, and environmental dimensions, and efforts to address debt and prevent tax evasion and banking problems, and produce change in the global economic infrastructure.

Ecuador expressed hope that FfD3 would include an evaluation of progress made and obstacles that remain, and stressed the need for, *inter alia*: creating training programmes; a new international financial architecture in which countries can participate in an equitable way; combating illicit flows, trafficking, and tax havens; completing the Doha round of trade negotiations; and adopting a new paradigm on cooperation for development.

Liechtenstein said FfD3 should be the MOI pillar of the post-2015 development agenda and called for enabling environments built on the rule of law and good governance. He also supported one coherent mechanism for the follow-up and review of implementation.

Timor-Leste stressed the importance of meeting ODA targets, complementing ODA with predictable sources of finance, and increasing concessionality for countries in special situations.

Egypt said the FfD3 mandate is larger and more complex than the post-2015 development agenda, and cannot be the MOI pillar of the agenda. Morocco said: there should be an effective mechanism for technology transfer; caution should be exercised with private sector intervention into social sectors; public-private partnerships can be effective in the area of infrastructure; and there is a need for MOI that are commensurate with the needs of sustainable development.

FfD3 Co-Facilitator Geir Pedersen summarized the day’s discussion, noting that the means of implementation for the SDGs are addressed within the FfD3 process, but delegates want to know how to take it further in order to develop transformative proposals. He noted that the FfD3 process is not only about implementing the SDGs, but also about creating an enabling domestic and international environment for development.

Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau highlighted that consensus is emerging on: the need for ambition, which he said is built into the SDGs; the need for universality, which he said involves challenging ourselves to engage and reach all constituencies; the need for financing, which will involve moving “from billions to trillions;” the recognition of the need and roles for both public and private sector financing; and the crucial and important role for ODA, including a need to better target it to certain groups. Kamau noted that divergence remains and more work must be done to define: the global partnership, including its new scope and how it will be different from the MDG sphere; whether the FfD3 process is the “pillar” of the MOI component, and how targets and timelines will be articulated; and how to deal with trade and technology.

## **DISCUSSION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Mohamed Mohieldin, the World Bank Group, discussed the jointly authored paper by the World Bank Group, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and all of the regional development banks, on moving resources “from billions to trillions.”

He said the needed trillions for implementing the SDGs must comprise “more than money,” and will be found in investments that are both public and private, national and global, and capital and capacity. Mohieldin pointed to the potential in private sector business, finance and investment, alongside the current substantial spending in public resources at the national level. He said the Bank will need Member States’ guidance on debt, trade and technology transfer, in addition to finance. Mohieldin also noted the Bank’s internal efforts, including improving the financial system and a review of developing countries’ shareholding, voices, and participation.

Sean Nolan, IMF, explained that contributing to the post-2015 development agenda and FfD3 are central priorities for the Fund, which has used its convening power to engage finance ministers in the processes. Highlighting the important policy issues at the national level, he emphasized: creating a resilient macroeconomic policy framework; boosting domestic revenue mobilization; tackling the infrastructure gap; facilitating financial sector development; and making effective use of foreign capital. He added that the SDGs are not just about growth, but also emphasize promoting inclusion and maintaining a sustainable environment. At the global level, he stressed creating an enabling environment through: ensuring global economic and financial resilience; tilting ODA towards poorer and/or fragile states; reinvigorating the international trade reform agenda; cooperating on international tax issues; and strengthening the framework for sovereign debt.

During the discussion, delegates inquired about: ways in which ODA could be better leveraged; ways in which the World Bank and IMF could support DRM; whether the IMF considers environment and development issues as separate; and ways in which the two institutions are addressing the particular circumstances of countries in special situations.

The representatives of the World Bank and IMF offered details on the projects that they support for countries in special situations and indicated they are ready to report on the progress made through their institutional structures. Nolan clarified that the IMF sees development and environment issues as interlinked. The World Bank stressed the need for all the sources of financing, incentive structures that are effective, and to include emerging players, such as private foundations.

Summarizing the discussion, Co-Facilitator Kamau stressed the need to “ring fence” on social protection floors, health, education, and inequalities, which, he noted, delegates have identified as priorities. He added that conversations might be organized with representatives of the World Trade Organization and the International Telecommunications Union on trade and information and communications technologies (ICTs).

### **TECHNOLOGY FACILITATION MECHANISM AND OTHER SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION ISSUES**

On Wednesday, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau introduced the two Co-Chairs of the UNGA structured dialogues on possible arrangements for a technology facilitation mechanism (TFM), Amb. Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota (Brazil) and Amb. Paul

Seger (Switzerland) to brief delegates on the recommendations of the dialogues that ended in July 2014.

Amb. Patriota explained that the structured dialogues were intended to pursue focused deliberations on the TFM in an incremental approach to find possible deliverables that have the broad consensus of Member States. He said that, although debates on the issue can slip into a North-South divide, agreement is possible and beneficial for both sides. The recommendations of the dialogues include: establish an online platform that maps existing technology facilitation mechanisms, initiatives and processes; promote the analysis of technology needs and gaps in addressing them; and ensure UN system coordination and coherence on the issue. Explaining that a UN Interagency Working Group had been established, he welcomed the engagement of the UN system with the dialogues’ recommendations. Patriota stressed that the mandate to disseminate “environmentally-sound technologies” was outdated, as the integrated SDG framework does not allow for the separation of the environmental dimension, therefore initiatives should address the SDGs in general. Finally, he said there is no clear answer for how the issue of a TFM will be dealt with in the FfD3 and post-2015 processes, and suggested producing a TFM deliverable in the post-2015 track while discussing broader, systemic issues of technology in the FfD3 track.

Amb. Seger noted that efforts have been undertaken in the field of technology transfer, but said these efforts are largely fragmented. He emphasized that countries differ greatly in their specific technology needs, and indicated that the main challenge is matching these needs with technologies that are available. Most technology is held by the private sector and not the government, he reminded delegates, further recommending engaging stakeholders in the discussion. He called for work to promote the end result of technology transfer in a means that is easier, faster and more economically efficient, while also looking closer at existing structures.

Member States raised issues related to: engaging the private sector; building enabling environments for the private sector in countries affected by conflict; whether technology transfer policies could be differentiated for technologies necessary for industrialization and basic services; whether there are technologies that could be considered public goods; the specific role the UN could play; and creating a solutions-oriented psychology.

Seger explained that: a friendly investment framework would be also a friendly technology transfer framework; identifying “global goods” technologies and removing related intellectual property rights (IPR) issues would stop innovation; and the UN could create awareness for technology transfer needs. Patriota noted that the public sector is “generating the brains” for innovation through education and the research infrastructure, thus technology doesn’t belong solely to the private sector, which owns only a part of it. He added that separating social and industrial technologies is not easy and recommended avoiding discussions of IPR regimes because of the diverging views on the issue. Patriota suggested that action could be taken to point out some technologies that are necessary for certain SDGs and are

no longer proprietary, or identify specific situations that would benefit from technological advances, so that multi-stakeholder consortiums could be created to find solutions to those issues.

