

## Critical milestones towards a coherent, efficient, and inclusive follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda at the global level

---

### Questionnaire: AUSTRALIA

*For each item below, please feel free to provide an answer in any format that is convenient to you. If possible, please provide a brief explanation for your responses. You may consider using the elements in italics to frame your answers. Please feel free to leave blanks for questions you feel unprepared to answer.*

#### **Preliminary comments: Australia's overarching vision for follow up and review**

Australia recognizes that this survey is intended to feed into a report by the Secretary General, referred to in Paragraph 90 of the 2030 Agenda, which will outline critical milestones toward coherent, efficient and inclusive follow up and review at the global level. In answering the below questions, however, we note that the HLPF is at the apex of a system of follow up and review that operates also at national and regional level, and within a complex international development system which periodically produces in-depth global assessments of a thematic nature which are highly relevant to the 2030 Agenda. We therefore wish to reiterate upfront our vision for the broader system, from which the more detailed responses in this survey flow.

Australia has always emphasized the need for follow up and review to be **fit for purpose** – to enable all countries to meaningfully participate, regardless of their level of statistical capacity. In order to be **efficient**, it is imperative that the system **build on existing processes** rather than mandating new ones, drawing together different types of information and identifying the most important conclusions for discussion.

Australia's vision is for an HLPF that maintains high level political engagement and energy, and enables the mobilization of resources to meet the ambitious goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda. We should seek to track progress through global trend reporting (in the Global Sustainable Development Report and the Secretary General's annual report based on global indicators), but also to highlight successes and areas that require further attention. The HLPF must bring together a wide range of stakeholders and connect people implementing the Agenda, enabling them to share ideas and best practice. It must provide positive incentives for national governments, the private sector and international organisations to present and promote their activities, and voluntarily report their contributions to the Agenda. It should seek to have a reputation as an event that pushes the boundaries of international development cooperation and showcases innovation.

There is a risk that, if the HLPF tries to build its agenda around formal consideration of the many hundreds of reports likely to be fed into it (from national governments, regional bodies,

functional commissions, UN agencies, civil society and other stakeholders), it will become a formulaic event that fails to attract high-level representation or add value beyond existing forums such as ECOSOC functional commissions and the committees of the General Assembly.

To counter these risks, and in order to carve out a high level role for itself, the HLPF will need to develop and demonstrate capacity to:

- Draw together a large number of inputs (including from outside the UN system) and analyse them to identify trends and examples that are sufficiently noteworthy to feature in HLPF sessions. The Global Sustainable Development Report will be a key publication in this regard – it will need to be authoritative and digestible.
- Support a variety of presentation styles that engage participants – this will mean breaking away from the panel discussions that have characterised the HLPF to date, and embracing more interactive forms of presentation, including encouraging participants to interact with one another informally. The opportunity to network should be one of the key incentives to attend the HLPF.

## **I. Institutional responsibilities for follow-up and review:**

1. How can the General Assembly, ECOSOC and the HLPF work coherently in follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda? What should be the role of the General Assembly in follow-up and review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda? Do you see a need to adjust the working methods and agenda of the General Assembly, its plenary, second, third committees in particular and their relation to ECOSOC to respond to the 2030 Agenda and ensure coherence, complementarity and efficiency? If so, how?

Australia considers that the GA, ECOSOC and the HLPF should work coherently (Question 1) according to a high-level understanding of each of their respective comparative advantages, which we understand to be:

The **General Assembly's** role is in norm setting and high level policy guidance, to express global consensus on key issues. In this case we would see this guidance as primarily coming from the 2030 Agenda document (including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda).

**ECOSOC** has a more technical role in managing and coordinating the work of its functional commissions (such as CSW), regional commissions (Australia's region being UNESCAP) and the specialised agencies, including the funds and programs (UNDP, UNICEF) and connections to key Bretton Woods institutions (WBG, IMF).

The **HLPF** should be a platform for exchange which invites participation from stakeholders beyond the UN system, and discusses the most important issues related to follow up and review of the 2030 Agenda. In terms of the modalities of the HLPF, we see a shared arrangement between the General Assembly and ECOSOC, with one of four years getting an overall high-level system engagement under the auspices of the General Assembly, and three out of four years being able to have more technical reinforcing discussions under the

auspices of ECOSOC, which Australia would suggest are organized under broad transversal themes (more detail in section II).

