

**Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda**  
**VII Session**  
**SDGs Goals and Targets - July 22, 2015**  
**Delegation of Brazil**

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.

On the introduction to the second chapter on SDGs Goals and Targets, we share the view expressed by some delegations on the content of para 51. It does not reflect appropriately the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

On the question of the proposed revised targets:

Let us preserve the delicate balance which underpins the SDGs as currently drafted. Attempts to revise the targets open the way for conflicting pressures in favor of further modifications in light of various technical arguments, reservations, particular interests and so on. This threatens to unravel the valuable package we have helped to put together.

We are approaching the moment when we will need to come to an understanding on this matter. We noted some positive signs of flexibility coming from several delegations, which can be considered encouraging.

Co-facilitator,

You have proposed two different types of "technical amendments", or "revisions":

- a) numerical values/specificity (only the x and y%, really, since the proposed revision on target 1.5 is about something else)
- b) consistency with international agreements

Since then, you decided to incorporate your proposals in the draft. You also introduced new changes in the text of some proposed targets for revision. We would welcome clarification on the background and justification for those changes at such a late stage in our process.

It is the view of my delegation that some amendments raise concerns from the technical point of view. One example is target 6.6, as previously mentioned by the delegation of Turkey.

Another example is the proposed version of 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 close to zero (Aichi target 5). In our view, extending this target to 2030, as proposed in the revision, would lower the level of ambition expressed in existing Aichi target agreed in the CBD.

Therefore, in face of existing political circumstances, and due to the technical reasons mentioned above, my delegation is not in a position to accept your proposal at this stage.

We would appreciate it if you could reconsider the amendments carried out without sound technical basis.

I thank you.