



**MISIÓN PERMANENTE DE MÉXICO
ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Wednesday, May 20th, 2015.

Review and follow up session (response to questions from the co-facilitators)

We appreciate this opportunity to specify our views on some issues discussed during the past few days.

It's always important to take a step back to ask ourselves about the purpose of our discussions. Such purpose for us is to find common agreements on the broad vision of the follow-up of the post-2015 development agenda. As mentioned yesterday by the co-facilitators, our priority should be to have an effective review framework of the development agenda and the SDGs.

We agree with you about the existing convergence on certain principles that should guide the follow-up framework such as: universality, voluntary, nationally owned, evidence- and databased, multi-stakeholder and inclusive, transparent, 'positive but not punitive' or "lean but not mean"— leading to an exchange of experience and best practices, using existing mechanisms and not overburdening countries.

This means that we need to understand that such a complex agenda should have an adequate follow up framework. Certainly, there is general agreement that the HLPF will be the main platform for the follow up and review of the post-2015 agenda and particularly the SDGs. As it was clearly identified by the co-facilitators there is also an agreement on the key actions that the HLPF will perform.

It is very important to stress that such general agreement was complemented by the call of many groups and delegations, including ours, to ensure a systematic approach so that the HLPF works properly and not in a segregated manner.

Therefore, it is crucial to understand the nature of the agreements pursuant to resolutions 68/1 and 67/290 on the United Nations architecture for sustainable

development. We are not starting from scratch. Since these resolutions were agreed, an extensive work has been conducted among Member States, in order to better understand such architecture.

This effort provides several elements to answer some of the questions raised yesterday, as well as to think differently and innovatively about how the follow up mechanism might work.

Some of those answers are:

1. If the HLPF is the crown, it should be understood as part of a system of processes, mechanisms and existing bodies that will follow-up on a number of relevant issues of the post-2015 agenda.

We are glad to hear that a mapping exercise of that system is being conducted. Our request is not only a long list of mandates and processes, and rather a pragmatic analysis of the processes in place and how these will contribute to an effective follow up of the agenda.

My delegation tried to do that mapping in one page, so I'm sure that with the support and expertise of the secretariat, we will get a clearer and better structured mapping that articulates a message of coherence and coordination.

2. The United Nations system is anchored in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The HLPF must serve as a dynamic platform, catalyzing the work of the UN machinery.
3. Taking into account the aforementioned convergences and mandates included in the relevant resolutions, the division of work between ECOSOC and the HLPF is clearly defined: The ECOSOC is the charter body in charge of the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development; it coordinates the work of the subsidiary committees, forums, funds, agencies, and programs as well as the intergovernmental work carried out in each of its segments.

None of these mandates overlap with those of the HLPF. Actually, the Council reform provides an opportunity to better utilize the existing system for the benefit of the political discussion at the highest level carried out in the HLPF under its auspices.

4. Therefore, our call is not to overload the HLPF with coordination or bureaucratic mandates already carried out by the ECOSOC. On the contrary, we must benefit and give renewed life to the intergovernmental processes under the Council, many of them with a thematic approach, to follow-up on specific issues of the post-2015 development agenda. This could be seen as a more focus and technical work complementary to the HLPF as a dynamic platform.

5. It is not a matter of transferring mandates and activities to the HLPF. On the contrary, it is about considering ECOSOC's activities (including its resources and time allocated), as part of the agenda's follow up framework, creating a cycle of activities that culminate in the high-level political discussion of the annual and quadrennial forums.
6. Regarding HLPF's main outcomes, it is clear that this will consist on a yearly ministerial declaration containing the political guide to continue with the implementation efforts of the SDGs, and another every four years under the General Assembly.

It is unclear for us why the HLPF should generate reports on global progress. On the contrary, we consider that reports such as the GSDR, should inform the HLPF's political discussion on global and systemic improvements and not the other way around. We will not elaborate on the GSDR's characteristics since we've already touched upon them in previous sessions.

