

UK STATEMENT ON FOLLOW UP AND REVIEW

Let me start aligning with the statement on behalf of the European Union and its member states.

Co-facilitators. Post-2015 implementation must be supported by a robust, inclusive and effective monitoring, accountability and review framework that drives action, brings actors together to share successes and challenges, is based on clear evidence, covers our agenda in its entirety, and maintains the transparency and inclusiveness that we have benefited from up to now.

We broadly welcome the proposed text and especially the references to the involvement of civil society and other stakeholders, to data, to building on existing platforms, and to effective join-up between the national, regional and global levels.

Nevertheless, there are seven priorities that we believe need to be strengthened.

- **Accountability** - we would like to see accountability - to our citizens and also mutual accountability among the member states, included as a key principle.
- Second, we need a **clear and complete understanding of global progress**. The HLPF should be the setting at which we review progress and assess where more concerted action and cooperation is needed, based on an aggregated set of global indicators. We would welcome a stronger message on this. The development of a set of global indicators should remain a technical process led by the UN Statistical Commission.
- Third, we need a **single, coherent and integrated follow-up and review framework** that covers the means of implementation and our Addis commitments.
- Fourth, a **strong evidence base** is essential. We need to cooperate to build data capacity, use data better and make it more accessible, and disaggregate data to ensure we leave no one behind.
- Fifth, this principle of **leave no one behind** needs to be hardwired across the agenda, including explicit reference to the commitment that targets should be only be considered met if met by all relevant economic and social groups.
- Sixth, the framework must remain relevant. This will require, through the HLPF, the **review and, if appropriate, upgrading of targets** during the lifetime of the SDGs. The world will not stand still over the next 15 years, and nor should we.
- Finally, **participation** - of people, civil society and business - is required if we are to achieve our objectives. Participatory monitoring is a key principle at all levels of accountability, and should be highlighted.

Once again, we welcome the work of the co-facilitators on this important issue and look forward to the HLPF becoming an effective, efficient and action-oriented apex of existing processes.

To turn briefly to another question, we agree with those who have said that the Summit outcome should encourage the Secretary General to ensure that the UN system provides effective and efficient support for the implementation of the post-2015 agenda, and where necessary undertakes reforms to ensure that it is able to do so.

Finally, co-facilitators, I wasn't going to speak about CBDR, but as this was raised in detail yesterday I am obliged to respond, starting by supporting the response by Japan and all those that have emphasised the importance of universality as a fundamental principle.

Co-facilitators, it seems that sometimes the debates detract from how much we all actually agree. We all agree that we face shared challenges. We all agree that we will need to act nationally. That we need a stronger global partnership – with better and more effective international cooperation – to end poverty and achieve sustainable development.

Co-facilitators: isn't the whole point of the paradigm shift of the SDGs that we are all in it together? That we are all in it together, each country with its different circumstances striving to develop in a sustainable way?

Yet CBDR is by its nature a divisive concept. The fact that we spend so much time arguing about those four letters is proof enough that it divides rather than unites. Perhaps we all invest CBDR with meaning that it need not have. But the arguments set us back rather than move us forward. We need different words with which to express our shared resolve and different realities – as has proved possible in other multilateral forums.

Now co-facilitators, let me respond to a couple of points made in the room.

First - it has been argued that we have already accepted that CBDR applies to the post-2015 development agenda. Co-facilitators, as we have said consistently for the last two years, we do not accept that the principle of CBDR applies to the post-2015 development agenda.

The principle of CBDR was carefully negotiated in 1992 with specific reference to global environmental degradation. At no point did it apply to sustainable development more broadly or to poverty eradication. At no point have we accepted CBDR outside of the context of Rio principle 7.

Second - co-facilitators, we don't see how CBDR has practical application to this agenda.

Our draft declaration sets out that '*targets are defined as aspirational and global, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances*'

We agree. On the one hand, the goals and targets are relevant and applicable to all countries. On the other, action to deliver the goals will differ in different countries depending on our capacity, capability and level of sustainable development. For example, the UK will implement the SDGs at home and,

internationally, we will contribute to the global partnership, including through our commitment to deliver 0.7% of our GNI on ODA, which has been enshrined in UK law.

The principle of CBDR adds nothing to this understanding. It does not help us identify what contributions we will make, nor does it help us identify what action is required in different contexts. In our view, CBDR obscures rather than illuminates both the concept of universality and our commitment to collective action.

Co-facilitators, we have 11 days left. We have made great progress, but still have much to do to craft our declaration, incorporate the outcome of the Addis conference, and agree follow-up and review arrangements that will truly drive us forward. Let that effort, rather than an argument about the applicability or otherwise of CBDR, be the focus of our limited time.

Thank you