

UK Statement Monday 27 July - Declaration

Co-facilitators

Let me start by fully aligning the UK with the statement made by the European Union on behalf of the EU and its member states. In addition I have a few points that I would like to emphasise. I will endeavour to be constructive and to focus on specific language.

First, we welcome the preamble. As and many others have said, it's important that we are able to communicate our agenda and the 5ps form a useful basis for this.

We would like to see the language on gender equality strengthened in two places.

In the second paragraph of the preamble: end the sentence after 'they seek to realise the human rights of all.' And add the following:

"We reaffirm that achieving gender equality, empowering all women and girls, and the full realisation of their human rights are essential to eradicating poverty and achieving sustainable development. Gender equality and women's and girls' empowerment is a prerequisite to the realisation of the SDGs"

In paragraph 9, it is important not to conflate gender equality with children's issues. We would propose the following:

"A world in which every woman and girl enjoys full gender equality and all legal, social and economic barriers to their empowerment have been removed. A world in which the rights and aspirations of children and youth are realised."

We have heard some delegations argue for the removal or dilution of the reference in paragraph 13 to the Programme of Action on the International Conference on Population and Development, the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of their respective review conferences. For the avoidance of doubt, co-facilitators, we see this language, which is agreed language that has been used elsewhere, as the minimum acceptable. It is essential that it is retained.

Turning to poverty eradication, which is rightly highlighted as the over-arching priority for this agenda.

First, we are greatly concerned that, in paragraph 4, reference to targets being met by all 'economic and social groups' has been deleted. As one of the most transformative elements of our agenda, it is essential to meet our ambition and for our credibility outside this room that this text is re-instated. We would be content with the language proposed by Japan.

Second, there needs to be an explicit reference to extreme poverty in the preamble:

Under “People”: after, ‘we want to end poverty in all its forms and dimensions,’ we should add “...including ending extreme poverty by 2030”.

Furthermore, there are two inconsistencies that we need to correct.

First, paragraph 16 rightly highlights the substantial progress in people emerging from extreme poverty. But paragraph 15 needs to mention that over a billion people still live in extreme poverty.

Second, Paragraph 25 is not aligned with the targets in goal 1, which commit, by 2030, to end extreme poverty and reduce poverty according to national dimensions by at least half. We can easily make our text consistent with goal 1 by deleting the comma after “including extreme poverty”.

Finally, on the subject of poverty, the title of the outcome document should state that the objective of this agenda is to achieve poverty eradication AND sustainable development.

Like others, we are disappointed with the handling of the **Addis Ababa Action Agenda** and the means of Implementation section of the post-2015 Outcome Document. We regret – for reasons of visibility and traction – that goal 17 and goal-specific means of implementation are not in chapter 3. Also that the Addis Ababa Action Agenda was not attached as an Annex to this draft.

We need to spell out much more clearly that Addis is complementary and supplementary to the Open Working Group means of implementation goal and targets and that, only together, can they comprise the necessary means of implementation for the post-2015 development agenda.

Thus, in paragraph 40 – in line with the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly today, we would amend this first sentence as follows:

We endorse the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development adopted by the Conference.

We would then replace the second sentence of para 40 with:

We recognise that the Addis Ababa Action Agenda alongside the Means of Implementation contained in SDG 17 and goal-specific targets together comprise the full means of implementation necessary for the achievement of this agenda.

We cannot accept the language on migratory status as it is in the zero draft. We recall recent General Assembly resolutions in this regard, which state:

“Calls upon States to promote and protect effectively the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all migrants, regardless of their migratory status...”
(GA res 69/167, OP1 on the protection of migrants)

In paragraph 20 the language goes further than this agreed language

Co-facilitators, my country is proud of its record in protecting and promoting human rights, including the human rights of migrants. However, we object to the assertion that illegal migrants are entitled to the same provision of public services as legal migrants and other residents as is implied by paragraphs 20, 24 and 26. The easiest way to deal with this would be to delete the references in these paragraphs to migratory status.

Furthermore,

Paragraph 44 on ‘the family remains problematic. The simplest way forward is to delete the paragraph. However, if others wish to retain a reference to the family, then the text needs to say “recognizing that in different cultural, political and social systems, various forms of the family exist”

This is in line with commonly agreed language which is used in the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Principle 9, and paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2; the Beijing Platform for Action (BPOA) paragraph 29, the +5 anniversary of the World Summit on Social Development (S-24/2, paragraph 56)

Finally, we have consistently argued that the Chapeau text is not needed, as it duplicates text already in the outcome document. However, if some member states feel that there are specific issues in that Chapeau that are not adequately covered in the text we stand ready to engage in finding a solution, as indeed we do on all aspects of the text.

Thank you