

**Post-2015 Development Agenda  
Intergovernmental negotiations - VI Session**

**Intervention of Brazil  
General Comments and Political Declaration  
June 22nd, 2015**

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of G77 and China. We wish to add the following remarks in our national capacity.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

Three years ago, today, June 22nd 2012, we concluded the Rio+20 Conference. Since then, we have come a long way and now we find ourselves in the final stretch of our work. We are confident that under your able leadership we will indeed devise the transformative and universal agenda we need for the future we want.

We would like to thank you for circulating the zero draft well in advance for adequate analysis and consultation with our capitals.

We consider that the proposed text is a good basis to start our negotiations. Naturally, we see a need for adjustments on a number of issues.

The 4-chapter structure of the zero draft makes that task easier. The organization of the text favors ease of reading. The annexes allow for addition of further details, as needed.

We wish to underscore, at the outset, the importance of ensuring coherence and complementarity between the Financing for Development process and the negotiations on the post-2015 agenda process, particularly as regards the issue of Means of Implementation and Follow up and Review.

In this regard, it would be helpful to hear from Ambassadors Talbot and Pedersen at some point about the pertinent elements of the Addis Accord, in particular the dedicated and integrated follow-up of the FfD as a critical contribution to the follow up and review of the Post-2015 Development Agenda under the HLPF.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

One of the elements in the draft stands out in contrast with the coherence of the whole and this is the Preamble to the Political Declaration.

We understand that this part of the text was added for purposes of communicability and simplification, which is laudable. The results, however, seem to have verged on redundancy on the one hand and further complication of our message on the other.

The reference to the 5 Ps in the first paragraph of the Preamble is redundant with its enunciation in paragraph 7 of the Political Declaration.

The proposed 9 bullet recluster the SDGs in an arbitrary and counter-intuitive fashion that does not reflect the three dimensions of sustainable development, isolating all environmental themes into just one item. This seems to repeat the silo-approach applied to MDGs. Furthermore, the bullet points leave aside crucial aspects of the SDGs, such as energy, water, sanitation, industrialization, infrastructure or sustainable patterns of production and consumption.

This approach threatens to upset the political balance that we have worked so hard to achieve in our deliberations so far.

The language used in the political declaration is already in our view geared to conveying a strong message to the global citizenry in general and not only specific constituencies.

We call, therefore, for the deletion of this preamble.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

We note with appreciation that poverty eradication was rightly acknowledged as our greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, as agreed in Rio+20.

However, consistency and coherence can be improved throughout the text of the political declaration. In particular, the concepts of universality and CBDR are misused in some paragraphs and even inverted in others.

Universality is not the same as equal responsibilities. Universality entails different responsibilities to countries that are intrinsically different from each other. It entails that different nations will focus on different challenges, according to their different circumstances, resources, capabilities, levels of development and historical responsibilities. It entails, in short, that the countries have differentiated responsibilities, despite sharing some common ones.

The concept that speaks to the universality of the Post-2015 Development Agenda is the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities.

It is worrisome, therefore, that the text fails to address the differentiation even in areas where there is agreed language about it, such as climate change and sustainable patterns of consumption and production. Paragraphs 25 and 27 need therefore to be changed so as to adequately reflect the differentiated responsibilities of different groups of countries in these subjects.

We also noted that there is not a single mention to developed countries in the whole document. We fail to understand why, for instance, the commitments of those nations in the provision of ODA is not mentioned in paragraph 32, fully dedicated to the subject. Even when it comes to official development aid, only groups of developing countries - in the case of paragraph 32 SIDS and LDCs - are singled out.

Artificially erasing the differences between developed and developing countries does not strengthen the universal character of the agenda. It undermines it.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

In paragraph 10, we would prefer not to mention the Synthesis Report of the Secretary-General alongside the intergovernmentally agreed documented mentioned therein.

As mentioned during the morning session by many delegation, paragraph 12 lists numerous challenges we have ahead of us but fails to offer the reasons why we firmly believe such challenges can be overcome. Even the phenomenon of migration has a negative connotation and is treated as a problem to be solved. Migration actually

generates benefits both for the countries of origin and for destination nations.

We suggest that the term "growing migration challenge" be replaced with "forced migration" and that a more positive and inspirational language is inserted either in this paragraph or in another part of the text.

Paragraph 28 needs to recognize the two-way relationship between peace and sustainable development. The text affirms that "sustainable development cannot be realized without peace, but it fails to recognize that peace also cannot be realized and will not last without sustainable development either.

Furthermore, we noted the lack of reference to the concept of "access to justice", which is in our view the main component of achieving goal 16. We suggest such aspects are also taken in consideration.

We appreciate the emphasis on human rights dimension of our goals in the zero draft. We welcome and support the references in the zero draft to the issues of gender equality and empowerment of women, including the reference to gender-based discrimination and violence against women and children in paragraph 18.

We also support the priority focus on people in vulnerable situations and all vulnerable groups, including older people and people with disabilities, as is the case in paragraph 17. In paragraph 29, we should mention not only natural and cultural diversity, but also social diversity. Those changes aim at better reflecting the core meaning of the expression "leave no one behind".

Finally, the section "A call for action to change our world" should also address broader on the challenges facing the United Nations.

The September Summit will celebrate 70th anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations, 15 years after the Millennium Summit and 10 years after the 2005 World Summit. In such a juncture, the Post-2015 Political declaration should also mention the need for reform in the governance structure of the United Nations, in line with mandates contained in 2000 and 2005 outcomes, which should also be mentioned in our declaration. The transformative agenda brought about by the post-2015 process cannot be expected to fully bear results without a corresponding change in the global governance structures.

In our view, it is not consistent to say that "sustainable development cannot be realized without peace", as stated in paragraph 28, and not address the need to reform the governance of peace and security in the United Nations.

Mr Co-facilitators,

The section on SDGs preserves the integrity of the 17 goals and 169 targets of the Report of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals. We have reservations however to the introduction of a new chapeau instead of retaining the one that was adopted in July 2014. The exclusion of the reservations that underpinned the political agreement that allowed some countries to accept the entire report must also be reviewed.

The chapter on means of implementation brings together Goal 17 and all MoI-related targets, which we cannot consider just as a placeholder for the results from Addis Ababa. The MoI-related targets are themselves the implementation pillar of the SDGs, part and parcel of the OWG report, and are the obvious basis for the MoI section of the text, to which the Outcome of Addis should be added.

Brazil welcomes the inclusion of the "Food for thought paper on a possible technology facilitation mechanism" as an annex. Delegations informally agreed to negotiate such issue in the FfD process and to reproduce the language related to the establishment of the Technology Facilitation Mechanism in the Post-2015 Development Agenda, without reopening or renegotiating it. We are encouraged by the developments on this particular issue in the FfD negotiations.

We commend the central role the text attributes to the HLPPF on the follow-up and review processes, as well as the attention dedicated to the regional dimension of this matter. Some proposals for the national level, however, will have to be revised in order ensure that they are not unnecessarily prescriptive..

We will come back at each session with more detailed comments.

I thank you.

