



THE PRESIDENT
OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

21 May 2020

Excellency,

I have the pleasure to transmit herewith, a letter dated 21 May 2020 from H.E. Mr. Kaha Inmadze, Permanent Representative of Georgia, and H.E. Mr. Jean-Claude do Rego, Permanent Representative of Benin, the co-facilitators for the intergovernmental negotiations for the review process of the Economic and Social Council and the High-Level Political Forum as per General Assembly resolution 67/290 of 9 July 2013, entitled, “Format and organizational aspects of the high-level political forum on sustainable development”, resolution 70/299 of 29 July 2016, entitled, “Follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the global level”, as well as resolution 72/305 of 23 July 2018, entitled, “Review of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 68/1 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council”.

Further to the virtual consultation on the zero draft resolution convened on Friday, 8 May 2020, the aforementioned letter conveys the inputs received from delegations by the co-facilitators. Further details on the process will be provided in due course.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurance of my highest consideration.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized, flowing script that ends in a circular flourish.

Tijjani Muhammad-Bande

All Permanent Representatives and
Permanent Observers to the United Nations
New York



**Permanent Mission of Georgia
to the United Nations**



**Permanent Mission of the Republic
of Benin to the United Nations**

21 May 2020

Excellencies,

We are writing in our capacity as the co-facilitators for the intergovernmental negotiations for the review process of Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the High-level Political Forum on sustainable development (HLPF).

As stated during our virtual meeting of 8 May 2020, we are conveying the written inputs received from the membership. We wish to take this opportunity to encourage delegations to continue to consult bilaterally based on those inputs.

We reaffirm our commitment to an open, inclusive and transparent process, and count on your active participation and support.

Please accept, Excellencies, the assurances of our highest consideration.

**Kaha Imnadze
Permanent Representative of Georgia
to the United Nations**

**Jean-Claude do Rego
Permanent Representative of Benin
to the United Nations**

To: All Permanent Representatives
And Permanent Observers of the United Nations
New York

Canada's Comments on HLPF Review, May 8, 2020

- We would like to thank the co-facilitators for sharing this draft resolution with us. We feel that it is a good basis for discussions and reaching consensus.
- We fully support postponing the in-depth review of the HLPF to next year. In the same vein, we would support postponing a decision regarding how to address the twenty-one 2020 targets by extending them until next year to allow for a more fulsome discussion and for any relevant outcome processes that were postponed by the current crisis to come to conclusion. It would be helpful for the Secretariat to share an update on the status of the goals coming due this year based on pre-pandemic data and any changes that have occurred as result of the COVID-19 pandemic. This information will help us determine a path forward.
- We are particularly pleased to see that SDG 5 and 16 are now included in each annual review, along with SDG 17, however we strongly feel that the environmental dimension of the SDGs should also be reviewed each year. There are a few options to facilitate this outcome, such as including one of the environment SDGs (i.e. SDG 13) on an annual basis or ensuring that the SDGs under review consider not only the opportunities and challenges faced but also interlinkages with other SDGs?
- We have no objections with the themes presented, with the caveat that within each of those themes the three dimensions of sustainable development (social, economic, environmental) need to be considered in a balanced way and that the interconnectedness of the goals is given due attention.
- With this in mind, we do not agree with the idea of taking a siloed approach to the review of the goals. Goals that represent each of the three dimensions should be considered and reviewed each year. This is the time when we need to also be looking more closely at the intersections and spillover effects between the goals and seeking to have more integrated conversations to support the decade of action in order to ensure we build back better from the current crisis. Canada supports the idea of in-depth reviews that focus on the synergies and trade-offs between SDGs, particularly those not traditionally associated together.
- There should be an emphasis on approaches, policies and actions that enable us to build back better, accelerate progress, and spur transformative change to achieve the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.
- The HLPF needs to be open and inclusive, providing opportunities for all stakeholders to participate in the discussions and preparations. Outcome document negotiations and general debate have their own dynamics; however, this does not preclude adopting more open and participatory approaches for review sessions, side events and, most importantly, the presentation of the VNRs.
- If the HLPF wants to serve its objective to advance the 2030 Agenda, consideration should be given to taking advantage of different platforms to encourage engagement during the HLPF. To deepen support and awareness of the HLPF, ECOSOC should consider sanctioning the planning of HLPF events to take place outside of New York to coincide with the main meeting here at the UN.
- We look forward to our continued engagement with you and all Member States on the HLPF.

