Advancing Regional Recommendations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

A Consultation with Civil Society

Conducted by the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service for the UN Secretary-General, the General Assembly, and the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals

UNITED NATIONS
NON-GOVERNMENTAL LIAISON SERVICE (UN-NGLS)
Strengthening UN-civil society relations since 1975
Acknowledgements

UN-NGLS wishes to acknowledge the UN Foundation, Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for their financial support to this project, and extends its gratitude to participating networks and organizations for their contributions.

This UN-NGLS regional consultation was conducted at the request of the Post-2015 Development Planning Team/Executive Office of the Secretary-General.

The consultation was managed by Anita Nayar, Chief of the NY Office of UN-NGLS, and Susan Alzner, Project Coordinator.

Lead authors: Susan Alzner and Hamish Jenkins
Additional writers: Beth Pooch, Kathryn Tobin, Susan Brandwayn, Hani Anouti and Jennifer Caruso
Extensive support was provided by David Vergari, Bernhard Frey, Victoria Cotino, Anthony Berginc, Laura Guirao Stern, Tiziana Papa, and Daniel Assamah.
Yonghyun Byun and Dillywood Films provided technical support for the event to launch this report on 22 September at UN Headquarters.

The responsibility for views and ideas expressed in this publication rests solely with the contributors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service or any other part of the UN system of the opinions expressed.

General contact details:
UN-NGLS, Room DC1-1106, United Nations, New York NY 10017, USA, telephone +1 212/963 3125, e-mail: ngls@un.org

UN-NGLS, Palais des Nations, CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland, telephone +41 22/917 2076, e-mail: ngls@unctad.org
UN-NGLS website: www.un-ngls.org
# Table of Contents

**INTRODUCTION** ............................................................................................................................................................................... 4

**REGIONAL CONVERGENCES** ............................................................................................................................................................ 6

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: REBALANCE POWER RELATIONS FOR JUSTICE** .......................................................... 9

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: FULFILL HUMAN RIGHTS AND OVERCOME EXCLUSION** ........................................... 12

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: ENSURE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION AND SAFE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES** ....... 15

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: ESTABLISH PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY** .... 18

**ASIA AND PACIFIC REGIONAL REPORT** .......................................................................................................................................... 21

I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice .................................................................................................................................. 21

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion ..................................................................................................................... 27

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources ...................................................................................... 33

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency .............................................................................. 39

**LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN REGIONAL REPORT** .................................................................................................................. 43

I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice .................................................................................................................................. 43

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion ..................................................................................................................... 48

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources ...................................................................................... 54

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency .............................................................................. 57

**EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGIONAL REPORT** ..................................................................................................................... 60

I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice .................................................................................................................................. 60

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion ..................................................................................................................... 68

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources ...................................................................................... 74

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency .............................................................................. 84

**AFRICA REGIONAL REPORT** ........................................................................................................................................................... 90

I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice .................................................................................................................................. 90

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion ..................................................................................................................... 95

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources ...................................................................................... 98

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency ............................................................................ 102

**ARAB STATES REGIONAL REPORT** ............................................................................................................................................... 105

I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice ................................................................................................................................ 105

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion ................................................................................................................... 110

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources .................................................................................... 113

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency ............................................................................ 115

**ANNEX I: List of Consultation Participants** ................................................................................................................................. 120

**ANNEX II: Methodology and Information Resources** .................................................................................................................. 123
Introduction

The United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS) launched a consultation on 31 May 2013 to gather critical analysis from civil society on the UN post-2015 development agenda. This initiative was conducted in partnership with the Post-2015 Development Planning Team of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, and with support from the UN Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Ford Foundation. The findings of the consultation, which will be delivered in two parts, serve as official input to the UN intergovernmental process for defining the post-2015 development agenda.

This report, presenting recommendations from regional civil society networks, is delivered to the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, Heads of State and Government attending the General Assembly Special Event on the Millennium Development Goals on 25 September, and the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG on SDGs). This report also formed the basis of a day of dialogue between civil society and UN Member States on 22 September 2013 regarding regional recommendations toward the post-2015 development agenda.

A subsequent report that integrates contributions from national and international civil society organizations with these regional perspectives will be delivered in December 2013 to the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, and the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG on SDGs).

The consultation process involved two components, each conducted in four languages: Arabic, English, French, and Spanish.

1) Civil society was invited to contribute to an open online review of four post-2015 reports that were submitted to the Secretary-General between March and June 2013:
   a) High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda
   b) UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN)
   c) UN Global Compact (UNGC)
   d) UN Development Group (UNDG): The Global Conversation Begins

   This exercise was conducted at www.worldwewant2015.org/NGLSconsultation from 31 May - 12 July. UN-NGLS provided numerous resources in the four languages listed above to inform civil society about issues relevant to the consultation, including a guidance note. More than 800 responses were received through the web site and email. All responses submitted online are still accessible from the site. The synthesis of this component will be published in the subsequent report.

2) Fourteen teleconferences were conducted with regional and sub-regional civil society networks that are based in Asia, the Pacific, Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Europe, North America, and the Arab States. All networks that participated focus a substantial portion of their work on the region in which they are based. The objective of these teleconferences was to deepen substantive engagement with civil society organizations at the regional level and to enable a more comprehensive and balanced range of perspectives to be heard at the United Nations, thereby widening and decentralizing the debates about the post-2015 development agenda. Civil society networks were invited to provide analysis of the four post-2015 reports listed above during these calls, but the dialogues extended outside of that frame as participants also discussed sustainable development policy in a broader sense. A total of 100 regional civil society networks participated in these teleconferences, and many of them sent supplementary written contributions. An additional 20 regional civil society networks that were unable to join a call submitted
written input. The 120 regional civil society networks and social movements that contributed to this consultation collectively collaborate with over 3,000 national and community-based organizations. These networks cover issues including development, trade and finance, human rights, peace, environment and climate justice, agriculture, energy, workers’ rights, women’s rights, sexuality, health including sexual and reproductive health and rights, education, youth empowerment, the rights of people living with disabilities, Indigenous peoples’ rights, the rights of migrants, discrimination based on race/caste/ethnicity, and social and solidarity economy.

A full description of the methodology for the consultation can be found in Annex II.

Through quotations and summaries of the discussions and written submissions, this report provides a detailed account of regional civil society perspectives on barriers to sustainable development and recommendations for overcoming them. It focuses on alternative proposals to those presented in the four reports under review. UN-NGLS has synthesized the findings according to four main objectives for the post-2015 development agenda, which surfaced through clear convergence of priorities identified by regional civil society networks:

- Rebalance power relations for justice
- Fulfill human rights and overcome exclusion
- Ensure equitable distribution and safe use of natural resources
- Establish participatory governance, accountability and transparency

Section I of this report – Regional Convergences – presents a summary of the principal civil society recommendations for achieving each of these four objectives, representing expert analysis received from all regions during the consultation. Sections II-VI provide detailed reports of the findings from each region, organized according to the four main objectives that were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV</td>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section V</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section VI</td>
<td>Arab States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these sections serves as a stand-alone synthesis of a region’s contributions. There are many similarities in the content across them. This overlap demonstrates significant convergence of critical priorities identified by civil society in all regions, and therefore presents a powerful demand for attention and action during design and implementation of the post-2015 development agenda. UN-NGLS emphasizes that although convergences have been identified through this exercise, a comprehensive reading of the full report reveals many unique insights and important proposals. UN-NGLS also conducted extensive research to provide links to valuable supplementary reading on subjects that are raised. Therefore, this report is best read on an electronic device.

This report presents robust analysis for consideration by all stakeholders involved in formulating the post-2015 development agenda. Due to the limited timeframe of the consultation, this report does not attempt to represent a full range of civil society and other stakeholders’ views on the post-2015 development agenda. UN-NGLS has made every effort, however, to accurately and comprehensively portray the breadth of expert perspectives received. UN-NGLS acknowledges the outstanding quality of the contributions received during this consultation, and is grateful to all who participated.

Annex I presents a listing of all participating regional civil society networks.
Annex II provides the methodology and links to all information resources that were used in the production of this report.
Regional Convergences

Civil society networks and social movements from every world region have provided remarkably similar accounts of economic, social and environmental crises, including extreme inequalities, extensive human rights violations, and rampant natural resource exploitations that are overwhelming the world’s ecosystems. The case for radical transformation is irrefutable. Within this consultation report, civil society analysts identify what is causing these problems, and share evidence-based solutions. It is clear that the obstacles to achieving sustainable development are not technical; they are political. The United Nations post-2015 development discussions provide a timely opportunity to mobilize leadership and support for fundamental change to ensure justice, equality, equity, and sustainability.

The recommendations received from regional civil society networks via this consultation convey strategies for achieving development and sustainability in tandem. The analysis has been organized according to four main objectives that surfaced from the inputs received:

- Rebalance power relations for justice
- Fulfill human rights and overcome exclusion
- Ensure equitable distribution and safe use of natural resources
- Establish participatory governance, accountability and transparency

Contributors raised fundamental concerns around power relations in a variety of contexts, identifying that imbalances of power have eroded justice and integrity in societies across all regions of the world. All of the economic, social, environmental and governance objectives discussed by civil society networks relate to rebalancing power in some sense, as well as to addressing historic and ongoing injustices. Civil society networks most fervently underscored the need to rebalance power relations for justice in terms of transforming economies – in particular, to re-orient economic governance and policies at all levels toward the fulfillment of human rights and the multiple dimensions of human well-being.

Civil society networks identified that blanket policy prescriptions, such as indiscriminate financial and trade liberalization, deregulation and privatization, export- and foreign investment-led growth, and a reduced role of the State, have led to tremendous concentration of wealth and power, exacerbated inequalities, and increased poverty. A truly transformative post-2015 development agenda must therefore promote the diversification of national economies towards more localized, employment-intensive forms of production and consumption, and away from resource-intensive means. The agenda must also embed strong redistributive and inclusive policies, including universal access to essential public services and a reversal of the widespread pattern of stagnating or declining wages and incomes affecting the majority of the world’s population. The regional networks presented a wealth of successful experiences to align economic activities with the imperatives of decent employment and environmental regeneration. However, many obstacles and systemic risks inherent to the current international trade, investment and financial architecture stand in the way of implementing this transformative agenda and must be overcome. Participants also emphasized the need for demilitarization and the redirection of significant amounts of military funding to sustainable development programmes.

Participants firmly asserted that the post-2015 development agenda must adopt a human rights-based approach to ensure that policies benefit the most vulnerable and marginalized people, and foster equity and equality. The post-2015 agenda must call on UN Member States to fulfill human rights and overcome exclusion, including by taking steps to the maximum of available resources to progressively achieve the full
realization of rights, and by respecting the principle of non-regression. Civil society networks urged for a strengthened role of the State in respecting, protecting and fulfilling the full gamut of economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights for all people. Contributors proposed approaches to ensure that the rights to education, universal health care (including sexual and reproductive health), decent work, and social protection are fulfilled, and that the rights of marginalized groups including women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, ethnic groups and migrants are no longer violated.

In numerous countries, the extractive, energy and agriculture industries are committing widespread human rights violations, particularly through land and water grabs, but also through civil and political rights violations. The exploitative practices of these industries have caused a significant amount of environmental and social stress, and have been responsible for extensive and disproportionate harm to Indigenous peoples. The Convention on Biological Diversity warns that human impacts, such as pollution and deforestation, risk pushing ecosystems past tipping points. Climate change is an urgent global environmental challenge that threatens severe climate justice. Civil society networks insisted that the post-2015 development agenda must promote policies to ensure equitable distribution and safe use of natural resources. Such policies must move beyond pursuing resource efficiency to asserting resource sufficiency, participants argued, adding that constraints imposed by environmental limitations make discussions about redistribution and fair shares in terms of natural resources unavoidable. Civil society networks recommended several models for sustainable consumption and production, including the circular economy, the social and solidarity economy, the sharing economy, and biomimicry. It follows that transformation of the energy industry is essential, and all nations must aggressively shift away from the use of fossil fuels and nuclear energy – which both carry tremendous economic, environmental and social liabilities – and advance toward truly clean, renewable, and equitably distributed power generation. Harmful subsidies to dangerous energy industries must be eliminated and re-directed to renewable energy and other sustainable development priorities.

To achieve sustainable agriculture, small-holder farmers, who feed a majority of the world’s people, must be supported through the model of food sovereignty. Organic and agro-ecological practices must be promoted, and staple food production should be oriented to serve local consumption needs before export markets. A powerful call for climate justice was issued from participants in Africa, who maintained that the scale of climate finance is insufficient to meet necessary levels of action, and that although adaptation finance is the priority for Africa, the significant majority of available funding is for mitigation. Developed countries must live up to their commitments to provide new and additional, adequate and predictable financing to developing countries, free of any harmful conditionalities, in accordance with the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and polluter pays.

As failure to deliver on commitments is a pervasive problem in sustainable development, the post-2015 development agenda must establish participatory governance, accountability and transparency, which are compelled by internationally agreed human rights, including the rights to participate in public affairs, access to information, and access to justice and administration. The post-2015 agenda should employ human rights accountability mechanisms, such as the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council, and seek to strengthen them.

Accountability in the post-2015 agenda will remain meaningless if strong means of implementation are not established. The private sector cannot be expected to play a leading role in managing the major structural

---

1 As agreed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
shifts required to realize development goals equitably and sustainably. Democratically defined public policies must steer public and private initiatives to meet sustainable development objectives. Civil society networks strongly criticized the prevailing tendency in the post-2015 discussions to rely on voluntary initiatives with the corporate sector and public-private partnerships, which can lead to many abuses. Credible partnership initiatives with the corporate sector should be subject to binding accountability mechanisms. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework should be supplemented with binding enforcement measures, including legislation, court adjudication and penalties for violations.

Participants identified that a substantial amount of global policy-making is occurring in unaccountable groupings such as the G8 and G20, and that the post-2015 development agenda should direct States to re-conceptualize and democratize the global policy architecture, especially in the areas of trade, finance and macroeconomic policy. Participants called on the UN to subject the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to oversight, and support regional efforts toward self-defined development. The policies and programmes of international financial institutions should be made compatible with the extra-territorial human rights obligations of Member States, defined in the Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations in the area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The post-2015 agenda itself must be defined, implemented and monitored through fully participatory processes in which all voices are heard. Civil society contributors emphasized that the onus is on decision-makers to build the capacity of people to participate. People affected by policies should not be considered followers of a debate; they should be empowered to help lead agendas, and ensure accountability for commitments. Monitoring processes must incorporate qualitative measures of progress, such as the Gross National Happiness Index developed by the Kingdom of Bhutan, or Genuine Progress Indicators, and data must be disaggregated by gender, age, geographical location, rural/urban location, income, educational background and other relevant indicators. It is critical to approach development holistically, and evaluate it comprehensively, to ensure that efforts are continually advancing justice, equality, equity, and sustainability.
Summary of Recommendations:  
Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

A Holistic Approach

According to civil society networks from all of the regions, the goals included in the post-2015 development framework must be truly universal and comprehensive, encompassing the changes that must take place in all countries. The post-2015 agenda must focus not only on goals, but also on structural and root causes of rising inequality, impoverishment, social exclusion, environmental degradation and conflict. It must address the barriers to meaningful structural transformation and incorporate strong means of implementation and accountability mechanisms. Contributors emphasized that the post-2015 agenda must also address issues of peace and excessive militarization, as there cannot be development without peace. States must move toward sustainable production and consumption patterns and establish global economic policy coherence.

The post-2015 agenda must avoid a “homogenizing view” of development (focused on “modern, urban and global” societies) and embrace diverse paradigms such as the Indigenous concept of “buen vivir,” which is beginning to guide development strategies in parts of Latin America. It should promote concrete strategies that transform economic relations at the local level, such as the worldwide social and solidarity economy movement, and incorporate more holistic mechanisms to monitor progress, such as the Gross National Happiness Index of the Kingdom of Bhutan.

Meaningful Structural Transformation

Rising inequalities, repeated financial crises, and warnings that ecosystems are approaching tipping points compel urgent and fundamental restructuring of economies worldwide. This cannot amount to doing “business as usual” in a more eco-friendly way. The post-2015 discussions should be a space to rethink the prevailing economic development paradigm, and to move beyond blanket prescriptions, such as indiscriminate promotion of financial and trade liberalization, deregulation and privatization, export- and foreign investment-led growth, and a reduced role of the State.

The post-2015 agenda must instead embrace State leadership of the transition under strong democratic oversight, in accordance with the concept of a “democratic developmental State.” In many developing countries, high growth rates fuelled by the recent commodity boom did not translate into job creation and expansion of social services. Although “rents” from extractive industries and primary commodity exports did lead to substantial redistributive policies in some countries (as in parts of Latin America), these sectors inflicted environmental and social costs, including extensive human rights violations. Growth is a highly misleading proxy for job creation and should not be an aim in itself; the objective should be the realization of all human rights and all aspects of human wellbeing. The private sector, absent a framework of policies and rules that steer investments towards nationally defined sustainable development priorities, will not lead development in that direction.

A truly transformative post-2015 development agenda must promote the diversification of national economies towards more localized, employment-intensive forms of production and consumption, and away from resource-intensive means. The agenda must also call for significant redistributive and inclusive policies, including universal access to essential public services and a reversal of the widespread pattern of stagnating or declining wages and incomes for the vast majority of the world’s population.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:
REBALANCE POWER RELATIONS FOR JUSTICE

Overcome Obstacles and Promote Means of Implementation

The post-2015 agenda should address the many structural and systemic obstacles that impede implementation of transformative economic, social and environmental policies. Civil society networks identified the need to:

1. Reform the Trade and Investment Architecture
   a) Review international trade and investment agreements, which restrict the ability of governments to regulate foreign investments in the public interest, impose barriers to technology transfer, prevent fair taxation, and include other measures not consistent with the objectives of sustainable development;
   b) Address the problem of excessive concentration of corporate power, such as global cartels that stifle innovation and crowd out alternative initiatives, notably by reinstating the equivalent of the former UN Centre on Transnational Corporations as an independent entity to monitor transnational corporations (TNCs) and help ensure that States respect their commitments to regulate them;
   c) Ensure that the trade architecture provides the flexibility for developing countries to adapt trade policies to protect the livelihoods of small producers and foster nascent domestic industries, including by ensuring the full participation of all Member States in the multilateral trading system, and giving Special and Differential Treatment (SDT) serious weight, operationalization, and legal status for developing countries in the next phase of negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO).

2. Reform Development Finance and the International Financial Architecture
   a) Refrain from treating foreign direct investment (FDI) as a substitute for overseas development assistance (ODA); the long standing commitment of developed countries to dedicate 0.7% of gross domestic income to ODA should be met, while a new rights-based approach of financial transfers beyond ODA should be implemented in the form of a mandatory system, a fiscal equalization scheme, or a compensation scheme, to pay off climate debt and other forms of ecological debt;
   b) Address the problem of unsustainable debt, including by: i) reviewing onerous debts and cancelling illegitimate debt; ii) prioritizing resources for meeting the development goals over debt repayments, especially in least developed countries; iii) establishing an independent and fair debt arbitration court that can provide a single statutory framework for debt crisis resolution by ensuring that both creditors and debtors cooperate to restructure sovereign debt, with respect to a country’s unique economic conditions;
   c) Reform the international financial architecture; reign in the power of “too big to fail” institutions through enforceable national and international regulations that would sanction them as “too big to allow,” and implement a range of measures to prevent the socialization of the costs of corporate malpractices; increase financial regulation and reverse the financialization of the economy in a manner that would allow for a sustained shift of resources from the financial economy back to the real economy;
   d) Reform and democratize international financial institutions to ensure that they: i) give much greater voice to developing countries, particularly Least Developed Countries; ii) genuinely respond to national and regional circumstances and priorities; iii) catalyze productive investment; and iv) abide by the international human rights obligations of States;
   e) Promote new financial and monetary architectures at the regional level, by: i) establishing regional monetary funds that would pool foreign currency reserves to combat speculative attacks and to compensate for economic asymmetries within the region; ii) extending intra-regional trade through regional complementary currencies; and iii) establishing or consolidating regional development banks.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: REBALANCE POWER RELATIONS FOR JUSTICE

that are oriented to finance transformative objectives and are aligned with the realization of economic, social and cultural rights and environmental regeneration;

f) Implement a financial transactions tax regionally and at the global level;

g) Agree internationally to automatic exchange of information of bank holdings, country-by-country reporting of TNCs, and the closing of tax havens, as indispensable measures to prevent tax avoidances and enable progressive redistributive taxes;

h) Adopt regional agreements to reverse the “race to the bottom” in national tax concessions to foreign corporations.

3. Promote National Redistributive Measures

a) Implement progressive taxation measures on wealthier companies and individuals and reverse regressive tax measures, such as high value-added tax (VAT), especially on essential products;

b) Phase out subsidies that support unsustainable production and consumption patterns and redirect these large amounts of resources to fund sustainable development, while ensuring that poorer income groups are not negatively affected by these measures;

c) Adopt targets to shift government resources away from military spending and towards social spending;

d) Reduce wage gaps by introducing or increasing the minimum wage and introducing caps on higher incomes;

e) Promote universal access to social services and promote redistributive policies such as cash transfers, while refraining from imposing socially-oriented conditionalities when these may, in practice, negatively impact on the unpaid care work of women;

f) Adopt goals and targets to frame these redistributive policies and combat excessive concentrations of wealth and land ownership, such as a universal objective on “maximum limits on wealth per person or enterprise”: for example, less than x% of the persons or enterprises cannot own more than y% of GDP.

4. Democratize Politics and the Media

a) Adopt policies that would favour the democratization of the media and counter the concentration of media ownership;

b) Democratize political parties and the financing of electoral campaigns with specific targets: for example, 80% of political party campaigns must come from a common public pool, and only 20% from the private sector or individuals.