This question is linked to both the processes of revitalising the General Assembly and the revitalisation of Second Committee – which are not the subject of this questionnaire. However, in relation to working methods etc we feel it is important to note the great degree of overlap between the General Assembly and ECOSOC currently; many Second Committee resolutions are similar to ECOSOC resolutions. The blurring of mandates is not helpful for clarity in relation to policy, process or implementation. It also represents a poor investment of Secretariat and member state time and political attention.

2. Given its Charter and other mandates, how can ECOSOC help ensure that global follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda is coherent?

Nil response – see question 1

3. How can the HLPF most effectively make linkages with the follow-up and review arrangements of United Nations conferences and processes on (1) least developed countries (LDCs), (2) small island developing States (SIDS), and (3) and landlocked developing countries (LLDCs)<sup>1</sup>?

There are two elements to dealing with LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS in the follow up and review system:

1. Incorporating an assessment of progress against the outcomes of relevant UN conferences (Istanbul Program of Action, Vienna Program of Action, SAMOA pathway).
2. Examining data against the Agenda 2030 global indicators for these groups of countries and analyzing how and why these groups' trajectories differ from global trends.

Australia considers evidence-based discussions incorporating both of these elements could be a useful component of the HLPF agenda, and should be aligned with the HLPF's broad thematic focus for the year (see following section).

4. Should the General Assembly provide some guidance to ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums on how they should best reflect their contribution to the review of SDGs, and to the HLPF generally, in their work programmes and sessions? And what would it be?

No. The management of ECOSOC functional commissions is clearly within ECOSOC's mandate, the General Assembly should not overreach its mandate. Bodies that interface with ECOSOC can reflect upon their own value add.

As regards providing direction to other bodies beyond those within ECOSOC's mandate, Australia is sceptical as to the value of such activities given these bodies have widely divergent purposes, structures and systems. It is likely that organisations will come up with

---

<sup>1</sup> 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

their own ways to reflect their contributions.

We have a strong preference that all stakeholders reflect their contributions to the Agenda as a whole, while reflecting their expertise, rather than limiting their input to specific goals, targets or indicators. Australia is concerned about designating particular institutions and forums as focal points for follow up and review of particular goals as we feel this excludes the contributions of other stakeholders and undermines the integrated and indivisible nature of the goals and targets by separating them out.

5. How can the HLPF best build on the outcome of ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development and the summary by the Co-Chairs of the multi-stakeholder forum on Science, Technology and Innovation?

The HLPF will need to deal with means of implementation in an integrated manner. Australia considers that presentations and discussions at the HLPF should incorporate an analysis of how financial and non-financial means of implementation are supporting progress, and where improvements could be made.

Elements regarding financing, innovation, science and technology will be key parts of country and regional review processes. The Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR) should be used as a focal point, bringing together reports from governments, the UN system, civil society, academia and the scientific community. The GSDR will synthesise these inputs in preparing the report, which would frame discussions at the HLPF. The ECOSOC Forum on FFD, and the multi-stakeholder forum on STI should therefore both forward their outcomes to the GSDR authors (to be determined).

Actors contributing to the ECOSOC Forum on FFD, the multi-stakeholder forum on STI and the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) should also be brought into HLPF discussions through inviting them to make presentations on particularly noteworthy aspects of these areas of work.

## **II. Overarching annual theme of the HLPF vs thematic reviews of progress of the SDGs to be carried out by the HLPF:**

*[The 2030 Agenda decided the thematic reviews of the HLPF will be supported by the reviews conducted by the functional commissions of ECOSOC<sup>2</sup> and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”<sup>3</sup>. These various bodies and forums are mandated to “reflect the integrated nature of the Goals as well as the interlinkages among them”. They “will engage all relevant stakeholders and, where possible, feed into, and be aligned with, the cycle of the HLPF”<sup>4</sup>. The HLPF, when meeting under the auspices of ECOSOC, “shall have a thematic focus reflecting the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development, in line with the thematic focus of the activities of the Council and*

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the Commission on Social Development, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Population and Development etc....

<sup>3</sup> Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

<sup>4</sup> 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

*consistent with the post-2015 development agenda”<sup>5</sup>. The thematic focus of the HLPF should allow the HLPF to follow-up and review the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The GA decided that ECOSOC will base its annual programme of work on a main theme and defined the characteristics of this annual theme.<sup>6</sup>]*

#### **Overarching comments on thematic reviews**

Australia is of the view that existing thematic review processes can add value to the broader follow up and review system.