Talbot suggested taking an incremental approach through the Secretary-General's proposal for an online platform for mapping existing options and opening up the possibility of finding solutions. Summarizing the discussion, Kamau stressed the need to: conduct a system-wide analysis to provide knowledge-sharing on solutions; start identifying the particular STI needs at the country level; identify partnerships between countries and stakeholders to tackle particular issues; and address the broader governance, institutional, and monitoring aspects. Underlining that even though technology might be in private hands, it does not necessarily need to be transferred from those hands, he invited Member States to think about global policies to guide engagement in the area.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:** South Africa, for the G-77/China, stressed that another round of discussions on the need for a TFM is not necessary, and that a global mechanism for the development, transfer and dissemination of technology for the implementation of the SDGs should now be brought into reality. He said discussions should focus on the establishment of a TFM under the UN, agreeing on the scope of its mandate, functions and institutional arrangements, and not on broader regulatory issues of technology and innovation, which belong under FfD3. The scope of the TFM should encompass the "breadth and depth" of the 17 SDGs, since technology is crucial for the implementation of each, he said.

Liberia, for the African Group, called for investments in and access to technologies for industrialization, infrastructure, agriculture, clean energy and other issues in line with each country's development needs. He proposed the establishment of an innovation fund to support early stage technology development, a technology bank, and an STI support mechanism dedicated to LDCs.

The EU spoke of the importance of STI as a driver of the sustainable development pathway, calling for the appropriate enabling environments, regulatory frameworks, investments at the local level, and capacity building and appropriate skills. He stressed the participation of the private sector through public-private partnerships. He said the EU is ready to engage in further consideration of the TFM issues in the broader preparations for FfD3.

Maldives, for AOSIS, called for modern, clean technology investments and know-how for SIDS, in particular in the areas of ocean-based technology, and connectivity and use of ICT through infrastructure, training and national legislation. She added that even the most modern, efficient and clean technology will not suffice without capacity and institution-building.

Belize, for CARICOM, said a TFM should rationalize approaches to technology in developing countries, and address the scale and appropriateness of technologies to specific circumstances. She said the proposed online global platform would need to be complemented by a management and coordination structure within the UN.

Tonga, for the Pacific SIDS, said a TFM will be a key MOI. He also said the tools provided by a TFM will differ from those

provided by the FfD3 outcome, and he recalled the need to conclude negotiations on this issue during UNGA 69.

Benin, for LDCs, called for a special and dedicated mechanism to facilitate LDCs' access to modern and appropriate technologies. On the UN Secretary-General's high-level panel on the proposed technology bank for LDCs, he called for it to conclude soon so the bank can be operationalized during UNGA 70, and said this will be a key deliverable of the post-2015 development agenda.

Zambia, for the LLDCs, recommended, *inter alia*, developing a special fund for technology, assessing LLDCs' technology needs, mapping existing technological issues, and establishing an online global platform building on existing complementary initiatives.

India urged moving from "empty debates" to meaningful cooperation for technology transfer. He noted that the proposal to create a TFM was not just called for by Rio+20, but had been suggested in the Secretary-General's 2012 report, which was prepared in consultation with many UN organizations, and, therefore, provides an existing "mapping" exercise. He proposed asking the following questions: what will a TFM do; what arrangements are needed for its oversight and administration; and how will it tap into the expertise of the private sector and others?

Mexico said technology transfer must be supported by bolstering capacities, including training individuals and establishing a favorable climate for trade.

Rwanda stressed digital inclusion and transformation, and stated that ICTs are a fundamental enabler for many SDGs.

The UK said investments in STI have yielded tangible results, and emphasized the government's role is to create an environment for innovation through a regulatory framework and good governance. MICs are major technology innovators, he stressed, saying that all countries should increase technology cooperation to implement the SDGs.

France called for incentives at the local level, technical assistance, training for capacity building, IPR, and a favorable climate for innovation. States are not the only actors, he stressed, saying that the debate should be made more tangible by bringing in multi-stakeholder partnerships to the FfD3 process.

Sri Lanka said a TFM should constitute the core of the MOI portion of the post-2015 agenda, adding that the recommendations of the UNGA dialogues on the TFM provided the guidelines to form such a mechanism.

Colombia said a TFM will be a key deliverable of FfD3 and the post-2015 agenda, and must be an essential component of the global partnership for development.

Belarus called for a timetable for establishing a TFM, and a new, strategic approach for addressing energy issues.

Bangladesh noted the challenges of drawing benefits from technology owned by the private sector. She suggested that public policies should include social and moral incentives for investing in technology, not only corporate ones.

Egypt said the TFM should aim to: coordinate related agreements; exchange best practices; examine how to address IPR constraints; and promote technology needs assessments. A global TFM should include a technology development fund, and

a management and coordination structure within the UN, with an advisory team of experts and stakeholders.

Pakistan: called for a clear and ambitious road map for addressing technology; said the TFM should not focus only on the environmental dimension; and called for addressing gaps in the cycle from research to diffusion of technology.

Germany said that in addition to patents, licenses and hardware, there is a need for North-South, South-South, triangular, and regional initiatives. He noted that Germany's feed-in tariffs for renewable energy led to massive private investment, demonstrating how governments can lead the way on private investment.

Indonesia underscored the need for a "breakthrough" in international cooperation in technology development, transfer and dissemination. He asked for establishment of a TFM to be integrated into the zero draft of post-2015 development agenda outcome document.

Sweden said FfD3 should identify the necessary conditions for creating enabling environments for technology transfer, adding that ODA remains an important means of addressing issues such as STI.

Switzerland suggested thinking about technology transfer as a house. The foundation would be the enabling environment, comprised of policies in areas such as public procurement, taxation or education. The pillars would be sector-specific targeted interventions, such as multi-stakeholder partnerships. The roof would be a support structure at the international level that could map and enable networking and knowledge-sharing to identify gaps and solutions. He added that ODA should play a leveraging role in countries affected by conflict.

Malaysia stressed the need to: protect indigenous knowledge and develop indigenous technologies; provide access to finance, capacity building and training for developing countries; build local capacities for developing technologies to be diffused at the national level; and strengthen ICT ecosystems to support industry.

Japan said the creation of a new structure in the UN should not be seen as an objective in itself but more focus should be placed on enabling environments built on the rule of law, balanced IPR regimes and education. He added that, through the FfD3 and post-2015 development agenda follow-up process, Japan could agree to promote partnerships for technology transfer related to particular SDGs and to encourage the engagement of the private sector.

Paraguay emphasized the roles and needs of transit countries and LLDCs. Italy introduced the work of several international scientific research centers in Trieste, noting that they are examples of a global partnership for science and UN-driven cooperation and could be incorporated into the MOI framework.

Costa Rica said the establishment of a TFM, including an online platform, will contribute to the level of ambition and should have a global fund. Panama stressed the importance of ICTs, and noted her country had created a government innovation center and is moving forward on a capacity-building project to create indicators.

The US noted the lack of consensus among Member States on a TFM and said the UNGA President's summary of the structured dialogues is not a consensus document. He also: said advances in STI bring promise of accelerated progress on every goal area of the SDGs; emphasized investment in physical infrastructure for a digital economy; and noted that universities, the private sector, and citizens could be attracted by different incentives than governments.

The Philippines said access to environmentally sound technologies is uneven not only between countries, but also within them. She said three key enablers for technology dissemination are: improved partnership and coordination through TFM; an online global technology innovation platform; and adequate financing, dissemination and transfer of sustainable technologies.