5. Scale up the Social and Solidarity Economy

a) Support the scaling-up of the social and solidarity economy (SSE), which represents myriad initiatives around the world by enterprises, cooperatives, organizations and community groups that undertake economic activities that create decent jobs, but at the same time seek to meet social and/or environmental objectives, following shared principles such as cooperation, democratic economic management and local ownership and reinvestments. Create a conducive environment for SSE through the creation of SSE appropriate legislative and legal frameworks, providing low-cost capital, and funding for development assistance in this field. (See details in the reports from Latin America, Africa, Europe and the United States).
Summary of Recommendations: Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

To ensure a just, equitable and sustainable world in which all people experience individual and collective wellbeing, the post-2015 development agenda must be fully aligned with the existing human rights framework, reflecting its fundamental principles of universality, equality and non-discrimination, as well as progressive realization and non-regression. Human rights are indivisible, interrelated and interdependent. Economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights must be fully realized for all; it is critical to focus support for fulfilling the rights of vulnerable and marginalized people, particularly those who face intersecting inequalities based on gender, age, class, ethnicity, indigeneity, sexual orientation, gender identity, (dis)abilities, and/or status as a migrant, asylum-seeker or refugee, many of whom have been systematically, historically and continually excluded.

It is essential to ensure policy coherence between the post-2015 negotiations and existing international human rights agreements. Human rights are not moral aspirations; they are internationally agreed legal obligations.

The human rights framework can provide clarity on the obligations of States regarding the outcomes of the post-2015 process. A human rights-based approach is essential to overcome growing inequalities, discriminatory practices, and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress. The new development agenda must prioritize measures to realize equality and equity, and accordingly must enable full and meaningful participation of all stakeholders – most particularly marginalized and disenfranchised groups – throughout all phases of policy-making, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The human rights framework also includes robust accountability mechanisms (discussed further in the sections on Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency where recommendations concerning progressive realization and non-regression, full ratification, human rights-based corporate accountability, and the extra-territorial obligations of States are presented).

Realizing Human Rights for All in the Post-2015 Framework

The post-2015 agenda must effectively address the numerous challenges that continue to prevent the fulfillment of human rights for many, and must reinforce the duty of States to use the maximum of their available resources to realize these rights progressively for all. Addressing these challenges will require Member States to agree to:

1. Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Promote Decent Work and Social Protection for All
   a) Put into practice the application of the Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights when formulating and implementing poverty eradication measures and other policies;
   b) Agree to a new goal on full and decent employment and livelihoods, incorporating the four pillars of the International Labour Organization (ILO)’s Decent Work Agenda;
   c) Agree to a stand-alone goal on universal social protection in the post-2015 agenda, emphasizing the need to introduce social protection floors in countries where social security is minimal, but with the aim to secure universal access to social services and basic income security for all, based on ILO Recommendation 202;
   d) Implement fully the ILO’s core labour standards and reject policies that present the deregulation of
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: FULFILL HUMAN RIGHTS AND OVERCOME EXCLUSION

labour standards as a necessity to maintain “competiveness”;
e) Promote associative forms of work in the social and solidarity economy.

2. Address Growing Inequalities as an Obstacle to the Fulfillment of Human Rights for All
   a) Adopt a stand-alone goal on reversing growing inequalities; and include inequality reduction targets in all other goals.

   a) Complete “the unfinished business of the unmet MDGs”: reaffirm the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, while adapting to new health challenges and addressing non-communicable diseases;
   b) Ensure that targets related to universal access to primary healthcare are defined to include not only basic services but all necessary services, while explicitly calling for quality healthcare services;
   c) Assure the right to quality health care for girls and women, including sexual and reproductive health and rights, e.g., access to all the methods available to control fertility, to safe and adequate maternity care, and to prevention and treatment options for HIV and other sexually transmitted infections; women and girls must also be free to decide on all matters of their sexuality, free from coercion, discrimination and violence;
   d) Include targets on the social determinants of health, including gender equality, access to education, water and sanitation, as well as State-provided incentives for healthy behaviour;
   e) Address the inter-linkages between health and inequality, and between ill-health and its impact on all other aspects of development, such as employment and education.

4. Develop a Comprehensive Agenda for Fulfilling the Right to Education
   a) Make explicit the obligation of States towards free education, at least in compulsory stages and progressively beyond, as stated in General Comment #13 on “The right to education” of the UN Committee on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights;
   b) Conceptualize education as central to structural transformation in countries with weak productive capacities, to achieve a shift from low to a high skilled workforce;
   c) Ensure that the education agenda does not get reduced to responding to questions of “employability,” but encompasses the development of life skills essential to participate meaningfully in economic, social and political activities, and the acquisition of adequate knowledge to respect and appreciate the value of human rights, gender sensitivity, social justice, community cooperation and multi-culturalism;
   d) Include targets for adequate remuneration and benefits for teachers, as well as good working conditions;
   e) Acknowledge and support the role of popular and traditional knowledge as a valid source of knowledge alongside formal academic science.

5. Respect, Protect and Promote the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
   a) Implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which outlines the minimal standards of development that Indigenous peoples have requested; promote, protect and respect the human and collective rights of Indigenous peoples, including through enforcement of their rights to their land, territories and resources, to self-determination, and to free prior and informed consent;
   b) Establish, within the Special Procedures of Human Rights Council, a Special Rapporteur on extractive industries and human rights in order to address human rights abuses in the extractive sector, especially in Indigenous territories.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:
FULFILL HUMAN RIGHTS AND OVERCOME EXCLUSION

c) Protect and Promote Women’s Human Rights and Gender Equality
d) Integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment not only as a stand-alone goal, but also across all goals and the full post-2015 development agenda, including targets to overcome women’s unequal access to economic livelihood opportunities and formal employment;
e) Incorporate zero tolerance targets for violence against women and girls in recognition of their human rights to live free of violence.
f) Ensure the full and equal participation of women in all public and private decision-making;
g) Address the unpaid contributions to development made by women at all levels, including by recognizing care work as critical to survival of the economy and society, and reinforcing State responsibilities to invest in social services including child care, elder care, and healthcare.

6. Eliminate Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity
   a) Enact national legislation to ensure the human rights of LGBT persons, including access to health care, education and justice;
   b) Commit to ending all violence and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity;
   c) Prohibit and take action to eliminate harmful practices, including customary practices based on the idea of the inferiority or superiority of any sexual orientation or gender identity;
   d) Promote changes to attitudes, beliefs and behaviours that perpetuate and foster discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity expression.

7. Overcome Discrimination Based on Ethnicity
   a) Eliminate structural discrimination based on caste and ethnicity and address its intersection with poverty;
   b) Ensure access to justice for all ethnic groups;
   c) Establish monitoring processes to help ensure that different ethnic groups are fairly represented in the different spheres of government and the State in order to foster stability.

8. Mainstream the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
   a) Mainstream the rights of people living with disabilities, building on the normative framework that the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provides to support the one billion individuals experiencing disability, with attendant impact on health, educational achievement, economic opportunities and poverty.²

9. Empower Youth
   a) Recognize that it is through young people that societies are transformed; the challenges they face such as mass unemployment are of the present and not only “the future,” and thus youth should be fully included in the design and implementation of the post-2015 agenda;
   b) End the tendency to marginalize youth development challenges, including by establishing a UN entity dedicated to mainstreaming youth issues across the development agenda, along the lines of UN Women.

10. Uphold the Rights of Migrants
    a) Address migration as a development concern to resolve, with due respect to the rights and welfare of migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees; overcome the severe discrimination that they face.

Summary of Recommendations:
Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources

Evidence abounds that human activity is severely damaging the ecosystems that support life through increasingly unsustainable and inequitable exploitation of natural resources, particularly by the extractive, energy and agro-industrial sectors. Large-scale agriculture is a significant cause of environmental stress, and large agri-business has been responsible for extensive human rights violations, particularly with regard to land and water grabbing. In numerous countries, extractive industries are displacing millions of people and destroying land, water and sacred sites, disproportionately affecting Indigenous peoples. In the face of accelerated climate change – including devastating environmental damage and economic loss – the extraction and use of fossil fuels must be dramatically reduced. The transition away from fossil fuels must not lead to increased use of other hazardous sources of energy, such as nuclear power – often misleadingly positioned as a clean source. Poor and marginalized communities are most at risk, and most severely harmed, by these activities and climate change impacts.

A paradigm shift must occur in the practices of the agricultural, extractive, and energy sectors, as well as in consumption and production patterns more generally. Comprehensive global-to-local strategies are essential to enable this shift, along with increased respect for natural systems and much more conscious and sustainable use of their resources. Civil society networks suggested founding natural resource management on protecting the “commons.” Water, public land, energy, air, forests, and biodiversity must not be privatized or commodified.

The Post-2015 Framework Must Address Inequities in Resource Use

A post-2015 agenda, grounded in principles of justice, equality, equity and sustainability, must address global environmental challenges, and seek to restore rebalance. Member States should agree to:

1. Protect the Global Commons
   a) Adopt measures to protect the global commons to ensure natural resources are not over-consumed, such as common-pool resource management, in which a community or village democratically manages its local resources, ensuring sustainability, as well as equitable use and distribution of benefits.
   b) Promote the ecosystems approach – the primary framework for action under the Convention on Biological Diversity – and territorial management planning, in which communities map their resources, consider sustainable-use studies, and develop plans to holistically manage the physical, social, political, and spiritual dimensions of a territory.

2. Ensure Food Sovereignty
   a) Adopt the concept of food sovereignty to guide national and international policies affecting food systems;
   b) Prioritize agrarian reform and adopt measures that would include: land redistribution, including to landless farmers; strengthening land tenure rights and rights of small farmers to work the land; ensuring pastoralists’ rights to communal land; and protection against land grabs;

3 Food Sovereignty is based on the following principles: food as a basic human right; agrarian reform; protecting natural resources; reorganizing food trade; ending the globalization of hunger; social peace; and democratic control, as defined by Via Campesina in 1996, described in detail in this document.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:
ENSURE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION & SAFE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

c) Adopt economic support measures to build the productive capacities of small-holder farmers and Indigenous peoples to ensure they are able to produce staple crops independently, and maintain food sovereignty;
d) Enact a range of measures to support food sovereignty, including: i) public procurement policies that favour the purchase of food for public schools from small-scale and family farms; ii) investments and capacity-building for local food production through organic and agro-ecological methods (which also increase yield, as outlined in FAO’s Organic Agriculture Programme); iii) support to “mutual help” networks that make essential foodstuffs available at low prices in poor marginalized areas;
e) Adopt the UN Food and Agriculture Organization Right to Food Guidelines and strengthen the FAO Committee on World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, by reconfiguring them toward enforceable multilateral agreements, including on responsible agricultural investment.

3. Regulate and Transform the Extractive and Energy Industries; Assess New Technologies

a) Eradicate subsidies to the fossil fuel and nuclear industries; end subsidies to carbon-emitting transnational corporations; adopt/enforce the “polluter pays” principle through quantifiable goals and measures;
b) Promote carbon-free sources of energy, including the expansion of solar energy and small-scale hydropower; aggressively phase out fossil fuel and nuclear energy, which both carry substantial financial, environmental and social liabilities;
c) Act upon a number of urgent recommendations regarding the ongoing Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant disaster from internationally renowned nuclear scientists and civil society analysts to ensure the protection of public health and safety both in Japan and globally, including that Japan must work with international organizations to put a worldwide engineering group in charge of resolving the situation;
d) Establish an independent technology assessment mechanism to assess the ecological and health impact of new technologies at international, regional and national levels;
e) Adopt the principles and standards of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative to promote revenue transparency and accountability in the extractive sector;
f) Respect, protect and fulfill the full gamut of the rights of Indigenous peoples, who are disproportionately harmed by energy and extractive industry practices including land grabs, pollution, and destruction of sacred sites;
g) Reduce production and consumption in order to achieve sustainable consumption through systems of incentives and disincentives, including social and legal means such as reducing packaging, developing guidelines for prolonging the life span of manufactured products, and sanctions against companies that engage in the “programmed obsolescence” of their products; implement the 10 Year Framework Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP), with enhanced involvement of civil society.

4. Urgently Take Aggressive Action to Address Climate Change

a) Recognize the historical responsibilities of industrialized countries to take the lead in emissions reduction, and provide the necessary resources and technology transfers for developing countries to make the transition to a low-carbon economy;
b) Include the principles of “common but differentiated responsibilities” and “polluter pays” (both recently reaffirmed during the 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development) in the post-2015 agenda, and translate them into quantifiable goals;

c) Conclude a fair, ambitious and binding international climate change agreement, which should: ensure that the parameters for reducing greenhouse gas emissions follow the ecological limits and timelines defined by science; focus on non-market mechanisms to address climate change; and ensure that developed countries provide the required funds and technology to developing countries;

d) Provide much greater levels of climate finance, ensuring that it is balanced between mitigation and climate adaptation;

e) Ensure climate finance is derived from stable and predictable public sources in climate debtor countries, is new and additional to existing ODA commitments, and is free of conditionalities, particularly those that might restrict Indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ involvement in decision-making and the design and implementation of related activities.
Summary of Recommendations: 
Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

Meaningful implementation of any post-2015 agenda requires a strong framework for participatory governance, accountability and transparency. Such a framework must be firmly anchored in existing international human rights agreements and instruments. Human rights standards and norms provide a comprehensive framework to guide policy and to assess impacts and monitor progress.

In a globalized interdependent world, the obligation to respect, protect and fulfill all human rights requires not only the democratization and reform of national governance structures, but also of global governance bodies, especially those dealing with economic and financial affairs.

Accountability in the post-2015 agenda will remain meaningless unless strong means of implementation are put in place. The private sector cannot be expected to play a leading role in managing the major structural shifts required to realize development goals equitably and sustainably. Democratically defined public policies must steer public and private initiatives to meet sustainable development objectives. Credible partnership initiatives with the private sector should be subject to binding accountability mechanisms.

The tools for monitoring and evaluating progress should involve a holistic set of indicators that measure the multiple dimensions of human wellbeing, not just quantitatively, but also qualitatively. Monitoring and evaluation must include a focus on structural barriers affecting diverse groups.

On these various fronts, Member States should agree to:

1. Integrate Strong Human Rights Accountability Mechanisms
   a) Integrate and commit to strengthening the human rights framework of inter-governmental processes and mechanisms for monitoring and accountability, including the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the UN Human Rights Council and mechanisms under human rights conventions;
   b) In accordance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, “take steps” (including legislative, judicial, administrative, financial, educational, and social measures) “to the maximum of available resources,” to progressively achieve the full realization of economic, social and cultural rights, and to monitor and report on progress and objectively justify any backsliding;
   c) Ratify the full spectrum of human rights treaties and their optional complaint procedures, withdraw the reservations that impede their implementation, and commit to the comprehensive, timely and regular submission of reports.

2. Promote Participatory and Transparent Governance Structures
   a) Fully respect and ensure the freedoms of expression, association and assembly;
   b) Adopt strong systems to fight corruption, ensure transparency and promote equal opportunities;
   c) Promote measures to ensure that accountability of elected governments is not limited to election periods, but is on-going, and striving for “participatory democratic governance”;

---

4 Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 3 (1990) on the nature of State parties obligations (concerning the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), paras. 3–7.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: ESTABLISH PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

d) Adopt measures to increase transparency in the financing of electoral campaigns, including through caps on contributions from the private sector and individuals;

e) Increase women’s participation in decision-making;

f) Recognize civil society as a key partner in identifying issues, informing policies and achieving goals; and in monitoring and evaluating implementation, by mainstreaming participatory processes at various levels of policy-making, including the provision of access to information;

g) Ensure full transparency of public budgets and public procurement, and enable civil society to participate in the budget process;

h) Adopt mechanisms and allocate resources to ensure that civil society, including associations of vulnerable and marginalized people, have the capacity to engage meaningfully in decision-making processes;

i) Implement Principle 10 of the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, which recognizes the rights to access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters; promote the development of regional agreements to realize these rights, such as the UN Economic Commission for Europe’s Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters;

j) Ensure meaningful civil society participation in the negotiations of the post-2015 agenda, including by building on the model of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) of the FAO Committee on World Food Security (CFS), which involves a sophisticated system of balanced civil society representation: non-governmental representatives engage on par with governments in draft negotiations while voting rights are reserved for governments.

3. Make Global Economic Governance Democratic, Accountable and Transparent

   a) Increase the voice and leverage of people and governments from developing countries, especially Least Developed Countries, in institutions of global governance – particularly the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO;

   b) Ensure that the policies and programmes of international financial institutions are compatible with the international human rights obligations of Member States, including by applying the Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations of States in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; agree to meaningful indicators in the post-2015 agenda that can address extra-territoriality and hold States and industries to account;

   c) Make all documents pertaining to multilateral, regional and bilateral trade negotiations, as well as those pertaining to negotiations with international financial institutions, publically available and in a timely fashion;

   d) Strengthen the United Nations’ legitimate role in holding various international bodies accountable for their policies and actions.

4. Establish Binding Corporate Accountability and Transparency

   a) Supplement the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework (adopted by the UN Human Rights Council and the General Assembly in 2011) with binding enforcement measures, including legislation, court adjudication, and penalties for violations;

   b) Require enterprises to release publicly any information regarded as “confidential business information” that is relevant to determining market share and defining inter-firm arrangements, such as strategic alliances and joint ventures;

   c) Agree internationally to require country-by-country reporting by transnational corporations of their financial performance for each country of operation or trading presence;
d) Require the labelling of products from enterprises with a track record of human rights violations and/or of causing serious damage to the environment.

5. **Adopt Holistic Approaches to Monitor and Evaluate Progress**
   a) Recognize that US$1.25 a day is not a reliable or meaningful measure of poverty, nor is Gross Domestic Product (GDP) a credible measure of progress;
   b) Agree that many goals and targets will need to be tailored to local conditions and needs, and should be identified through national participatory processes, with global goals and targets as a reference point;
   c) Provide the resources required for governments of developing countries, especially Least Developed Countries, to develop the capacity to gather and manage data and targets;
   d) Develop targets and indicators that are disaggregated at least by income groups, gender, youth, ethnicity and other marginalized or vulnerable groups, including indicators that point to structural barriers of access to essential services;
   e) Adopt the [Human Rights Indicators](#) developed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR);
   f) Develop qualitative targets and indicators that measure the multiple dimensions of human wellbeing, such as the Kingdom of Bhutan’s [Gross National Happiness Index](#);
   g) Develop targets and related measures on the extent to which economic policies are damaging to local communities including migrants, fisherfolk, forest and Indigenous peoples, pastoralists, and other marginalized communities;
   h) Develop targets and indicators for the promotion of short distribution circuits aimed at promoting self-sustaining local circuits of production, trade and consumption, as well as targets to increase the percentage of public purchases from small producers and local actors of the social and solidarity economy.
I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

A wide range of civil society networks from the Asia-Pacific region welcomed the calls for structural transformation included in the Post-2015 High-level Panel (HLP) and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) reports. However, the networks prioritized the need for fundamental change in an area that these reports did not adequately address: economic policy reform. Contributors insisted that the dominant economic model of globalization and free market policies must be transformed and reformed because it disproportionately benefits the corporate sector, especially transnational corporations (TNCs), and has not delivered on its promise — that widespread growth would bring development gains for all people. To the contrary, it has resulted in a tremendous concentration of wealth and power, which equates to increased inequality. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development cited that “even following multiple global crises, the total wealth of the richest 1% has grown while those in the middle and bottom have seen their incomes decline.”

Consultation contributors conveyed that the post-2015 development framework must be more ambitious than the reports to the Secretary-General with regard to structural change: “Overall, these reports are about reforms within the existing system of financial, corporate, and nation-state control. Such reforms could be interim measures, but a truly sustainable and equitable future needs far more radical transformations,” ICCA Consortium: Indigenous Peoples’ and Community Conserved Areas/Kalpavriksh argued. For Third World Network, a “credible” post-2015 development agenda will “summon the political will for genuine transformation on both structural and institutional levels…. This means reformulating policies, redesigning strategies and even rethinking development and its purpose.” Civil society networks are resolute: policies must aim to simultaneously eliminate inequality and poverty, and as People’s Health Movement articulated, the post-2015 development agenda must prioritize “the achievement of equity within countries and between countries.” Toward this end, participants provided recommendations regarding:

A. Establishing a new paradigm for economic policy
B. Overcoming economic policy barriers for sustainable development
C. Reducing militarization to advance development

A. Establishing a New Paradigm for Economic Policy

“The goal of development is individual and collective well-being,” Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact underscored, and development should be founded in the respect, recognition, protection and enjoyment of individual and collective rights. Achievement of this objective requires comprehensive, democratic and inclusive approaches,
as well as accountability. It must involve decentralized decision-making, so that people can achieve well-being according to their own needs and values, contributors stressed. It is aided by policies and investments that grow the real economy of manufacturing and services within ecological limits. Rural and urban communities and producer groups must have a central say in the economy.

These approaches are divergent from the dominant economic model, which emphasizes privatization, liberalization and financialization\(^5\) of the economy and relies on growth and the corporate sector to drive change and stimulate investments. Civil society networks asserted that the post-2015 development agenda must prioritize the real economy over the financial economy, pursue holistic and equitable development objectives, reassert the role of strong public finance, and promote regulation of the corporate sector – including measures to control corporate concentration.

**Prioritize the Real Economy Over the Financial Economy**

As Third World Network explained, financial deregulation and liberalization have paved the way for international finance to create an economy of its own – an economy that has become increasingly disconnected from the activities of production and investment in job creation and wage growth. The impacts of this financialization, according to Third World Network, include volatile commodity and food prices, rapid shifts in exchange rates and speculative boom-bust cycles that have led to chronic financial crises and economic recessions with devastating effects on development, equality and rights.

Participants referred to a comprehensive study produced by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 2013, which found that “financialization stands as the single most adverse factor in terms of explaining the decline of labour income shares” in both developed and developing economies.\(^6\) The ILO explains the reason for this: “The switch in the 1980s to corporate governance systems based on maximizing shareholder value and the rise of aggressive returns-oriented institutions, including private equity funds, hedge funds and institutional investors, put pressure on firms to increase profits, especially in the short term.”\(^7\) Since the 2007-08 financial crisis, these banking and financial sectors responsible for instigating the credit and asset bubbles that led to the crisis remain essentially unreformed. The post-2015 development framework needs to address the financialization of the economy by reviving a focus on strategic government policies, tailored to local conditions, that allow for a sustained shift of resources from the financial economy back to the real economy.

