

## Questionnaire on the Process to Follow-up and Review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

### **Institutional responsibilities for follow-up and review:**

1. How can the General Assembly, ECOSOC and the HLPF work coherently in follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda? What should be the role of the General Assembly in follow-up and review of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda? Do you see a need to adjust the working methods and agenda of the General Assembly, its plenary, second, third committees in particular and their relation to ECOSOC to respond to the 2030 Agenda and ensure coherence, complementarity and efficiency? If so, how?

The roles of ECOSOC and the General Assembly should be complementary – ECOSOC should provide an effective platform for coordinating sustainable development goals while the GA should focus on policy matters and build political momentum for the 2030 Agenda implementation. As expected, many resolutions adopted in the Second Committee in the 70th Session of UNGA reflected the aspirations of both Agenda 2030 and Addis Ababa Action Agenda. This gave a strong signal that both developed and developing countries are gearing towards the achievement of the universal development goals. Nevertheless, the General Assembly should step up in finalising the indicators for the goals and targets for SDGs to avoid delays in its implementations.

In the meanwhile, HLPF should continue to conduct regular reviews, on the follow-up and implementation of sustainable development commitments and objectives, including those related to the means of implementation, within the context of the post-2015 development agenda. It must offer guidance on how to move from global commitments to national implementation and sustainable development results. the ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development (FfD) follow-up must be closely linked to the Agenda 2030 follow-up and review processes,

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

ECOSOC through the the high-level political forum will have a central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes at the global level, working coherently with the General Assembly, and other relevant organs and forums. There should be a multilevel mechanism that merge the regional inputs at the global level.

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)?

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?

Yes, General Assembly remains the most universally represented international bodies there is. As long as this factual reality exist, General Assembly should be guiding the work of other UN components as best decided by member states. However, in order for HLPF to be effective in reviewing SDGs, member states shall rely on data and statistics of the implementation gathered from various sources especially from other relevant UN components. There is no one size fits all in finding the remedy to end poverty, therefore more interactions, either joint sessions or joint meeting between UN bodies should be institutionalise to ensure all parties are supporting each other in implementing SDGs.

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 multistakeholder forum on Science, Technology and Innovation?

By conducting briefings, allow for inputs and allow discussions around updating the documents when relevant. Interaction with the HLPF needs to be promoted and member states need to be more aware about how they can interact with the HLPF.

#### **I. 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?

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?

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?

HLPF theme should be decided way ahead of time in order to member states and the General Assembly to plan its work ahead. Several aspects of SDGs are new, and statisticians as grappling in coming out with best possible indicators to measure the achievement of its targets. What more, without base data, several years are needed to achieve data maturity before the world can really best measure our achievement. This has always been the position of many countries especially the developing countries and the current practise should remain.

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?.

The UN Statistical Commission should contribute to the work of the HLPF through ensuring relevant data and reviewing the global set of indicators annually in order to ensure quality, accessible, timely and reliable disaggregated data to help the measurement of progress. The UN Statistical Commission should operate as the coordination body that receives and elaborates the regional and national statistical inputs and review of the regional and national indicators

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

The process of determining the themes should allow the opportunity to respond to, and consider, new and emerging issues, including responding to key areas of the framework that are lagging behind in progress

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?

They could contribute with their experience, expertise, knowledge, assessments and observation on the progress of the SDGs

### **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?

Probably every two years. However this could be adjusted later according to the needs and dynamics of the HLPF itself

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?

the recommendation emanating from the review and follow up process should not be prescriptive to member states and should rather be aimed at assisting developing countries in pursuit of sustainable development in line with their national development strategies and plans.

*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?

The HLPF should focus on the most transformative issue that give significance impact to a country

17. How can the guidelines leave enough flexibility to Member States while ensuring sufficient comparability between HLPF reviews to facilitate crosscountry 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?

It should be by comparing and sharing best practices across countries

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

The national review should be able to identify areas that are insufficient and support could be mobilised to fill in those gaps.

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 national review should be able to provide recommendation in assisting the country to assist the SDGs. It should also highlight success and area that should be improved

#### **IV. Regional reviews and processes**

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

It should provide synthesis of trend and general idea on the needs of the specific region

## The regional review 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)?

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?

Stakeholders can report on their contribution through their participation in partnerships with Member States and International Organizations as well as with mandatory reporting on their projects and programmes on themes and at the national, regional and global level

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?

The strategic plan (3-year or 5-year plan) of each UN bodies, specialised agencies and its regional commissions should set the implementation of Agenda 2030 as its ultimate thrusts. Being 'local' to a specific region is a big advantage to regional commissions to assess the best strategy in supporting national government in implementing international development goals.

### VI. Other views and ideas

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