

**Statement of the United States of America
Post-2015 Session on Follow-up and Review
May 20, 2015**

**as delivered by
Mr. Doug Carey, Advisor, U.S. Mission to the United Nations**

Thank you, Mr. Facilitator. I join others in thanking you for the discussion of the last few days and for yesterday's summary.

We agree with many of the statements made this week and believe there is convergence on many basic principles for monitoring and review processes that are voluntary, country-led, multi-level, non-duplicative, transparent, inclusive, based on evidence and focused on outcomes.

We also agree that the ultimate objective of monitoring and evaluation is to support decision-makers, inform policy choices and mobilize implementation and partnerships ("review and follow-up," as India noted). The monitoring and reporting process is a tool to achieve that objective. Therefore we need to emphasize flexible processes that lead to and facilitate political dialogue, action and cooperation.

There are a few other issues that were raised yesterday that we would like to address.

First, on the **coherence of follow-up to Financing for Development and Post-2015**. The Addis outcome document will play an important role in driving the Post-2015 agenda. For this reason, we have supported a single framework for reviewing the Post-2015 agenda that includes the relevant and related issues from FfD. However, at this stage, it is difficult to talk in greater detail beyond these general principles until we see what's agreed in Addis and how the two agreements come together.

Second, on the **work of the HLPF**. As we said Monday, the HLPF should be a forum for real political dialogue and cooperation, not a source of additional and unnecessary bureaucracy or expanded meeting sessions. The purpose of the HLPF is not to conduct technical analysis, review in detail individual country performance, or to issue reports – that kind of technical and specialized follow-up should be handled by member states, regional bodies and the subsidiary bodies, functional commissions, and segments of ECOSOC. The HLPF is also not the appropriate forum for negotiating multiple decisions. Rather, the HLPF should involve a high level discussion on the key questions and issues that have been identified in advance, and should have a single declaration to capture the political will expressed in that discussion. An expansion of its dialogue would dilute the high level focus of its mandate. And a separate secretariat from ECOSOC would be counterproductive to the achieving an integrated, system-wide review process. In short, as we said Monday, we do not support changing the HLPF's modalities, but rather think the focus needs to be on improving the effectiveness and coordination of the tools we have, and in that regard we thank Mexico for their detailed comments today.

Finally, a word on **indicators**. We strongly support the ongoing work of the Statistical Commission and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs to develop an indicator framework. The work of the IAEG should be undertaken in an open and inclusive manner that is driven by technical expertise, and that benefits from the involvement and contributions of a variety of stakeholders. The development of an appropriate indicator framework will take time. We agree with the G77 that this should remain a technical process, led by the Statistical Commission, and any specification or political discussion of indicators at this stage would be premature. There's no need to establish any formal relation of the HLPF with the UN Statistical Commission or the Working Group as the latter already has a workplan to address matters that are inherently technical, not political.

Thank you.