**Pursue Holistic and Equitable Development Objectives**

Many contributors were concerned that proposed policies and goals aimed at stimulating economic growth may undermine policies and goals on social and environmental issues. As expressed by the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, growth-led development “does not create jobs, depletes natural resources, and intensifies inequality.” Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP contributed, “Recognizing that the current economic model which promotes unsustainable consumption and production patterns, facilitates a grossly inequitable trading system, fails to eradicate poverty, assists [the] exploitation of natural resources toward the

---


\(^7\) Ibid. p. 51.
Consultation participants cited examples of “Indigenous development vision,” the Kingdom of Bhutan’s *Gross National Happiness Index*, and the civil society “Development Justice” framework, as embodying the ideals of holistic and participatory approaches, and advocated for their wider implementation in development efforts. Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact explained that Indigenous development vision is based on ten interdependent and indivisible aspects: culture; social system; spirituality; politics and institutions; judicial system; education, including all ways of learning; economy; natural resource management; technology and innovation; and health. South Asia Women’s Network (SWAN) advocated for the post-2015 development agenda to promote the Gross National Happiness Index, which is based on nine “domains”: psychological well-being; health; time use; education; cultural diversity and resilience; good governance; community vitality; ecological diversity and resilience; and living standards. This approach “integrates inclusive economic development with strengthening communities, protecting the environment, providing universal access to health services and education, and preserving traditional culture and heritage.” Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) pointed to the “Development Justice” model, described in the *August 2013 Bangkok Civil Society Declaration* and endorsed by 116 Asia and Pacific civil society organizations: a “transformative and redistributive framework that aims to reduce inequalities of wealth, power and resources between countries, between rich and poor and between men and women.” Development Justice should be framed by five foundational shifts: Redistributive Justice, Economic Justice, Social Justice, Environmental Justice and Accountability to Peoples. The Bangkok Civil Society Declaration describes in detail how these shifts should be achieved.

**Promote Regulation of the Corporate Sector**

Many organizations are concerned that the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports frequently declare that private investments, especially foreign direct investments (FDI) by TNCs, will be engines of sustainable development – without mentioning the often devastating effects that those investments have had on the environment. This is “extremely problematic,” ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh insisted. People’s Health Movement condemned private investment in developing countries for “rapacious exploitation of natural resources, rent seeking behaviour and the privatization of public utilities for private profits.” Referring to the recent major catastrophe in a textiles factory in Bangladesh, the South Asia Alliance for Poverty Eradication (SAAPE) said, “To encourage FDI, governments are willing to allow businesses to violate legally established non-negotiables.”

Consultation contributors also noted that corporate concentration has driven a massive surge in inequalities in recent decades. According to Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP, “None of the reports acknowledged that there are transnational corporations that are wealthier than countries, and that the income of the world’s richest people is much more than the combined income of the world’s great mass of poor people. None of the reports mentioned that the top 10 seed corporations control 90% of the global seed market in 2009, while the top 10 agro-chemical corporations control 72% of the global market in the same year. Without acknowledging these

8 This statement is drawn from the Kathmandu Declaration of the Asia-Pacific Major Groups and Stakeholders Regional Consultation Meeting with UNEP, submitted by Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP.


great disparities and massive concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, no amount of SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals] can effectively address poverty, hunger and inequality.”

Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP recommends that multilateral agencies should cooperate to “undertake a study of the capacity of national governments, regional intergovernmental associations, and the UN system to monitor and control industry cartels and corporate concentration and make recommendations for the establishment of appropriate regulatory measures and mechanisms.” This civil society network added that the UN Center for Transnational Corporations should be reinstated as an independent entity to monitor TNCs and help ensure that States deliver on commitments to regulate them.

In addition, civil society networks urged careful examination of the private control and administration of public utilities like water and electricity, and other public goods into so-called “public-private partnerships,” as a solution to the lack of sufficient public funds for investment in infrastructure, or the lack of government management capacity to run public utilities. Third World Network warned, “There is an increasing range of researched evidence by academics, think-tanks, civil society and policymakers that urge caution on the various risks and controversies demonstrated by the history of public-private partnerships and that calls for a deeper re-think on the role of the private sector in development.”

Reassert the Role of Strong Public Policies

Many contributors stated that the private sector could provide a positive contribution to development only within an overall strategy of reasserting the role of strong public policies, along with assertive democratic oversight. All private sector funds must be monitored and strongly regulated by governments, or by independent commissions (comprised of members from different segments of society), participants proposed. One step forward would be aligning private sector financing and developing countries’ investment and development priorities by allowing conditions such as performance requirements to be applied to FDI, either autonomously or through international agreements, suggested Third World Network. “FDI should mandatorily create jobs, transfer technology and transmit skills and practices from which the recipient population can benefit. Conditions can also be imposed to address the issues of inequalities that may stem from the natural operation of FDI (e.g. not going to rural areas),” Third World Network elaborated.

Tax structures can be reformed to support equality and development in many ways. For example, substantial public revenue for development can be provided by increasing taxes on foreign direct investment, extractive industry profits and financial market profits while cutting corporate and developed country agricultural subsidies. To curb adverse effects on the environment, Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP proposed taxes on aviation, shipping, chemical and extractive industries and carbon emissions, to be implemented in a progressive manner, along with cutting fossil fuel subsidies. Third World Network called for implementation of financial transaction taxes, and Asian Dalit Rights Movement proposed setting zero-targets to end illicit financial flows and tax evasion, such as those recommended by the Financial Action Task Force. Third World Network added that governments must also ensure access to basic critical services such as water, energy, food, credit, health and education, preferably by public provisioning, so that these are affordable and widely available. This network also suggested that publicly-owned development banks can direct credit to agricultural and low-income populations and encourage equitably distributed opportunities for productive activities.
B. Overcoming Economic Policy Barriers to Sustainable Development

Civil society networks identified that implementation of these and other policies is hampered by international constraints on trade and investment, distortionary subsidies, and onerous debt owed by developing countries. Consultation participants described the principal challenges and proposed measures to overcome them.

Reform international rules on trade and investment

Participants on the Asia consultation conference calls expressed particular concern regarding trade and investment rules that threaten the right to development, particularly the role of the developmental State. This architecture is marked by a steady proliferation of thousands of bilateral investment treaties (BITs) and free trade agreements (FTAs) that developing countries have signed in the past two to three decades. These agreements overwhelmingly benefit TNCs and financial firms at the expense of States and people, according to consultation participants.

Third World Network identified that the policy space for governments to regulate corporate sector activities in the public interest, or for development, is increasingly threatened. For example, under the provisions of BITs, TNCs have been suing developing country governments for huge sums of money in secret arbitration cases in international tribunals if they determine that any regulation or policy of the host country is infringing on their profits (including expected profits). These provisions challenge policies of developing countries that promote environmental protection and public health. Similarly, BITs impose restrictions on technology transfer and production of generic medicines through international property rights that are often even more stringent than the already highly constraining rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO) on the subject.

International trade and investment rules are also hampering developing country government’s ability to provide essential and critical services, stated Third World Network: “Food support programmes that can provide price support to farmers and food subsidies for poor consumers are considered trade distorting subsidies under the WTO.” In addition, similar constraints through international intellectual property rights frameworks are hindering accessibility to cheap medicines for poor patients worldwide, a situation that the post-2015 agenda must address, participants stressed.

The gender impact of trade policy needs serious attention, as trade policy is not “gender neutral,” explained Third World Network, because women’s economic and social positions are weaker, their rights are not well defined and a harshly competitive system hurts the weakest the most. The various frameworks of trade and investments, e.g. the WTO, FTAs, and BITs, affect women’s access to critical physical, financial and human resources and access to basic services, with significant implications for their empowerment, livelihoods, health, socio-economic status and well-being. The post-2015 development agenda must ensure comprehensive gender sensitive international policies in order to address the gendered impacts of international trade and investment and to deliver progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

These trade and investment agreements and aspects of WTO rules are not serving the public good and should therefore be radically reformed, participants insisted. This echoes the call in the SDSN report for trade and other international rules to “be revised to meet the test of whether they are consistent with the objectives of sustainable development.” In particular, Third World Network urged that the post-2015 development framework must strengthen the targets of Millennium Development Goal 8 to enable meaningful reform of rules related to global trade, finance, investment, and intellectual property rights with associated technology transfer arrangements. In addition, national extra-territorial obligations must be strengthened and
implemented by applying the Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations of States in the area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the application of trade and investment agreements. Third World Network emphasized that accountability is critical for all of these recommendations: “National governments must be able to monitor and regulate such arrangements in the public interest” to protect environmental and social justice, including public health.

Participants also touched on other dimensions of trade policy, including heavy agricultural and fisheries subsidies in developed countries that have been destroying livelihoods in developing countries through artificially cheap imports. Third World Network was pleased that the HLP report called for the reduction of trade-distorting agricultural subsidies, while the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development appreciated that the HLP and Global Compact reports take “a clear and firm stand on the need to end trade barriers, unfair trade rules, and distortive agricultural and fisheries subsidies of developed countries.”

**Fulfill Official Development Assistance Commitments and Review Debt Relief**

Participants also expressed much concern about the future of debt relief and official development assistance (ODA). Civil society networks appreciated that the HLP and SDSN reports call on nations to meet their ODA commitments, but most developed countries fail to meet these targets year after year, “due to a lack of political will,” according to SAAPE, and measures are needed to ensure compliance. Furthermore, Third World Network indicated that in the last seven years bilateral development agencies have channeled a rapidly growing share of ODA to the private sector, or to financial markets where ODA funds are being leveraged, which civil society networks identify as deeply problematic due to various factors. Participants warned that the private sector prioritizes returns on investment over development impact; there is a lack of transparency as to whether ODA funds directed to the financial market ever reach the domestic economy. Discussions on debt and market access, and debt relief – including for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) – need to be invigorated. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development emphasized the need to review onerous debts and cancel illegitimate debt. Third World Network also stressed the need for an independent and fair debt arbitration court that can provide a single statutory framework for debt relief, by ensuring that both creditors and debtors cooperate to restructure sovereign debt, with respect to a country’s unique economic conditions.

**C. Reducing Militarization to Advance Development**

Civil society networks advocated for public and private spending on national militarization to be re-directed to development efforts. APWLD observed that although the Global Compact and SDSN reports recognized the importance of peace and security, they failed to include measures to reduce military spending or militarized environments. APWLD advocated for the post-2015 development framework to include targets for reducing: government spending on the military; private sector spending on militarized zones – particularly those linked to the extractive industry; and numbers and percentages of militarized peoples – including from military, government, police and private sector. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development proposed a target “to end the surging arms trade and military expenditures of economically and militarily hegemonic nations.” South Asian Network of Gender Activists and Trainers (SANGAT) explained that small arms industries are proliferate in South Asia, and their presence drives violence against women.

Civil society networks commended the Global Compact report’s inclusion of a separate goal for peace and stability and the SDSN report’s treatment of peace and security “as cross-cutting all other separate goals.”
ADVANCING REGIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS - ASIA AND PACIFIC

In this context, the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development stressed that “peace and security can only be achieved on the condition that everyone enjoys genuine justice and decent living.” This network advocated for the pursuit of peace to be viewed “within the context of redistributing power and wealth equitably across all members of society and between nations, promoting greater inclusivity, and respecting the cultures, identities, and self-determination of Indigenous peoples.”

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

According to Asian Dalit Rights Movement, South Asian Alliance for Poverty Eradication (SAAPE), and Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, there are many serious human rights issues in the Asia and Pacific region, including: poverty, deprivation and insecurity; caste and ethnic exclusion; issues of labour including forced labour migration, child labour and a growing informal sector; and violations of women’s human rights, including violence – structural, interpersonal, and on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Inequality and inequity are the root causes of all of these injustices, participants maintained. Accordingly, consultation contributors emphatically assert that measures to realize equality and equity must be a central focus of the post-2015 development agenda, thus requiring a rights-based approach as the underpinning framework. Many civil society networks, including Asian Development Alliance, Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD), and Asian Dalit Rights Movement, strongly advocated that a stand-alone goal for reducing inequality must also be included.

Several contributors cited the need to establish definitions of inequality and poverty that include all their dimensions and intersections. Contributors asserted that the Post-2015 High-level Panel (HLP), Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Global Compact reports displayed a lack of understanding of the interconnectedness of these issues, as evidenced in their use of the World Bank’s US$1.25 a day benchmark in targets to “eliminate extreme poverty” or “end poverty.” The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development stated, “Despite a strong lobby for measures to address inequalities, we have seen that the main focus is on poverty eradication, and the targets continue to use the highly questioned and uninspiring US$1.25 a day benchmark for poverty. This is a starvation rate, not a poverty measurement.” Poverty is eradicated when a life of dignity is attained, not when an unsubstantiated financial benchmark is met, conveyed APWLD. To solve the complex problem of poverty, the post-2015 development agenda must comprehensively address poverty in all its dimensions. As inequality drives poverty, human rights must be enforced to eradicate it. Civil society networks advanced proposals regarding:

A. Making development policy coherent with existing human rights agreements
B. Overcoming discrimination and exclusion

---

11 The open letter of the UN High Commissioner’s for Human Rights on “Human rights in the post-2015 agenda” provides the following definition of poverty as a complex of human rights violations: “Poverty, as affirmed by the UN human rights system and by persons living in poverty themselves, is a global human condition characterized by the sustained or chronic deprivation of the resources, capabilities, choices, security and power necessary for the enjoyment of an adequate standard of living and other civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. As such, poverty itself represents a complex of human rights violations, and must therefore be addressed with the urgency that this characterization implies.” www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/HCOOpenLetterPost2015.pdf.
A. Making Development Policy Coherent with Existing Human Rights Agreements


**Right to Access Quality Health Care and Services**

Several contributors highlighted that the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports paid inadequate attention to the public dimension of basic entitlements, including to free and universal health care. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development highlighted the need for greater State subsidy for public health and the need to halt the prevailing trend of privatizing public hospitals and institutions. In addition, the new framework must include a structure that will address the interlinkages between health and inequality, and between ill health and its impact on all other aspects of development (employment, education, etc.), especially in the global South. Many organizations emphasized the importance of including sexual and reproductive health within primary health care, and protecting those rights.

ARROW emphasized that any new goals must be inclusive of sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) for all, framed in a way that ensures equity and equality and addresses the social determinants of health. Contributors emphasized the need to close the gap between policy development and programme implementation, by ensuring strong monitoring and evaluation systems, and providing equitable health financing. For example, in South Asia and South East Asia, the increased privatization of services erodes the responsibility of national governments to provide universal and equitable access to health care. Unfair trade policies also affect access to lifesaving medicines and undermine universal health care. Participants advocated for the post-2015 development agenda to promote global and regional trade and financial policies that address food insecurity, malnutrition, and interlinked SRHR concerns.

**Education for social, economic and political development**

Civil society networks expressed the view that the education goal (goal 3) proposed by the HLP falls short of the ambition advanced by civil society in order to address persistent social conditions and prevailing inequities. Gender, language, socio-economic status, geography, migration, disability, social exclusion and ethnicity were indicated by participants as some of the more enduring barriers to education and literacy. Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) explained that lack of education and literacy replicate poverty and limit people’s participation in economic, social and political activities. This organization called for
the revision of goal 3 to read “Provide Quality Education and Lifelong Learning for All,” with a number of additional indicators, including “develop life skills essential to participate meaningfully in economic, social and political activities, and acquire adequate knowledge to respect and appreciate the value of human rights, gender sensitivity, social justice, community cooperation and multiculturalism.” ASPBAE also advocated for affirmative policies, along with a specific target on adequate and sustainable financing of the education goal, including through access to resources, asset reforms and tax justice.

Employment and Decent Work

Third World Network, the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, and APWLD advocated that a new goal on full employment is critical for Asia to overcome a number of challenges insidious in the region, including inequitable systems and multiple forms of precarious employment. SAAPE indicated that in South Asia a very large percentage of the population work in informal labour conditions: “Child labour – in the aluminium or steel industry – is casual and it is hidden away from public perception. Many work under these conditions because survival is at the heart of a problem and they’re not able to bargain.”

Strong concern was expressed by many over the reports’ positioning of job creation through economic growth largely fuelled by private sector investment and innovation. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development denounced this approach, citing that “experience over the last three decades of promoting the same agenda has seen the share of workers’ wages in the national income falling and joblessness rising, violations and attacks against workers’ rights intensifying, and unsafe and intolerable working conditions proliferating.” Third World Network recommended that the post-2015 development agenda instead promote the implementation of regulations on working conditions, as well as labour laws and standards.

A number of participants, including SAPPE, APWLD, Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, and the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, drew attention to the importance of the Decent Work Agenda of the International Labour Organization (ILO). APWLD stated that the HLP report “undermines the Decent Work Agenda by creating a reduced category of ‘good jobs’ for the developing world while the developed world can expect the broader decent work agenda (8a). While it’s suggested that these good jobs need to be secure and ‘fairly paid’ (but presumably without other labour standards), they have not specified what fair pay would amount to.” Diverse Voices and Action for Equality added, “This represents a clear threat to the advancement of labour conditions worldwide and justifies double standards for workers in the Global North and the Global South.”

Respondents focused on women in the labour force and the need to ensure their equal access to employment and economic opportunities, as well as the unpaid care work of women. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality insisted that the post-2015 development framework must address “the unpaid contributions to development made by women at all levels, which in many cases represent the fundamental pillar of rural livelihoods and community well-being.”

IWRAW called for a more comprehensive target on decent work, and indicated that the use of temporary special measures provided for in Article 4 of CEDAW, which aim to accelerate the equal participation of women in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field, could be a useful means for advancing women’s rights. Measuring women’s rights, IWRAW indicated, could also include whether laws guarantee equal opportunity in employment, equal access to occupations and trades, equal remuneration as well as the broader issues of access to skills and development training, microfinance, entrepreneurship opportunities, reducing women’s unpaid care work, access to land and resources, as well equitable access to other forms of economic empowerment for women.
ADVANCING REGIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS - ASIA AND PACIFIC

Social Protection

Numerous contributors called for a stand-alone goal on universal social protection in the post-2015 agenda, with LDC Watch calling for the inclusion of specific goals for countries with special needs, particularly LDCs, landlocked developing countries, and small island developing States. According to the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, social protection should be universal and not merely an option which countries may or may not choose to adopt; it should also be part of the permanent development strategy of countries. Accordingly, “Governments should establish national social protection floors that secure universal access to social services and basic income security for women, youth, unemployed, disabled, the aged; must extend to migrants and the informal sector; and should be non-stigmatizing and non-discriminatory.”

Participation Rights

There was broad consensus that the reports were weak on participation rights: “Each report cites the right to participation and to information, but not in terms of concrete recommendations in the governance of the post-2015 framework that would include civil society in terms of full and effective participation in deliberations, in decision-making, etc.,” the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development articulated.

Land and Property Rights

According to many contributors, including APWLD and Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, the issue of rights to land was inadequately and improperly addressed in the HLP report. APWLD explained, “Goal 1.b\textsuperscript{12} of the report focuses on security of tenure and the commercializing potential of land rather than the fact that landlessness is the largest single indicator of poverty.” Diverse Voices and Action for Equality identified that goal 1.b “does not take into account the unfair distribution of assets among social actors.” Diverse Voices and Action for Equality and APWLD also criticized this target for assigning equivalence to people and businesses regarding land rights. According to Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, it “can promote further inequalities since securing ‘rights of business’ can exacerbate violations of women’s and community right to land, food, water, etc.” APWLD added, “The inclusion of ‘businesses’ in the goal reduces the goal to a target than can be easily distorted and enable land-grabbing and forced evictions to follow.” Also of concern was language used for goal 2, target c\textsuperscript{13}: Diverse Voices and Action for Equality indicated agreement with “ensuring equal right of women to own and inherit property,” but asked, “What is the point of legally owning land if it can be appropriated by an agribusiness with support of the government?” APWLD called for the post-2015 development framework to measure the distribution of land and resources, and to aim for equitable distribution amongst people, rather than corporations. Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact acknowledged that the non-recognition of the right to land, territories and resources of Indigenous peoples is a key concern common to all Indigenous peoples in Asia.

B. Overcoming Discrimination and Exclusion

To break down barriers to the attainment of human rights, many organizations, including Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh and ASPBAE, identified that addressing inequality in its multi-

\textsuperscript{12} Post-2015 High-level Panel report Target 1.b: “Increase by x% the share of women and men, communities and businesses with secure rights to land, property, and other assets.”

\textsuperscript{13} Post-2015 High-level Panel report Target 2.c: “Ensure equal right of women to own and inherit property, sign a contract, register a business and open a bank account.”
dimensional forms is essential in order to eradicate poverty through social, economic and ecological framing. SACGE and Asian Dalit Rights Platform explained that this necessitates recognizing the ways in which multiple factors – age, race, ethnicity, class, caste, tribe, gender, language, religion, sexual orientation, and disability – increase and compound discrimination and marginalization. Indicating that some communities are marginalized because they are not perceived as equal, the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development acknowledged that attempts to eradicate extreme poverty cannot be effective if they do not challenge the structures that reinforce discrimination and inequality between people. Therefore, Asian Dalit Rights Movement recommended that the post-2015 development framework should call for laws, policies and programmes that protect and promote equality, equity, social inclusion, absence of stigma, and accessibility within different intersecting identities, along with principles of substantive equality and non-discrimination.

**Gender Equality and the Rights of Women**

Many contributors, including SACGE, Diverse Voices and Action for Equality, and IWRAW, welcomed the standalone goal on gender equality, considering it an unquestionable component of a transformative agenda. SACGE expressed, however, that the goal “does not include how the multiple forms of discrimination and violence against women – which are major obstacles across South Asia – result in deeper experiences of poverty, deprivation and social marginalization; how women face unequal and unfair burden of the well-being of the society and economies in both the wage and the care economy; and how women face violation of their human rights that obstruct their equitable participation in economic, social and political life.” IWRAW, SANGAT, and Diverse Voices and Action for Equality also articulated concerns regarding systemic barriers to women’s rights to inherit and own property, learn skills, sign a contract, register a business and open a bank account.