Australia understands ‘thematic reviews’ to mean not only purposive exercises that may be undertaken using a subset of the goals and targets as a guiding framework, but also existing, periodic processes conducted by international organisations. Page 48 of the 2015 Global Sustainable Development Report is instructive in this regard, noting 36 international assessments with findings relevant to the 2030 Agenda and mapping their coverage across the 17 goals.<sup>7</sup>

In keeping with the agreed follow up and review principle of building on existing platforms and processes and avoiding duplication, Australia questions the need for the HLPF to conduct exhaustive thematic reviews in its own right. The HLPF could instead focus on drawing together the conclusions of relevant assessments published over the course of the preceding years, and invite experts from relevant organisations to present at the HLPF on what the findings of these assessments tell us about progress towards relevant goals and targets, and any policy implications. For example:

- the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) publishes an annual *State of Food Security in the World* report. This report is most clearly relevant to Goal 2, but has important links also with Goals 1, 3, 4, 8, 16, and 17. The FAO could be asked to present key findings of the report to the HLPF, drawing relevant trends to the attention of participants.
- The World Bank’s *World Development Report* is a good example of a regular, evidence-based assessment that differs from year to year because it of a changing thematic focus.
- The *Census of Marine Life* is an example of an international assessment conducted largely outside the UN system, but with clear value to add to follow up and review discussions on Goal 14, among others. It is essential that these stakeholders are also connected with the HLPF and their input welcomed; limiting the HLPF to sources of data from the UN system and international financial institutions undermines the nature of the 2030 Agenda.

6. Should the HLPF thematic reviews of the progress on the SDGs (i) focus on clusters of closely related SDGs or (ii) examine progress in all SDGs based upon on a transversal theme such as gender, health or education or (iii) address four SDGs every year, taken in a numerical order, along with SDG17? If

<sup>5</sup> General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

<sup>6</sup> General Assembly resolution 68/1, paras 7-9

<sup>7</sup> Global Sustainable Development Report 2015 is available at <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/globalsdreport/2015>.

option (ii) is preferred, when and how should the transversal theme be decided upon?

Australia has a strong preference for broad transversal themes for the HLPF (option ii) over clusters of goals (i), or an approach that deals with goals in numerical order (iii). (i) and (iii) undermine the integrated nature of the agenda, and transversal themes also better enable the HLPF to recognise new and emerging issues .

7. What kind of inputs should functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums provide to the HLPF (e.g. negotiated outcomes, summary of discussions and analysis or other)? And how should the inputs of various platforms be presented to the HLPF so as to best support its review and political leadership, guidance and recommendations?

Functional commissions, intergovernmental bodies, and other organisations and stakeholders should be encouraged to provide **short, concise** briefs outlining how any relevant negotiated outcomes (from major conferences) or published analysis (annual reports, major assessments) indicate progress against the goals and targets. In 2015, a two-page brief on each chapter of the Global Sustainable Development Report was prepared; this format is a good example of material that can be digested by participants. A key overarching concern for Australia is the volume and variety of information and analysis that may flow into the HLPF; participants' ability to engage will be severely constrained unless materials are concise and easily understood.

8. What would be good overarching annual themes for the HLPF to address (when it meets under the auspices of ECOSOC) and how can they be aligned to that the theme of ECOSOC? Please give several examples?

There should be one theme that is the same across the system (HLPF and ECOSOC). Australia suggests the following themes as examples:

- Integrating sustainable development into plans and processes: giving effect to the 2030 Agenda
- Governance for sustainable development: a means and an end
- Empowering women and girls for sustainable development
- Harnessing innovation for sustainable development

All themes should integrate consideration of the means of implementation (policy approaches, financing and technology.)

9. How long in advance should HLPF themes be known? For example, (i) should there be a programme of work for the four years in between two meetings of the HLPF under the auspices of the General Assembly or for a longer time period or (ii) should themes be determined every year and if so how could

other intergovernmental platforms and other relevant actors contribute to the HLPF review?

A single transversal theme that is the same for ECOSOC and the HLPF is preferable to having different themes for different forums – this would be too confusing. While it would be ideal to have this theme apply also the multistakeholder forum on STI and the ECOSOC Forum on FFD, this may not be possible given the different organizing frameworks of these latter forums.

