

Peruvian responses to the questionnaire of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs on a coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review framework for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

New York, November 14th 2015

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 and third committees in particular and their relation to ECOSOC to respond to the 2030 Agenda and ensure coherence, complementarity and efficiency? If so, how?*

A graphic representation of the sequential roles and functions of each instance would be helpful to inform actionable recommendations on a more coherent, complementary and efficient follow-up and review framework for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Such framework should be understood as a dynamic, participatory and multi-layered network of state-led mechanisms built on existing platforms and processes, in accordance with existing mandates. At the global level these include the General Assembly, the ECOSOC the HLPF, and other intergovernmental bodies, organs and forums as appropriate.

The General Assembly is however the only intergovernmental body that ensures the universal engagement of all United Nations member states in a systematic follow-up and review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda at the global level. It is therefore called to play a crucial role by providing political and operational guidance to the works of the ECOSOC and by supporting and informing the HLPF's annual oversight.

Building on its existing agenda items – including by establishing new ones, and clustering and merging the related ones, as appropriate – the General Assembly has the capacities required to follow-up on systematic thematic reviews of progress to be ultimately oversights at the HLPF, while ensuring the universal participation of the United Nations member states.

To ensure an integrated approach and avoid duplications, it could be useful to cluster the agenda items addressing the implementation of the Agenda 2030. In order to ensure the coherence and promote synergies and complementarities amongst related processes followed by all relevant General Assembly's main committees – in particular the Second and Third – and by ECOSOC, joint sessions should be arranged as well as meetings of the General Assembly's plenary, as appropriate.

The working methods and agenda of the General Assembly should thus evolve as to reflect the new priorities given by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in order to ensure coherence, complementarity and efficiency, along with a holistic and integrating approach. However, this should be done gradually and by consensus, and taking into consideration that the agenda of the General Assembly is wider than the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

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

ECOSOC is called to ensure coherence by coordinating and reviewing the implementation of operational policies by the United Nations funds and programmes, and by undertaking studies, producing reports and providing recommendations. It should also act as an evidence-based observatory of replicable good practices and of emerging challenges to be showcased at the HLPF. In these regards it should inform and enforce General Assembly's mandates while preparing and following-up on the HLPF.

ECOSOC is also called to play a central role in the preparation of the HLPF under its auspices. The HLPF's programme should be elaborated by ECOSOC by conducting a consultative process with all the United Nations member states and all relevant stakeholders in a transparent and predictable manner, including the definition of sub-themes and the composition of the HLPF's segments, panels and invitees.

3. *How can the HLPF most effectively make linkages with the follow-up and review arrangements of the United Nations conferences and processes on (1) least developed countries (LDCs), (2) small island developing states (SIDS), and (3) land-locked developing countries?*

The follow-up and review arrangements of such conferences and processes are considered by the General Assembly under specific agenda items, and should also support and inform the HLPF including through specific segments of its program dedicated to presentations of the incumbent chairs followed by interactive dialogues with other concerned high-level authorities. The same applies, *mutatis mutandi*, for the UNFCCC and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

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

Yes, as appropriate, the General Assembly should provide periodic guidance to ECOSOC and other intergovernmental bodies and forums on how to ensure a coherent, efficient and inclusive review of the SDGs to inform and support the HLPF. Although such guidance would have to be defined on a case by case basis, this should become a standard in the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly under different agenda items that are related, and should be aligned, to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

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?*

Both issues should be reflected in the HLPF programme through specific segments including the presentation by the incumbent Co-Chairs of their conclusions and recommendations, as well as an assessment of progress, challenges and lessons learnt, for its interactive discussion with concerned high-level national authorities.

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 the 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?*

To avoid a silo approach, all thematic reviews should be granted a segment for their consideration at the HLPF programme every year. Preference is thus to annually review all the SDGs along with all crosscutting issues – this without prejudice of the possibility of having a specific focus on a transversal theme or on a cluster of goals.

