

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 GA 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?

Any effective and sustained follow-up of the 2030 Agenda must be grounded in a series of processes and mechanisms that can bridge different strands in an inter-linked and complementary manner.

Consensus on using the HLPF as the main follow-up mechanism (meeting under ECOSOC yearly and the GA every four years) at the global level builds momentum to generate political leadership, overall guidance and recommendations, in the absence of an ‘enforcement’ mandate, with the ECOSOC Financing for Development (FfD) Forum providing a main input on means of implementation. To make this happen, however, there is a need to enforce system-wide coherence and complementarity between the HLPF and other existing bodies and institutions, namely ECOSOC. Outcomes of the HLPF should be strategic and visionary in nature, supplementary to the ECOSOC as the overall body for coordination, public policy and policy dialogue on all three dimensions (economic, social and environmental) of sustainable development. In particular as HLPF has a Summit status, represented by Heads of State every four years, it will be important that HLPF be used as a strategic forum to provide the high-level political impetus needed to ensure the implementation efforts to achieve the SDGs are in place. Each HLPF meeting should focus on a set of key strategic issues.

ECOSOC’s role, coordinating support of system-wide coherence, could be further strengthened by linking different segments—i.e. high-level,

operational activities segment; coordination segment; and humanitarian segment—with a stronger thematic focus across all areas. A selected theme for the high-level segment could also be considered in the coordination and operational activities to assess the contribution of the entire ECOSOC system to the theme. Regional review platforms should also be guided by this theme. Since ECOSOC will be the main convener of both the HLPF and FfD Forum (as well as the Development Cooperation Forum), it may make sense for ECOSOC to take a leading role in structuring agendas (including planning) in a complementary way.

The 2030 Agenda is an integrated one, meant to simultaneously pursue the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development. Similarly, HLPF and ECOSOC should pursue greater integration so that the former is not seen as the home for one pillar (e.g. environment) and ECOSOC another (e.g. economic). In addition, the integrated aspect of the 2030 Agenda will not be achieved automatically, but will require the analytics and political mechanisms to ensure that countries can act on it.

ECOSOC should also permeate the 2030 Agenda in its various Forums (and the work of its functional commissions, see Q4 in more detail) so that deliberations and outcomes also have the ‘bigger picture’. This would enable the Council to provide additional policy guidance, ensure coordination among the ECOSOC system, and support a more effective response from its operational component. In this regard, ECOSOC could explore further how normative and operational bodies could be leveraged to, for example, share experiences, lessons learned and results achieved. Outcomes of ECOSOC-led processes should then enable the GA, as the ultimate policy making and representative body with a universal membership, to garner the requisite political will and leadership at the very strategic and highest possible level so that there is momentum at all levels. Noting that the HLPF will only meet under the auspicious of the GA every 4 years (2016, 2020, 2024, 2028), consideration could be given to having the 2030 Agenda as one of the sub-themes under the GA Summits for the next 15 years so that an additional political platform is established for world leaders to ground their statements in the context of the new Agenda. This can serve as a good inspiration for countries that are at different stages to follow-up.

Main Committees of the GA (particularly second and third) have a role to play, and there is a clear link between the SDGs and several themes covered by these Committees. To ensure there is no duplication, and not to overburden Member States, it may be useful to clarify the value-addition to discussions in the 2nd or 3rd Committees on items also covered

by the HLPF or FfD Forum. If the Committees are expected to consider these issues, it might be useful to ensure the discussions are focused and outcomes are strategic and forward-looking so that they can inform the discussions under the FfD Forum and/or HLPF.

Additionally, a new holistic and integrated development agenda, which brings together all pillars of the UN Charter, is a strong and compelling reason for the individual Committees to rationalize their work programmes. Business as usual should not be the case. The Committees have the potential to capitalize on the UN's normative role, issuing guidance on how to achieve balance across the SD pillars.

Moreover, the substantive work and outcomes of the UN Human Rights Council, its Experts, Mandate-holders and Working Groups, and the Third Committee should also feed into thematic debates, plenaries, and thematic reviews at the HLPF, ECOSOC and GA levels. There should be a modality that facilitates this synergy and avoid compartmentalization of the agenda.

