

## Questionnaire:

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

Paragraph 90 of the 2030 Agenda (<http://bit.ly/1Epf648>) 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:

- (i) include a proposal on the organizational arrangements for State-led reviews at the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC, including recommendations on voluntary common reporting guidelines,
- (ii) clarify institutional responsibilities,
- (iii) provide guidance on annual themes, on a sequence of thematic reviews, and
- (iv) [provide guidance] on options for periodic reviews for the HLPF.”

In order to informally contribute to the reflection, major groups and other stakeholders are hereby invited to complete the below questionnaire to provide their views and proposals on these issues by midnight (NY time) on Sunday, 15 November 2015. The responses received will be made available on the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform\_ <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/>

Please feel free to leave blanks for questions you feel unprepared to answer.

## II. 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?**

Operating at both the ECOSOC and UNGA levels, coherence between the various levels of work must be prioritized. The three years of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC must focus on identifying gaps for implementation and ways to address these shortcomings as an

international community. The UNGA HLPF should focus on the bigger picture and on political leadership and guidance, and be used for strategic discussions on issues coming out of the HLPF and ECOSOC committees. This includes lessons learned from the follow-up and review processes at the ECOSOC level, and taking up decisions made by the functional commissions of ECOSOC and the UNGA committees. However, the Presidents of ECOSOC and the UNGA must ensure balance and coherence of this work on a regular basis (not just at the beginning/end of each four-year cycle) – potentially even through joint sessions hosted every year.

*From our experiences with the HLPF over its first handful of years, we have sometimes seen a lack of “balance” in the levels of work between ECOSOC and the UNGA Presidents. This is to say that, in theory, we could have three years of the HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC, with three UNGA presidents not having the obligation to take this work into account in their own work/agenda-setting. By calling for both presidents to work on these HLPF issues, whether they have the “mandate” for a particular year or not, we ensure that both ECOSOC and the UNGA are paying due attention to the HLPF and the 2030 Agenda in their own work – in addition to enhancing coherence between the work of ECOSOC and the UNGA, since the agendas for each are set by their respective presidents.*

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

When the HLPF meets annually under the auspices of ECOSOC it should focus on thematic and national review (building on the AMR) and the UN system review (building on the QCPR). ECOSOC’s subsidiary bodies and other entities reporting to ECOSOC should help provide tailored input for the HLPF review. A UN Task Team (possibly linked to the CEB) could help assemble and aggregate this kind of information. Engagement of civil society and all other stakeholders in these discussions will also be critical. These discussions must take into account the lessons learned and experiences from all member states, and enable civil society stakeholders to participate actively in all relevant processes. Robust and inclusive stakeholder engagement modalities will help ensure that civil society participates actively in national review processes and that their views are reflected in the final national reviews that are being put forward to the HLPF.

### **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) landlocked developing countries (LLDCs)?**

The HLPF could provide a formal space for the UN conferences and processes to present their results. Inversely, the HLPF could provide the organising framework for the thematic framing of the conferences and processes. The SDG agenda needs to be integrated.

It is also important that the HLPF helps continue to forge an inclusive global partnership for sustainable development, and helps create a space for governments to partner on implementation, particularly in issue areas where collective capacity is lacking.

**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?**

The following information should be sought from all related intergovernmental bodies and forums:

- Progress, achievements and critical success factors to attain the SDGs – including data sources and progress against global-level SDG indicators;
- Challenges and gaps;
- New and emerging issues; and
- Recommendations to mobilize further actions to accelerate implementation.

In line with para. 74(e) of the agenda, this information should be gender-sensitive, respect human rights and have a particular focus on the poorest, most vulnerable and the social and economic groups or 'segments of society' that are the furthest behind. The recommendations should be considered by the HLPF for inclusion in the negotiated Ministerial Declaration.

Inputs should be sought from other accountability mechanisms such as the Human Rights Council (including its special procedures and the UPR), human rights treaty bodies and UN Secretary General Special Representatives.

