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**Statement:**
Grenada, on behalf of CARICOM:
Acknowledges the work of the IAEG-SDG and supports the annual refinements to indicators. CARICOM Countries appreciate the effort made by the working group in ensuring that indicator 17.3.1 include mostly flows that contribute to sustainable development of developing Countries and in this regard, does not create a huge financial burden on countries, especially SIDS, in terms of debt servicing. Given that we continuously warned against the mixing of official grants/concessional loans with non-concessional loans and regional public goods, as such combinations would cloud the real amount of resources that are available by developing and least developed countries as grants or at concessional terms, we are happy that complimentary indicators were developed. Hence, we are satisfied that flows of different nature and concessionalities can be distinguished allowing us to identify the actual resources that developing countries receive for development bearing in mind that non-concessional financing, international public goods, Private finance mobilized and private loans are not necessarily accessible by many developing countries. We are therefore satisfied that this indicator in the context of target 17.3 is now in keeping with the recommendations of the Addis Ababa Action Plan.

We are also pleased that the initial conceptual framework on South-South cooperation has been developed which would allow our countries to put measures in place to report in the future. We therefore look forward to this sub-indicator being reincluded to the list in 17.3.1 as a sub-indicator. In light of this and also being a part of the working group on development support, I support the adoption of the new indicator 17.3.1 and to agree to the dissolution of the Working Group as it has completed its mandate.

Given recommendation in paragraph 39 CARICOM countries are not in favour of the future consideration for international public goods for sustainable development to be part of the indicator 17.3.1. This would put our SIDS at great disadvantage when measuring support for development since the indicator would not take into account that some countries are not in a position or do not have the capacity to access these public goods and hence they would not be of any benefit to the country. Although it is available to all, we strongly believe that the indicator should focus more on what is of benefit to the countries in terms of sustainable development. Given that countries may not be able to avail themselves of these international public goods the characteristic of non-exclusivity of these goods no longer holds.. This indicator should not be included since it does not involve any transfer of resources to developing countries.

We would like to place on record our discontent with the fact that no movements were made to reinstate the indicator 8.9.2 for sustainable tourism under the target 8.9 and refining it to make it more relevant. It was one of the recommendations we put forward to this honourable forum on the re-inserting of this indicator which received resounding support from many countries. We cannot
begin to emphasize how important this indicator is for our SIDS given the great contribution of Tourism to our economies and to our sustainable development. It is indeed very sad that a decision was made at the IAEG-SGD level that is not in keeping with the spirit of the SDGs in leaving no one behind.

We clearly remember that the decision was adopted at the 51st UNSC meeting that the IAEG-SDG continue its research and methodological work to improve the global indicator framework, including addressing important policy issues, such as sustainable tourism and climate change. However in the year 2020 to 2021 no work was done in this regard. At the 52nd session last year the meeting encouraged the Group to continue to implement and refine indicators, and requested the Group to work with relevant custodian agencies to develop and test a methodology for indicators on sustainable tourism, in preparation for submission at the 2025 comprehensive review, as this indicator is of particular importance to the least developed countries, landlocked least developed countries and small island developing States. Again, no work began in 2021 to 2022 in this regard. There is no signs in the work programme of 2022 to 2023 that this work would begin. I want to therefore recommend that the review of indicator 8.9.2 should be explicitly stated as part of the work programme for 2022 to 2023 of this committee so that we do not lose sight of the decisions made by this commission and the voices of countries. With the indicator on sustainable Tourism still excluded, we cannot support the 2022 work programme for the IAEG-SDG.
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