

Questionnaire (annotated):

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.

All comments and answers made in this questionnaire were made with the spirit of making the 2030 Agenda a success when taking stock on the overall implementation of the Agenda in 2030. Having spent several years of intense negotiations prior to adoption of Agenda 2030, a shared vision on how to operationalize a robust follow-up and review architecture is vital. The universal and indivisible nature of the 2030 Agenda calls for such an approach. We have now the opportunity to shape an architecture for the next decade to come. This takes place in the year the UN celebrates its 70th anniversary. Switzerland is committed to contribute to an ambitious and future oriented architecture, and making progress on this challenging endeavor.

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?

- *The mandates outlined in the 2030 Agenda, GA resolutions 67/290 and 68/1 give us already specific indications on the relationship and roles of the different bodies. In particular, according to paragraph 82 of Agenda 2030 “the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) will have a central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes at the global level, working coherently with the UNGA, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and other relevant organs and forums”.*
- *While the ECOSOC plays a key role in coordinating the UN system and ensuring all its parts are working coherent towards the same objective, the distinctive feature of the HLPF is its role in bringing all the different streams together on the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda. The HLPF, at the apex of a network of follow-up and review processes, will be the locus where the 2030 Agenda will be discussed in its integrality, including the means of implementation, taking into account the integrated and interrelated nature of goals and targets.*
- *The annual meetings of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC should feed into the quadrennial HLPF under the auspices of the UNGA. The HLPF*

Meeting under the auspices of ECOSOC produces a Ministerial Declaration. Every 4 years the HLPF Meeting under the auspices of the UNGA will produce a concise Political Declaration. Both offer options to provide substantive normative guidance.

- *The work of the UNGA Plenary and its Committees, including the Second and Third Committees, will be impacted by the 2030 Agenda follow-up and review and should be examined in the future with a view to avoid duplication in the context of the architecture of follow-up and review defined by the 2030 Agenda. Therefore, when re-considering and re-structuring current agenda items and related resolutions of the UNGA Committees, including the Second and Third Committees, the four-year cycle of the HLPF should be taken into account. However, it will be key to avoid unnecessary duplication between the work of the different UNGA Committees and the work of the HLPF.*
- *We consider it as important to start with a process on the revitalization of the work of the UNGA Committees now. However, we will need a phased approach. It is important that we work towards a shared vision and agree on broad principles. A more substantial discussion on the methods of work should be held during this year's 70th UNGA, including the plenary discussion on the revitalisation of its work - given that the 2030 Agenda has direct implications for the work of all the committees. Such a process could take the form of a more thorough and structured dialogue among Member States that could also feed into the discussion on the follow-up and review mechanism at the HLPF in July 2016.*
- *We particularly welcome the informal consultations with NGOs on the agenda and work of the UNGA's Second Committee held earlier this year. This is a continuation of the inclusive and transparent consultation process leading to the 2030 Agenda.*
- *The process on the revitalization of the UNGA and its Committees should be coherent with the overall process launched in the 2030 Agenda to answer the remaining questions on follow-up and review.*

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

- *The mandate of the ECOSOC is to ensure system wide coherence and coordination to ensure that the system and its parts are working towards the same objective. The roles of the different segment and meetings under ECOSOC need to be clarified in the context of the 2030 Agenda. A better use of these is required to strengthen ECOSOC and position it in light of the 2030 Agenda.*
- *For instance, the integration segment is considered to be particularly well placed to bring together the inputs of the UN System (for example, in preparation of the HLPF thematic review). However, more reflection on the relationship between the Integration Segment and the HLPF thematic reviews*

is needed. In the current set-up it seems rather duplicative and difficult to communicate to the different Ministries. The necessity of this duplication is not evident. At the same time, they cannot be completely separate: the themes of the Integration segment and the HLPF thematic reviews need to be in close alignment. In order to simplify and thereby also strengthen these segments, we are in favour of them having the same theme.

- *Similarly, the role of the Partnership Forum and its relation with regards to the HLPF Partnership Platform needs further clarification and reflection (e.g. exemplary partnerships should be linked to the thematic and country-reviews of the HLPF, while the ECOSOC Partnership Forum should focus on multi-stakeholder partnerships in a more systemic manner by looking at general criteria for and reviews of multi-stakeholder partnerships).*
- *In addition, the High-Level Segment of ECOSOC and the Ministerial Meeting of the HLPF need to be streamlined and organized as one session. Every 2nd year the High-Level Segment of ECOSOC will also include the HL Meeting of the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF). It is important that the DCF maintains its distinctive informal multi-stakeholder format.*

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)¹?