**Review of the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 67/290 and 70/299 on the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the global level and resolution 72/305 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council
8 May 2020 consultation
EU comments**

General comments:

- Good basis. A few gaps.
- Resolution has to cover the full cycle. Set themes and sub-sets of goals for 2021-23. That will ensure coherence, and provide the membership and the Secretariat with the horizon necessary to prepare properly.
- Good to have language on COVID; could underline better the link with 2030 Agenda implementation.
- Themes should cut across silos.
- Current practice of distributing the SDGs to be reviewed in-depth over a three year period should be maintained. Sub-sets of SDGs help mobilise policy communities / develop ownership of line ministries. Be pragmatic, and build on lessons learned from the first cycle.
- Remain consistent with 2030 Agenda; avoid any reopening.
- Negotiation process should be inclusive.

	Text as of 24-04-20	Detailed comments
	<i>The General Assembly,</i>	
PP1	<i>Recalling</i> its resolutions 67/290 of 9 July 2013 and 70/299 of 29 July 2016;	
PP2	<i>Recalling also</i> its resolution 72/305 of 28 July 2018 and all previous related resolutions on strengthening the Economic and Social Council;	
PP3	<i>Reaffirming</i> its resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015, entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, and reaffirming our unwavering commitment to achieving this Agenda and utilizing it to the full to transform our world for the better by 2030;	
PP4	<i>Reaffirming</i> further its resolution 74/4 of 15 October entitled “Political declaration of the high-level political forum on sustainable development convened under the auspices of the General Assembly” (Political declaration of the SDG Summit) and our pledge to launch a decade of action and delivery for sustainable development;	Add “2019” after "October".

OP1	<p><i>Recognizes</i> the central role of the high-level political forum under the auspices of the General Assembly and ECOSOC in overseeing follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at global level and the role that the Charter of the United Nations and the General Assembly have vested in the Economic and Social Council as a principal organ for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on issues of economic and social development;</p>	
OP2	<p><i>Decides</i>, bearing in mind the threat to human health, safety and well-being caused by the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, which continues to spread globally, to conduct the reviews of the high-level political forum and the Economic and Social Council in conjunction with each other during its seventy-fifth session after the most acute aspects of the COVID 19 crisis have been addressed and the United Nations has resumed its normal operations;</p>	<p>Stop paragraph after “seventy-fifth session”.</p> <p>Add language on the participatory character of the review – non-State actors to be invited to contribute to the inter-governmental process.</p>
OP2bis		<p>Add “Recognizes the unprecedented effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and highlights the need for a coordinated global response to address its adverse social, economic and financial impact on all societies; recognizes that the poor and the most vulnerable groups are the most affected and that the impact of the pandemic will have repercussions on development gains, hampering progress in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); further stresses that the current crisis is a reminder that full implementation of the 2030 Agenda is crucial to help better equip the world for future systemic shocks, and that the SDGs are a shared blueprint for a better recovery.”</p>
OP3	<p><i>Decides</i> to define the thematic focus of the high-level political forum on sustainable development under the auspices of ECOSOC, and that of the Economic and Social Council, for the cycle 2021-2023 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For 2021: “Human well-being and the SDGs: Recovering after the COVID-19 crisis”; - For 2022: “Achieving sustainable and just economies and promoting sustainable urban development”; - For 2023: “Universal access to energy in harmony with nature”; 	<p>The cycle is 2020-23 – adjust language in the chapeau accordingly. Important to avoid treating the social, economic and environmental dimensions in silos; themes should help address inter-linkages between the SDGs. Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2021: “Rebuilding better: towards a sustainable recovery from the COVID-19 crisis and human well-being”. • 2022: “Achieving sustainable, inclusive and resilient economies and societies”. • 2023: “Securing the global environmental commons and universal access to sustainable energy”.
OP4	<p><i>Also decides</i> that the high-level political forum will conduct the following in-depth reviews of the Sustainable Development Goals and</p>	<p>Welcome attempt by the co-facilitators to underline that some concerns (e.g. gender equality, governance) have to be present</p>

