

**U.S. Statement on Follow Up and Review**  
**Intergovernmental Post-2015 Negotiations**  
**As Delivered by Tony Pipa, U.S. Special Coordinator for the Post-2015**  
**Development Agenda**  
**July 29, 2015**

Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitator, for your work on this section. We think this overall section, and the principles in particular, have improved, and we believe it has moved us closer to a consensus. We have only a few small concerns and suggestions on specific wording in an effort to help w/streamlining and clarity. Before jumping into those, however, we would like to offer our appreciation to all groups for their active engagement on goals and targets yesterday, which throughout our process has been a particularly challenging issue. We greatly appreciated the constructive efforts by all delegations to engage on this as we move closer to consensus by Friday.

Turning to the text, we support the spirit of paragraph 87 but want to ensure that it accurately describes the relationship between member states and the UN system. As currently written, we worry that it undermines the notion of national ownership and the principle of a voluntary follow-up mechanism. If it's read literally, it gives a mandate to all UN entities to "take all necessary measures" to implement and monitor the Agenda. It is the responsibility of the Member States, rather than the UN system, to implement and follow-up on the Agenda. The UN system should support national efforts. We therefore call for deletion of this paragraph, as it also duplicates previous paragraphs that adequately cover this topic.

In Paragraph 70, principle C, we would like to clarify the link between follow up and review and means of implementation. We suggest that last sentence be edited so that it starts with, "They will **provide the basis to** mobilize the necessary means of implementation."

We thank you and commend the inclusion of "country-led evaluations" in principle G of paragraph 70. We think it is also important to support capacity building for evaluation programs, and would support adding this idea to principle H, so that it reads, "They will require capacity-building for developing countries, including the

strengthening of national data systems **and evaluation programs**, particularly in African countries, LDCs, SIDS, and LLDCs.”

This entire section of the document is predicated on the fundamental idea that follow up and review is country-owned and voluntary, an idea that has clear consensus and acceptance and is clearly enshrined in the first principle of paragraph 70. We therefore think it unnecessary to mention policy space in this section and call for its deletion in paragraphs 70a, 77, and 79. The reference in 79 is particularly redundant with the language in paragraph 71. We could support the alternative suggestions of other delegations regarding this issue.

On paragraph 78, we strongly prefer the language of the previous draft describing the HLPF as the apex of a global network of review processes, as we believe the concept of a global network of processes is the key to the HLPF’s success. The new language muddies and confuses the point.

There has been consistent agreement that we should not reopen the modalities of the HLPF, and that the institutional arrangements for follow up and review will be guided by previously-agreed resolutions, including 68/1 and 67/290. We therefore note some inaccuracies in the latest text from our perspective, such as the last sentence of paragraph 79 and the first sentence of paragraph 86. We therefore call for the deletion of the last sentence of paragraph 79. Proposals for the scope and methodologies of the Global Sustainable Development Report could be included in the report of the Secretary General, which is referenced in paragraph 86. In paragraph 86, we also call for the phrase “for consideration by the 2016 meeting of the HLPF” to be changed to read “for consideration by member states before the 2016 meeting of the HLPF.” We also call for deletion of the phrase in paragraph 86 that says the Secretary General’s report “should clarify institutional responsibilities.” That sentence should therefore begin with “It should provide guidance on annual themes and on a sequence of thematic reviews for the HLPF.”

Paragraph 84 deals with the UN development system. We do not think it appropriate to mention the SDG Progress Report in this paragraph, as this is inconsistent with paragraph 79, where that report is appropriately addressed. We therefore call for the deletion of the sentence on the SDG Progress Report in paragraph 84.

We will provide these suggestions in writing for your convenience and look forward to finding consensus on this critical part of our agenda. Thank you.