



**STATEMENT**

**BY**

**AMBASSADOR JANINE COYE- FELSON DEPUTY PERMANENT  
REPRESENTATIVE OF BELIZE**

**ON BEHALF OF CARICOM**

**AT THE**

**INFORMAL MEETINGS OF THE PLENARY ON THE  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON THE POST-2015  
DEVELOPMENT AGENDA**

***Discussion on Sustainable Development Goals and Targets***

*July 22, 2015*

*PLEASE CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY*

## **GOALS AND TARGETS (DAY THREE), 22 July 2015**

"Allow me Mr. Co-facilitator a brief moment to thank the major groups and other stakeholders for their valuable contributions. We have received various proposals from different constituents on how the Declaration can better reflect what it is we are striving for, and how to better balance the various interests. Many of these ideas you will have heard in our own statement, for instance the need to ensure that the Declaration better reflects the people-centered nature of this agenda, that it better reflects the integrated nature of the agenda and the need for coherence and balance across all three dimensions of sustainable development, that it refines the challenges we face to sustainable development and that it accurately captures how this Agenda will make a difference for everyone and every country.

On the latter point, there have been important voices for children and youth, women, and persons with disabilities amongst others, and from our side of the floor we have continued to emphasize the special case for sustainable development for small island developing states alongside the calls from other representatives of countries in special situations and with specific challenges as in the case of MICs. Our focus should not be mistaken as an attempt to rewrite the agenda for SIDS alone. We accept and support that this is a universal agenda. At the same time, one size does not fit all. Universality does not imply uniformity and so we expect that the agenda will integrate the programs of action from all countries in special situations in equal manner.

I also want to appreciate the countries that have supported our proposals. To be fair, some attribution may have been done in error as in the case of paragraph 38, but we would like to think Mr. Co-facilitator, that you will be able to count on our group to offer constructive proposals to ensure that we can bridge the differences that remain on key areas in the Declaration and other parts of the Agenda as a whole.

Today's debate is a case in point.

Even prior to the start of these negotiations, our regional secretariat did a review of the SDGs and associated targets. Not unlike many of the other delegations here, we saw areas for improvement. On indicators alone the secretariat, coming out of the experience with the MDGs where we struggled with data, flagged specific areas including where we would need to strengthen data collection and analysis. However, two years into the process, we could not in good faith press the restart button. Imagine the floodgates that we would have opened. Imagine where we would be now. Certainly, not at this point with the finish line just within our reach.

### **Co-facilitator,**

For this reason, In line with the position of the Group of 77 and China and the Alliance of Small Island States, the member States of the Caribbean Community [CARICOM] have **maintained that the sustainable development goals and targets as recommended in the Report of the Open Working Group represent a delicate political balance and that therefore** we are not in favor of re-opening targets for substantive amendments.

The CARICOM has instead previously stated that we could consider how to treat with the “x” variables in some targets. As we reported during the post-2015 intergovernmental negotiation session in May<sup>1</sup>, our regional secretariat examined the proposals for filling in the x’s and concluded that the proposals were **too vague, that they would be better treated with relevant data on baselines for measurability and for determining the associated costs for implementation. They also observed that several of the proposals revised timelines resulting in a reduction of ambition and in some instances resulted in substantive amendments.** Given that the proposals for the “x’s” remain the same in nature, we wish to re-confirm those conclusions. The CARICOM member States are therefore **not in a position** to accept the proposed revisions for “x” variables.

The member States of the CARICOM reiterate our suggestion that, in light of the work currently underway in the Statistical Commission, this intergovernmental process need not hastily and for political expediency revise targets. We are not closing the door on the possibility that targets can or should be revised. We are however recommending deferring this issue until after the Commission reports at its forty-seventh session. Furthermore, we wish to underscore that the nature of the Agenda is such that it is not static. National governments will be working towards integrating the Agenda in line with their national priorities, policies and capacities. As we begin to engage in the follow-up and review process, we may very well be in a better position to suggest more informed proposals for tweaking.

Finally we note that in target 11.b the “Hyogo Framework” is replaced with the “Sendai Framework”. We agree to this factual change and nothing more. We do not consider that such an editorial amendment should be the subject of a debate for the intergovernmental process.

Thank you.

---