

## 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?
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)<sup>1</sup>?
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?
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?

---

<sup>1</sup> 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

## 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 ECOSOC<sup>2</sup> and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”<sup>3</sup>. 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”<sup>4</sup>. 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”<sup>5</sup>. 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.<sup>6</sup>]*

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?

As SDG 6 on water and sanitation has strong interlinkages to most, if not all, of the other SDGs, any of the three options are actionable for this Goal. To provide a transparent and predictable process, however, option (iii) would seem to be a most constructive way forward. Whichever solution is chosen SDG 17 should be part of every thematic review.

A suggestion such as (ii) for “transversal themes” along the lines recommended by this questionnaire is not feasible. As health, gender and education each have their “own” SDG, (namely 3, 5 and 4, respectively), choosing them as topics for the year would in fact prioritize them over others. We should avoid creating this hierarchy of SDGs. This would also be the case if any other transversal theme was proposed and it

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

<sup>4</sup> 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

<sup>5</sup> General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

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

would be divisive and difficult to get consensus.

Option (iii) is a practical way to undertake review of progress that covers all SDGs equally. If this were the case, the linkages of Goals 5, 6, 7 and 8 (and 17) in the second year of review would be very beneficial, as the linkages between water and energy, water and jobs and also water and sanitation with gender and inequality generally, are well-known and would lend themselves to a coherent linkage of all four of these SDG areas.

Alternatively, if option (i) for closely-related SDGs is followed, the SDGs could possibly be grouped along the dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social, environmental and resilience), with SDG 6 connectable to any or all of these areas. It is not clear, however, whether grouping them in this way would allow for all dimensions of each SDG to be considered, or whether Goals can easily be distributed equally amongst these areas. Finally, other well-known linkages such as the water-energy-food nexus, or connections between sanitation-drinking water-health, lend themselves well to the understanding of water issues, but it is not clear whether similar groupings or connections could be found for the remaining Goals.

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?

For water and sanitation, several bodies, water-related treaties, MEAs and forums already exist which touch upon these issues, which could be tasked or better connected to provide inputs to the HLPF – examples include the UNFCCC COPs on climate change and the UN World Conferences on Disaster Risk Reduction (6.4); the UNECE Water Convention MOPs (6.5); and the CBD COPs, the IPBES platform on biodiversity or the United Nations Conferences on Housing and Sustainable Development (6.6).

UN-Water avails itself to respond to the needs of Member States by providing consolidated technical input on water and sanitation from the UN system in support of intergovernmental processes. Monitoring and reporting are two clear examples of its work, which builds upon the expertise within the UN system.

In the case of monitoring, UN-Water is well advanced in developing a monitoring framework for SDG 6 which builds upon the solid foundation of the experience of the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP) for targets 6.1 and 6.2; the GEMI (Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related SDGs) for targets 6.3 – 6.6, and the UN-Water Global Analysis and

Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) for targets 6.a and 6.b.

In addition, the annual World Water Development Report, UN-Water's reporting mechanism on freshwater, is produced on a rotating theme with inputs from UN-Water's Members and Partners. The themes, much as with the potential annual SDG progress report and the Global Sustainable Development Report, could be aligned with strategic topics under discussion at that year's ECOSOC (water and gender; water and education, etc.) to allow for maximum coordination and input. If mandated to do so, UN-Water could discuss how the World Water Development Report could help provide an analysis of progress on broad goals of SDG 6.

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?

Similar to the suggestion for clusters of themes in question 6, overarching themes could be selected to coincide with the dimensions of sustainable development.

Also, as the HLPF is a high-level political group it would be good to have a broader theme about the 2030 Agenda such as "Keeping the 2030 Agenda on track". With a focus on operational aspects to ensure conformity, this kind of group could address, for example, how to get the poorest countries on track or support those lagging behind or not responding.

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?

The longer in advance and the more predictability the better – a minimum of 3 years would be desirable to allow for data collections, research and documentation and reporting, or in some cases, the establishment of agreed baselines.

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

Coordination of different processes around a common theme each year would be highly advantageous and desirable to maximize synergies and reduce duplications in

work.

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

The UNSC will be agreeing on a set of proposed global indicators in March 2016, which would go to the UN General Assembly for approval. The UNSD should continue to provide overarching statistical analysis of the progress on Agenda 2030 through consolidating and mapping progress on these global indicators.

Where current statistical information or processes needed to monitor and report on elements of targets are lacking or in adequate, the statistical division should be encouraging and supporting the development of appropriate indicators and monitoring procedures that enable the political objectives of the 2030 vision to be realized. Expertise from specialist groups such as UN water could be harnessed to assist in this direction.

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

The HPLF will need a support group to do this job, (perhaps similar in function to CSD). It could be an existing entity with a new mandate that is specific to the role of the HLPF.

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?

Several processes and platforms do already exist outside the UN system which could be better coordinated or used as a platform for stock taking, lessons learnt and feedback on SDG 6 progress. These include partnership networks such as the Global Water Partnership the 2030 Water Resources Group, events such as the annual Stockholm World Water Week and the triennial World Water Forum, regional processes such as AMCOW and Africa Water Week, the Arab Water Week and the Asia Water Forum, among others. In addition, the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) initiative convenes a biennial high-level meeting for political accountability to work towards water and sanitation access (SDG targets 6.1 and 6.2 in particular). The Global Water partnership provides a multi-stakeholder network covering water

resources management (6.4, 6.5, 6.6) and Aquafed makes an important link to the private sector (6.1, 6.2, 6.3). Such platforms and processes could be linked more clearly and formally to the UN General Assembly and play a role in follow-up and review for SDG 6.

### **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?

Yes. At least every 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year.

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?

#### *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?
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?

#### *Presentation of national reviews to the HLPF:*

18. How should the country reviews be featured and discussed at the formal HLPF meeting?
19. How can national reviews give adequate attention to the means of implementation? How can they help to mobilize new support and partnerships?
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?

#### **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)?

UN-Water, which counts more than 30 Partners outside the UN system as well as 31 UN agency Members, could be mandated to prepare consolidated progress reporting on SDG 6 on an annual basis within a few years. This could include analysis of gaps and obstacles, lessons learnt and recommendations related to the means of implementation. The World Water Development Report, UN-Water's reporting tool since 2000, serves as an example of consolidated UN input around water issues.

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?<sup>7</sup>

Partnerships and networks related to specific topics of the SDGs could be identified and contacted. They could serve as an organizing entity that would coordinate their network's report on contributions to the SDGs, as part of their action plans.

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

This is best done agency by agency, which in turn could be summarized in a UN SG report. For SDG 6, consolidated reporting could be provided by UN-Water with contributions from its UN agency Members, such as is currently done with the World Water Development Report.

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 standardized template/ToRs for the review reports at the goal level could be developed. These could address each Goal and an agency (or coordination mechanism) tasked with taking the lead to gather and consolidate inputs.

## **VI. Other views and ideas**

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

In terms of reporting, the following review cycle could be taken into consideration:

- Every year: provide a general report on select SDGs (e.g. the four chosen for the year)
- Every two years: provide a thematic report (on the overarching themes)

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.”

- Every four years: provide major reporting on all SDGs (the first one being in 2018 and the last in 2030)

Moreover, a template for each of these reviews should be provided.