Themes should be set at least 2 years in advance; Australia suggests that themes could be decided on a 4 year cycle through a General Assembly resolution.

Ideally, themes would take into account other high level events - for example, a 2015 theme might have had a gender focus, linked to the 59<sup>th</sup> Commission on the Status of Women (Beijing + 20).

10. Should the multi-stakeholder forum on Science, Technology and Innovation address the same theme as the HLPF?

Nil response – see q 9

11. How should the United Nations Statistical Commission best contribute to the work of HLPF?.

The key role of the UN Statistical Commission is to ensure updated information against the global indicators is available to inform discussions at the HLPF, and to form the evidence base of the annual progress report on the Sustainable Development Goals.<sup>8</sup>

As the highest decision making body for international statistical activities and standard-setting, the Statistical Commission will also have an ongoing role overseeing the work of the Inter Agency Expert Group on SDG indicators (IAEG), particularly with reference to areas in need of statistical development (eg indicators for Goal 16). The Statistical Commission will also need to oversee the IAEG in regularly reviewing the list of global indicators to ensure technological and statistical advancements are utilised to the greatest extent possible.

12. What arrangements would be needed to allow the HLPF to identify and consider new and emerging issues?

Australia considers that our broad vision for the HLPF – having it be a conference-style event that is attractive to stakeholders such as academics and the scientific community – supports consideration of new and emerging issues as part of the broader follow up and review discussion. We note that the 2015 Global Sustainable Development Report undertook specific crowdsourcing of briefs on possible emerging issues; while Australia is not wedded

---

<sup>8</sup> See paragraph 83 of 2030 Agenda outcome document.

to this particular approach, it is clear that the scientific community will be critical to identifying and prioritising those new and emerging issues that warrant attention at the HLPF.

13. How can platforms and processes outside the UN system, including those run by other international or regional organizations and by non-state actors, contribute to thematic reviews at the HLPF?

See our overarching comments on thematic reviews. A fundamental principle of the HLPF should be that expertise and experience beyond the UN system has value to add; modalities must be found to enable the use of data sources beyond the UN system to inform analysis and the GSDR, and participants from specialist organisations and experts should be among those invited to speak at the HLPF.

From a practical perspective, the HLPF could set up a website with a repository for reports, summaries and analysis from all stakeholders, enabling organisation from outside the UN to submit documentation for inclusion. A high-quality search function which allowed users to search by organisation, theme, year, or goal area (organisations could determine which goals their input is most relevant to) would help users locate the most relevant information.

### **III.HLPF National Reviews of implementation:**

#### **Overarching comments on national reviews**

States have the primary responsibility for their own development, and are primarily accountable to their citizens. To encourage transparency and promote high-quality national reports, the HLPF could post all national presentations and related reports and other supporting material to the website, so users beyond HLPF participants are able to see what how their own country and other countries are responding to the Agenda.

Presenting the findings of national review processes at the HLPF is one exercise which states may find valuable in order to draw attention to their particular efforts, successes and challenges, and seek the views and experiences of other states. It is not the primary purpose of conducting such reviews.

#### *Preparation and conduct of national reviews:*

14. How often would countries be expected to participate in regular state-led reviews in order to allow for a meaningful exchange of experiences and feedback at the HLPF? Should there be a minimum number of reviews within 15 years to be presented at the HLPF?

Australia sees it as unrealistic to expect that states will undertake reviews of progress against the Agenda more frequently than a national census, or other major population surveys. It would therefore be realistic that states would undertake approximately two reviews of progress over the fifteen year timeframe, allowing for an incremental start in the coming years as states integrate the Agenda with national planning processes and start to draw together relevant data.

Australia cautions against overly ambitious approaches that would see all states presenting across the four-yearly cycle, as this would lead to lower-quality review processes which are less meaningful in their national contexts. Such an approach would also be more likely to lead to 'review fatigue' because it would imply around 35-40 national presentations at each session of the HLPF, dominating the meeting agenda and limiting the forum's capacity to fulfil other aspects of its mandate. In short, fewer, better presentations that genuinely add value and set an example for other states will be better than potentially a lowest common denominator, compliance-based approach.

15. How can the HLPF discussions on the reviews be best prepared in order to facilitate a sharing of experiences and the provision of political leadership, guidance and recommendations at the HLPF? How would countries like to be supported in preparing the review process at global level?

