

Questionnaire:

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.

I. Institutional responsibilities for follow-up and review:

In the follow-up and review of Agenda 2030, Iceland emphasizes non-duplication of work, building on existing mechanisms and streamlining efforts within those, towards an integrated approach.

We emphasize transparency of efforts to map contributions that different actors within the UN system will be able to make to Agenda 2030. This will help in getting a fuller picture and in making the best decisions possible on how to proceed, with implementation as well as follow-up and review.

Iceland suggests that GA committees each fall should focus their work on the theme/s of HLPF the following year, as appropriate. In cooperation with initial sponsors, resolutions could be streamlined, prioritized and their periodicity revised both in the second committee and others.

We believe the GA, where every member state has a voice, will need to be involved to an extent. Therefore, we are positive towards exploring the possibility of GA guidance to different commissions, intergovernmental bodies and forums. Guidance should include a call for cooperation and synergies - the age of Agenda 2030 will have to be the age of cooperation not competition between different UN actors.

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 ECOSOC¹ and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”². 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”³. 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

¹ For example, the Commission on Social Development, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Population and Development etc....

² Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

³ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

consistent with the post-2015 development agenda”⁴.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.⁵]

The most important aspect when trying to decide on themes for thematic reviews, is to avoid formation/use of silos. This is a possibility if the SDGs will be addressed in numerical order. Hence, we are more inclined to think that clusters of closely related SDGs or transversal themes would serve this purpose. Regardless of how themes are selected, we stress that all goals should be reviewed and followed-up on with integration in mind.

In line with Iceland’s non-duplication views, we emphasize that work of the HLPF should not be a repetition of the work of functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums. Therefore, inputs from those bodies to the HLPF should be concise and focused on analysing and identifying challenges for the HLPF to give political guidance on. As the HLPF will have a negotiated outcome, input from the other bodies should be in submitted in a different format, to make sure the same issues will not be repeatedly negotiated on. The work of the HLPF should include a focus on best practices, as well as gap analysis.

The HLPF in 2016 should provide states with an opportunity to discuss and reflect on national planning for SDGs implementation.

We suggest to look at the possibility of HLPF having the same or similar annual theme as ECOSOC.

III.HLPF National Reviews of implementation:

Preparation and conduct of national reviews:

Iceland suggests that regular reviews of countries should not take place more often than every three years.

Voluntary common reporting guidelines:

These should take into account the level of transparency and inclusion of non-state actors in review processes.

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

⁴ General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

⁵ General Assembly resolution 68/1, paras 7-9

Iceland emphasizes that major groups and other stakeholders should not just have access to global follow-up and review, but that different social groups will also have to be involved on a local level, in the spirit of Agenda 21. Reports on the contribution of major groups should if possible also focus on the local aspect.

To make sure that the UN system contributes to Agenda 2030 in the best manner possible, sufficient and transparent mapping of pre-existing contributions will have to take place as this may effect decision-making on how best to review these. Again, the age of Agenda 2030 will have to be the age of cooperation and partnerships not competition between different UN actors.