Bangladesh statement on Follow up and Review – IGN 7 / P2015 by Mr. Riaz Hamidullah, Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dhaka

New York, 24 July 2015

To begin with, we join all other delegations in conveying our deep condolences to the delegation of Djibouti.

My delegation aligns itself with the statements delivered by South Africa, on behalf of the G77 and China, and Benin, on behalf of the LDCs. We also recognise a number of useful texts suggested by Maldives, on behalf of the AOSIS.

Moving forward, we would place on record our appreciation for the manner in which both of you, Co-facilitators, have been deftly steering our work uptil this stage of our work. We share your elaboration, this morning, in terms of the wider context and the uniquely vast space that we all are stepping in. This agenda is complex because it is inter-linked. That offers opportunities as much challenge!

As we consider Follow up and Review, it is important to note that for the new Agenda to effectively deliver on ambition and transformation, differentiated appreciation of roles, responsibilities and capacities of various actors would be necessary. It is important as we ask for ownership and delivery by the States, particularly the low-income or the countries in difficult circumstances, within a revitalized global partnership. For instance, the nature and spread of private sector varies widely in a globalised world.

Within a **revitalized global partnership**, we would also need to delve how the UN System, the Funds and Progarmmes and the Specialised Agencies

deliver in unison – particularly at the country level. We would therefore stress on the need to carry forward our conversation beyond.

Mr. Co-facilitators

In our national capacity, we have a few specific languages to suggest.

On para 57(a), in keeping with para 72, it should read as: "they will be voluntary and **State-led** and country-owned, will take into account different national realities, **circumstances**, capacities....."

In Para 57 (d), in order to ensure consistency, in line with GA/Res./67/290, "all people" should be replaced with "major groups", as others also stressed.

On 57.f, suggested addition to LDCs and SIDS, should be in order.

In para 59, in second line, it should read as "....... to strengthen national statistical offices and data systems **across the government** is critical. ..." in that regard, the suggestion from EU—on geo-spatial data - is worth considering. The additions suggested by AOSIS are worth considering.

The same way, as we recognise at the country level, clarity on para 60 could be useful. This is based on as our national stakeholders start mobilising and organizing themselves. Thus, we would thus suggest reformulation of the para, to read as: "we encourage all member states to [develop] mobilize all efforts towards ambitious national responses to the SDGs and targets. These can support the transition to the SDGs and build on existing planning processes and mechanisms, such as instituting national [development and] sustainable development strategies, suitable intra-government coordination /implementation mechanisms, as appropriate."

In Para 61, as for conducting national reviews, our understanding of the second sentence in consonance with Para 57, is that as the governments conduct the reviews, they will engage with the major groups and stakeholders and take into account the views and contributions.

The Regional Reviews – as reflected in Para 62 and 63 – are important. We go along with the objective of regional exercise, as is there in the first sentence. Yet, we would have to reflect how the regional reviews to feed into global level at HLPF will vary from region to region. We elaborated earlier that not only the regions differ, but nature and dynamics of discussions within regional Commissions also are diverse.

As regards Global level, para 64 should be fully aligned with res. 67/290. Para 65 is a useful addition. As we heard in HLPF earlier this month, GSDR could serve as a useful catalyst. we appreciate the useful elaboration from Mr Nikhil Seth; and this is what we also underscored in last HLPF. We would underline that we make a cautious beginning and let GSDR gradually evolve in its own merit, yet not as a reporting or monitoring tool or, instrument. We would suggest the second sentence to be adjusted so that it serves to strengthen science — policy interface and provide useful evidence-base to the policy-makers and actors, and add: '....in regard to contemporary and emerging issues as well as possible solutions towards poverty eradication and promoting sustainable development.

We consider the thematic reviews, as in para 67, is an important pillar of Follow up and Review. In our view, these Reviews can complement and also draw on national and global Reviews. As the delegation of Tonga underlined, we would suggest for adding a sentence at the beginning to elaborate on

the importance, purpose and linkages of thematic reviews vis-à-vis the rest of follow up architecture.

As we consider **para 71**, we would stress on the need for categorical pronouncement on a revitalised UN, System-wide. As we consider Implementation part of the Declaration and global review parts, we would suggest for the following as the fourth sentence in para 40 in line with the essence of para 71. It should read as: "The UN System, including the Funds and Programmes, Specialised Agencies, should be adequately-resourced and deliver effectively in coordinated and responsive manner, especially at the country level to support countries towards full and effective realization of the Agenda. We believe, this would be important not only to bring clarity, but also to underscore that serious rethinking for the UN system vis-à-vis country level implementation remains.

Lastly, as we go along with para 72, certain clarity on *reporting format* would be necessary. G77 has suggested for the development of formats to be left to the countries. We believe, if a format is to be suggested, such a format could be an **indicative template**.

I thank you.