

Multidimensional Vulnerability Index for SIDS

Informal Consultations

10 May 2023

Thank you, Excellency.

Let me start by expressing my gratitude to the co-chairs and members of the high-level panel for their efforts.

Ethiopia fully endorses the statements delivered by the PR of Nepal and by the PR of Mongolia on behalf of the LDCs and LLDCs, respectively.

Ethiopia is still examining the index with interest. Ethiopia is both an LDC and LLDC and it is particularly relevant for us to see how this process got here and how the panel intends to take this forward.

I do not intend to go into the technicalities of the report in my intervention today. However, I would like to kindly note the need to have clarity on the issues that have been raised since the first consultation. This is important because the exercise itself is being done for the first time. Additionally, our expectations, as expressed by various delegations, has been that the exercise was to develop an MVI for SIDS. The distinguished panel can also note that these are questions that are being asked by our political capitals to which we cannot provide answers unless the panel itself provides convincing explanations. It is important to address all concerns as long as the member states are expected to take this process forward.

At this stage, I cannot definitively speak if the values assigned to Ethiopia are true reflections of its vulnerabilities. I raised some questions during the last consultation on the importance of including some indicators such as GNI PC and manufacturing. The answers we are given take us back to the operative definitions that the panel used.

It is, however, important to note the importance of considering all aspects that add to vulnerabilities of member states. For instance, on the issue of manufacturing, we understand that the panel believes manufacturing is not related to vulnerability. This squarely goes against the reality that any LDC faces. To state an obvious fact, LDCs are LDCs because they are least resilient primarily because of low productive capacities. This is what the Productive Capacities Index of UNCTAD reveals. This is not an academic exercise. And if we want it to be a universally acceptable policy tool, it has to be a reflection of reality. And our reality cannot go away just because we decided to omit it from our working definitions.

Finally, I would like to reiterate the points raised in the interventions made on behalf of the LDCs and LLDCs on the issue of the representation of the voices of all member states as well as the importance of the resolutions that mandated this process. We wonder if the draft MVI would have looked different if there was an LDC or LLDC voice. To be very clear, the work of the panel should be based on the resolutions of the General Assembly, not reports of the Secretary-General as reports are not basis for mandated actions.

Thank you.