### PMI Statements in regards to Sustainable Development Goals and Technology Access (TFM: Technology Facilitation Mechanism)

### Post-2015 Side Event on

'Rethinking Technology in the Post-2015 Development Agenda: Technology Assessment, Facilitation Mechanism and Non-Financial Means of Implementation' Organized by UNCTAD, UN-NGLS, Women's Major Group, Global Forest Coalition, Tebtebba Foundation and ETC Group

### April 22, 2015

### **New York**

### Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India to the UN as a panellist

- The issue of a technology facilitation mechanism (TFM) has been a subject of intense debate since Rio+20, there is a very broad agreement among all those involved that technology is central as a solution to the common problems that we confront.
- We expect the proposed TFM to also be an inclusive forum a *platform* that taps into the strengths and expertise of all stakeholders.
- Among the issues that the mechanism could help us address meaningfully, the foremost is fragmentation of efforts on international technology cooperation. The mechanism could *inter alia* undertake comprehensive needs assessment on technology in the context of sustainable development, trials with and comparisons between different technologies, help in adaptation of technology to local conditions, assist in coordinating actions of technology actors, financial sector and policy-level actors, promote cross sectoral and atscale learning, and at-scale capacity building especially for policy design, financial engineering and business model implementation.
- Technology cooperation is not just about North-South Cooperation, it is also about South-South and potentially even South-North cooperation. There would be, for example, merit is also looking at more holistically at low-cost innovations happening in the developing countries. There is a lot of potential in the uptake of these low-cost innovations, which can be relevant across geographies and economies, but by themselves or purely through private sector action they will not attain the desired scale. The TFM could play an important role in identifying, showcasing and scaling up such innovations for global benefit.

4th Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda Joint Session between FfD and Post-2015 processes Statement delivered by Amb. Asoke Kumar Mukerji, Permanent Representative of India to the UN on Technology facilitation mechanism, and other science, technology and innovation issues on April 22, 2015

- Technology cooperation is not a zero sum game, nor should this issue become a taboo subject for discussions in the UN, in the name of exaggerated fears about Intellectual Property Rights or mandatory technology transfer requirements.
- We believe that if we engage constructively and in a spirit of cooperation that has characterized our engagement on the SDGs and this process so far, it should not be impossible to arrive at an understanding that meets our expectations and fully takes care of our individual interests

4th Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda - Joint Session between FfD and Post-2015 processes Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, on Global Partnership and North-South Divide on April 24, 2015

The concern among the membership on the role of private sector is given by a **disproportionate emphasis on the role of private sector to the detriment of international public cooperation** or a tendency of overreliance on the role and capabilities of the private sector.

Research & development and investments by the private sector are not always oriented towards the problems faced by the poor, nor will purely market based solutions always correspond to the urgency of the challenges we face.

It is important to maintain a balance in our approach. Our emphasis on the role of private sector should be **as a complement to international public cooperation and not a substitute**. It is equally important to **stress the notion of inter-governmental oversight and the notion of private sector accountability** which has been stressed by several delegations and the civil society also needs to be addressed seriously

3rd Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda March 23-27, 2015 Intervention by Mr. Adarsh Swaika, Director (UNES), MEA March 27, 2015

We would once again firmly **caution against the notion of using indicators to reinterpret the targets**. The indicators are tools for measurement and should therefore directly relate to and be fully consistent with the political intent and balance contained in the targets.

We over-emphasize the central significance of enhanced international cooperation on technology for the success of the new agenda that we are crafting.

Business as usual in the manner we think about technology will not deliver the gains we expect across multiple dimensions in an integrated agenda. A constructive, substantive and ambitious outcome on technology is, in our view, an absolute must for the success of outcome in September.

Finally, a brief comment on the themes of the **interactive dialogues during the Summit**, we are **broadly supportive of your initial proposal and also support fully what was said by the G77**. We would however add that when we discuss strong institutions, the focus should be on **strengthening international institutions**, in particular the UN system and making them fit for purpose.

3rd Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda March 23-27, 2015 Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India to UN March 26, 2015

After the SDGs were adopted, we have had a series of Inter-Ministerial consultations in India and several of our line Ministries have expressed concerns with the package.

Many of those concerns arise from the perceived challenges in implementing many of those objectives particularly as they are not accompanied with an enhancement of international support and resources.

Several challenges arise out of **lack of full incorporation of national circumstances**, as many of the targets seem to be generalized across geographies and development levels.

There are also **challenges arising out of definitional issues** which many of our line Ministries have found deeply problematic.