- *2030 Agenda § 82: “Effective linkages will be made with the follow-up and a review arrangements of all relevant UN conferences and processes, including on LDCs, SIDS and LLDCs”. For example, the Mid-Term Review of the Istanbul Plan of Action (LDCs) can feed into the HLPF Meeting 2016.*

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?

- *2030 Agenda calls for the contribution of ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental forums in paragraph 85 and 86.*
- *On practical terms, it could be useful to have a template for the UN system contribution. It would ensure relevance and comparability of information e.g. top key recommendations of the sector/related to the respective goal/target (political input), based on evidence/scientific analysis (substantive-technical input, e.g. to be presented through the Global Sustainable Development Report/an annual edition or chapter in preparation of the Global Sustainable Development Report every 4 years.). See answer provided to question 7.)*

¹ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

- *ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies should be invited to present their contributions directly at the HLPF Meetings (Thematic Review Sessions based on para. 85 of 2030 Agenda).*

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?

- *2030 Agenda calls for the contribution of ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental forums in paragraph 85 and 86.*
- *The Finance Forum should possibly provide for a relevant input to the thematic reviews of the HLPF (see question 6, where we currently propose option iii). Consequently, the Finance Forum could also look at the 4 SDGs chosen every year with a Finance/SDG 17 lense/es.*
- *The multi-stakeholder forum on STI should focus on a topic that is inspired by the theme of the HLPF and relevant for the thematic review of the HLPF. The summary of discussion should then feed into the thematic review of the HLPF (see answer question 10).*

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 ECOSOC² and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”³. 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”⁴. 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 consistent with the post-2015 development agenda”⁵. 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.⁶]

6. Should the HLPF thematic reviews of the progress on the SDGs (i) focus on

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

³ Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

⁴ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

⁵ General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

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

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?

- *Starting point is that in every 4 year cycle of the HLPF Meetings under the auspices of ECOSOC, all the SDGs should be considered. The HLPF Meeting under the auspices of the UNGA would review global progress towards the achievement of all goals. Switzerland proposes that annual HLPF meetings feed into the HLPF under the auspices of UNGA every 4 years (see question 1).*
- *The 2030 Agenda was designed to be an integrated set of goals and targets where goals already go a long way to breaking a strictly siloed approach. With regards to the annual thematic reviews at HLPF Meetings under the auspices of ECOSOC Switzerland has a preference for part of the agenda to be considered every year. This would ensure both an in depth review as well as an integrated vision. In our view, some kind of “objective”, mechanical formula could avoid complex negotiations on the theme. We therefore opt for option iii) (4 goals a year plus always goal 17). This could be done in several ways, e.g. in a numerical order or by random selection in to avoid possible silos. It is important to focus the review on the goals and targets of 2030 Agenda and avoid duplication with other reviews (e.g. with sectoral reviews).*
- *This way, UN intergovernmental fora and bodies (e.g. the CSW, the CFS, UNFF etc.) can contribute with their distinctive expertise to the 4 goals and related targets chosen (plus goal 17 which will also benefit from inputs of the ECOSOC Finance Forum). It is important that a forum does not see itself “responsible” only for one specific goal and, therefore, any organization can give inputs. The integrated nature of the goals requires the organizations to look at all the 4 goals and related targets.*
- *Given that the HLPF itself has no specific expertise, the contributions of dedicated intergovernmental fora and bodies to the thematic reviews are essential.*

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?

- *Key objective is to have an examination of the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and a consequent Ministerial Declaration of the HLPF when it meets under the auspices of ECOSOC and a Political Declaration when it meets under the auspices of the UNGA.*

- *Given that information will be provided partly through the reports of existing UN sectorial / thematic processes and the regional organisations, the links between them and the HLPF need to be strengthened. This means all sectorial / thematic processes should embark on follow-up and reviews to feed into the overall Agenda 2030 follow-up and review process based on their work. However, it is important not to overburden the sector/thematic processes.*
- *In order not to overburden the HLPF, the different sectors and related UN Organizations should provide only relevant information: e.g. key recommendations of the sector/related to the respective goal/target (political input), based on evidence/scientific analysis (substantive-technical input, e.g. to be presented through the Global Sustainable Development Report/an annual edition or chapter in preparation of the Global Sustainable Development Report every 4 years. See question 4.).*
- *It should be avoided that the HLPF is overloaded with any type of different descriptive / activity reports. Similarly to the national report, a template for the UN system contribution would ensure relevance and comparability of information.*

