

6th Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015 Development Agenda

Statement delivered by Mr. Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India
on Follow-up and Review

June 25, 2015

Thank you Mr. Co-Facilitator,

We agree with others that the outcome document must contain a short and visionary narrative for the review and follow-up of the agenda. They say that the best plan is usually the one that is implemented well, and review of progress in implementation and follow-up actions to address the shortcomings will be an important determinant of our collective success.

Our first reaction however is that this section is not adequately lean, but more than enough mean!

And judging by the comments we heard yesterday and earlier today, this sentiment seems to be shared by many in the room.

As several others have noted, correctly in our view, we need a framework on review and follow-up that is less detailed and prescriptive, elaborating broad principles and structures and leaving the details to be developed subsequently.

We continue to be uncomfortable with words like 'accountability' in the document and would respectfully suggest that they be deleted. Just as national governments have the primary responsibility for their own development, likewise they are also accountable to their own people.

Principles

We can broadly go along with the five principles you have elaborated.

The five principles however do not adequately address the 'why' of review and

follow-up. In our view, one of the main purposes of this exercise, in addition to addressing progress in implementation, is to enable sharing of knowledge, best practices and lessons learned. The delegation of Brazil had, in the last session framed this as ‘diffusion of innovative solutions’, which we think is a very constructive way of framing this.

It is also very important to clearly elaborate as a principle - and this has also been spoken to by many delegations - that review and follow-up should be underpinned by an recognition of different national realities, circumstances, developmental levels and priorities and therefore avoid a one-size-fits-all approach.

Another principle which is very important to recognize is that this is a global and aspirational agenda and that governments will have the policy flexibility to set their own national targets, which will be the object of review at the national level.

In principle 3, we did not fully understand the import of ‘an enabling environment’ for the participation of people and stakeholders. This could be streamlined and simply stated, by saying that the review process will be open and inclusive supported by the participation of all people and stakeholders.

National level

Paras 4 and 5 could and should emphasize that the national level reviews of progress will be ‘government led’ and complemented by contributions by all other stakeholders, as the para already states.

Regional level

We agree with others that there is a genuine risk of ignoring the diversity in regional models in the kind of mechanism that has been proposed. We would in particular strongly caution against the idea of ‘regional review’ as it would inevitably add yet another reporting layer for national governments and burden national administrations. Excessive reporting requirements and multiple layers of reviews would also divert precious resources, particularly in developing countries, from implementation to reporting.

We would suggest therefore that instead of requesting HLPF to establish ‘regional reviews’ of the agenda, we frame this level as a regional *dialogue* for sharing best

practices and enabling mutual learning, as was stated by the delegation of Canada in the last session. Regions and sub-regions must retain the necessary flexibility to devise processes best suited to their particularities. I should point out that resolution 67/290 speaks of regional meetings as a contribution to the work of the HLPF and not regional reviews.

Global level

We welcome the notion of thematic reviews to bring necessary focus to the specific goals and targets in a time-bound manner.

We are hopeful of an ambitious framework for review and follow-up for means of implementation including the FfD outcomes to become a part of this document.

We agree with the delegation of Brazil and others who pointed out that the Global Sustainable Development Report was conceptualized as a medium for science-policy interface, and not as a monitoring tool. Its proposed role in the zero draft seems erroneous therefore and reconsidered.

Likewise, the Inter-Agency and Expert Group under the Statistical Commission is expected only to prepare the set of indicators. Its mandate does not extend to preparing an annual report on SDGs. Statistical Commission in its decision 46/101 taken during the 46th session, gave the mandate for strategic leadership for SDG implementation process to a separate High Level Group which is in the process of being constituted.

In para 14, we support the notion of ensuring participation of stakeholders in line with resolution 67/290, but would prefer the word 'meaningful' to be deleted, as it is subjective and open to different interpretations.

In fact we would request that at this stage, that in so far as HLPF is concerned, we stick to the letter and spirit of resolution 67/290.

I thank you for your attention.
