

**U.S. Statement, Means of Implementation, Follow-Up and Review  
Post-2015 Intergovernmental Negotiation Process  
Statement by Mr. Tony Pipa, lead negotiator  
January 21, 2015**

Thank you Mr. Co-Facilitator for the chance to address both Means of Implementation and Follow-Up and Review. As we have done in our previous statements, we will remain focused on practical recommendations for our coming sessions, building on the earlier themes we emphasized: 1) expertise, evidence, and action, 2) minimizing duplication of work, and 3) flexibility.

Regarding **Means of Implementation**, we add our voice to the many in the room recognizing the tremendous importance of this topic – as we have said previously, this agenda will stand or fall on the strength of our efforts on implementation.

The world, and the world economy, have changed dramatically in the last twenty years, and will continue to do so. This offers us an extraordinary opportunity to support the plans, leadership and ownership of countries as they implement these goals – to mobilize vastly greater resources for development from a combination of private and public, as well as domestic and international flows; to do much more to maximize the development impact of existing development flows and to unlock reserves of capital toward development purpose; to leverage the considerable resources, knowledge, and expertise of a host of new partners; to realize the catalytic and transformative potential of sustained investments in science, technology, and innovation; to promote the national and international economic conditions and policy enablers that enable broad-based economic growth; and to truly revitalize a global partnership around proven ingredients of successful implementation.

In our earlier statements, we have mentioned the legacy of the MDGs and Rio+20. We must now also recognize and build on the legacies of Monterrey and Doha – and their the forward-leaning, comprehensive, and multi-stakeholder approach to financing and implementing development. The rich and wide-ranging remit for those two conferences gives us considerable confidence in the role that the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis can play in our process here.

We therefore believe that MOI – both financial and non-financial – and the Global Partnership (Goal 17) should be addressed principally within the Addis process and incorporated within the post-2015 process. We have spoken already against the duplication of work, and support the continued thoughtful coordination and integration of our two processes.

In practical terms, we would therefore emphasize again the potential we see in using our April post-2015 session to surface cutting-edge knowledge, science, and practice from all corners of the globe and seek fresh thinking, smart ideas, and new insights about implementation overall. We highlight especially the recommendation we've made to hear directly from those who will be responsible for implementation. We would also welcome hearing from implementation scientists and development practitioners in a range of fields – people who have studied and experienced what works, what doesn't, and what tools are necessary to implement effective health programs,

food security programs, environment programs. As we said yesterday, there is a science to this, and we encourage using these sessions to surface that science.

Not least among the successes of the Open Working Group was the benefit of sustained engagement and active interaction between member states and experts. We learned from them and we learned from colleagues here, in this engagement with them.

We are pleased that our own calendar gives us both scope and opportunity to do it again as we move toward a final outcome. The experts you have invited here this week, Co-Facilitators, have helpfully started us down this path. Their insights have been enormously beneficial already, and we look forward to more such interaction.

If we do indeed address MOI and Goal 17 within the context of FFD, we see scope for closing it in that context – and then later inserting it as an MOI section of our outcome document - rather than renegotiating it here in our July session. To do this effectively, we must closely coordinate the nature of the outcome in advance. The Elements Paper from the FFD co-facilitators, which we have not seen yet, could be used as a starting point for discussion.

Turning now to **Follow-Up and Review**, we are pleased to have time to discuss this with you today and in the days to come. The conversations we have here, on this topic, will enable us to learn as we go, and to make this agenda ever more effective. We have not yet had time to consider proposals and ideas as a group, and we look forward to the conversations to come.

As a starting point, we outline a few principles we see to be central to our success in monitoring and review.

First and foremost, we hope to craft a follow up and review system that is open, innovative, and dynamic. We will need platforms that allow us to share data easily and openly, identify trends or issues that need more considered or higher-level attention, and support course-correction in real time and be updated as needed. Follow-up systems should focus on outcomes not inputs, be simple enough to be followed and maintained, and be data-driven, flexible, and oriented toward learning.

We should thus take into account the revolutionary advances in data and the latest thinking about flexible learning systems, and we should draw from our extensive experience with a wide variety of existing monitoring frameworks, as well as recent advances and specialized expertise in data architecture and analysis. There has been widespread attention to the need for a data revolution. For us, that means unlocking the development power of data from many sources, and we would support having dedicated sessions on the data revolution within MOI or follow-up and review so that we challenge our collective understanding as to what's possible.

We agree with those who have suggested that the backbone of an effective monitoring framework should be at the national level. Country reports and domestic reviews based on national implementation strategies and country-specific targets and indicators ensure national ownership, broad ownership and participation, and direct accountability of national authorities.

At the international level, the monitoring and review process should maintain a longer-term orientation, focused on comparable data, vigorous thematic analysis, identification of gaps and challenges in implementation, and knowledge sharing.

On institutional arrangements, notwithstanding some resolutions on related topics, we believe the question of institutional architecture remains wide open. It will be vital to think in innovative terms.

Practically, we would recommend sessions that surface a range of proposals, and allow us time to consider them – both on data and on institutional architecture. We recommend a considered analysis of available data, as well as of the experience of the MDGs. We look forward to further conversation.

**In closing,** I want to take a moment to reflect on our President’s remarks at last night’s State of the Union address. Speaking about our global engagement, he once again highlighted our commitment to fostering smart development and to ending extreme poverty. He also spoke eloquently in domestic terms about a fundamental element that we think underpins our entire agenda here, and I quote:

*“It’s now up to us to choose who we want to be over the next fifteen years, and for decades to come.*

*Will we accept an economy where only a few of us do spectacularly well? Or will we commit ourselves to an economy that generates rising incomes and chances for everyone who makes the effort?”*

That is the opportunity before us as we work toward agreement in September, and we look forward to being a strong partner on this journey. Thank you.