	<p>areas of acceleration for the same cycle 2021-2023:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For 2021: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Human health, well-being and capabilities; and Sustainable food systems and healthy nutritional patterns; For 2022: Goals 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Sustainable and just economies; and Promoting sustainable urban and peri-urban development; For 2023: Goals 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Achieving energy decarbonisation; universal access to sustainable energy and securing the global environmental commons. 	<p>throughout the cycle. But, as some mentioned, reviewing certain goals more often than others may be perceived as setting a hierarchy. Moreover, it is for practical reasons (time) important to limit the number of goals reviewed in-depth every year. We could therefore agree to reviewing every SDG only once over the cycle (with the exception of SDG17). The cross-cutting issues should then be addressed through a new paragraph on the need for an integrated approach throughout the cycle – see OP4bis.</p> <p>Building on the GSDR while making sure that sub-sets cut across silos, we could then imagine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2021: Goals 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 and 17. • 2022: Goals 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 17. • 2023: Goals 4, 7, 9, 13, 14 and 17.
OP4bis		<p>Add: “Stresses the importance of mainstreaming human rights, gender equality, promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, the rule of law, climate change and environmental protection in the implementation of SDGs at global and national level, and the HLPF deliberations; also stresses the need to address inter-linkages between Sustainable Development Goals, to promote integrated actions cutting across the three dimensions of sustainable development that can create co-benefits and meet multiple objectives in a coherent way, leaving no one behind.”</p>
OP4ter		<p>Add a final para to make sure that the thematic multi-year programme of the next cycle is agreed a year before it starts. “Losing” the first year of every cycle is not optimal. “Further decides to agree at its seventy-seventh session on the thematic review of progress for the next four-year cycle of the forum, including the yearly sequence of themes and the set of Goals to be reviewed at each session, with a view to facilitating an in-depth review of progress made on all Goals over the course of a four-year cycle.”</p>

Japan's comments on the zero-draft resolution
for the ECOSOC/HLPF review

8 May 2020

- I would like to express our appreciation for the co-facilitators' leadership in this process, which is quite important in light of how the devastating socio-economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic affect our implementation of the 2030 Agenda.
- Considering that the impacts of the pandemic has now spread globally, and the situation is continuing to evolve, we need to carry out our reviews flexibly, based on assessment of socio-economic situations and analyses of the challenges that we face, and we cannot prejudge them in the themes we set now.
- If we are to hold discussions based on the proposal by the co-facilitators for the thematic focuses, the in-depth reviews of the SDGs, and the areas of acceleration for the years 2021 to 2023, our comments are as follows.
- Regarding the theme and in-depth goals for 2021, we believe they represent a very good thematic setting to discuss the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic from the perspectives of health, sanitation, food and nutrition. We welcome this proposal. If there is a room for improvement, we would like to request the co-facilitators to consider inserting "building back better" after "recovering" in order to clarify our approach to "recovering", as this key phrase has been repeatedly emphasized in the context of our response to COVID-19.
- As for the 2022 theme, we believe it is important to include the element of building a resilient economy and society, including resilient health systems, in light of the impacts of COVID-19. It is also important to incorporate the perspective of a preventive approach for resilience. In this regard, we propose to add the phrase "resilient economies and societies" to para 3, and to add the word "resilient" and also the phrase "in light of prevention of future risks" to para 4. We also suggest that health (SDG 3) be added to the in-depth goal in terms of health system resilience.
- As for the year 2023, we understand that the idea behind this thematic focus is to reconcile the goals related to energy and environment, instead of trade-offs. In this perspective, we propose to add the element of "virtuous cycle of environment and growth" to para 3 and/or para 4.
- SDGs 16 and 17 are cross-cutting goals connected to the implementation of respective goals of the 2030 Agenda. We therefore welcome the current proposal to review these two every year.

(End)



HLPF/ECOSOC Review

Reactions of Mexico to the co-facilitator's zero draft proposal

19 May, 2020

Mexico supported the proposal of the co-facilitators to limit the process to a procedural resolution to define the most relevant elements of the 2021 HLPF and indicate a path for the future sessions. We believe that in a way, the current proposals goes beyond that initial goal. Therefore, we believe the draft should fundamentally do the following:

1. Only define a theme for the 2021 HLPF related to the world after the COVID-19 pandemic and the transformations needed to achieve the SDGs. The pandemic will have a cross-cutting impact in the entire 2030 Agenda and we believe the current zero draft reflects this for the 2021 theme proposal. Nonetheless, we should only deal with the 2021 theme at this point.
2. The 2021 SG's progress report should have a focus on the status of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda against the backdrop of the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic.
3. Have an HLPF dealing with the 2030 Agenda in general and focusing on its way forward in light of the effects of the pandemic. Trying to prioritize some SDGs over others will go against their integrated and indivisible nature. Furthermore, it would not be possible to assess where we stand on implementation as a whole at the risk of leaving some SDGs behind, particularly where the impact might not yet be visible. Having a general HLPF will give us the opportunity to take stock on where we stand when it comes to the recovery after the pandemic. The current proposal is assuming clustering for the next three years that seems to be based more on the focus of the MDGs. Therefore, we need to find a middle ground.
4. We believe that the conclusions of the GSDR can still be used as a starting point to find a that middle-ground.
5. Mexico agrees with the decision to postpone the review process of the modalities of the HLPF and the ECOSOC to the 75th period of sessions. Additionally, we reiterate the need to consider 2020 and 2021 as a hiatus given the unprecedented situation that all Member States are confronting with the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, we should reset the cycle (as established in A/RES/70/1, para. 87) and start it again in 2022. This will allow enough time to include the inputs of the postponed international fora that feed the work of the follow-up and review process, such as the regional fora, the FfD Forum, and the STI Forum, among others.



HLPF/ECOSOC Review

Reactions of Mexico to the co-facilitator's zero draft proposal

6. We need to establish in the current text that the review of both the HLPF and the ECOSOC should take place in conjunction and should be conducted during the first half of 2021, to ensure that there is enough time for preparations of the 2022 HLPF.
7. In conclusion, we find that the current text goes beyond the agreement to have a procedural text that defines the most essential elements for the 2021 HLPF and in a way addresses aspects that require in depth negotiations that may not be possible in the current environment.

Zero draft resolution, G-77 & China input

Review of the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 67/290 and 70/299 on the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the global level and resolution 72/305 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 67/290 of 9 July 2013 and 70/299 of 29 July 2016;

Recalling also its resolution 72/305 of 28 July 2018 and all previous related resolutions on strengthening the Economic and Social Council;

Reaffirming its resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015, entitled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", and reaffirming our unwavering commitment to achieving this Agenda and utilizing it to the full to transform our world for the better by 2030;

Reaffirming also its resolution 69/313 of 27 July 2015 on the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, which is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, supports and complements it, helps to contextualize its means of implementation targets with concrete policies and actions;

Reaffirming further its resolution 74/4 of 15 October entitled "Political declaration of the high-level political forum on sustainable development convened under the auspices of the General Assembly" (Political declaration of the SDG Summit) and our pledge to launch a decade of action and delivery for sustainable development;

1. Recognizes the central role of the high-level political forum under the auspices of the General Assembly and ECOSOC in overseeing follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at global level and the role that the Charter of the United Nations and the General Assembly have vested in the Economic and Social Council as a principal organ for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on issues of economic and social development;

1bis. Reiterate the significant opportunities to advance SDG progress through the regional forums on sustainable development and the regional assets of the UN development system. Common development challenges, can be addressed through regional mechanisms and the outcomes transmitted to the HLPF more systematically.

2. Decides, bearing in mind the threats to sustainable development, including to **human** health, safety and well-being and to the world economy caused by the ~~coronavirus disease~~ 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, which continues to spread globally, to conduct the reviews of the high-level political forum and the Economic and Social Council in conjunction with each other during its seventy-fifth session after the most acute aspects of the COVID 19 crisis have been addressed and the United Nations has

resumed its normal operations while recognizing each responds to different mandates and has different objectives and should therefore be treated separately, with due attention to their interconnectedness.;

3. ~~Decides to define the thematic focus of the high-level political forum on sustainable development under the auspices of ECOSOC, and that of the Economic and Social Council, for the cycle 2021-2023 as follows:~~

3[ALT]. Decides that the thematic focus of the high-level political forum on sustainable development under the auspices of ECOSOC, and that the theme of the High Level Segment of the Economic and Social-Council, for the year 2021 should be “Sustainable and resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic: Building an equitable, inclusive and effective path for the achievement of the 2030 Agenda in its entirety and improving well-being for all in the context of the Decade of Action”.

