



Post-2015 intergovernmental negotiations

Session on Follow-up and review

24 July 2015, New York

Co-facilitators,

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the EU and its Member States.

We are grateful to you for the revised draft and for your efforts to address some of our concerns. While in some respects the section is improved, we are disappointed to see that several positive and important elements from the zero draft have been lost. There remains a need to better set out the importance of a robust and effective system of monitoring, accountability and review. The section should be further strengthened in order to ensure that the commitments taken will be followed by action.

Our **main concerns** are the following:

- We need a strong, transparent, inclusive, gender sensitive, robust and evidence-based framework for monitoring, accountability and review in order to meet our own ambition of "leaving no one behind".
- We would like to see a stronger statement on the objectives and benefits. Without monitoring of progress, including assessing the effectiveness of implementation, there will be limited evidence to support the other review functions, and the process will lose value and impact.
- Integration of civil society and other stakeholders, including the private sector, into the monitoring, accountability and review process is crucial and needs to be further strengthened at all levels.
- We need one overarching monitoring, accountability and review framework integrating the Addis outcome and its follow up and review elements, so as to address the implementation of the post-2015 agenda in its entirety. This point should be included upfront, in §56. This is because we are convinced that the Addis outcome is an integral part of the new agenda and crucial for the delivery of the SDGs and targets.
- At national level, a commitment to report regularly and publicly is critical for effective monitoring and review at all levels but also as regards accountability to citizens.

- At regional level, the idea of peer-review needs to be brought back in and we should clarify that this is the place to identify regional trends and to track progress on transboundary issues and shared targets.
- At global level, the section should include a reference to the possibility of recommendations by the HLPF for further action at national, regional and global level.
- The section should also mention the HLPF's role in assessing whether and ensuring that the Agenda remains relevant and ambitious with respect to global commitments.
- Finally, it is also important to spell out clearly the interlinkages (in particular feedback on learning and recommendations) between the different levels.

I will now turn to **more specific comments** on the different paragraphs in the section:

In paragraph 56, we welcome the attempt to strengthen language on the importance of follow-up and review and the reference to accountability. However, we would like to see a stronger statement on its objectives and benefits, stressing that "monitoring and measuring progress, including by data disaggregation is beneficial for all and at the heart of leaving no one behind." Without monitoring of progress, including assessing the effectiveness of implementation, there will be limited evidence to support the other review functions, and the process will lose value and impact.

We should say clearly in paragraph 56 that an integrated follow-up and review framework is "essential for the achievement of the Agenda, including the SDGs, the implementation of the AAAA and for the effective use of all means of implementation." As we stated consistently, this overarching framework will be crucial to ensure coherence, visibility and impact, and will allow us to link in a comprehensive fashion the results achieved with the available means.

Concerning the **principles**, we all agree that the monitoring, accountability and review framework relies on the voluntary participation by each and every stakeholder and will also take into account different national capacities. However, we would like to see a clear commitment for all countries to "fully engage, nationally, regionally as appropriate, and globally in review processes" and a clear commitment to conduct review processes "in an open, inclusive and transparent manner with multi-stakeholder participation."

It would be useful to stress in paragraph 57 also that review processes will "create mutual accountability, foster exchange of best practices and mutual learning by states and other stakeholders including collectively addressing shared challenges". We should also emphasize that the review processes will include a gender equality perspective and "respect human rights and have a particular focus on the progress for the poorest, most vulnerable and marginalized groups and others that are furthest behind." In addition, language on global aggregation and leaving no one behind should be strengthened.

Paragraph 57 d needs to be strengthened in terms of meaningful and systematic participation of civil society.

In para 57.f we call for reverting to previous language which is consistent with target 17.18, as disaggregation of data now seems to be made subject to their relevance in national contexts. The wording "characteristics relevant in national contexts including" should be deleted. Instead, at the end of the sentence after "location", the words "and other characteristics relevant in national contexts" could be added.

Paragraph 57 should also state that the system will evolve over time by taking into account the development of new methodologies and of emerging areas.

In para 58, the language on indicators and data could be strengthened by including a reflection on their importance in measuring progress, through global aggregation, in an integrated and balanced way and identifying and acting on, off-track issues, areas. Furthermore, this section need to make it clear that we will leave no one behind and that the targets must be met for all economic and social groups.