Third World Network provided a detailed set of recommendations that the post-2015 development framework should incorporate in order to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment:

- Inter-weave gender dimensions in all goals, in addition to dedicating a goal to gender equality.
- Ensure access to productive resources (physical, financial and human) such as land, water, credit, infrastructure, skills and technology for women by making public investment in these areas, if needed.
- Enact policies including external sector policies to protect and promote women’s entrepreneurship especially in small and medium enterprises with access to credit, infrastructure, technology, and market access on fair terms.
- Recognize care work as critical to survival of the economy and society, and promote means to ease the burden of care work (e.g. by necessarily providing public services/sourcing of healthcare, education, energy, water).
- Deepen introspection about protection of women: Implement policies focused on changing social mindsets through education, awareness building, etc.

Regarding political representation of women, IWRAW and ARROW called for incorporating a proactive component instead of simply requiring the elimination of discrimination. IWRAW recommended that targets should include a reference to “ensuring the full and equal participation of women in all public and private decision-making [...] to ensure that States involve women and civil society organizations as partners in all aspects of development-related decision-making, including development finance and macroeconomic policy.”
Empowering Youth

Realising Sexual and Reproductive Justice (RESURJ) noted that the reports fall short in recognizing the role of young people in social change and decision-making: “Adolescents and young people’s human rights, including in terms of having sexual and reproductive health care, access to livelihood opportunities, and quality education, are critical in order for young people to have the skills to participate in social and economic life, and to contribute to sustainable development.” Of particular importance in the Pacific context is the issue of youth empowerment: “In most of our countries, 50% of the population is below the age of 30, and we have an emerging youth bulge under 18,” Pacific Youth Council explained. Therefore, “There should be a more deliberate commitment by government and development partners to really work with young people rather than in the service of youth, through policies, structures, and processes where youth participate.”

Indigenous Peoples’ Rights

A number of contributors discussed Indigenous perspectives on development, which are based on many interdependent and indivisible aspects including culture, social systems, spirituality, ways of learning, and natural resource management. “Most of the UN bodies and multilateral institutions have already defined guidelines and policies for Indigenous peoples and local communities, which should be carried over in all of our discussions, and this includes the recognition of culture as one of the pillars of sustainable development and should be integrated in all the other dimensions of sustainable development,” Tebtebba (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education) asserted.

Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact cited that Asia is home to more than 250 million Indigenous people. Many suffer from dispossession, marginalization and exploitation, due to the failure of States to promote, protect and respect the human and collective rights of Indigenous peoples. States must enforce Indigenous peoples’ rights, including to their land, territories and resources, to self-determination, and to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), contributors stressed.

Rights of Persons with Disabilities

A number of contributors highlighted the importance of the reports’ recognition of the needs of persons with disabilities, acknowledging that this was a step forward. Pacific Disabilities Forum indicated that the HLP report concept of “leave no one behind” provides a key entry point and gives persons with disabilities – and other vulnerable and marginalized groups – the space and opportunity to be involved and engaged, even in the Pacific context. To strengthen this transformative shift, ASPBAE insisted social inequity must be addressed in a thorough and comprehensive way. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality called on Pacific governments “to continuously implement and progressively realize the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), recognizing that this should occur regardless of whether countries have signed/ratified the Convention.”

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights

Diverse Voices and Action for Equality emphasized that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people (LGBT) and others with diverse sexual orientation and gender identities are still left out of the global development agenda and must be included. This network explained that around the world, LGBT people are targets of

---

14 This statement from Diverse Voices and Action for Equality was drawn from the Pacific Civil Society Statement to the May 2013 Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) Dialogue on Conflict, Peace & Security. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality submitted this document to the consultation.
physical and psychological violence, which often remains invisible and unaddressed even where there are laws in place for protection. Over the past 20 years, six United Nations treaty bodies including the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Committee Against Torture, and the Committee on the Elimination on all Forms of Violence against Women, have addressed violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation. The post-2015 development agenda must call on governments to commit to ending all violence and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, Diverse Voices and Action for Equality urged, elaborating that governments must “prohibit and take action to eliminate harmful practices, including customary practices based on the idea of the inferiority or superiority of any sex or gender identity; and change attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that perpetuate and foster discrimination and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV).”

**Equal Rights Amongst Ethnic Groups**

Discrimination based on ethnicity was another deep concern articulated by contributors, including SANGAT, SAAPE, SAGCE and the Asian Dalit Rights Movement. “In Asia, caste is one of the most important factors of poverty and discrimination,” Asian Dalit Rights Movement stressed, asserting that caste-based discrimination, and its resulting negative impacts on the rights to development and access to justice, must be addressed by the new development framework. The post-2015 agenda, this network continued, must address multiple intersectionalities of discrimination, for example between gender and caste. It should be supported by mechanisms and very clear policies with indicators, as well as disaggregated data. According to SANGAT, bringing about effective results would require a structural shift in society and in governance, something civil society had been advocating for the last thirty years.

**The Rights of Migrants**

A number of contributors voiced dissatisfaction that the issue of migration was not given more substantive discussion in the reports, including the challenges or discriminations migrants face or their contributions to society – aside from the economic aspects. “Migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees all also have rights and they need to be acknowledged in the framework that has been proposed,” ARROW insisted. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development underscored that forced labour migration must be addressed in the post-2015 development agenda, specifying that migration must be treated as a development concern that needs to be resolved, with due respect to the rights and welfare of migrants.

**III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources**

Six of the seventeen most biodiverse countries in the world are in Asia: India, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, and China. These same six countries are experiencing some of the highest rates of biodiversity loss. Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP, a regional network of more than 140 civil society organizations, attributed this to habitat loss and degradation due to deforestation, land use, climate change and pollution. Loss of biodiversity equates to a decline in ecosystem sustainability; they are mutually reinforcing.

Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP, ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh, Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, and People’s Health Movement assign the primary responsibility for extensive ecosystems damage to private and State-sponsored

**15 Ibid.**
business and industry, identifying that much of the world’s resources are now controlled by trans-national corporations, and as AIPP stated, “economic development is driven by unbridled resource extraction.” Peoples’ Sustainability Treaties articulated that a course correction toward sustainability requires “a radical rethinking of the entire paradigm of development.” In particular, a paradigm shift must occur in the practices of the agricultural, extractive, and energy industries, as well as in consumption and production more generally.

While appreciating some elements of the related recommendations in the four reports to the Secretary-General, civil society organizations advocated for more comprehensive, global to local strategies to enable this paradigm shift. Organizations spoke about critical dimensions overlooked by the four reports, including “the role and rights of Indigenous communities and other natural resource dependent poor,” as highlighted by Asian Dalit Rights Movement and ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh. Contributors provided specific guidance on:

A. Food sovereignty: a key to sustainable agriculture
B. Protecting against exploitation by the extractive and energy industries
C. Addressing inequities in resource use
D. Evaluating new and emerging technologies

A. Food Sovereignty: A Key to Sustainable Agriculture

Large-scale agriculture is a significant cause of environmental stress. Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP cited that the industrial food system uses 70-80% of the world’s arable land, accounts for almost 80% of fossil fuel consumption, and uses 70% of water in agriculture and causes 44-57% of greenhouse gas emissions annually. Large-scale agriculture is dependent on synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, which pollute groundwater. It is a leading driver of deforestation. In addition, contributors detailed that large agri-business has also been responsible for extensive human rights violations, particularly with regard to land and water grabbing.

Therefore, many contributors, including Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development stressed the need to empower the small-scale farmers who form the backbone of the agriculture sector, both in Asia and globally, through the framework of food sovereignty. Asian-Pacific Resource & Research Centre for Women (ARROW) described food sovereignty as a holistic concept that “asserts the right of people to define their own food systems, and puts people who produce, distribute and consume food at the center of discussions on food systems and policies, rather than the corporations and market institutions.” The concept of food sovereignty was defined by Via Campesina in 1996, and incorporates six principles: food as a basic human right; agrarian reform; protecting natural resources; reorganizing food trade; ending the globalization of hunger; social peace; and democratic control.16

Contributors criticized the reports to the Secretary-General for a narrow focus on increasing agricultural yield. Third World Network stressed that national policies should help to build the productive capacities of small-holder farmers, to ensure they are able to produce staple crops independently and maintain food sovereignty, and are not overrun by large-scale agri-business. Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP added that emphasis on yield can drive dependence on pesticides and synthetic fertilizers that are harmful to human health and the environment. This civil society network urged that the post-2015 development framework should instead include a global goal that promotes agro-ecological and organic agricultural methods, which also increase yield. In line with this proposal, Asian Peasant Coalition recommended the report “Agroecology and the Right

16 The six principles of food sovereignty as defined by Via Campesina are described in detail in this document.
to Food,” by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, which explains that in recent agro-ecological projects in 20 African countries, average crop yields more than doubled over a period of 3-10 years.  

The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development contended that the following economic dynamics limit food access and must be addressed urgently: the production of cash-crops for export at the expense of food self-sufficiency; speculative investment in food commodities that results in steep increases in the world price of staples; and private investors seizing control of millions of acres of farmlands in poor countries to take advantage of rising farmland values. Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP specified that economies must instead adopt the following practices, which follow the principles of food sovereignty:

- Ensure equitable control and access over wealth and productive resources such as land, energy, water, seeds, forests and livestock; ensure the right to food, developed through bio-diverse, ecologically sound, humane practices and methods; respect the rights, cultures, languages and wisdom of Indigenous peoples and local communities; and acknowledge already existing sustainable practices by people in various fields of agriculture, sustainable consumption, environmentalism, and recycling.  

Tebtebba identified the recognition of land tenure rights as critical for ensuring food sovereignty and preventing land grabbing and land degradation.

Third World Network recommended the promotion of public programmes on food stockholding, which benefit small producers through price support, as well as poor consumers. This organization also suggested that the post-2015 development framework should encourage all countries to adopt the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Right to Food Guidelines. Similarly, Diverse Voices and Action for Equality called on governments to strengthen the FAO World Food Security Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, by reconfiguring them “toward enforceable multilateral agreements, including on responsible agricultural investment.”

B. Protecting Against Exploitation by the Extractive and Energy Industries

“Of the more than a hundred corporate mines currently operating in Indigenous territories in Asia, there is no single mining company that has undertaken a credible process of obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of the affected Indigenous peoples.” - Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact

According to several contributing organizations, extractive industries in Asia are committing widespread human rights violations, displacing millions of people and destroying land, water and sacred sites. Indigenous people are disproportionately affected. This is partly because the rich deposits of resources are located on Indigenous lands, but it is also because the extractive industries target lands occupied by communities that lack financial means to resist. This does not mean these communities acquiesce. “Amazing people’s movements have responded to extractive industries and resource-grabbing, and have resulted in a contestation of who the resources belong to,” underscored South Asian Network of Gender Activists and Trainers (SANGAT). However, many of the Indigenous people resisting peacefully have suffered serious violation of their civil liberties, stated South Asian Alliance for Poverty Eradication (SAAPE).

18 This statement is drawn from the Kathmandu Declaration of the Asia-Pacific Major Groups and Stakeholders Regional Consultation Meeting with UNEP, submitted by Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP.
Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact has documented harassment, threats, and killings of Indigenous peoples for their resistance against extractive industries in the Philippines. Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact also explained that the governments of the Philippines and Indonesia have “provided security services to these companies in the face of growing resistance of Indigenous peoples and other affected communities,” while in Cambodia, “the government absconds on its responsibility to resolve these issues.”

The construction of large dams for hydropower has also caused massive displacements, loss of livelihoods, and food insecurity for Indigenous peoples across Asia, as described by Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact. This organization quoted a World Commission on Dams report conclusion from 2000: “Due to neglect and lack of capacity to secure justice because of structural inequities, cultural dissonance, discrimination and economic and political marginalization, Indigenous and tribal peoples have suffered disproportionately from the negative impacts of large dams, while often being excluded from sharing in the benefits.”

Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact expressed profound concern that large dams are considered “green technology” under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), fostering plans for hundreds of large dams across Asia that pose serious threats to Indigenous peoples.

In light of these realities, ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh questioned why none of the four post-2015 reports to the Secretary-General called on Member States to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples, including to self-determination, to free, prior and informed consent, and to land, territories and resources, as recognized in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international instruments. It is essential that the post-2015 development framework include such a call, particularly because, as Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact stressed, “Achieving ‘national development’ has always been the excuse to justify the massive exploitation and appropriation of Indigenous lands, territories and resources.” Tebtebba added that national laws relating to Indigenous peoples’ rights are sometimes in conflict with existing permits and licenses held by mining, timber and plantation corporations. Member States must resolve such matters to avoid fueling conflict, participants underscored.

In the Pacific, as described by Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP, issues of concern include deep sea mining in areas beyond national jurisdiction, as well as unregulated, unauthorized and underreported fishing. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality called for meaningful indicators in the post-2015 agenda to address extra-territoriality and hold States and industries to account. Pacific Youth Council and Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD) shared some useful resources for accountability in these sectors:

2. The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, a global standard for “monitoring and reconciling company payments and government revenues from oil, gas and mining at the country level.” APWLD highlighted that Timor-Leste has developed a particularly interesting Transparency Model, which includes an online Transparency Portal.
3. The Nauru Agreement, which Pacific States use to work together as a regional block for negotiations on issues pertaining to fisheries, including unregulated, unauthorized and underreported fishing.

---

C. Addressing Inequities in Resource Use

Contributors emphasized that strategies to address global environmental challenges must seek to rebalance inequities in resource use. Civil society networks advocated urgent action on climate change and the degradation of ecosystems, including through the implementation of sustainable consumption and production practices and the polluter pays principle. Contributors strongly rejected any measures that involve the financialization of nature, such as payment for ecosystem services, and presented examples of preferred natural resource management approaches, particularly the conservation and sustainable use practices of local communities and Indigenous peoples.

As Diverse Voices and Action for Equality described, “The devastating consequences of climate change, ocean acidification and ecosystem degradation are impacting on communities that have had little role in destroying them,” such as Pacific small island developing States where people are facing sea level rise, droughts and other climate related threats. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality emphasized that the post-2015 development agenda must respect the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and polluter pays, and called on Member States to urgently reach agreement on an ambitious international climate change treaty that stipulates that developed countries “re-pay their climate debt by transferring environmentally-sound technologies and financial resources required for South States to shift to low-carbon growth.”

Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP recommended that the polluter pays principle be translated into quantifiable goals, for example through the eradication of fossil fuel subsidies. APWLD welcomed the HLP’s recommendation to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, but stated that its proposed indicator is “too vague and won’t compel change.” APWLD specified that this indicator should “at least cover the eradication of subsidies to fossil fuel industries and should ideally end subsidies to carbon emitting multi-national corporations.” Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP also urged the elimination of fossil fuel subsidies, with “due consideration to their impact on marginalized sectors.”

ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh, Peoples’ Sustainability Treaties, and the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development expressed appreciation for the references to sustainable production and consumption in the SDSN and HLP reports, but called for their significant elaboration in the post-2015 development framework. ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh suggested that all countries require “systems of both incentives and disincentives, including social and legal means of achieving sustainable consumption lines,” and that a significant target for reduction in materials and energy consumption is needed in the global North – perhaps by a factor of 10. Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP underscored the need for implementation of the 10 Year Framework of Programmes for Sustainable Consumption and Production, with enhanced involvement of civil society.


---

20 This statement from DAWN was drawn from the Pacific Civil Society Statement to the May 2013 Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) Dialogue on Conflict, Peace & Security. DAWN submitted this document to the consultation.
In response to the SDSN report’s recommendations for the implementation of payment for ecosystem services (schemes that provide financial incentives for natural resource management), the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development articulated a strong rebuke:

[T]he commodification of nature and ecosystems creates more incentives for privatization and accumulation of these resources which, in turn, fuels further resource exploitation and displacement of many marginalized communities (e.g. forests turned into biofuels or industrial tree plantations). There is also a denigration of the intrinsic values of nature and erosion in the stewardship role of communities. Creating market values for natural resources will make them more vulnerable to powerful investors who prioritize profits over people and the environment.

Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP added that payment for ecosystem services can divide communities. This network asserted that ecosystems conservation is most effectively achieved through the traditional expertise of Indigenous and local communities.

To protect biodiversity and respond to climate change impacts on communities, Tebtebba emphasized two indispensable management processes: the *ecosystems approach* – the primary framework for action under the Convention on Biological Diversity – and *territorial management planning*, in which communities map their resources, consider sustainable use studies, and develop plans to holistically manage the physical, social, political, and spiritual dimensions of a territory. Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact elaborated that territorial management planning is critical to ensuring the right of self-determination for Indigenous peoples in the management of resources within their territories.

“Traditional knowledge – especially of Indigenous women – has been critical in the food security of Indigenous peoples, enhancement of biodiversity, the practice of herbal medicine, and the innovation of Indigenous technologies,” stated Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact. “All of these have contributed to sustainable development.”

D. Evaluate New and Emerging Technologies

ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh observed that although many forms of traditional knowledge have sustained human societies for millennia, the four post-2015 reports to the Secretary-General tend to focus on the development of modern science and technology. Particularly in the energy and agriculture sectors, many new technologies are being promoted as contributions to sustainable development, identified Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP. Civil society organizations urge thorough and independent evaluation of new technologies to prevent unintended harm to human health and the environment. “The capacity of international institutions, national governments and local communities to evaluate new and emerging technologies needs to be strengthened,” Asia-Pacific CSOs@UNEP asserted. This civil society network pointed to the 2012 UNEP Foresight Report, which proposed the adoption of regional or international mechanisms to assess technologies. This network further noted that Paragraph 275 of the agreed outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development refers to the necessity to build the capacity to evaluate the impacts of new and emerging technologies at the national and regional levels. ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh asserted that the post-2015 development agenda should value and support not only new technologies, but also the knowledge of local communities and Indigenous peoples as crucial to sustainability and equity.

---

21 [http://blog.ecoagriculture.org/2012/03/14/forest_peoples_programme/](http://blog.ecoagriculture.org/2012/03/14/forest_peoples_programme/)
IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

In April 2000, the UN Commission on Human Rights recognized “that transparent, responsible, accountable and participatory government, responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people, is the foundation on which good governance rests, and that such a foundation is a sine qua non for the promotion of human rights.” Civil society networks including Asian Dalit Rights Movement identified that the observance of several internationally recognized human rights laws compels participatory governance, transparency and accountability. These recognized rights include: direct participation in government and public affairs, access to information, and access to justice and administration. Accordingly, consultation respondents argued that the processes to design and implement the post-2015 development agenda must observe these “access rights” in order to be legitimate and effective.

The HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports each proposed a goal to address the transformation of governance, and included associated targets that either refer to, or correlate with, the promotion of participation, transparency and accountability. Civil society networks welcomed the significant majority of these proposed targets, particularly Global Compact target 10a: “Raise awareness and implementation of all UN human rights conventions and instruments among all people and at all levels of governance.” Consultation contributors conveyed, however, that “such articulations are not enough,” as Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) underscored. Commitments must include stable and sustainable financing, Asian Dalit Right Movement and ASPBAE emphasized. The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development stipulated, “The post-2015 development agenda should provide robust accountability and transparency frameworks to ensure delivery of commitments and that services reach targeted populations.” Civil society networks therefore strongly criticized the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports’ reliance on voluntary commitments and self-regulation, particularly with regard to the role of the private sector.

Civil society networks presented recommendations regarding:

A. Effective accountability mechanisms and conventions on access rights
B. Expanding and empowering public participation
C. Strengthening corporate accountability
D. Improving monitoring and measurement

A. Effective Accountability Mechanisms and Conventions on Access Rights

Civil society networks, including the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development, argued that accountability for the post-2015 development agenda would be best served by adopting a rights-based approach for the framework, and linking development policies to human rights accountability mechanisms. Asian Development Alliance praised the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process in the Human Rights Council, and called for a UPR for progress on goals in the post-2015 framework.

---

Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP advocated for the post-2015 development agenda to promote implementation of Principle 10 of the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, which recognizes the rights to access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters. This network highlighted the European Economic Commission’s Aarhus Convention as an example of a regional agreement to realize these rights. The Aarhus Convention “links environmental rights and human rights; acknowledges that we owe an obligation to future generations; establishes that sustainable development can be achieved only through the involvement of all stakeholders; links government accountability and environmental protection; and focuses on interactions between the public and public authorities in a democratic context.”

Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP highlighted work by The Access Initiative to encourage governments in Asia and other regions to adopt similar protocols to ensure access rights.

B. Expanding and Empowering Public Participation

Several organizations expressed appreciation for the HLP report’s target 10c: “Increase public participation in political processes and civic engagement at all levels.” As APWLD articulated, however, stronger specificity is required. People’s Health Movement outlined, “Civil society participation in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies and programs is essential in making the new development agenda work for all.” Pacific Disabilities Forum added, “Partnership has to be equal, empowering, enabling, genuine, recognizing what we bring to the table in these discussions.” The HLP also identified that the development agenda should be “realized through the equal partnership of all stakeholders” in the Communiqué from its meeting in Bali in March 2013.

“There is a need for more than consultations,” Asian Development Alliance underscored, calling for effective mechanisms for civil society engagement in policy-making at the national level. As Asia Peasant Coalition asserted, “It is the people who suffer hunger, poverty, disparities and repression who have the legitimate right to set the agenda of overcoming their problems.” ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh emphasized that a genuine decentralization of power and decision-making to the local rural and urban community, in the form of direct democracy (where people can vote directly on key policies), is urgently needed.

Pacific Disabilities Forum and GEEJ Pacific identified that capacity-building for diverse public participation is also critical. As the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development declared, “People should be empowered to claim their rights.” People’s Health Movement expanded on these points: “The new development agenda should ensure that mechanisms and resources are put in place that will empower civil society to build solidarity and security which entail democracy, accountability, probity, justice and equity.” According to Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP, the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is “a role model in terms of providing an equal platform for civil society to engage with governments” for national, regional and global decision-making.

The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development commended the SDSN report for citing that voting rights and shares are imbalanced in many global institutions, and that this problem must be corrected for the institutions to “speak and act with greater legitimacy.” As the SDSN report conveyed, “Global problems require global institutions that are representative of the world they seek to govern.”