~~For 2021: "Human well-being and the SDGs: Recovering after the COVID-19 crisis";~~

~~For 2022: "Achieving sustainable and just economies and promoting sustainable urban development";~~

~~For 2023: "Universal access to energy in harmony with nature";~~

4. Also decides that the high-level political forum will ~~conduct the following in-depth reviews of review~~ all the Sustainable Development Goals in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic and its impact on the Decade of Action and delivery for the SDGs, while taking into account the different and particular impact of the COVID-19 pandemic across the SDGs. ~~and areas of acceleration for the same cycle 2021-2023:~~

- a. ~~For 2021: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Human health, wellbeing and capabilities; and Sustainable food systems and healthy nutritional patterns;~~
- b. ~~For 2022: Goals 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Sustainable and just economies; and Promoting sustainable urban and peri-urban development;~~
- c. ~~For 2023: Goals 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17; and, as areas for acceleration: Achieving energy decarbonisation; universal access to sustainable energy and securing the global environmental commons.~~

Republic of Korea 's Statement on the zero draft of the HLPF/ECOSOC Review

1. Thank you, Mr. Co-Facilitators, for convening today's meeting and for circulating the zero draft which we believe is a good basis for our consultations. And thank you for the detailed explanation for the draft today. Overall, we support the idea of focusing on immediate issues in this session and postponing the review of HLPF and ECOSOC to the next session, as you proposed at the previous meeting and also as well reflected in OP2 of the zero draft.
2. Regarding the thematic focus, presented in OP3, we believe that the zero draft is headed in the right direction. We support the themes and their sequencing for the years from 2021 to 2023, given that our overarching priority should be responding to and building back better from the COVID-19 pandemic. Considering the inevitably huge socio-economic impacts of the COVID-19 and its prolonged effects, which look obvious now, we would support having themes for the entire HLPF cycle for the next three years to have not only immediate but also mid-term guidance and expectations on HLPF.
3. That being said, we agree with the sequencing of the thematic focus placed on Health/Human well-being, sound economy, and energy.
 - We strongly support the theme on energy and climate change for the year 2023, in particular, as a green recovery from COVID-19 should be the only path towards a sustainable and resilient future for all of us beyond the pandemic. In this regard, we propose the focus of 2023 HLPF to be "access to sustainable energy and green transition" to be more specific and straightforward (rather than "universal access to energy in harmony with nature)."
4. As for the in-depth reviews of the SDGs in OP4, we are of the view that selecting several SDGs each year is the only feasible and appropriate way to assess the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. We also agree to clustering the SDGs which are relevant under the thematic focus of the year. However, we are concerned that reviewing nine SDGs each year might not allow for an in-depth review of each goal. So, we would like to have a maximum of seven SDGs each year, including cross-cutting ones, to ensure more effective reviews.
 - On a related note, we welcome the inclusion of SDG 5, 16, and 17 each year as they are of cross-cutting character. However, we would have preferred to see rationales for SDG 6 to be included as one of the cross-cutting goals that require reviewing every year. We are not entirely certain that SDG 6 (water and sanitation) is as

naturally and intuitively cross-cutting across the 2030 Agenda as SDG 5, 16, and 17 (gender, governance and partnerships) are.

5. Regarding the areas of acceleration, we can support the idea of identifying key areas of acceleration, as presented in the zero draft, in that they can provide guidance on where to focus in the implementation of the SDGs under the thematic review. They may also be useful for countries preparing for their VNRs.
 - However, reiterating our concern regarding too many SDGs under review in each year, we see the potential risks that SDGs that are not directly linked to the areas of acceleration might fail to mobilize sufficient attention.
6. That being said, we would like to thank the Co-Facilitators again for providing the zero draft. We will continue to be constructively engaged throughout the process. Thank you.
/END/

Position of the Russian Federation on the ECOSOC and HLPF review

- We fully **support the approach taken by cofacilitators to postpone the comprehensive negotiation** on the review of ECOSOC and HLPF until physical meetings are possible and taking on board more broad and at the same time wise approach to put forward the draft about themes and sets of SDGs to be considered in a four-year perspective. We believe that such approach will guide the ECOSOC and its subsidiary bodies work.
- We think that the draft should be **very simple and only relate to the themes of ECOSOC and HLPF. We should avoid any modalities discussions (f.e. civil society participation etc.) at this stage.**
- We are flexible on the timeframe to be considered in the draft. We can go along with one theme for 2021 or we can consider the proposal for the themes of next 4 year cycle.

Regarding the draft resolution we would like to express some observations and amendments.

First, we would like to reiterate that ECOSOC is a principal Charter body for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on issues of economic and social development as well as for implementation of the international development goals agreed at the major UN conferences and summits in the economic, social, environmental and related fields. We would like to have this message in its entirety to be included in the text (language from GA resolution 72/305, P.1 of the annex).

