

Turkey Views on Follow-Up And Review Of The 2030 Agenda at the Global Level

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?

Turkey believes that political ownership is the key for effective implementation of Agenda 2030. We foresee that GA has an overarching role for guiding the whole process and political ownership. ECOSOC will guide the GA by its technical review of process. The expected monitoring framework will have a special role for this purpose. HLPF should be designed to review the progress regularly in SDGs and also for serving to the most acute problems of the world in its relation to implementation of SDGs. Thus, HLPF Agenda should cover both the 2030 agenda and the emerging issues for the implementation of SDGs. In this manner, since we perceive GA as the political decision making level, the relevant committees should align their work at least for the discussions of the emerging problems and issues of implementation.

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

As it is known most targets of the SDGs are coming from the existing decisions and outcomes of those UN conferences and processes. Therefore for the follow up and review of those targets and the others in relation, UN discussion platforms are the most practical mechanisms for follow up and review. The specific UN secretariats and relevant bodies shall be responsible for reporting and review at the global and maybe at regional level. If those bodies could not conduct this role by the existing agenda under these conferences, they may need to put an additional agenda for discussion of post 2015 developments. We think that these conferences may have a special role especially for timely indication of problems for implementation, and the necessary measures to be taken.

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?

Turkey values the GA's guidance to the ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums for contributing to the review of SDGs. We believe that after the results of this questionnaire were aired in the 70. session of GA, in the light of Secretary General's Report, membership should offer a general request from those structures. That request, no doubt, would be in line with the monitoring framework of the process. With this guidance those structures should arrange their work programmes and sessions and contribute system-wide coherence.

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?

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

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?

We think that option (i) could provide a more focused and fruitful analysis since clusters of related items may provide a more concrete discussion of implementation and challenges to be dealt for achieving targets. In the areas of SDGs that are already covered by various UN conferences and processes (i.e. ICPD, women, biodiversity etc.) the SDGs shall be gathered around these themes. For thematic discussion of subjects in HLPF those UN bodies should provide background discussion and review papers for the review of HLPF.

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?

The inputs of those various platforms should be in the form of a brief analysis that summarizes the main discussions and recommendations on the theme.

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?

Refer to Q6.

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?

We believe that a two track approach can be followed. Themes gathered around SDG's can be programmed on 4-year basis. Additionally, for the emerging issues and challenges, UN can determine an additional agenda item to be discussed annually. This decision can be taken in the meeting under auspices of ECOSOC.

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

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

- Key component of the follow up and review should be a transparent and accountable monitoring system. We are supporting the work of UNCS and we also believe contributions of international organizations and academia will certainly be necessary in this technical process.
- The set of global SDG indicators should be scientifically proven to measure the progress in implementation of the targets in all its aspects. Given the integrated and rich content of our targets, we may need some multidimensional and composite indicators or indices. Qualitative assessments and special surveys might also be used for monitoring as well. This process should be designed at all levels in a coherent way so that global, regional and national monitoring and evaluation processes would nourish each other.
- Four year national reporting to HLPF should be synchronized with head of state level meetings of HLPF. We believe that the key for rigorous review system is setting up a robust and credible global monitoring system. Thus, the outcome of UNSC work will be very valuable. This process necessitates both nationally produced data as well as regional and global level information generation. In order to have a flexible and effective follow up framework, national focal points can be defined to share their achievements through a well-structured and interactive web-based global monitoring system in UN.
- HLPF review should build on regional and national reviews. The structure of Global Sustainable Development Report is very valuable for communicability of results and can be further improved for monitoring of post-2015 development agenda. We may need breakdown of developments by regions and specific thematic discussions particularly in areas with limited progress. Establishing a strong science-policy interface is necessary for drawing robust policy directions out of these discussions. The views of ad-hoc scientific committees like IPCC will be valuable for guiding the thematic review of post-2015 development agenda.

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

As it is mentioned in Q6 and Q7, we believe that role of UN conferences and processes are critical for reviewing the lacking points of implementation. These processes may give indication of emerging challenges to be raised in HLPF. Therefore coordination of work within the UN system is very important.

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?

In general UN work at various levels is open and participatory in its nature. Further, HLPF meetings should be open and give chance of raising voice for the different stakeholders and processes.

III.HLPF National Reviews of implementation:

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?