---

C. Strengthening Corporate Accountability

According to the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports, the private sector must thrive and play a principal role in development efforts for post-2015 objectives to be achieved, including through public-private partnerships. These reports also recommended that the post-2015 development framework should consist of voluntary goals and targets, and rely on corporate self-reporting and self-regulation. Although they refer to the need for accountability, the reports do not make specific recommendations regarding accountability measures. Civil society networks strongly criticized these “loose” and “weak” approaches because, as APWLD argued, self-regulatory systems “have failed to ensure the private sector is accountable for any environmental, social and human rights harm.” In addition, as SANGAT explained, political contestation is occurring over voluntary Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives in Asia because corporations are pursuing their own interests via these programmes, and not the interests of communities or marginalized people. The post-2015 development framework must therefore clearly define what is expected of the corporate sector, including objectives for CSR, and to incorporate robust corporate accountability mechanisms, participants urged.

Regarding the definition of accountability, Diverse Voices and Action for Equality contended that an important correction must be made to the HLP report assertion, “Accountability must be exercised at the right level: governments to their own citizens, local governments to their communities, corporations to their shareholders, civil society to the constituencies they represent.” Corporations are not only accountable to their shareholders; they are also accountable to everyone impacted by their activities, contributors stressed.

As a next step, it is necessary to increase institutional capacity to hold corporations accountable. Asia Pacific CSOs@UNEP advocated for the UN to reestablish the UN Center for Transnational Corporation (UNCTC), “to monitor the activities and practices of TNCs and recommend specific accountability mechanisms that will be respected by all UN Member States.”

For maximum effectiveness of corporate accountability efforts, civil society networks suggested that the post-2015 framework should incorporate targets and accountability mechanisms that focus on corporate activities that destroy the environment and violate human rights. Diverse Voices and Action for Equality indicated that the post-2015 framework must include targets for “changing the structural conditions that advance large-scale land, water and ocean appropriation by private interests” and for regulating mining, gas and oil projects. APWLD called for a distinct extractive industries accountability mechanism within private sector accountability mechanisms.

The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development praised the report “Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations ‘Protect, Respect and Remedy’ Framework” by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises. However, as the civil society network identified, principles are not enforceable unless accompanied by a range of measures to strengthen accountability and regulation of the corporate sector, including legislation, court adjudication and penalties for violations. As SAAPE expressed, “It should be the norm for governments to be vigilant, and those businesses that do not conform should be brought under punitive measures.”

---

D. Improving Monitoring and Measurement

Many participants, such as Peoples’ Sustainability Treaties, stressed that the post-2015 framework must include a blueprint for monitoring delivery on commitments and national progress toward targets. Contributors emphasized the importance of using qualitative as well as quantitative analysis, and disaggregated data.

Development must be measured beyond economic terms, insisted several civil society networks, who questioned the use of the World Bank’s benchmark of US$1.25 per day for the measurement of poverty, and the use of Gross National Product (GNP) as the dominant progress metric. “The UNDG report recognizes that countries like India failed to make rapid growth more inclusive and equal,” said Asian Dalit Rights Movement. Further, GEEJ Pacific described that as Fiji has experienced economic growth, workers’ rights have eroded, and ecologically destructive industries have expanded, in the name of development.

The multi-dimensional nature of poverty necessitates holistic solutions, monitoring and evaluation, APWLD explained. ICCA Consortium/Kalpavriksh recommended the use of genuine progress indicators and measures of well-being which gather qualitative and quantitative data, building on existing proposals including the National Accounts of Well-being, Genuine Progress Indicators, Ecological Footprint, the Kingdom of Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness Index, and others.

Pacific Disabilities Forum urged that measurements and indicators must be inclusive, adding, “The tracking of discrimination indicators are very important in the spirit of leaving no one behind.” The Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development elaborated that “there is a need to disaggregate goals by gender, ethnicity, caste, age, and geography as an essential means to identify inequalities and ensure equity in resource mobilization and allocation.” Vulnerabilities within populations must be examined and considered when assessing the overall capacity of nations to meet development goals, added RESURJ.

Diverse Voices and Action for Equality called for targets and related measurement of “the extent to which any economic policies are damaging to local communities including migrants, fisherfolk, forest and Indigenous peoples, pastoralists, and many other marginalized communities, where women are at the forefront of both production and ‘care’ work.” Additionally, Asian Dalit Rights Movement asserted, “Tackling social exclusion is crucial for the achievement of every goal.” This network recommended qualitative measurement of: political and social deprivation; means of participation; rule of law; administrative transparency; marginalization of social groups; cohesion in society, and vulnerability – including lack of social protection.
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I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

Latin American participants echoed the call for the post-2015 development agenda to strive for transformative change, in line with the Post-2015 High-Level Panel (HLP) report’s statement that “there is a need for a paradigm shift,” but the nature of the shift that civil society networks seek departs from the HLP’s principal objective of “sustained prosperity.” Civil society networks articulated sustainable development priorities in terms of social and environmental justice, human dignity, and human rights.

Addressing this imperative from a Latin American perspective prompted participants to wrestle with the many paradoxes, challenges and opportunities that characterize the region today. Historically, most Latin American countries have suffered from some of the highest rates of inequality in the world. Therefore, poverty cannot be eradicated (as called for in the HLP report) without dramatically addressing massive inequalities in the region, emphasized many participants. For example, the Consejo Internacional de Educación de Personas Adultas argued: “To eradicate extreme poverty is not enough; there is a need to address the structural processes that generate unequal and discriminatory societies.” Likewise, the Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of the Social Solidarity Economy (RIPESS) suggested that the two are inseparable: to end poverty, the root causes of poverty must be examined; and poverty is the result of a structural system that generates inequalities. For the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Advisory Group to UN Women, this assessment necessitates “a process for the region to really deepen this proposal of combatting inequality as a fundamental axis of public mobilization.”

At the same time, civil society networks observed that many countries in Latin America are among the few in the world that have seen inequalities decline in recent years – albeit from very high starting points. Since 2000, these countries have reduced extreme poverty and improved access to health, education and basic infrastructure services, largely through the use of innovative models and policies that are more inclusive of social groups, and more comprehensive – bringing together economic, social, environmental and cultural considerations. These approaches include active redistributive policies by the State, such as conditional cash transfer programmes (although not without their own controversies, as discussed in section II of this report), increases of the minimum wage and other innovative social and economic policies. On this basis, many participants felt that Latin America has much to contribute to the post-2015 agenda, and found the proposals in the reports too timid, if not a “step backward” from what is already practiced in many parts of the region.
Participants articulated some contradictions and challenges in Latin America that must be addressed through fundamental changes to the region’s current development paths. For example, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN) noted “the paradox that we are living in the region today”: the many active State policies in the region, including increased social expenditure, compare favourably with other regions of the world trapped in an austerity paradigm, but these are financed through rents from extractive industries and commodity exports, a model that is not sustainable. Many consultation contributors denounced the severe impact of extractives and mono-crop agricultural policies on affected populations, especially on the livelihoods of small farmers and Indigenous communities, and on the environment (as discussed further in sections II and III). This model has also led to recurring territorial conflicts, militarization of affected zones, and repeated human rights abuses, respondents elaborated.

As emphasized by Mesa de Articulación de Asociaciones Nacionales y Redes de ONGs de América Latina y el Caribe, participants urged movement away from “reprimarización” – the increasing reliance on the production of primary commodities – that economies on the continent have returned to in recent decades. A truly transformative post-2015 development agenda must promote the diversification of national economies toward more localized, employment-intensive forms of production and consumption, and away from resource-intensive means. The agenda must also call for more significant redistributive and inclusive policies, including universal access to essential public services, urged civil society networks.

According to participants, power relations in the region must be rebalanced on a number of fronts:

A. Reform of the trade and investment architecture
B. Reform of the tax and financial/monetary architecture
C. Political and media reform
D. Space for alternative development paradigms
E. Empowering the social and solidarity economy

A. Reform of the Trade and Investment Architecture

Many participants were concerned with the primary reliance that the HLP, Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Global Compact reports gave to foreign trade and investment as engines of change and development. Most countries in the region have entered into various forms of trade and investment agreements that have reduced the scope for governments to regulate foreign investors in the public interest. As expressed by Social Watch, Coalición de los Pueblos por la Soberanía Alimentaria (PCFS) and DAWN, free trade and investment treaties have benefitted large transnational corporations (TNCs), particularly those in agriculture and extractive industries, at the expense of the environment on which so many social groups depend for their livelihood, including women and Indigenous peoples. PCFS explained that these “free trade agreements (FTAs) are supra-national, so national laws have been modified to accommodate the interests of the large corporations.”

Social Watch emphasized that some of the governments in the region are now taking the initiative to review these agreements as a necessary basis to change the “rules of the game” with respect to foreign investors – which can currently sue governments for new regulations (such as health regulations related to the tobacco industry) in international arbitration tribunals. This initiative could be an important contribution of the region to the global post-2015 discussion, Social Watch suggested.
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For the Caribbean region, the Association of Development Agencies (ADA) underscored that foreign trade is not serving as a vehicle to grow out of poverty and finance development under the current free trade system. Exporting is very difficult as standardization requirements in the markets of developed countries in North America and Europe act as non-tariff barriers to trade. In addition, cheap imports abound, as the Caribbean is becoming “a dumping ground in this part of the world,” especially for highly subsidized products from industrialized countries. ADA expressed concern that Caribbean countries have little voice in international financial and trade organizations: “Reform of institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO) needs to be addressed,” and the “blanket market-fundamentalist approach” to international trade must be shifted toward environmental sustainability and poverty reduction. RIPESS added that this shift requires effective democratization of these institutions.

Alianza por la Diversidad en América Latina argued that the United Nations should take a much clearer stand with respect to “flawed policy prescriptions” on trade and investment promoted by the IMF, World Bank and WTO, and should play a truly independent role in defending the public vis-à-vis commercial interests, “which it is currently not doing.” Alianza por la Diversidad en América Latina noted that independent oversight of the activities of TNCs cannot be relegated to national governments, citing the need for an agency like the UN Centre on Transnational Corporations, which operated as an independent UN entity until 1992. For Plataforma Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Desarrollo (PIDHDD), the UN should establish groups of lawyers that could provide quality assistance to developing countries in managing their relations with TNCs.

DAWN called for the implementation of: policies to promote investments that would contribute to the diversification of the productive structure toward more sustainable economic sectors that are employment- and knowledge-intensive, with low environmental impact; value-chains that have local and national bases, complemented by regional production networks; and intra-regional trade in national currencies (rather than dollar-based trading); as well as strong norms and mechanisms regarding the social and environmental impact of investments.

Many participants, especially those representing small farmers and Indigenous peoples, argued that reform of the trade and investment architecture in the region cannot be discussed in isolation from the increasing militarization and human rights abuses related to extractives and land acquisitions. These issues are discussed in more detail in sections II and III.

B. Reform of the Tax and Financial/Monetary Architecture

Taxation, financial regulation and new financial/monetary instruments were seen by many participants as essential tools to support more redistributive policies and to enable a truly transformative economic agenda for sustainable development in the region. Relief and cancellation of unsustainable or illegitimate debt are also essential.

Articulación Feminista Regional had recently followed inter-governmental deliberations on sustainable development goals at UN Headquarters, and expressed concern about the frequent references to private investment as a source of income for social objectives. This civil society network asserted that instead an agenda is needed for “wealth redistribution within our countries.” A number of organizations, including DAWN, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO), and Rio+Vos/Asociación Nueva Vida proposed a range of concrete tax measures to combat inequalities and generate income for social and environmental goals, including: taxes on international financial transactions; closing tax havens; taxes on capital gains with the financial sector; taxes on real estate; and taxes on concentration of wealth and resource ownership.
RIPESS proposed goals and targets to frame these redistributive policies and combat excessive concentrations of wealth and land ownership: “One universal objective could be ‘maximum limits on wealth per person or enterprise’: Less than x% of the persons or enterprises cannot own more than y% of GDP/land/economic power. With this, we are addressing land reform, economic power in terms of donations to electoral campaigns and privileges of those in political office or close to political elites.”

Gender, Economic and Ecological Justice (GEEJ) – LAC proposed policies and regulations on private finance that would discourage speculation and favour long-term investments aligned with the human rights and environmental commitments of States. This would require strengthening the new regional financial and monetary architecture under construction in parts of Latin America, including by: creating a regional monetary fund that would pool foreign currency reserves to combat speculative attacks and to compensate for economic asymmetries within the region; extending intra-regional trade through regional complementary currencies; and bolstering the newly created Banco del Sur (“Bank of the South”) as well as ensuring that it is oriented to finance key development objectives, such as food sovereignty, health and education – as a counter-point to the other development banks in the region that are primarily financing infrastructure geared for exports.” The overall thrust of the new regional financial architecture should be to promote economic activities that reduce wealth concentration and biodiversity depletion, such as initiatives of agro-ecology, solidarity economy and peasant agriculture, respondents asserted. RIPESS emphasized the need for effective local access to these alternative regional funds, to ensure local control of project funding allocations and monitoring of effectiveness. This could involve channeling these resources through local community development banks mentioned in the section below on the social and solidarity economy.

Reform of the financial architecture also means that the international community must durably address the problem of unsustainable and illegitimate debt. Social Watch notes with concern that in the HLP report, “the goals on solving the debt problem and of attending the special needs of least developed countries, land-locked countries and small island States that were included in MDG 8 have dropped off the list (without saying why).” ADA noted that debt levels in the Caribbean had reached levels that are so unsustainable that children not yet born already carry the burden of [impossible] debt repayment. Some Latin American countries, such as Ecuador and Argentina, have been able to take unilateral measures to reduce their external debt burden, which freed up resources to invest in development and poverty alleviation programmes. However, in the absence of an independent and fair international debt resolution mechanism, countries remain vulnerable to asymmetric power relations between debtors and creditors.

Some participants also referred to the need to integrate discussion of “ecological debt” in the post-2015 development agenda, which is discussed in more detail in section III.

C. Political and Media Reform

Many participants noted that extremely high levels of inequality in the region go hand in hand with a historical concentration of political, economic, and media power in the hands of a few major conglomerates. FLACSO noted that in each of the Latin American countries, the media is controlled by a small number of families, and the ties between the media and commercial interests are very strong. Accordingly, GEEJ-LAC proposed policies that would favour the democratization of the media and counter the concentration of their ownership. RIPESS mentioned that laws regulating media have been approved or are being discussed in several Latin American countries, including Ecuador, Argentina and Uruguay.
To prevent excessive concentration of political power, Coordinación de ONG y Cooperativas (CONGCOOP) proposes a goal to democratize political parties and the financing of electoral campaigns with the following targets: 80% of political party campaigns must come from a common public pool; and only 20% from the private sector or individuals. Political reform is key to strengthening democracy and to addressing social inequalities; according to DAWN, the reform of campaign finance should be accompanied by mechanisms to increase the political participation of women, Afro-descendent people, Indigenous people, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, and other social groups that have been socially excluded.

D. Space for Alternative Development Paradigms

Many Latin American participants were adamant that the post-2015 agenda should not lead to a homogenized view of development. FLACSO explained: “For Latin America, one cannot speak of universal goals without considering diversity. Respect for diversity practically does not appear in the reports. It is as if the whole world should convert to one global labour and consumer market.” FLACSO provided the example that mainstream development thinking assumes that continued urbanization is inevitable just because it has been occurring since the middle of the 20th century. This assumption should be countered, FLACSO asserted, and measures that support rural habitation such as the “right to land – to work and live on” should be promoted. Developing this point further, Campaña Latinoamericana por el Derecho a la Educación (CLADE) stated: “We are preoccupied with the homogenizing perspective in the [HLP] report. It takes it for granted that development is the equivalent of “modern, urban and global” societies, and ignores totally the diversity of cultures and peoples.”

Many Latin American participants put forward the Indigenous concept of “Buen Vivir” (living well) – a worldview and development paradigm based on the objective of harmonious relations between individuals and community, between humans and nature, and which features in the new constitutions of Ecuador and Bolivia. For example, the Ecuadorian constitution of 2008 outlines seven dimensions of “The Rights of Buen Vivir,” related to: water and food; a clean environment; communication and information; culture and science; education; housing; health; and work and social security. Ecuador’s “National Plan for Buen Vivir 2009-13” seeks to implement a “change of paradigm from development to buen vivir” through 12 national objectives, each involving specific policies and targets.

E. Empowering the Social and Solidarity Economy

A number of participants emphasized the need to include the social and solidarity economy (SSE) as an alternative economic model that can address all three dimensions of sustainable development. DAWN emphasized that “the objectives of the economy have to be the sustainability of life and social redistribution. If one wants to meet sustainable development goals, the social and solidarity economy provides a much more direct and universal path.”

The SSE movement is a worldwide phenomenon, growing particularly fast in Latin America. It promotes economic relations based on shared values such as cooperation rather than competition, reinvestments and redistribution of surpluses for social and environmental goals rather than profit maximization, democratic economic management, and respect for ecological limits. It is growing from the diverse experience of myriad initiatives involving networks of cooperatives, self-managed enterprises and other groups and associations involved in activities of production of goods and services, distribution, solidarity finances and responsible consumption. RIPESS noted: “The SSE thus expands the range of actors that promote development far more than a corporate-centered approach. Its initiatives intrinsically address cultural diversity, social inclusion,
gender equality, environment protection, active citizenship, work and economic activity. It is not only expressed by its initiatives, but also by a systemic development strategy based on the reproduction of life rather than capital.”

RIPESS noted a number of governments in the region have begun to adopt policies and programmes to empower this movement. In Brazil, for example, the National Solidarity Economy Secretariat of the Federal Government promotes a range of SSE initiatives, including support to community development banks (owned and managed by the community, creating local complementary currencies to stimulate localized production and consumption), rotational funds, local credit cooperatives, and other “solidarity finance” institutions and mechanisms. SSE can offer entry points for strategic questions in the post-2015 debate, RIPESS argued:

> Economic democracy is a key condition for sustainable development. Is the country’s economy a Solidarity, Fair, Transparent and Democratic Economy? In Ecuador, for example, this was established in their new constitution, where it is stated that the economy of that country is a solidarity economy. This led to the creation of laws and public policies directed to solidarity economy, which in turn provide better access for the people to control the economy, and also reduce inequality. Solidarity economy is based on self-management and fairness both inside the economic activity as well as with respect to the community and the market.

RIPESS further noted that the Director-General of the International Labour Organization (ILO) viewed SSE as a better solution to the crisis in Europe than austerity.27

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

Participants agreed that the post-2015 agenda must be firmly rooted within the framework of the international human rights obligations of States. From Latin American and Caribbean perspectives, the following major human rights themes emerged:

A. Policy coherence and human rights
B. Human rights versus corporate rights
C. The need for social inclusion and non-discrimination
D. The right to education
E. The right to decent work
F. The right to health

A. Policy Coherence and Human Rights

Many participants expressed concern that the proposed goals in the HLP report emphasized civil and political rights and did not treat the full gamut of economic, social and cultural rights in the same measure. Social Watch said that prioritizing some rights over others could mean “creating a separate category of ‘important rights’ that will be promoted with funds from development cooperation while those not mentioned will fall into political oblivion.” Such a practice, it was noted, would be against the Vienna Declaration of the 1993 UN Conference on Human Rights, which states under paragraph 5: “All human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated. The international community must treat human rights globally in a fair and equal manner, on the same footing, and with the same emphasis.”

27 ILO Director-General Guy Ryder, Opening remarks to the UNRISD Conference on Social and Solidarity Economy, 6 May 2013.
Some participants expressed concern that the discussions about the post-2015 agenda in New York are disregarding existing international agreements on human rights. “Within the United Nations, the difference between what is discussed in Geneva, where the governance of the international human rights architecture is based, and New York is worrying,” observed DAWN. “We need to take the more progressive parts, which are the Special Rapporteurs and other human rights monitoring and follow-up mechanisms in Geneva, as the basis. It is not acceptable to have to discuss things that are already obligations of States.Human rights are not moral aspirations, they are truly legal obligations, and our role is to push for policy coherence” within this framework.

Civil society networks mentioned a variety of human rights instruments, including the *Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights*, adopted in September 2012, whose principles encompass the responsibility of private companies, trade and investment agreements, and the need for impact assessments of macroeconomic policies on the human rights of the poor. Contributors also referred to the *Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, which Social Watch noted is not only relevant for sustainable development, combatting poverty and respecting human rights, but also ensuring that monetary, trade, investment and financial policies are in compliance with globally agreed human rights obligations. This instrument was adopted with significant support of Latin American governments.

### B. Human Rights Versus Corporate Rights

Participants were concerned that the HLP report gives the impression that the rights of people and corporations should be on the same footing. For example, Social Watch notes that: “in target 1.b under the ‘end poverty’ heading, the HLP proposes to ‘increase the share of women and men, communities and businesses with secure rights to land.’ Equating land access and rights of women, men and communities with business ‘rights’ to land only serves to legitimize the massive corporate land grabbing underway across the globe.” DAWN also condemned this conflation of human rights and business rights, adding that such an approach would exacerbate existing inequalities and further violate the rights of women and communities to land, food, water and other essentials.

As discussed in section I, many civil society organizations from the region decried the fact that international trade and investment agreements give excessive rights to corporations, often at the expense of human rights. This bias was seen to be also manifest in the increased militarization of zones where there are clashes between the concessions given to large companies and the human rights of local farmers and Indigenous people affected by displacements, loss of livelihoods, sexual exploitation, or contamination of their local environment. For example, Coalición de los pueblos por la soberanía alimentaria (PCFS) explained that in one country of Central America, “each time there is a demonstration or mobilization against a mining company, the Government declares a state of emergency or siege.”

GEEJ-LAC called for a number of measures in this regard, including: the establishment of a UN Special Rapporteur on extractive industries and human rights to investigate and overturn the impunity that prevails in territories with mega projects; monitoring by the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty of the social impacts of extractive industries in the region; and reversing the process of “criminalization” of public protests, especially in zones subject to environmental conflicts.

