

## NATIONAL STATEMENT ON MAR

Distinguished co-facilitators, the UK aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union, and I would like to underline some points in my national capacity.

Co-facilitators, as you have underlined, we firmly believe that the success of the post-2015 agenda will rest on its implementation. And its implementation in turn will rest in a significant way on upholding a strong and effective approach to monitoring, accountability and review – grounded in national ownership. That is why we strongly align to the EU point, echoed by others, that an effective approach to MAR will be crucial to the success of the post 2015 agenda as a whole.

Our commitment to a robust MAR mechanism is not because we want to score countries' progress or point fingers. Rather, we must commit to a strong MAR framework to drive implementation and as a platform for engagement by all actors (governments first but also civil society and business) to transparently monitor progress, share lessons, continuously learn, and take real, credible and collective action where progress against the goals and targets is off track.

As others have said, we believe there should be one overarching MAR framework for the whole post-2015 agenda (including for the goals and targets on Means of Implementation pillar to be agreed at Addis). This in turn will bring together the “what” and the “how” of the post-2015 agenda, helping ensure we match assessment of progress on goals and targets with the means to achieve it.

Important institutional and process foundations for the MAR framework for the post-2015 agenda are already in place, particularly the establishment of the High Level Political Forum (HLPF), as others have pointed out. The annual meetings of the Forum, and especially the four-yearly meetings, will be critical to driving real action across the whole post 2015 agenda – a pinnacle of existing processes, if you like, where key decisions should be made to drive the post-2015 agenda forward. We will need to make effective use of existing structures to complement a “positive and proactive agenda” for the HLPF, while avoiding duplication with other processes. And we will need national and regional accountability mechanisms which feed into and support the HLPF. We welcome the work of the Group of 7 countries on the HLPF and see this as a helpful basis for further thinking.

Co-facilitators, I would like to focus on three specific issues that we see as particularly important for effective monitoring, accountability and review framework.

- Firstly, ensuring the framework gives life to the principle of “leave no one behind”. The principle of LNB, ensuring that no target is considered met unless achieved by all relevant economic and social groups, needs some hard wiring into the MAR framework. We think the most tangible way to do this is for all actors to aspire to full data disaggregation, ensuring that progress at all levels – national, regional and global – gives the fullest possible reflection to the progress made for and by these groups. We recognise that, just as with the MDGs, there will be data gaps and challenges at the outset. We need to build data capacity, capability, use and accessibility, thinking innovatively. We should stand ready to support national statistical offices, and the wider data community, to deliver.
- Second, we strongly agree with importance of global aggregation of progress against all goals and targets. It is only through global aggregation that we will get a clear picture of progress against all the SDGs, helping us see where progress is off track and what solutions are required. Global aggregation will critically depend on producing a common set of global indicators that are

of all goals and targets, whilst remaining limited in number, supporting integration of the framework and embedding inter-linkages. We welcome the work through the inter-agency experts group to develop this indicator set on a technical track, and against the timeline they have set out.

- Third, and finally, the MAR framework must help the post-2015 agenda to stay relevant each year until 2030. We don't want the post-2015 to lose its relevance because targets or global indicators become outdated or do not reflect the latest state of the art evidence or scientific findings. That is why we think it is necessary for the MAR framework to include a process for review of targets and indicators to ensure they remain relevant: 'future-proofing' if you like. For example, for those targets with an end date of 2020 we should ensure the MAR framework reviews and updates the appropriate measure of success for the following ten years. Or, for example, if scientists adjust their perspectives on appropriate targets and global ceilings on climate or environmental sustainability, we need to find a way for member states to re-examine and adjust our post-2015 ambition as necessary to reflect this.

Co-facilitators, I will conclude by saying that we agree with the Secretary General's advice that the new agenda requires a new type of accountability. It needs to be robust, inclusive, proactive, data driven and multi-layered. It must deliver a credible global call to action where necessary. And it must do justice to ambition of the post-2015 agenda we will commit to.

Thank you