

**Statement by Mr. Won Doyeon  
Director, Multilateral Development Cooperation and  
Humanitarian Assistance Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea  
Follow-up and Review Session, Intergovernmental Negotiations  
on the Post-2015 Development Agenda  
19 May 2015, New York**

---

Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitator, for giving me the floor.

Since our delegation already made a comprehensive intervention yesterday regarding many elements in the discussion paper, I would like to make a few additional comments today.

As stated yesterday, the Republic of Korea is of the view that the September outcome document should not be too prescriptive in laying out the follow-up and review mechanism. We should aim at agreeing on core principles and the basic elements of institutional design, leaving the details of the mechanism to be discussed after September. In this regard, our focus should be on answering the key questions that relate to these core principles and basic elements.

With this in mind, I would like to make a few points regarding some of the questions raised in the discussion paper.

First, regarding the principles of follow-up and review, we believe the principle of ‘accountability’ can be further highlighted as some delegations mentioned yesterday. The follow-up and review mechanism can have a real impact on the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda by ensuring universal accountability. Strong national accountability is fundamental, as it encourages government responsibility to citizens. At the same time, we should recognize the importance of shared responsibility reinforcing the accountability of all actors as pointed out in the UN Secretary General’s Synthesis Report.

Second, regarding the provision of incentives, we consider various incentives – such as access to best practices and policy advice, sharing experiences, and improved access to resources for implementation – useful. However, it should be noted that the removal of disincentives is just as important. In this regard, we wish to emphasize that the review should not be a “naming and shaming” exercise. A headmaster cold-calling on students is not the way to go.

As for the regional review, Korea fully supports utilizing existing regional mechanisms. However, we should also bear in mind that the situations facing various regions greatly differ from each other. Some regions have well-functioning existing mechanisms such as peer-learning processes, while others do not. An attempt to harmonize them would be a great challenge.

Therefore, rather than spending too much energy on achieving comparability, we should try to make best use of existing mechanisms. Korea suggests requesting regional organizations to make relevant proposals themselves, as alluded by the questions in the discussion paper.

Lastly, I wish to comment on how the global review should operate. Regarding the details of the architecture itself, we can always have further discussions after September. However, one important aspect we have to agree on at this stage is what we aim at with the global review. The global review should be more than just a backward-looking assessment on each country. Instead, it should be constructive and future-oriented. Participating countries should have the opportunity to engage in candid discussions, based on mutual trust, about challenges and solutions. This forward-looking, action-oriented approach is what is most needed in the global review process. In this vein, Korea supports the comment made by the distinguished delegation of the UK, who noted yesterday that the review process should include reviewing targets as well.

I will stop here. Thanks.