**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?**

The Forum on Financing for Development must be closely linked to the Agenda 2030 follow-up and review processes, in particular review and monitoring of progress and challenges related to Goal 17 and the Means of Implementation.

The annual HLPF should devote a special time slot to discuss the outcome of the annual meeting of the ECOSOC Forum on FFD together with the other Means of Implementation that are necessary to implement the SDGs. All of these processes should be seen as individual parts of the same whole.

In particular, the findings and outcomes from the FFD Forum should be considered in country and thematic reviews at the HLPF where relevant, helping to review a country's efforts in mobilization of domestic resources, policy coherence, development cooperation, and the global partnership for development. It will also be important for finance ministers and related high-level representatives to attend both the FFD and the HLPF discussions to increase coherence.

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

The 2030 Agenda decided the thematic reviews of the HLPF will be supported by the reviews conducted by the functional commissions of ECOSOC and “other intergovernmental bodies and forums”. 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”. 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”. 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.

**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?**

**Focus on clusters of closely related SDGs. This will allow thematic reviews to be looked at and analysed from a broad perspective giving leeway for more participatory involvement from those who want to engage.**

To ensure an integrated follow-up and review framework for the SDGs, the preferable option for reviews would be to base them on a transversal and over-arching theme (option ii.) One of these themes should be SDG 16 and the interlinkages between this goal and all other goals. One way could be to identify the themes based on the five Ps in the preamble of the 2030 Agenda – these cross-cutting issues have already been approved through the GA adoption of the 2030 Agenda. Additionally, we could build upon the clustering of issues identified for the Post-2015 Summit through the those six roundtable clusters.

Regardless which option is pursued, all thematic reviews should ensure:

- a. In line with para. 74(b) of the agenda, the universal nature of the agenda is respected and all goals are reviewed at least three times from 2016-2030;
- b. The process for selecting the theme is inclusive, transparent and participatory and provides the opportunity for input from civil society including children.

*We've been hearing about this from a few Member States as a potential option to build upon, since Member States have already worked somewhat towards clustering of issues – despite the fact that there is generally resistance to the issue of “clustering” by many.*

**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?**

Functional commissions need to align themselves closely to it and to producing outputs that support the work plan of the HLPF (including related monitoring and follow-up).

There should be a template for their input, and these inputs should be provided to the HLPF in written form during a preparatory period ahead of the HLPF - they should be framed around and linked to specific SDGs that are subject to each thematic review. This process should be inclusive of civil society stakeholders and inputs should be fully transparent and accessible to all.

In particular, the role of the human rights mechanisms will be key to supporting accountability to people in follow-up and review at the global level. The UN system should ensure a systematic flow of information between the human rights mechanisms and the HLPF, and integration of this information into the HLPF review process – and these inputs should be considered in the negotiated ministerial declaration of the HLPF.

**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?**

As the HLPF is a “hybrid” between the GA and ECOSOC: The annual theme of the HLPF 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. Yearly joint consultations with the ECOSOC and UNGA Presidents and Member States (including civil society) will be needed.

The themes should be strategically selected to highlight topics where progress is slow or there are concerns about results or where an issue is already flagged as being critical. A multi-year work programme, as suggested below, is needed in advance.

One option could be to frame the annual themes for the HLPF around the five Ps (People, Planet, Peace, Partnership and Prosperity) that are included in the preamble of the 2030 Agenda.

Ideally, the overarching theme for the HLPF should relate to the cluster of goals or specific thematic focus selected for that particular year.

**9. How long in advance should HLPF themes be known? For example, (i) should there be a programme of work for the four years in between two meetings of the HLPF under the auspices of the General Assembly or for a longer time period or (ii) should themes be determined every year and if so how could other intergovernmental platforms and other relevant actors contribute to the HLPF review?**

The Second Committee could make suggestions for a four-year cycle of themes for the HLPF meetings under the auspices of ECOSOC - but be able to adjust this should there be pressing new or emerging

challenges. To provide this flexibility, the selection of HLPF themes could be determined every two years. Providing the programme of work four years in advance would not allow the HLPF to be sufficiently flexible or responsive to new and emerging issues. In order to provide additional predictability, the programme of work could also be structured around the five “Ps” outlined in the preamble of the 2030 Agenda.

