

**Joint statement: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico and Peru**  
**Delivered by Ambassador Gustavo Meza-Cuadra, Permanent**  
**Representative of Peru, on July 31<sup>st</sup> 2015**

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the delegations of Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico and my own delegation, Peru.

- 1) We welcome the title as appears in the new version of the document. We consider the concept of sustainable development to be key and believe no other concepts need to be added to the title.
- 2) We do not intend to overcharge the shorter version of the preamble, but we call for the inclusion of four key concepts that we believe are a must and are in the long version:
  - a) The interlinkages and integrated nature of the SDGs. We can bring back the sentence from the original preamble *“The interlinkages and the integrated nature of the SDGs are of crucial importance in ensuring that the purpose of the new Agenda is realized.”*
  - b) The specific mention of SCP. Let’s not forget that this is the third issue referenced in “The future we want” – right after eradicating poverty and hunger. We propose the following amendment on the paragraph under Planet: *We are determined to protect the planet from degradation, managing its natural resources sustainably and changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, so that it can support the needs of the present and future generations.*
  - c) As a matter of consistency, refer to poverty in all its forms *and dimensions* under the element “People”. This also applies all throughout the document
  - d) We need to include the concept of social inclusion.
- 3) On Paragraph 3, second line, after “protect human rights”, we propose to add “promote social inclusion” and follow the paragraph as it is with “and gender equality”.
- 4) On paragraph 4, instead of all sections of society, we would like to have *all social and economic groups*. The same applies to paragraphs 44 and 82, as the implementation on the leave-no-one-behind principle requires focus on the social and economic groups that are furthest behind.
- 5) On paragraph 7, we would like to see language on “a world free of harmful emissions” in the last sentence
- 6) We want to support the reference of the human right to water and sanitation in paragraph 7 of the Declaration, and delete the reference to “affordable”
- 7) On paragraph 9 we should add, after the reference to the eradication of poverty, *in all its forms and dimensions*.
- 8) We strongly support all references to gender equality and empowerment of women. On paragraph 11, after the reference to the ICPD and the Beijing Platform for action, we would like to bring back to the document the reference to their review conferences.
- 9) On Paragraph 14, fourth line, after “combatting inequalities within and among countries”, we propose to add “promoting social inclusion”.
- 10) On Paragraph 20: We strongly reject the language “[all internationally recognised]” and call for its deletion. All human rights are indivisible and interdependent, and our understanding of human rights evolves with time. Recent additions are, for example, the rights of persons with disabilities, and the right to safe drinking water. In addition, different regional human rights treaties and mechanisms exist and must be also

recognized, such is the case of the Interamerican convention on the rights of older persons.

- 11) On paragraph 28, eighth line, after “We will adopt policies which”, again, we propose to add “promote social inclusion and”, and follow the paragraph as it is.
- 12) On climate change, we are working constructively on a consensus paragraph, based on paragraph 31.
- 13) We want to add our voice of support to the last sentence of paragraph 32 on promoting sustainable development and decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation.
- 14) We agree with the small changes made to the targets, but would like to see the concepts of "ending modern slaving and human trafficking" added to target 8.7. Paragraph 28 of the Declaration should be amended accordingly, as to also include these elements in its fifth line.
- 15) We like the Mol section, and appreciate the decision of the facilitators to not have any annexes, as a compromise solution.
- 16) We like par 38 as it is
- 17) We see MICs very underrepresented in a document that pledges to leave no one behind. We therefore propose to add a reference to this very large group of countries on paragraph 41 and to bring paragraph 71 from the AAAA as paragraph 60 bis into the text
- 18) On follow up and review, we think we need to reflect the full architecture for follow up and review, especially with regards to ECOSOC
- 19) On follow-up and review: paragraph 43 and 82, we ask to incorporate after HLPF the wording “under the auspices of the GA and ECOSOC” according to the standard way of referring to it. In both sentences the reference “the central role in overseeing” is not consistent with any of the mandates of the HLPF. We could use the formulation of previous versions of the document that refers to: “responsible for the follow-up and review process”. We can also go with some wording along the lines of what the US proposed: HLPF under the auspices of the GA and ECOSOC is the apex of the follow-up and review process at the global level”.
- 20) We add our voice to those calling for the inclusion in our text the full language from Addis on the technology facilitation mechanism.
- 21) We also add our voices to those calling for the inclusion of a reference to indigenous peoples among the people listed in paragraph 48.
- 22) On Paragraph 76, first line, MICs should be added to the list of countries in which national statistical capacities on disaggregated data should be strengthened.
- 23) On paragraph 42, we agree with the proposals by Cameroon of taking the end of the paragraph “while stressing the importance of strengthened national ownership and leadership at the country level” to the end of the first line. We also agree that it is best to speak about the UN development system instead of only the system and on reflecting the full name of the ECOSOC dialogues instead of the process. We do however want to keep sustainable development in the paragraph.
- 24) On paragraph 88, we should delete the caveat “as appropriate” at the end of the paragraph as it is not part of the compromise resolution ECOSOC 2014/14
- 25) Finally, we support the revision of target 11.5, as it has been suggested by Japan, in order to make it consistent with the Sendai conference on Disaster Risk Disaster.