A clear mapping of how the different mechanisms and processes are inter-related and inform each other would be required to ensure that Member States delegations and the UN system adequately contributes.

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

Kindly see the relevant ECOSOC inputs under question 4.

The Annual Ministerial Reviews (AMR) that the ECOSOC conducted during the Millennium Development Goals, comprised of voluntary presentations by countries was an important mechanism to facilitate exchange of good practices, a platform for country interactions, and the needed political push to focus on particular elements of the global MDG agenda. A new iteration of this process covering the SDGs would be needed and useful to countries. It is understood that the ECOSOC has already invited Member States to volunteer for such presentations in the upcoming round in 2016.

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?

Need to coordinate the calendar of other major processes in a sequencing manner that their outputs feed into the HLPF deliberations (e.g. SAMOA

⁵ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

Pathway; the Istanbul PoA (2011-2020.) In this respect, other UN Summits and Convention processes (e.g. International Conference on Population and Development process; direct relevant MEAs such as UNFCCC) which are of direct relevance to the SDGs can also produce inputs of relevance to HLPF deliberations.

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?

It would be useful for all UN bodies generating relevant information for follow-up to structure their inputs in a way that contributes efficiently to HLPF and related review. In this regard, it will be useful to establish in advance themes/areas for particular review in a given year (2016, 2020, 2024, 2028), so that other bodies and forums can plan their agenda effectively.

ECOSOC, as the parent body of functional commissions, has an important role to play in supporting their work and in providing political leadership. Thus, interactive dialogues of ECOSOC (and also GA) around the thematic issues dealt with by functional commissions can send important political signals of commitment and support.

While the work of functional commissions should be as focused and specialized as possible to ensure follow-up to conferences, it is important to ensure that they contribute to the work of ECOSOC on any given theme. As the HLPF is also expected to conduct thematic reviews, including cross cutting issues, it is critical that any reviews by the functional commissions and other inter-governmental bodies and forums also reflect the integrated nature of the goals as well as the interlinkages between them. At the regional level, greater cooperation between the functional commissions, regional commissions, and regional UNDG entities must be ensured.

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?

Once there is further clarity on how the Financing for Development follow-up process will be configured, we will be able to offer some recommendations in this regard.

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 ECOSOC⁶ and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”⁷. 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”⁸. 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”⁹. 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.¹⁰]

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?

The HLPF Meetings/Summits (held every four years) should focus on option (ii) described above – focusing on specific transversal themes, which are of relevance to majority of goals. This would allow for a high level political strategic engagement of Heads of State.

The Thematic Meetings (held annually) under the ECOSOC could take into consideration option 1 above, focusing closely on clusters of goals, as it will lend for a more thorough and technically focused review of all the SDGs (perhaps more than once) during the timeframe of the agenda. As time progresses, this could help facilitate identification of where interventions for acceleration is needed.

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?

⁶ For example, the Commission on Social Development, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Population and Development etc....

⁷ Examples would include the World Health Assembly, International Labour Conference etc.

⁸ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, para 85

⁹ General Assembly resolution 67/290, op 7c

¹⁰ General Assembly resolution 68/1, paras 7-9

They should report on their work to the forum (drawing on existing reporting mechanisms) and this should be taken into consideration for the Forum's outcome(s).

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?

This will depend on the option selected under Q6. If every year a cluster of SDGs is chosen then these would collectively inform the theme. Given the importance of the 2030 Agenda and HLPF for the broader ECOSOC agenda, the HLPF theme could simply become the ECOSOC theme. The first meetings of the Forum should be aligned so that Member States are considering the same development issues and deliberating on similar messages at both the Forum and the ECOSOC.

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?

Suggested to set the themes on a four year cycle with a corresponding four-year work programme. This would allow other UN processes that are of direct relevance to the SDGs to inform the discussions.

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

At minimum it should be sub-theme or complimentary. Consideration could also be given to the work of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development.