Kazakhstan welcomed the UN's growing role in promoting global technology coordination, and the proposed online global platform as part of the TFM. He also: underscored connectivity and ICT use; suggested the Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) initiative could be applied to the TFM; and called for prioritizing technologies that promote sustainable agriculture.

Niger said basic and industrial technologies are all "indispensable" for the post-2015 development agenda. While recognizing the role of the private sector, he noted that, no matter what mechanisms will be adopted in September, governments must lead the way.

Australia stressed that a discussion on a potential new institutional structure could only take place after achieving a common understanding of the desired outcomes. She stressed the need to identify how to best harness innovation through partnerships with the private sector, civil society, academia and individuals with great ideas.

The Netherlands called for an integrated approach that identifies specific areas where multi-stakeholder partnerships could be created to accelerate the implementation of the SDGs. He also underlined the need to build on indigenous knowledge.

China expressed support for the creation of a TFM focused on the implementation of the SDGs. He added that North-South cooperation remains the major channel for international cooperation on technology, while South-South and triangular cooperation could work only as a complement.

Ecuador, for CELAC, said it is time for pragmatic consideration of proposals for the TFM, building on the recommendations in the report of the Structured Dialogues. He also highlighted the need for a comprehensive action plan for cooperation with MICs. He said the post-2015 zero draft should include specific language on the mandate, functions and modalities for the TFM, and a timetable for achieving its implementation.

The United Arab Emirates said technology transfer does not happen in a vacuum, but requires a strong enabling environment, which is brought about through capacity building. Thus, TFM is about capacity building, and she proposed that the UN Secretariat conduct a gap analysis of capacity building for all 17 SDGs.

Algeria suggested using the recommendations from the structured dialogues as the parameters and basis for this discussion, and that the ongoing work by some agencies is a step forward but must result in the establishment of a TFM.

Latvia called for nurturing multi-stakeholder partnerships with the private sector to connect SMEs with global value chains. She emphasized: the importance of enabling environments, built on good governance, rule of law, accommodating tax regimes and IPR regimes, at the national level; the role of ICT to foster innovation; and the need to build synergies between existing mechanism and networks.

The UN Environment Programme (UNEP) updated Member States on the work undertaken by the informal inter-agency working group comprised of UNEP, the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and the World Bank. He clarified that the group was set up to support the Secretary-General's suggestion of the online platform and to follow-up on the structured dialogues through exploring possible arrangements for a potential TFM. He explained that the group's work focuses on four areas: mapping existing initiatives that are fragmented and need to be linked; identifying areas for synergies and possible cooperation; looking at options for an online platform to share lessons learned and information on the available technology initiatives; and identifying necessary partnerships.

Brazil, India, and Egypt expressed support for having informal consultations to reach an agreement on the mandate, functions and governance structure of the TFM. Closing the session, Co-Facilitator Donoghue informed Member States that the FfD3 and Post-2015 Co-Facilitators would consult on how to carry forward the discussion.

***INTERACTIVE DIALOGUE WITH STAKEHOLDERS FROM THE POST-2015 PROCESS (MAJOR GROUPS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS) AND FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (CIVIL SOCIETY AND BUSINESS SECTOR)***

On Thursday morning, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau opened the interactive dialogue with stakeholders, thanking them for their continued engagement and ideas. The discussion was organized under a series of three themes.

***TECHNOLOGY FACILITATION MECHANISM, AND OTHER SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND INNOVATION ISSUES:***

Silvia Ribiero, ETC Group, called for the transfer of environmentally safe and gender sensitive technologies to developing countries, while protecting indigenous knowledge. Alisa Jane Holloway, Stellenbosch University, urged governments to make specific commitments to increase public expenditures in research and development (R&D), enhance technology capacity in LDCs, and expand access to the benefits of knowledge and technology for all.

Amb. Michael Gerber, Switzerland, stressed the need for: creating enabling environments comprised of conducive policy frameworks that provide incentives and ICT infrastructure;

innovative approaches to engage the private sector as a key source of innovation; and finding the best instrument for technology facilitation, noting that in the case of the TFM, "form should follow function." France stressed the need for establishing conducive, local regulatory frameworks and strengthening capacity and IPR at the national level. As a way to move forward, he suggested focusing on the added value of all partners and to structure partnerships with the private sector.

Sue Marie Carlson, Farming First, welcomed FfD3's focus on nutrition and agriculture, but called for including more language on women's land tenure and access to science, especially on extension services. Mirna Cunningham Kain, Centre for the Autonomous Development of Indigenous Peoples, stressed indigenous peoples' knowledge and the rich biodiversity existing in their territories, for innovation and technology.

Amb. Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota, Brazil, said the agreement on the TFM in the post-2015 development agenda should comprise its concept and mandate. He stressed that not all technology is owned by the private sector, as much innovation and research is funded by taxpayers.

In a general exchange of views, speakers raised the issues of alternatives to international IPR, investing in R&D, and scaling up technologies for rural communities.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FFD3 AND POST-2015 PROCESSES:** George Ndung'u, Beyond 2015, stressed the need for enabling environments consistent with international human rights, and said all people need to be partners in the global partnership for sustainable development. Merybel Nabilah Reynoso, Restless Development, called for strong monitoring and accountability frameworks, and for investments in statistical capacity at the national level to generate disaggregated data, so that children and youth do not remain invisible.

Marta Subira, Government of Catalonia, said democratic and bottom-up participatory governance must be at the core of the new global partnership, and called for resource mobilization and targeted funding for the local and sub-national governments. Samuel Zan Akologo, Caritas Ghana, called for a special focus on the poor and marginalized, and said a global accountability mechanism for post-2015 should be based on the CBD principle. Tessa Khan, Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development, supported basing free trade agreements (FTAs) on transparency and respect for sustainable development, and welcomed the FfD3 zero draft's reference to the role of FTAs' dispute settlement mechanisms. Abla Sibai, Centre for Studies on Aging, stressed the needs of the poorest and most marginalized, and called for increased public funding for social protection floors, health, education and training.

Amb. Tekeda Alemu, Ethiopia, called for the coherence and convergence of the post-2015 and FfD3 processes, in order to create a strong development platform with all actors. Bangladesh said post-2015 and FfD3 are complementary, although distinct in scope and substance. She said any overlap of work between the two might be needed for better understanding of the paradigm shift in development.

Maria Alejandra Scampini, Association for Women's Rights in Development, called for: financing that integrates human rights and fundamental freedoms; placing gender equality

and women's empowerment at the center of the agenda; and a binding accountability framework for the private sector. Ajay Kumar Jha, Centre for Community Economics and Development Consultants Society, expressed concern about the emphasis put on private finance and stressed the need for: addressing the issues related to small family farmers, including women; climate finance to be additional to ODA; and implementing duty-free and quota free markets for LDCs. Andrew Hanauer, Jubilee USA Network, called for addressing sovereign debt restructuring as the "root cause" of global inequality, and for specific language to "reduce by 50% illicit financial flows by 2030." Elisabeth Kisakye, Instituto de Comunicação Social, highlighted the need for investments in people, and welcomed the FfD3 zero draft's reference to "unlocking the potential of marginalized groups." Jennifer Vinas-Forcade, LAC Youth Alliance, asked if participants had tried to explain the FfD3 and post-2015 processes to their families, highlighting that terms such as "partnerships" and a "universal agenda" are "empty."

