

I. Institutional responsibilities for follow-up and review

Q1. 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?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS generally agreed that coordination among the GA, ECOSOC and the HLPF is critical for a coherent and efficient follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, but emphasized that each body must adapt to the agenda, align policy priorities and work to break down silos. Some highlighted the adaptation of the GA's Second and Third Committees as a crucial stepping stone to achieving such coordination through, for example, a mapping exercise to consolidate the agendas of the Second and Third committees in order to avoid overlaps.</p> <p>Regarding the relationship between ECOSOC and the GA, MGOS advised that their roles should be complementary – ECOSOC should provide an effective platform for coordinating development activities, while the GA should maintain and build political momentum around implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The GA, as underscored by some colleagues, should make sure that SDG-relevant information stemming from its relevant subsidiary bodies makes its way to the HLPF. Furthermore, for the purpose of focus and coherence, it was recommended that the three years of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC should focus on identifying gaps in implementation and deciding how the international community could address these shortcomings. The UNGA HLPF could then focus on the “bigger picture”, political leadership and guidance, and be used for strategic discussions on issues coming out of the HLPF and ECOSOC.</p> <p>On the relationship with MGOS, stakeholders welcomed inclusiveness, transparency and participation as cornerstones of effective implementation and follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda. While some colleagues suggested that the participation could take place in the form of collaborative briefings and special events, others proposed a comprehensive review of the working methods of the GA's Second and Third Committees, to accommodate the participation of MGOS while respecting the committees' intergovernmental nature. Once again, the open nature of the OWG and IGN work was praised as a best practice that should be reproduced during the 2030 Agenda's implementation, follow-up and review.</p>

		Finally, it was highlighted that the follow-up and review process should not lose sight of the importance of producing national action plans and communicating the SDGs, as well as inviting private parties and citizens to become active in this process. Partnerships were highlighted as another important component that should be reinforced to the maximum extent possible at the global level.
--	--	--

Q2. Given its Charter and other mandates, how can ECOSOC help ensure that global follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda is coherent?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS will be expecting the ECOSOC to provide guidance, coherence and inclusive space during the 2030 Agenda follow-up and review. Several respondents called for ECOSOC to provide common reporting guidelines for the 2030 Agenda country reviews to enable comparability, efficiency and facilitation of meta-analysis. The work of ECOSOC should also give equal attention to all goals and targets, avoiding siloes.</p> <p>The annual theme of ECOSOC and its mainstreaming among subsidiary bodies was stressed as a means for ECOSOC to contribute to the global follow-up and review. The theme should be aligned with the 2030 Agenda review and treated by the functional commissions with a “HLPF mind-set”. To this end, MGOS suggested that subsidiary bodies should provide tailored information for the HLPF use as well as adopt dedicated agenda items on 2030 Agenda. Additionally, different functional commissions of ECOSOC could organize preparatory meetings prior to the HLPF to discuss the HLPF annual theme, supporting robust country and thematic reviews.</p> <p>Finally, MGOS emphasized that allowing ample space for stakeholder participation would enable the process to remain collaborative, bringing in a wide range of views from each of its functional commissions to ensure meaningful follow-up and review. This should include welcoming the private sector perspective and providing incentives for its reporting on the SDGs implementation.</p>

Q3. 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)1?

¹ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, paragraph 82

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	Generally, MGOS agreed that the HLPF should dedicate an agenda item and provide space for UN processes on countries in special situations, such as LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS, to present their results on an annual basis. Other UN processes, such as those on population (IPCD) and women (Beijing), should be addressed under this agenda item as well. Some colleagues expressed concern about duplication and recommended that the HLPF work through existing mechanisms and arrangements, in order not to compromise the Forum's efficiency.

Q4: 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS agreed that the GA has a critical role to play in providing guidance to ECOSOC functional commissions and other bodies, including through increasing coordination and efficiency, avoiding duplication, and ensuring some degree of standardized contribution through reporting on progress, achievements, challenges, gaps, emerging issues, and recommendations.</p> <p>Many underscored that when providing information to the HLPF, the ECOSOC functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums should be guided by the principles of the 2030 Agenda, especially those signalled in paras 74 (d) and 74 (e).</p> <p>Some cautioned that Commissions are independent and their mandates go beyond the SDGs, so the follow-up and review process should not compromise their regular mandates; and that the GA should provide "big-picture" guidance, with more substantive guidance from ECOSOC.</p>

