



**STATEMENT OF THE GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA
AT THE THIRD SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT
DURING ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT OUTCOME DOCUMENT OF THE
CONFERENCE: *INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION*
WEDNESDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2025**

Co-Facilitators,

On para 37, in the preamble we require a recognition that North-South cooperation remains the main channel of international development cooperation, the fact that the target for developed countries to provide 0.7% of GNI in ODA has not been met once since its formal approval, recognition of the trillions owed to developing countries in terms of unmet ODA commitments and concern about the shift of ODA towards humanitarian and crisis situations. We also require a recognition that International Development Cooperation plays a unique, indispensable and transformative role in financing development

2. The sub-section of paragraphs 38 need to be completely reformulated to make clear the differentiation between developing and developed countries. Hence, paragraph 38 (a) should call on developed countries to scale up and achieve their ODA commitments of 0.7%.

3. 38 (b) should be strengthened to call on developed countries yet to do so to set concrete and binding timeframes for achieving ODA targets

4. We regret that the G77 proposal for a multilateral process for defining the parameters and objectives of ODA has not been incorporated and request for its inclusion. We also propose a standalone commitment in the ODA section to provide and mobilise additional grant-based or highly concessional finance for sustainable development

5. We request the deletion of 38 (d) as the group believes ODA should not be utilised for humanitarian issues and we believe the commitment justifies double counting.

6. On the SSC section, we request for an inclusion of a chapeau paragraph reaffirming the principles of south south cooperation, as was done in Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

7. On the MDB section, we request that the language be made direct and implementable. Hence, throughout the sub-paragraphs, we request the replacement of the phrase 'work through the MDB executive boards' with direct commitments.

8. On the financing for climate, biodiversity and ecosystems section, the group reiterates its position that climate finance should be new and additional from ODA (as it is conceptually and legally different) and must not be double counted and this must be included in the chapeau. Para 39 and its subsections require rephrasing. In the chapeau, we must refer to the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement. Moreover, we reject the reference to 'our commitments on climate finance'. Climate finance is an obligation of developed countries and ODA should not be restricted to one purpose, as developing countries have other legitimate development priorities and needs.

9. We are concerned that the only action in sub-para a is encouraging developing countries to make contributions. A shifting of the burden on developing countries is not acceptable.

10. We are deeply concerned that the entire section contains no reference to 'provision' of finance when we know that this is a standard formulation under the UNFCCC

11. In sub-para c, we again see a rewriting of the Loss & Damage decisions. It must be developed countries which must urgently scale up their contributions to the Fund

12. The reference to ocean and mountain economies in sub-para D is unclear. Moreover, we do not believe this paragraph has to be limited to only some category of developing countries.

13. On sub-para e, we continue to have concerns about infringing on mandates of funds under the UNFCCC. We have significant concerns on the references to eligibility criteria, to consolidating climate and environment finance initiatives and the reference to donor countries.

14. We also propose a standalone action on advancing measures to ensure additionality of climate finance

15. We broadly support the provisions in the development effectiveness section and propose that in 40 (b), we may strengthen the language by changing invite to call on. We support reference to prioritising core contributions. We would also like to add a sixth element calling on development partners to channel a larger proportion of financing through recipient government budgets, either as general or sectoral budget support.

16. On the development cooperation architecture, we look favourably on the proposal for a strengthened Development Cooperation Forum. However, in 41 (b) we must refer to the norm setting and decision making role of the UN. We possess reservations on the proposal for the SG to convene expert technical discussions focused on coherent financing of development, climate and humanitarian needs and request its deletion,

17. Lastly, we do not support referencing non-inclusive foras, and hence request the deletion of the reference to TOSSD in 41 c (ii).