It is in this context that the **Chapeau of the document** was found useful by us in explicitly mentioning some of the key political understandings that underpin the SDGs. This is why we have called for the Chapeau to be fully integrated into the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

We are aware of the importance of consistency of SDGs with international agreements. But our understanding is that SDGs do not override, supersede or substitute other international agreements. We all want a complementary international agenda.

2nd Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, on February 20, 2015

We wholeheartedly **agree with the proposal of Netherlands that our Declaration should be understandable to a 13-year old**. At the same time, it should not be oversimplified to such an extent that it is only understandable to a 13-year old.

We feel it extremely important that the Rio principles, in particular **the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, must be explicitly and unequivocally reaffirmed** in an early part of the Declaration. We *do not agree with those who feel that this principle applies to a bygone era and nor too with their claim that it is somehow inconsistent with the notion of universality*.

For those who claim to **dislike the so-called North-South dichotomy** would do well to recount how this dichotomy is being willfully perpetuated even today, through unequal international governance structures which protect the privileged position of some over others, or through exclusive settings in which policies relevant to the entire agenda, for example the norms for development aid, continue to be made. The second claim, of inconsistency of this principle with universality is equally problematic. Universality is dear to us too, because it means that for the first time, developed countries would also be held to account for their actions. This is in turn linked with the integrated nature of the agenda, which speaks to issues such as unsustainable consumption patterns (an issue that is conspicuous by its absence in the draft), which are particularly, if not entirely relevant to actions by developed countries.

In Para 2, the emphasis on completing unfinished business is welcome. However, equal emphasis must be given to the lessons on why the achievement has been uneven, in particular the failure to deliver on the global partnership for financing and technology transfer.

The Declaration should **fully endorse the SDGs not contextualize them**. The SDGs are not the basis of the new agenda; they are its actionable core. We agree with the United States that para 7 on poverty eradication needs to be moved upfront. Apart from reiterating that eradication of poverty is the greatest global challenge, the Declaration should recognize it as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development and as the central and overarching objective of the agenda. For us, this is self-explanatory and of central importance. While the ideal of no target to be considered met is an important one, this should not be at the cost of recognizing progress. We need to ensure that all progress will nevertheless be duly measured and accounted for.

We support the call for giving **higher prominence to gender equality** in the Declaration. The lack of a strong reference to technology, which holds the golden key to the problem of sustainability, is jarring by its absence. We must embrace the notion that technology is key and that meaningful

cooperation of sharing its fruits is not only useful, it is also essential if we are to combat climate change and save our planet.

We support a reference to **climate change** in the Declaration, which must be accompanied with a reference to the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC. However, we would not support language, as in the current draft, that incorrectly classifies the new agreement or indeed prejudices or prejudges the outcomes of current negotiations under UNFCCC.

In para 12, we should talk **not only strengthening the UN but also reforming it**, including its primary organs. On the one hand we insist on incorporating political issues into the agenda, but then we artificially want to restrict the inclusion of elements that are most germane to international governance.

The para on follow-up and review must make a reference to the review of the revitalized global partnership, a key weakness of the MDGs. **We suggest deleting the term 'mutual accountability'**.

### 1 st Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda - Intervention by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor on January 20, 2015

In so far as the 'measurability' of the targets is concerned, we note that the SDGs are not only for the citizens to hold their governments accountable, but also for the **accountability of international action to support the revitalized Global Partnership for development**. Besides, the lens of measurability must especially be applied to the several targets in the SDG package that are clearly political in nature and do not lend themselves to measurability. On Indicators, we agree that this is a technical process, and emphasize it should remain a technical process, and not a means to inject ideas that did not find consensus under the SDGs.

I would like to now share some thoughts on the Declaration for the Summit in September 2015

The Declaration must **unequivocally reaffirm all the Rio principles**, including in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities .

It should be anchored on the **principle of equity in international relations and for international cooperation to achieve sustainable development**.

It must **unequivocally affirm the high political vision for ending poverty** – the greatest global challenge – and for enhancing international cooperation to put the world on a more sustainable path.

It must articulate a vision of **development that is comprehensive and integrated across all three dimensions of sustainable development, rooted in the indispensable requirement of poverty eradication.** 

It must anchor a renewed global partnership necessary for implementing the new agenda

It should anchor a follow-up and review process that is rooted in **national sovereignty and** international cooperation, built upon existing mechanisms, one that is lean and flexible, incentivizes action at all levels, and makes a special provision for the accountability of the renewed global partnership.

It should renew a **vision of democratization of global governance** to give real voice and participation of developing countries in line with current realities.

It must **eschew a narrow vision of one-size-fits-all** and recognize the importance of respecting diverse national circumstances and starting points.

