

### **2016 HLPF VNR session 3 (expert's reflections)**

Thank you Mr. Moderator - Excellences, Ladies and Gentlemen,  
4 countries in 5 minutes - this does not allow to spend time on an introduction joke.  
My scheme is to highlight one *good practice* and one *challenge* per country – and to focus on highlights and challenges that could be relevant also for other countries:

#### Finland

- I would like to commend **Finland** for sharing good practices with regard to *institutional mechanisms* for effective implementation. Finland not only has a national commission for SD at the Prime Minister's Office, with broad stakeholder involvement, but also an Agenda-2030 Coordination Secretariat and inter-ministerial Coordination Network, and a Task Force to develop new tools and governance models. With the help of these institutions, Finland did a mapping and a gap analysis, revised and updated the national SD strategy and its set of indicators, complemented by a national implementation plan and a communication plan. Plus it shared and discussed these good practices, for example through the *twinning* process with Colombia.
- As for the challenge: *How* does Finland plan to make its future *economic* development truly sustainable in all three dimensions? How to create *jobs* while effectively protecting the *environment* and ensuring that *inequality* does not rise any further (looking at the first objective of Finland's National SD Strategy "equal prospects for well-being" and at the same time the increase in the Gini coefficient in the last 10 years). You presented your model of *national-level* "operational commitments". Why did you choose this way (instead of legislation) and how do you plan to follow-up the commitments?

#### Samoa

- I would like to praise **Samoa** for its use of *regional* frameworks, the Samoa Pathway, and especially the *SIDS Partnership Framework*, incl. the newly established steering committee and the dialogue for reviewing progress made by those partnerships with the help of a standardized reporting template and process. I think that this is an excellent model for working with and through partnerships.
- I would like to highlight a *systemic challenge* for your country, and that is protecting the *oceans* and the *climate* – with natural disasters endangering your development (both in the past and in the future). Clearly, you cannot do this alone. So, what kind of support do you expect from the UN system and the member states and what role do you see for the HLPF follow-up and review in that context?

#### Uganda

- As for **Uganda's** "Readiness Report" – I like that term and that you used the window of opportunity to *integrate* the 2030 Agenda and SDGs into your new "Second National Development Plan" and in the legal and policy frameworks attached to it. I also would like to praise that you explicitly outline "room for improvement" (as you call it in your report) and the need for further capacity development >> it is important to use these HLPF reviews also for *assessing needs* as regards means of implementation.
- Uganda's report says your country intends to *partner with the international community* in delivering the 2030 Agenda. Your report mentions, for example, areas like good governance and institutional capacities, sufficient human resource and financing; I would also like to see more integration of the *environmental* dimension and *participatory* processes strengthened. During the launch of the 2015 Uganda Human Development Report somebody said "Reports are only as good as the actions that follow". So, following your HLPF report, what kind of *tailored follow-up and support* for country implementation would make you tell others that your participation in this reporting and review exercise was well worth it?

## Germany

- With the focus of this year's round of reviews on *preparatory* efforts, it is great that the **German** report outlines for each SDG a number of concrete *measures*. And Germany also commits to *voluntarily report again* in 2021, presenting the first *periodic* progress report on the new German Sustainable Development Strategy -- that then hopefully also *evaluates the impact of these measures*, not only in Germany but also with regard to impact on *other* countries and on *global* public goods. *Periodic* reviews can help to ensure that we establish an *on-going learning process* (instead of once-off events).
- As for the challenge: So far, mainly the Chancellery and the two Ministries present here (for Environment and Development) push for implementing the SDGs (thank you for that). How will Germany use the new *strategy* to *mainstream* the SDGs in a *whole-of-government* fashion into every-day decision-making in Parliament and government – going beyond the approximately 60 so-called *key indicators* of the strategy – to *incentivize* and achieve *policy coherence*?

To conclude, the 2016 HLPF ministerial declaration “encourages countries to take into consideration experience gained and lessons learned from these 22 State-led voluntary reviews”. So, I would like to close by asking all countries to provide feedback on the format of these sessions. I think your efforts deserve better recognition, more time and more in-depth feedback and analytical debate – as these are indispensable prerequisites for the kind of mutual learning envisaged for these sessions.

Thank you!

<http://www.swp-berlin.org/en/dossiers/sustainability-climate-and-energy/sustainable-development-governance.html>