In selecting the themes for the HLPF, an inclusive, transparent and participatory process should be conducted that provides for the inputs of Member States, other intergovernmental platforms, and civil society. A similar process to this online consultation could be considered.

Additionally, an over-arching theme for the UNGA-level meeting of the HLPF should consider the UN-system coherence to addressing the issues outlined in the follow-up and review processes in the previous years of its cycle.

*This would address the issue of the HLPF's alignment with the QCPR and also be in line with our recommendations of having a UNGA-level HLPF meeting every four years that provides political impetus and guidance for the following four year cycle, and providing opportunities for “mid-course correction.”*

## **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 also play a key role in the drafting process of the Annual SDG Progress report, in identifying key data gaps, progress against the global indicators, and disaggregation of data. Specific bodies of the UNSC – such as the Praia Group on Governance and Peace Statistics – could be drawn upon to continually engage on strengthening the global indicators and supporting methodological and capacity development. Finally, the UNSC should play a role in encouraging and supporting its members – national NSOs – to provide the necessary data required for global monitoring of progress. The UNSC should also provide guidance and recommendations to refine the global indicators framework based on feedback from Member States and non-state actors. They should not spend resources producing reports but rather provide the platform for others to extract the data and assess progress. This work should continually feed into the HLPF processes, and vice-versa.

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

There should be a focal point within the UN Secretariat 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. Accordingly, the HLPF will need to have the necessary mechanisms in place in order to be able to respond to these issues.

Rather than allocate a specific session or dedicated time slot to consider new and emerging issues, the HLPF should require that all inputs and reports identify and reflect upon new and emerging issues across all goals on an annual basis. In this regard, new and emerging issues can be mainstreamed across all national and thematic reviews under the HLPF. The views of civil society stakeholders will be a critical element to this process, and therefore a transparent and inclusive mechanism for soliciting the views of all stakeholders will be critical to this exercise.

### **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?**

The HLPF should encourage independent “shadow reporting” by all stakeholders. These shadow reports conducted by non-state actors on the different SDGs should be available online, compiled, synthesised and handed to the HLPF representatives in advance of the HLPF. In addition, CSO representatives who have produced shadow reports relevant to the annual theme should be invited to present their findings to the HLPF – potential discrepancies between the findings of civil society and the official data presented by UN Member States in their reviews should be discussed and analysed.

Platforms and processes outside the UN system, including by non-state actors and sector-specific global partnerships, should provide inputs to the HLPF via the SDG Progress Report, the Global Sustainable Development Report, written reports and statements at reviews. These entities should report on progress, challenges, emerging issues and recommendations related to their area of expertise.

## **IV. 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?**

At least once in a four-year cycle (or at least three times during the full 15 year period), assessing:

- first the level of ambition of national strategies, goals and preparatory measures,
- second the output and implementation of measures, and
- third the outcome and impact of measures, including the follow-up of the recommendation of the first two rounds of reviews.

This timeline will allow the HLPF to periodically assess national progress and make recommendations to mobilize further action on implementation if countries’ policies, programs or interventions are not achieving their intended aims. Such touchpoints are critical to allow the HLPF to collectively ‘keep its finger on the pulse’ in overseeing the implementation of the SDGs and to be in a position to address new and emerging issues.

In addition to reporting on progress, challenges, emerging issues and recommendations, all countries should report on their actions taken to follow-up HLPF recommendations from previous reviews.

**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 review should be a solutions-based tool that aims to support evaluation of collective and individual progress in achieving the SDGs. Beyond that, local civil society and other stakeholders have to play a crucial role in this process to increase ownership, transparency and accountability. This means that these processes for civil society consultation need to be inclusive, open, transparent and participatory and include civil society data and shadow reports to complement these “official” reports.

The HLPF discussions should be based on:

- A government report with information provided by the state under review;
- A report from the UN summarizing information submitted by non-state actors including civil society and children; and
- A report from the UN summarizing information and data from across the UN system, including from UN agencies, the Universal Periodic Review and UN treaty bodies.

