

**7<sup>th</sup> Session of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015  
Development Agenda**

**Intervention by Mr.Amit Narang, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India  
on 'Follow-up and Review'**

**July 24, 2015**

**Mr. Co-Facilitator,**

Thank you for the opportunity to share some comments on Follow-up and review. Needless to say, we endorse the statement made by G77 on this issue.

India has consistently maintained that a simple, non-prescriptive, voluntary and state-led process for review and follow-up of the agenda will be a crucial determinant of its success.

We have also consistently maintained that this process should be voluntary, inviting and positive, must minimize reporting burden on national administrations and must have as its overarching objective the facilitation of the achievement of the agenda globally. For this, it should prioritize the sharing of best practices and solutions, across geographies and sectors.

Anchoring as it does a voluntary and aspirational agenda underpinned by the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, the review and follow-up process must always recognize that countries will have the policy flexibility to set their own national targets, which will be the object of review at the national level.

**Mr. Co-Facilitator,**

In the Declaration section, as we pointed out earlier this week, in paragraph 43 there is an incorrect linkage between quality disaggregated data and measurements beyond GDP.

We would suggest that this could be re-framed by adding the notion of quality data with the second sentence as follows: *“We agree to intensify our efforts to strengthen statistical capacities in developing countries, particularly least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, small island developing states and other countries in special situations for the provision of quality disaggregated data to ensure that no one is left behind”*.

**Mr. Co-Facilitator,**

We welcome the revised section on follow-up and review in the final draft which reflects in large measure the views of the member states in the last session.

We do not expect it to be changed drastically at this stage.

We reiterate our preference for this outcome document, to be adopted at the level of our leaders, be strong on broad principles and parameters and light on excessive details.

We can broadly support the principles that have been outlined in paragraph 57.

We can broadly support the formulations on national level review. We also concur with the non-prescriptive approach you have taken to craft the language around this process at the regional level.

**Mr. Co-Facilitator,**

We have consistently maintained that there is no mandate currently for undertaking regional reviews and we note that in the text we are requesting the High Level Political Forum to further discuss regional level follow-up and review at its next meeting.

We would once again stress that we should bear in mind the diversity in regional models and should therefore avoid a one-size-fits-all approach to issues like peer reviews. We also remain cautious against adding additional reporting layers for national governments which may unduly burden national administrations and also divert scarce resources away from implementation to reporting.

We continue to believe that this level is better conceived as regional 'dialogue' for sharing best practices and enabling mutual learning in similar settings. Moreover, regions and sub-regions must retain the necessary flexibility to devise processes best suited to their particularities.

We agree also with the strong endorsement in this document for the dedicated-yet-integrated framework for the review of the FfD outcomes and SDG Means of Implementation as decided in the Addis Ababa outcome.

A similar endorsement needs to be made for a review of technology related commitments as part of the Technology Facilitation Mechanism. The TFM is also mandated to report to the HLPF.

It is important, as some other delegations have also emphasized, that there needs to be a holistic reference to the mandate of the HLPF, which goes beyond merely reviewing and follow-up.

We believe, that the GSDR, as correctly mentioned in the draft is a tool for science-policy interface, and not a monitoring tool. The GSDR must, at all times, maintain a balance between the three dimensions of sustainable development and not overemphasize any one of them. The GSDR should

also enhance consideration of issues and problems of the developing world and also progressively augment the participation of researchers from the South. In any case, and this is to answer the question posed earlier by Amb. Kamau, we do not expect this document to go into the details of the GSDR mandate.

**Mr. Co-Facilitator,**

As we conclude our work this week, we will merely thank you for your strong and visionary leadership. We will refrain from repeating the points made by our delegation earlier, not even for emphasis. We trust in your judgement and have no doubt that your teams have taken careful notes.

I thank you very much and we look forward to completing our work next week.

\*\*\*\*\*