Q5. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
---	-------------	---------

1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS broadly agreed that the Forum on FFD and the summary by the Co-Chairs of the multi-stakeholder forum on STI should feed into the HLPF, and that the findings of these two forums should be considered for country and thematic reviews, along with a dedicated session to discuss their progress. In order to guarantee valuable inputs, some respondents suggested that Member States should strengthen the ECOSOC Secretariat and provide it with the necessary expertise to take on the task of coordinating the nexus of finance/economy/trade to make it relevant to the MOI of the SDGs, and to ensure effective follow up on the recommendations to be made on STI. It was also suggested that regular meetings be hosted in the lead-up to the HLPF, and that the Forum should have dedicated sessions to review the outcomes of both the ECOSOC Forum on FFD and the multi-stakeholder forum on STI.</p>
----------	------------------	---

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

Q6. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>The majority of stakeholders preferred to approach the HLPF with a combination of options (i) and (ii). Some stated that options (i) and (ii) offer the opportunity to ensure that integration, which should be the overall objective of the thematic reviews, is not lost. Others responded that a blend of the three options is the best-suited strategy for the HLPF.</p> <p>It was recommended that the HLPF themes be established in cooperation with MS, UN agencies and MGOS. According to the questionnaire, the HLPF should solicit annual submissions from all stakeholders on possible themes well in advance of making a decision against a set of objective, robust and consistent criteria. In this regard, some proposed a focus on option (ii), with an open online poll to allow the decision from a series of key options.</p> <p>Some proposed a focus on clusters of goals, and the possibility of using the 5Ps was welcomed as a strategy to frame a holistic and inclusive view of the agenda. Others cautioned against “siloing” the goals. Each cluster should be clearly cross-cutting among the three dimensions of sustainable development. Gender was underscored as a cross-cutting goal that should be considered in every review, and certain principles such as those on leaving no one behind and meeting all goals and targets for all economic and social groups, including for persons with disabilities, should guide and inspire the HLPF themes.</p>

		<p>Some MGOS favored a combination of options (ii) and (iii): transversal themes should be selected, so the 2030 Agenda could be tackled in an intersectorial manner, while at the same time giving each goal attention within a given periodicity.</p> <p>Finally, some respondents supported option (iii), and proposed that Goal 17 be addressed each year, with a dedicated focus on every fifth year, which would also identify two thematic reviews based on the themes covered by the roundtables held during the SDG Summit in September 2015. There was a suggestion to substitute Goal 17 for Goal 16 in option (iii). According to the respondent, SDG 16 (governance related) also constitutes a key enabler for the other goals and so can usefully inform the review of the entire SDGs framework at each session of the HLPF.</p>
--	--	--

Q7. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>Inputs from functional commissions and other intergovernmental bodies and forums to the HLPF should be focused and coherent with the HLPF annual theme, so that the forum's discussions, annual reports, peer reviews as well as outcomes can benefit from the inputs.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested that bodies and forums could hold a half-day discussion on the annual theme in advance of the forum and provide a summary as input to the HLPF. Others would like to see proposed an annual compilation of inputs from across the UN system in the form of a report made available well in advance of the HLPF. Multi-stakeholder partnerships were also highlighted as valuable sources of input.</p> <p>One respondent underscored that negotiated outcomes should be prioritized as the main inputs for the HLPF by the functional commissions under ECOSOC, to guarantee the flow of information between UN subsidiary bodies and the HLPF.</p>

Q8. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS provided diverse opinions regarding the relationship between the ECOSOC and HLPF themes. Some respondents suggested that they should not necessarily be aligned, given that the HLPF has a broader scope than ECOSOC, while others disagreed. One noted that given the special and hybrid quality of the HLPF, its annual theme under the auspices of ECOSOC could be decided in close consultation of the President of ECOSOC and the President of the GA or the head of the Second Committee. Some representatives proposed that HLPF and ECOSOC themes should always be aligned.</p> <p>Stakeholders provided a wide range of suggestions for the HLPF annual themes. The principles of “Leave no one behind” and the 5 Ps were highlighted. Inequalities within and among countries were also mentioned as possible overarching themes. It was suggested that “accountability” and adequate MOI could provide good themes, or that the HLPF 2016 theme could include key enablers for general SDG attainment, key commitments and key overlaps. Finally, the some respondents cautioned against overarching themes, preferring option (iii), to address four SDGs every year, taken in numerical order, along with SDG17.</p> <p>Some of the themes proposed by MGOS included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic services delivery • Building economies and societies within planetary boundaries • Capacity building in different levels, technical cooperation • Cities and Human settlements • Connecting Economic and Social Development • Decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation/exploitation • Ensuring inclusive, transparent and accountable decision-making for sustainable development • Fight against epidemics • Gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls • Human Rights as an enabler for Sustainable Development • Inclusive Development • Inclusive Education • Inequalities within and among countries • Integrating SDGs into national, regional and local planning • Partnerships • Policy coherence for sustainable development • Public-Private partnerships • Resources allocation for Sustainable Development • Road Safety • Securing sustainable livelihoods for all • Science and Technology • Vulnerable and marginalized groups

