- We would like to thank the co-facilitators for the helpful summing up yesterday of the rich discussion over the last days.

- At this point, in response to your summary we would like to comment on three issues that seem particularly important to us.

- First, concerning the terminology, we consider all three elements, monitoring, accountability and review, to be essential. Each of these elements plays an important role for the implementation of the agenda. We heard many colleagues underline the importance of evidence-based review. It is indeed monitoring that provides the data and information on which to make an assessment of progress. Without monitoring progress and implementation, we will not know where we stand and whether there is a need to review. Accountability is crucial. It is not about finger-pointing but about taking ownership and responsibility and therefore ensuring follow up to the commitments we all have made. You, Mr. Co-Facilitator, have rightly noted the convergence on the importance of a review at national level which must be transparent and inclusive. Therefore, the concept of accountability of governments to their citizens is essential.

Moreover, monitoring, accountability and review must incorporate disaggregation of data by income, gender, age, and other factors – this will be essential to ensure that targets are met by all relevant groups and that no one is left behind.

Taken together, monitoring, also using disaggregated data and statistics, accountability and review will ensure that we leave no one behind.

- Second, we do agree that we must make best possible use of existing reporting, monitoring and verification mechanisms, including through provision of data and information, and that the HLPF should not operate in a vacuum. In this context, we look forward to the mapping of existing reporting mechanisms which will be very helpful input to our further work.
The governing bodies of UN agencies, and funds and programmes or multilateral agreements all have an important role to play in implementing the agenda and feeding into the work of the HLPF.

We also acknowledge that the HLPF will have a challenging task ahead. But we do not believe that fully delegating the responsibility for the thematic reviews for selected goals and targets to other bodies is a viable approach. We are concerned that this would perpetuate the fragmented approach that we try to move away from. Only the HLPF has the unique mandate to ensure that the review at global level fully captures the integrated and transformative nature of the agenda. It is also the best forum to bring together the voices from all the stakeholder groups representing the different components of the agenda.

Reflecting in more detail on the cooperation between the HLPF and other bodies could be usefully discussed at this year's HLPF session for which we look forward to seeing the agenda in the next few days.

- Finally, it is our firm belief, as stated previously, that there should be one overarching MAR framework for the whole post 2015 agenda, covering all goals and targets and the means of implementation pillar of the Agenda to be agreed at the Addis FfD conference. An additional mechanism for MoI sitting alongside the monitoring framework for post 2015 which will cover Goal 17 and all MoI targets would be duplicative and not efficient. For the MAR framework to be effective in promoting progress, both achievements and challenges in reaching the goals and targets need to be considered in an integrated manner together with all the means of implementation.