These issues related to extractive industries and land grabs are further discussed in section III.
C. The Need for Social Inclusion and Non-Discrimination

Civil society networks emphasized that the post-2015 development agenda needs to focus more on the issue of non-discrimination and social inclusion. Many people continue to be neglected in social development programmes and have diminished or no access to justice – particularly Indigenous and Afro-descendent women, adolescent girls, the elderly, Indigenous peoples, LGBT people, and migrants among others. The Caribbean Civil Society Coalition on Population and Development pointed to the reports’ lack of mention of the specific discrimination faced by LGBT people “and how this affects development”; CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network advocated that the post-2015 framework should “at a minimum call for non-discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity expression.” Also, CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network raised the concern that migration and the human rights of migrants – of particular relevance to the Caribbean “as one of the most migratory regions of the world” – have not received adequate attention in the post-2015 discussions thus far. Axios made a special case for more active representation and participation of young people, including in the design of the post-2015 agenda, as it is through the young that societies are transformed.

Some countries in the region are using innovative policies to promote more inclusive development in communities in ways that respect their needs and culture, and also supports their sustainability. A Brazilian law requires public schools to buy at least 30% of meals for students from local small farmers, and pays 30% more to these farmers if the products are organically grown. These policies promote economic activity in the community, provide children with healthy locally-produced food, increase inclusivity, and the community as a whole benefits. Red de Mujeres Afrolatinoamericanas, Afrocaribeñas y de la Diáspora referred to Nicaragua’s Autonomy Law and other legislation adopted to grant more autonomy to Indigenous peoples so that they can take their own decisions regarding common property holdings and the like. Colombia, Honduras and Panamá have adopted similar legislation.

Women’s Rights and Gender Equality

Coalición Mundial por Los Bosques, Río+Vos/Asociación Nueva Vida, CLADE, Articulación Feminista Regional, DAWN, CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network, and Red de Mujeres Afrolatinoamericanas, Afrocaribeñas y de la Diáspora noted the many references to the human rights of women and girls in the HLP and SDSN reports, but were critical of the treatment of gender issues in some of the proposed goals. For example, the HLP report statement that “Women with equal rights are an irreplaceable asset for every society and economy” (page 34) and the SDSN report association of sexual and reproductive health and rights with “rapid voluntary reduction of fertility” (target 2c) equate to the instrumentalization of women for development gains, as CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network highlighted. Civil society networks perceived these “utilitarian approaches” as regression on women’s human rights, which have already been comprehensively defined in several UN agreements.

Social Watch elaborated on the criticism of the SDSN report’s proposed target 2c regarding “rapid voluntary reduction of fertility,” explaining that it “blames the poor (where high fertility is more frequent) for the problems that are in fact caused by unsustainable consumption and production patterns in the North and not by the poor,” and this “turns the clock backward to pre-Cairo times” (the 1994 UN Conference on Population and Development). Articulación Feminista Regional asserted that this type of policy approach would have a significant negative impact on the reproductive rights of women.

Participants specified that if development goals are to be adopted, the achievement of gender equality should
be a separate goal and incorporated in all other goals. Indicators to capture and measure progress toward the full realization of women’s human rights should be defined within all pillars of sustainable development. CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network identified that the gender equality goals and targets must further “address the ways in which gender inequality persists despite gender neutral language in law and de jure equality of access in many areas.” Consultation contributors also stipulated that the post-2015 development agenda must tackle women’s unequal access to economic livelihood opportunities, formal employment, and a living wage; it must also recommend laws and policies that support women’s unpaid care work and recognize – with indicators – its contribution to sustainable development.

Mindfulness of women’s care work is critical across all development policy-making. As DAWN pointed out, some innovative social protection policies in Latin America that have reduced poverty and inequality overall have increased women’s unpaid care work. For example, the Brazilian “Bolsa Familia” conditional cash transfer programme requires health check-ups and sending children to school, and this often necessitates long travel to the closest facilities, led by women. DAWN suggested: “eliminating all conditionalities that increase unpaid and care work.” RIPESS pointed out that there is a growing movement around the world, including in Brazil, to guarantee a basic minimum income for every citizen, free of conditionalities. These transfers would be recouped through taxes for individuals above a certain income bracket.

**Non-Discrimination Regarding Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity**

According to the Coalition of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Travesti, Transexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTTTI) Persons from the Americas, in the countries of Central America, “discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity has increased, with acts of verbal and physical violence, torture, cruel and inhuman treatment, forced disappearances, and killings as the extreme expression of such violence.” Further, the coalition explained that eleven Caribbean countries “criminalize and prohibit consensual same-sex intimacy, crossdressing ‘for an improper purpose,’ as well as entry of foreigners based on their homosexuality,” and other Caribbean governments “exclude LGBT persons from protections against discrimination.”

The post-2015 development agenda must adopt a rights-based approach to lead countries such as those in the Caribbean sub-region to establish mechanisms to ensure equal rights for all citizens and eliminate violence and discrimination. As the Coalition of LGBTTTI Persons from the Americas explained, in the Caribbean, “access to justice and the mechanisms of human rights protection are weak, constitutional protection excludes sexuality, access to supranational human rights defense mechanisms is limited, and Caribbean governments have declared that human rights protection of sexual minorities requires a ‘political mandate’ of the majority.” The coalition calls on all Members of the Organization of American States to ratify and implement the recently adopted **Inter-American Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination, and Related Forms of Intolerance** and to enact national legislation to ensure the human rights of LGBTTTI persons, including access to health care, education and justice.

DAWN contributed that Uruguay has adopted new policies to counter discrimination against LGBT persons. As young transgender and transsexual people in Uruguay live in extreme poverty due to structural discrimination, the Ministry of Social Development recognized the need to include them in cash transfer programmes without any conditionality attached. The associated food card allows people to buy food in “fair trade” small and medium-sized shops, so this programme also helps to boost the local economy and create jobs. It is also an entry point for young trans people to benefit from other programmes, such as education and employment and access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health services.
D. The Right to Education

Many civil society networks were critical of the approach to education in the HLP report, which they see as framing education as a vehicle to fulfill labour market needs. CLADE mentioned that this “reductionist view” of education derives especially from the World Bank and other international financial institutions (IFIs), where education for development has been boiled down to employability and measurable outcomes in “reading, writing and basic math,” which is inconsistent with the much wider and development-friendly view of education put forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and many other human rights instruments. The goal of education is for the full development of the human being and society; education is also important to strengthen democracy and peace, respondents stressed. For Asociación Latinoamericana de Educación Radiofónica (ALER) and many others, education is the key to transform values, to form attitudes, to promote democratic and cultural practices for self-empowerment; it also provides the basis for transformation with full participation and inclusion. CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network underscored that education is a human right, and this “needs to be made explicit” in the post-2015 development framework.

A goal on education should include targets for adequate remuneration and benefits for teachers (FLACSO), as well as good working conditions, and overcoming illiteracy among youth and adults (CLADE). RIIPESS advocated for the post-2015 framework to acknowledge the role of popular and traditional knowledge in preserving history and culture “as a valid world view and source of knowledge alongside formal academic sciences.” It should also promote non-discrimination and a culture of human rights, stated CLADE, and “should furthermore make explicit the obligation of States toward free education, at least in compulsory stages and progressively beyond, as stated in General Observations of the Committee of Economic, Cultural and Social Rights.”

ALER and Consejo Internacional de Educación de Personas Adultas (ICAE) referred to the concept of lifelong learning, which according to ICAE, must be based on four pillars: learning to know, to do, to be, and to live together. CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network pointed to the tension between the HLP report’s goal 3, “Quality Education and Lifelong Learning,” and the targets within that goal, which stop at universal lower secondary education. For the Caribbean, the education target has to be more ambitious than lower secondary school “because only university level education makes a difference in women’s earnings. [...] InterAmerican Development Bank (IADB) research has demonstrated that in the region men (as a group) with only primary education outearn women (as a group) with secondary education,” CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network explained. So if we want to link the education goal to the gender equality goal, for the Caribbean the target cannot be universal lower secondary education,” CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network explained. CPDC called for enhanced quality of education, and Caribbean Regional Youth Council advocated improvements in technical and vocational education in order to match skills with employment opportunities.

E. The Right to Decent Work

Social Watch and Americas Union Confederation drew attention to the HLP report’s use of the concept of “good jobs,” derived from the development model of the World Bank, rather than the concept of Decent Work adopted by members of the ILO. Contributors explained that “good jobs” refers to sufficiently remunerated employment, but leaves out other essential dimensions of the Decent Work Agenda, namely rights at work, social protection and social dialogue.

Grupo Género y Macroeconomía América Latina (GEM-LAC) referred to additional barriers that women face to guarantee equal access to decent work. In this regard, the current social organization of care, which relies mostly on women’s unpaid care work, should be transformed to provide “social co-responsibility” in care. Lack of social care services results in lower labour market participation of women, especially of poor women. Expansion of access to care services, as well as the improvement of actions to facilitate work-life balance (including those that are the responsibility of the enterprises) should be part of the goals to improve women’s livelihoods, contributors argued.

DAWN mentioned the Government of Uruguay’s new social policies as an example of forward-looking employment practice in the region for social inclusion and expansion of social protection. The government has adopted an active approach to employment, establishing wage councils, promoting maternity/paternity leave and care services, and enacting measures so that domestic, rural and other workers in the informal economy can claim employment benefits. For RIPESS, the social and solidarity economy model opens room for work opportunities in non-profit economic initiatives in the production of goods and services, which should be fully recognized and supported under the law. Recognition of this right would provide a foundation for workers to advocate for public policies supporting the development of these kinds of initiatives.

Due to high levels of unemployment, particularly of youth in the Caribbean region, participants pointed to the importance of encouraging entrepreneurship. “Some governments are trying via short-term employment schemes” to stimulate employment, Caribbean Regional Youth Council observed, but in addition individuals are starting their own businesses, using social media for marketing, and implementing other innovative measures to fill some of the employment gaps. CPDC recommended that within this context, the post-2015 agenda should promote entrepreneurship. RIPESS cautioned, however, that there are many forms of “entrepreneurship” and care should be taken not to promote entrepreneurial models that replicate the flaws of the current economic system.

F. The Right to Health

A few contributors addressed health issues, recognizing that there has been marked improvement in terms of access, and identifying that the concept of universal access to health is being implemented in some States such as Mexico and Brazil. Yet, the quality and range of services must be improved, as RIPESS noted with respect to the Universal Health System in Brazil. For DAWN and Articulación Feminista Regional, it is important that the post-2015 development agenda include stronger emphasis on ensuring adolescents’ and women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights, which were subsumed under “maternal health” in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). DAWN added that an “MDG approach” tends to create silos and obscures the need to implement more comprehensive agreements such as the Programme of Action of the 1994 UN Conference on Population and Development.

Articulación Feminista Regional observed with concern that there is an increasing presence of the private sector in the provision of social services, including health and education. These services are recognized entitlements and human rights throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region, and as such they must be the responsibility of the State. Contributors expressed that further discussion is needed to ensure that the principles of universality, equity and quality are kept in the development vision. To ensure social justice, the right to quality health care must be assured for girls and women, including access to all the methods available to control their fertility, to safe and adequate maternity care, and to prevention and treatment options for HIV and other sexually transmitted infections. Women and girls must also be free to decide on all matters of their sexuality free from coercion, discrimination and violence.
III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources

As mentioned in sections I and II, civil society organizations from Latin America expressed deep concern at the unsustainable use of natural resources in the region, even when these serve to finance programmes that help reduce poverty and inequality. Civil society networks call on the post-2015 development agenda to:

A. Increase regulation of agro-industrial plantations and extractive industries
B. Promote a “commons” approach to natural resource management
C. Promote land reform and small-scale agriculture, especially agro-ecology
D. Address climate change and the historical responsibilities of industrialized countries
E. Implement clean technology transfer and assessment
F. Reform sustainable development governance
G. Further assess the concept of development within planetary boundaries

A. Increase Regulation of Agro-industrial Projects and Extractive Industries

Contributors were very critical of current standard practices of natural resource-based industries, including in large scale agro-industrial projects, mining, and hydrocarbons (oil and gas). As noted earlier, these projects are causing enormous environmental damage and pushing many individuals – and in some cases whole rural communities – off the land on which they depend for a living. This is not only the case in many parts of Latin America; in the Caribbean, extractive industries, over-fishing, tourism, sugar, and other economic activities “have resulted in economic growth in periods of boom but [also] long-term ecological imbalance” as well as biodiversity loss and pollution, Caribbean Policy Development Centre (CPDC) identified.

Caribbean Youth and Environment Network highlighted the impunity enjoyed by extractive industries due to the high level of money they bring in to Caribbean countries: “Some quarries are not adhering to rules and certificates of environmental clearance”; mining and other extractive industries face little intervention from Caribbean governments, participants asserted. Greater transparency and regulation will be necessary to protect ecosystems in the region from pollution and exploitation.

Local communities in many countries are organizing to face these issues and propose solutions. FLACSO and ICAE mentioned that communities in Chile affected by large mining and agro-industrial projects are organizing under the ILO’s Convention 169, which gives them legitimacy and strength to face the companies behind the natural resource-based projects, defend their interests and work with them if necessary.

B. Promote a “Commons” Approach to Natural Resource Management

Global initiatives aimed at curbing environmental degradation, such as Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD), REDD+ and the Green Economy, have not succeeded, according to many participants who equated these initiatives with the “financialization” or “commodification” of nature. According to Alianza por la Biodiversidad en América Latina, GFC, Río+Vos/Asociación Nueva Vida and PCFS, these initiatives are contributing to climate change, promoting monoculture, contaminating water, displacing people and turning public goods like water into financial assets for large companies and speculators.
Instead, a “commons” approach is needed for natural resource management, civil society networks advocated. RIPESS proposed as an objective for the post-2015 agenda that commons, such as water, public land, energy, air, forests, and biodiversity “can never be considered as merchandise.” The “commons” should be given clear legal status, argued Consejo Internacional de Educación de Personas Adultas, citing that the global movement for the recognition of access to clean water as a human right should be replicated for other common goods. According to RIPESS, the social and solidarity economy “is a concrete way to guarantee the management of the commons in community, through local economic initiatives owned by community members, without a profit-centered approach. In many cases it proves to be more efficient than a profit-oriented approach.”

Related to the commons approach, participants noted that the “Buen Vivir” approach adopted in Bolivia and Ecuador includes the “Rights of Nature.” FLACSO and ALER explained that the vision that nature has its own rights goes beyond the traditional consideration of nature as a set of resources at the disposal of human beings. In this context, nature is respected and its value to sustain all life is recognized. This view sets the foundation for a new attitude toward nature and much more conscious and sustainable use of its resources.

### C. Promote Land Reform and Small-Scale Agriculture

Many organizations emphasized the need to prioritize agrarian reform and support to small-scale agriculture (especially peasant agriculture and agro-ecology). According to Alianza por la Biodiversidad en América Latina, it is critical to establish policies that truly support sustainable agriculture, and in particular small-scale agriculture of small farmers and Indigenous peoples, because they produce the food for 70% of humanity.

Proposed measures included land reform that would involve land redistribution to landless farmers, as well as strengthening the rights of small farmers to work the land, and protecting them against land grabs. Civil society networks also proposed the public procurement policies noted in section II that favour the purchase of food for public schools from small-scale and family farms. Some participants, such as CPDC proposed the concept of food sovereignty to guide national and international policies affecting agriculture. The concept of food sovereignty was defined by Via Campesina in 1996, and incorporates six principles: food as a basic human right; agrarian reform; protecting natural resources; reorganizing food trade; ending the globalization of hunger; social peace; and democratic control.29

### D. Address Climate Change and the Historical Responsibilities of Industrialized Countries

A number of participants raised the challenges facing the region related to climate change. For example, as CPDC explained, the high ratio of coastline to land in the Caribbean region makes these islands particularly vulnerable to natural disasters and unpredictable and violent climate patterns with hurricanes; many people feel the impact of climate change in their daily lives, with farmers and fishermen noting a decline in yields and crop quality due to changing weather patterns, ADA described.

Many participants emphasized the historical responsibilities of industrialized countries to take the lead in emissions reduction and provide the necessary resources and technology transfers for developing countries to make the transition to a low-carbon economy. Río+Vos/Asociación Nueva Vida and Social Watch noted with concern that the HLP report does not clearly spell out the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities or the Polluter Pays Principle, which were reaffirmed at the 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20).

---

29 The six principles of food sovereignty as defined by Via Campesina are described in detail in this document.
RIPESS emphasized the need to change unsustainable consumption and production patterns, including by reducing (and in some cases banning) chemical pollutants, conserving energy, reducing packaging, and developing guidelines for prolonging the life span of manufactured products, along with sanctions against companies that engage in the “programmed obsolescence” of their products.

Río+Vos/Asociación Nueva Vida added that the concept of “ecological debt” should become part and parcel of the post-2015 discussions and should be additional to the need for developed countries to meet their long-standing commitments to provide 0.7% of gross national income toward official development assistance (ODA).

E. Implement Clean Technology Transfer and Assessment

The post-2015 development agenda must ensure that developing countries have access to clean technologies, civil society networks asserted. Some organizations noted that the free trade and investment agreements discussed in section I act as an obstacle to clean technology transfer, notably because of restrictions related to intellectual property rights and local content requirements. These would need to be revised along with other restrictions that prevent governments from making policies designed and applied for sustainable development objectives.

Consultation contributors also called on the United Nations to establish an independent technology assessment mechanism to assess the ecological and health impacts of new technologies (even when these are portrayed as “green” by the producing companies). Alianza por la Biodiversidad en América Latina noted that paragraph 275 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document recognizes the importance of strengthening technology assessment capabilities at international, regional and national levels, notably with regard to the impact of new technologies on biodiversity and health.

F. Reform Sustainable Development Governance

A number of participants were concerned that 20 years after the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development, there is still a lack of coherence between economic policies and social and environmental objectives. Iniciativa Construyendo Puentes (ICP) proposed a global pact, including TNCs, government and civil society, to address economic, social and environmental issues in a holistic manner and promote the sustainable use of natural resources so as to protect the planet for future generations. ICP advised that reform of the international sustainable development architecture (the transition from the UN Commission on Sustainable Development to the High-Level Political Forum as agreed at Rio+20) should enable monitoring and enforcement of environmental agreements and standards around the world. At the national level, governments should establish national sustainable development commissions to holistically address economic, social and environmental issues, which are currently managed under different ministries, ICP added.

G. The Concept of Development Within Planetary Boundaries: Further Assessment Needed

Referring to the SDSN report, Social Watch noted that it makes reference to “planetary boundaries” but does not adequately address what this implies:

If planetary boundaries are recognized, two issues emerge: a) How to allocate among countries the limited “budget” of global emissions (if the boundary is climate change) or of catches (if the boundary is fish depletion)
that are possible within a limit that allows nature to regenerate and how to ensure compliance; and b) How to distribute the burden of adjusting to those boundaries or of mitigating the effects of having trespassed them.

Social Watch elaborated that SDSN’s proposed goal 2 to “Achieve development within planetary boundaries” does not set or call for global limits or disciplines, but rather simply indicates that countries should report on their contributions to those boundaries, which does not ensure that the total stays within limits.

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

According to civil society networks, the topics of participatory governance, accountability and transparency are closely intertwined with the issues discussed in the previous sections of this report. These topics were seen as essential dimensions for rebalancing power relations, fulfilling human rights and ensuring responsible management of natural resources. Consultation contributors focused on:

A. Accountability and transparency of a strong democratic State
B. Corporate accountability and transparency
C. Stronger civil society participation mechanisms
D. Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation

A. Accountability and Transparency of a Strong Democratic State

Civil society networks repeatedly expressed concern regarding the tendency within the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports to reduce the role of the State, and to transfer more responsibility to the private sector. As noted earlier, in Latin America the opposite is happening: the role of the State is increasing – in transferring resources to the most vulnerable, in reducing inequalities, in providing more inclusive social services. According to CLADE and many others, the State should be the main actor in development because only the State can guarantee human rights for all, address inequalities, and redistribute resources. Additionally, Caribbean Regional Youth Council asserted, “Accountability and transparency on the part of government will be key because the MDGs have no binding authority to ensure that the citizens actually get those deliverables.” To rectify this, “there should be a measure of whether governments are working toward making their commitments,” CPDC added.

CPDC pointed to the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, established in Busan in 2011, as a guiding framework of international standards, including regarding transparency and accountability. Other contributors, such as DAWN, did not find the Busan agreement a progressive platform as it favours “building blocks” of voluntary commitments between “donors” and “recipients.” DAWN sees this as part of a broad trend toward voluntary initiatives that contribute to eroding multilateralism, and prefers the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) as a locus of accountability for the international development architecture.

As an example of a useful accountability measure, the Caribbean Civil Society Coalition on Population and Development referred to the Freedom of Information Act in Trinidad, which enables public access to documents from government and state agencies. Similarly, RIPESS pointed to the access to information laws in Brazil and Uruguay as “very good references on openness and transparency measures for universal public access to government budgets, contracts and other actions.” For some participants, democratic governance and accountability cannot be addressed in isolation from relations of power in society. As mentioned in section
I, CONGOOP proposed measures to increase transparency in the financing of electoral campaigns, including 20% caps on contributions from the private sector and individuals.

The strengthening of substantive democracies is a core element of an environment that is conducive to the realization of human rights, explained CLADE: “This principle is clearly expressed in the Carta Democrática Interamericana, approved in 2001, which specifies the democratic regime as a necessary condition for the realization and fulfillment of human rights, and underlines that this implies going beyond representative democracy to substantive democracy.”

B. Corporate Accountability and Transparency

Contributors observed that while the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports devoted much attention to government accountability, they do not adequately address the issue of corporate accountability; as one contributor expressed, it is as if the impact of the activities of private companies on the economy, society and the environment were neutral. This lack of accountability must be corrected to move toward equitable and sustainable development, respondents stressed. In addition to corporate accountability to shareholders, as mentioned by the HLP, CatchAFyah Caribbean Feminist Network pointed to the necessity to ensure that businesses are also accountable to workers and to the communities in which they operate. Corporations must report on the social and environmental impacts of their activities, in addition to their financial performance, CPDC added.