Example to illustrate how such a template could look like in order to channel relevant information in the sector-/theme specific reports):

- *Key recommendations/decisions: should not exceed 1000 words (e.g. this is already an unwritten rule in certain fora, such as the Committee on Food Security).*
- *These recommendations could be accompanied by the executive summary of an experts' report or simply a short rationale (6-10 pages)*
- *Linkages between the sector/theme of a specific body and the goals and targets of the SDGs discussed at the annual thematic review: How can the body/forum contribute to reaching these targets?*
- *Relevant sector/theme-specific science bodies could dedicate one report per year to these linkages. However, each body will have to assess its capacities to do so. This could be fed into the annual chapter/version of the GSDR.*

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?

- *The ECOSOC should have a focused theme that guides the work of its segments for that cycle. The same theme should be used for the Integration segment and the HLPF. Consideration should also be made to having the same theme for FFD Forum and STI forum.*
- *A proliferation of different themes (as is currently the case) is complex and confusing and serves to further fragment the ECOSOC cycle and its segments, which is not in the interest of a strong ECOSOC or a strong UN.*

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?

- *Our priority is that the entire agenda is reviewed by the end of each 4 year cycle. Also see answer for question 6.*

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

- *The two-day multi-stakeholder forum on STI “will provide a venue for facilitating interaction, matchmaking and the establishment of networks between relevant stakeholders and multi-stakeholder partnerships in order to identify and examine technology needs and gaps, including on scientific cooperation, innovation and capacity-building, and also in order to help to facilitate development, transfer and dissemination of relevant technologies for the Sustainable Development Goals.” Given the diverse STI challenges, a clear focus for the STI forum is indispensable to ensure its relevance and make it attractive for non-state actors. The theme of the STI Forum should be inspired by the theme of the HLPF and contribute to the thematic review at the HLPF of the corresponding year, however it might be necessary to focus on one specific aspect (a focused and substantive in-depth discussion will have more added value than a general discussion covering a broad range of issues).*

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

- *We see merit in having a particular slot at the HLPF Meetings for exchange with the UN Statistical Commission to exchange on new developments, what is working or not working in terms of data collection and updates on the Indicator Framework and the list of the global indicators:*

- *The global indicator framework should be presented at the HLPF Meeting every year, starting with the HLPF Meeting in 2016. It is crucial that there is a dialog between the UN Statistical Commission (statistical community) and the HLPF (political community) on the global level in the next years.*

- *In addition, we would like to high-light 2 additional points:*

- *The UN Secretary-General, in cooperation with the UN System, has to provide the SDG Progress Report (paragraph 83 2030 Agenda) based on the global indicator framework in a timely manner, ready to*

contribute to the HLPF Meeting. Existing structures used for the MDG Progress Reporting should be used as the basis.

- *We expect the UNSG, in cooperation with the UN System, to present a first baseline report at the HLPF Meeting in 2016. Existing structures used for the MDG Progress Reporting should be used as the basis.*

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

- *This is based on the current mandate of the HLPF, UNGA Res. 67/290.*
- *However, UNGA and ECOSOC already provide for this flexibility and can include debates on additional emerging issues at any time. These could be fed into the HLPF. In this sense, days/time for the HLPF could be saved and the HLPF could focus on the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda.*
- *Any new and emerging issues to be discussed at the HLPF should be clearly related to the 2030 Agenda implementation, for example emerging issues identified in the SDG Progress Report or the Global Sustainable Development Report.*

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?

- *The HLPF provides for innovative participation modalities for a broad range of actors (see, for example, paragraph 17 of UN GA Res. 67/290).*
- *The thematic review at the HLPF should be based on input from the main UN fora and bodies. The HLPF should serve as a “docking station” for the UN System to work together in a coherent manner. There are, however, organizations outside the UN system which can and should contribute to the thematic reviews due to their expertise, high quality and evidence based analytical capacity. They are already contributing to existing reviews and analysis (e.g. in the context of the MDG 8 Gap Task Report) and should also be allowed to participate at main meetings. This also applies to non-state actors, such as civil society, academic institutions and the private sector.*
- *The Global Sustainable Development Report will also provide an opportunity to include additional inputs from outside the UN system.*

III. HLPF National Reviews of implementation:

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?

