UN General Assembly

Inter-Governmental Negotiations on the Outcome Document of the Post-2015 Development Agenda

New Zealand Statement

Delivered by Angela Hassan-Sharp,

Counsellor

28 July 2015

Check against delivery

Thank you Co-Facilitators.

We support others who have said that the case for including the Chapeau has not been made. The content of the Chapeau is already well covered in the final draft for adoption and we do not see the need to include it. Reservations made to the Open Working Group should also not be included for reasons already expressed.

Regarding technical revisions to the targets, we have consistently supported inclusion of the co-facilitator's proposed technical revisions in the final outcome document. No-one will commit wholly and sincerely to a plan of action that is incomplete and that is inconsistent with existing international agreements.

Heading towards our 31 July deadline, NZ proposes the following:

Firstly, we would accept, as revised, the 11 targets in Annex 1 in which Xs and Ys are specified. 'Blanks' in the agenda are not acceptable.

We can accept the remaining revisions to targets relating to consistency with international agreements, with the exception of the current formulation of target 17.2, which, as the Ambassador from Benin speaking on behalf of LDCs so clearly articulated, does not align with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

Regarding Target 14C, we still strongly prefer the proposed revision put forward by the co-facilitators. However, in the spirit of compromise, we would be prepared to accept the proposal that emerged following discussions with interested member States last week. Target 14C as currently stated would not be acceptable to New Zealand as this language did not enjoy consensus during OWG negotiations. The co-facilitators recognized this when they isolated this target in an annex in the previous draft.

Regarding the additional 5 proposed revisions to targets on LLDCs, we are willing to engage in a discussion to determine whether they can be resolved within the timeframe we are working to. We would note here that if we are looking to introduce language on LLDCS, we would at least like to see SIDS also referenced where appropriate.

Thank you.