--	--	--

Q9. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>There was no consistent preference among MGOS regarding how long in advance the HLPF themes should be known.</p> <p>Some preferred to know the HLPF theme one year in advance, and argued that it is enough time to allow for preparatory work for reporting, and would enable the Forum to detect emerging issues and bring them to the thematic reviews.</p> <p>Other MGOS would rather have the HLPF themes defined two years in advance, noting that this amount of time would be ideal to provide some predictability and flexibility to deal with new and emerging issues.</p> <p>Some opted for knowing the thematic review topics four years in advance, to enable the possibility of conducting thorough consultations and research for reviews.</p> <p>Finally, some respondents cautioned against devoting too much effort to thematic reviews, stating that the themes might distract from the main objective of implementation, review and monitoring of the 2030 Agenda.</p>

Q10. Should the multi-stakeholder forum on Science, Technology and Innovation address the same theme as the HLPF?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS see advantages in both scenarios. It was stated that the forum should be addressing the same set of goals or the topic covered by the HLPF. It was recommended that the overlap should not be complete, but that the STI forum devotes some of its time to a focus on a theme. A proposal was made in the sense of the STI addressing how the content of the forum can and has contributed to the SDGs and other processes feeding into the HLPF.</p> <p>On the other hand, some MGOS are concerned about the level of flexibility that the STI must have in order to act effectively, in a cross cutting way, being able to constantly tackle emerging issues.</p>

--	--	--

Q11. How should the United Nations Statistical Commission best contribute to the work of HLPF?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS underscored a series of ways in which the UNSC can contribute and support the HLPF, mainly through the work of the IAEG-SDGs. One answer recommended the UNSC to provide technical updates on the relationship between indicators and their intended outcomes. Further, it was stated that indicators and sources should be updated throughout the process, in a way that complements follow-up and review efforts. This is considered to be a critical point, as the improvement of indicators over time can offer new options for how indicators could better reflect the SDGs. Some answers underscored that the UNSC should be supporting and giving guidance to the IAEG-SDGs, so it can provide technical expertise for the implementation of the approved global indicators as well as to the monitoring framework. The importance of working closely with the IAEG-SDGs throughout the 15 years of follow-up and review was also highlighted. Further comments consider that the UNSC has a role to play on assuring data revolution and innovation.</p> <p>One of the main contributions of the UNSC is considered to be related to its role in the drafting process of the Annual SDGs Progress report, including identifying key data gaps, progress against the global indicators, and disaggregation of data. It is also considered that the UNSC should ensure that data are comparable and consistent, identifying challenges faced by national statistical offices and provide recommendations to address those challenges. The UNSC should ensure data availability to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p>It was added that the UNSC should support the development of new methodologies, guidelines, and recommendations for the generation of information on key national aspects of importance not yet covered, or covered well, by existing procedures and highlighted the importance of considering statistical office-civil society partnerships for the retrieval and management of data. The issue of national capacity and support to overburdened NSOs was also given consideration by the MGOS.</p>

Q12. What arrangements would be needed to allow the HLPF to identify and consider new and emerging issues?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGoS presented different approaches to identification of new and emerging issues. There were suggestions for the establishment of an expert advisory group to provide guidance in this matter, for the ECOSOC Bureau to make recommendations on emerging issues with the HLPF to ultimately have its own bureau, and close collaboration and</p>