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

It is very important to understand the SDG monitoring process at the global, regional and country level. At the global level, UNSTATS is responsible for producing the SDG Progress Report (which is equivalent to the MDG Progress Report produced annually). The scientific report to be produced by the HLPF should inform key messages/findings into the

SDG Progress Report. How these reports are sequenced would be of relevance to ensure they are somehow aligned or reinforcing key relevant messages.

The undg is expected to drive the process for supporting countries to monitor and report on the SDGs at country level, as done during the MDG period. The undg WG on SDGs has a Task Team responsible for defining the UN development system offer to support countries and for preparing a set of guidelines for SDG reporting at country level. UNSTATS co-chair this Task Team with UNDP.

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

The Annual Ministerial Reviews under the ECOSOC could facilitate the identification of emerging issues. The GA Committees (2nd and 3rd) could also contribute to setting priori agenda for the HLPF. In addition, call for papers as background and dedicated, multi-stakeholder expert briefing sessions according to cluster of goals (SDGS) are two possible arrangements that would allow the HLPF to identify and consider emerging issues.

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?

Establishing a predictable, long-term horizon for the thematic reviews – with a clear published calendar –would enable other platforms and processes to better plan and prepare necessary inputs. This could be made available through Member States who are involved in the platform process, or through observers, Major Groups, etc. It will be important that those charged with compiling documentation and analysis for thematic review—as well as those charged with scheduling the agenda of reviews—be empowered and encouraged to solicit the most relevant evidence from all sources available. Recent outcomes of such platforms can be part of the Forum’s agenda each time it meets.

For instance, the World We Want –a platform jointly managed by the UN and civil society organizations and which was used in the preparatory process of the SDGs as a one stop shop – could be used for SDG implementation to engage with stakeholders in several ways: 1) Serve as a

repository of information on progress of SDG implementation, with links to different sites of stakeholders engaged in implementation; 2) Information could be gathered and analyzed periodically to show progress as well as feedback on implementation by a particular constituency, relevant sector/goal, particular country or region; and 3) Host online discussions on specific topics as well as thematic focus on HLPF. The outcomes could be consolidated and analysed with a report produced for the HLPF sessions.

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?

Given the voluntary nature of the reviews, any global review is subject to countries conducting their own national reviews first. The Forum under ECOSOC will meet annually for a period of eight days including a three-day ministerial segment. The Universal Periodic Process of the Human Rights Council allocates 3 sessions per year and each review session is 10 working days and covers 14 countries; for the first cycle, each country gets 3 hours and the second cycle onwards is 3.5 hours. It is important to clarify how the proposed voluntary country reviews under the HLPF/ECOSOC will differ from the modality previously conducted under the Annual Ministerial Reviews focusing on the MDGs. Under the AMR, a limited set of countries would present every year focusing on a particular theme. Given that the reviews are voluntary, conducting it annually with a limited set of countries would be ideal. Countries should feel encouraged to share their experiences.

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?

A clear set of guidelines on the format of the sessions, examples of how effective presentations can be delivered and the space available to countries to share their experiences would help them to prepare for the review process. In addition, at the country level, the UN Country Teams, in particular the office of the UN Resident Coordinator – should be the first entry point to provide technical support to countries preparing for

the reviews.

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?

Some issues that can be considered include *inter alia*:

- **How countries have been transitioning from the MDGs to the SDGs (taking into account that the unfinished agenda of the MDGs is embedded into the SDG Framework)?;**
- **Challenges faced by countries in mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs into national and sub-national plans and how these were overcome;**
- **How transformational is the 2030 Agenda for countries? What has changed or likely to change at country level?;**
- **How countries development vision strategies reflect the principles embodied in the 2030 Agenda (integrated approach, leaving ‘no one behind’)?**
- **Challenges for countries in setting up monitoring and evaluation frameworks that are not only sectoral (with clear accountability lines), but that also capture the interrelatedness of goals and targets;**
- **What are the strategies countries are putting in place to plug the data gaps?**
- **How partnership is being leveraged to support the 2030 Agenda implementation?**
- **How innovation has been applied and is captured in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda (innovation not restricted to technological innovations); and**
- **What criteria countries are using to sequence actions (to implement the SDG targets) that are needed today to harness results in medium and long-term?.**

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 a first phase, HLPF reviews could focus on what countries are doing to adjust their national strategies and policies for SDG implementation. HLPF thematic reviews should look at nexus of topics and cross cutting issues, moving beyond a silo approach and examining the links between various goals. It is also important to find a balance between ensuring comparability of national reviews and preserving flexibility and national ownership. Consideration could be given to drawing also from the Guidelines developed for the Universal Periodic Review process by the Human Rights Council.