Australia is of the view national presentations should not have a set format, but that countries should be encouraged to do analysis (rather than just collating data against indicators) through posing questions such as:

- What processes has your state gone through to give effect to the 2030 Agenda, and integrate it into policy and planning cycles?
- What have been the key challenges in your national context? Are any of these challenges more likely to be address through regional solutions?
- What have been the major successes in your national context in relation to the Agenda? What can other countries learn from this?
- What kinds of partnerships or other forms of international support (international financial institutions, national or international development banks, private sector, global funds, UN agencies, bilateral ODA) have been most critical in enabling progress in your country, and why?

*Voluntary common reporting guidelines:*

16. In order to help elaborate voluntary common reporting guidelines for State-led reviews at the HLPF, kindly indicate what issues you would want the HLPF to address systematically when it examines national implementation reviews?

When the HLPF is considering national reviews Australia considers it should focus on:

- **Identifying data gaps and ways to fill them:** in areas where there is a lack of official data against global or complementary national indicators, the HLPF should seek out alternative sources of relevant data, proxies or estimates.
- **Analysis of areas where official data do not tell the full story:** for example, in monitoring Goal 16 on peaceful societies and governance, quantitative indicators will need to be complemented by qualitative analysis. Furthermore, many of the means of implementation targets address sources of development finance beyond ODA, but not all of these sources enjoy internationally agreed definitions or methodologies to enable consistent measurement.
- **Ensuring national reviews encompass consideration of the means of implementation, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda:** National review processes should actively

consider all resource flows available for sustainable development, and how effectively or otherwise they are being used to further national progress. This involves going beyond the global indicators which are limited because of definitional and monitoring issues around other financial flows. The Asia Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility (AP-DEF) has been supporting countries in Australia's region to undertake Development Finance Assessments, which enable countries to understand the sources of development finance available and how their policies might optimize the scope and scale of finance available. These exercises could be a useful example for integrating meaningful consideration of MOI at the national level.

17. How can the guidelines leave enough flexibility to Member States while ensuring sufficient comparability between HLPF reviews to facilitate cross-country comparisons and to help track global progress? Could guidelines identify a core set of issues, in addition to the status of all SDGs and Targets, which all countries would be encouraged to address in their reviews and, in addition, a number of issues which countries might consider addressing if feasible?

See Australia's responses to questions 14-16; our view is that national presentations and reports should not have prescriptive guidelines and we do not anticipate a high degree of comparability will be possible. Australia views a core set of analytical questions as outlined in our response to question 15 will be more useful than guidelines suggesting any generic format for presentations.

*Presentation of national reviews to the HLPF:*

18. How should the country reviews be featured and discussed at the formal HLPF meeting?

Australia believes that the HLPF should consider featuring national review presentations in a format other than plenary sessions. There is a risk that a series of national presentations will not promote questions and dialogue in response to issues raised by the presenters.

Holding either parallel sessions, whereby participants might attend review presentations more relevant to their own national context, or holding a marketplace-style event with various countries could present with visual aids (videos, maps showing particularly interesting national trends) and participants circulate freely, could encourage more engagement among participants and enable open exchanges between state representatives, civil society and other stakeholders.

19. How can national reviews give adequate attention to the means of implementation? How can they help to mobilize new support and partnerships?

As set out in the 2030 Agenda, in particular the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, member states

will need to consider their national context (economies, governance practices, regional opportunities, business opportunities etc) to formulate their reform agendas to achieve sustainable development, thus linking policies and inputs to results. National reviews should actively consider the full range of resource flows and policy measures that are being utilised to achieve sustainable development, and the effectiveness of these resources and policies. National reviews also provide an opportunity to showcase or share lessons learned in relation to the range of policies, approaches and instruments that national governments are utilising at the national, regional and global level to address development challenges on the ground to implement our shared ambition in the 2030 Agenda.

20. What kind of outcome should result from the HLPF national reviews of implementation, and how could there be a follow-up to these reviews?

National review processes, and presentations relating to these processes at the HLPF, are voluntary. This is not the Universal Periodic Review - there will be no formal processes for stakeholders to formally respond to the contents of a national presentation. Participants at the HLPF will take away the most interesting lessons and utilise them in their own contexts – hence the importance of making presentations engaging and basing them on high-quality analysis.

