



**Statement by H.E. Mr. Desra Percaya
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Indonesia
to the United Nations**

**at the Inter-governmental negotiation on the
Post-2015 Development Agenda
New York
22 July 2015**

“Goals and Targets”

Co-facilitators,
Distinguished delegates,

Allow me to first and foremost associate my statement with the statement made by the representative of South Africa at the morning session on behalf of the G77 and China. With regard to Chapter II “SDGs and targets”, there are two main issues that we would like to raise in our national capacity.

First, we are of the view that Chapter II should reflect the proposal of the OWG on SDGs in its **entirety**.

We are of the view that the Outcome of the OWG on SDGs, in which its process spanned over a period of two years, is the result of a comprehensive inter-governmental consultations and negotiation. It was characterized by transparency, inclusive participation and engagement of all the relevant stakeholders, which greatly enriched the debate and the process.

In light of this, my delegation believes that the Introduction of the Report of the OWG on SDGs, which is now still kept as an Annex in the revised draft, must be an inalienable and inseparable part of the SDGs. Resolution 68/309 adopts the proposal of the OWG on SDGs as the main basis for integrating the SDGs into the post-2015 development agenda. The proposal, articulated in the document 68/970, clearly reflects the Introduction, as the part and parcel of the SDGs proposal. Therefore, we are fervently of the view that there should not be any questions on the inseparability of the Introduction part with the SDGs. We therefore call for the **inclusion of the “Introduction of the SDGs” to Chapter II of the revised document**, preceding the SDGs.

Second, we note that your proposals for target revision are now being integrated in the Chapter II.

While we express our appreciation to your hard work and efforts in presenting the proposal for revision for the SDGs targets, we recall that in March and May sessions, we were introduced to the proposal for “tweaking’ and ‘proofing’ of the SDGs targets. We also recall that there were disagreements in the debate on what constituted “technical” or otherwise, and which targets needed further “retouch”.

Since the very beginning of this process, Indonesia has consistently echoed caution that tweaking and proofing might not only undermine the delicate balance and compromises achieved in the OWG Report, but it could also unravel the entire package that is encapsulated in the Report.

We would caution to not let the discussion fall into this direction; and therefore, Mr. Co-facilitators, we commend your leadership in this regard. Further serious discussion on this issue is needed.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

We share your view that we need to ensure that the targets have to be aligned with existing international agreements. Our observation is that on this ground, very little revision is actually needed. We are fully confident that further in-depth discussion on this issue could pave the way toward consensus.

However, we are also of the view that some of the proposals that are on the table right now are far from a mere technical revision or in coherence with existing international agreements. Rather, they are substantive in nature and those revisions have more of a political weight. My delegation finds those somehow problematic.

For instance, the proposals to remove the “Xs” in the targets by using proposed qualifiers such as “all”, “substantially increase” and “doubling” on the one hand, may be useful to be further considered. But on the other hand, they raise more questions on what the referenced baseline for those proposals is and whether we have adequate data and methodology to back them.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

Taking into account your proposal this morning, we share your view that we should conclude our work here and should not leave it to other forum. In light of the on-going work on determining global indicators that are currently underway under the auspices of the UN Statistical Commission until March 2016, we are confident that we can work out to define the Xs now and therefore provide better framework for the Commission to complete its work. In this regard, we are ready to engage in the substantive discussion related to those targets.

We realize nevertheless that without a clear baseline and availability of the data to support the formulation of a specific number/qualifier for targets, defining a consensus for Xs would be challenging, and we are concerned that this would not be merely a technical decision. This is where we expect your leadership in directing our further discussion on this matter.

As an example, the proposed revision for targets 1.5 (on the assistance on the humanitarian emergencies) and 8.7 (on modern slavery) could have substantive consequences both conceptually and politically at the national level/perspective. Such proposals need to be treated very carefully as they could result in unraveling the already delicate consensus that member states managed to forge in the OWG on SDGs process.

In this light, we further are of the view that the first follow up and review process of the post-2015 development agenda in 2019 could also focused on these revised goals and targets so that we can have a better picture of the extent to which we implement Post-2015 development agenda at the national, regional and global levels.

I thank you Mr. Co-facilitators.