Presentation of national reviews to the HLPF:

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

Country reviews should also take into account the SDG Country Report or equivalent produced by a particular country for reporting on the progress status of SDGs. It will be important that countries engage in the production of such instruments.

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

While countries are in the front-running of SDG implementation, each country should be encouraged to showcase innovative mechanisms and partnerships established to generate financial or technological resources. This could involve civil society and private sector groups that may be working closely with the government at national or sub-national levels.

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?

Given that the national reviews are voluntary in nature, participating countries at each round could volunteer to include a section in the SDG Country Report, reporting on its experience at the HLPF national reviews. It could also include specific details on follow up recommendations/actions. It is important to note that production of SDG Country reports are also voluntary in nature and periodicity is decided by each country.

IV. Regional reviews and processes

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

Regional reviews are important to bridge national and global reviews and there are expertise and resources available (including all the UN system regional entities, i.e. Regional bureau directorate offices) to support the member state-led process, as the outcome document expects the member states to ‘identify the most suitable regional forum in which to engage.’ Also, regional review processes should not be in isolation from the national and global. All relevant regional entities should be engaged in this process.

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)?

For the thematic reviews, HLPF needs to set clear guidance of engagement of major groups during its various processes/meetings and clearly indicating the type of inputs sought from major groups. As per usual practice, major groups should be allowed sufficient time to convene a series of caucus meetings to review documentation and prepare their respective inputs into the HLPF as a group of stakeholders, like CSOs, either in the form of reports to be submitted or presentations to be made at hearings, where major groups are invited to participate.

For the country reviews, HLPF can recommend a series of options on how countries can engage major groups and how major groups can contribute to the country reviews. Given that the country reviews are a voluntary process – it is important that each participating country has the space to shape the type and degree of engagement of different major groups. Countries should not feel that major groups or peer are evaluating its performance in achieving the SDGs.

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?¹¹

Thematic reviews should provide the space for that collecting information on participation of civil society and contributing for specific issues. On country reviews, government could be encouraged to provide the space for major groups to report on how they are directly engaging on SDG implementation.

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

Periodic reports by the UN Secretary-General prior to each HLPF Summit could be issued focusing on the contribution of the UN system broadly and key thematic issues.

The role of the Chief Executives Board (CEB) should also be leveraged here. The CEB could discuss once per year at its formal session on how the UN system is contributing towards the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The High Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) – under the CEB – is expected to establish a stream of work to facilitate the inputs to the CEB on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The upcoming formal session of the CEB on 18 November will consider the 2030 Agenda implementation.

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

From a data perspective, the UN system could do the following: 1) Improve coordination and coherence between UN agencies and other development stakeholders to support national statistical capacity for SDG monitoring and the production of national SDG reports (UNDG Task Team on data and country SDG reports, under the UNDG Working Group on the SDGs, can facilitate that); 2) Encourage interoperability of data systems through standardization, knowledge sharing and collaboration (CEB programme of work on the data revolution); 3) Facilitate partnerships to strengthen national statistical capacities, mobilize resources for SDG monitoring and explore innovative approaches for engaging stakeholders and plugging data gaps (CEB programme of work on data revolution).

¹¹ 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.”

VI. Other views and ideas

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

The review process should also consider several cross-border issues (e.g. migration, water, trade, partnerships). How will the HLPF monitor and follow-up on this, and how will the UN support? How can the HLPF use all its resources to provide guidance on the inter-linkages of these goals and carrying forward to ones with the most spillover/multiplier effects on the global, country and local levels?