

KEY MESSAGES ON FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW, JULY IGN

First, I associate the UK with the statement made by the representative of the EU on behalf of the EU and its member states.

Co-facilitators

The UK believes that a robust, effective, efficient, voluntary and country-led mechanism for monitoring, accountability and review is essential. To serve as a platform for engagement by all actors - governments, civil society, parliaments, the UN system, and business. To share learning and solve problems collectively. To identify where action and support are needed to accelerate progress. And to monitor and drive the means of implementation.

We have high ambition across the goals, targets and means of implementation. Our success will depend on a mechanism for follow up and review that ensures we all live up to this ambition.

We therefore welcome the work of the co-facilitators on this important issue and, for example, the way in which the draft refers to data, to building on existing platforms, and to ensuring effective join-up between the national, regional and global levels. However, like many others, we feel that there are a number of issues that need to be strengthened.

- First, we will need a **clear and complete understanding of global progress**. We would welcome a more explicit message on the importance of global aggregation, both in the principles in paragraph 57 and in paragraph 65 on the relationship between indicator reporting and the HLPF.
- Second, we appreciate that some countries see regional dialogue as an important way to share experiences and lessons. We respect this. However, the key levels are the national and global and the text needs to make this distinction clear.
- Third, if we are to meet the ambition of the SDGs, we must reach the poorest and most vulnerable. We should include **leave no one behind** as one of the principles in paragraph 57, and state that no target will be considered met unless met by all relevant economic and social groups.
- Fourth, just to echo the point from the EU, France and many others on para 58. As Norway explained so eloquently, it is vital that we maintain the technical nature of discussions on the indicators, and the flexibility to update indicators as we go along. Hence indicators should not be agreed or endorsed by ECOSOC or the General Assembly. That sentence should be deleted.
- Fifth, the world will not stand still over the next 15 years and the HLPF has a key role in **'future proofing' our framework**. Targets with a 2020 deadline will need upgrading within a few years. Other targets may

need to evolve as new evidence, ambition and consensus emerges. We call for an additional paragraph outlining the responsibility of the HLPF to keep targets under review to ensure they remain credible, relevant and ambitious.

- Sixth, we welcome the reference to follow-up from our Addis commitments, but the **single, coherent and integrated nature of the follow-up** needs to be much clearer in paragraph 68.
- Seventh, as we have emphasised before, **participation** - of people, of civil society, parliaments and of business - is central - first to achieving our objectives and second to the credibility of our agenda. Participatory follow up and review at all levels will only strengthen credibility of the agenda. We would like to see this key principle clearly highlighted within the opening paragraphs of this section.
- Finally on this, agreement of this outcome document must be the beginning, not the end, and that applies to our system for follow up and review. We therefore support calls, to be included in the current paragraph 72, for **the UN Secretary-General to propose a timeline and process after September** through which member states, the UN system and others can build the mechanism that we need, and this agenda deserves, to drive implementation over the next fifteen years. We also note calls for the UN to undertake system-wide reporting of the SDG implementation by the UN Development System. However, we see no need to alter paragraph 71 from your current draft as the QCPR is the correct fora to discuss this and will do so next year.

Co-facilitators

I am not going anywhere, but as this is our last statement of this week, let me join the G77 and others in responding to some points made in the room, in the spirit of ensuring you are clear on our view.

First, we strongly support the pre-ambule and would not want to see any major changes. We fully agree on emphasising the indivisibility of our agenda and the importance of the three dimensions of sustainable development. It is also important to us that the “5 Ps” are maintained as a means of communicating our agenda in a crisp and clear manner. This is, as Norway said, an executive summary, and we could not accept any implied hierarchy among the Ps.

On the declaration, let me emphasise three points:

First, the importance of giving greater prominence to our commitment to eradicate extreme poverty in the declaration.

Second, the reference to CBDR implies it applies to the whole of the post-2015 development agenda. We cannot accept this.

Third, we are encouraged by your commitment to improve the text on climate change, which we trust will include a clear reference to the agreed global objective to limit global average temperature to 1.5-2 degrees above pre-industrial levels.

Co-chairs, we agree with all those in this room that understand why we cannot put forward targets that are defined by an “x”, that fall below existing international standards, or are not in line with international law. We have heard your guidance on this and are ready to engage with your proposals in the next draft.

On means of implementation, we cannot accept a duplication of the Mol targets in both sections 2 and 3. One option is to delete Chapter 3. However, we feel that the best way to ensure prominence, equivalence, and visibility to our means of implementation, and ensure strong emphasis in their follow-up and review, would be to include goal 17 and other Mol targets in Section 3.

Let me reiterate our consistent view that the Means of Implementation for the post-2015 development agenda comprises Goal 17 and the goal-by-goal Means of Implementation targets and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. This should be clearly articulated in the text.

Finally, we recognise the need to reflect in our text the agreement on a technology facilitation mechanism. But I would like to re-iterate that it would not be appropriate, or balanced, to single out a single paragraph from the Addis Ababa Action Agenda to include in our text. There are other key paras in Addis Adaba, and I should be happy to share a short list if that were helpful.

Thank you