**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?**

There needs to be standards regarding minimally accepted levels of transparency, accountability and participation for reporting on and conducting the reviews.

The HLPF should systematically address the following:

- The situation of the poorest, most vulnerable and those furthest behind, per para. 74(e) of the agenda;
- The actions countries have taken to fulfil the pledges to leave no one behind, reach the furthest behind first, and meet goals and targets for all segments of society;

- The actions countries have taken to consult with civil society, parliaments, societal groups and the most marginalized and vulnerable at the national and sub-national level in implementing the goals and preparing their report;
- the extent to which they are setting national targets which will implement the whole agenda (social, environmental and economic) and not ‘cherry picking’ and
- Progress made to achieve the full disaggregation of data.

**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?**

Countries should report on all goals. For flexibility one could use a “comply or explain” approach.

Guidelines should encourage countries to report on progress, challenges, emerging issues and recommendations for further implementation of all SDGs. Ensuring countries report on these key topics can provide for cross-country comparability. This includes:

- Actions taken to prioritize marginalized groups in order to leave no one behind and to meet all goals and targets for all segments of society;
- Actions taken to promote the participation of civil society in awareness-raising of the 2030 Agenda, and implementation and accountability processes including the production of national reports;
- Actions taken to produce high-quality, accessible, timely, reliable and disaggregated data that is publicly available and to consider citizen-led or third party data; and
- Actions taken to independently monitor progress on the SDGs at national levels.

**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 be discussed via peer or partnership reviews at the HLPF and should be *the core part of the HLPF, in order to generate evidence about successful strategies and policies, and emerging problems. Parallel or simultaneous partnership/peer reviews could be conducted by groups of countries representing a balance of high, middle and low-income countries, as well as geography.*

*Partnership/peer reviews should provide for the meaningful participation of non-state actors in the country under review, including the private sector and civil society. This would help to facilitate a*

*dynamic platform for partnerships where countries, UN agencies, the private sector and civil society come together to address challenges, showcase good practices and share lessons learned.*

*The country reviews must be more than just an opportunity for the country under review to present a report or showcase its good practices and instead an opportunity for real engagement, dialogue and learning.*

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

National reviews will need to pay careful attention to the means of implementation, as a cross-cutting issue relevant to all goals, as well as through dedicated attention to Goal 17. Reporting guidelines can help to ensure these issues are addressed, as well as the organization of reviews and presentations.

Countries (especially developed countries) should be encouraged to present based on 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 – i.e. policy coherence with sustainable development objectives.

The HLPF can also provide informal spaces to facilitate interaction, matchmaking and networking among different stakeholders to further promote multi-stakeholder partnerships. Importantly, partnerships themselves must also be subject to review, monitoring and accountability, including through analysis at the HLPF.

## **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?**

There should be a written summary of recommendations from each national review that is made publicly available and accessible in a timely manner. These recommendations should contribute to a continuum of accountability at national, regional and global levels.

At national and sub-national levels, recommendations should be considered by government and non-state actors in the period between reviews, in order to make further progress in implementing the SDGs and to address any challenges, gaps or emerging issues.

At the regional level, key recommendations should be used to discuss shared regional challenges in implementation and possible solutions.

At the global level, countries should outline the steps they have taken to address recommendations arising from previous reviews. Country reports for subsequent reviews under the HLPF should thus outline: progress, challenges, emerging issues, follow-up on previous recommendations and any new recommendations that will further implementation.

## V. Regional reviews and processes

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

As many SDGs have a transboundary dimension, issues such as resource use or production and supply chains, should be dealt with at the regional level, in addition to being addressed at the global level. Nuances will have to be found to allow for differentiated approaches at the regional level, building on those regional institutions that have the support of Member States. The HLPF under the auspices of the ECOSOC could dedicate a slot for reports from the regional level.

## VI. 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 and other relevant stakeholders defined by General Assembly resolution 67/290 and the practices of the General Assembly open working group on SDGs)?