Amb. Kajsa Olofsgaard, Sweden, stressed the need for the engagement of "the full breadth of society," where she said the capability and resources to implement the agenda is actually found. Amb. Alya Ahmed Saif Al Thani, Qatar, presented her country's multi-stakeholder initiatives on food security and resource use in dryland countries and financial support for youth entrepreneurs. Amb. Michael Grant, Canada, offered definitions for the "Global Partnership" vs. "global partnerships" for development, saying the Partnership embodies core principles that must be championed by all stakeholders, such as solidarity, human rights, equality, sustainability and accountability, while partnerships reflect the multi-stakeholder efforts organized around each of the goals, which build on private sector and civil society expertise and address the full range of MOI for development.

**FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW ON FFD3 AND MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND COHERENCE BETWEEN RESPECTIVE OUTCOME DOCUMENTS, OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND WAY FORWARD:** Ariel Meyerstein, US Council for International Business, suggested integrating in the post-2015 agenda the sections on domestic public finance, domestic and international private finance, international public finance, and data and monitoring from the FfD3 Outcome. On technology transfer, he proposed doubling the efforts on open trade, protecting IPR, and enabling frameworks. Nicholas Corby, Leonard Cheshire Disability, called for securing progressively increasing funds at the national and international levels for the social protection and inclusion of persons with disabilities, and for disaggregating the distribution of funding by disability. Paul Quintos, IBON International, expressed concerns about the emphasis on private finance in FfD3 and on public-private partnerships in the SDGs. He called for implementing national regulations that prevent the infringement of exterior human rights abuses from the private sector. Gay McDougall, Minority Rights Group International, stressed that the land of indigenous and minority peoples' communities is being misappropriated and stolen, and highlighted that they have their own democratic processes, which need to be recognized at the international level. Diego Azzi,

CUT Brazil, said DRM must be based on fair taxation and all countries should be able to participate on an equal footing in work towards developing a UN tax convention.

Amb. Ahmed Sareer, Maldives, said FfD3 provides a complete and ambitious framework for MOI. Amb. Vladimir Drobnyak, Croatia, said FfD3 must take a holistic approach, focusing on building a stable and enabling environment, effective institutions, and the policy environment to build sustainable economic growth. He stressed the importance of differentiation of countries, and the need for precise definitions of financial and non-financial MOI.

Matti Tapani Kohonen, Christian Aid, called for the establishment of an FfD Commission to monitor the FfD3 outcome, which would meet biannually at the ministerial level to adopt a negotiated document on MOI for post-2015. Beverly Sakongan Longid, Indigenous Peoples Movement for Self-Determination and Liberation, called for clear references to Indigenous Peoples in the SDGs, and for the goals to be consistent with existing human rights standards. Michael Castro, International Budget Partnership, called for full transparency of the spending and aid for every target of the SDGs and for public engagement throughout the budgetary process, including through public hearings. Nor Nabila Mohd Nasir, Asia Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, shared her personal experience with female genital cutting and called for the respect of and access to sexual and reproductive health and rights. Aldo Caliarì, Centre for Concern, stressed the importance of monitoring the FfD3 commitments and called for a dedicated follow-up mechanism for MOI in FfD.

Amb. Hiroshi Minami, Japan, stressed the importance of a review, monitoring and accountability framework, and said the HLPF should be used for both processes. He stressed the need to collect disaggregated data, to ensure that the impacts on the most marginalized of society will be monitored. Anthony Pipa, US, recalled that out of 193 UN states, only about 40 are traditional aid recipients and about 30 are traditional donors, and said FfD3 offers a chance to keep pace with the evolution of the development finance landscape. Amb. Hahn Choong-hee, Republic of Korea, said: the follow-up and review from the two processes should be coherent; there is a need to accelerate the role and function of the HLPF and to identify the relationship between national and regional reviews; and the FfD3 outcome should be the MOI pillar of the post-2015 agenda.

### **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FFD AND POST-2015 PROCESSES**

Introducing the discussion on Thursday afternoon, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Donoghue said the discussion would provide an opportunity to look in more detail at issues of the global partnership and ideas for transformative actions in specific areas.

FfD3 Co-Facilitator Pedersen said the next draft of the FfD3 outcome document would reflect all of the MOI included in the SDGs. However, action on a few issues could produce crosscutting, mutually-reinforcing progress on many areas, he explained, such as sustainable infrastructure, clean energy, agriculture, SMEs, and social protection.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, called for engaging with the OWG's report holistically, and not to mention "key drivers" or give precedence to any goals or targets. He said the Global Partnership should be based on CBDR and have North-South cooperation at its core. The FfD3 process should be a set of tools that will support the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda, he explained, as FfD3 is a separate process whose scope goes beyond financing the SDGs. He stressed that the revitalized Global Partnership must be coupled with concrete actions and time-bound targets on ODA, debt relief, trade, the TFM, and the participation of developing countries in global economic governance.

The EU said the Global Partnership should be based on universality, comprehensiveness, shared responsibility, and a multi-stakeholder approach. He stressed the need to integrate in a balanced manner the three dimensions of sustainable development, noting that the FfD3 outcome should include crosscutting, concrete actions for all of the MOI targets.

Maldives, for AOSIS, said the linkage between the FfD3 and post-2015 processes is the goal to eradicate poverty. Tonga, for Pacific SIDS, said FfD3 will provide some useful tools for implementing the SDGs, and added that some are better financed through commitments not traditionally entailed in the FfD3 process. He also said SDG 14 on oceans is not adequately addressed in the FfD3 zero draft.

Uganda said the FfD3 outcome should include a cohesive and holistic framework for sustainable development and deliverables as elaborated in the SDGs, as well as a strong follow-up process.

The Republic of Korea said effective development cooperation is characterized by country ownership, inclusive partnerships, transparency, and accountability. On trade as a MOI, he noted the need to modernize and harmonize domestic frameworks with international commercial law, to build confidence in doing business.

Canada said partnerships should be dynamic and multi-stakeholder, and will be critical for delivering on the new agenda. The Global Partnership, on the other hand, is a concept and broader vision that will be the foundation of all efforts over the next 15 years, he explained.

Venezuela said the FfD3 and post-2015 processes have their own identities, stressed the specificities of each country under CBDR, and said the outcome documents must stress the ability of all states to steer, in a sovereign manner, the development of their own natural resources. Nigeria said the ambition of FfD3 is low compared to the SDGs, and this outcome document should not constitute MOI, which is found in SDG 17.

Chad said the FfD3 and post-2015 processes are different and FfD3 needs to provide a conceptual framework, adapted to current challenges. He underlined that CBDR must be at the heart of the Global Partnership and called for: the development of agro-industries, sustainable infrastructure, and ICTs; the empowerment of vulnerable groups; and improving resilience.

Germany noted that all actors need to consider themselves global partners and to take action at all levels, adding that the Global Partnership needs to be built on the principles of: universality; shared responsibility; monitoring and review; and a multi-stakeholder approach. He said the FfD3 outcome could be:

integrated in the post-2015 development agenda in its entirety; only endorsed in the document and integrated as an annex; or integrated in a condensed version to be decided in Addis Ababa.

