



Post-2015 intergovernmental negotiations - 27 July, New York

Co-facilitators,

On behalf of the EU and its Member States, let me thank you warmly for your leadership, your work over the weekend and the new draft circulated. We continue to fully support you continuing to hold the pen in the days ahead.

Before reacting more specifically to the draft Preamble and draft Declaration, let me share a few comments on the revised draft as a whole:

- We appreciate your efforts to better reflect in the new draft the transformative features of the agenda (universality, integration, balance, participatory and inclusive nature), and its ownership by all, notably in the revised preamble. We also note the reinforcement of references to human rights and gender equality. We also see some improvement to the language on the follow up and review section. All these issues should be further strengthened but we recognize that points made by many in the room have been taken on-board and we see this as progress.

- On the other hand, we have significant concerns on the structure and balance of the new draft: The Addis Ababa Action Agenda is not annexed anymore and the language on its integration to our new agenda needs to be clearer. The MOI section appears to lose the balance just agreed in Addis, and the MOI actions under various SDGs do appear once but are not included in the MOI section as we would prefer. At the same time, the technical adjustments of targets are not included anymore, which we see as a step backward given the positive informal contacts we had last week, including on 14c. The "chapeau" of the OWG is still annexed leading to great deal of duplication and lack of clarity on its purpose and added value to the existing draft. We are also worried by the introduction of some divisive issues like unilateral economic measures at this late stage. We will comment on these issues in all relevant sessions.

Co-facilitators,

Let me turn now to the preamble and the declaration. I will present our main comments on these two sections. These include concrete, operational comments that can help to move forward in a focused manner. We are also ready to engage in specific language on all these points.

On the preamble:

We support the preamble as structured and the proposed 5 "Ps" which provide a compelling, communicable and action-oriented narrative. We also see progress in the message on the integration and interlinkages and to avoid any form of prioritization. These messages remain a key for the future implementation of our transformative agenda and its ownership by all, leaders, civil society and the private sector.

On the Declaration:

We support a number of useful additions, including on human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability. This is a step in the right direction, although further efforts will be needed in specific paragraphs.

There are some key issues where we still have concerns and would want to see improvements:

- We see overall efforts on reflecting the balance between poverty eradication and sustainable, but efforts are still needed – actually in both directions, notably in the title, preamble, para 3, 8 and 10.
 - On the one hand, the revised para 8 includes an addition on poverty which goes against the balance with sustainable development achieved now in para 3. One option can be to move up, to para 8 or further above, the very useful language at the end of para 14 which recalls that all these key challenges are linked to each other and interdependent.
 - On the other hand, other places of the text refer to sustainable development but not to poverty eradication. The EU insists in keeping a balanced approach also in this scenario and to refer to both. One very important case is the proposed title where we would

like to see reference to poverty eradication alongside sustainable development.

- We believe we still need a better narrative on the new Global Partnership, its underlying principles, as we have highlighted in our previous interventions. The language on means of implementation, while it has improved in some areas, remains unbalanced and will need fundamental adjustment. Let me give a few examples. While the reference to primary responsibility of domestic efforts is included, the description of the role of ODA is not balanced. It should be clearly presented as a complement to domestic efforts. There should also be a reference to all public international finance, not just ODA. The importance of policies, including policy coherence for sustainable development, and enabling domestic institutional and legal frameworks is not adequately reflected. In all these cases, the Addis outcome that we all agreed earlier this month is very well crafted and needs to be the basis for the necessary adjustments. We should not reopen it, alter its balance or render this section too detailed.
- Related to this, the EU considers it essential to strengthen the text on the relationship with the Addis outcome, to ensure that the documents are considered in conjunction when it comes to means of implementation and global partnership. This complementary and integrated approach should build on the Addis text (in its paras 2, 19 and in the section on follow up and review) and we need to highlight and strengthen this vision also in our outcome document. We welcome the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and its full integration is now fundamental. The Global Partnership and Means of Implementation section of the text must describe this integration more fully and specifically. The text must stress that the Addis outcome an integral part of the post-2015 agenda and, together with Goal 17 and the goal specific means of implementation targets set out under the individual goals, is fundamental to its effective delivery. We have concrete proposals to make to that end, while we remain flexible on the precise formulation to reach consensus.
- Bringing all means together to support our new endeavour will serve us best. Therefore, annexing the AAAA to the September outcome to be endorsed by Heads of States and Government will give it the visibility and

political support it deserves. We question that this proposed annex has been removed.

- We welcome the addition in para 11 of the Millennium Declaration, which has been at the origin of the MDGs, is, alongside the Rio Declaration, and is therefore one of the main basis of our work. There must be a general reference to its principles, as agreed at the turn of the century by our Heads of State, which remain fully valid and directly relevant to our comprehensive agenda. We do not think the text should refer and single out specific principles, neither from the MD nor later on the Rio Declaration – but if we do, we support adding a reference to shared responsibilities.
- As to para 13, the EU considers that there is no need to quote in the specific principle of CBDR. We are opposed to singling it out among all the Rio principles. It is a concept which reflects differentiation only in the context of global environmental degradation issues and cannot cover our whole agenda. We note the additional reference to principle 7 that provides its scope. Having said that, we remain ready to work with others for the articulation of the necessary differentiation of countries that have different capabilities, although we should avoid repetition (e.g. in 19).
- In para 31 on climate change, although we welcome the reference to 2C, we are concerned to see that there is now a new bracketed reference, , to the concept of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. We acknowledge this derives from the UNFCCC, but do not believe it needs to be highlighted in this section. The suggested addition does not take into account latest developments, such as the additional expression agreed at Lima on 'taking into account different national circumstances'. In any case, we are not in favour of introducing in the climate paragraph this reference to CBDR-RC, since the purpose of this section should focus on summarising the agreed goals and targets. At the same time, we are concerned that this paragraph has been weakened when it comes to the reference to the new agreement to be adopted in Paris – we would want to reintroduce key terms such as universal and legally-binding.
- As already stated, we do not support the references to divisive issues like in para 30 unilateral economic measures and we would like to say very

clearly that in our view we should not bring these divisive issues to our Agenda on poverty eradication and sustainable development.

- We appreciate the language on cultural diversity in para 9,. By contrast, in para 22, we do not support the addition to 'culture' in the middle of the language agreed at Rio+20 on universality and differentiation, which is otherwise a very consensual paragraph.
- On families, we still do not support the para 44 as currently drafted.

On all these points, we are ready to provide drafting suggestions.

Apart from these main comments, we have also specific suggestions for a number of important issues for which we will be sending additional written comments (e.g. without being exhaustive, issues related to children and youth, SRHR, relevant groups, right to development, migration, planetary boundaries). We are ready to engage constructively and look at concrete language suggestions.

Co-facilitators, we look forward to the negotiations this week. We still have difficult issues to solve but we believe that if we all engage in the negotiations in a constructive spirit, we can finalize our work.

We trust and appreciate your continued leadership and are confident that we can conclude by Friday evening. Thank you.