

Critical milestones towards a coherent, efficient, and inclusive follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda at the global level

COVER NOTE:

1. In September 2015, the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit adopted a new framework to guide development efforts between 2015 and 2030, entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development”.
2. The 2030 Agenda contains 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets¹. The SDGs address, in an integrated manner, the social, economic and environmental dimensions of development, their interrelations, aspects related to peaceful societies and effective institutions, as well as means of implementation (finance, technology, capacity development etc.).
3. Heads of State and Government also committed to engage in systematic follow-up and review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The follow-up and review will be based on regular, voluntary and inclusive country-led reviews of progress at the national level feeding into reviews at the regional and global levels.
4. At the global level, the United Nations high-level political forum on sustainable development (HLPF) will have the central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes. It is to work coherently with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other relevant organs and forums, in accordance with existing mandates, building on their work in order to boost implementation.
5. The HLPF will meet (i) every four years at the level of Heads of State and Government under the auspices of the and (ii) every year under the auspices of ECOSOC.
6. The follow-up and review processes at all levels will track progress in implementing the universal goals and targets, including the means of implementation, in all countries, in a manner which respects their universal, integrated and interrelated nature and the three dimensions of sustainable development. These processes will be guided by a number of other principles

¹ [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E]

defined in the 2030 Agenda². For example, they will be voluntary and country-led, support the identification of solutions and best practices, help to mobilize the necessary means of implementation and partnerships, as well as be open, inclusive, participatory and transparent for all people.

7. The dedicated follow-up and review for the Addis Ababa Conference on Financing for Development-and the means of implementation of the SDGs is integrated with the follow-up and review framework of the 2030 Agenda. The HLPF will build, inter alia, on the outcome of the annual ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development as well as on the summary of the annual Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation launched by the 2030 Agenda as part of a Technology Facilitation Mechanism. The HLPF will also take into account the biennial ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum. A General Assembly Dialogue on Financing for Development will be held back-to-back with the HLPF meeting, when it meets under the auspices of the General Assembly.
8. The 2030 Agenda stipulates that the HLPF will conduct:
 - i. Regular reviews of country-level implementation, “including developed and developing countries as well as relevant UN entities and other stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector”;
 - i. Thematic reviews of progress on the Sustainable Development Goals, including cross-cutting issues, building on the work of the functional commissions of ECOSOC and other intergovernmental bodies and forums.
9. The follow-up and review by the HLPF will be informed by an annual SDG progress report and a Global Sustainable Development Report, which shall strengthen the science-policy interface and serve as an evidence-based instrument to support policymakers³.

Mandate for the report by the Secretary-General on global follow-up and review

10. The 2030 Agenda requested “the Secretary-General, in consultation with Member States, to prepare a report, for consideration at the seventieth session of the General Assembly in preparation for the 2016 meeting of the HLPF which outlines critical milestones towards coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review at the global level. The report should:
 11. include a proposal on the organizational arrangements for State-led

² Agenda 2030 para 74

³ 2030 Agenda, extracts of para 83

- reviews at the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC, including recommendations on voluntary common reporting guidelines,
- (i) clarify institutional responsibilities,
 - (ii) provide guidance on annual themes, on a sequence of thematic reviews, and
 - (iv) [provide guidance] on options for periodic reviews for the HLPF⁴.”
12. The present questionnaire aims to collect views of Member States on milestones towards coherent, efficient and inclusive follow-up and review of 2030 Agenda at the global level, so as to inform the analysis and proposals to be contained in the report of the Secretary-General.
13. It takes existing mandates as a starting point and aims to determine how these can be operationalized or further clarified or elaborated on if needed.
14. The Secretariat kindly invites all Member States to provide responses to the following questions and submit them to the Division for Sustainable Development of the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs (axster@un.org, copied to zubcevic@un.org and powellj1@un.org) **no later than 15 November 2015**.