Member states conducting a second or subsequent national review process could be encouraged to consider major changes since their last review and how development trajectories have been impacted.

#### **IV. Regional reviews and processes**

21. How should the outcome of regional review processes be considered at HLPF?

Australia considers that a range of key 2030 Agenda challenges can be addressed at the regional level, including economic reform, private sector engagement, and transboundary infrastructure investment. A regional perspective may be useful in thematic discussions; strong engagement with key regional experts and regional examples should be drawn on in HLPF discussions.

The Asia Pacific region includes large East and Southern Asian economies as well as small, remote economies of the Pacific Small Island Developing States. Data in our region is therefore most useful when it is disaggregated by country, so that countries with particular challenges (such as remoteness from markets, particular health impacts, education impacts) can be identified. Averages taken across our region are in general not useful due to its diversity.

We note that disaggregation of data by country will also better support analysis of the progress of cross-regional groupings such as LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS, which are also all advocating for specific consideration at the HLPF.

The outcomes of regional review processes should feed into the GSDR, which in turn will frame the HLPF discussions.

## V. Inclusion of UN system and other stakeholders in global follow-up and review

### Overarching comment:

Australia considers that all stakeholders should be actively encouraged to participate in follow up and review, including civil society, the private sector, multilateral development organisations, and the academic and scientific community. Our vision for the HLPF would see all stakeholders engaged in speaking roles, running side events, and participating in interactive sessions to contribute their ideas and analysis into follow up and review discussions.

22. How can the HLPF support the participation by the major groups and other relevant stakeholders in the follow-up and review processes conducted at the global level including the thematic and country reviews? What are possible options to seek their contributions to the reviews at the HLPF, (building on the modalities for the participation of major groups defined by General Assembly resolution 67/290 and the practices of the General Assembly open working group on SDGs)?

Australia notes the potential of major groups and other stakeholders to contribute valuable perspectives and analysis, and would like to see these groups able to input in a meaningful way – for example, speaking in formal sessions as well as side events. One example of an important external stakeholder is the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. While not a UN body, the GPEDC is a large multilateral body focussed on improving the quality of development investments. The GPEDCs workplan is complemented by a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework, to which countries voluntarily contribute data. The GPEDC has much to offer the Agenda 2030 follow up and review system, both in terms of data to inform reviews and regarding providing incentives for countries to participate in voluntary monitoring exercises.

23. The 2030 Agenda calls on major groups and other stakeholders to report on their contribution to the implementation of 2030 Agenda. How can such reviews be prepared and conducted at the HLPF? How can these actors be encouraged to engage in such reviews?<sup>9</sup>

Nil response – see overarching comment

24. How should UN system contribution to the implementation of 2030 Agenda be

---

<sup>9</sup> Agenda 2030 states in para 89 that “the high-level political forum will support participation in follow-up and review processes by the major groups and other relevant stakeholders in line with resolution 67/290. We call on those actors to report on their contribution to the implementation of the Agenda.”

reviewed?

The HLPF should not focus on reviewing the UN system's support for the Agenda. There will already be an abundance of reports flowing into the HLPF; the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review is an existing and appropriate process by which to review how the system is contributing to the achievement of the Agenda's goals and targets.

Outputs of the QCPR such as the Secretary General's annual report on QCPR implementation, as well as the individual strategic plans/frameworks of the agencies, funds and programmes and their annual reports, provide sufficient material to support discussion of the UN system's performance in this regard.

25. What steps can the UN system, including the Secretariat take to best support follow-up and review in a coherent and effective manner?

Australia considers that the most valuable things the Secretariat and UN system could do include:

**Focus on the factors that support or impede engagement and participation of stakeholders.**

The HLPF has struggled to attract high level representation to date in part because of its panel discussion format – this does not support engagement, and does not allow Ministers sufficient opportunities to interact or promote their countries' efforts. Australia would consider 8 days of sitting in plenary listening to presentations without an opportunity for meaningful discussion a failure to fulfil the HLPF's mandate.

**Reduce the number of processes and documents.** The HLPF should provide an opportunity to streamline and consolidate follow up and review processes, and ensure it reduces layers, rather than adding to them. There needs to be a focus on implementation and results, not on complex or onerous monitoring and reporting mechanisms.

## VI. Other views and ideas

26. Please add any other points you would like to raise.