HLPF Reform Option: **Sherpa** as curator of year-round process around annual HLPF under the auspices of ECOSOC

(Based on working paper "Reviewing the HLPF's format and organizational aspects – what's being discussed?" February 05 2020, Marianne Beisheim, SWP)
The HLPF should be embedded in a *year-long process* culminating in the thematic panels at the HLPF in July. The discussions during these HLPF sessions should build better on the preparatory process.

To help with a year-round preparatory process for the Thematic and SDG Reviews and the corresponding HLPF panels, member states could decide to ask the ECOSOC Presidency to install a “**Sherpa**” for each main panel (incl. maybe also for related official side events).

The Sherpa’s primary task would be to help organize an *inspiring panel* to motivate and support member states and stakeholders in their efforts.

The Sherpa could be a renowned *scientist* (e.g. from the GSDR Independent Group of Scientists or of other UN science-policy platforms or panels), thereby also enhancing the UN’s science-policy interfaces, or a former diplomat with a high level of expertise and standing in the field (like Ambassador Peter Thompson of Fiji for the 2017 review of SDG 14).

While the process is led by the ECOSOC Bureau, the Sherpa could support DESA’s preparatory work where useful and appropriate. The Sherpa could take up the results of the UN System’s preparatory work and, on that basis, help curate the further process for preparing the panel session, for example by supporting DESA in identifying and briefing suitable panelists. The Sherpa could also help collect information on relevant new and emerging issues in that field, or, for example, on issues that require the input from other policy fields.

The Sherpa could also help produce a “digestible” *one-page note* for the particular panel. This note could help UN missions to consult with their capitals early on, thereby getting meaningful guidance from them for negotiating the Ministerial Declaration in June and preparing fit-for-purpose inputs for the HLPF’s interactive debates. On this basis, member states and stakeholders could also be invited and motivated to share good practices, for example through DESA’s database, and to bring suitable commitments to the HLPF in July.

During the HLPF, the Sherpa could serve as a well-prepared *moderator* of the panel. The Sherpa should insist that invited panelists take note of all relevant reports to the HLPF and, in the interest of the “decade of action and delivery”, discuss action-oriented and policy-relevant recommendations (rather than to merely represent their own topics and interests).

Last but not least, the Sherpa could help push for an action-oriented *follow-up* after the HLPF.

For this, Sherpas would have to be appointed sufficiently in advance.