The HLPF should support the participation of stakeholders including civil society by:

- Providing dedicated time for interactive dialogue with Member States;
- Establishing a trust fund to support stakeholders to participate in reviews;
- Using new technologies to facilitate the participation of stakeholders outside UN Headquarters including through video calls and other online platforms;
- Encouraging and facilitating an open platform for shadow reporting by all stakeholders.

Stakeholders should be able to contribute to reviews by:

- Providing written inputs for national reviews to a UN report that summarizes information submitted by non-state actors including civil society;
- Providing written inputs to the SDG Progress Report and the Global Sustainable Development Report; and
- Participating in multi-stakeholder thematic review and national partnership review sessions.

### 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?

There should be a formal and agreed space for actors to participate in review. This would be stipulated in the minimum criteria for a review to be considered valid.

*The major groups and other stakeholders (MG&OS) should be able to participate in national and thematic reviews at the HLPF, including by submitting independent reports. There must be an official channel for these reports to be submitted and considered to complement official reports from Member States. In these reports, MG&OS should be encouraged to report on their contribution to the implementation of the agenda, but also on implementation by the government and relevant partnerships, based on their experience working at the national, local and community levels.*

*Additionally, an independent “Global Accountability Report” could be created that summarizes non-state actors’ contributions to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and through other independent civil society processes.*

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

The focus of this review should be based on how well the UN system is doing in terms of contributing to the implementation of the SDGs, as well as how well it is doing in terms of overcoming siloes between different UN entities. A holistic approach is crucial.

The UN system can report on their contribution to *the 2030 Agenda* by:

- Participating in multi-stakeholder thematic reviews and national partnership/peer reviews as ‘One United Nations.’ The UN should adopt a ‘Delivering as One’ approach not just at a country level in delivering programs, but in relation to global national and thematic reviews under the HLPF;
- Providing individual agency written inputs to national and thematic 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 suggested in question 23.

## **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 HLPF needs a solid, transparent and participatory preparatory process. Past experiences with international review mechanisms suggest that a robust mandate, sufficient time and secretariat support as well as the meaningful participation of local civil society are crucial for an effective review. The Secretariat can be a vehicle for awareness raising amongst civil society and ensuring that civil society plays an active role in HLPF – this includes civil society from developing countries with more limited opportunities to engage in discussions. The HLPF needs to have the right policy guidance as well as the resources (human, financial, technical, etc.) to execute it. The Secretariat must also help to integrate the outcomes and recommendations from reviews at the HLPF into the UN’s funds, policies and

programmes; provide support to countries and civil society in following up on recommendations from reviews at the HLPF; and providing support to further implementation of SDGs.

## VII. Other views and ideas

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

The review process, however it is implemented, must be underpinned by the principles of transparency, accountability and participation.

There should be space for the process to evolve over time, with stepwise refinement and substantiation. A collective effort will be necessary to demonstrate the benefits of such a review mechanism as a “means of implementation”, to further work on the incentives for broad participation and to support countries conceptualising the process at the national level. Countries’ capacities need to be strengthened at the national level in order to enable data collection and setting up a transparent and participatory review process, with governments as duty bearers and citizens as rights holders.

Follow-up and review for the implementation of *the 2030 Agenda* should be seen as a continuum of accountability from local to global levels. While the framework must ensure coordination and flow of information across all levels, particular focus must be placed on strengthening national accountability between states and citizens.

The HLPF should be the global platform for accountability for *the 2030 Agenda* acting as an umbrella to bring together different processes. Sufficient human and financial resources must be allocated to the HLPF in order for it to fulfil its mandate.

Accountability processes at all levels should be people-centred with meaningful opportunities for citizens to engage effectively in follow-up and review at all levels, including through providing written and oral independent supplementary information in formal review processes at all levels.

Data collection systems and processes should also provide space for data collection with citizens, including children, and other stakeholders. Engaging citizens in participatory monitoring and data collection will not only increase the availability of data but also ensure it accurately reflects the context and realities of local communities.