- *The submission of national reports should be done by all UN Member states on a regular basis by taking into account the four year cycle of the HLPF as well as different national realities, capacities and levels of development.*
- *Ideally this would lead to one review of national progress at the HLPF every four years. However, in order to maintain dialogue between the national and the global level, we recommend each country to have at least 2 reviews within the 15 year timeframe. In order to take into account to national cycles, some flexibility should be factored in.*
- *In line with paragraphs 78 – 79 of 2030 Agenda the state-led reviews should look at the overall implementation of the 2030 Agenda (universal, integrated, interrelated nature of SDGs). We support a phased approach: in a first 4-year review cycle the focus should be on how countries translate the 2030 Agenda into their national contexts (including assessing national commitments), and in subsequent 4-year cycles the focus could move to the implementation of the national commitments.*

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?

- *Apart from common reporting guidelines (see question 16), a proposal for guidance on the organizational arrangement and structure of state-led reviews at the HLPF could be helpful. Such guidance should take into account lessons learned from former National Voluntary Presentations of the MDG-reports.*
- *Presentations of results and efforts to realize the SDGs including means of implementation should be followed by interactive discussions that include questions on ‘main challenges countries face in the implementation’, ‘good practices and successes countries would like to share with other countries’ and ‘lessons learned in this process’.*
- *This knowledge exchange among countries should lead to recommendations and guidance by the HLPF (see also answer 20).*
- *In our view, the national reviews of implementation at the HLPF should provide THE platform with the utmost attention for high-level representatives to showcase their efforts, achievements and challenges in the implementation of the SDGs.*

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?

- *First, national progress reports, as the main basis of the national reviews of implementation should include data sets and statistics, e.g. a part summarizing and assessing data that refers to all the global as well as the possible national indicators, in order to give an overview on where a country*

is on track and where shortcomings or challenges occur (traffic light system might be a suitable tool, as already used in different international organizations and in many countries). This would also allow for comparability.

- *Second, the main part of the national report should be an assessment of progress in form of a narrative, on major policy interventions, achievements, challenges identified, covering all SDGs and including means of implementation and the role other stakeholders and partnerships play in the implementation or how actors give account on their actions (see also answer 17).*
- *The reporting should be participatory and include the contributions of the private sector, civil society, the scientific community, philanthropic organisations and foundations in line with national laws and regulations.*
- *It will be important that the report stick closely to the SDGs. The reports should not imply a huge reporting burden but rather allow countries to match it with their present or future reporting. The national reports should also be useful within the countries (parliament, other actors). In general, coherence between the national, regional and global reporting and review should be strived for.*
- *In our view no thematic focus for the national reports should be given (see paragraph 78-79 and the universal, integrated and indivisible nature of the SDGs). Moreover, it is not realistic for countries to hand in a national report on an annual basis (e.g. on the annual thematic reviews).*

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? (See answer 16). 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 answer 16).

- *In order to have comparability, a given format for structuring the national report is needed and should be adopted by all countries.*

Suggested criteria for national reports:

- *Cover all 17 SDGs and targets and AAAA (coherent integrated Agenda 2030 and AAAA follow-up and review).*
- *Illustration of linkage between national and global level*
- *Ensure national stakeholder participation*

Suggested points to be covered in the national report:

- *National commitments*

- *National relevant policy frameworks (overall strategies, sectoral strategies etc.)*
- *Monitoring of 17 SDGs based on indicators (global and national) in tables containing aggregated datasets and statistics, including through graphs to illustrate text*
- *Assessment of achievements, challenges and gaps*
- *Lessons learned*
- *Follow-up of recommendations*

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

- *The reports on the national reviews of implementation related to the SDGs and their means of implementation, as the basis for the country reviews, should be open and transparent. Appropriate allocation of time should be given for interaction among member states on sharing of experiences, knowledge, information and lessons learned. Attractive formats, including moderation, as used in other settings (e.g. the multi-stakeholder Development Cooperation Forum, elements of the Human Rights Council UPR Sessions, World Bank and WEF Meetings could be used as inspiration).*
- *The reviews should be inclusive and participatory with adequate arrangements for transparency and broad participation, including through the participation of major groups and other relevant stakeholders.*
- *The content of the presentation should not cover the full breadth of the national report. The presentation should focus on selected issues of high priority to the country and, where possible, present specific examples.*
- *“State-led reviews”:* *Three to five countries could join at the beginning of the process/preparation and act as mutual reviewers. National reports would be shared and discussed among these countries in advance of the review at the HLPF (e.g. in meetings). Comments and feedback of the reviewers to the presenting country should guide (initiate and stimulate) the discussion, whereas interaction with other present actors should be possible too.*
- *Feedback from the reviews should serve as orientation and recommendation for countries to adopt to a better performance and to react on emerging issues in their national sustainable development strategies. (= driving force for further progress)*

