

Follow up and review on FfD and Means of Implementation and coherence between respective outcome documents, outstanding issues and way forward

Aldo Caliari, Center of Concern, on behalf of NGO Major Group

The scope of this intervention is limited to the international dimensions of follow up and coherence (without denying the importance of the need for national and regional dimensions, too).

In order to ensure comprehensiveness and avoid confusion and duplication between the Outcomes of both conferences, we call for the Addis Ababa Outcome to provide commitments on, at least, the financial means of implementation for the SDGs. Any remaining Means of Implementation should be given sufficient space in the post-2015 agenda Outcome document by addressing such matters as infrastructure development, indigenous knowledge, policy coherence, technology transfer and support for civil society's role in implementation. Adequate space for the non-financial means of implementation is particularly important when it comes to addressing the environmental pillar of sustainable development in the new agenda.

The Financing for Development process was deliberately designed as a broad process that includes all major stakeholders whose jurisdictions have impacts on development finance. It has a history that predates even the Millennium Development Goals. It expresses the consensus of the international community that the UN should have a rightful place as an actor in international economic decision-making, later reaffirmed by other conferences, notably the World Economic and Financial Crisis conference where Member States agreed to entrust the UN with discussing “reform processes aimed at improving and strengthening the effective functioning of the international financial system and architecture.”

Therefore, while the FFD process supported the MDGs and it should now support the SDGs, and in particular restate and expand on the meaning of the MOI targets in the SDGs, it should also be truthful to its nature which transcends both sets of goals. It is primarily a platform at the UN for coordination across all sources of finance in a holistic and comprehensive way, and with all relevant development actors.

It is our view that the Financing for Development Conference follow up process has failed to live up to the expectations in advancing implementation and accountability for commitments and without major adjustments it will equally disappoint in a task to support achievement of the SDGs. We believe these shortcomings stem from a weak design of its institutional architecture. The fact that, unlike major UN conferences, FFD does not have an intergovernmental follow-up process is a major inconsistency with the lip service paid to the importance of the internationally agreed development goals. We know without financing there are no goals, so why is there not a strong and well-resourced follow up body to deal with this neuralgic aspect of the agenda? Addis Ababa should have the honor of giving birth to an autonomous FFD follow up mechanism that conveys the renewed commitment by all parties to prioritize actionable means of implementation. Such mechanism should 1) allow for modalities for involving all FFD stakeholders 2) meet periodically to deliver an intergovernmentally-negotiated outcome on the status of implementation of the Monterrey, Doha and Addis Ababa commitments and 3) receive Secretariat support commensurate to its important task.

At the same time, finance-related decisions need to be strongly embedded and coherent with the three dimensions of sustainable development, and for that the FFD Follow up, with all its actors, needs to be aligned and contribute periodically to an equally robust accountability arrangement for the post-2015 agenda, for instance through an allocated space to share its outcomes within the work of the High Level Political Forum.

Follow ups of both FFD and post-2015 should offer proper space for accountability and review mechanisms of, any partnership established in order to implement the agenda, with access to all interested parties. Such partnerships should be aligned with the reinvigorated Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, which both outcomes should recognize and enhance as a genuine partnership primarily between Northern and Southern States and bound by international human rights, social and environmental commitments and the SDGs. It is also crucial that the Global Partnership encourages the participation of civil society through transparent and suitable arrangements to receive its contribution.