

Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda
VII Session
General Statement - July 20, 2015
Delegation of Brazil

Thank you very much, Co-facilitators,

First of all, Brazil aligns itself with the statement delivered by G77 and China. I would like to present the following additional comments in our national capacity.

We add our voice to those who have expressed appreciation for the revised text. We believe it presents a good basis for our deliberations, even though there are crucial issues to which we will need to devote greater attention over the next days in order to finish our work by July 31.

I also take this opportunity to commend on Ambassadors Pedersen, from Norway, and Talbot, from Guyana, for leading member States towards an agreement in Addis.

The Financing for Development Conference outcome constitutes an important first step on the way to the implementation of the SDGs and the post-2015 development agenda as a whole.

The Addis Outcome updated the Financing for Development framework in order to render it consistent with the shared vision agreed by our Heads of State and Government in the Rio+20 Conference, which will culminate with the adoption of the Post-2015 Development Agenda and its SDGs next September.

The Financing for Development proved to be a valuable independent process with a scope and challenges of its own.

The Addis Outcome supports Goal 17 and other means of implementation of the SDGs – as stated in its paragraph 19. They complement the existing Goal-specific MoIs, as well as stand-alone Goal 17, which are integrated and should be preserved as they are - as essential elements of the framework of goals and targets of our universal agenda.

The dedicated and integrated follow-up and review for the Addis Outcome was a positive result, which will contribute to the overall follow up and review of implementation of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The establishment of a Technology Facilitation Mechanism was not only another positive outcome from Addis, but also an example of constructive North-South dialogue that helped us make progress on an issue that is very relevant for many and still sensitive for some.

Allow me to recall that we agreed that the entire text of paragraph 123 of the Addis Outcome, not only its chapeau, would be inserted in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. That agreement needs to be honored now.

The Addis Outcome posed the right questions. We need to make sure that we are able to articulate the right answers to them.

Mobilization of new and additional resources are still necessary and this challenge should be reflected in the Political Declaration and in the MoI chapter, in a way that not only strengthens our commitment to the implementation of the Addis Outcome, but also promotes greater ambition in mobilizing new and additional means of implementation for the Sustainable Development Goals.

Notwithstanding the progress achieved in Addis, we regret that was no consensus to upgrade the Tax Committee to an intergovernmental body, as proposed by G-77 and China and widely supported by civil society and renowned economists and policymakers around the world, not to mention the media, whether specialized or not.

Regardless of the call to enhance the role of domestic mobilization in financing for development, it was not possible to achieve consensus precisely on the matter that could be a crucial driver in dealing effectively with the issues of tax evasion and illicit flows thus unlocking much needed resources for sustainable development worldwide.

This was a setback to our attempt to devise a universal agenda. It also exposed the contradiction of a few countries that wish to outsource the financial burden to developing countries but not the decision-making power on issues of systemic relevance.

We still live in a world of historical asymmetries and differentiated responsibilities.

[POLITICAL DECLARATION]

Co-facilitators,

On the Political Declaration, we appreciate your efforts to provide us with a well-written text for the Preamble and the Political Declaration, which communicates easily to the broader public outside the United Nations what we are striving to do.

Nevertheless, we feel there is a need to make sure we are not departing from the multilaterally agreed concepts that have underpinned our endeavor until now.

Firstly, as far as the preamble is concerned, the text needs to be redrafted in our view in order to reflect the concept of sustainable development and its three dimensions under each heading in a balanced way. We need to avoid getting back to the siloed approaches we all worked so hard to get out of in years of deliberations.

After all, the integrated treatment of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development is a political concept whose consistent use over decades has allowed us to get to the point where we are now.

Partnership and peace are of obvious relevance, but do not represent dimensions of sustainable development and cannot be placed at the same level as people, prosperity and planet; words that correspond to the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. And this is a comment, an argument, that I just heard, made by the distinguished delegate of Mexico, among others.

Furthermore, these three dimensions are more than just "crucial dimensions", as referred to in the last sentence of paragraph five of the Political Declaration.

We need to reformulate the Preamble in a way that is consistent with the concept of sustainable development.

A second fundamental issue that is still not adequately reflected in our agenda is the one of differentiation. We welcome the reference, in paragraph 10, to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, whose inclusion in this Agenda is "non-negotiable" for developing countries, as clearly stated by the G-77 and China Chair in the closing of the Addis Conference.

However, it is not enough to just mention the principle. We need to mainstream the concept of differentiation throughout the text, as we did for the SDGs, in line with the mandate contained in the Rio+20 Outcome Document.

We will provide precise language on these two critical gaps in our next intervention.

[REVISED SDG TARGETS AND FOLLOW UP & REVIEW]

Finally on Follow-up and Review and the SDGs proposed twicking. We cannot support the amendments to the SDG targets.

At our last meeting, my delegation expressed its disagreement regarding some of the proposed changes, in particular target 6.6, on water-related ecosystems, whose current formulation is inconsistent with and undermines the Aichi targets agreed to in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Regarding the Follow-up and Review, we believe that the new text represents a positive evolution, but there are still some fundamental issues that need to be addressed.

We need to bear in mind that the High Level Political Forum was established to succeed the Commission on Sustainable Development, not to replace the Annual Ministerial Reviews. In fact, the mandate of the Forum goes beyond being the “apex of a global network of review processes”.

Your draft still poses excessive emphasis on review functions, undermining other important mandates of the Forum, as stated in paragraph 2 of resolution 67/290.

Heads of State and Government, in September, should provide broad guidance on how to adapt the UN institutional arrangements and governance structures to the challenges posed by the new agenda. That means that follow-up and review is not just for members states, it should also place the UN system of cooperation for international development itself under scrutiny, as well as all other stakeholders who are part takers in the implementation of the agenda and the fulfilling of the commitments that are there, such as civil society organizations and the private sector. This should be clearly stated in our chapter on follow-up and review.

As follow-up and review section only focusses on issues of reporting and reviewing, Member States will have to undertake additional focused deliberations on these matters.

In this context, it is regrettable that the last High Level Political Forum, which was mandated to deliberate on its working methods, did not result in an substantive agreed outcome.

Of course, my delegation will come back with specific comments on each Chapter of the draft, beginning with the Political Declaration.

Allow me, co-facilitators, one final comment. We have been working and negotiating in good faith and towards a positive outcome that we hope can consolidate everything that we have achieved up until now. It is essential that, whatever the outcome of this exercise is, Member States will not, at the end, make a series of reservations to the agreements as this would reduce the impact and the force of our work and what we need to achieve for the next 15 years. It would be my suggestion that you emphasize that Member States should refrain from making reservations to our consensual agreement.

Thank you.