

**Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda
VIII Session
Follow up and Review – July 29, 2015**

Delegation of Brazil

We support the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of G-77 and China. I would like to present the additional comments in my national capacity.

We believe the text evolved positively, as it preserved consistency with existing agreements on the matter. We still believe our greatest challenge is to provide clear guidance on the work ahead of us, instead of focusing on detailed modalities or controversial concepts.

In the political declaration, in paragraphs 47 and 49, we should include explicit references to civil society and other stakeholders in the listings contained in those paragraphs. In paragraph 47, the reference should be included after "volunteer groups". In paragraph 48, we propose the inclusion, in the second sentence, after the word "accountability", of the following: "with meaningful participation of civil society and others stakeholders, as set out (...)", and the text continues as it is.

In chapter three, in the first sentence of paragraph 69, we suggest to replace "citizens" for "people", as formal citizenship status is not granted to many of those people left behind, such as migrants.

In paragraph 70 we believe that the inclusion of reference to "people-centred" in the chapeau is misplaced and would be better placed in item "e" .

In paragraph 70 "d", we wish to propose the following formulation: "They will be open, inclusive and transparent for all people and will support the "participation of and reporting by all stakeholders.

Still in paragraph 70, item b, we noted the inclusion of universal, and we would like to propose the inclusion, in the end of the sentence, the expression "while taking into account different capacities, needs and priorities of developing countries". This proposal is consistent with the principle of differentiation mentioned in the declaration and embedded in the SDG framework.

In paragraph 75, we propose to replace "other actors" by "other stakeholders", for the sake of consistency with the terminology adopted throughout the Agenda.

At the regional level, we would prefer the language to be broad in order to provide guidance without prejudging or prescribing regional decisions.

In this regard, in paragraph 76, the auxiliary verb is not "should", but "could". Furthermore, we do not support the reference to "peer review", included in paragraph 76, which was basically supported by delegations from one particular region and may not reflect the views or priorities of other regions. In order to accommodate their regional concerns on this matter, we would propose to replace "peer review and learning" by the following formulation: "peer learning, including through voluntary reviews, (...)".

In paragraph 77, we believe the mandate to UN Regional Commission should be clearly stated. We cannot request those commission to continue to do something they have not started doing - at least not in the context of this agenda. We would prefer to replace the last sentence with the following: "We request UN Regional Commission to support member States in implementing regional follow-up and review mechanisms and we commit to strengthen the institutional capacities of UN Regional Commissions to this end".

There is also need to revise the reference contained in paragraph 79, which affirms that global indicators will provide guidance to national indicators. In many cases, national experience may demand different indicators or greater attention to policy areas not necessarily reflected in or aligned to the global indicators. We propose the following formulation: "National indicators should address national needs, capacities and priorities and, to extend which is possible, they should complement and be consistent with global indicators."

Still in paragraph 79, allow me to note that the mandate for the HLPF to consider the scope and methodology of the Global Sustainable Development Report was originally mentioned in resolution 67/290, but was not fulfilled. The same mandate was repeated in resolution 68/210 and 69/214. This last resolution, adopted in December/2014, requested the HLPF to "consider the scope and methodology of a global sustainable development report (...), taking account and in order to contribute to the intergovernmental process of the post-2015 development agenda". This mandate was once again not fulfilled. As you can see, by giving mandates to the HLPF, we were not able to address the matter of the GSDR in the past three years.

If we are to address this issue this time, we should provide clear guidance to the President of ECOSOC. We would suggest the following language to be added to the end of paragraph 79: “We invite the President of ECOSOC to take the necessary steps to start early consultations on the scope and methodologies of the GSDR, with the aim of reaching a conclusion on the matter which should be included in the Ministerial declaration of the HLPF in 2016.”

Because of this and other unfulfilled mandates of the HLPF, I would like to present a simplified version of my previous proposal, which can be inserted after paragraph 79 and reads as follows:

“We recognize the need to ensure that the high level political forum is capable to perform its functions and fulfill its mandates, as established in resolution 67/290. We therefore request the Secretary General to strengthen the institutional support and resources available to the Forum to effectively carry out its work and fulfill its far-reaching mandates. We also call on the President of ECOSOC to improve the intergovernmental process dedicated to the preparation of the meetings of the high level political forum under the auspices of the Council. We commit to consider ways to improve the institutional arrangements and modalities for continued work under the purview of the high level political forum, including its format, organizational aspect and support structure”.

In paragraph 86, we are concerned with the feasibility of all governing bodies reporting through the SDG Progress Reports, which, according to paragraph 79, would be based on global indicators. We believe governing bodies should be requested to report to the HLPF, but not through the SDG Progress Report.

Finally, in paragraph 82, we wish to note that there has been no agreement on a common reporting format for all countries. In our view, this should be reflected in the last part of the second sentence of paragraph 82, which should read: “including recommendations on possible voluntary common reporting guidelines”.

Co-facilitators,

The High Commissioner for Human Rights circulated yesterday a letter to all Member States. Brazil encourages the co-facilitators to take into account the suggestions made by the High Commissioner in the understanding that they i) are relevant to achieving sustainable development and ii) build upon and strengthen elements already present in our working document.

The High Commissioner explicitly regrets the absence of accountability requirements for the private sector actors as well as the absence of safeguards and due diligence standards to ensure that private sector breach of or disregard for human rights, labor, environment and sustainable development are prevented or remedied.

He also encourages adding specific provisions to more explicitly i) align language with existing UN human rights standards, including the right to development, ii) to add references to minorities, including racial, ethnic, religious, sexual and gender minorities, iii) to add concrete and expanded modalities for participation by civil society and other stakeholders in the new agenda and its monitoring and review.

As he accurately puts it, as the world has already recognized civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights, as well as the right to development, the language should be directed not to recognition of these rights, but rather to their respect, protection and fulfillment.

For Brazil the proposals of the High Level Commissioner are critically important and should be seriously considered in the next revisions of the document for adoption in September.

I thank you, Co-facilitators.