RIPESS referred to target 10a in the SDSN report, which calls for not only governments but also businesses to commit to sustainable development goals, with “transparent monitoring, and annual reports – including independent evaluation of integrated reporting for all major companies starting no later than 2020.” This is “an important goal,” RIPESS said, “but it’s not only about reporting ‘corporate social responsibility’ but also providing governance information from all enterprises: who owns it, with what percentage of the votes in the decision-making processes? This should be required not only for enterprises that sell stocks in the market, but for all big enterprises.”

RIPESS also suggested that product labels should not be one-sided – they should not only identify “good” production traits such as organic or fair trade, but also “bad” ones, such as usage of agro-toxics or unjust employment practices.

C. Stronger Civil Society Participation Mechanisms

The essential role of civil society and social movements in promoting development at the local, grassroots level, and in monitoring and ensuring accountability of government and the private sector is widely recognized. In that context, most contributors from Latin America and the Caribbean that have participated in the various consultations for the post-2015 development agenda expressed sharp criticism at how the process has been handled. They contended that the private sector has been given much more space and attention than has civil society.

PIDHDD and others advocated the implementation of mechanisms to improve transparency in the post-2015 agenda decision-making processes, so that civil society organizations can see how their inputs are being used. Further, CPDC said that there is a need to institutionalize civil society participation. Civil society must be included in monitoring processes, including of global partnerships and the private sector in particular, added Caribbean Civil Society Coalition on Population and Development. A good model for civil society participation
that could be emulated, according to Alianza por la Diversidad en América Latina, is the Civil Society Mechanism used by the FAO Committee on World Food Security, which involves a sophisticated system of balanced civil society representation, where non-governmental representatives engage on a par with governments in draft negotiations, while maintaining the inter-governmental nature of the body with voting rights reserved for governments. ADA recommended the incorporation of a civil society charter to codify participation and speaking rights.

### D. Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation

Civil society networks stressed that development progress must be holistically measured, using diverse indicators and disaggregated data to assess the many dimensions of development. Social Watch strongly criticized the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports’ use of the World Bank’s US$1.25 per day benchmark in targets for eradicate poverty by 2030: “This not only reduces poverty to only one of its many dimensions (income), but also lowers the bar to ensure that it meets the present trends and thus allows for victory to be proclaimed in 2030, without having to change anything in the global and national economies.” RIPESS also expressed concern that the US$1.25 does not capture major differences in purchasing power, not only between countries, but also within countries; for example, the cost of living in Sao Paulo is considerably higher than in the rural areas of Brazil.

DAWN argued that more indicators are needed, both quantitative and qualitative, to monitor advances in and obstacles to gender equality. In this vein, many contributors mentioned that indicators are also needed to measure informal barriers to accessing to health services, including sexual and reproductive health services, and identifying the ways in which women and girls experience multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination.

It is now widely recognized that traditional measures of development, particularly GDP, do not reflect the well-being of people or the environment. Consejo Internacional de Educación de Personas Adultas praised UNDP’s Human Development Reports and Human Development Index as improved means for assessing human development, because they incorporates variables beyond purely economic indicators, such as access to health and education. Additionally, RIPESS proposed the use of indicators to measure happiness and well-being. Latin America is advancing in this area. Indicators include components that go beyond personal income and consumption, and measure community links, participation in society, and relations between generations, among others. RIPESS suggested additional indicators to measure the impact of local programmes that promote production, trade and consumption processes within the same communities, referred to as “short-circuit programmes” that are part of the SSE. For example, the effectiveness of such policies could be indicated by measuring the share of public sector purchases that are granted to local producers, including small farmers and family businesses.

Caribbean Civil Society Coalition on Population and Development emphasized the value of the HLP report’s concept of a “data revolution” as particularly necessary in the Caribbean region, which lacks “accurate, timely data and statistics.” DAWN cautioned that there is a need to have a strategic conversation on indicators to measure intersecting inequalities, quality, empowerment, well-being, etc., which are core elements to assess progress on human rights. This conversation should be based on the priorities of the people, and the needs and capacities of governments to gather and manage data and targets.
I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

European and North American civil society networks also echoed the calls in the Post-2015 High-level Panel (HLP) and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) reports for structural transformation, and emphasized the major responsibilities that their governments have to correct the long-standing structural and systemic issues, including what they described as a flawed trade and financial system that favours the global movement of goods, services and finance, often at the expense of preserving and revitalizing the socio-economic fabric of local communities and societies. Participants stressed that these systemic imbalances are central drivers of inequality, poverty, and environmental degradation, and as such, must be forcefully addressed by the post-2015 agenda. Contributors proposed alternative economic approaches that observe human rights and give rise to social and environmental well-being. Civil society networks contributed perspectives on:

A. The need for holistic development approaches within an integrated agenda
B. Addressing systemic obstacles to sustainability
C. Alternative economic approaches that align jobs and sustainability

A. The Need for Holistic Development Approaches Within an Integrated Agenda

Civil society networks conveyed that the post-2015 reports to the Secretary-General included several strategic elements that should be carried forward in the post-2015 development agenda, but that overall, the proposed approaches are not comprehensive enough, and do not tackle critical structural issues. Global Policy Forum (GPF) suggested that:

The HLP and SDSN reports identify the need for a structural transformation, but they fail to follow up and to come to comprehensive policy recommendations and policy goals. They talk about the need for a universal agenda, an integrated agenda, but the policy descriptions and the proposed goals reflect the traditional concept of goals for the poor countries of the South. We need an integrated agenda that looks also at the problems of the so-called industrialized countries.... When aiming for a really holistic approach to development, this future set of what we call ‘Universal Sustainability Goals (USGs)’ must go beyond poverty and environmental goals and must include, for instance, the economic and financial systems, and goals with regard to peace, disarmament and demilitarization, even though it may be politically difficult.
The concept of Universal Sustainability Goals was developed by the Civil Society Reflection Group on Global Development Perspectives,\(^{30}\) of which GPF is a member, and includes six dimensions in an integrated manner: dignity and human rights for all; equity, equality and justice; respect for nature and planetary boundaries; peace through disarmament, demilitarization and non-violent dispute settlement; fair economic and financial systems; and democratic and participatory decision-making structures.

Participants emphasized the need for the post-2015 framework to include not only goals, but also address root causes of perverse patterns such as unsustainable production and consumption, rising inequality, impoverishment, social exclusion, environmental degradation and conflict. Young people are particularly concerned “whether any of these initiatives will have any lasting impact, or actually be sustainable, if they don’t directly address the fundamental issues of inequality,” emphasized USA Cooperative Youth Council. “Youth are not necessarily just interested in talking about sanitation or clean water; they also want to talk about the underlying inequalities, or larger systemic issues.” “Focusing the international discourse mainly around goals is dangerous, since it is also necessary to target the obstacles, the constraints and the political barriers with regard to the post-2015 framework and the implementation of any future sustainability goals,” GPF argued. Likewise, the Northern Alliance for Sustainability (ANPED) insisted on the importance of “policy coherence\(^{31}\) for sustainable development, which means focusing more on the barriers and blockers of sustainable development instead of only promoting it.”

**B. Addressing Systemic Obstacles to Sustainability**

European and North American civil society networks were concerned that many of their governments have a primary responsibility for addressing systemic obstacles to sustainability, but have so far failed to take decisive action on a number fronts, and in many cases, have promoted policies that are exacerbating problems. Of particular concern is the way in which governments have handled the global economic crisis. Civil society networks criticized the use of austerity measures and promoted several public financing measures to alleviate debt while also supporting sustainable development objectives. Participants also called for measures to reduce corporate concentration of power and influence, and discussed strategies for rebalancing the trade and investment architecture.

**Alternatives to Austerity: New Financial Mechanisms**

According to many participants, the austerity policies\(^{32}\) pursued in a particularly brutal fashion in Europe exemplify a failed economic paradigm that includes the doctrine of transferring responsibilities of the State to the private sector. Civil society networks noted that the HLP and SDSN reports, within an overall call for “structural transformation,” emphasized an expanded role for the corporate sector in development. Participants said this approach has many flaws and proposed alternatives.

---


\(^{31}\) “Policy coherence means different policy communities working together in ways that result in more powerful tools and products for all concerned. It means looking for synergies and complementarities and filling gaps among different policy areas so as to meet common and shared objectives.” Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Policy Framework for Policy Coherence in Development – Working Paper No. 1,” (2012), p. 3.

The European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) described the major negative impacts that substantial public budget cuts in many parts of Europe are having on jobs and public services, including healthcare, education and culture, as well as development cooperation budgets. They also undermine “the ability of the European Union and its Member States to shift towards a greener and more sustainable low-carbon economy.” Natural Capitalism Solutions described the prevailing paradigm as one in which “corporate profits are subsidized, losses are socialized, the commons are privatized, and the ‘too-big-to-fail’ are bailed out.” It noted that the financial crash of 2008 and its aftermath caused US$50 trillion and 80 million jobs globally “to evaporate.” While living standards continue to decrease for many people, with record high unemployment in a number of developed countries and workers facing wage cuts, as Natural Capitalism Solutions observed, corporate profits continue to grow, with the bankers responsible for the crisis continuing to receive large bonuses. Arguing that the systemic risks leading to the crisis have not been adequately addressed, Natural Capitalism Solutions warned: “a collapse-prone world is a bad platform for development policy.”

GPF asserted that the power of “too big to fail” institutions must be reigned in through enforceable national and international regulations that would sanction them as “too big to allow”: financial institutions must be prevented from becoming so large that they pose systemic risks if they go bankrupt, and financial markets must be reorganized in the interest of people in both the global North and South.

Civil society networks discussed measures to end the current socialization of the cost of corporate malpractices and to generate resources to finance jobs in carbon-reducing sectors domestically, as well as to fund sustainable development goals globally. Natural Capitalism Solutions called for policies that would enable “bankrupt communities around the world to escape the crushing debt that stifles efforts to build prosperity.” Referring to the subprime mortgage crisis in the United States that sparked the global financial crisis and subsequent recession that began in 2008, Natural Capitalism Solutions suggested that “it would have been far better to pay people at risk of defaulting on their mortgages to enable them to pay the banks and stay in their homes, than to bail out the banks, and then allow them to hoard the resulting cash.”

Participants did not accept arguments favouring austerity on grounds that governments are over-indebted and face the sanctions of financial markets if they do not put their public finances in order. They argued that debts can be reduced and public finances increased through measures such as an international financial transactions tax (currently planned amongst 11 EU Member States), progressive taxation on corporations and wealthy individuals – and preventing tax evasion through international agreements involving country-by-country reporting of corporate earnings, automatic exchange of information on bank holdings and the eventual abolition of tax havens. Many participants also urged governments to eliminate subsidies to socially and environmentally harmful industries, and to redirect the more than one trillion US dollars spent on them towards sustainable development objectives, as discussed further in section III.

The financial crisis also triggered governments to shift discussions on international financing for sustainable development away from overseas development assistance (ODA) toward greater domestic resource mobilization and private sources. InterAction identified that this is inherently dangerous because it is “letting governments off the hook without a clear sense of how financing will be available, or coordinated, or measured.” InterAction added that there is a tendency “to leap to foreign direct investment (FDI) as a proxy for ODA, as if all transfers of resources were inherently good.” While acknowledging that some value chains
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are aligning to provide some social good, InterAction warned, “The problem is that there aren’t clear established norms [to assess] what is working and what the return is on the social side.” These issues will become all the more complex as the question of financing sustainable development goals (SDGs) interfaces with the negotiations on climate finance, InterAction highlighted.

For GPF, “the post-2015 agenda must come to a new global system of financial burden-sharing beyond ODA.” Citing that the HLP and SDSN reports mainly refer to the 0.7% target and to aid-based development financial transfers, GPF advocated an alternative approach:

Instead, we must come to a rights-based approach of financial transfers. There must be a new mandatory system, a fiscal equalization scheme, or a compensation scheme, to pay off climate debt or other forms of debt... A future development agenda, which is holistic, must go beyond the traditional division of the world between developed and developing countries and must go beyond this traditional concept of ODA. It must find new forms of financial transfers, which imply the commitment and the obligation of the rich countries to pay more to the poor countries than they do now.

On the resource allocation side of the equation, InterAction called for “budget transparency, the publishing of budgets, the ability of local civil society to engage in a budget process and the degree to which those budgets focus on different populations.” GPF suggested that a key challenge that must be addressed in the post-2015 discussions, particularly by the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing, is aligning public budgets with sustainability. “SDGs only make sense when they are reflected in sustainable development budgets,” GPF asserted.

**Addressing Corporate Concentration of Power**

A number of participants emphasized the need to address what they described as the excessive concentration of power and influence of major multinational corporations. Taking agribusiness firms as an example, ETC Group referred to a report it had just produced “Putting the Cartel before the Horse” which asserts that 6 transnational corporations control well over 50% in every sector of agricultural inputs at the global scale—ranging from plant breeding and commercial seeds to agro-chemical sales. “Most economists still would argue that when you get above 50% for 6 companies you end up in a cartel environment, and secondly, of more concern, you actually reduce the level of innovation among companies. We can’t afford to be in that situation.”

ETC Group argues that these global cartel arrangements make national competition policy insufficient and called on the United Nations to create a platform for dialogue on these and related issues, such as intellectual property rights, which it described as “perhaps the most powerful form of subsidy when it comes to creating corporate concentration and reducing innovation....”

Participants were equally concerned by the degree to which concentration of corporate power is distorting democratic policy-making. Referring to “powers and interests against sustainability,” ANPED argued that sustainability is “not a technical problem, it’s a political problem.” GPF mentioned that Goldman Sachs has been lobbying against the financial transactions tax in the European Union and that other major businesses are trying to resist country-by-country reporting required by US legislation, not only by lobbying but also through lawsuits. Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) warned that engaging the corporate sector cannot just be about incentives and voluntary initiatives: the post-2015 discussions must include the need “to take harsh
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measures vis-à-vis entrenched interests – tobacco, big pharmaceuticals, fossil fuel industries, and extractive industries – which are highly mobilized and determined to protect their own profit-oriented business model.” The “problem of the business lobby” must be addressed as part of the post-2015 discussions, many participants insisted.

Rebalancing the Trade and Investment Architecture

As in other regions, European and North American civil society networks stressed the need to rebalance the trade and investment architecture on a number of fronts.

CCPA welcomed the SDSN report’s proposed target to reform international trade and investment rules to ensure they are consistent with sustainable development goals, but warned that the various free trade agreements that European and North American countries are parties to, or in the process of negotiating, “are moving in the opposite direction.” Participants discussed the many restrictions that current international trade and investment agreements impose on the ability of governments to regulate FDI in the public interest without facing the risk of very expensive lawsuits in international arbitration panels, which tend to side with the rights of investors. (These restrictions are explained in more detail in the Latin America, Asia and Arab regional reports for this consultation.)

CCPA remarked that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) “is attempting to create an alternative dialogue around those excessive mechanisms” and that a number of countries are leading the way on re-establishing State regulatory authority: “Australia has renounced investor-State dispute settlements in many of its agreements. Simultaneously, South Africa is reviewing all its bilateral investment treaties that were signed in the post-apartheid era,” while a number of Latin American countries “are revoking some of these treaties and attempting to develop alternative sets of rules that are more deferential to State authority.” As part of the post-2015 development agenda, these agreements must be reviewed to ensure that they do not act as an obstacle to meeting sustainable development goals.

Participants also discussed how indiscriminate trade liberalization and free trade agreements exacerbate inequalities and undermine livelihoods. Social-Ecological Fund NGF, based in Kazakhstan, observed that regional trade integration among countries of the former Soviet Bloc and other trading partners in Eurasia have mostly benefitted the larger economies, and have increased economic asymmetries among countries. Economies with weaker productive capacities, especially those relying on natural resource extraction, are unable to compete with economically more advanced trading partners. Fair Trade Federation observed that the “widespread dumping of corn crops in Mexico,” resulting from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), “has led to artificially depressed prices, leaving Mexican farmers without markets.”

The undermining of development objectives by trade and investment agreements is an example of a lack of policy coherence, participants said. CONCORD pointed out that at the level of the European Union, “there is a legal obligation for policy coherence for development…. At a very minimum, EU policies should not undermine the EU’s development objectives.”

According to Fair Trade Federation, “the primary problem with these agreements is that they do not give power to local communities or producers.” Therefore, many small producers in the South have turned to fair trade certification schemes, which cut through many intermediaries and provide them with fair incomes and security through price guarantees. Fair Trade Federation describes the fair trade movement in the following terms: “We have envisioned fair trade as an alternative system of trade that overturns traditional power
structures, and in doing so seeks to eradicate poverty at the very local level.... It was a movement that at the grassroots level was about small buyers from the global North forming relationships with small producers from the global South, usually artisans and farmers, in order to sell their products in developed markets. Fair trade works within global trade, but at the same time, seeks to create real alternatives where trade is based on people and relationships rather than on products and profit.”

The fair trade movement is part of the wider social and solidarity economy movement discussed in the section below. It prioritizes more localized forms of trade with much shorter supply chains than in more conventional trade. Fair Trade Federation added in this regard: “Most of the success in poverty alleviation, in terms of trade, happens at the local level, when producers can own their production and as much of the supply chain as possible, and where the latter is as short as possible. This is where trade becomes transformative.”

C. Alternative Economic Approaches that Align Jobs and Sustainability

The HLP and SDSN reports emphasize the need for economic structural transformation to meet the imperative of sustainability. They also repeatedly indicate that economic growth is essential to development. Participants found these two assertions to be incongruent. GPF expressed concern that “structural transformation” could end up meaning “more or less doing business as usual, but in a more eco-efficient way, which is not sufficient.” CONCORD remarked: “The HLP report focuses on the need for fast growth of the traditional sort, but at the same time it talks about the need for a rapid economic transformation in the face of limited resources, and the two don’t really tally.” Many participants echoed the view expressed by CONCORD that growth should not be an aim in itself; the objective should be the realization of all human rights and all aspects of human well-being.

Natural Capitalism Solutions quoted John Fullerton who argues that the growth imperative “is fundamentally misaligned with the finite boundaries of the biosphere,” and asserts that the global economy must evolve to “align itself with this scientific reality,” and “address other critical challenges, most notably the grotesquely inequitable distribution of wealth, intractable poverty in much of the world, and chronic unemployment.” Natural Capitalism Solutions advocated for the models of regenerative economics and finance, which are described in John Fullerton’s paper, “A Summary Call to Regenerative Capitalism.”

Many participants emphasized that a holistic understanding will benefit development far more than pitting economic, social and environmental concerns against each other. This often occurs with the subject of jobs. “Growth” is often used as a proxy for “job creation,” despite the fact that the two do not always correlate, and then a false dilemma is framed between job creation and environmental protection. Natural Capitalism Solutions suggested that “jobs have become the currency of politics worldwide, but the typical prescription of growth at any cost turns out not to be best way to create durable, well-paying jobs.”

An example of this was presented by the International Organization of Industrial, Artisanal and Service Producer Cooperatives (CICOPA) North America: In the State of Wisconsin, which underwent a process of environmental deregulation in recent years, a mining company is proposing a 22-mile long mountain-top removal project near the shores of Lake Superior. “It’s being billed as a job creator, but it is not about jobs,” insisted CICOPA, because in fact, the project would eliminate existing jobs in the local food system, as well as the green energy and ecotourism sectors, which are growth sectors of the local region’s economy. US Solidarity Economy Network (US-SEN) added, “It is all well and good to say that we need to create jobs... but an underlying question is missing: what kind of jobs?” It is necessary to ground jobs in the local community and democratize the workplace through approaches such as cooperative ownership, asserted US-SEN, because
“often, as corporations get larger, they lose their rootedness in the community and pull up stakes to chase the lowest costs of production in the world.”

Several participating networks are part of a worldwide “movement of movements” that is increasingly being referred to as the Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE). It encompasses a broad and diverse range of initiatives that undertake economic activities to create decent jobs and livelihoods, but at the same time seek to meet social and/or environmental objectives. It builds on the long history of community economic development, including the worldwide cooperative movement, which arose in response to the rampant exploitation of workers in the mid-to-late period of the industrial revolution. Cooperative members are workers, customers and/or local residents that collectively own and manage economic activities. Some SSE actors emphasize the “social economy,” (more focused on the internal democratic management and ownership of social enterprises, such as cooperatives) and others emphasize the “solidarity economy” (cooperative and collective forms of economic management and ownership that extend to the whole community and beyond). US-SEN explained, “Social economy is a sector of enterprises, and solidarity economy is about a whole systemic view of looking at all the economic sectors of production, distribution, exchange, finance, consumption and the role of governance.”

US-SEN explained that the term “solidarity economy” emerged approximately 10 years ago, and solidarity economy organizations and networks now exist in Latin America, most European countries, Africa, Asia, and Canada. US-SEN described the solidarity economy movement as broad and diverse, encompassing for example: the cooperative movement (worker, producer, consumer, housing and financial cooperatives); local exchange systems and complementary currencies; collectively-owned social enterprises and self-provisioning; social investment funds; worker-controlled pension funds; fair trade; solidarity finance; the “reclaim the commons” movement and the sharing economy; community land trusts, the cities in transition movement; community supported agriculture; permaculture and ecological production; and community development finance and financial institutions, such as credit unions, community loan funds, community development banks, and participatory budgeting processes.

Solidarity Economy actors often distinguish themselves from both the public and private “capitalist” sectors of the economy. They are highly diverse but are grounded in common visions that US-SEN describes as: “solidarity and cooperation, rather than the pursuit of narrow, individual self-interest,” and promotion of “economic democracy, alternative models of local economic governance, equity and sustainability rather than the unfettered rule of the market.”

The cooperative economy has a 200 year track record; it is one of the flagship movements of SSE, explained CICOPA. Participants gave a number of examples of how a cooperative approach can transform communities. CICOPA referred to the thriving Province Gipuzkoa in the Basque region of Spain where the Mondragon Cooperative Corporation (MCC) is located. Its core values are cooperation, participation, social responsibility, and innovation. From its modest beginnings in the 1940s, MCC now encompasses 140 cooperative enterprises and employs over 83,000 workers and educates 9,000 students. CICOPA added: “Here, poverty and health are not significant issues. Why? Because workers own the means of production, own the capital, direct the capital and make the social investments. Democracy is so extraordinarily embedded in their culture that solutions to their immediate problems are dealt with not from some edict from above, but through the intelligence of the hive....” It was noted that Mondragon is an important model of the cooperative solidarity economy that has
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been woven into the local economic fabric. The social and economic foundation it has established “defied Spain’s slump,” contributed US-SEN, citing a 2012 news article.  