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

- *All countries need to give adequate attention to all the means of implementation (and demonstrate what was done in terms of DRM/domestic resource mobilization, policy coherence etc.).*

- *The reviews should also provide a platform for partnerships, including through the participation of major groups and other relevant stakeholders, by identifying the necessary means of implementation, taking into account capacity building and financing needs, and by facilitating the sharing of best practices and technology and other support to be provided by a wide range of actors. The reviews should be based on long-term orientation and incentives such as access to best practices, policy advice and sharing of experiences and provide a follow-up mechanism at the national level.*
- *Identification of major challenges, best practices and emerging issues can give medium- to long-term orientation for reasonable future engagements and partnerships.*
- *Countries could bring their national multi-stakeholder partnerships - active at the national level, but also across countries - along with their presentation of the national report*

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?

- *(2030 Agenda §77) Along with regional dialogues and global reviews, they [national reports] will inform recommendations for follow-up at various levels.”*
- *General recommendations and guidance, including on policy for all member states and other stakeholder on the way forward to achieve the 2030 Agenda should be part of the annual HLPF Ministerial Declaration and the Political Declaration of the HLPF when it meets under the auspices of the UN General Assembly.*
- *Reviewed countries can further benefit from country specific recommendations arising from the interaction and feedback of the national reviews. These can trigger follow-up interventions at national level such as by improving national strategies (see also answer 18).*
- *We strongly encourage to use one single website/platform for the 2030 Agenda in order to facilitating access to a network of global partners and experts to support Governments in the implementation of their sustainable development strategies (the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform could be used, drawing on/cross-referencing the “Development Strategies that work” website related to the former National Voluntary Presentations).*
- *Reviewed countries could report back to the HLPF on developments that followed the national review (Lack of follow-up is considered a major issue, as identified in the lessons learned of CSD).*

IV. Regional reviews and processes

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

- *Starting point is paragraph 80 and 81 of 2030 Agenda.*

- *Key function of the regional level can be simultaneously: the support of countries in the region in their national implementation, reporting and review*
- *Due to the diversity of regional fora it will not be possible to have a similar approach across regions- Some sort of comparability / standardization across countries can be achieved through the global reporting guidelines to be proposed by the UNSG.*
- *What needs to be avoided is a heavy duplicative reporting exercise at the regional and the global level (regional issues could be fed into the annual GSDR/and the SDG Trends Report). While the regional level is important, the universality of the agenda applying to all states calls for a knowledge exchange amount countries, also from different regions, at the global level.*
- *At the global level, we could have a lively – however limited in time - interactive regional exchange among different regional approaches in a common session. It should, however, not replace country reviews / direct exchanges among countries of different regions at the global level. Countries in different regions may find to have similar challenges, while countries in the same region may find it difficult to find common issues and challenges.*
- *[Maintain an interactive and up-to-date Knowledge Management Platform and a database for sharing good practices and lessons learned.(see question 20)]*

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

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)?

- *Involvement of stakeholders already in the agenda-setting process of the HLPF through broad and transparent consultations.*
- *All agreed elements for engagement according to paragraph 14, 15 and 16 of UN GA Res. 67/290 must be applied.*
- *HLPF 2016 could/should consider effective mechanisms and modalities for engaging stakeholders at the HLPF*

15. *Decides, in this regard, that, while retaining the intergovernmental character of the forum, the representatives of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders shall be allowed:*

- To attend all official meetings of the forum;*
- To have access to all official information and documents;*
- To intervene in official meetings;*
- To submit documents and present written and oral contributions;*

(e) To make recommendations;

(f) To organize side events and round tables, in cooperation with Member States and the Secretariat;

Important: the overall process should be guided by the open, transparent and inclusive spirit of the post-2015 negotiations. In order to ensure broad participation of all actors from all sectors the mandates of Agenda 2030 should also serve as a basis.