Concerning the process, it is important that the global indicators are developed by technical experts and not subject to political negotiation, and we are concerned that the present para 58 creates ambiguity as to the work of the UNSTATCOM and the further adoption of global indicators. Therefore, the respective part of the sentence should be deleted. In paragraph 59, we suggest stating explicitly that "While most of the data should be collected and analysed by national statistical systems, we are committed to harnessing the opportunities from research and technological progress in particular ICT technologies, including geo-spatial information, to exploit large volume of heterogeneous data ('big data'), including by public-private cooperation."

Concerning the **national level**, there should be - as outlined in the previous draft – a clearly stated commitment in paragraph 61 for periodical assessment and reporting, strongly involving all relevant governmental and non-governmental actors. Dedicated regular reports are an indispensable tool to ensure accountability and to allow the regional and global levels to meaningfully assess progress and identify possible challenges. Contributions from civil society are fundamental at all levels and it needs to be clearly stated that civil society needs to "effectively participate and contribute". The outcome document should further state that a gender equality and human rights perspective should be systematically applied in national reporting. It will also be important that countries promote transparency and assess the contribution of the private sector to the implementation of the agenda, by supporting the uptake of voluntary corporate sustainability reporting as already called for in Rio+20.

We should recall in paragraph 61 also the important role that national parliaments as well as other institutions such as National Sustainable Development Councils, national human rights

institutions, supreme audit institutions and other independent oversight bodies, as well as local governments and authorities can play in these processes.

Concerning the **regional level**, we are disappointed that the reference to peer review has been lost, as this is fundamental to ensuring peer learning, and therefore to maximising progress across the region. It also needs to be clarified in paragraph 62 that this is the place to identify regional trends, to track progress on transboundary issues and shared targets and to feed this into the monitoring and review at global and national level. We should also stress that regional processes should engage all stakeholders in reporting on their actions and providing inputs and analysis. In paragraph 63, we should clarify that "to foster transparency and cross-regional learning, interested countries, regional organizations as well as relevant institutions from outside the region will be allowed to participate as observers."

Concerning the **global level**, we should further emphasize in paragraph 64 the crucial role of the HLPF in monitoring "in an integrated and balanced manner, progress against, and implementation of this agenda and the AAAA." The section should also include a reference to the possibility of recommendations by the HLPF for further action at national, regional and global level and to its role in assessing whether and ensuring that the Agenda remains relevant and ambitious with respect to global commitments.

It is also important to spell out clearly the interlinkages (in particular feedback on learning and recommendations) between the different levels.

In paragraph 65, we should clarify that the GSDR will be produced every four years for the HLPF meeting under the auspices of the General Assembly.

With regard to paragraph 66, we believe that all countries should strive to participate in the review process at the global level to present their implementation efforts, possibly twice by 2030. We support the idea that national reports should be produced – as far as possible - in a standardised format to ensure consistency and should be made publicly available in order to allow for transparency. It should be clarified in this paragraph that "regular reviews" include at the same time national presentations and general reviews of SDGs' implementation.

Paragraph 67 on the thematic reviews at global level should also be strengthened as regards its scope by including a reference to "cross cutting themes". The reference to contributions from other reviews should not be restricted to those prepared within intergovernmental fora.

In paragraph 68 we should affirm that "the follow-up and review provisions set out in AAAA will be an integral part of the follow-up and review process of this Agenda." Since indeed both the Means of Implementation issues and the SDGs are complementary and equally crucial to the implementation of the Agenda, they should be assessed in an integrated

fashion. The current wording, "encouraging" the HLPF to discuss the conclusions of the new ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development does not make this clear enough. Those conclusions should rather be part of the follow-up and review of this Agenda.

In paragraph 70, we should stress the importance to assess the contributions of all actors, including the private sector, and to discuss these assessments within the HLPF meeting at ECOSOC level.

In paragraph 71, a reference to the importance of ongoing work to ensure the future relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UN development system would strengthen this section.

On the way forward: In order to establish a strong follow up and review process that supports implementation and ensures a more forward-looking and action-oriented HLPF from 2016 onwards, we should ask the UNSG to provide proposals for the further elaboration of the post 2015 monitoring and review architecture. Specifically, we should request proposals by the end of 2015 for consideration by member states, on the wider organizational arrangements concerning the work of the HLPF and its articulation with ECOSOC, including the preparatory work of the UN system, and for state-led reviews. It will also be important to clarify that the Inter-agency Task Force referred to in the AAAA should also play a role in supporting the overall follow-up and review process of this Agenda in order to ensure coherence and reflect the integrated nature of the Agenda.

Finally, we would suggest a new para 73 which should spell out clearly that "To ensure the full realization of this Agenda, we call on the United Nations General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council and their subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies to take all necessary measures required for its effective comprehensive and timely implementation, follow up and review".