

**Statement of Iceland for the discussion on Follow-up and Review of the
Post-2015 Development Agenda**

Tuesday 20 May 2015

Ms. Anna Pála Sverrisdóttir, Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Co-facilitators

First, I'd like to thank you for your useful inputs for our discussions this week.

An effective follow-up and review framework will be one of the keys to success, and judging from our discussions so far, there seem to be quite many things we agree on, although there are still some to sort out.

Co-facilitator,

Cost-effectiveness is a concept that should be added to the list of principles for the follow-up and review framework. We should avoid creating an inflated review industry by using existing mechanisms to the extent possible, and amend them and add to them only as necessary to bridge gaps and improve quality.

Iceland furthermore heavily emphasizes non-duplication of work, including on follow-up and review of the FfD and Post 2015 processes.

A successful implementation of the SDGs requires that we avoid silo approaches, including for thematic reviews. A cross-cutting issue to be kept in mind at all times, is gender equality. An example of existing mechanisms is the Commission on the Status of Women, which should contribute to the follow up and review of the entire post-2015 development agenda and feed its recommendations into all thematic reviews and the global review of the HLPF.

Co-facilitator,

We agree with others on the need to strengthen capacity of national statistical offices, especially in developing countries. The collection of data will need to be increased - but most importantly improved. There, we point to the importance of the collection of primary data from the field, i.e. from local authorities, health care centers, schools and so on. Allow me to express that we agree with what has been touched upon this morning, on a particular effort for LDCs and fragile states. Iceland also appreciates the wide recognition of the necessity of disaggregation of data so as to leave no one behind. Regarding indicators and your question on the relationship between the HLPF and the Statistical Commission, I reiterate what we've pointed out before; that the indicator work is for the experts first and foremost although flow of information and dialogue will be important.

Reporting burdens will need to be appropriate and not excessive; we also need

to ensure comparability of national reports, to ensure the universality of our agenda. From the point of view of a small state with limited capacity, annual national reviews might prove too burdensome.

To ensure accountability between state and citizen and a truly inclusive process, the national reviews will need to include the input of all stakeholders, as outlined in your discussion paper.