The HLPF is a platform for overseeing follow-up and review of the Agenda 2030 at global level. So these mechanisms are of different weight. That's why we prefer to have ECOSOC mentioning at the first place and HLPF at the second in OP1, 2 and 3.

The themes of the ECOSOC and HLPF. Taking into account today's situation with COVID-19 pandemic we think that the issues of social and economic recovery after this pandemic should be in the center of the UN work. It is actually since the latest publication of the UN framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19 which is planned for 12-18 months. In this connection we support the formulation of the first theme for 2021 where human well-being is in the center, as well as the intention to dedicate the 2022 to the sustainable economy. At the same time we do not understand the notion of just economy which is not mentioned anywhere in the UN language as well as its link with urban development. Why we do not talk about agricultural development as well? In this logic we think it is more rational to speak about sustainable economies in harmony with nature – two issues which are more of broad character and can be combined in general. While the theme for 2023 we can dedicate to the universal access to energy, which should be affordable from our point of view (we prefer to add this adjective) and to the urban development which is more relevant in the context of energy supply.

Third point is related to the sets of goals to be considered each year.

The Agenda 2030 states that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. In light of the pandemic this challenge became very topical. All statistics including of the UN organizations show that the poverty level is likely rise by 8 per cent. The number of malnourished people will go up as well. In this logic we think that this goals should be cross-cutting and in the center for the forthcoming four year cycle of the HLPF review. While for sure we can add other SDGs which are relevant to the topics of well-being, sustainable economy in harmony with nature as well as for energy and urban development. At the same time we think that we need to take an approach which was proven effective during the last four year cycle to make a selection of goals each year without repeating them during next years.

**ECOSOC/HLPF Review
Zero draft resolution**

8 May 2020

Inputs Switzerland

- We thank the co-facilitators for the submission of the zero draft resolution and commend their efforts to work with delegations on the most pressing issues related to the ECOSOC/HLPF Review, despite the difficult circumstances.
- Switzerland welcomes the zero draft and considers it a good basis. The co-facilitators can count on our full support to reach consensus in a smooth and timely manner.
- At this point, we would like to highlight the following four aspects:
 - As stated during previous interventions, we welcome that the findings of the GSDR are reflected and provide the framework for the themes of the ECOSOC and the review at the HLPF in 2021, 2022 and 2023.
 - We consider it important that the limited selection of goals to be reviewed each year are defined now for the remainder of the current four-year cycle. We therefore welcome the proposal of the co-facilitators.
 - The meeting of the high-level political forum under the auspices of the General Assembly in 2023 marks the end of this four-year cycle. For the sake of completeness, we would ask to include a reference in the resolution accordingly.
 - Finally, the phrase “the cycle 2021-2023” is confusing. In our view, the formulation “for the remainder of the current four-year cycle 2020-2023” would be more appropriate.

UK position on draft HLPF review resolution: 8 May

The UK's top priorities for this negotiation are ensuring the resolution reflects the importance of 'leaving no-one behind', as well as reflecting the importance of 'building back better'.

OP1: *Recognizes* the central role **and effective and participatory character [OP27j, A/Res/74/4]** of the high-level political forum under the auspices of the General Assembly and ECOSOC, **working coherently with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other relevant organs and forums, in accordance with existing mandates [PP3, 70/299]**, in overseeing follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at **a [editorial suggestion]** global level and the role that the Charter of the United Nations and the General Assembly have vested in the Economic and Social Council as a principal organ for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on issues of economic and social development;

Rationale: the UK strongly supports the multistakeholder nature of the HLPF. Having listened carefully to views from Member States, we would like to propose the agree language above which we hope would help to address concerns and priorities from all. We also believe it is important to emphasise the coherence of the HLPF with the GA and ECOSOC – this is also agreed language from 70/299.

EU's OP2bis: the UK can support the EU's addition and suggests adding 'while leaving no-one behind' at the end, to emphasise this critical issue, particularly in light of the COVID-19 crisis.

OP3:

Alternatively, 'leave no-one behind' could be added to the theme of 2021. We support calls for the theme to include 'rebuilding better', which is a priority for the UK.

For the 2022 theme, we suggest adding referring to 'humanity and society's wellbeing' so that it encompasses better the SDGs under review. We also support Japan and the EU's suggestion to add 'resilience' to the theme of 2022, as COVID-19 has shown this to be an important issue that merits consideration by the HLPF and ECOSOC.

