

Remarks

By

H.E. Achraf Ibrahim

Deputy Assistant Minister for Economic Affairs

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Egypt

at

IGN on the Post 2015 Development Agenda

Follow up and Review Session

June 22nd-25th, 2015

24 July 2015

Check against delivery

Distinguished Co-facilitators,

I would like to associate my remarks with the statement made by the distinguished Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, the statement made by the distinguished Permanent Representative of Rwanda on behalf of the African Group, the statement made by the distinguished Permanent Representative of Algeria.

Co-facilitators,

My delegation believes in the need for a robust, efficient, transparent, voluntary follow up and review process for the Post 2015 Development Agenda, a process which we believe that the High Level Political Forum “HLPF”, consistent with its universal intergovernmental character, shall provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, follow up and review progress in the implementation of sustainable development commitments, enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner at all levels based on the outcome document of Rio+ 20 and the modalities of the HLPF as stated in GA resolution 67/290.

Allow me to emphasize that the HLPF role will be follow up and review.

Having said that, we believe that we should consider and decide on the authority deficit currently facing the HLPF and its ability to exercise its functions, we should clearly address the HLPF’s working methods including its need to receive and issue reports, take decisions and have a separate secretariat.

Furthermore, we would like to reiterate our position on what has been discussed during the joint session of Post 2015 Development Agenda and FfD, specifically with regards to the relationship between both process, our view is that while both process are separate and independent, there are elements of convergence between both process, and we support the current proposal in the Financing for Development Revised draft regarding the establishment of a dedicated follow up and review of the FFD outcomes and the means of

implementation of the post 2015 development agenda, and for that outcome conclusions and recommendations to feed into the HLPF thematic debates.

Co-facilitators,

We would like to highlight that the zero draft includes too many details that we should avoid to ensure it is not deemed prescriptive and/or intrusive on the national level. Therefore we propose that its structure should concentrate at the global level, then the regional and national levels to capitalize on the guidance provided at the global level. And we have the following comments with regards to the zero draft:

1. The terms used should focus on follow up and review and not accountability, respect for national policy space should be emphasized, taking into account different national realities and that the global reviews should be based on national data.
2. We welcome the input and participation of stakeholders, but in line with national laws and regulation, and we propose that we struck out language prescribing entities responsible for follow up and review at the national level as this may conflict with national legislations.
3. With regards to the regional level we don't support the idea of peer reviews and we would propose instead Peer learning, we also support the work of the regional organizations work to enhance, upscale or develop regional review mechanisms for the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda, recognizing the importance of building on existing follow-up and review mechanisms at the regional level and allowing the adequate policy space. These efforts will benefit from the support of the relevant regional commissions, but don't support the use of regional commissions as a platform for such reviews.
4. With regards to the global level, we support your proposal for thematic reviews at the HLPF, we don't agree with the proposal's approach towards the Global Sustainable Development Report as it changes the understanding for the report's function as an assessment of assessments/ enhancing the policy-Science interface and not a monitoring tool, and we reiterate our position that the Secretary General should provide a proposal for follow up and review to be considered by the member states.