		<p>consultations with stakeholders around the world, including other intergovernmental bodies in the regional and national levels, which could be achieved through open calls for inputs and a platform for information sharing.</p> <p>Some suggested the UN Secretariat appoint a focal point who would receive input from different stakeholders on new and emerging issues, with the responsibility to act accordingly and brief the HLPF on these issues on a regular basis if necessary. MGoS did not agree on whether to have dedicated sessions to discuss these issues during the HLPF.</p> <p>Another recommendation suggested that emerging issues be considered on a case-by-case basis by the HLPF every five years, since constant changes in priorities might harm the fulfilment of the Forum's mandate. Many respondents disagreed, proposing that consultations on emerging issues be done on a more frequent basis (annually or biannually), or mainstreamed in national reports, and recommended the establishment of a HLPF agenda item on emerging issues relevant to the 2030 Agenda.</p> <p>Finally, the role of the General Assembly in identifying emerging issues and informing the HLPF was also underscored.</p>
--	--	---

Q13. 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?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGoS are keen to see the HLPF as an open and inclusive space where their participation in global follow-up and review is encouraged, where their voices can be heard, and they can share best practices and lessons learned. Some welcomed online global consultations, and proposed the organization of a civil society forum parallel to the HLPF. The official submission of shadow reports was indicated by many as an important method of MGoS participation in the HLPF. It was further underlined that these reports should be available online, compiled, synthesised and made available in advance of the HLPF. The HLPF should rely on data retrieved from a variety of sources, including by civil society and the private sector. Platforms should be put in place to allow MGoS to contribute to the HLPF via the SDG Progress Report, the Global Sustainable Development Report, written reports and statements at reviews.</p> <p>It was recommended that capacity building initiatives should be developed, when necessary, to reach the most marginalized and disadvantaged individuals and communities.</p> <p>Many of the respondents abstained from providing opinions on a possible reporting format for HLPF submissions. There was</p>

		<p>no consensus among those who did express their views on this matter. While some colleagues expressed a preference for a more flexible, adaptable format, others would rather count with clear guidance on the format of submissions.</p> <p>Finally, the establishment of an Advisory Expert Body was recommended to assist in this exercise and make recommendations for invitation of MGoS representatives.</p>
--	--	--

II. HLPF National Reviews of implementation

Preparation and conduct of national reviews

Q14. 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?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>The majority of respondents expressed that they would like to see every country participating in state-led reviews every 4-5 years and reviewed at least three times during the 15-year cycle. A mixed review model was suggested: oral review, where a certain number of Member States make presentations and a discussion is conducted, including with stakeholders; and an online written review platform where Member States contribute by filling out a questionnaire. A written review mechanism would enable the HLPF to assess all Member States. The written questionnaires could also be helpful in establishing a global platform to share and compare best practices.</p> <p>The voluntary nature of the agenda and its reporting was emphasized. It was recommended that countries could contribute and provide feedback based on an agreed model of reporting. Further emphasis was given to the importance of mobilizing multi-stakeholder partnerships, engaging civil society, to ensure accountability in the review process.</p>

Q15. 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?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS have dedicated special attention to the sharing of experiences and mutual learning. The main format welcomed by respondents was a tripartite reporting: government-prepared reports, UN-wide reports and MGOS reports, to be compiled by the United Nations in each specific country. The role of national preparations and space for civil society was highlighted (as enablers of transparency, ownership and accountability), as well as the importance of an enabling environment and structure at the HLPF to allow the practice of shadow reporting by a diverse set of stakeholders. Some colleagues recommended the HLPF to be provided with a dedicated and adequately staffed secretariat to support MS in their preparation for the reviews.</p> <p>Many of the respondents pointed to the UN, especially country teams, as the most suited candidates to support national governments in their reporting exercise. The questionnaire also conveyed a strong message that reports should take the 2030 agenda para 74 (e) into account, focusing on the poorest and most vulnerable groups, and reach those furthest behind. MGOS also see the value of guidelines for reporting, as well as capacity building initiatives, including for stakeholders.</p>

Voluntary common reporting guidelines

Q16. 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?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>Different MGOS constituencies indicated their respective lists of core issues to be systematically addressed by the HLPF, including: transparency and accountability; inclusion and participation of non-state actors; measures taken to reach the furthest behind; assessment of PPPs; robustness of structures for implementation, including National Sustainable Development Strategies, national indicators and mobilization of resources and other governance structures; gender equality and mainstreaming throughout implementation; integration among the three dimensions of sustainable development; meaningful parliament participation, including in establishing national development plans and delegations to the HLPF; and human rights standards.</p>

