

Statement by Ambassador Achraf Ibrahim
Deputy Assistant Minister
For International Economic Affairs, MFA Egypt

CO facilitators

I would like first to align my statement with the statements made by the G77 and China, African Group and Arab group.

I would also like to thank you for the changes that were introduced to this section. Having said that, it is crucial that all delegations engage in a constructive manner to bring to conclusion the negotiations by Friday, and to achieve so we need to refrain from re opening issues that were agreed upon with regards to the follow up and review process and the functions of the HLPF as stipulated in A/RES/67/290.

We believe that the any attempt to renegotiate these issues does not serve our purpose, specifically on issues of the voluntary nature of the follow up and review the need to respect national and regional policy space.

Having said let me provide the following specific comments:

1. with regards to Para 49, we need to strike the word “accountability” again in line with 67/290 which identifies the functions of the HLPF as follow up and review.
2. On Para 70 a, we believe we need to stream line the language to read “the outcome of the national level process” we believe that we cannot burden developing countries with several processes on follow up and review at the national level. We also request the addition of the word “Official” before national data sources
3. On 70 (d) we request the deletion of “all people” to bring the language in line with 67/290.
4. On 70(e) we request the deletion on “marginalized groups”, our positions on this issue are known, furthermore, this term doesn’t constitute any agreed language with the res. 67/290.
5. On 70 (g) we support the language but propose the deletion of the Christmas tree following the word disaggregated in the 2nd line.

6. On Para 73, we support the language, but purpose to delete “regional dialogues” at the 4th line to bring the language in line with Para 77 of the Zero draft that calls on countries to identify the most suitable regional forum to engage.
7. On Para 76, we support the proposal by Brazil on the deletion of “peer review”, and would propose “peer learning including through reviews”. In the 5th line we propose a more clear language by stating “Regional processes will draw on national level reviews”.
8. On Para 78 we propose the insertion of “and will follow up on the implementation of sustainable development commitments and objectives including those related to the means of implementation” at the 7th line, again **this is in line with the agreed language from 67/290.**
9. On Para 79 we propose replacing the word “guidance” with **guidelines”** propose the deletion of the section on the GSDR, and we will include a proposal on it on Para 86.
10. On Para 80 we propose it to read as follows, “The HLPF, under the auspices of ECOSOC, shall carry out regular reviews, in line with Resolution 67/290. Reviews will be voluntary, state-led, involving ministerial and other relevant high-level participants while encouraging reporting, and include developed and developing countries as well as relevant UN entities and relevant stakeholders. They shall provide a platform for partnerships, including through the participation of major groups and other relevant stakeholders” again **this is brings the zero draft in line with agreed language from 67/290.**
11. On Para 81, we don’t support the language “including civil society and the private sector”” we believe that the term relevant stakeholders covers these groups and is in line with agreed language of the HLPF modalities resolution.
12. On Para 83, while we see the merit in the language with regards to the aligning of the HLPF cycle and the QCPR process, we don’t believe that the language proposed provide enough clarity, taking into consideration that due to the developments at the FfD negotiations, member states were not able to hold serious discussions on this issue, and we propose that we request member states to consider it during the upcoming GA session.
13. On Para 86, we propose that the SG prepare a report, in consultation with member states for the consideration of the GA at its 70th session with regards to the scope and methodology of the GSDR and the recommendations for the a voluntary common reporting guidelines and guidance on the annual themes and sequence of thematic reviews for the HLPF, we believe these issue are of great importance to the

follow up and review process, but again having used most the previous weeks in continuing negotiations o the FfD document ,we believe further consultations need to be provide for the member states to achieve consensus n these issues.