On the 2023 theme, we suggest using commonly agreed terms and concepts such as 'protect' rather than 'secure', as otherwise this could cut across on-going and complicated processes. We suggest the theme could be 'Protecting the global environment, and ensuring access to energy'

OP4:

We suggest replacing SDG5 with SDG13 for review in 2021, as this (1) is consistent with the SG's call to build back better, e.g. his 20 April speech; (2); has better interlinkages with SDG7; (3) has greater relevance to the international community's 'One Health' approach. We agree with RoK/EU that we should not review too many SDGs each year.

U.S. Response to the Co-facilitators' Proposal Regarding the ECOSOC/HLPF Review

Following the informal discussion on May 8, the co-facilitators of the ECOSOC/HLPF review requested that all delegations which intervened during the videoconference share their interventions in writing. The U.S. intervention at the time was, in part, informal and extemporaneous in response to proposals advanced by other delegations participating in the discussion. As such, the following is a precis of the U.S. position, but is not a verbatim transcription of what was said.

Ambassadors do Rego and Imnadze,

The United States would like to express our appreciation to you and your missions for your dedication and focus on moving this very important issue forward during these difficult times. We appreciate the inputs shared by fellow member states thus far regarding the review process of ECOSOC and the HLPF. We remain committed to working together towards our common goal of improving their overall efficiency, effectiveness, and impacts of ECOSOC and the HLPF.

We strongly agree with the co-facilitators that, under the current circumstances, now is not the time for a deep, substantive review. Aside from logistical challenges many delegations may face, we must recognize that addressing the impacts of COVID must be considered in a proper review going forward. We therefore applaud the co-facilitators for incorporating member state inputs and drafting a streamlined resolution for our consideration.

The United States notes that, by establishing the themes for the next three years, the proposed resolution makes an assumption as to the member states' out-year priorities during very unstable times. We believe our Mexican colleague's suggestion of making next year's them open-ended and restarting the cycle of consideration may be a productive way forward. We recognize, however, that some delegations may prefer more clarity on themes for future planning. Therefore, the United States would encourage limiting the current resolution to next year's theme, or incorporating an opportunity to reassess the relevancy of the 2022 and 2023 themes during the next session of the General Assembly.

In the case it is decided to lock in the themes for the next three years, we would like to provide some initial thoughts on the draft proposal shared with all delegations.

Preamble: No Comments

OP1: No Comments

OP2: No Comments

OP3:

- The theme of recovery for 2021 is appropriate and we support the approach. We would like member states to consider adding the term resiliency, so our work not only highlights our efforts to recover but also the work needed to mitigate the impact of future global crises and shocks. We would seek to phrase the theme as: “Human well-being and the SDGs: Resiliency and Recovery following the COVID-19 crisis.”
- For 2022, rather than focusing on urban development, we would encourage a focus on institution building and strengthening. The United States believes that building strong, resilient, and trusted institutions will catalyze our collective ability to sustainably recover and thrive as countries seek to achieve the 2030 Agenda goals. Trusted and capable institutions driven by data and science, ones that are transparent, accountable, and effective, will play a vital role in this effort. Therefore, the suggested theme would be: “Achieving sustainable and just economies through institution building and strengthening.”
- For 2023, we are concerned with the theme “Universal access to energy in harmony with nature.” “In harmony with nature” implies both a subjective and prescriptive approach to energy access, that may, in the end, be counter productive to the theme’s stated goal of universal access. Instead, we would propose a broader approach that all delegations should be able to agree to: “Universal access to energy and the SDGs”

OP4:

- We support the approach in sub paragraph a and would propose member states consider adding resiliency to the area of focus.
- For sub paragraph b, we recommend incorporating institution building and strengthening to this area for acceleration.
- For sub paragraph c, Achieving energy decarbonization is overly prescriptive and not something we can support.

Regarding the proposal to incorporate discussion of financing for development as a crucial component of dialogue going forward, the United States notes that this issue is already addressed in other ongoing dialogues. A statement on the issue was recently adopted following significant negotiation, and we believe that incorporating the issue in the ECOSOC/HLPF review will only serve to further complicate discussions. We therefore do not support a proposal to incorporate this issue going forward.

Lastly, as other colleagues have noted, the United States believes that civil society plays an important role in informing the intergovernmental process. We welcome and encourage efforts to incorporate their participation in discussions and invite their perspectives, recognizing that the overall review process is, in the end, member state driven.

Thank you.