Q17. 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?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Name	<p>The “Comply or Explain” approach was mentioned by a significant number of respondents as the best way to go about reporting while allowing enough flexibility to member States. This means that countries would be asked to report on all goals and targets and provide the rationale for the lack of reporting on any aspect the agenda they may fail to address. According to the questionnaire, the set of goals and targets already provides a comparable framework among countries. MGOS cautioned against selecting a certain core of issues, as they may give space for cherry-picking and siloing of the agenda. On more general terms, it was recommended that guidelines should encourage countries to report on progress, challenges, emerging issues and recommendations for further implementation of all SDGs.</p> <p>Some respondents did put forward a set of core issues they would like to see reported by countries. They include: data veracity, data gaps and other measurement dimensions; taxation and regulation of multinational corporations; and commitments and objectives present in each country context, even if not necessarily included in the SDGs.</p> <p>A number of MGOS highlighted that gender mainstreaming in implementation as well as specific measures to reach the most vulnerable and furthest behind first should be have a prominent space in country reporting.</p>

Q18. How should the country reviews be featured and discussed at the formal HLPF meeting?

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS raised a variety of suggestions regarding the HLPF country reviews.</p> <p>Some consider the HLPF an opportunity for real dialogue and learning among MS and stakeholders. For instance, it was recommended that specific strategies and incentives are considered to encourage participation. It was also asserted that all States must participate and provide feedback as equals in reviewing their differentiated responsibilities for meeting collective commitments, for example with climate change and financing.</p> <p>The value partnership/peer reviews was also underscored, as they could provide for the meaningful participation of non-state actors in the country under review, including the private sector and civil society. A proposal suggested that each year, a</p>

		<p>number of countries should be reviewed. The ministerial segment should then focus on reviewing the global process. Conversely, a response suggested that time should be found within the 5-day pre-ministerial HLPF schedule for presentation and discussion of each review. Presentation and discussion could be relatively short and focused.</p> <p>The ECOSOC Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) is seen as a process that offers several points of departure for the HLPF review process, yet its concrete implementation is considered to reveal a significant need for improvement. Also regarding format, a suggestion pointed to the direction of presenting reviews outcome through a multi-stakeholder roundtable or panel consisting of government, parliament, civil society and private sector representation from the country under review.</p> <p>The Universal Periodic Review was also mentioned as a good model for the HLPF reviews. MGOS also would like to see country reviews featuring inclusive stakeholder reviews and at the first instance should be presented at the regional level. In this sense, there is a general agreement that the reviews to be transparent, inclusive, open, ensuring meaningful participation of all stakeholders – including persons with disabilities. Respondents are also keen to see a dedicated agenda item with open space for MGoS in line with the full range of modalities available to them. It was suggested that stakeholders are able to perform parallel reporting to the national progress report. All materials submitted and final recommendations should be placed in the public domain.</p>
--	--	--

Q19. How can national reviews give adequate attention to the means of implementation? How can they help to mobilize new support and partnerships?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>The responses suggested that national reviews should have a dedicated section for Mols – financial and non-financial – assessing financing strategies & financing gaps, policy coherence as well as partnerships themselves. It was also suggested that an adequate review of Mols would count with extensive consultation with MGOS, including persons with disabilities, as well as other experts. The contribution made by non-state actors to the SDGs should be recognized, including the role of civil society and the private sector. According to MGOS colleagues, it is crucial to mobilize and engage these actors, together with governments, in implementing the 2030 Agenda.</p> <p>Others suggested ensuring that adequate attention is dedicated to Mols is to stipulate country reporting guidelines, and to allocate time in the ministerial segment of the HLPF to discuss overarching and underpinning issues of implementation, including: a) domestic implementation including means of implementation b) direct contribution to implementation overseas via ODA/development cooperation and c) impacts on implementation overseas via other policies and actions. For national</p>

		level reporting, extensive consultation with stakeholders, involvement of the private sector, and the inclusion of the gender dimension of MoIs were highlighted as relevant points to enable adequate national reviews.
--	--	--

