

Post-2015 Intergovernmental Negotiations
U.S. Statement on Follow-up and Review
Delivered by Mr. Tony Pipa,
U.S, Special Coordinator for the Post-2015 Development Agenda
June 24, 2015

Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitator.

First, let me just begin by underscoring the vital importance of this piece of Agenda—and why it matters so greatly that we reach the strongest possible outcome on follow up and review. Simply put, only through reaching the right balance for monitoring progress at the global, regional and national levels, will we know whether our efforts are adding up for our citizens and for the planet we inhabit.

Follow up and review enables us to track what works—and, just as importantly—to adjust and accelerate and redouble our efforts when we're falling short. Take child survival, where monitoring our progress against MDG4 indicated that we were not where we needed to be; this knowledge empowered us to take collective action and issue the 2012 Child Survival Call to Action, when the world came together to make a new pledge to end preventable deaths of children under 5 by 2035.

This understanding and commitment prompted new efforts by the US and host governments in 24 countries, with 500,000 children's lives saved in just two years. Six of those priority countries have now reached MDG4.

These course corrections were only possible due to the data and policy analysis provided by the follow up framework. It is often through such course corrections that the biggest progress can be made in achieving our goals.

We believe there has been convergence on many basic principles for a follow up and review framework: that is voluntary, country-led, multi-level, non-duplicative, transparent, inclusive, and based on evidence. We especially appreciate your focus on transparency and inclusivity in the zero draft – as we've said before, the inclusion of multiple external stakeholders is critical, and we must be able to leverage data from multiple sources to our benefit.

We think the framework needs to be flexible rather than overly prescriptive, focused on outcomes, accommodating to different governing structures and challenges, and collaborative with the many subnational public and private actors. We also agree that the ultimate objective of follow up and review is to support decision-makers, inform policy choices and mobilize partnerships for implementation – to take our lessons, identify gaps, and accelerate our efforts. We hope to build on and improve our experience with the MDGs regarding follow up and review, including by disaggregating data appropriately according to key demographic variables including sex, age, and disability status. We are grateful to see these principles reflected in the draft, and thank you for your efforts in this regard.

One area where we would like to see this section strengthened involves language on the need for stronger national capacities for program evaluation, which is essential in telling us if we are doing the right things, doing them correctly, and doing them in a way that is making a genuine difference in achieving the SDGs for each country. We would therefore suggest specific technical edits to principle (e) in paragraph 3, adding “evaluations” in appropriate areas of the text (and we will provide these in writing):

[“They will be rigorous and evidence-based, informed by *evaluations and* data which *are* timely, reliable and disaggregated by *characteristics relevant in national contexts such as* income, *sex*, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics. Support for developing countries, particularly LDCs, to strengthen national *statistical and evaluation* systems is critical.”]

We appreciate your language on the HLPF as the “apex” of a global network of review processes, which needs to work coherently with existing entities. We agree with others that this system will rely on the ability of the many individual pieces to interact in a coordinated way, both among national, regional and global reviews, as well as within the various elements of the UN system.

We continue to have productive discussions with partners on creative ways to improve the effectiveness of and coordination among the existing technical and specialized follow-up actions that will be conducted by member states and regional bodies, as well as by the subsidiary bodies, functional commissions, and segments of ECOSOC, in order to better support the HLPF. We call on the Secretariat to think constructively about this as well, as requested in paragraph 16, including by factoring in the input and best practices of other organizations in this area. We agree with your approach that the outcome document does not need to be too prescriptive in this area, but more work needs to be done in this area once the agenda is adopted and we may want to give clearer guidance to the Secretariat in this regard.

The other aspect that is essential for the HLPF is the Global Sustainable Development Report. We strongly believe it must have the required technical rigor as well as the analytic quality to allow the HLPF to succeed. Paragraph 12 defers decisions on the scope and methodology of the GSDR, and it would be good to hear views on when and where you envisage that that discussion will take place. DESA has already published a GSDR for 2015. We believe Member States should fully discuss the substance, process, and leadership of developing the GSDR and look forward to a comprehensive debate on the best way to ensure that it meets the needs of member states in supporting the HLPF.

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 and a list of global indicators for consideration by the Statistical Commission in March 2016. The work of the IAEG should continue to 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 relevant stakeholders. We believe that the SDG Progress Report referred to in paragraph 12 is a

continuation of the reporting that was done under the MDGs, and would be completed by the Statistical Commission rather than the IAEG. Our experience with the MDGs showed that the appropriate frequency of reporting on individual indicators varied, and thus while regular reporting is crucial, we may want to maintain some flexibility for the Statistical Commission on the optimal reporting period.

We also thank the facilitators for the graphics on “Illustrative Follow-up and Review Framework” but are skeptical that they add value in a final outcome document and would support their removal. While they are helpful in visualizing the follow up and review framework and could perhaps be useful in awareness raising efforts, including them in the outcome document would unnecessarily complicate the negotiations.

Before I end, Mr. Co-Facilitator, I want to provide a few reflections on CBDR, given the remarks made yesterday by the co-facilitators about further input on this issue. As we mentioned in our opening statement, we believe strongly that our new global partnership, like our new agenda, must reflect the economic and global realities of today – and how they are likely to evolve over the next 15 years. CBDR, as others have pointed out, relies upon a historical conceit steeped in the North/South divide, one that no longer accurately reflects the global reality of today and that from our perspective does not apply to a development agenda that is universally applied. We hear a great deal of consensus that the hallmark of a universal agenda, and of successful development, is that effort and implementation should be tailored to national and local contexts to maximize national relevance and to evolve as conditions change. We look to working with other delegations to define and articulate a concept of shared responsibility that matches this progressive and forward-looking nature of our agenda.

We would like once again like to thank you for the draft chapter on follow up and review in nicely capturing the common elements of the previous discussions, and we look forward to continuing dialogue on this topic.

Thank you.