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Thank you, Mr Co-Facilitator.

I want to elaborate on a point raised by my civil society colleague this morning regarding the need to maintain the structure of the Monterrey and Doha Outcomes. I want to discuss three reasons why we believe this is of crucial importance.

First, it is true that years have passed since Monterrey and new events and new conferences have taken place, that need to be taken into account in the Addis Ababa conference. We had the Rio + 20 Conference, and the World Conference on the Economic and Financial Crisis. Moreover, we had a global financial crisis, the lessons of which need to be part of deliberations towards Addis Ababa. I would even mention, very dear to us as civil society, some decisions emanating from the Human Rights Council regarding taxation and human rights – for instance, highlighting the relationship between progressive taxation and gender equality --, sovereign debt restructuring and human rights, Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, and so on, that we believe should be considered.

None of these call for, or require, departures from the structure of Monterrey and Doha Outcomes. Moreover, we know of no new source of finance that has miraculously appeared in the last 12 years that cannot fit perfectly in the very complete framework developed at Monterrey.

Second, we need to remember that the structure of Monterrey was the product of a very delicate balance achieved among the views of very diverse stakeholders about the weight that different sources of finance need to have in financing development. We do not think that this moment, when we are trying to build trust towards an ambitious outcome in the post-2015 agenda, is the right one to risk upsetting that delicate balance by departing from the structure of Monterrey. For instance, if we have more pillars on the agenda then Systemic Issues becomes not one-sixth of the agenda, but maybe one-tenth, or one-eleventh, that does upset the balance, with unpredictable consequences.

And, finally, I want to address the issue of coherence with the post-2015 agenda. Mr Co-facilitator, you already reminded us this morning of the need for an ambitious outcome for the post-2015 agenda to go hand in hand with an ambitious outcome to the Third FfD Conference. So I don’t need to remind everybody of that. It is something we support. The processes need to be coherent. FFD should support and have synergy with the SDGs.

But this is only one of the functions of the FFD Conference. Let us not forget that FFD is a process with a life of its own, one that started before the international community even began
discussing international development goals. It was meant primarily to provide a platform at the UN for coordination across all sources of finance in a holistic and comprehensive way, and with all relevant development actors. So while it supported MDGs, and should support the SDGs, it transcends both sets of goals.

At the same time, we should be clear that the Means of Implementation for the post-2015 agenda include financial and non-financial means of implementation. The FFD process is precisely about financing for development policies. Trade, for instance, when addressed in the Monterrey context, is not trade per se. It is trade as a means of financing development. FFD can and should cover financial means of implementation but, in our view, non-financial means of implementation have no role whatsoever to play in a financing conference like this one. In fact, bringing onto the agenda non-financing issues has the effect of reducing the space for addressing the financial ones. This is a space already quite reduced in the United Nations, and we hope we will not, as a legacy of the Addis Ababa conference, see such space being reduced even further. But this could certainly happen if the agenda is overloaded with non-financial issues.

Thank you.