

This is tentative statement for interpretation and not necessarily exact statement as still under editing. Thank you.

My delegation would like to highlight just a few points, because we have already submitted detailed comments on the documents, which were circulated among Member States.

Form and function of APFSD

· As we are aware, discussions on follow-up and review and other matters of implementation of the 2030 Agenda including regional dimension, are ongoing in New York under the leadership of the President of the General Assembly, in accordance with GA Resolution 70/1. We need to see the outcome and then analyze what kind contributions the ESCAP could make.

· The follow-up and review at the regional level should avoid duplication and be streamlined with those of the global level, built upon existing mechanism, to ensure integrated and coherent follow-up and review processes. As the meeting on April 2 indicated, Member States will discuss this matter later.

· In this context, we have to ask ourselves what roles and functions are expected for ESCAP and if these can be addressed in the context of the existing conference structure of ESCAP, in order to avoid duplication and additional reporting burdens on Member States. We would like to have a clear understanding on what the Commission and Committees cannot deal with and what can be done otherwise under the APFSD.

· My delegation would find it very useful if such analysis would be provided by the secretariat in the context of subsequent discussions in the .

· We have a variety of options in a format and modalities - intergovernmental or not, independent or under the Commission session, annual or biannual and so on. These depend on what Member States deal with and discuss at a meeting.

· We welcome inputs from the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders. Japan has emphasized the importance of the global partnership to achieve SDGs, although governments take the main responsibility of its implementation. We have had active participation from stakeholders at Committee sessions indeed.

· We further reiterate that the follow-up and review process as well as other relevant activities of APFSD must be conducted within the existing mandates and resources.

· We may be able to have a tentative plan for the form and function of the APFSD in 2017 at this session, without prejudging beyond 2017 because of issues mentioned. After we receive inputs from the global discussions, including the follow-up and review process, we can discuss further on this agenda.

· One option for the meeting next year is to have it a two-day preparatory session to the 73rd Commission session as a senior officer level meeting. We welcome views of other delegations in this regard.

Road map

· At the 2nd session of APFSD, the forum decided that it would initiate the development of a regional road map for implementing the post-2015 development agenda, which would be defined in consultation with Member States at its third session in 2016. Member States have just started discussion on its nature, necessity, and role of the proposed road map.

· My delegation would like to point out that there is no mandate on regional road map arising from the GA resolution 70/1, as there is no reference on this. At the same time in light of APFSD decision

last year and discussion just initiated, we welcome discussions while emphasizing that Member States need to discuss on how we define the nature, purpose and added values of the regional road map. My delegation reiterates that such discussion can continue utilizing existing conference structure of the ESCAP including ACPR.

Also, the role of ESCAP needs to be discussed in this context. Last year the Commission adopted the resolution 71/1 "Restructuring the conference structure of the Commission to be fit for the evolving post-2015 development agenda" addressing priority issues for ESCAP. Discussion on priorities also has been conducted in the context of its discussion on the draft strategic framework 2018-19 that incorporates a support for Member States for the implementation of the Agenda as the core activity of ESCAP. Relevant activities and work of ESCAP must utilize already available resources, including additional resources provided by the resolution 71/1.

We can utilize existing mechanisms to support Member States. Taking an example of statistical development, we highlight that the SIAP has enormously assisted Member States in Asia and the Pacific, enhancing capability of statistics for more than 15,000 people since 1970. Japan has been a host country of SIAP with strong support for more than 20 years. We believe these efforts have built a firm foundation for data analysis as well as monitoring for SDGs and targets.

Chair's summary

We appreciate chair's efforts on April 2. We will keep working based on Chair's summary as we did this morning, without prejudging the outcome of further discussions later.

Process

It's unfortunate to say that the process of drafting the proposed road map has been inappropriate. The first preliminary consultation was carried out just three weeks ago, March 8. It was drastically revised after that, and redistributed later, and the latest version was sent to Member States on March 24 as well as the form and function. We emphasize that these demonstrated that Member States did not have adequate consultations and some of them left behind. The process of defining the content of the proposed road map also had problems, as mentioned before.

Member States provided comments on both documents but many of them were not reflected because of lack of time. We believe these processes created confusions while facilitating only limited inputs on the documents. If the preparation had been properly done, we could have more substantive discussions.

My delegation would like again to request more consultations among Member States after the meeting on these matters while receiving inputs from the global discussions. Then we can move forward.