

Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

The New Draft – July 31, 2015 – 12:00 p.m.

Statement by H.E. Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota

Deputy Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations

Mr. Co-facilitator,

We commend you for providing us with a revised document in a very short period of time, a text that certainly moves us forward towards consensus and completion.

The document, however, has still not entirely the right balance for adoption. A few, though very important points require further consideration and tweaking, without prejudice to all that has been achieved. There must be no retrogression, and we have noticed that the document lacks some important references contained in the previous version, and has incorporated a couple of formulations that move us away from consensus in some critical areas.

We were encouraged to see that almost all delegations showed a constructive attitude towards the text during our debate last night. Brazil will also engage in a constructive and flexible spirit. We are close to an agreement everybody would be proud of.

We will refrain from picking the document apart, overburdening negotiations at this late hour with everything that is not perfectly aligned with our national positions as a gesture of flexibility, conciliation and compromise, and we will address four main issues at this stage.

We remain to be convinced of the need for a preamble for reasons we have previously stated. We can work with the short version of the preamble offered by co-facilitators, but would have greater difficulty with the now modified longer one. The shorter version, though maintaining the five Ps as equal entries in a glossary type list - which we expressed a strong position against - constitutes a commendable improvement, and avoids summarizing and referencing all SDGs in a single page, something almost impossible to

achieve affecting the balance of the OWG negotiated outcome, adopted by the UNGA.

- In the short preamble, we need to add a reference to SCP as a central component of Planet. I don't think the planet will be safe and that we will all prosper if we do not agree to make our SCP more sustainable. Support proposals made by Peru and Colombia on this regard.

- Still in the short preamble, we propose replacing the last sentence before the People heading with the following: "The Goals and targets will stimulate action over the next fifteen years in the three integrated dimensions of sustainable development and in other areas of critical importance for humanity and the planet:"

This seeks to address with minimal modifications concerns expressed by delegations including ours about the lack of integration of the 3 dimensions of SD in the preamble.

- We are particularly disappointed with modifications in the language on human rights and gender equality, which backtracks on the previous text. We insist on sticking to the human rights-based approach - and balance - negotiated in the Open Working Group, itself a considerable compromise for countries like my own favorable to a more assertive and progressive text on these matters.

- In paragraph 4, we share views expressed by South Korea and Mexico with regards the need to refer to social and economic groups, instead of "sections of society".

- In paragraph 11, we must preserve the reference to the outcome documents of the review conferences of the Beijing Platform of Action, as mentioned by other delegations.

- In paragraph 20, we must delete reference to "all internationally recognized", an unacceptably restrictive caveat, standing against the core idea of protecting humans irrespective of their status, vulnerabilities, race, disability, etc. The expression above, which we strongly oppose, when used in other circumstances generally refers to "internationally agreed treaties" not the human rights themselves. Were we to let the bracketed formulation pass I am afraid we would soon find out, to the total discredit of our first P, that very few human rights, as such, are "internationally recognized". Not

even the fundamental right to life would fit into our agenda under this formulation.

- We oppose changing the word “gender” by “sex” in paragraph 26, which contradicts our call for gender equality as stated in the preamble and many other parts of the document. Gender is a more encompassing word and a more precise expression than sex, and serves to mitigate the striking absence in a document supposed to serve us in the XXI century of any reference to non-discrimination for reasons of sexuality. We also oppose the deletion the reference to families in the end of the same paragraph 26. And we have a strong view that people living with HIV have to be included in the list of vulnerable people who need to be on the proposal of paragraph 24.

- A third issue of concern for my delegation refers to differentiation among countries. The new document excluded references to different national circumstances, capacities and priorities, from paragraphs 22 and 19. It also limited by dilution and revisal of meaning the references to "policy space", a key instrument of differentiation in practice.

Our proposals, as follows, are based on agreed concepts and language, to facilitate compromise:

- In paragraph 5, the second and third sentences should be kept together. It should read: “It is accepted by all countries and is applicable to all, taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and level of development and respecting national policies and priorities”. This is the language from paragraph 246 of Rio+20, which refers to the universal applicability of the SDGs.

