I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

The Candidate Countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, Montenegro*, Iceland* and Serbia*, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Ukraine and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

On behalf of the European Union and its Member States, let me reiterate the high value we place on this process and the appreciation of your work towards fulfilling the mandate contained in GA resolution 68/204. We welcome the possibility of taking the discussion further into the purpose and role of the conference in the context of the UN development agenda beyond 2015.

Distinguished co-facilitators,

We appreciate and welcome the attempt in the background paper to summarise the arguments and focus the discussion, and understand that this is a discussion-starter which does not aim to be comprehensive in covering all arguments and elements of the discussion. With this in mind we would like to highlight three key elements, linked to the very relevant questions put forward in the paper;

First, as stated in the first informal meeting, we firmly believe that the conference should build on Monterrey and Doha, aiming to present a comprehensive financing for development approach to achieving international goals, including supporting the UN development agenda beyond 2015. For this, it is important that the Conference takes into account the outcome of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF) and also the synthesis report of the Secretary

---

* The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

* Iceland continues to be a member of EFTA and the European Economic Area.
General due in the autumn this year. Notably, the ICESDF discussions are using a more easily understandable way of structuring the categories of finance (for example avoiding the putting public and private finance together in one category – as is the case in the Monterrey Consensus with Domestic resources), while at the same time retaining the comprehensive approach of the Financing for Development process. In other words, we believe that the scope should cover the substance of Monterrey and Doha, while being able to reflect the evolving global landscape and the upcoming reports that should input to the preparations of the conference.

To keep the comprehensive and system wide approach of Monterrey the Conference should result in a framework that takes into account the implementation of relevant international agreements in addition to the post-2015 agenda, notably climate and biodiversity related agreements. Only in this way can it provide a single, comprehensive, holistic and forward looking approach to sustainable development, that is useful in supporting progress in each country, and which has been agreed in resolution 68/204.

Second, we reaffirm the importance we attach to means of implementation and a new global partnership for the success of the post 2015 framework, and acknowledge that regardless of the chosen date for this conference, there needs to be an opportunity to discuss financing, means of implementation and related issues comprehensively. We also acknowledge the importance of other international negotiations referred to earlier, such as those relating to climate finance, which will conclude in late 2015 and the need to consider how these will relate to our discussions on sustainable development financing. However, the Conference should not become a parallel negotiation on what countries will commit to in the context of the post-2015 agenda or other international processes. In this regard, we welcome the co-facilitators aim to focus on setting a universal framework for action. In our view such a comprehensive strategy, which ensures coherence and consistency, would have much added value.

Third, mutual accountability is at the centre of the international agenda, and the Financing for Development process should contribute to the accountability mechanisms of the post-2015 agenda and other relevant processes, to create a stronger link between progress, the allocation and effective use of resources and implementation tools. This would allow better assessment and support of actions that bring results at the country level and address greatest need.

Distinguished co-facilitators,

In conclusion, we look forward to a constructive and open dialogue with all stakeholders on how best to take forward the discussion on financing for development, and to support the UN development agenda beyond 2015. Ahead of the third international conference on financing for development we will continue to further define and adapt, as necessary, our position on financing and other means of implementation.

Thank you.