Mexico stressed that the FfD3 and post-2015 process are complementary but not subsidiary to each other, as the FfD3 results should be much broader in ambition and produce more than the MOI required for post-2015 development agenda. He added that FfD3 contributions to MOI should be included in a section of the FfD3 outcome dedicated to the SDGs.

India said the relationship between post-2015 and FfD3 should be one of "complementarity, not subsidiarity." The MOI component of the OWG proposal should not be left behind, he said, by replacing it with the FfD3 outcome. Instead, SDG 17 should be seen as a "floor," with FfD3 providing policy tools to implement the SDGs and their targets, and enhance their ambition. India also favored elaborating modalities for the TFM in the post-2015 track, while FfD3 could address wider systemic issues related to STI. But, with the FfD3 outcome not yet known, he said it would be premature to judge whether it will be able to provide the entire pillar of post-2015 MOI. On universality, India said the notion cannot stand on its own, without differentiation. Developed countries must be accountable, especially on environmental sustainability and unsustainable consumption. He noted that CBDR does not mean developing countries will not take action on issues of collective importance, but said "the universality of the agenda does not translate into uniformity of its application."

The Holy See said each country must seek to fulfill the SDGs, in line with its own priorities and capacities, while helping other countries to do the same.

Indonesia said the synergy between the FfD3 and post-2015 development processes lies in how FfD3 will provide tools, commitments, and policies to ensure the realization of the SDGs. He also cautioned against "cherry-picking" goals and targets from the SDGs.

Cabo Verde highlighted the unfinished business on the Global Partnership and called for FfD3 to adopt a concrete outcome to be incorporated into the post-2015 outcome document.

Morocco highlighted the role of infrastructure as critical for access to education, health care, social protection, support for SMEs, and food security. He also stressed transport and energy infrastructure as key for economic development, particularly in rural areas.

Italy highlighted the importance of agriculture for sustainable development, and expressed hope that the institutions participating in the World Bank and IMF Spring Meetings would become sustainable development knowledge hubs.

Turkey said the FfD3 outcome needs to support and respond to the needs of the SDGs, and should raise the ambition on goal-specific MOI. He said DRM, capacity building, ODA, private investment, STI, and trade are critical for sustainable development.

Japan said the FfD3 outcome should be a policy framework for resource allocation and the enabling environment, and be overarching and crosscutting. No MOI should be prioritized over another, he stressed, and FfD3 should be distinguished from specific country commitments and pledges.

China said the post-2015 agenda should promote the fulfillment of commitments to ODA and technology transfer to developing countries. He said it should promote a global partnership, which is more balanced and based on win-win solutions, with South-South cooperation and multi-stakeholder partnerships playing a complementary role.

Qatar called for action on the Doha Declaration adopted on 12 April 2015 during the United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. She further stressed the need for: regional cooperation for capacity building; strong institutions, rule of law and transparency; and effective criminal justice systems.

France stressed the need for, *inter alia*: North-South, South-South, and city-to-city cooperation; green credit for SMEs; and supporting small-holder farmers.

The UK: said the FfD3 outcome should be integrated into the post-2015 development agenda as its MOI pillar; noted that FfD3 should be the place for national commitments and international support to address bottlenecks; stressed the central role of private investments for sustainable infrastructure; and emphasized the need to raise the level of ambition on good governance, sound institutions, and the rule of law.

Switzerland said FfD3 should provide the framework for implementing the SDGs, and stressed that the deliverables should have the potential to be real game changers and be limited in number.

The US said: a successful FfD3 outcome is a prerequisite for a successful post-2015 agenda; MOI should remain in FfD3; and the substance and process for post-2015 and FfD3 must be coherent.

Iceland said the inclusion of women's rights in the FfD3 and post-2015 processes is one of their most important transformative ideas. She added that examples of key deliverables could be found in the area of sustainable land use and fisheries.

El Salvador said MOI are different but complementary to FfD3, and one is not the equivalent of the other as they have dimensions that need to be considered.

Timor-Leste said the FfD3 outcome should not compromise SDG 17, noting that the SDGs describe "what" we want to achieve in the post-2015 period but the FfD3 outcome will only describe one of the ways "how" we will accomplish this.

Australia said FfD3 should encourage broad-based, multi-stakeholder partnerships and build confidence for delivery of the SDGs. She said MOI are the actions we will take, while the global partnership is the approach to taking these actions.

Palau noted that the post-2015 agenda calls for more than financing, and suggested calling the FfD3 outcome the "Means of Implementation for Sustainable Development," and ensuring that the zero draft addresses the requirements.

Colombia said the deliverables should include: the establishment of a TFM; the transformation of the Committee of Experts on Tax into an intergovernmental commission for tax; and the establishment of a follow-up mechanism for the commitments from SDG financing processes and from FfD3.

Peru said the establishment of a TFM and access to technology innovation must have an impact on women, children and vulnerable groups.

Delegates continued offering comments on this agenda item on Friday morning. Uruguay called for: CBDR; developed countries to respect their ODA commitments; addressing the specific challenges of MICs; transparency and accountability; and reforming the governance structures of international financial institutions.

Paraguay stressed the need for the FfD3 and post-2015 processes to complement each other and coordinate with the UNFCCC processes. He said FfD3 should provide the framework for a revitalized Global Partnership based on the principles of solidarity, cooperation and shared responsibilities according to capabilities.

Brazil noted that the proposal to limit the MOI discussion to the FfD3 process disregards the SDGs' integrated approach and existing mandates, adding that MOI should also be discussed in the declaration and the follow-up and review sections of the post-2015 development agenda. He cautioned against both elaborating an FfD3 summary after July and re-opening SDG 17 in light of the FfD3 outcome.

Chile said FfD3 goes beyond the financing of the post-2015 development agenda. She stressed the need to: foster technology transfer and South-South and triangular cooperation, without replacing North-South cooperation; emphasize regional cooperation; and set monitoring frameworks for the commitments made, including by the UN Regional Commissions.

Bolivia stressed that FfD3 and post-2015 are different processes and the "Addis document is not MOI for post-2015." She said MOI should have its own follow-up and review mechanism.

Egypt said FfD3 is more comprehensive and not a tool for MOI for the post-2015 agenda, adding that the success of both depends on the new global partnership.

New Zealand highlighted the regional Pacific partnership to strengthen infrastructure investments in SIDS as a transformative example for strengthening sustainable development. She emphasized the importance of cooperation between development partners, including China and Brazil, and welcomed the establishment of the BRICS' "New Development Bank."

Niger supported a Global Partnership under UN auspices, emphasized that ODA should be increased and capacity strengthened, and said trade facilitation should be enhanced.

The Czech Republic supported integrating the FfD3 outcome into the post-2015 agenda as the MOI pillar, emphasized the importance of data quality and capacity for data analysis, and said ownership of the post-2015 agenda at the national level will be critical, with local level partnerships playing a role in this respect.

Finland said a single agenda should lead to a single follow up and review process with the HLPF playing a key role in this regard. She emphasized the need to keep all stakeholders involved and not to limit their participation, adding that "we cannot expect them to participate in an agenda they did not help develop."

Noting the differences between private sector organizations, such as SMEs, transnational corporations, or cooperatives,

Mongolia called for the integration and special mention of cooperatives in the FfD3 outcome.

