

# HLPF and post 2015; Structure, position, review and participation

APCSOFSD, Bangkok

16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2015

Ajay K Jha, CECOEDECON, India

# Overview

- Foundation & Mandate
- Institutional structure
- Challenges and major issues
- Review mechanism & experience of review mechanism
- Role and participation of the MGs
- How a review should look like (suggestions)

# HLPF

- A decision was taken at Rio+20 to create an HLPF to strengthen the integration three pillars of SD and review SDGs
- UNGA asked PR of Brazil and Italy to put up a proposal, based on their proposal HLPF was created by UNGA Res (67/290) in July, 2013

# Mandate

- “it shall provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, follow up and review progress in the implementation of sustainable development commitments, enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner at all levels and have a focused, dynamic and action-oriented agenda, ensuring the appropriate consideration of new and emerging sustainable development challenges.
- It will also replace CSD and AMR, and will be institutional home for the implementation of the SDGs

# Structure

- The HLPF has been set up under the auspices of the UNGA and the ECOSOC. It is the first of its kind hybrid institution.
- The UNGA will convene the HLPF High Level Forum every four years, and the ECOSOC will convene HLPF for 8 days every year including three days Ministerial Forum
- The HLPF will coordinate with the bureau of the ECOSOC and the bureaux of the UNGA. It will be also supported by the DESA.

# Participation of MGs

- “*Decides*, in this regard, that, while retaining the intergovernmental character of the forum, the representatives of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders shall be allowed:
  - (a) To attend all official meetings of the forum;
  - (b) To have access to all official information and documents;
  - (c) To intervene in official meetings;
  - (d) To submit documents and present written and oral contributions;
  - (e) To make recommendations;
  - (f) To organize side events and round tables, in cooperation with Member States and the Secretariat;

# Participation of MGs in ECOSOC and UNGA

- The sections dealing with the participation of the Major Groups are always interspersed with the phrase “while retaining the intergovernmental nature of the forum” and words like “as appropriate,” or as “applicable to the Forum”
- ECOSOC, which provides accreditation to the NGOs, forming the basis of their participation in UN Meetings and other proceedings does allow NGOs in its public meetings only as observers!
- Same with the UNGA, unless MGs are invited specially
- However, HLPF Resolution must have an overriding effect over the rules of procedures of the UNGA & ECOSOC. But is not clear yet and open to interpretation.

# Experience of HLPF

- HLPF1, Sept 2013, only speeches of Ministers
- HLPF 2, June-July 2014, ten moderated dialogues on different thematic issues, with limited participation of MGs (as observers), few multi stakeholder dialogues, morning meeting with MGs (1 hr and 15 minutes)
- Lot of confusion regarding the agenda, process, selection of speakers, role of MGs etc
- The transition phase ends and main task of review begins in 2016 and lot of work needs to be done.



# Review under the HLPF; Major issues

- Institutional position of the HLPF: Most of the countries viewed HLPF only as a platform (hlpf) rather than a body to review post 2015 (HLPF)
- Capacity: HLPF does not have a Bureau of its own, no clarity whether it is to be helped by UNDESA-DSD or DESA Secretariat for the ECOSOC
- Review process: No clarity on mechanism, reporting format, regional processes, depth and breadth of review, universality & differentiation, voluntary & mandatory, capacity & MOI, decision making power, role of MGs etc.
- No consensus on regional processes (whether review or consultations), extensive or nominal, on depth or breadth of review, outcomes etc.

# Current position wrt to review mechanism

- Near consensus on that “Review Mechanism should be universal, voluntary, state led, multi tiered process with a global content covered annually under the HLPF”
- Russia, US, India, Mexico, Venezuela etc. are concerned about infringement of national sovereignty, and are critical of oversight and inclusion of non state actors/MGs
- Informal group of 7, Egypt, Liechtenstein, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Korea, Switzerland want more extensive discussions
- India skeptical of regional reviews prefers regional consultations
- LDCs need special support
- G77& China wants commitment of donor countries to be reviewed, donor countries want to review whether they have made ample efforts to raise resources.
- Newly industrialized countries want to review SCP of industrialized countries and vice versa

# Current review mechanisms; AMR

- Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) set up in 2005 to review implementation of the MDGs
- Main elements, voluntary participation of countries, 3 peer reviewer countries chosen by country making presentation, SGs reports and Ministerial Declaration are outcomes, regional consultations
- Main criticisms; no incentive for states to participate, no follow up, limited MG participation
- Supplemented BY DCF, its not a review forum but discusses trend, progress, gaps in implementation of international development goals, MGs are allowed

# Universal Periodic Review

- UPR by HRC examines human rights situations in all member countries by a period review
- Elements: mandatory, 42 countries report every year, peer review is done by troika from diff regions selected by draw of lots, recommendations are not binding
- Sources of info: country report, report by UN treaty bodies and Special Rapporteurs, and NGOs
- During presentations, SURs make presentations, followed by discussion, member countries speak, NGOs can't speak
- Troika prepares the report compiling all comments and provide recommendations, SURs provide written reports responding to each reco
- The report is adopted next year by the HRC and followed by one hour discussion on the report, MGs can intervene
- Next year on FU
- A voluntary Fund for financial and technical assistance has been set up to help developing countries.

# How the review should look like

- First cycle (2016-2020)
- Review National Commitments (National reports including parliamentary oversight, wide stakeholders consultation, submit report to the HLPF by the end of the period, HLPF may invite countries from one of the five regions)
- Examine national capacity, specificity, adequacy of MOI, whether countries commitments added together will have the desired effect, explore possibility of additional finance

# How review should look like

- Second cycle; Review implementation of commitments
- Beginning with national review with highest political accountability, MGs participation
- Comprehensive regional peer review, discussing cross border challenges, thematic as well as country reviews feeding into global review at HLPF
- Global review (adopt the UPR style), compressed format as HLPF has only 8 days, spend 5 days on review and 3 days of Ministerial session to link learnings from country review in the Ministerial Declaration.
- Many of these will have to be decided in the next HLPF (26<sup>th</sup> June-8<sup>th</sup> July)

Thanks for your attention  
feedback and comments are welcome  
at [k.ajay.j@gmail.com](mailto:k.ajay.j@gmail.com)