Q20. What kind of outcome should result from the HLPF national reviews of implementation, and how could there be a follow-up to these reviews?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS agreed that country reviews should not single out countries that face challenges, but should rather serve as a collective problem-solving exercise.</p> <p>Some stakeholders noted that national reviews should allow for country comparisons and peer learning, as well as continued efforts and progress. Some also emphasized the role of the learning process and respective actions that should result from national reviews.</p> <p>Other respondents said that each national review should result in a summary of recommendations or action points, which should be made publicly available in an accessible and timely manner, contributing to accountability and transparency. At the national and subnational levels, the recommendations should be addressed by stakeholders in between reviews. At the regional level, the recommendations could play a role in understanding what are the common challenges and contribute to coordinated solutions. It was suggested that recommendations should also engage and inform the UN system, enabling them to meaningfully contribute to implementation.</p> <p>According to some, the reviews would benefit from following a common format, and a searchable website would be an interesting tool to ensure the availability of recommendations, as well as shadow reports produced by MGOS. In this sense, 4-year review cycles would be adequate. Some agreed that implementation should take inputs and reports from MGoS that provide a narrative on what the agenda should be measuring, and without limiting it to the indicators. Others suggested that country reports be prepared annually with the contribution of a wide range of stakeholders.</p>

III. Regional reviews and processes

Q21. How should the outcome of regional review processes be considered at HLPF?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>Regional reviews were welcomed by MGOS as an opportunity for peer-learning, sharing of good practices and consideration of challenges faced by different regions. Respondents suggested that a session of the HLPF is dedicated to the regional reviews, including during one of the three days of ministerial sessions. This could serve to (a) share findings, experiences, best practices and lessons learned in implementation among countries with similar development backgrounds and histories; (b) identify regional-level trends and challenges, as well as strategies to address them, including through cross-border approaches; (c) identify South-South and triangular cooperation to accelerate implementation, as well as other means of implementation; and (d) identify regional-level priorities for the HLPF.</p> <p>The HLPF should ensure that the regional reviews reflect the wealth of information stemming from national reviews, and not become a mechanism to mask differences within regions or prevent important issues from being considered at the global level. The HLPF should clearly define the objective of regional reviews, and coordinate them with thematic and national reviews. Some answers suggested that regional human rights mechanisms should be involved in these reviews.</p> <p>The value of the UN Regional Commissions was recognized as important players in establishing the mechanisms for regional peer reviews. Some suggested that regional reporting could happen every three years, giving time to prepare for the five-year review at the HLPF.</p> <p>Finally, many of the respondents highlighted the importance of including MGOS into the regional review process in an open, transparent and inclusive manner.</p>

IV. Inclusion of UN system and other stakeholders in global follow-up and review

Q22. 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)?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGoS broadly agreed that the OWG and IGN/post-2015 practice of inclusion of civil society should be preserved and expanded during the HLPF. Some points raised by various stakeholders included: 1) establishment of funding modalities and a trust fund to allow the participation of MGoS constituencies who are not based in New York City; 2) utilisation of innovative alternatives and technology tools to engage colleagues remotely (webcasting is just a first step in this process); 3) allocation of speaking slots to MGoS as a regular practice of the forum, including dedicated interactive dialogue sessions with MGoS. Various answers highlighted the crucial importance of availability of information, including data, summarized reports and all other official documents pertinent to the HLPF in a timely fashion and, ideally, translated to all official UN languages. It was also underscored that the HLPF should ensure participation of marginalised people, including persons with disabilities, in the global review.</p> <p>MGoS are also keen in submitting shadow reports, either on countries or concerning a thematic review. It was recommended that country review sessions should follow the modalities established by resolution 67/290 and allow for written submissions and oral contributions in public review sessions. As an alternative to make these submissions manageable, the total length of the report could be subject to limitations. The facilitation of an open platform for shadow reporting by all stakeholders was championed by some MGOS. According to them, stakeholders should also be able to contribute with written inputs for national reviews to a UN report that summarizes information submitted by non-state actors including civil society, as well as to the SDG progress report and the GSDR, additionally to participating in a multi-stakeholder thematic review and national partnership review sessions. A two-fold approach was also suggested, which could hold governments accountable, and also hold MGoS accountable. For the latter, the creation of a “Platform for Partnership Review” was also suggested.</p> <p>The HLPF can support participation of MGoS by requesting member States to provide information on their involvement in the implementation and review of the 2030 Agenda as a standing item in their national reviews. The role played by human rights institutions at the national level was also highlighted, with some stating that indigenous peoples should not be treated or perceived as vulnerable groups, but as rights holders who are able to work effectively within the HLPF.</p> <p>One of the stakeholders offered support and sponsorship to a possible regular roundtable discussion with parliamentarians attending the HLPF as part of the official programme and in cooperation with the UN. In addition to MPs attending each session of the HLPF, members of the IPU Committees on United Nations Affairs and on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade may be invited to participate.</p> <p>Outstanding: Concern was expressed over the possible prevalence of the “stakeholder” language forwarded by</p>