⁴2030 Agenda states that this report should “include a proposal on the organizational arrangements for state-led reviews at the high-level political forum on sustainable development (HLPF) under the auspices of ECOSOC, including recommendations on voluntary common reporting guidelines. It should clarify institutional responsibilities and provide guidance on annual themes, on a sequence of thematic reviews, and on options for periodic reviews for the HLPF” (Paragraph 90, Transforming our world” the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development)

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:

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?
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 coherent implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which has inequalities at its heart, needs not only to ensure coherence between the three dimensions of sustainable development. To make good on the central promise of the Agenda “to leave no one behind” and “to target those furthest behind first” and “to realize the human rights of all” it also needs to systematically address inequalities and fight discrimination.**
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)⁵?
 - **SDG 10 focuses on reducing inequalities not only among but also within countries. While it will be important to connect with the follow-up and review processes of the LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS, given the 2030 Agenda’s central message “to leave no one behind,” the HLPF should also focus on the most marginalized people wherever they live.**

⁵ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

4. 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)⁶?

See above

5. 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?

- **Human rights information is directly relevant for all of the proposed SDGs and is particularly important as a tool to help assess progress on realizing the central aim of the Agenda “to leave no one behind”.**
- **All the key human rights mechanisms including the Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the human rights treaty bodies and the “Special Procedures” (Special Rapporteurs, Independent Experts and working groups) should be called upon to make a contribution to the HLPF. Specific suggestions on the contribution of the different human rights mechanisms are outlined below.**
- **The Human Rights Council (HRC) could review the implementation of the 2030 Agenda as part of its work. Different modalities could be adopted by the HRC to consider the SDGs in its work. For example, the HRC could consider rededicating existing forums, such as the Social Forum or the annual Human Rights Mainstreaming Panel, to the review of HLPF themes from a human rights perspective. Alternatively, the HRC could consider establishing new mechanisms such as a new SDG WG/Standing Committee under the HRC, the dedication of a session of the HRC to the SDG review or the establishment of a new Special Procedure on the 2030 Agenda. The budgetary implications of these different options vary significantly.**
- **Independent of new modalities for the consideration of the SDGs by the HRC, the existing Special Procedures are well placed to contribute to the SDG review. Several Special Procedures played active roles in the formulation of the SDGs, and many have one of the SDGs as their focus areas. If the HLPF thematic review themes are known well in advance, relevant Special Procedures could be invited to contribute to the thematic reviews through their reports. They could also help mobilize support and resources through their advocacy role.**
- **Certain human rights treaty bodies, within the scope of their mandates, have also expressed interest in contributing to thematic and country reviews of SDG implementation. Others might also be encouraged to play a role. The mandated concerns of the HR treaty bodies (including the rights of children, women, persons with disabilities, migrants, civil and political rights, the rights to health, education, housing, water and sanitation, social security, work and others) overlap extensively with the**

⁶ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

goals and targets that the HLPF will review. As such the treaty bodies could provide a significant amount of information to assist in the review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. At a minimum, the concluding observations which are directly relevant to SDGs and targets should systematically be integrated within HLPF country review, along with country-specific recommendations of relevant Special Procedures.

- **The Universal Periodic Review has an important contribution to make to the HLPF country reviews. The inputs into the UPR process, and the outputs (recommendations) of UPR reviews, should be integrated systematically within HLPF country presentations. The principal inputs, on which there is much convergence with the subject matter of the SDGs, are the National Reports and Mid-term reports, the Compilation of UN Information Report and Summary of Stakeholders' Information. UPR recommendations for countries under review are prepared by members of the UPR Working Group and are directly relevant for the purpose of HLPF country reviews (see also below).**

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?

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 ECOSOC⁷ and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”⁸. 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”⁹. 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”¹⁰. 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.¹¹]

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?

⁷ For example, the Commission on Social Development, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Population and Development etc....