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?⁷

- Existing tools should be used, where possible, to report on contributions by stakeholders. Example: using analysis of sustainability reporting by the private sector (tools for organisations to include their contribution to SDGs in their regular sustainability reporting are provided by United Nations Global Compact-WBCSD-Global Reporting Initiative, “SDG Compass”).*
- Contributions of non-state actors could be built in review sessions. Options: country review session which could provide for real opportunity for exchange, and/or thematic review session.*

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

- The review of the UN System needs to follow existing established processes. The reviews of UN Entities foreseen in UNGA Res. 67/290 should be interpreted in line with paragraph 74 of 2030 Agenda emphasizing duplication of review processes should be avoided.*
- Regular review and reporting processes, for instance in the context of the review of the strategic plans should be used. With a view to limit reporting burden we support the proposal not to have individual Entities reporting to the HLPF but to have consolidated reporting on how and whether the UN Entities are on track with implementing the SDGs.*

Answer provided to question 25 is also relevant to 24. Starting Point of any contribution of the UN System is paragraph 88 of 2030 Agenda: “88.

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

A. The UN System Contribution:

⁷ 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.”

1. Alignment of the UN System with regards to the overall follow-up and review process at the global level (systemic approach)

- *The UN General Assembly, ECOSOC, relevant sector- and theme-specific intergovernmental bodies and fora and the HLPF should be coordinated in time, with meetings scheduled in a logical cycle and coordinated in substance. UN entities, in line with their different functions, will need to contribute to the review of implementation of the SDGs.*

•

2. System-wide strategic planning, implementation and reporting

- *Starting Point of any contribution of the UN System is paragraph 88 of 2030 Agenda: “88. We also stress the importance of system-wide strategic planning, implementation and reporting in order to ensure coherent and integrated support to implementation of the new Agenda by the UN development system. The relevant governing bodies should take action to review such support to implementation and to report on progress and obstacles. We welcome the ongoing ECOSOC Dialogues on the longer term positioning of the UN development system and look forward to taking action on these issues, as appropriate.”*
- *Switzerland expects from the UN Development System a thorough reflection on how it can best contribute to the implementation of the 2030 agenda in a coherent, effective and efficient way. It is of utmost importance that the UNDS is able to provide fast and system-wide (coordinated) technical assistance to review, adapt and amend the **national development plans**, or develop new planning instruments that are **aligned with the SDGs**, and supports countries in data capacity-building, and reviews of implementation at the national level.*
- *2016 is a key moment. The mid-term review of the strategic plans of the funds & programmes, the 2nd round of the ECOSOC dialogue on the longer-term positioning of the UNDS and the 2016 QCPR need to produce concrete proposals and common views that provide guidance for the UN in order to implement paragraph 88 of the Agenda 2030 that asks for system-wide strategic planning, implementation and reporting in order to ensure coherent and integrated support to implementation of the new Agenda by the UN development system.*

B. The Secretariat Contribution (UN DESA):

Setting in place a coherent mechanism for follow-up and review of the Agenda 2030 including AAAA requires a coordinated approach across the different DESA offices concerned (“a single coherent Secretariat”): the FfD office, the ECOSOC office, the Sustainable Development Division and others.

To guarantee a successful preparation of the global follow-up and review process at the High-Level Political Forum a dedicated task-team is needed. It could be inspired by the approach chosen for the post-2015 process and the meetings of the OWG on SDGs (also in order to ensure existing structures and resources are used, duplication and unnecessary transaction costs avoided).

VI. Other views and ideas

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

- *The concretisation of the follow-up and review architecture should be followed by the guiding principles decided in paragraph 74 of Agenda 2030.*

Key functions of a follow-up and review architecture:

Monitoring progress on the realization of the SDGs is not an end in itself. A follow-up and review framework of the 2030 Agenda should provide support for information sharing, decision making and accelerated implementation by all relevant stakeholders, at the national, regional and global levels, through the following functions:

- *Assess and review the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, including achievements, gaps and challenges;*
- *Strengthen the knowledge base for sustainable development;*
- *Foster dialogue, learning and exchange about underlying causes of successes, challenges and constraints, failures and gaps as well as good practices, among all relevant stakeholders and actors including international institutions;*
- *Provide evidence for high-level policy guidance for the SDGs;*
- *Ensure high-level visibility and attention of the international community for the SDGs;*
- *Reinforce responsibility of governments and contribution of all other actors;*
- *Identify gaps in mobilizing necessary means of implementation;*
- *Provide a platform to identify/encourage partnerships;*
- *Increase coherence, collaboration, efficiency and efficacy of the UN System and other actors in providing support to implement the 2030 Agenda.*

- *The 2030 Agenda Follow-up and Review Architecture **should be guided by the lessons learned of existing structures.** Particularly, lessons learned from the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD, Rio-Track) and the National Voluntary Presentations of MDG Reviews should be taken into account. Approaches used in the context of the CSD which led to its ineffectiveness and ultimate abolishment should not be repeated.*