- We believe that review need to be data driven and government-led. Participation of relevant stakeholders is critical in the follow up process at national level as well. National reporting for indicators should be voluntary in nature. UN has a crucial role in encouraging countries' participation as well as empowering the necessary capacity for national reporting.
- National reporting, with no doubt, should be according to countries' priorities and capacities. The periodical reporting is useful and we propose monitoring data should be gathered biannually if possible, and national review and reporting shall be done at least in accordance with HLPF' time-frame, 4-year based reporting. Since reporting will be the mechanism of national review, it should be presented to highest possible level of decision making to increase the political ownership. Review and assessment should be based on indicators and supported with relevant regulations, institutional arrangements and projects. Assessment process also should be open to participation of all stakeholders.

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?

HLPF review should be built on regional and national reviews. The structure of Global Sustainable Development Report is very valuable for communicability of results and can be further improved for monitoring of post-2015 development agenda. We may need breakdown of developments by regions and specific thematic discussions particularly in areas with limited progress. Establishing a strong science-policy interface is necessary for drawing robust policy directions out of these discussions. The views of ad-hoc scientific committees like IPCC will be valuable for guiding the thematic review of post-2015 development agenda. Therefore we are expecting that UN processes may drive some policy proposals and conclusions out of the GSDR and scientific committees. These recommendations which are filtered from deep assessments should be provided in a timely manner to facilitate the national and regional level discussion platforms. UN regional bodies may have a special role in facilitating regional issues, i.e. oceans, migration etc.

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?

- HLPF should follow-up the general implementation status based on global indicators. That will be decided. There should be some key indicators for each goal that will be submitted by all parties. This set will set the basis for the comparability among countries. This key set of national level indicators should be balanced among three dimensions of sustainable development. HLPF could use these comparisons, for analysing the regional level progress, special challenges of regions and countries, and the areas to be focused for diverting the SDG related finance.
- Transparency of national level reviews and participation of all stakeholders could be a general concern for HLPF meetings. This will support that all stakeholders to be engaged in the process of implementation and increase ownership.
- Another issue could be the dissemination of implementation of SDGs at national level. This refers to both localization and private sector engagement. There could be some success stories to be presented to all parties that are relevant to the ongoing agenda. There could be some specific programs/ projects designed for SDG's implementation that could be enlightening for all.

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 suggested approach of a core set of issues to be reviewed by all countries seems practical for cross-county comparisons in the follow-up of SDGs.

Presentation of national reviews to the HLPF:

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

We believe that HLPF will be a forum for discussion of global and regional level challenges. Countries may give some indication of their policies and implementations in their official statements. Other than that, UN could facilitate the necessary accommodation for side events and presentation of country reviews.

19. How can national reviews give adequate attention to the means of implementation?

How can they help to mobilize new support and partnerships?

MOIs are considered as one of the goals of SDGs and their follow-up indicators should be in the core set of indicators which will be submitted by all countries. Other than that, MOI commitments and developments could be better reviewed by the mechanism determined in Addis Ababa process. The outcome of this review could be discussed at HLPF.

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?

As we have indicated in Q16, we foresee that HLPF should produce recommendation regarding the areas falling short of implementation. These recommendations could be thematic, regional or country focused. The recommendations may facilitate diversion of finance resources, partnership mechanisms, or technical assistance towards those countries and regions. Follow-up of these recommendations could be done by UN process on a more long-term basis, the results of which to be presented at head of state level HLPF meetings.

IV. Regional reviews and processes

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

As it is expected that regional level processes will produce region specific challenges and recommendations for overcoming those challenges, HLPF can facilitate discussions on those matters at panels. And also regional level processes can feed the recommendations of HLPF on the issues that poor performances are detected.

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)?

HLPF meetings should be open to major groups and other relevant stakeholders. Those groups may prepare their own assessments and HLPF could facilitate a special session for them to present their findings like in SDG-OWG.

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?

Refer to Q 22.

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

In the post 2015 discussions, countries raised the issues of UN system wide coherence and the need for better coordination of UN processes and conferences. There are existing mechanisms for review of UN work at each secretary and UN body. We think that UNSG could have a role for follow-up of those bodies to observe whether those discussions are being taken into account.

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

UNSG has a very critical role for preparing a sound, communicable and clear Sustainable Development Report. We believe that UNSG has the first responsibility for setting a practical science-policy interface when writing the Report. Also he can conduct the international campaigning of the post-2015 development agenda and set the scene on the discussions of the Agenda through effective consultancy.