**Statement delivered on Focus Areas 15 and 16
by Amit Narang, Counsellor
Permanent Mission of India to the UN**

...

Focus Area 15

Means of Implementation and Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

Mr. Co-Chair,

At the outset, let me commend you for providing an elaborated and detailed focus area on means of implementation.

We are happy with the elaboration of this Focus Area under separate sections.

We continue to strongly believe that in addition to a standalone goal on Global Partnership, means of implementation also need to be integrated with each of the proposed goals.

We support the important statement made by Group of 77 on this issue, which I am sure you will take fully into consideration.

This section would require much more detailing and specificity in terms of targets. In the interest of brevity, we can support the various suggestions made by several delegations including Brazil, Indonesia, Argentina and others on this issue.

During the course of this session, we have shared our concrete proposals on means of implementation for individual focus areas. We will also be submitting our detailed suggestions on focus area 15. We hope these suggestions will be taken into account for further elaborating means of implementation as a standalone focus area as well as mainstreamed under other focus areas.

The reference to ODA needs to be redefined and made specific. We reiterate our proposal for ODA commitments to be met urgently by 2020 and for the commitment to be enhanced to 1% of GNI by 2030.

Similarly, on technology, we would need to summon our collective imagination and political will to craft something more meaningful than the current formulation under sub-area (e) which is passive and inert. We propose to add "Early operationalisation of the Technology Facilitation Mechanism" whose institutional arrangements are currently under discussion.

The one area of concern we have with Focus Area 15 is the separate treatment of Global Partnership.

Like it was emphasized by both G77 and CARICOM, we do not support the attempted division of Global Partnership from Means of Implementation.

This division gives the impression of an implied link with Global Partnership only with the engagement with the private sector. This is not acceptable.

The Global partnership for development is in fact the vehicle for means of implementation and not something extraneous to it.

Mr. Co-Chair,

We also do not favour divorcing discussions on means of implementation and postponing it to next year's FfD Conference as some have suggested in today's session. We believe this cannot be helpful in reaching an ambitious outcome of this process.

Focus Area 16

Peaceful and Inclusive Society, Rule of Law and Capable Institutions

Mr. Co-Chair,

I couldn't help notice throughout the day today that this set of issues continues to leave this Group a 'house divided'.

As we noted in our intervention in the last session, no one in this room disputes the important links between Peaceful and Inclusive Societies and Capable Institutions with development. Moreover and as a matter of fact, we find many of the target level issues included in this version of document under this Focus Area quite useful.

We are not convinced however, with the need to have a standalone goal on this focus area, let alone two, to address these issues.

We feel that the template of the goals that we are crafting is broad enough for many of these specific issues to be clustered under relevant Focus Areas.

It remains our view that this group can contribute meaningfully to the creation of Peaceful and Inclusive Societies by creating conditions for

rapid, sustained and inclusive economic growth and by putting the world on a more sustainable pathway.

Further, we continue to believe that our work in this Open Working Group is clearly framed by the mandate and the template of Rio+20 with equal focus on its three pillars – economic, social and environmental. We must not depart from this mandate.

We have been listening very carefully to those who support standalone goals on these areas. While their views are undoubtedly very important, the arguments advanced so far in favor of these proposed goals have not been that consistent.

This discourse started with issues of peacebuilding, security and armed conflict along with rule of law and good governance. It then deviated towards conflict situations and instability and has now further deviated towards crime, violence and discrimination at the national level. In our view, all these various baskets of issues are different and require distinct approaches.

An over-simplification of equating issues such as peace and international security on the one hand, conflict and armed conflict situations on the other hand and tackling crime and violence on yet another is just that – an over-simplification.

While initially issues in this focus area were raised in relation to concern with countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, we are not sure how the current formulation of targets in this focus area relate to the particular situations of such countries.

Insofar as the current composition of this focus area, we feel that some of the specific issues are useful.

However, there is merit, as many delegations have pointed out, in moving these specific issues under other focus areas, including under means of implementation.

We have the following proposals in this regard:

We propose that target 16(a) be deleted, not because issues of crime and violence are not important, but because such issues are outside of the mandate of the Rio template. Issues of exploitation of women and children under this target can be addressed under the proposed focus area 5.

16 (b) should be moved to the focus area of inequality. It is incongruous to place the important issues of empowering the poor and the vulnerable alongside crime and violence.

16 (c) can be usefully moved under focus area of means of implementation and its scope should be widened to include both national as well as international levels.

Promoting inclusive and participatory decision making is a laudable objective which we attach great importance too. But this objective is equally relevant for the international arena.

16 (d) should be moved to focus area 5. 16 (e) could be moved to focus area 8 and further refined.

Mr. Co-Chair,

The second part of this focus area on Capable Institutions contains several important targets which we can support, but not under a standalone goal.

In fact, most of these targets can be usefully integrated under the proposed goal on means of implementation.

Target (a), under this section, should be modified to specifically include both national and international levels.

Accountability and transparency are values applicable not just to national level but also the international level, which is the main remit of this agenda.

We are strong supporters of eliminating corruption and improving probity of public institutions and are committed to freedom of media, association and speech.

However, the targets addressing these issues, under the Means of Implementation goal, would need further refinement. The word "unnecessary" in target (f), for example, is subjective and subject to various interpretations.

We support the statement made by NAM on Rule of Law. As we have said before, Rule of Law should be equally applicable to the international level where deficits in this area are far more glaring.

Our attempt should be to address the democratic deficit of international institutions including here at the United Nations and international institutions of economic governance.

I thank you.

*****