

Directing funding toward the achievement of SDGs

I am delivering this statement on behalf of the following member states, France, Netherlands, Sweden, Australia, Italy, Netherlands, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Canada, Belgium and my own country, the United Kingdom. We accept the decision of the Bureau to continue work on the decision on the structured funding dialogue. The bureau is of the view that this is not a substantive decision, however, we believe that a threat to the mandate of UNFPA is the very essence of a substantive decision.

We as Members and Observers of the Board note with regret that this discussion has been unnecessarily politicized. We are unequivocal in our position on clearly maintaining UNFPA's mandate of protecting and progressing sexual and reproductive health and rights. Forcing us back to 1994 is a direct encroachment on the advancement of SRHR and human rights and the progress made on the agenda since. This is especially unacceptable during the 25th anniversary of the Cairo Declaration and the ICPD Programme of Action, and the 50th anniversary of the creation of UNFPA.

Let us be clear. The issues that have been raised go well beyond the scope of the structured funding dialogue which aims to effectively allocate donor funding where it is most needed to achieve the three transformative goals of the UNFPA strategic plan and are fundamental to the achievement of the SDGs.

We note that this text was placed under silence procedure and member states supporting this statement did not receive notification that the silence procedure had been broken. We appreciate that the members of the bureau have made their decision to recommend a deferral with due consideration, however, we are unable to support this approach.

The decision text presented by the facilitator contains one minor adjustment to previously agreed language, namely the Structured Funding Dialogue decisions from 2016, 2017 and 2018.

We stand fully behind UNFPA's mandate. We would appreciate clarification in the future how these decisions are arrived at both in the Bureau and the Board. We would also like to ask a clarification question-can members of the Executive Board table a decision for consideration at the time decisions are being adopted?