Saudi Arabia underlined that, even though there are converging elements between the FfD3 and post-2015 processes, the two are independent tracks. He further stressed that: financial and other regulations are domestic issues; carbon pricing should be discussed under the UNFCCC; and besides aid and ODA, all other verifications should be voluntary.

China called for developed countries to fulfill their ODA commitments, stressing that South-South cooperation is a voluntary system that can only be a complement to North-South cooperation.

### **FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW AND MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

Opening the discussion on this agenda item on Friday, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau explained that the mainstream conversation on MOI should take place in May, and invited delegates to focus their interventions on the inter-relationships between the two tracks and on how they see that in the context of the post-2015 agenda.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, stressed that the two processes should be retained as two separate tracks, as the scope of FfD3 goes beyond implementing the SDGs, while MOI for the post-2015 agenda should go beyond FfD3. He explained that FfD3 should provide a set of tools for implementing the universal post-2015 development agenda, noting that the notion of universality cannot stand on its own but needs to be understood in conjunction with the principle of CBDR. He called for creating adequate frameworks that hold all stakeholders accountable and monitor ODA commitments, technology transfer and capacity building, stressing that, at the national level, follow-up and review should be decided by governments. He added that FfD3 should prioritize the implementation of its own outcome, while considering the HLPF for the follow-up of the FfD3 commitments that are complementary to the post-2015 agenda and other processes.

The EU called for a single overarching monitoring and accountability framework, covering all the SDGs, targets, and MOI. He said the FfD3 monitoring framework should be merged in the follow-up and review framework of the post-2015 development agenda, under the oversight of HLPF, and should track international and domestic, financial and non-financial MOI, such as policies. He further stressed the important role played by national parliaments, local governments and civil society actors, as well supreme audit institutions.

Trinidad and Tobago, for CARICOM, said the FfD3 follow-up and review should be distinct from that for post-2015. He suggested focusing on the periodicity of review, the quality of data, and building synergies among national, regional and international reviews.

Maldives, for AOSIS, said commitments under each track need to be followed up separately. Mexico rejected any mechanism that would lead to sanctions of any kind and proposed establishing a task force to produce annual reports on the implementation of the post-2015 agenda, which he said

should also be reviewed by the HLPF, and called for upgrading the HLPF.

The Republic of Korea said follow up and review should be coherent and the HLPF should be the global focal point for monitoring and review of MOI. He also emphasized the need for: reliable and timely data that is measurable, collectable and comparable; assessment of the quality of development cooperation as part of the follow-up and review process, including through processes like the Development Cooperation Forum and Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation; and incorporating regional mechanisms for review.

France said there should be a single institutional framework for the processes, and the global partnership should be, *inter alia*, under the auspices of the HLPF, universal, transparent and take into account existing mechanisms.

Sweden said universality is one of the most distinguishing and valuable characteristics of the post-2015 development agenda, and that the agenda is for and by all states. She said it must acknowledge the need for accountability of all actors, and effective implementation will be facilitated by a solid monitoring and review framework.

Peru, on behalf of a group of seven countries (Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Egypt, Peru and Pakistan), stressed the importance of a robust review mechanism and said this group is working to develop concrete recommendations for the May post-2015 meeting. He said Member States would soon receive an invitation to a workshop on follow-up and review, which will take place on 30 April.

India explained that concern about the private sector comes from a perceived abdication of public responsibility, adding that the role of the private sector is to complement not substitute for international cooperation.

Canada noted that FfD3 should be the MOI pillar of the post-2015 development agenda and called for a single accountability mechanism underpinned by knowledge sharing, effectiveness, inclusiveness, transparency and national ownership.

Germany said the FfD3 monitoring framework should be merged into a single follow-up and review framework of the post-2015 development agenda, under the HLPF. She suggested the monitoring framework should: cover the entire post-2015 development agenda, including MOI and their respective targets; link the national, regional and global levels; be rooted in the concept of a renewed global partnership, in which multi-stakeholders participate with commitments of their own and help with collecting data; and go beyond numbers to provide an analytical perspective.

Colombia said FfD3's review framework should feed into the HLPF. Paraguay said follow up and review must be universal and inclusive, and welcomed the process seeking to establish a Latin America and Caribbean Forum on Sustainable Development.

The Philippines said the local level will need to make a link between planning, programming, and budgeting and requires capacity building to do so. He also noted a need for high quality data and information.

Japan reiterated his country's earlier statements indicating that monitoring and follow-up of the FfD3 outcome should be an integral part of the post-2015 development agenda, there should

not be a separate and independent monitoring arrangement for FfD3, and the HLPF should be at the top of a “pyramid” that would also include regional and national structures.

The UK emphasized the need for disaggregated data and building capacity within national statistical offices. He said the follow-up and review process should be open and participatory, and should make use of existing mechanisms wherever possible.

The US said there should be one integrated framework for reviewing implementation of both FfD3 and the post-2015 development agenda, and it should involve country reporting, ensure national ownership, and take advantage of dynamic, open data systems. He proposed holding a discussion on data during the May post-2015 session.

The Netherlands stressed the key role of the HLPF and the need to invest in data at the national level and to build multi-stakeholder partnerships at the international level.

Timor Leste called for allowing the existing mechanisms used to monitor the SDGs to evolve, and underscored the need for commitments that countries will not be penalized for not being able to report because of capacity constraints.

Nikhil Seth, Director of the Division for Sustainable Development, DESA, announced that 46 developing countries requested assistance to participate in the current session of the intergovernmental negotiations, 19 of them being LDCs. After 11 last-minute cancelations, 15 LDCs and 20 developing countries received support to take part in the negotiations. He added that there are no new contributions to the Trust Fund.

### **COHERENCE BETWEEN RESPECTIVE OUTCOME DOCUMENTS, OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND THE WAY FORWARD**

Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Donoghue opened the Friday afternoon session on ensuring coherence between the outcomes of the FfD3 process and post-2015 development process, recalled the Co-Facilitators’ hope that the FfD3 outcome will “lend itself to integration” in the post-2015 summit outcome document, and invited views on options for achieving this.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, stressed “coherence and interlinkages” as their emphasis regarding the two outcomes. He said any outstanding issues from the FfD3 process should be addressed in the remaining ten days of July, within the post-2015 track.

Niger, for the African Group, said the two processes remain separate and different in scope, with FfD3 covering issues beyond those related to MOI. He indicated support for an autonomous, intergovernmental follow-up arrangement, which would feed into the follow-up arrangements for the post-2015 process.

The EU called for an “integrated result,” and said failing to integrate the FfD3 outcome into the September post-2015 package would detract from the credibility, consistency and impact of collective action. He looked forward to discussing all STI issues during the upcoming FfD3 meetings.

Denmark said one process is not subsidiary to another, and supported an “integrated package” of joint actions. He said ODA commitments should be reaffirmed, and the country-level enabling environments must include good governance, rule of

law and human rights. He also noted that the partnership of the four Co-Facilitators is “an important partnership for our success.”

Hungary said it is time to agree on “the future we build.” He said implementation must cater to all Member States if the agenda assigns tasks to all Member States, and noted that “leaving no one behind” creates tasks at the national level for developing countries. He called for adequate coordination of partnerships, and for the UN to undergo a “fit for purpose” exercise.

