

**Intervention delivered by Mr. Vincent Rigby, Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic Policy, Canada
Wednesday, 20 May**

I would like to join others in thanking the co-facilitators for sharing their preliminary impressions following the rich exchange we had over the last two days.

You raised many points that seem to enjoy general agreement, and this is very encouraging. You also posed a number of questions to further guide our thinking, and even challenged us with some provocative ideas. Canada would like to take this opportunity to briefly address some of them.

Allow me to begin by thanking you for tasking the Secretariat to prepare a mapping of existing mechanisms. We see this as a critical starting point for our work going forward. Knowing what mechanisms are out there will help us make informed decisions about how we can best take advantage of relevant bodies and processes. However, we think this exercise should be about more than just listing mechanisms; it should also include details about their respective strengths and weaknesses. And as we stated yesterday, the most important question is how these mechanisms relate to each other and whether they complement or overlap with one another. The answer, we believe, will bring us one step closer to real coherence, and only then will we be able to address another crucial question you raised yesterday, related to the possible discontinuation of some activities.

Turning now to the HLPF, we would like to reiterate two important principles that we think are critical as we flesh out institutional arrangements: pragmatism and flexibility. We need to ensure that the framework we develop can be accommodated by the instruments we already have at our disposal. The proposal to convene the HLPF twice a year is not something we heard mentioned over the course of our discussion, and we would not favor this approach. We should avoid creating a system that demands more than the eight days that we already have allocated to the HLPF. We need to focus on what we can do to use the time we have in the most efficient manner possible. In this regard, we agree with the need to consider whether there are tasks that can be delegated to other platforms, and believe the proposals to make best use of regional forums, and to have the thematic reviews take place within the governing bodies of the UN system, merit further consideration. Equally important, we need to create a system that is not so rigid that we are unable to make changes and adjustments down the road, as required. This is critical because we will not be able to anticipate every changing circumstance over the next 15 years.

On the issue of nomenclature, Canada is of the view that no matter what terminology is used in the title, the key issue for us is that follow-up and review mechanisms will only be effective if they are supported by key functions such as monitoring, evaluation, and oversight. That said, we found the suggestion by India to use the term ``review and follow-up`` worthy of consideration, as we believe it is in line with the common view that our mechanism should be action-oriented, evidence-based and focused on results.

Finally, from Canada's perspective, we do need to determine how much detail we wish to include in the outcome document of the Summit. Our focus should be on laying out the main principles, identifying key mechanisms, establishing important milestones, and agreeing on the venue for continuing the discussion on follow-up and review.