A flexible approach could allow a combination of the options provided.

A specific focus or theme should be decided by member states at least two years in advance in order to ensure proper preparation of the corresponding HLPF. However, this decision should not preclude other more specific mandates coming from the different thematic preparation processes at the General Assembly or ECOSOC levels.

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 reviews and political leadership, guidance and recommendations?*

The HLPF inputs should be decided on a case-by-case basis by the General Assembly or by other intergovernmental bodies or platforms entitled to support and inform the thematic reviews taking place at HLPF. In principle, such inputs should be integrated into the Secretary General's annual progress report on the SDGs, as appropriate.

All inputs, including the Global Sustainable Development Report, should be made available in due time, considering that they will also inform the negotiations of the HLPF's ministerial declaration (to take place in advance and at the expert level) intended precisely to provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations. A roadmap and a timeline for all inputs to be issued would be helpful in this regard.

Inputs should finally be presented in an interactive manner at the corresponding segments of the HLPF by their respective authors or facilitators, as appropriate.

8. *What should 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 the theme of ECOSOC? Please give several examples.*

Examples of overarching annual themes:

- Eradication of poverty in all its forms and dimensions.
- Social inclusion for sustainable economic growth.
- Integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development.
- Environmental challenges for sustainable development.
- Strengthening and renewal of the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.
- Science and technology and productive diversification for sustainable development.
- Human rights approach to leaving no one behind.
- Crosscutting enablers of Sustainable Development: Culture and the rule of law.

In principle, the HLPF and the ECOSOC annual themes should be complementary, in order to fully align the latter's agenda with the priority assigned to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. While the HLPF theme should focus on substantive issues, the ECOSOC theme could focus on the corresponding operational arrangements of the United Nations Development System.

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?*

Option (ii) is preferred in order to favour the establishing of priorities in a more dynamic manner. The HLPF annual themes (and eventually sub-themes) should therefore be decided annually, either by the General Assembly or by the HLPF itself. The themes should be defined in a participatory and consultative manner at least two years in advance, in order to ensure a proper preparation by all contributing platforms and stakeholders.

The definition of the annual theme should be flexible enough to allow also consideration of themes emerging from national, regional and thematic reviews in order to ensure dynamic responses to specific junctures.

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

Not necessarily. The STI forum should take into account the HLPF theme but ultimately be able to develop an autonomous approach to follow-up on its mandates.

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

The Chair of the Statistical Commission should present an annual assessment of its global indicator framework and of its programme for capacity-building in developing countries – this in a dedicated segment with the interaction of the economic regional commissions.

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

Either a General Assembly resolution or the HLPF Ministerial Declaration would suffice to identify specific arrangements. A comprehensive summary of the HLPF would help to inform further considerations and decisions on the matters.

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?

By observing and implementing, as appropriate, the principles and provisions already established in General Assembly resolution 67/290 on the modalities of the HLPF, as well as in the follow-up and review section of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Platforms and processes outside the UN system could consider the adoption of specific mechanisms for a streamlined contribution with the HLPF in their respective fields of competence, including during its preparatory stages, with a focus on dialogue and evidence based analysis.

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 of reviews within 15 years to be presented at the HLPF?

Due to its voluntary nature, a minimum number of State-led reviews could be difficult to establish. Also, considering the limited number of days allocated for the annual HLPF, as a matter of efficiency its programme should prioritize the global follow-up and review of the SDGs implementation.

Thorough State-led reviews providing concrete feedbacks for national processes should preferably take place amongst peers engaged in comparable developmental processes. In this regard, UN regional commissions or other regional or sub-regional platforms could encourage a minimum frequency of national reviews at the regional level.

The regional level of follow-up and review, and eventually the thematic reviews, could identify good practices, trends and challenges of a wider scope that could be selected for its interactive presentation by high-level national authorities at a regional or a thematic segment of the HLPF. ECOSOC should consider these inputs as part of the HLPF preparatory process.