Mexico said the FfD3 outcome document should be balanced in terms of the three pillars of sustainable development to reflect the multi-dimensional nature of poverty. Switzerland stressed that it is important that the political commitments made in Addis Ababa are “not questioned the following day,” so the FfD3 outcome must define the full package of MOI for the post-2015 agenda. Brazil said “The more interesting things that come out of Addis, the greater the support we will have for integrating them into post-2015.” He stressed the OWG package should not be reopened, but that interesting or relevant aspects from FfD3 could be integrated into it.

### **CLOSING SESSION**

At the end of the fourth and final day of the joint session of the FfD3 and post-2015 development agenda negotiating processes, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Donoghue said the joint meeting had been a very valuable exercise and had improved the scope for agreement on many challenges related to MOI, the Global Partnership, and the follow-up and review of the post-2015 development agenda. He noted general agreement that: the success of the agenda will depend on political will on policies, institutions, commitments and the Global Partnership; the two processes are synergetic and complementary, not subsidiary; the FfD3 outcome must match the universal, ambitious and transformational SDGs and targets; and the report of the High-Level Panel on a Technology Bank for LDCs will play an important role in the discussions on the TFM.

Donoghue observed that some Member States wish to leave room for further negotiations on MOI after FfD3, while others disagreed because that would diminish the level of ambition of FfD3. On the TFM, he said many delegations expressed support for the creation of a TFM, while others recommended finding ways to maximize the use of existing initiatives. The suggestions brought up during the meeting included: a Global Forum on Innovation for Development; a Global Fund for Technology; creating multi-stakeholder partnerships; and the Secretary-General’s proposal for an online platform mapping existing initiatives. However, he noted, divergences remain and the TFM will remain a joint endeavor between the post-2015 and FfD3 processes, adding that the conversations on the issue within the FfD3 track, which will take place during FfD3’s third drafting session, from 15-19 June 2015, will be co-chaired by the four Co-Facilitators.

With regard to the May session of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, focused on follow-up and review, he announced that the Co-Facilitators will soon circulate a proposed programme and a background paper,

which will be based on the membership's inputs received during the January stocktaking session and Friday's discussions. He added that, during the May session, Member States will also receive an update on the work undertaken by the UN Statistical Division on indicators, and that a zero draft of the post-2015 development agenda will be released shortly after the session. He also noted that informal-informals at the expert level will be held during the coming weeks.

FfD3 Co-Facilitator Talbot stressed the need to identify more clearly what the ambitious components of the FfD3 outcome will be and said that a revised zero draft of the FfD3 outcome, based on the inputs received during the drafting session that took place on 13-17 April 2015, will be circulated in the beginning of May. He announced that the FfD3 Co-Facilitators secured additional time for negotiations, which will take place from: 11-15 May 2015; 26-29 May 2015; and 1-5 June 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 pm.

### A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETING

Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Macharia Kamau greeted delegates to the joint meeting of the post-2015 development agenda and Third International Conference on Financing for Development negotiations with a "reality check." Reading the headlines from that morning's issue of the *New York Times* regarding global tragedies and violence stemming from inequalities among and within countries, he asked participants: "How are we going to put together a post-2015 agenda and find the resources to address the very fundamental challenges that we face at the dawn of the 21st Century?"

Following this bold introduction, delegates to the four-day session embarked on a discussion of the complex and historically conflictual issues of financing, technology, partnerships and accountability, and how they will apply to the next development agenda. This brief analysis reviews the competing definitions and proposals that delegates to the post-2015 and FfD3 processes presented and now must clarify as they approach the start of negotiations in earnest, and seek to draft agreements in line with the reality they are seeking to address.

### LINKING PARALLEL PROCESSES

Delegates openly welcomed the presence of the four Co-Facilitators and the opportunity to address how the two parallel and deeply intertwined processes should coordinate and potentially be integrated. However, different interpretations of the relationship between the two processes were presented during the meeting.

Many developed countries proposed that the outcome of the FfD3 process should represent an agreement on the MOI of the post-2015 agenda, and called for the FfD3 document that will be adopted in Addis Ababa to be incorporated in its entirety as the post-2015 agenda's MOI pillar. By contrast, many developing countries preferred to withhold judgement on how the FfD3 text would be recognized in the post-2015 agenda outcome document. Some explained that it was a matter of not wanting to agree to anything until they knew what the final FfD3 outcome will be. Others indicated concern that the developed countries'

proposal entailed removing SDG 17 on MOI and possibly other MOI-related targets from the proposed SDGs. Suggesting an alternate format, South Africa, for the G-77 and China, insisted "the two processes should be retained as two separate tracks, as the scope of FfD3 goes beyond implementing the SDGs, while the MOI for the post-2015 agenda should go beyond FfD3."

While many countries agreed duplication of the work of the post-2015 and FfD3 processes should be avoided, others welcomed maximum attention on financing for the goals, and some even considered whether new commitments could be added on in Addis. With such differing ideas of the identity of FfD3 and its purpose for the post-2015 agenda, many left the four-day meeting without a clear view for how this traditionally difficult cluster of issues would be resolved in the 80 days remaining before FfD3 begins in Addis. Despite the concern that the ambitious agenda set out in the proposed SDGs might not receive the MOI that many delegates argue it needs to become a reality, some pointed to the procedure used during the four-day meeting as an important step forward. The attentive Co-Facilitators of both the Post-2015 and FfD3 processes presided over discussions on each of the agenda items, and delegates noted that the four men's partnership in shepherding the two processes will prove important for the success of both agendas, which they noted must also be marked by new and innovative partnerships.

### BUILDING SHARED DEFINITIONS

As disagreements continued on the fundamental purpose of the implementation section of the post-2015 agenda and how parallel negotiations on FfD could be coordinated with this agenda, Member States also recognized that many of the key words that they have used for months still lack common definitions. Encouraged by the Co-Facilitators to offer specific and concrete ideas, options for some of these definitions emerged.

During the discussion on the global partnership for development, for example, Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau pointed out the discrepancy between discussing "The Global Partnership" and "global partnerships." Canada offered definitions for these two concepts, describing the first as an underlying principle of solidarity and the second as the multi-stakeholder efforts necessary to achieve the goals. Developing countries replied with a different approach, stressing that North-South cooperation and commitments should be central to the Global Partnership concept. There appeared to be general consensus that the inclusion of civil society and the private sector in the implementation of the agenda will be crucial, with Finland essentially summarizing the thoughts of many when she stated that "we cannot expect them to participate in an agenda they did not help develop." However, competing perspectives arose in this area, too, with Germany proposing a monitoring framework rooted in the concept of a renewed global partnership, in which stakeholders participate with commitments of their own and help with collecting data, while the G-77/China stressed the importance of monitoring frameworks to monitor commitments on ODA, technology transfer and capacity building.

Participants observed that Member States' divisions also followed fairly traditional lines about the larger notion of universality, which is supposed to underpin the post-2015 agenda. Offering a definition of universality that moves away from a partnership divided along North-South lines, the UK explained that "universality" should be defined as a shared responsibility for implementation by all actors. India, on the other hand, said "North-South is not a divide, it is a fact," and proposed addressing this reality by viewing universality as a complement of the principle of differentiation. He said universality means that developed countries would now also "be held responsible for their actions," while developing countries would also take action on issues of collective importance in ways differentiated by their capacities to do so.