		<p>A/RES/67/290, since it may obscure the power imbalances between various sectors and groups and may encompass both rights holders and duty bearers, and, as such, obscures the differences between their objectives. In order to participate as “constituencies” at the HLPF, groups should have governance and accountability measures that are public, transparent and understandable. Requirements for official participation represent an effort to ensure that a balance of power, influence, and interest is maintained among the MG and OS.</p> <p>On the other hand, some respondents believe that business and the private sector should be distinguished as an important collaborator for all countries in advancing toward the SDGs. As an element of the non-governmental community that occupies a singular role, business and industry must be given its own voice, independent of the rest of civil society, if the opportunities of Sustainable Development are to be realized.</p>
--	--	---

Q23. 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? 2

#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>When discussing the opportunity to report on their own contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, many stakeholders underscored the importance of having the space to properly present their findings. A suggestion indicated that MGoS should have a session to share their views and contributions, in line with the OWG and post-2015 processes. Stakeholders should be required to submit statements on their contributions to achieving the SDGs. These could be grouped by national contribution, regional contribution and global contribution, and be cross-referenced with relevant targets. It was added that these reports should be included as an integral element of the work of the HLPF that is sufficiently reviewed and discussed.</p> <p>An additional suggestion was that stakeholders could report on their contributions 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 (e.g. as it is done for ECOSOC or UNESCO partnerships). According to the answers, this could be led by the HLPF secretariat, which would seek inputs from MGoS on various themes and their contributions. These inputs could be consolidated into global reports.</p>

² 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.”

		<p>On the modalities and incentives for reporting, an answer underscored that each grouping should report separately, according to their own modus operandi, but following strong guidelines and templates developed through multi stakeholder dialogue and the Secretariat. Clear incentives should put on the table to motivate MGoS to report on their own activities. One concrete suggestion was that willingness to submit to review could be a precondition for stakeholder involvement in the wider review and HLPF process. According to this approach, 5-10 reports could be more actively addressed, following the format of a written report, a presentation and deliberation in a public discussion. Other respondents proposed that MGoS be encouraged, in their shadow reporting, to provide a section on their own contributions to the implementation of the agenda in a certain country or thematic area. The creation of a “Global Accountability Report” was encouraged, encompassing the summaries of MGoS’ reports to the HLPF. This proposal is echoed in the recommendation of a compilation document, resulting from the MGoS’ reports.</p> <p>Adequate funding and support will be needed, should MGoS be expected to undertake review of their activities. MGOS also expect the UN to take the lead in making this process more attractive to stakeholders, ensuring online and face to face meetings among MGoS as well as meaningful and timely exchanges with MS.</p> <p>The private sector welcomes the opportunity to widen the scope of its decades long reporting and compliance practices. Other respondents underscored that special attention should be dedicated to secure private sector accountability and compliance to human rights standards.</p>
--	--	--

Q24. How should UN system contribution to the implementation of 2030 Agenda be reviewed?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS provided suggestions on how to catalyse the UN’s potential to support and promote the implementation of the 2030 Agenda while avoiding duplication and becoming fit for purpose. Many of them emphasized that the UN should report and be reviewed on its efforts to engage non-state actors in an open and transparent manner. Respondents suggested that UN bodies and agencies would produce annual reports on their contributions. One suggestion was that UN entities should be reviewed at least 3 times during the 15 years of HLPF follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda. The UN capacity to provide complementary data for monitoring the implementation of goals and targets was also highlighted. The UN is believed to have the potential to be a key player in the global thematic reviews.</p> <p>Similar suggestions involved the UN participating in multi-stakeholder thematic reviews and national partnership/peer reviews, and contributing to an independent report that summarizes non-state actors’ contributions to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, such as an annual Global Accountability Report.</p>

		<p>One respondent proposed tasking the UN Secretariat, funds and programmes whose work fall under the purview of ECOSOC, to provide reports to the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC. Specialized agencies, on the other hand, should provide reports to the HLPF under the auspices of the General Assembly. The Secretariat of the HLPF should synthesize those findings and submit recommendations for HLPF review and decision-making on the way forward. The idea of engaging UN independent experts for the UN review was also entertained by the MGOS answers.</p> <p>“UN fit for purpose” was also highlighted, where each session of the HLPF dedicated to the review and discussion of this topic. Promoting a firm process of de-corporatization of the UN was also recommended, at the same time opening the “fit-for-purpose” process to Member States and civil society, to make it more transparent and inclusive.</p>
--	--	---