- We should also bring the same language back to paragraph 22, immediately following the second sentence.

- On paragraph 29, we can accept your formulation on SCP but we wish to make clear that proposals we heard from other delegations to dilute the primary responsibility of developed countries on this issue are not in line with the longstanding international consensus on SCP and are therefore not favored by us.

- In paragraph 74, item “a”, we wish to request you to bring back the concept of policy space.

- Finally, differentiation is also critical in paragraph 13 and 31. Specifically in paragraph 13, we believe the reference to “principle 7” should be deleted, reflecting the encompassing applicability of differentiation to our universal agenda.

In this regard, allow me to reiterate for the last time that differentiation does not undermine the universality of our Agenda neither does it allow for lower commitments in social and economic fields. On the contrary, differentiation has allowed all countries to commit to a transformative and ambitious set of goals – as the SDGs take into account different national circumstances, capacities and priorities.

- Paragraph 31 is of critical importance, but I will refrain from commenting on it for the sake of time and due to the fact that delegations are already discussing text proposals.

We also wish to request the deletion of last sentence of paragraph 32, as it unduly expands an concept of “decoupling” which has a very specific formulation in the SDGs and the Rio+20 outcome document.

Before moving to my **fourth and last point**, I would like to propose two small amendments to make our text more coherent with the SDGs:

- In paragraph 9, we suggest the inclusion of “decent work” after growth. It would then read: “We envisage a world in which every country enjoys sustained, inclusive and sustainable growth AND DECENT WORK (...)” and the rest remains unchanged.

- In paragraph 34, we would like to propose a small addition after Rule of Law, in the fourth line. We would like to include the expression “**at all levels**” at the end of the sentence. This is consistent with relevant GA resolution, specifically the resolution on “rule of law at all levels”, and reflects the agreement achieved in Goal 16.

The **fourth and last issue** we would like to address refers to the MOI and the status of Addis in our document. We thank the EU for their constructive approach on this issue, and we concur with the need for consistency in the relationship between paragraphs 40 and 41, when referring to the Addis outcome. We are open to working on this basis.

- We propose to take the last sentence of paragraph 40 (the one starting with “and we recognize that its full implementation [...]”) and merged with the beginning of paragraph 41. Our proposal for paragraph 41 would than read:

“We recognize that full implementation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda is critical for the realization of Sustainable Development Goals and targets. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda is an integral part of this Agenda alongside relevant strategies and programmes of action which we are also committed with the fully implement”. The rest remains unchanged.

This proposal aims at highlighting the role of Addis in supporting and complementing the Post-2015 Development Agenda as we all agreed and has been reflected in paragraph 19 of the Addis outcome. That understanding is not up for re-negotiation or reopening.

- Still on MoI, we also take the point made by the United States regarding the first sentence of paragraph 40. We do not support any formulation that could lift one Goal above others – no goal should be left behind. Although we recognize that the means of implementation are a requirement for the achievement of the other SDGs.

In any case, we wish to propose an amendment in first sentence of paragraph 40, replacing the reference to the Agenda by a reference to the Global Partnership. The revised sentence would read:

“At the core of the revitalized Global Partnership for Sustainable Development are the means of implementation targets under goal 17 and under each SDG.”

The following sentence would remains unchanged, as it reflects the language in Addis modalities resolution and paragraph 19 of Addis outcome.

- We do not share the view that Addis Outcome incorporated all the MoIs and therefore should override them. The Addis Conference did not have as an objective to replace or reinterpret the MoIs of the SDGs. Furthermore, there are some MoI targets, which are not reflected in the Addis document, and many others that are presented in loose narrative formulation, fragmented, associated with different issues or put in a different context.

- In chapter 3, on MoIs, we believe that paragraphs from 55 to 59 are critical, as well as paragraph 71. We are flexible to consider ways to address the concerns expressed by delegations regarding other substantive paragraphs.

- Finally, with respect the Technology Facilitation Mechanism, I would like to reaffirm the agreement to have the full text of paragraph 123 of Addis outcome reflected in our document. On this issue, I thank the delegation of Japan for acknowledging the agreement in their previous intervention.

Thank you.