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Co-facilitators,

Denmark wholeheartedly supports your efforts and leadership to bring forward our deliberations to a successful result by July 31. My delegation hopes that this meeting provides useful input to you and to all of us in this endeavor and for a zero draft.

I would at the outset like to align myself with the statements made by the EU yesterday and this morning and limit myself to some additional comments in my national capacity.

As indicated yesterday, the success of the post-2015 agenda depends ultimately on our actions beyond September 2015. This is therefore a welcome opportunity to deepen our considerations regarding the framework for monitoring, accountability and review - the MAR - for effective actions and transformative results. The universal nature of the whole post-2015 agenda, including the SDGs, will have implications for all governments and other major actors, including major corporations, and should spur significant policy change at national, regional and global level.

A solid, comprehensive, efficient and effective approach will be crucial in order to assess progress and ensure effective achievement of the goals of the post 2015 agenda.

For the global monitoring, accountability and review framework to be efficient, it will have to build on a robust and efficient framework at the national level. Therefore, a few words on this important interlinkage. For this to work, we believe, that we should agree on some common core principles that can help guide every country in developing the national monitoring, accountability and review process and periodic reporting. This could include some guiding principles as listed already by many delegations and it could also be in the form of a common or globally standardized template which our national reporting can build on.

The main operational commitment at the national level should be an honest and fact-based assessment of status based on the global indicators, identification of gaps, and identification of strategic priorities for reaching the goals in 2030. A common template, which is flexible in its structure allowing for national fine-tuning, would facilitate feedback into the regional and global levels. The national MAR should be easily understandable for citizens and policy makers.

The periodic national reporting will build on data collected at national level. Hence, we call for the use of global indicators across countries, well knowing that these will be supplemented by additional relevant regional and national indicators. The national
indicators should also be collected and developed in accordance with internationally agreed principles to ensure that the full spectrum of the SDGs are measured at all levels and in a transparent and accountable way. Data is of key importance in assessing our progress and results.

The regional level provides us with different opportunities for learning through our commonalities and learning despite our differences. Because some regions and countries within regions are very similar and therefore the advantages of having regional peer reviews and thematic reviews are more easily seen. In other regions the commonalities are not so obvious. Therefore, the regional level should also leave room for flexibility – for doing things differently among different regions. Furthermore the regional level gives us the opportunity to assess results on areas, where only a trans-boundary effort and efforts throughout the region will create results.

As for the regional UN commissions, Denmark finds that they could provide a useful mechanism for peer review and learning, exchange of best practices, as well as contributing to global monitoring and review. The regional commissions could also provide technical assistance and support the synthesis of national reports into regional trends and analysis. It will be crucial to build on existing frameworks and processes in the individual regions, not least existing mechanisms such as the African Peer Review and EU’s common reporting on the 2020 Strategy, among others.

With regard to the global level, we will, by March 2016, have a global indicator framework, which allows us to assess and review progress, initiatives and policy options globally and among countries. The latter has become quite contested and sometimes has led to a perception that it is about naming and shaming. In our view, that is not the point. Instead, it is a matter of addressing gaps or areas, where more effort is needed. But without this common understanding and identification of "being on or off track" we risk not reaching the goals or risk leaving some of the most vulnerable and marginalized people behind. The input from the global indicator framework and the national reporting will have to come together in a manageable way. The setting is provided through the High Level Political Forum.

The HLPF will play a key oversight role in monitoring the implementation of the post-2015 agenda including by making recommendations for further action at all the levels.

The HLPF should build its monitoring, accountability and review on fact-based knowledge and science. At the same time it should present findings in a way, which serves to stimulate political commitment and action and is accessible to citizens.
The HLPF should provide a forum for review at the global level with the aim of sharing of best practices and innovation. As our Heads of State and Governments decided in Rio three years ago, a review of global progress should be made every four years for discussion at the HLPF meetings at the level of Heads of State and Government to be held under the auspices of the General Assembly. This will give us the needed political leadership. The Global Sustainable Development Report as mentioned yesterday should form a key part of this endeavor.

The Global Report should draw on a wide range of existing evidence from credible sources. As outlined in the Rio+20 outcome document, the HLPF would, as one of its functions, "strengthen the science-policy interface through review of documentation bringing together dispersed information and assessments, including in the form of a global sustainable development report, building on existing assessments".

Lastly, and independently of the levels of the MAR framework, Denmark would like to encourage a further discussion on how to assess the contribution from non-state actors, in particular the private sector, investors and public-private partnerships to the implementation of the post-2015 agenda.

Such an assessment could be based on voluntary corporate sustainability reporting based on programmes such as the 10 year framework programme for sustainable consumption and production. And the UN Global Compact could present global assessments for discussion at global level at the HLPF. Likewise, other non-state actors, including NGOs, philanthropic organisations and foundations should be encouraged to present their contributions and assessments of progress.

Thank you.