The GSDR should:

- *Be the instrument where the measurement and track of **global indicators** is reflected. Thus, data availability is essential.*
 - *Contain recommendations for global policies, on the implications of the assessment made based on the global indicators assessment to inform the discussions of the HLPF and the negotiations of the Ministerial declaration of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC.*
 - *Be produced by a task force across the United Nations system led by the Committee for Development Policy to be transformed as an Independent Advisory Group.*
 - *Group the main results of the thematic follow-up conducted by the subsidiary bodies of ECOSOC (functional commissions and expert committees, relevant forums and segments of the ECOSOC).*
7. The HLPF, under the auspices of ECOSOC, should review the global progress in achieving the SDGs, as the multi-stakeholder platform for exchange of national and regional experiences and identification of cooperation opportunities for the subjects in which there is no progress.

HLPF under the auspices of the General Assembly: 1) will review the global progress every four years at the highest level; 2) will be based on global progress during the four years of work of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC.

8. Given that the HLPF's working methods and modalities and those of the ECOSOC system have been already clearly identified and agreed upon in relevant resolutions, we do not consider necessary to further elaborate on them, including on the number of times that HLPF meets under ECOSOC, nor do we feel this issue is pertinent for this process or as a topic for the Summit.

What is crucial though is to discuss the organization of its work program and the focus and dynamics that it should have in order to carry out the tasks that we hope it will accomplish, in particular in defining how global, national, and regional reviews will be executed in a dynamic and productive manner. This year's edition of HLPF under ECOSOC presents a good opportunity to further discuss this topic.

We believe it is adequate that next year, the HLPF discusses the way in which countries should work to implement SDGs at a national level.

9. FFD-post 2015 follow-up. We reiterate the position we expressed in both this process and FFD, that the mechanism to follow up the Post-2015 Agenda should have as a counterpart an independent follow-up mechanism to evaluate the progress in the application of the Addis Ababa agreements. The review of the SDGs in the HLPF, particularly SDG 17 and the goals regarding means of implementation, will enable a convergence between both follow-up mechanisms.

We have presented a proposal to the FFD co-facilitators which includes likewise, a systematic and cyclical view that takes into account the processes and the dedicated activities at the UN system to follow-up on different aspects of financing for development.

10. We reiterate that it is essential to have an integrated secretariat for both ECOSOC and the HLPF. This is not a new call; it has been reiterated by most delegations, since the creation of the HLPF and throughout the current transitional period. Without coordination and coherence in the substantive and the organizational support of both the HLPF and ECOSOC, it will be difficult to achieve an integrated and dynamic follow up and review framework.

In conclusion, we must focus on topics that are truly unresolved issues and relevant for this process. We need to understand:

1. The differences and scopes of the notions of: monitoring, following-up, accountability, and review, all of which complement each other and are relevant in different manners and contexts.
2. Define the interaction between national, regional, and global follow-up.
3. Define the dynamic for the multi-stakeholder interaction in the framework.
4. Define the GSDR's scope as an instrument for monitoring and as the scientific base for the political debate.

Briefing of the group on global indicators under the Statistical Commission.

We consider the group of experts of global indicators as an independent technical process whose job does not require the oversight of this political process or any other. It should be granted the sufficient time to complete its work, and once completed, it should be adopted through the corresponding institutional channels: Statistics Commission-ECOSOC-and finally, the General Assembly. The interaction with the Group until it completes its work should continue through briefings to the General Assembly after the conclusion of the intergovernmental process.

Once the global indicators are integrated to the SDG through a GA resolution in 2016, they should become a central part of the Global Sustainable Development Report, to monitor the global progress in the achievement of the SDG.

In that context, we support the establishment of a global database under the Statistical Commission for the global indicators, similar to the database already in place for the MDG indicators. It should serve as a basic statistical reference repository serving national, regional and global reporting. Such database is the logical extension of the formulation of a limited set of global indicators on which the interagency and experts Group is currently working.

As mentioned by the President of the Statistics Commission, the global database should be founded on global statistical standards and, thus, ensures the consistency of indicators and methodologies across countries and regions. Also it would support our efforts to build the necessary statistical capacities as it would help identify gaps and highlight needs for statistical capacity investments.