



Intergovernmental Negotiations Post-2015 Third Session / Goals, Targets, Indicators

Session on Targets

STATEMENT BY SWITZERLAND

New York, Thursday, March 26, 2015

Thank you Co-Facilitators,

Switzerland considers the OWG proposal of **goals and targets** the best possible outcome, balancing the interests of all member states. The goals and targets set our collective ambition and we therefore also consider that the reservations made last year do not constitute an intrinsic part of the OWG proposal.

We also share the position that the current negotiations on the Post-2015 Agenda should focus on the political declaration, the means of implementation – in conjunction with the FFD process – and a monitoring and accountability framework.

We have taken note of the proposal submitted to us early this week.

In our view, any proposed change must not touch the **substantial content** of the OWG proposal as doing so would endanger the political balance of the SDG-proposal. It is a significant challenge to distinguish the “political” from the “technical” aspects of the targets. In many cases, it may not be possible at all.

Any proposed changes should therefore exclusively focus on **increasing coherence and clarity** of the SDGs **for more effective implementation** of the goal framework, with a clear and limited mandate.

Changes proposed may not lower the **level of ambition** of the OWG targets, based on “technical” arguments of clarity or feasibility.



With this in mind, we would support possible changes to the OWG proposal, similarly to what was outlined by the co-facilitators yesterday, but **only under the following conditions:**

We would need to agree collectively on a **clear mandate and scope**.

The **scope** of the exercise should be limited to the two instances below:

- a) Where targets contain an “**x**” or “**y**” **value**, we welcome proposals to quantify these, based on the existing levels of ambition and agreements or commitments or the expert advice of the UN system. While we welcome close consultation with statisticians, we question whether they are really those best placed to determine what is achievable and set the level of our collective political ambition. The advice of thematic experts will be important here.
- b) Identifying targets which **contradict or fall below existing international agreements or commitments** (i.e. concerning ambition, scope, degree of participation...) and suggesting an amended wording only in order to raise the level of ambition. As was stressed by Mexico and others, the proposed changes to the targets in goal 15 appear to lower the ambition of agreed Aichi targets. We would therefore oppose the suggested change of the target date from 2020 to 2030.

Once the proposals have been made, Member States will then need to agree or disagree on the proposed modifications. Where they cannot agree, the **fallback option** would be the Open Working Group proposal. The changes proposed would therefore be a matter of “**take-it-or-leave-it**” and not re-open the substance for discussion.

In conclusion, Co-Facilitators, I would like to emphasize our full support for your ongoing guidance and leadership.

Thank you!