⁸ Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

⁹ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

¹⁰ General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

¹¹ General Assembly resolution 68/1, paras 7-9

- **The HLPF thematic reviews should focus on four thematic SDGs each year. The four thematic SDGs could be clustered based on their common substantive focus. The four thematic SDGs could be considered alongside SDG 17 as well as the key principles of the review as set out in para. 74.**
- **As stated in sub-paragraph (e) the reviews should be people-centred, gender-sensitive, respect human rights and have a particular focus on the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind. They should further also be “based on data which is high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts as set out in paragraph 74 (g).**

Cluster	Targets	MoI/FFD	Crosscutting principles
Cluster 1	1,5,10,16,	17	as defined in para. 74 especially bullet e and g (leave no one behind + data disaggregation)
Cluster 2	2,3,4,6	17	as defined in para. 74 as defined in para. 74 especially bullet e and g (leave no one behind + data disaggregation)
Cluster 3	7,8,9,11	17	as defined in para. 74 as defined in para. 74 especially bullet e and g (leave no one behind + data disaggregation)
Cluster 4	12,13,14,15	17	as defined in para. 74 as defined in para. 74 especially bullet e and g (leave no one behind + data disaggregation)

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?

- **As indicated above, the Universal Periodic Review Process of the Human Rights Council generates information and recommendations on a country-by-country basis, which is applicable across goals and thematic areas, and should serve as a key input for HLPF country reviews.**
- **The Treaty bodies assess the progress of countries in implementing the human rights treaties that they have ratified. As a result of its assessments, treaty bodies express concerns and address recommendations to Member**

States which are included in treaty body concluding observations. In addition to the UPR recommendations, which emerge from a peer review among States, the recommendations of Treaty bodies, which emanate from government appointed independent expert bodies, should also be considered as part of the UN country level presentations, along with country-specific recommendations of Special Procedures.

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?

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?

- **There should be a programme of work for the four years in between two meetings of the HLPF under the General Assembly.**
- **The four year programme of work should be adopted well in advance in order to allow intergovernmental platforms and other fora, such as independent international human rights bodies, to contribute to the discussions.**

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?

- **Through the IAEG, the statistical commission will take the lead in preparing the Sustainable Development Goals Report assessing progress in the achievement of the SDGs based on the indicator framework which is currently being developed by the IAEG and which is expected to include the disaggregation of data (based on para 74, and target 17.18). The report should offer the IAEG the support of the UN system entities that serve as observers in the IAEG in the preparation of the report.**
- **In response to the Agenda's call to leave no one behind, the Statistical Commission should support national statistical capacity building and exchange of good practices, in particular on data disaggregation and surveying "hard-to-count" population groups (e.g. homeless, migrants, minorities). UN system entities should support the Commission and national statistical systems in these efforts. Apart from offering support**

on the disaggregation of data, subject to the availability of resources, OHCHR could also support the efforts of the UNSC to improve individual SDG indicators, in particular on indicators relating to legal obligations of member States under human rights treaties corresponding with the subject matter of the SDGs.

- **The Statistical Commission should also provide guidance and support to Member States in implementing the data revolution in line with international statistical, ethical and human rights standards to ensure that the data revolution helps to advance sustainable development and the realisation of human rights and avoids harming marginalized and vulnerable population groups. OHCHR can support the Statistical Commission in this work by advising the Commission on an approach to national data collection which meets human rights standards as well as international statistical standards.**

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

- **New and emerging issues could be identified every four years when the HLPF meets under the auspices of the GA.**
- **The Political Declaration of the GA could provide guidance on steps to be taken by existing UN system entities and relevant other international and regional organizations to address the new and emerging issues.**
- **The HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC could receive an update on the progress made in addressing the new and emerging issue at its session.**

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?

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 2030 Agenda is a universal agenda applicable to all countries. Hence all 193 countries that adopted the Agenda as their vision for the**

coming 15 years should report on the status of the implementation of the Agenda.