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?

Building-up on the previous response, this would be an issue to further consider and develop at the regional level and through ECOSOC as part of the HLPF preparatory process.

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?

- Provision of adequate means of implementation.
- Access to information systems for timely and evidence-based decision-making.
- Enabling environment for eradicating poverty and achieving sustainable development.
- Identification of good practices and emerging challenges.

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?

The identification of a core set of comparable and common issues would be better established through State-led reviews amongst peers at the regional level, with the support of regional commissions and other relevant regional stakeholders. The issues identified should be then assessed by ECOSOC as part of the HLPF preparatory process.

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

Country reviews could be featured and discussed at the HLPF by previously identifying and selecting wider regional or thematic issues of relevance to the global follow-up and review. Regional platforms and ECOSOC should play key roles in the selection process.

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

National reviews can give adequate attention to the means of implementation by identifying progress due to good practices replicable in other contexts and shortcomings attributable to a lack of access to adequate means of implementation of a transnational or systemic scope. The identification of such progress, challenges and lessons learnt through regional or thematic assessments will bring visibility to issues that in turn would favour new partnerships and cooperation with the concerned countries.

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?*

Regional and thematic reviews should identify replicable good practices and transversal emerging challenges, inform the Secretary General annual progress report on the SDGs, and recommend its presentation by the responsible high-level authorities for their discussion at the HLPF.

The follow-up of such reviews should provide recommendations and promote enhanced cooperation and partnership, in order to secure the provision of adequate means of implementation.

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

There should be a segment dedicated to present all the regional review processes, and their reports should inform the Secretary General annual progress report on the SDGs.

Regional review processes should assess not only progress but also shortcomings and recommend strategies to address them, including by identifying transversal lines of action and of technical assistance.

22. *How can the HLPF support the participation by 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 contribution 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)?*

The referred resolution 67/290 and the section on follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development contain principles and provisions reflecting a delicate balance achieved by member states for participatory processes at all levels. At this stage, focus should be put on the implementation of such principles and provisions rather than on further building on them. To this extent, invitations could be submitted to major groups and other relevant stakeholders with relevant information about the modalities established for their participation.

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?*

Major groups and other relevant stakeholders could present their reports, as appropriate, in an interactive manner in the segments of the HLPF dedicated to thematic reviews related to their contributions.

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

The UN system contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda should be reflected in the reports informing all national, regional, thematic and global reviews. The incumbent high-level officials should present the contributions of their agencies, funds and programs, at the corresponding thematic segments of the HLPF in an interactive manner.

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

- Outreach governments at the national level in order to help build capacities for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including for follow-up and review, taking into account specific national circumstances and needs.
- Avoid silo approaches and competition amongst agencies, funds and programs.
- Open-up to member states the discussions being entertained under the “fit for purpose” motto, and align them with the ECOSOC dialogues on the longer term positioning of the UN development system, called to inform the 2016 QCPR.
- Leave behind resistances to the Delivering as One approach at the country level.

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

The Secretary General report on a coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the global level should consider the constraints that the HLPF presents in terms of available time and resources.

It should then provide a map of the different intergovernmental platforms and processes called to support and inform it. This should provide a benchmark for drafting a programme with all the thematic reviews that should be part of the HLPF, as well as of the stakeholders that will have to present their inputs in an interactive and integrated manner. Along should come a proposed schedule for the preparatory process, referring all the inputs to be assessed by Member States with sufficient time.

This approach would ensure coherence between the HLPF’s ministerial declaration and its actual programme, as the latter would reflect the inputs informing the former.

A particular concern is that the HLPF ministerial declaration would not actually be informed by the high-level discussions, as it is normally negotiated in advance and at the expert level. This implies the need for a subsequent follow-up based on a comprehensive summary, which should be elaborated in a predictable and transparent manner by a designated rapporteur. Such outcome could actually become a cornerstone of the preparatory process for the subsequent HLPF.
