

Intervention

Delegation of the Republic of Indonesia at the sixth intergovernmental negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda “Follow up and review”

June 25, 2015

Mr. Co-facilitators,

I would like to associate my statement with the statement delivered yesterday afternoon by the representative of South Africa on behalf the Group of 77 and China.

First of all we felt that the cluster on follow up and review has not adequately captured the takeaways from the discussions and issues raised during our meeting on follow up and review last month. We are concerned that the proposed mechanism on the follow up and review as laid out in the zero draft felt overtly prescriptive.

We share the notion in **paragraph 2** that the outcomes of the national level review process will be significant to inform the regional and global processes. However, we are of the view that the robustness of the review process in national level, which take into account among others policies and measures as well as specific circumstances, conditions and challenges at national level, are crucial and need to be further reflected in the zero draft.

We also share the view that currently, the immediate priority for governments at national level is to address **the transition from MDGs to SDGs into its national and sub-national policy framework**.

We are of the view that the zero draft should focus in ensuring adequate support and capacity for governments to conduct this transition in a smooth and integrated manner. Ensuring “national ownership” of the post-2015 development agenda is imperative; therefore an overtly prescriptive notion in paragraph 4 and 5 will not serve to purpose.

At the regional level, we would like to reiterate that regions have their own specific characteristics, conditions and challenges, therefore there should not be a one-size fit all approach in the context of follow up and review at the regional level. We view that **strengthening UN regional commissions**, including ensuring its capacity and responsiveness in supporting member states as well as identifying gaps/challenges at

the regional and sub-regional levels are imperative. Follow up and review at regional level should be oriented to promote exchange of experiences in the implementation of the SDGs as well as strengthening participation from relevant stakeholders at regional level.

At the **global level**, we support the reiteration on the role of HLPF as the apex of a global network for follow up and review process in **paragraph 8**. We further support the view reflected in **paragraph 9** that follow up and review as the mechanism to exchange views and experiences, in assessing progress, achievements as well as challenges among member states.

However, our expectation is that the zero draft could flesh out **an inclusive global strategy for follow up and review of the post-2015 development agenda**, to be agreed by our HoS/HoG in September, and not be overtly prescriptive - focusing on specific modalities of follow up and review by HLPF, which actually can be further addressed at a later stage.

We also noted that there are several inconsistencies and reinterpretation with regard to the purpose and existing mandates of certain processes, for instance the reference to the Global Sustainable Development Report, as well as the role and mandate of the UN Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDGs Indicators in paragraph 12.

On **paragraph 16**, we are of the view that UN resolution 67/290 provides adequate guidance on arrangement for the state-led review at the HLPF. We are not in favor of reinterpreting or renegotiating a mandate or modalities that has been previously agreed and adopted, and therefore we do not see the necessity for a recommendation on organizational arrangement, which could overlap and be inconsistent with the existing mandate.

Before concluding, Mr. Co-chair, we observed that during the last few days, there were several specific interventions focusing on CBDR. We felt compelled to add a voice in this regard. We are of the view that the arguments, which claimed that the CBDR principle is no longer up-to-date because of geopolitical and economic change, are misleading. As an initial point, we are of the view that completely discarding CBDR would do nothing to change the evident socio-economic disparities between developed and developing countries. Massive income inequalities and massive gaps in the consumption and production still exist, and have even worsened to some extent in recent years.

We would like to reiterate the view that **universality does not constitute uniformity**. CBDR is the internationally agreed principle reiterated in numerous

international outcomes agreed upon by all member states at the highest political levels. We fervently believe that **the principle of CDR** continue to apply and have **a central importance** as the basis of the future development agenda.

I thank you Mr. Co-Facilitator.