It must therefore anchor an agenda universal in relevance but differentiated in action .

It must reaffirm, as has been done in the Introduction of the SDGs, that the **agenda and its goals and targets are global and aspirational in nature**, that each Government will have the policy flexibility to set its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition, but taking into account national circumstances

Statement by Ms. Sunita Singh, Director (Sustainable Development & International Cooperation), Ministry of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, Government of India, on the issue of development of Indicators at the 3rd Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda [March 23-27, 2015] on March 23, 2015

We would like to emphasize the following seven points as crucial markers for the development of indicators.

First, development of indicators is a technical process and this technical process should be fully consistent with the SDGs and their targets, which have been agreed politically. Development of indicators should not be used to undermine, re-open or even second-guess the agreed outcome of the SDGs.

Second, the indicators are meant to measure progress related to the implementation of the targets. It follows therefore, that **indicators should directly relate to and be relevant to the target or targets they are supposed to measure**. In the list presented by the Commission, there are several indicators that do not speak to the targets but instead present quite distinct ideas. This should be avoided. **Indicators must follow the political intent behind the targets and not substitute them in any way.** 

Third, the **process of development of indicators must not be used to introduce contentious notions** that do not enjoy wide acceptance or to disturb the delicate political balance of the SDGs package, including by over-emphasizing any one dimension of sustainable development.

Fourth, **all goals and targets must be treated on equal footing** and no target should be left behind. Not all targets may render itself to measurability by the same yardstick, but lack of uniform measurability does not mean that some targets are less important than the others. As the report of the OWG emphasized, the SDGs constitute an integrated, indivisible set of global priorities for sustainable development. Fifth, it needs to be emphasized that the indicator framework being developed by the Statistical Commission/UN Inter-agency task force is for global monitoring of the agenda. Indicators for national level monitoring will be developed by the national statistical authorities subsequently, taking into account their national circumstances and capacities.

Sixth, differentiation in the application of SDGs must be duly noted. The Introduction to the SDGs clearly notes that "Targets are defined as aspirational global targets, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances". Similarly, it should be borne in mind that not all targets are for monitoring of national level actions. Some targets are meant to monitor international actions. Finally, the most pressing issue when it comes to development of indicators and follow-up of the Post-2015 Development Agenda is 'Capacity deficit', which is most pronounced in the developing countries.

## Statement by Ambassador Asoke Kumar Mukerji, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations at the 1st Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda, New York on 19th January, 2015

### First, we must build on what we have and move forward.

The *foundation* for the Post-2015 Development Agenda was laid by the outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference, which contains the international consensus at the highest level on the entire gamut of sustainable development. The building blocks of the agenda have in turn been put in place by the outcomes of the Rio+20 follow-up processes. These must remain the basis on which we move forward.

As the Group of 77 has emphasized, we believe **it would be imprudent to re-open or re-negotiate the comprehensive and balanced package of the OWG**, either directly or indirectly. In our view, the SDGs have already been agreed upon by member states, through an open and transparent process in which all member states participated and which gave full opportunity for other stakeholders, not to mention the UN system, to enrich the discussion with their inputs.

We welcome the fact that the Secretary General has also fully endorsed the outcome of the Open Working Group Report on Sustainable Development Goals.

While the idea of re-packaging the SDGs along 6 pillars, as suggested in the Synthesis Report is an interesting one, we need to be cautious lest this should amount to yet again segmenting the integrated agenda of the SDGs with its inter-linkages and synergies into distinct silos.

This will undercut our ambition to holistically integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development.

#### Second, we must now embrace ambition and not revert back to business-as-usual.

The integrated and comprehensive agenda of the SDGs displays a remarkable level of ambition. Never before has the international community articulated an action-oriented agenda across such a wide spectrum. Will we now match this ambition of the substance of the agenda with equally ambitious template of action to achieve it? Will we create the conditions necessary to enhance international cooperation for development, or will we slip back into well-rehearsed policy shibboleths, particularly when it comes to means of implementation, finance, technology etc?

Third, we must keep our sights on the centrality of the political, economic, moral and ethical imperative of ending poverty. We must not lose sight of this overarching objective of this agenda. The needs and concerns of 1.3 billion men, women and children deprived of a life of dignity across the world must be our topmost priority.

To do this, we must aim at ensuring that development is sustainable across all three dimensions - economic, social and environmental.

**Fourth, the agenda must be built around universality of issues and differentiation in action**. In our view, there is no contradiction between the *principle* of differentiation and the *notion* of universality. Both complement each other and a balance of both is well captured in the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Universality demands an agenda which is equally relevant as well as applicable to *both* developing and developed countries. Unlike in the past, this time the developed countries will also be called into account for their specific actions and commitments.

