

**Post-2015 Development Agenda Negotiations**  
**VI Session: Follow up and Review**  
**June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Intervention by Brazil**

Mr. Co-facilitators,

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of G-77 and China and we wish to add the following comments in our national capacity.

We believe that the transformative potential of the Post-2015 Development Agenda will depend to a great extent on a follow-up and review arrangement that is constructive, flexible, supportive and inclusive of all stakeholders. Participation of the civil society will be key in that regard.

The zero draft provides a good basis for our deliberations, but we feel there is room for improving coherence within the text with a view to devising a roadmap to guide us through the next years.

In paragraph 2, for example, we are of the view that it is not enough to say that the national level processes will inform the reviews at regional and international levels. Measures and policies adopted at the national level will lay the foundation for regional and international processes. The national level is the primary instance for follow-up and review, the one in which more comprehensive and participatory reviews can and should take place.

The follow-up and review at regional and global levels should also provide positive incentives for member States and other stakeholders to further engage at their national level. In this case, it is important to ensure that the next two or three years of the HLPF can provide an opportunity to identify and exchange best practices on how to implement the new agenda at different levels by various actors.

We see merit in the five principles enumerated in paragraph 3, which summarize key challenges ahead, namely: the interdependence of the SDGs, including their means of implementation; their long-term orientation; the critical role of civil society and other stakeholders; and the need to build upon existing platforms and

to develop better data. On this last aspect, we support the need to ensure data disaggregation, but we also stress the need for capacity building in that regard.

At the national level, we wish to underscore that there can be no one-size-fits-all formula and we need to avoid being overprescriptive when it comes to national reviews.

We would caution against defining artificial timeframes or prescribing modalities from a top-down perspective as this approach will not necessarily lead us to effective measures at the national level.

At this early stage, we should ensure that governments work on the transition from the MDGs to the SDGs, adapting the framework of goals to national priorities, disseminating the new concepts, and engaging municipalities and other subnational levels of government as well as civil society.

If SDGs are not effectively owned at national and subnational levels, the periodic reports will run the risk of becoming an exercise of bureaucratic data compilation, instead of a participatory process of policy dialogue based on a genuine multistakeholder engagement.

We suggest, therefore, that paragraphs 4, 5 and the first sentence of paragraph 16 be revisited in light of these considerations.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

It would be important to state, in general terms, that the level of detail, density and the frequency of follow up and review processes should be higher at the regional level in relation to the global one.

The reference to peer review seems also limited and somewhat prescriptive, as it may not apply to all regions, in particular in the short term. We would prefer to stress the importance of the regional level to promote policy dialogue, mobilize regional stakeholders and develop modalities for review. It is also relevant to mention the possibility of regional thematic follow-up or review processes as well as sub-regional initiatives, as appropriate.

We welcome the idea to discuss progress at the regional level in the next HLPF, but we also believe there must be stronger emphasis on means of implementation, which is of critical importance as we all know.

We should provide a clear mandate to Regional Organizations, including Regional Commissions, to work constructively in the elaboration of follow-up and review fora at regional level.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

Brazil supports the idea that the HLPF is the apex of the arrangement for follow up and review. However, in our view, the text seems to overemphasize specific modalities for review, while disregarding the need for a broader strategy for follow up of the Agenda at the global level in the next years.

There is need to provide guidance to our objectives for the first years of implementation of the new Agenda. The HLPF could focus on exchanging best practices from national and regional processes, on the following up on MoIs and on mobilizing support from other stakeholders.

When mentioning HLPF mandates, we should be cautious not to delve into too much detail regarding the modalities of the Forum in a document to be adopted by Heads of State and Government.

We see merit in the approach adopted in paragraph 10, enhancing the contribution of the functional commissions of ECOSOC and other thematic fora to review the implementation of those SDGs that correspond to their mandates. It would be useful to clarify that the HLPF would receive, as an input for discussions, the outcomes of such fora. Furthermore, it would be important to recommend the HLPF to dedicate special attention to the review progress of goals or thematic areas that are not addressed by a dedicated forum within the UN System, such as inequalities within and among countries.

In paragraph 12, the reference to the Global Sustainable Development Report does not seem to take into account that the report was proposed in the Rio+20 Outcome document as an instrument to strengthen the science-policy interface, not to inform the follow up and review. We should acknowledge the importance of science for the follow up of the Agenda, encouraging the participation of scientific community in our deliberations in the future. However, the follow-up and review of implementation will not be carried out base on a scientific report. It is supposed to be a policy dialogue led by governments, as defined in resolution 67/290 and reaffirmed in paragraph 9.

The same paragraph also seems to reinterpret the mandate of the UN Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs indicators, which is to develop proposal for global indicators to be considered by the statistical commission in March 2016. It is not supposed to elaborate an Annual SDGs report.

Finally, we would appreciate to have further clarity on what motivates the need for recommendations on the organizational arrangements for State-led reviews at the HLPF, in light of the given that the modalities for these reviews were established in resolution 67/290 and their implementation have not yet started.

Thank you.