

CARICOM
response to United Nations Department of Economic and Social
Affairs Questionnaire Entitled
“Critical Milestones towards a Coherent, Efficient, and Inclusive Follow up And
Review of the 2030 Agenda at the Global Level”

Institutional Responsibilities for Follow up and Review:

(Questions 1-6, 8, 9 and 12)

Question 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, complementarities and efficiency? If so, how?

Question 2:

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

Question 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)?

Question 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?

Question 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?

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

Question 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?

Question 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?

Question 12:

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

- CARICOM Member States wish to reaffirm that the relationship between the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council is determined by the Charter of the United Nations. It is the view of CARICOM Member states that amendment of the Charter is not required for the purposes of determining the follow up and review of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda at the global level.
- In the light of the foregoing, CARICOM Member States wish to submit the following observations in response to the questionnaire concerning "Critical Milestones towards a coherent, efficient, and inclusive follow up and review of the 2030 Agenda at the global level":
- There is a need to consider how we can achieve system wide coherence in review and follow up of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with a focus on ECOSOC and the relationship between its processes and mechanisms, and the meetings of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC.
- For the follow up on the Financing for Development(FFD) outcome, the focus should be the dedicated ECOSOC forum. The HLPF should endorse the intergovernmentally agreed conclusions and recommendations of the forum.
- The follow up and review arrangements for the SAMOA Pathway should be conducted through the dedication of one day for the consideration of SIDS issues in the context of the meetings of HLPF.

- Questions were expressed on how the agencies outside of the ECOSOC will feed into the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development follow-up and review process, and whether or not their input should be captured in one of the two reports to be prepared by the Secretary-General (progress report/global sustainable development report).
- The reports produced by the Secretary-General should be considered in joint sessions of the General Assembly and ECOSOC and then fed into HLPF review process.
- The Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) agenda should be reconfigured so that it will be able to address SIDS issues; there is a need to ensure multi stakeholder participation in this process.
- Major groups' arrangements need to be reconfigured: this issue should be addressed by the HLPF to facilitate more comprehensive engagement of diverse stakeholders from all countries at the global, regional and national levels. For example, should the "farmers" group be expanded to include small-scale fisher folk and other resource users? How can the "NGO" group be rethought to reflect the diversity of interests represented in this group? How can civil society with environmental interests be specifically represented?
- There is a need to consider how small and micro enterprises can be included in follow up arrangements in the context of the Development Cooperation Forum.
- When dealing with trade issues, need to make sure that all the partners feed into that system, for examples a similar system as in the LDC.
- The accelerator framework utilized in monitoring implementation of the MDGs, should be replicated for the SDGs follow-up and review process and apply without distinction or hierarchy to all countries in special situations.
- Reporting requirements should be streamlined. UN country offices and regional commissions should assist member states in the reporting process.

Regional perspectives on the review process:

(Questions 4, 7, 21).

Question 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?

Question 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?

Question 21:

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

- Assistance from development partners and the UN system should focus on capacity building and institutional strengthening at the regional level.
- A peer review process for sharing and learning could be it loses at the sub-regional level in the context of follow up and review.
- Consideration should be given to the establishment of a regional platform to facilitate coordination of civil society at the regional level.
- There is a crucial need for resources to strengthen data collection and statistical systems in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in developing countries.
- Consideration should be given to a period of transition, in considering the periodicity of reporting. A multi-speed approach should be considered.
- At the sub regional level the role of Regional Coordination Mechanism (RCM) cannot be over emphasized. This body will address the synergies between the follow-up of the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It is therefore recommended that resources are urgently directed to strengthening the RCM.
- In terms of reporting and the scope for regional reporting: CARICOM Member States are of the view that a number of different regional reports may be generated. An assessment of national reports may form the basis of a regional report to be submitted to the HLPF through regional commissions reporting to ECOSOC. This report would analyze trends and highlight areas for learning and recommendations. A second report based on regional/sub regional priorities and indicators should also be considered. This report would assess regional-level impacts that go beyond the national level and are part of regional cooperation efforts. It could also include the review of the implementation of regional policies and programmes. This report could contribute to an inter-regional report to track implementation across all SIDS.

- The implementation of the SAMOA Pathway is distinct from the implementation of the SDGs and should not be subsumed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It would therefore be important to synergize SDGs to the SAMOA Pathway. The RCM should produce a joint report that would track the implementation and follow up of SAMOA Pathway in relation to the SDGs.

National perspectives on the review process:

(Questions 14-20)

Question 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?

Question 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?

Question 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?

Question 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?

Question 18:

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

Question 19:

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

Question 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?

- A certain basic level of UN system support should be free for developing countries for review and follow up efforts at the national level, including in relation to the support offered by UN Country Offices.
- Mutual accountability needs to be assured with the provision of the means of implementation to offer institutional capacity building and technical support.
- The National Voluntary Presentation process should be reformatted to ensure equitable geographic distribution in the ordering of countries giving presentations.
- CARICOM Member States recognize the need for the involvement of civil society in national planning processes, including determining national priorities and participation in national coordination mechanisms.
- There is a role for civil society in the review process in the context of producing a possible citizens' report on implementation of the 2030 sustainable development agenda.
- Civil society should report on its contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as a contribution to national reports.
- Private sector should be invited to report on their implementation of the agenda as a contribution to the national report. This can be streamlined with existing mechanisms for corporate reporting.