



AUSTRALIA



AUSTRALIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

E-mail australia@un.int

150 East 42nd Street, New York NY 10017-5612 Ph 212 - 351 6600 Fax 212 - 351 6610 www.AustraliaUN.org

Intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda

29 July

Follow Up and Review

**Statement by Kushla Munro,
Assistant Secretary, Global Development Policy Branch,
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia to the
United Nations**

(Check against delivery)

Co facilitators,

We think there have been significant improvements made to this chapter and it broadly represents a reasonable compromise to help achieve a principles-based follow-up and review system. We would therefore caution against including new text in this chapter that makes it any more prescriptive than it is currently drafted.

Unfortunately in your efforts to be inclusive of a multitude of views, the chapter has given way to repetitive and/or redundant language which we consider could be deleted to bring greater clarity to the text. This clarity is important if we are to strike the right balance and ensure we provide the necessary guidance for the follow-up and review system to evolve over time.

In the interests of time and moving toward consensus, we will focus on a small number of priority issues on streamlining and coherency.

Firstly, a point on alignment and clarity, and as recently addressed by Japan, there are now four references to the need to build statistical capacity in the document, in paragraph 50, target 17.18, and paragraphs 70H and 72.

Across these paragraphs there are three different articulations of which groups of countries require particular focus.

We consider that the highest needs are for LDCs and SIDs, and therefore **propose that all references to statistical capacity needs are aligned with target 17.18.**

Secondly, we note there are now three references to policy space in this chapter, in paragraphs 70A, 77 and 79.

One principle which is not in contest, is that participation in follow up and review will be voluntary, and paragraph 70F specifies that processes will account for national circumstances. The concept of policy space in this chapter is at best redundant, and at worst undermines the obligations of states to work towards our shared ambition. We therefore **propose the deletion of all three references.**

Third, we have not yet adequately captured the significant role we expect that cross-cutting thematic reviews will play in the follow-up and review system. In Australia's view, the analysis and conclusions of international organisations working across the spectrum of our agenda, and already conducting regular review processes of relevance, will greatly enrich and mobilise efforts at the global level.

Paragraph 81 currently limits thematic reviews to ECOSOC functional commissions and intergovernmental forums, and we think **this paragraph should be amended to read:** *'Thematic review processes related to this agenda will be an important complement to information drawn from national processes in informing the HLPF. These reviews will reflect the integrated nature of the goals and targets, will engage all relevant stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector, and where possible, feed into and be aligned with the cycle of the HLPF.'*

Fourth, with regard to paragraph 73. We believe the references to 'regular national reports' and 'recommendations for follow up at various levels' are both potentially problematic.

We consider the specification that countries will produce regular national reports is contradictory to paragraph 70F, which states that review processes will respond to national circumstances. Some countries may wish to use online platforms or other means by which to track national progress, and we therefore **do not support the reference to 'regular national reports' in this paragraph.**

We also question the references to 'recommendations for follow up' in this paragraph. Co-facilitators, we have agreed that this system should not point fingers. Who would recommend what to whom, and on the basis of what information and authority? We have not sufficiently elaborated our follow up and review system to answer this question fully, and hence **propose to delete the reference to recommendations.**

Both of these issues in paragraph 73 could be resolved through **deleting the last two sentences, and replacing them with: 'national processes will assess progress and identify challenges, and inform discussions at regional and global levels.'**

Lastly, co-facilitators, in the interests of time I won't go into detail but simply state we support the arguments and language proposals made by the United States with regards to paragraph 79, 84, 86 and 87.