

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

**Intervention of Brazil
Sustainable Development Goals**

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.

My delegation consistently cautioned against threatening the political agreement and hanging the delicate balance which underpin the SDGs. As for the preamble, we have stated our reservations in our previous intervention yesterday. Additionally, I would like to make an addition point that the issue of indicator would be better addressed in the follow-up and review section.

As for the targets, any attempt to change their content opens the way for further modifications in light of technical arguments, reservations, particular interests and so on. This would threaten to unravel the entire package, as we already heard from many delegations.

We are not, therefore, in a position to accept your proposal at this stage.

Furthermore, some proposed revisions can be seen as going beyond technical amendments, as they change, without sound justification, substantive aspects of some targets.

I can mention, for example, the proposed revision in target 6.6, which proposed that water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests and other should be "fully protected". The original formulation of target 6.6 does not mention "fully protection", which is an expression that disregards the key concepts of sustainable management or sustainable use of natural resources. Those are the concepts applicable for biodiversity in general, including forests and other ecosystems.

In the case of target 6.6, instead of ensuring consistency with international agreements, in our view, the proposal for revision stands against international agreements, such as the Convention of Biodiversity and the Non-Legally Biding Instrument on All Types of Forests.

The same concerns apply to the proposal to revise target 15.2, which aims at extending to 2030 the Aichi target to halt the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, and where possible bring it to close to zero (Aichi target 5). In our view, extending such target to 2030, as proposed in the revision, would lower the level of commitments with existing targets agreed in the CBD.

Clearly, there is no consensus yet on the way forward on this issue.

I thank you.