Q25. What steps can the UN system, including the Secretariat take to best support follow-up and review in a coherent and effective manner?		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS emphasized the role of the United Nations in providing expertise, technical support and ensuring coherence in national, regional and global follow-up and review. They said that the UN will be critical in coordination work and should continue to facilitate the inclusion of non-state actors in this process. Some stakeholders recommend that the HLPF is provided with a permanent and adequately staffed secretariat which should support Member States and other stakeholders in their preparations for the review process, support the coordination of the HLPF sessions and follow-up and facilitate engagement of civil society. That would also include the production of reporting templates. Additionally, the UN country and regional offices should provide support to Member States and other stakeholders in their preparations for and follow-up to HLPF reviews.</p> <p>The UN is seen as a suitable player for data collection and support of states with overburdened statistical capacity. It was recommended that MGOS also benefit from that, counting on UN support in the production of shadow reports.</p> <p>Many stakeholders stated that the UN system should work towards integration and coherence of follow-up and review in the global, regional and national level. Special emphasis was given to the UN country teams which, as mentioned before, are seen as key enablers for efficient and inclusive reporting in the national level. A further recommendation would like to see the UN country teams supporting the implementation of HLPF recommendations in the national level. UN regional offices are believed to be well placed to support MS and MGOS in their preparations for the HLPF. In the global level, MGOS expect the UN to facilitate a solid, transparent and participatory preparatory process. The idea put forward is that the Secretariat can be a vehicle for awareness raising amongst civil society and ensuring that civil society plays an active role in HLPF – this</p>

		<p>includes civil society from developing countries with more limited opportunities to engage in discussions.</p> <p>Some underscored that assessing existing structure, commissions and bodies and allocating them to the best agreed format will help them to contribute to and take responsibility for the delivery and achievement of the Agenda 2030.</p>
--	--	--

V. Other views and ideas

Q26. Please add any other points you would like to raise.		
#	Stakeholder	Comment
1	Synthesis	<p>MGOS are very keen to be active players in the 2030 Agenda follow-up and review. The review process must be underpinned by the principles of transparency, accountability and participation.</p> <p>Some concern was raised regarding the disconnect between New York actors (Permanent Missions, UN HQ and NYC-based MGOS) and actors based on the ground, and MGOS recommended that the HLPF addresses this disconnect by integrating the national, regional and global levels of review.</p> <p>Follow-up and review for the 2030 Agenda should be seen as a continuum from local to global levels and the HLPF should be a global platform and umbrella to bring together the different processes and ensure accountability.</p> <p>The indicators work was underscored as crucial, and some expressed concern that several of the targets lack clear numerical quantification. The HLPF was recommended to request that, working with the IAEG-SDGs, relevant committees within the GA draw on global indicator baseline data, as it becomes available, to set specific numerical benchmarks for success in 2030 for all unquantified targets. MGOS colleagues also underscored that data systems and collection should provide space for alternative data collection methods and sources.</p> <p>Para 48 of the 2030 Agenda was addressed by some respondents, who called for new and innovative ways to quantify GDP.</p> <p>Further measures of private sector accountability were recommended, such as reports on human labor rights and environmental sustainability, the creation of an intergovernmental tax body, and increased transparency in bilateral negotiations (e.g. international trade negotiations), among others.</p>

		<p>One response recommended the establishment of a High-Level Political Forum Business Coordinating Group (HLPF/BCG) that, supported by DESA, could enable a more meaningful participation of the private sector.</p> <p>Regarding persons with disabilities, a twin-track approach was recommended for mainstreaming and disability-specific approaches. Persons with disabilities must be included in all phases of any future development processes, starting from design and planning, through review and follow-up. Universal design and participation for all were part of these recommendations.</p> <p>A call for the inclusion of farmers in implementation, follow-up and review was made, recognizing the importance of agriculture to the 2030 Agenda.</p> <p>On parliamentary participation, stakeholders manifested the intent to regular parliamentary review of the SDGs within its OP committee structure. Parliamentarians want to have an active role in the design and implementation of follow-up mechanisms at all levels.</p> <p>It was noted that the questionnaire did not give enhanced attention to the relationship between the HLPF and other review processes, such as the UPR, CEDAW, among others. The case was made that while these are all independent processes, they should inform the HLPF work.</p>
--	--	--