

Intergovernmental Negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda  
Follow-up and review: National, regional and global levels  
19 May 2015

Statement by Mr. Takeshi Osuga, Ambassador,  
Deputy Director-General for International Cooperation and Global Issues

Today, I would like to share Japan's view on the follow-up and review (FUR) modalities at the national, regional and global levels.

1. National level

National implementation of the post-2015 development agenda is at the core of the overall FUR mechanism. From the human security perspective, the implementation and its FUR should have strong focus on the community level. National governments will have the primary responsibility to ensure that the targets are implemented in the communities and they will be encouraged to share internationally the good practices and lessons learned on the ground.

There are a variety of existing mechanisms for the domestic FUR, starting from parliaments, and the concrete modalities should be left to countries. Those that have established the monitoring and review mechanism for MDGs, could build on that.

Timeframe of developing national implementation strategies as well as the timelines for the review should also be flexible, in respect of different national circumstances and existing frameworks. Broad multi-stakeholder involvement is strongly encouraged, but the concrete modalities should be left to countries to decide.

2. Regional level

The merits and the added value of FUR at the regional level is to compare best practices and lessons learned among the countries sharing similar situations. Reviewing the implementation of the targets that necessitate trans-boundary efforts, such as the connectivity of infrastructure or combatting infectious diseases, could also be dealt with in the regional and sub-regional format.

There are regions where commonality among its constituents are strong and where regional integrity is more developed than others. Regional FUR should build on each region's ownership and the modalities should reflect the different regional circumstances.

UN regional commissions could play an important role, but in some regions, non-UN regional organizations are also playing very important roles. Unlike our African colleagues, we have not heard much from the 10 members of ASEAN about the relevant ASEAN processes. The level of maturity of policy discussions and coordination under the sector-wise frameworks engaging 10 countries of ASEAN is remarkably high. Japan, China and the Republic of Korea join in these discussions in the ASEAN+3 Cooperation format.

It would be a challenge for the UN system to capture all these existing regional and sub-regional non-UN frameworks that are conducting a very effective work in areas related to SDGs. Strengthening the mandate of the UN regional commissions doesn't seem to be the way forward. FUR framework could only be effective if it incentivizes and promotes the voluntary sharing of efforts already taking place in these non-UN regional and sub-regional entities without imposing excessive burdens on them.

It would be useful, as pointed out in the discussion paper, to start with conducting the mapping exercise of existing reporting mechanisms, not limited to the UN system, at the regional level.

### 3. Global level

The main objective of FUR at the global level is promote the achievement of the overall post-2015 development agenda, in all regions and sectors, by sharing best practices, identifying obstacles and to discuss the way forward.

The structure at the global level should have HLPF at the center, supported by the widest possible network of existing review mechanisms. There exists a number of global frameworks outside of New York such as WTO for trade, OECD/DAC for ODA and GPEDC for multi-stakeholder efforts. In New York as well, we have GA, ECOSOC and their subsidiary forums and frameworks. HLPF should effectively build on the network of all these existing frameworks.

During the eight-day HLPF, it will be useful to listen to the results of country- and regional-level review. Reporting from countries should be voluntary and shouldn't impose excessive burden on them but rather incentivize them to report. Thematic discussion based on the experiences at the country- and regional-levels could also be useful. It would be important to ensure the multi-stakeholder engagement in the HLPF process as well.

Thank you very much.