

**Statement by Ambassador Hahn Choong-hee
Deputy Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea
to the United Nations
Eighth Session of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the
Post-2015 Development Agenda (Follow-up and Review)
29 July 2015, New York**

Thank you, Mr. Co-facilitator.

1. Korea agrees that the follow-up and review chapter should not be over-prescriptive. However, as the Co-facilitators put it properly last week, we should bear in mind that this will be the first universal review process that requires comprehensive systems encompassing the national, regional, and global levels. I would also like to recall ECOSOC President's message last Friday that our negotiations should present as concrete ideas as possible for the successful launch of the follow-up and review process at the HLPF in 2015. That being said, let me share a few comments.
2. First, we would like to see a clearer reference to the integrated relationship between the Post-2015 and FfD follow-up and review processes in paragraph 82. We need a single, integrated follow-up and review framework that covers FfD in the overall context of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. In this regard, we propose replacing the second sentence of paragraph 82 with the language of paragraph 68 in the previous draft to read as follows:

“The HLPF will discuss the conclusions and recommendations of the annual ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development follow-up as part of its overall integrated follow-up and review of this Agenda.”

3. Second, Korea would like to reiterate the importance of assessing effective development cooperation as an integral part of the follow-up and review framework. Therefore, we suggest adding a new paragraph 73.bis which reads as follows:

“Assessing the quality of development cooperation in support of the implementation of this Agenda should be part of the overall follow-up and review framework. The Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) should serve as the thematic platform focusing on the quality of development cooperation. Other relevant processes and structures, such as the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) should be taken into account.”

In this regard, we also support the European Union’s proposal to include “development effectiveness principles” in paragraph 70 and the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation in paragraph 79 respectively.

4. Third, we understand and fully recognize the importance of national ownership in the follow-up and review process. However, we should refrain from singling out this particular element throughout the outcome document. We note with concern that the repeated formulations such as “informed by country-led evaluations” in paragraph 70.g, “country-driven” in paragraph 75, and “voluntary common reporting format” in paragraph 86 might make our ambition seem lower.
5. Fourth, Korea welcomes the reinstatement of “peer review” in paragraph 76 as we emphasize the value of its contribution to the overall review process. We are especially pleased to see the addition of paragraph 84 on the important role of the UN Development System (UNDS).
7. Finally, we would like to emphasize that thematic reviews are another integral component of the overall review framework to chart global progress on sustainable development to help identify challenges and mobilize action to address them. In this context, Korea welcomes the substitution of “will” for “may” in paragraph 81. However, we believe that thematic reviews should not only feed into but also be aligned with the cycle of the HLPF. Therefore, we suggest deleting the phrase “where possible” in the middle of the last sentence in paragraph 81. We also welcome the inclusion of the last sentence in paragraph 86 requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report that includes guidance on a sequence of thematic reviews for the HLPF.

Thank you, Mr. Co-facilitator. /END/