

## **Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda**

### **VIII Session**

#### **Preamble and Declaration - July 27, 2015**

##### **Delegation of Brazil**

Brazil aligns itself with the statements delivered by South Africa on behalf of G77 and China.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

As many others, I suppose, we have many inputs from our capital in various different issues. But, attending to your requests, we will limit our comments.

On the preamble, despite your commendable efforts, Brazil considers that the new text does not reflect appropriately the Rio+20 outcome document. The 5Ps are not equal in nature. The 2 last Ps do not have the same status as the three first, that truly represent the 3 dimensions of sustainable development. As Ambassador Kamau stressed several times, the purpose of an eventual preamble would be to communicate the Agenda, not to create new doctrine, different from that which underpins the SDGs.

Therefore, although we highly appreciate the efforts of our co-facilitators to reflect in a more accurate way the Rio consensus, we cannot accepted the Preamble as it is drafted now.

A possible way to address this issue would be to place paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Preamble between Prosperity and Peace.

On CBDR, we acknowledge the efforts of the co-facilitators to integrate the concept of differentiation in the Post-2015 Agenda. Even though can find now more references to differentiation in the new version of the text - which we deem positive – we consider that the way CBDR is reflected on paragraph 13 now is weaker than in paragraph 10 of the previous version of the text. G77 and China has been consistently requesting to have CBDR as an overarching Principle of the Agenda. We therefore call for the reversion of current paragraph 13 to the language used in former paragraph 10.

This afternoon we heard from a delegation proposals involving language that dilutes the interlinkage between poverty eradication and sustainable development. For us, these are reason of great concern. We believe they are inseparable, and poverty eradication is an indispensable requirement for sustainable development as correctly stated in paragraph 3 of the current draft.

We have full confidence on your judgment when dealing with these sensible issues.

Mr. Co-facilitators,

We have the following additional specific language suggestions for the final draft.

First,

Brazil would like to commend you for adequately addressing throughout the text the need to promote gender equality as a crucial and mandatory step towards sustainable development. We believe this issue should be further strengthened, not weakened. We thus urge you to assure that the current mentions to the subject be kept unchanged.

Second,

We note the square brackets in paragraph 31. Brazil considers the addition of the mention to the UNFCCC and its principles and provisions as mandatory when discussing the issue in any forum. Therefore, we strongly recommend the deletion of those brackets as an important step for reaching an agreement.

Third,

In paragraph 43, we suggest the inclusion of the following language after the word “coherence” in the second line:

“(…) including by ensuring trade and investment agreements do not constrain domestic regulation in pursuit of sustainable development and human rights”

Fourth,

We believe paragraph 44, on family, should be deleted. This concept is not present in the Millennium Declaration and neither it is mentioned in Rio+20 or the SDGs. There is a reason for that. The current language is a backtrack if we compare it to the language agreed over 20 years ago at the Cairo International Conference on Population and Development. The current formulation does not reflect the fact that we have already recognized the various forms of families. The reference to family in the text could thus trigger complex, unnecessary discussions at this late stage of the negotiations.

Thank you.