Statement on Follow-up and Review by Norway, 24 July 2015

- Norway welcomes the co-facilitators' proposal to include clear guidance on follow-up and review in the outcome document. This is crucial to ensure a successful implementation of the Post 2015 agenda at all levels, as well as transparency and accountability.

- We support the key principles in para 57. However, in 57 f the reference to national context characteristics should come at the end of the list, instead of at the beginning. Disaggregation by income, sex, age etc is relevant in all countries.

- We note with some concern the amended language in para 58 on the global indicators. These indicators, to be developed in the agreed process under the Statistical Commission by March 2016, should not be cut in stone. We need to be able to update them as new scientific knowledge becomes available and data systems are improved. Formally adopting them in ECOSOC and the GA may make such updates difficult.

- In our opinion, para 61 on reviews at national level should be clearer on the importance of including civil society, private sector, parliaments and other actors. It should also highlight the contributions by UN entities. We would also like to see civil society specifically mentioned in para 70, as was the case in the zero draft.

- Regarding the follow-up and review at the global level, we believe it is of utmost importance that the outcome document provides a roadmap for the further elaboration of how to organize the global review process within the HLPF in the years leading up to the Summit in 2019, where the HLPF will meet under the auspices of the GA.

- Well in advance of next year's HLPF, we should have a common understanding and a plan for this process, that outlines milestones for the establishment of a functioning follow-up and review mechanism, clarifies institutional responsibilities and the proper sequencing of the thematic reviews to be undertaken as well as defines the annual themes of the HLPF. We suggest that the outcome document should request the SG to develop such a plan.

- As for the Global Sustainable Development Report mentioned in para 65, we believe the text should emphasize that the report should also build on the best available science from other assessments carried out in the UN system and that it should be produced in close collaboration with all relevant UN agencies.

- In para 68, we would like to see a more accurate reflection of the agreement from Addis that the dedicated follow-up process on ffd and MoI should be integrated with the post-2015 follow-up and review process.

- Finally, as the UN Development System will be key in assisting Member States in the follow-up of the new agenda, we would

suggest that para 71 should be clearer on the importance of an adequately resourced, relevant, coherent, efficient and effective UN Development System and the need to ensure inter-agency coordination and strategic direction for the system.

- We note the proposal made by some member states regarding a new system-wide reporting on how the UN contributes to the implementation of the new agenda. We caution against creating new and duplicative reporting streams and would recommend using the QCPR for guidance and reporting on this issue.

- Co-facilitator,

- As this is our last statement of the week, let me follow other delegations in reiterating a few points of priority for my delegation on the other sections discussed in the course of this week:

- First, we believe the declaration should focus on the "Why" and the vision of the agenda, and be a clear call for action, and that the preamble should help communicate the key messages of the agenda in a crisp and clear manner. Neither should be an executive summary of the agenda nor should they try to paraphrase the content of the goals and targets.

- Second, on tweaking of targets: We reiterate that we cannot ask our leaders to commit to unfinished targets such as those containing "x"s, nor can we ask them to sign on to targets that fall short of existing

agreements and commitments. This includes target 14(c) which needs to be adjusted to bring it in line with agreed UN language and international law.

- Third, Norway does not see the need to repeat goal 17 and the targets on MoI twice in the outcome document. Our preference would be to see them as an integrated part of the goal set in section 2.

- I thank you.