

Joint Session between FfD and Post-2015 processes
The relationship between the FfD and post-2015 processes
23 April 2015

Statement by Mr. Takeshi Osuga, Ambassador,
Deputy Director-General for International Cooperation and Global Issues

First of all, I thank the Secretariat for providing the food-for-thought papers on four specific areas. I enjoyed reading them.

I would like to begin by sharing Japan's view on how to deal with specific sectors in the FfD outcome. This is fundamental in reflecting on the relationship between FfD outcome and the post-2015 development agenda, in particular the SDGs goals and targets.

As I stated last week and also earlier this week, Japan believes that the FfD should provide a policy framework for resource mobilization, its effective use and the enabling environment with a view to increase overall resources that will be allocated to the different goals and targets areas identified by the OWG according to countries' specific priorities.

Japan acknowledges the effort to bridge FfD outcome and the post-2015 MOIs by highlighting specific sectors in the zero draft. However, we should be careful not to fall into a silo approach. Furthermore, FfD outcome should also be careful not to address sector-wise MOIs in such a way that prioritizes one against another and, by doing so, reopen the discussion on MOI targets of the OWG report. FfD should retain its overarching and crosscutting character.

Then, how should specific sectors be referred to in the FfD outcome? They should be mentioned in the context to building blocks to which they are most relevant. For example, infrastructure is an important area for the effective use of "domestic public finance". It is also a "must" for attracting private direct investment, both domestic and international. Hence, infrastructure should be mentioned in those contexts. SMEs will naturally be taken up in the "domestic private business" context.

In short, FfD outcome should not deal with the issue of allocating or directing financing towards specific sectors. On the contrary, FfD outcome should make reference on those specific sectors which are relevant to mobilizing different resources and to using them effectively.

In this regard, let me quickly share Japan's understanding on the words "ambitious" and "deliverables" that have been used so frequently by the Co-facilitators and the delegates.

In our view, SDGs is an extremely ambitious policy framework that will be implemented till 2030 and be followed up throughout these years. The FfD outcome should also be an ambitious policy framework that will last until 2030. Ambitious policy options and recommendations to be contained in the FfD is the "deliverables" of the FfD.

They should be distinguished from individual pledges, commitments or initiatives on specific sectors and targets covering a couple of years to come. That is the role of side events, pledges by countries or group of countries on the sidelines of the Addis conference in July and in NY in September.

Lastly, on global partnership, I will not repeat what I have been advocating since last year as a member of the ICESDF and reflected in its report, but only refer to two key words. They are “Inclusiveness” and “multi-stakeholder”. GPEDC explained by the distinguished delegate of the Republic of Korea is a good example of such global partnership.

Japan is also in favor of partnerships on specific program, sector, or even a project, in particular between public and private sectors. This can be an effective means to pursue specific objective but do not necessarily be as inclusive as the “global partnership” I mentioned earlier.

Thank you very much.