- All States should report at least once every four years to ensure that each country makes at least one presentation between two HLPF meetings under the GA at the Heads of State level. This implies that 48/49 countries should make a presentation each year. To accommodate 48 to 49 countries per year the HLPF will need to add additional sessions to the HLPF or it will need carry out reviews in parallel sessions.
- As all countries should be treated equally, each session should feature an equitable geographical distribution of countries and each session should include countries at different stages of development.
- The focus of the HLPF during the high-level segment of ECOSOC should be to identify a set of recommendations to be agreed by the country, taking into account and reinforcing (and at a minimum, not contradicting) relevant recommendations from international human rights mechanisms.
- Given the limited time available at the HLPF session itself, ECOSOC should set up an HLPF working group to assist countries with the preparation of the reviews. This could also include assisting Member States with the mobilisation of resources for the implementation of the recommendations emanating from the review. (see also below)

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?

- To allow for a meaningful exchange of experiences, the HLPF should set up a working group for the preparatory process at the global level. The Universal Periodic Review can serve as helpful model for the design of the HLPF review process.
- For the UPR, a troika of three member States with the support of the UPR Secretariat facilitates the review and preparation of the working group report. Three hours and a half are allocated per country for the peer review between the State under review and Member/Observer States of the Working Group. 70 minutes are allocated to the State under Review to present its National Report and answer questions from States, while 140 minutes are given to States to make observations, express concerns and issue recommendations. Half an hour is allocated for the adoption of the WG report.
- There is an option for States to provide “Advance Questions” which has helped to ensure a smooth and better organised review and has

allowed States to prepare structured and more detailed responses to the questions raised.

- **If a similar model were to be adopted for the HLPF the main role of the HLPF Secretariat would be to support the country with its preparations of its national review at the HLPF session. This would include supporting countries with conducting an open, transparent and inclusive national consultation process with multi-stakeholder participation at the country level and the preparation of a country report which will form the key background documentation for the work of the HLPF working group. It would also imply the preparation of a UN system compilation report, including inputs from UN Country Teams.**

15.

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**

- **The common reporting guidelines should outline both the “what” and the “how” of the voluntary reporting.**
- **Clearly outlining the process of the preparation of the report, including the participation of all key stakeholders in the preparation of the report is critical for the credibility of the national reports. (see also below MSH involvement)**

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?

In terms of the content of the report, recognizing the universality and indivisibility of the SDGs, countries under review should review all of the SDGs and their related targets based on the set of indicators under development by the IAEG.

Given the Agenda’s commitment to a human rights based implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and given the need for efficiency as well as coherence, member States should be strongly encouraged to integrate relevant recommendations from international human rights mechanisms (UPR, treaty bodies, Special Procedures) within their national reporting.

Presentation of national reviews to the HLPF:

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

- **The experience with the UPR model provides helpful guidance for the HLPF. During HRC plenary session for the adoption of the outcome of the country review, the State under review must state its position on all of the recommendations. While the implementation of all recommendations is being monitored, subsequent UPR cycles focus on the implementation of accepted recommendations.**
- **The one hour allocated for the adoption of the outcome is divided between the State under Review (20 minutes), Member/Observer States (including UN entities) (20 minutes) and Stakeholders (including an A-status National Human Rights Institution and regional organizations (15 minutes) and the adoption of the recommendations (5 minutes).**
- **Codifying the past practice of the AMR National Voluntary Presentations and building on the UPR model, the HLPF could allocate 20 minutes to States under review, including 5 minutes for civil society and private sector actors in the State under Review, 20 Minutes to States and Observers, 15 minutes to the major groups and other key stakeholders and 5 minutes for the adoption of the outcome.**

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

- **In the case of developing countries, it is critical that support - financial and/or other - be provided to the State under Review in order to support the implementation of recommendations with resource implications. Countries can also support each other in advancing the implementation of the 2030 Agenda domestically in other ways, including through the exchange of lessons learned and best practices.**
- **The recommendations of the review should be prepared ahead of the HLPF session following the conclusion of the meeting of the working group.**
- **The HLPF session can serve as a forum where Member States and other stakeholders can pledge their support to the State under Review to implement specific recommendations.**

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?

