



Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

Eighth Session

New York, 29 July 2015

Follow-up and Review

Statement by Switzerland

Distinguished Co-facilitators,

We would like to thank you for this new chapter which now brings greater clarity to the follow-up and review of the Post-2015 Agenda. We share the view others have expressed that you have really managed to find a good balance between the different positions in the room, reflecting the need for **specificity** while not being prescriptive, keeping **flexibility** for national ownership and further development of the mechanism going forward.

On Principles:

We support the idea in **paragraph 70a)** that explicitly reflects the link between the national, regional and global levels of review. We think this is very important so that the reviews at regional and global level are truly grounded in **country realities** and relevant and useful for representatives that will participate. We also support similar language in **paragraph 73**.

We welcome the inclusive and participative follow-up and review process called for in **paragraph 70d)**. In our view, this principle must be strengthened to specify that participation is important “at **all levels**”.

On the national level:

We welcome the revised language on **national reviews in paragraphs 74 and 75**, linked with the regional and global levels, as one of the key instruments to support and guide countries in implementation over the next 15 years.

My next points concern the section on the **global level**:

[On Indicators and SDG progress reports:]

We also welcome the different elements concerning the elaboration of indicators, including the reference to **annual SDG progress reports in paragraph 79**. These reports should be based on data from the national level and could include information compiled at regional level. In order to be more accurate, we propose to replace "*regional reviews*" by "***information collected at the regional level***".

[On the GSDR:]

Concerning the Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR) in paragraph 79, we favour getting as much clarity as we can **now** on this report. At the Rio+20 conference three years ago we collectively decided to have this report, meanwhile we have had two prototypes presented by the Secretariat and many informal discussions. We therefore call for clarity on **scope and periodicity** of the report in this outcome document.

Similar to the EU we support language that calls for a "**flagship GSDR**" every four years, but **in addition** to an **annual thematic GSDR** to guide discussions at the HLPF. We would also support to specify that these reports should draw from science and academia, the SDG progress reports and relevant thematic reviews and assessments.

However, if we cannot agree on these aspects now, let us at least clearly outline **when** this decision will be taken, as Canada also stated. We would therefore support that the last sentence of **paragraph 79** states that the discussions on the scope and methodologies are to be **concluded** by the end of HLPF in 2016.

[On thematic reviews:]

Concerning thematic reviews at the HLPF as reflected in paragraph 81, we welcome the reference to the integrated nature of the thematic reviews.

[On the role of the UN development system:]

We support that the agenda includes a strong message from our Heads of State on the key role of the **UN Development System** in supporting the implementation of the Post-2015 Agenda. We welcome **paragraph 84** in this regard.

Here, as the USA, we only question the appropriateness of referencing the SDG progress report here, as our understanding of the nature of this report is a different one. If we wish to specify which report should contain this information, it would be the Secretary General's report on the implementation of the QCPR.

[On the road ahead for more clarity in the process:]

We do support calls for a clearer indication of the **road ahead to prepare for the next meetings of the HLPF, starting in 2016**. We welcome your proposal in **paragraph 86** in this regard. Given the complexity and various options available to us for reviews, we see a real and urgent need for a report prepared by the UN Secretary General to guide us in this process. We see merit in member states considering the report in the **HLPF in 2016** as currently reflected in this paragraph in order to allow adequate preparation and broad inclusion of stakeholders.

[On the role of the UNGA and ECOSOC]

We join Mexico and others in supporting the idea in **paragraph 87**. Our understanding of this paragraph is that the General Assembly as well as the ECOSOC and their subsidiary bodies will have to reflect on how to bring their programmes of work in line with the new Agenda. What we wish for, is that they are also called upon to contribute in an **effective, comprehensive and timely** manner to the implementation, the follow-up and the review of the Agenda.

However, in order to bring more clarity to this paragraph we can support proposals to amend the language so that the UN General Assembly and ECOSOC are called on **"to take measures to coordinate their work to support the implementation of the Agenda"**.

A reference to "support national efforts" as proposed by some delegations, would in our view dilute the purpose of the paragraph which is different from the purpose of paragraph 86.