At the same time, *universality* of the agenda does not translate into *uniformity* of its application. Given the amount of inequality and developmental diversity in the world, a universal agenda can and indeed must be a differentiated one.

**Fifth, the Post-2015 Development Agenda must adhere to the test of multilateralism**. We need to bear in mind that this is an agenda for international cooperation. It should therefore go beyond merely identifying global problems and providing policy prescriptions, and aim at genuine *collaboration* by pooling efforts of different countries and stakeholders in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities, to solve those problems.

Multilateralism also means that there must be shift from the MDG model of addressing the *symptoms* of lack of development, to a new model, which addresses the *drivers* of development and growth.

Statement by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, on Agenda Item 19: 'Sustainable Development' at the Second Committee of the 69thSession of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 2014

Energy poverty or the lack of universal access to energy is a critical impediment in developing countries, holding back the full potential of people and exacting a high social and health-related cost.. the key challenge for us therefore is to rapidly enhance access to affordable energy, to employ strategies that ensure that energy is used wisely and cost effectively, and that the proportion of sustainable and renewable energy is constantly increased.

In India, independent studies have revealed that as a result of several initiatives taken by the Government, an average of 791 million tons of oil equivalent energy was saved between year 2000 and 2011. This translates to an avoided electricity generation of about 10,836 MW, which, if produced from coal, would have burnt an additional 98 million tons of coal.

Statement by H.E. Ambassador Bhagwant S Bishnoi Deputy Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations At the General Debate of the Second Committee 69th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on October 8, 2014.

On SDGs, the report of the Open Working Group managed to produce a proposal which we believe commands a broad consensus of the international community.

The outcome emphasizes the role of robust and sustained economic growth, industrialization, infrastructure and full employment, gives balanced emphasis to the three dimensions of sustainable development, puts in place ambitious action to rationalize consumption patterns and to preserve the environment, and integrates means of implementation as an integral part of the goal set.

India has consistently maintained that the ambition of the development agenda must be matched by the ambition of the means of implementation for developing countries. What is needed is a holistic approach to finance in order to address issues such as falling Official Development Assistance flows, volatile capital flows, continued debt problems, trade-distorting agricultural subsidies by developed countries, non-tariff barriers, non-inclusive international norm-setting frameworks, loss

### of policy space, etc all of which serve to exacerbate the development challenges of developing countries.

Let me add that South-South Cooperation has also emerged as an important complement to traditional North-South aid. It is important that the new development framework allows South-South Cooperation to grow within its own space and in accordance with its own principles.

# Statement by Mr. Mayank Joshi, First Secretary, on the Agenda Items 13 (a) and 115: Report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF) at the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 2014

The Third Conference on Financing for Development, to which the report of the expert Committee is an input, must provide a holistic & balanced approach reflecting the needs, challenges and developmental priorities of the developing countries while considering ways to provide new and additional support to finance their sustainable development trajectories.

The report of the expert Committee contains broad recommendations. **Consequently there is a need to streamline these through international dialogue taking into account national circumstances and level of socio-economic development developing countries,** before making more detailed and concrete proposals for financing for development.

The report recognizes **poverty eradication as the overriding objective** of the post-2015 development agenda. This must remain the central focus of the FfD Conference too. The concerns of over 1.3 billion people living in poverty must be foremost in our endeavours

The report also **underscores the centrality of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in the context of financing sustainable development**. This is an important affirmation.As we have emphasized before, the notion of universality is not in contradiction to the principle of differentiation. In fact, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities encapsulates both these ideas.

The report acknowledges the dual challenges that developing countries face - of lack of investor enthusiasm for investments in sustainable development on the one hand and the limits of domestic public financing on account of competing demands on public resources on the other.

It therefore emphasizes the central importance of international support to developing countries to enable them to follow sustainable development pathways.

Unfortunately, the report of the expert Committee could not take into account the Sustainable Development Goals that were developed in parallel with its work.

The SDGs that have been agreed to, constitute, in the words of the Open Working Group, 'an integrated, indivisible set of global priorities for sustainable development'.

As such, the preparatory process for the FfD Conference should therefore not only aim to update the Monterrey and Doha frameworks but also the options proposed by the expert Committee, so as to achieve a cohesive and comprehensive financing strategy to finance the SDGs.

The concept of sustainable development can only be understood in terms of a balanced emphasis on all its 3 pillars i.e economic, social and environmental. Our work for financing development must also fully recognize this imperative and not over-stress climate finance, for which we have in any case a separate track of discussions.