- **The country review should identify a set of recommendations. During the HLPF session the State under review should identify the**

recommendations which it would like to adopt. In areas of convergence, the HLPF recommendations should draw upon and reinforce recommendations of international human rights mechanisms. Subsequent country reviews should focus mainly on progress in implementing the recommendations previously agreed.

- The ECOSOC President should communicate the outcome of national reviews to relevant international human rights mechanisms so that these mechanisms can in turn take the outcome of the HLPF country reviews into account when implementing their mandates and thereby help reinforce the implementation of the HLPF recommendations through their respective ongoing work. A virtuous cycle would be created thereby, generating potentially significant efficiencies, avoiding duplication, and enhancing positive impacts.

IV. Regional reviews and processes

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

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)?

- As stipulated in para. 74 (d) it will be critical for all parts of the follow up mechanism to be open, inclusive, participatory and transparent for all people and will support the reporting by all relevant stakeholders. The HLPF has a responsibility to lead in upholding transparency and participation at the global level. It should also signal an unequivocal commitment to upholding the participatory national reviews in all countries, and call for countries volunteering to make presentations to define a broad and inclusive national consultation process.
- A key lesson from the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council and other global review processes is that a predefined, meaningful role for civil society in the process is vital to identify and inspire action on the most urgent gaps and priorities that need to be addressed. A key modality that has been essential to integrate the contributions of different stakeholders into the Universal Periodic Review are stakeholder reports, which supplement the State's official

report and the information furnished by the UN system. The Summary of Stakeholders Information includes a section on A status National Human Rights Institutions, contributions from regional organisations such as the EU, OSCE, Council of Europe etc. In their inputs, stakeholders are encouraged to clearly indicate the specific recommendations to which their contribution relates.

- **The HLPF should build on past practice to provide civil society with the opportunity of free, active and meaningful engagement through direct stakeholder interventions and live webcasts. It should make full use of the modalities of participation of non-governmental stakeholders, including major groups. It should continue to expand its sustainable development platform and increasingly make it available in multiple languages.**

- **As an input into the UN system compilation, the HLPF should solicit a compilation report by OHCHR which could provide for each country the relevant concerns and recommendations of the treaty bodies, the special procedures and the Universal Periodic Review.**

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?¹²

From a HR perspective it is critical to make a distinction between ...

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

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

VI. Other views and ideas

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

Private sector accountability and the 2030 Agenda:

¹² 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.”

- **To date, the emphasis on public private partnerships and the role of the private sector in financing and implementing the new Agenda has not been balanced with an equivalent focus on principles to guide such partnerships and how to ensure accountability of private sector actors for adverse impacts.**
- **One key concern is how to close this accountability gap, given the larger role which is being accorded to the private sector in the 2030 Agenda. Not only should the private sector be held accountable for its own actions, but Governments, which have the primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, should also be held accountable for how they protect against adverse human rights impact by private sector partners in the broader monitoring and review architecture of the 2030 Agenda.**
- **As identified in the 2030 Agenda, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, endorsed by the UN Human Rights Council in 2011, provide a framework for closing the private sector accountability gap. The Guiding Principles reaffirm the duty of States to put in place and enforce rules to protect human rights in the context of business activities. This implies taking appropriate measures to ensure that any activity or partnership undertaken in support of the 2030 Agenda involving the private sector entity should clarify accountability and remedial measures for all actors involved in the activity.**
- **The Guiding Principles further stipulate that all business enterprises have a responsibility to respect human rights which includes not undermining States' abilities to meet human rights obligations. The Guiding Principles furthermore imply that the responsibility of corporations to respect human rights everywhere cannot be offset by efforts to advance sustainable development or to promote human rights on a specific topic. The responsibility to respect human rights exists independently of States' abilities or willingness to fulfil their own duties.**