The discussion of technology also revealed recurring divides, as developing countries insisted that a long-discussed technology facilitation mechanism be created through the post-2015 process, and developed countries continued to favor existing initiatives and broader efforts on science, technology and innovation. Brazil and India stated that deciding on the mandate and form of a TFM could be a key deliverable of the post-2015 agenda, and some thought that the discussions at this joint meeting finally pointed to the possibility that past disagreements on this issue could be overcome. Others thought the reality of upcoming negotiations on this topic would entail late nights and extended consultations.

### **ENSURING COMMON AMBITION**

Following Post-2015 Co-Facilitator Kamau's reality check during the opening plenary, delegates quickly turned to the reality that the high ambition set by the proposed SDGs and targets would require huge commitments of resources in order to be achieved. Research done by the Bretton Woods Institutions, whose representatives briefed delegates following their Spring Meetings the previous weekend, informed delegates that funding must increase from "billions to trillions," in order to achieve the SDGs as currently proposed.

But efforts to fulfill that ambition will require more than successful negotiations on the format, wording and relationships of the post-2015 and financing agreements. As one delegate remarked, regardless of whether Member States reach consensus on how to implement the SDGs, the international community will still have to mobilize the money to make any progress on the central goals of ending poverty and sustainable development.

On more than a few occasions, participants in the meeting attempted to remind each other of the weight and reality of the issues that they are contemplating, and the importance of matching their ambitious agreement on "what" to do—the SDGs—with resources for "how" to address them. Bringing delegates back to reality on the ground in their search to match political will with their pocketbooks, one Major Group representative silenced the room while presenting her personal account of female genital cutting and appealed for funds to educate others about the practice. Her courage and story were applauded by delegates, although whether their words will be filled with an equivalent level of courage will only unfold during the coming months, as delegates move into a schedule of almost continuous negotiations.

## **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**Asia-Pacific High-Level Consultation on Financing for Development:** Members and associate members of the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and other stakeholders are expected to agree on the Jakarta Consensus, an outcome document containing discussions and recommendations related to the mobilization and effective use of financial resources in Asia and the Pacific, which will be the region's input to the preparations and outcomes of FfD3. **dates:** 29-30 April 2015 **location:** Jakarta, Indonesia **contact:** ESCAP **phone:** +66-2-288-1234 **fax:** +66-2-288-1000 **email:** [escap-scas@un.org](mailto:escap-scas@un.org) **www:** <http://www.unescap.org/events/hlcfdd2015>

**Workshop on Options for the HLPF Review Mechanism:** This workshop will take place in New York on 30 April 2015. A background paper for the meeting, titled "Architecture for review and follow-up of the SDGs: Options for the High-Level Political Forum," has been prepared by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). The event is being convened by a group of seven countries (Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Egypt, Peru and Pakistan). **date:** 30 April 2015 **location:** New York City, US **contact:** Maja Messmer **email:** [maja.messmer@eda.admin.ch](mailto:maja.messmer@eda.admin.ch)

**Intersessional consultations for the outcome document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development:** Three sets of informal intersessional consultations will take place on the FfD3 outcome document. **dates:** 11-13 May 2015, 26-29 May 2015, and 1-5 June 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Financing for Development Office **phone:** +1-212-963-4598 **email:** [ffdoffice@un.org](mailto:ffdoffice@un.org) **www:** <http://www.un.org/ffd3/>

**Second SE4ALL Forum:** The second annual Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Forum will continue the momentum from the launch of the UN Decade of SE4ALL (2014-2024) and will facilitate coordinating input from SE4ALL to other processes, such as the climate change negotiations and the post-2015 development agenda. **dates:** 17-21 May 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General's Global Facilitation Team, SE4ALL **email:** [forum@se4all.org](mailto:forum@se4all.org) **www:** <http://www.se4all.org/> <http://www.se4all.org/se4all-forum/>

**Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda – Fifth Session:** The fifth session of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda will focus on follow-up and review. **dates:** 18-22 May 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **phone:** +1-212-963-8102 **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org) **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015>

**Informal Hearings with NGOs, Civil Society, Major Groups and the Private Sector on the Post-2015 Development Agenda:** As part of the preparatory process for the September 2015 UN General Assembly Summit for the adoption of the Post-2015 Development Agenda, two days of stakeholder hearings will be hosted by UNGA President Sam Kutesa and the Co-Facilitators of the post-2015 development

agenda negotiations. **dates:** 26-27 May 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **www:** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=13&nr=1012&menu=1561>

**Third drafting session of the outcome document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development:** The third drafting session of the outcome document for FfD3 will take place in June. **dates:** 15-19 June 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Financing for Development Office **phone:** +1-212-963-4598 **email:** [ffdoffice@un.org](mailto:ffdoffice@un.org) **www:** <http://www.un.org/ffd3>

**Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda – Sixth Session:** The sixth session of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda is expected to focus on negotiating the outcome document for the September 2015 Summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda. **dates:** 22-25 June 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **phone:** +1-212-963-8102 **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org) **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015>

**Third Meeting of the High-level Political Forum:** The third meeting of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, which will take place under the auspices of ECOSOC, will focus on the theme, “Strengthening integration, implementation and review – the HLPF after 2015.” The HLPF is mandated to meet every year under the auspices of ECOSOC and every four years at the level of Heads of State and Government under the auspices of the UN General Assembly. **dates:** 26 June - 8 July 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org) **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1838>

**Third International Conference on Financing for Development:** The Third International Conference on Financing for Development will be held at the highest possible political level, including Heads of State or Government, relevant ministers—ministers for finance, foreign affairs and development cooperation—and other special representatives. The conference will result both in an intergovernmentally negotiated and agreed outcome and summaries of the plenary meetings and other deliberations of the Conference, to be included in the report of the Conference. **dates:** 13-16 July 2015 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** UN Financing for Development Office **phone:** +1-212-963-4598 **email:** [ffdoffice@un.org](mailto:ffdoffice@un.org) **www:** <http://www.un.org/ffd3>

**Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda – Seventh and Eighth Sessions:** The seventh and eighth sessions of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda will focus on negotiating the outcome document for the September 2015 Summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda. **dates:** 20-31 July 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **phone:** +1-212-963-8102 **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org) **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015>

**UN Summit to Adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda:** The Summit is expected to adopt the post-2015 development agenda, including: a declaration; a set of Sustainable Development Goals, targets, and indicators; their means of implementation and a new Global Partnership for Development; and a framework for follow-up and review of implementation. **dates:** 25-27 September 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** [dsd@un.org](mailto:dsd@un.org) **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/summit>  
For additional meetings, see <http://sd.iisd.org/>

## GLOSSARY

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CELAC	Community of Latin American and Caribbean States
DESA	UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
DRM	Domestic resource mobilization
FfD3	Third International Conference on Financing for Development
GNI	Gross national income
HLPF	High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
ICTs	Information and communications technologies
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPRs	Intellectual property rights
LDCs	Least developed countries
LLDCs	Land-locked developing countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MICs	Middle income countries
MOI	Means of implementation
ODA	Official development assistance
OWG	Open Working Group
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small island developing states
SMEs	Small- and medium-sized enterprises
STI	Science, technology, and innovation
TFM	Technology Facilitation Mechanism
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly