

Statement by Canada/Israel/US team on Means of Implementation; Peaceful societies and capable institutions

May 9, 2014

As prepared for delivery by Ambassador Elizabeth Cousens, US Ambassador to ECOSOC

Remarks on means of implementation

Thank you, Mr. Co-chair.

A strong and actionable Post-2015 Development agenda will stand or fall on the degree to which we are committed and prepared to take actions to implement it. We fully agree with G77 colleagues and others that seriousness and precision about implementation is therefore crucial.

As others have noted, whatever the Open Working Group crafts on Means of Implementation or Global Partnership will need to reflect previous commitments, including the outcomes of Monterrey and Doha, and be flexible enough to take account of the forthcoming work of the International Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Finance as well as the preparation and outcomes of a third Financing for Development Conference in 2015 or 2016.

We will make only preliminary and selective observations for purposes of today, and reserve further comments for the next iteration, as there are too many targets and issues to address in the depth they deserve. I think we can all agree that the time we have for this topic today is too short, and we will need to find opportunity for a more substantive dialogue about means of implementation, both in relation to a standalone goal and in relation to specific goal and target areas. We appreciate Denmark's remarks about GAVI in this regard.

First, on finance: Any targets on financing need to acknowledge the comprehensive context of total financial flows, including the range of external public financing that is not considered ODA but has catalytic development effects as well as increased transparency of private flows that are growing in scale and development impact.

Official Development Assistance is obviously crucial. We are encouraged to note that ODA reached an all-time high last year and is further expected to increase in 2014. We can support a target **calling on donors to fulfill the commitments they have made**, which we would strengthen by including specific reference to the need for **increased efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance**.

We support a target on **domestic resource mobilization** along the lines of Target O, which should be strengthened by **specific reference to minimum targets for domestic spending on social protection and public services** in order to secure meaningful, sustainable, and contextually appropriate improvements in peoples' lives.

A target on remittances is important; we would add specificity to Target J in line with commitments that many countries have already made to **“strive to reduce the average transfer cost of remittances to 5 percent, while still maintaining strong counterterrorist financing and anti-money laundering systems.”**

We believe strongly in the need to spur Foreign Direct Investment, among other flows like portfolio investment and bank lending, but think Target K is poorly crafted and should instead be framed around **enabling conditions** which are the prime determinant of the scale and productivity of private flows.

We could support some form of target to “**reduce corruption and illicit financial flows,**” but believe the current target needs more careful crafting.

We could also support Target M, on debt with the emphasis on **debt sustainability**. We further welcome promotion of **sustainable public procurement** as in Target P.

Let me turn to trade. Trade is clearly critical and needs to begin with an open, rules-based, non-discriminatory trading system though we are not convinced we need a target to make this general point. We support efforts to expand market access although access alone is not sufficient and a target would need more careful crafting to emphasize the sound fiscal and macroeconomic management that is necessary to making good use of trade preferences. Likewise, any target language, if adopted, needs to be consistent with existing WTO agreements.

Science and technology cooperation and capabilities are also key and linked to capacity-building. We could support Target D, on science and technology cooperation regionally and globally. We could support a version of Target E that adds reference to transfer and dissemination on **voluntary and mutually agreed terms** and to **technology diffusion**. A better formulated target could spur new multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize public and private sector know-how and resources for action.

We also support Target G, recognizing the important role of institutions for creating an ecosystem that generates knowledge and innovation. This target should be strengthened by adding reference to **removal of barriers to entrepreneurship and innovation more broadly**.

On building human and institutional capacity we support the intent of these targets and welcome further discussion about the best ways to frame issues like investing in higher education, particularly in STEM fields. We had raised this issue under other goal areas, like Economic Growth and Education, and we strongly support the broader objective but need to examine the best way to formulate a target.

We also believe this goal area needs to include targets on data and information. Data is essential glue for a new global partnership, essential to tracking achievement of goals and targets, to underpinning accountability, and to enabling continuous learning and innovation in implementation, including through harnessing new technologies. Thus we welcome a strong target – or targets – in this area. One option could be: “**Make data more accessible and actionable, by improving relevance, scale, accuracy, timeliness, and accessibility to all citizens and development actors.**” An alternative could be: “**Improve development outcomes by promoting low-cost, scalable technologies that increase public access to high-quality and relevant information.**”

Finally, regarding global partnership: We see Focus Area 15 as fundamentally about partnership. We can support Targets U and V, though we would amend Target V to say “**shared accountability frameworks**” in the plural, as we are convinced that full engagement, buy-in, and relevance of this agenda will require a networked approach to accountability at different levels. We would also support moving a version of Target N here with a simple focus on **inclusive, participatory decision-making at all levels** as a fundamental underpinning of partnership and mutual trust. This goal would also be strengthened by a target to “**protect space for civil society to operate freely, pursue a broad range of self-defined objectives, and seek and secure funding from domestic and international sources.**”

Remarks on peaceful and inclusive societies and capable institutions

Regarding Focus Area 16, we continue to believe that this Focus Area should be elaborated in two separate goals: one on Peaceful and Inclusive Societies and one on Institutions. We also continue to believe there is considerable room for agreement in these areas. We all have a stake in, and sustainable development depends on, the responsiveness and quality of our institutions, the safety of our citizens, and the ability of all people to have a voice in their own development prospects.

We underscore that we see these two areas as universally relevant to all our societies. In relation to some concerns we have heard expressed, we do not see these areas as a means to impose new conditionalities on development assistance. Rather, we see them as priorities for all of us in relation to evidence regarding key drivers of development progress and challenges relevant to all of our countries. We agree that these issues are enablers but believe that – like other critical enablers such as Infrastructure, Economic Growth, and Jobs – they are fundamental enough drivers of progress to deserve dedicated treatment as goals in their own right.

Turning first to Peaceful and Inclusive Societies, as we have frequently noted, the empirical case is clear – peace is necessary for development, violence undermines it, and we all have work to do. We see particular merit in the following targets:

Target 16A includes important issues that could be better focused by separating them into three. We would support a target to: “**strengthen personal safety by reducing violent deaths per 100,000 by x percent.**”

We would support a separate target to “**eliminate all forms of violence against children and women, including human trafficking.**”

We strongly support targets related to the responsiveness of justice and police systems. There are various ways to formulate strong and measurable targets in this area. We would recommend a revision to what is currently the second 16B : “**Provide equal access to responsive, adequately-resourced, and accountable justice institutions that respect due-process rights and enhance the capacity, professionalism, and accountability of the police.**” Indicators could then be developed around metrics like the percentage of people with access to justice and legal aid services, the timeliness and affordability of such services, access to mediation and negotiation, including informal mechanisms, and so on. We also see scope for a target to “**reduce levels of**

organized crime and illicit flows of finance, narcotics, wildlife, arms, and natural resources.” These are all areas that require cooperation and mutual support where illicit flows contribute directly to violence and reversals of development.

We do not believe a target on migration policies is warranted here.

Turning to governance and institutions: It is very clear that stable, inclusive, and responsive public institutions are an essential underpinning of inclusive growth, social cohesion, and sustained and shared prosperity. We would emphasize the following outcome-based targets:

We strongly support a more precise version of Target 16A on open, accountable and transparent institutions. As formulated now the target is too vague, but there are multiple ways to specify it, and we would propose adding: “**and increase publicly available information about government activities, expenditures, and decision-making with access for all citizens.**”

We strongly support a reformulated Target 16C to “**promote free and universal legal identity, such as birth registrations.**” Every year, 50 million children start life without a legal identify because their birth is not registered. This is a solvable problem and a clear and compelling target ripe for inclusion in this agenda.

We strongly support a target to address the inclusivity of institutions and decision-making – currently addressed under the first 16C. We would strengthen this by making it more quantifiable, such as “**Increase public participation in inclusive political processes and decision-making at all levels, including the proportion of women and minorities, such as ethnic, religious, and socio-economic, in decision-making bodies.**” While we agree with the intent of taking into consideration the interests of future generations, we are not sure what this means in practical terms.

We support a version of the second Target 16D, but would reframe it to broaden the reach beyond an exclusive focus on public finance, to “**guarantee the public’s ability to access information in accordance with open data standards as well as access to government budgets and fiscal accounts, including those regarding natural resource wealth.**”

We could support a target to decrease **illicit flows and decreasing corruption in all its forms** which could also be addressed under a MOI/Global Partnership goal to reflect the mutual accountability in this area.

Finally, we support Target 16F but would reframe it positively to read “**ensure that people enjoy freedom of speech, association, peaceful assembly, and the right to participate in government, directly or through chosen representatives.**”

Thank you.