Idle No More gave a number of examples of how SSE initiatives can help marginalized Indigenous people find jobs in Canada. For instance, the Neechi Food Cooperative, which trains and employs local Indigenous people, “works with the local socio-economic circumstances of the inner city, using locally produced goods and services and reinvesting profits locally.” It presents the case for a “community economic development planning process geared towards developing a convergent, self-reliant local economy based upon community economic development principles: maximizing income retention, strengthening and promoting economic linkages and maximizing community employment.”

US-SEN mentioned the importance of “community development finance” and related support, which is provided by independent organizations to those unable to access mainstream finance, such as businesses in disadvantaged areas, financially excluded individuals and SSE enterprises.

Many participants said that in order to scale-up and/or replicate SSE experiences, national and local authorities should develop enabling policy, institutional and legal frameworks for social and solidarity enterprises, and provide access to grant funding and low/no-cost capital, which can be accepted with the expectation of local control. It was noted that with a few exceptions, such as the Province of Quebec in Canada, experience with SSE is much more advanced in Latin America, and in parts of Europe, than in North America. According to CICOPA, South America is the “powerhouse” and the North is the “poor cousin” with regard to the cooperative economy. In Uruguay, Brazil and Argentina “they have State and government support, written into their laws, including laws about financing. They have organized capital itself in funds, grants, and other financing mechanisms to develop their enterprises and strengthen the movement.” Meanwhile, “in the US we struggle with reaching a wider policy level…. There is no national enabling legislation for worker cooperatives, and few states have it either.” The role of the State in supporting SSE is also more advanced in Europe, where in France, for example, the current government established a sub-ministry on social and solidarity economy under the Ministry of Finance, with notably the objective of developing enabling legal frameworks and financing mechanisms tailored to the needs and conditions of SSE actors.

CICOPA mentioned the Blueprint for a Cooperative Decade promoted by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA), which represents 1 billion cooperative members worldwide. Building on the 2012 UN International Year of Co-operatives, the Blueprint strategy puts forward a worldwide campaign toward 2020 “to take the cooperative way of doing business to a new level.” Among its strategic objectives are to “position cooperatives as builders of sustainability;” “ensure supportive legal frameworks for cooperative growth;” and “secure reliable cooperative capital while guaranteeing member control.”

Having met sustainability objectives locally and in some cases, regionally, participants from these movements said that bringing SSE activities to scale should be a core transformative priority of the post-2015 agenda. Integrating SSE in the post-2015 discussions would provide political leverage to help bring it to a more systemic level. The role of not only national governments and local authorities, but also regional and international development partners was seen as fundamental to creating well-resourced, enabling environments for SSE initiatives to flourish, and to integrating SSE frameworks in the strategic planning processes of national and international authorities.
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local sustainable development efforts. The importance of political leverage for the expansion of SSE was also reflected in the other regional consultations where SSE was profiled as a more sustainable and inclusive economic model (Latin America and the Caribbean, and Africa).

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

Consultation contributors from North America and Europe, including Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), Center for Reproductive Rights (CRR), Coalition for Sexual and Bodily Rights in Muslim Societies, CONCORD, and US Human Rights Network underscored the need for the post-2015 agenda to align itself with the broader human rights framework that already exists, fully reflecting fundamental human rights principles of universality, indivisibility, equality and non-discrimination. It should also be based on principles of progressive realization and non-regression of human rights, and should ensure full and meaningful participation. Further, as CESR identified, the post-2015 agenda must “underline that States have binding obligations under international human rights law to ensure their bilateral and multilateral policies contribute to, or at least do not harm, the realization of human rights beyond their borders.” Center for Reproductive Rights suggested that the human rights framework could serve as a tool to provide clarity on the expectations and obligations of States with regard to the outcomes of the post-2015 process. CONCORD’s vision of these outcomes is a just, equitable and sustainable world in which every person can realize their human rights, fulfill their potential and live free from poverty.

CESR identified, “Under their human rights treaty commitments, States are already obliged to aim for universal access to at least a basic level of social rights, to dismantle discrimination, to achieve substantive equality (beyond mere formal equality of treatment, which may include positive measures or affirmative action for excluded and marginalized groups), and to ensure the availability, accessibility, affordability, acceptability, adaptability and quality of services.” The post-2015 development framework must reinforce the duty of States to use the maximum of their available resources to realize these rights progressively for all, CESR argued. This requires moving away from “an outdated vision of market/business-led development,” and recognizing that economic, social and cultural rights are as fundamental as civil and political rights. While the HLP report proposes a stand-alone goal on governance, CESR cautions that it does little to recognize the role of human rights mechanisms in strengthening the fabric of accountable governance, which is fundamental to putting in place the right institutions and effective incentives to translate commitments into lived realities. For Global Policy Forum, internationally codified rights and obligations, along with ecological boundaries, are “by their very essence, absolute goals – universally valid and not time-bound,” and their achievement requires “tackling and overcoming structural obstacles and barriers.”

Civil society networks advocated for a strengthened role of the State in ensuring the basic rights of its citizens; they also called for the respect, protection, promotion and fulfillment of all human rights of marginalized groups including women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people. A recurring thread throughout the consultation was acknowledgement that public participation at the community level is critical to addressing many of these challenges – including job creation, combating discrimination and gender-based violence. Civil society networks advanced proposals regarding:

A. Ensuring the Rights to Decent Work, Healthcare and Education

Consultation contributors pointed to specific areas that needed priority attention in the new framework in order to ensure basic rights for all.

The Right to Decent Work

The Council of Canadians, Social-Ecological Fund NGF and US Human Rights Network pointed to the erosion of decent work as a growing threat to workers’ rights. The insistence on “flexibly regulated labour markets” in the Post-2015 High-level Panel report was problematic for CESR, who suggested that this was an open invitation “for further weakening of under-protected labour rights.” Pointing to the widespread role that rising income inequality has played in causing economic instability and impeding progress on extreme poverty, CESR expressed dissatisfaction that the Panel’s report argues against including commitments to reduce income inequality. As a counter measure, Global Policy Forum advocated for the strengthening of State employment policy, including the establishment of a social protection floor, in recognition of government responsibility to ensure the human rights of their populations.

Civil society networks pointed to particular situations where the role of the corporate sector was linked to the degradation of basic human rights, including the right to security of person and dignity, the right to a standard of living adequate for health and well-being, and the right to assemble.

Citing the deaths of more than 1,100 workers in a recent factory fire in Bangladesh, Worker Rights Consortium identified that “the main reason why workers die in Bangladesh is because brands and retailers put pressure on their contract factories to produce at the lowest prices; the only way this is possible is by ignoring the rights and safety of workers.” Therefore, binding and enforceable agreements between global corporations and labour unions are essential “to compel those global corporations to make changes in the way they operate their supply chains if we want to see improvements for workers,” argued Worker Rights Consortium. This organization pointed to the recently agreed Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh as a model binding agreement between labour unions, non-governmental organizations, and the apparel industry. The importance of binding obligations for corporations will be discussed further in section IV.

Social-Ecological Fund NGF pointed to the difficult situation of labour unions and the lack of social protection for workers in the Caspian region and northern part of Kazakhstan, particularly in extractive businesses run by foreign corporations. Insufficient initiatives for decent work or minimum living standards have exacerbated the situation, creating an unstable environment, tension and shadow economic activities that are difficult to regulate.

US Human Rights Network asserted that there is a significant number of workers in the US – primarily people of colour, single women, and women with families – who are living in poverty because they do not earn enough; this is linked to both the lack of good jobs and decreased collective bargaining in the US over the past 18 months as states are increasingly passing legislation to curtail collective bargaining. “These efforts are primarily being driven by the corporate sector, which creates concern regarding their role in determining or informing regulation, while undermining the role of governments in regulating their activities,” US Human
Rights Network stressed. The burden of unemployment is borne disproportionately by and is increasing among African-Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, and youths of colour, and is linked to discrimination. “While the unemployment rate for the general population is about 7%, it’s almost double for African-Americans ... for black youth it’s roughly 40% ... for Native Americans it’s about 14% or 15%. Studies show that discrimination is one of the key factors that explains why people of colour are not getting access to decent work.”

Part of the solution, US Solidarity Economy Network (US-SEN) made the case, is pursuing social and solidarity economy approaches for jobs, as described in section I, including through worker cooperatives: “We can do better if we think about democratizing the workplace and grounding it in the local community.” What is needed, US-SEN added, is legislation and public financing to encourage the development of such initiatives, as well as funding support for training and technical assistance.

**Guaranteeing Universal Healthcare – A Rights-Based Approach**

Action for Global Health (AfGH) and EuroNGOs welcomed Goal 5 in the report of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, “Achieve health and well-being at all ages,” including universal health coverage at every stage of life – seen as an essential measure to address inequalities and to realize the overarching goal of health for all. To make this more inclusive, AfGH underscored the need to define universal access to primary healthcare as all necessary services – not only basic services; “this target must make the quality of healthcare services explicit.” In order to protect the most vulnerable and marginalized, universal health coverage must include a target on financial risk protection, AfGH stressed.

Positioning health within the post-2015 framework, AfGH recommended the inclusion of other targets on social determinants of health, including gender equality, education, and water and sanitation, as well as State-provided incentives for healthy behaviour. The new agenda must also complete “the unfinished business of the unmet MDGs” – reaffirming the fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, while adapting to new health challenges and addressing non-communicable diseases, AfGH asserted.

EuroNGOs welcomed the High-level Panel’s target 4.d on ensuring universal sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), and recommended reinforcing the language to read “ensuring universal sexual and reproductive health and rights is to ensure access to services, respect, protection, and fulfillment of these rights.” These include access to contraception, education and counseling, safe abortion services, safe delivery services and pre- and post-natal care, prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS. AfGH indicated that access to public health services must be ensured for vulnerable groups, such as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people, as well as often criminalized groups such as sex workers, in order to ensure the right to health for all. “What needs to be added is how health systems can be strengthened and what role communities can play in making the health services accessible for hard to reach populations,” AfGH urged.

**The Right to Education**

Consultation contributors made reference to the importance of quality education and lifelong learning as a fundamental right and as a means of eradicating poverty, providing better lives and opportunities for children and adults worldwide. Building on the High-level Panel’s goal 3 “Provide Quality Education and Lifelong Learning” and its four targets, Basic Education Coalition made specific recommendations, calling for disaggregated data for children with disabilities (ensuring that such data is reliable, features criteria that are observable, measureable and understandable to teachers and families and can be linked to educational and
other relevant services); and for children and youth in conflict and/or emergencies who face enormous challenges in accessing and receiving a quality basic education. “A varying portion of the estimated 59 million children not attending primary school, some estimated 28.5 million children, are in conflict-affected countries – where civil or national strife, current or past, has reduced or eliminated schooling options. Twenty million out-of-school adolescents were living in countries affected by conflict in 2011, of which 11 million are female,” Basic Education Coalition stressed. Establishing appropriate techniques for measurement, use of new tools, such as mobile technology and software, and institutional commitment to transparency for measurement will require both resources and political will.

EuroNGOs supported the SDSN report’s call for adequately trained teachers and its identification of secondary education as a key driver for equality; however, this civil society network cited the need for more emphasis on the importance of secondary education as an enabling factor for youth to continue on to tertiary education or training to access decent work and fulfill their true potential. EuroNGOs recommended the inclusion of comprehensive sexuality education.

For Basic Education Coalition, national standards should be reflected in the design and implementation of national education plans along with specific indicators on the ratios of students to teachers (trained to national standards), and students to textbooks. Countries should also track “the percentage of teachers trained or certified; teachers trained with specific academic and gender awareness skills; adequate supply of textbooks, equipment, and other learning materials according to national norms; availability of sanitation and toilet facilities for boys and girls; and the extent of conflict- and violence-free environments for students en route to and within schools, among other things,” Basic Education Coalition stressed.

B. Overcoming Discrimination and Exclusion

The new agenda must imperatively address inequalities, tackle the causes of exclusion and rule out any form of discrimination, EuroNGOs and GPF asserted. Achieving equality, according to CESR, requires a self-standing goal, and inequality should be explicitly integrated across all other goals – in particular through enhanced data collection and disaggregation, equality benchmarking, and equality monitoring for each.42 For CONCORD a specific goal on inequality must address “the gross disparities that characterize our society.” Of concern to AfGH was the SDSN report’s focus on getting countries to shift from low to middle-income status, which neglects the inequality that exists in middle-income countries and “places too much emphasis on a measure of progress based on economic growth rather than improvements to the lives of the whole population.”

It is critical to focus support for people that face intersecting inequalities based on gender, age, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and (dis)abilities, GPF advocated, with particular attention to those who have been systematically, historically and continually excluded. Centre for Reproductive Rights stated, “In terms of addressing those inequalities, one of the key issues is public participation of groups that aren’t receiving the services that they need because of these kinds of historical inequalities.” EuroNGOs contributed that the work to overcome inequalities must begin with an accurate assessment of the reality of lives around the world, and therefore data must be disaggregated by gender, age, geographical location, rural/urban location income, educational background and other relevant indicators to ensure no one is left behind.

US Human Rights Network indicated that they are trying to engage civil society to use the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) as a tool to connect development work with human rights instruments: “When countries are reviewed on their compliance with human rights treaties, they often don’t mention the development goals. This might be something that civil society and groups could promote more.” US Human Rights Network further stressed that it would be useful if the new development agenda explicitly mentions the ICERD reviews as a tool for accountability, making a clear link to existing enforcement mechanisms for human rights at the UN.

**Gender Equality and Women’s Rights**

According to CESR, gender equality in the HLP’s report is still framed in a reductive and instrumental way, and the proposed targets “dimly reflect” the range of measures States are already obliged to take to ensure the equal enjoyment of human rights by women, people with disabilities, Indigenous people and others facing systemic discrimination. CONCORD drew attention to the progressive realization of human rights and the obligations that States’ have under international human rights law to fulfil these, including the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

EuroNGOs indicated that gender discrimination must be recognized as a root cause of poverty and one of the underlying factors that hinder development. “Mentioning gender only in terms of avoiding discrimination is not enough. We recommend inserting references to the need to work on the role of men, and to concretely address social norms, such as proposed by UN Women’s transformative stand-alone goal on achieving gender equality, women’s rights and women’s empowerment.” EuroNGOs further stressed that gender equality “should appear in one form or another in every goal,” commending the SDSN report for making linkages to lack of access to secondary education and sexual and reproductive health services as being clear drivers of gender inequality. EuroNGOs expressed concern that the Global Compact report had placed the emphasis more on women and their families, rather than on “equity as being beneficial to women themselves.”

Social-Ecological Fund NGF provided specific examples for why increased attention is needed on women’s rights and gender equality in the post-Soviet region, asserting that “women are not well-protected by the law in terms of jobs, social protection of family, professional development and self-sufficiency”; they are often the first to suffer the impact of laws and regulations designed to address the economic crisis and government deficits, including the recent adoption of a law raising the age of retirement for women from 58 to 63.

**The Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) People**

It is important that the post-2015 agenda names the discrimination, violence and marginalization that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people experience, and promotes their equal rights, Action for Global Health stressed. Center of Concern referred to the Vienna+20 Civil Society Declaration of June 2013, which acknowledges that human rights are based on personal dignity, including the development of one’s identity without discrimination: “This includes the right to develop one’s own sexual and gender identity and the right to form a family.” In addition, in this declaration, civil society demands that States are asked to protect such freedoms against dogmatic fundamentalism that suppresses and discriminates against people because of their sexual orientation and gender identity; and that they can freely develop and exercise it under the protection of the law.

Jer’s Vision, an organization working with youth to address homophobia and transphobia, called on organizations that commit to environmental sustainability or social justice practices to be inclusive of people of diverse sexual orientation and gender identity, and to promote their rights. Pointing to Canada’s passing of
laws to protect the rights of LGBT people, Jer’s Vision acknowledged the role of the church in bringing about positive change: “What has been helpful in causing policy and systemic changes within police forces, institutions, schools, communities and community organizations is that Canada’s Anglican church has become gay friendly and several of its dioceses now permit gay marriage. This has had a strong impact in addressing homophobic and gender-based violence in our country.” Coalition for Sexual and Bodily Rights in Muslim Societies pointed to progress made in several countries in the European Union, where nine countries have legalized same-sex marriage, and three more are considering same-sex marriage bills: Finland, Luxembourg and Scotland.

**Indigenous Peoples’ Rights**

Idle No More, an Indigenous peoples’ mass movement, indicated that the dominant socio-economic system marginalizes and fails Indigenous peoples who face tremendous development challenges, including low life expectancy rates, inadequate housing, and unemployment. In addition, rural and remote Indigenous peoples experience difficulties with bureaucracies and societies that do not understand the need to hunt, trap, fish or otherwise harvest from the environment for sustenance: “Recreational harvest by the non-native population is often considered more important than Indigenous harvest.”

Collectivity is central to Indigenous being, and communities were traditionally governed by principles and laws that emanate from deep respect for all of life – vital when considering community development and establishment of public policy, Idle No More stressed. The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples outlines the minimal standards of development that Indigenous peoples have requested, the organization emphasized, indicating that Indigenous communities are demanding equal and transparent partnership processes and a halt to destructive economic development practices in their communities: “We need a new model of development that utilizes the talents of entire communities for the liberation and benefit of entire communities, ones that embrace the Indigenous principles of wakotawin [deep respect for all life] and miywichtowin [establishing good relations with humankind, the animal world and nature],” and underpinned by values of mutual respect and dignity.

**The Rights of People Living with Disabilities**

CESR referred to a recent global survey that suggests that more than one billion individuals experience disability, with attendant impact on health, educational achievement, economic opportunities and poverty. The post-2015 development negotiations should therefore imperatively engage with this issue, building on the normative framework which the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provides. Thus far, the Convention has been ratified by 134 States, not including the United States, and its Optional Protocol has garnered 77 ratifications.

Center for Reproductive Rights (CRR) drew attention to the disability rights movement, indicating that it has made tremendous strides over the past decade through a set of means, including problem recognition and dialogue, that could be beneficial in discussions on the post-2015 agenda: “One of those is, first, recognition from governments that there’s a problem that exists, that there is inequality that needs to be addressed.” This recognition leads to other processes, including forums in which different groups are brought together to talk about the issues, inequalities and ways to address them. “When groups come together, even if they have conflicts they are often able to work them out to come together to form a common message and bond. That’s
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43 Idle No More submitted written input by Priscilla Settee, Professor of Native Studies at University of Saskatchewan, Canada.
what we saw with disability rights groups from all people with intellectual disabilities, people from the blind community, all sorts of different issues but they were able to come together with one voice once these forums started getting opened up for their engagement in those issues and their self-advocacy on those issues,” CRR explained.

III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources

It is essential for the post-2015 development agenda to ensure “ecological integrity” in order to ensure human well-being, identified Natural Capitalism Solutions. “This basic principle of sustainability ought to be embedded at every level, and be the touchstone from which all of the goals flow.” The agenda must fundamentally re-orient natural resource management, asserted Social-Ecological Fund NGF: “The way that the world has been developing since the industrial revolution cannot continue in the post-2015 period.”

Natural Capitalism Solutions referred to two reports which irrefutably establish that the current course of human activity is unsustainable: Planetary Boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for Humanity, by an interdisciplinary group of 28 internationally renowned scientists, and Global Biodiversity Outlook 3, the most recent global status report from the UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Planetary Boundaries report identified nine interdependent boundaries in order to estimate the “safe space for human development.” It warns, “Transgressing one or more planetary boundaries may be deleterious or even catastrophic due to the risk of crossing thresholds that will trigger non-linear, abrupt environmental change within continental- to planetary-scale systems.” The contributing scientists quantified human impacts in seven of the nine areas, and determined that three boundaries have already been transgressed: biodiversity loss (the current rate of species loss will result in “functional collapses”); the global nitrogen cycle (excessive synthetic fertilizer use in agriculture is polluting land, water and air); and climate change (CO2 concentration in the atmosphere has exceeded 350ppm). In addition, human impacts are challenging the planetary boundaries for freshwater use, land-system change, ocean acidification, and the phosphate cycle.

The Convention on Biological Diversity’s Third Global Biodiversity Outlook report similarly states: “There is a high risk of dramatic biodiversity loss and accompanying degradation of a broad range of ecosystem services if ecosystems are pushed beyond certain thresholds or tipping points.” Conclusions within this report parallel those of the Planetary Boundaries report:

- Ecosystems are already showing negative impacts under current levels of climate change, [resulting from] an increase of 0.74°C in global mean surface temperature relative to pre-industrial levels, which is modest compared to future projected changes (2.4-6.4 °C by 2100 without aggressive mitigation actions). (page 56)
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45 “Ecological integrity is the abundance and diversity of organisms at all levels, and the ecological patterns, processes, and structural attributes responsible for that biological diversity and for ecosystem resilience.” Coast Information Team, 2004. [http://www.sfu.ca/haida-ebm/ecological_integrity/](http://www.sfu.ca/haida-ebm/ecological_integrity/).

• The Amazon forest, due to the interaction of deforestation, fire and climate change, could undergo a widespread dieback, with parts of the forest moving into a self-perpetuating cycle of more frequent fires and intense droughts, leading to a shift to savanna-like vegetation. (page 10)

• The build-up of phosphates and nitrates from agricultural fertilizers and sewage effluent can shift freshwater lakes and other inland water ecosystems into a long-term, algae-dominated (eutrophic) state. (page 10)

• The combined impacts of ocean acidification, warmer sea temperatures, and other human-induced stresses make tropical coral reef ecosystems vulnerable to collapse. (page 11)

Consequences of these scenarios include decline in fishery and agriculture yields, loss of habitat and biodiversity, and damage caused by extreme weather. The report emphasized that although “ultimately all societies and communities would suffer,” the most vulnerable people will be impacted earliest and hardest. With regard to climate change, this is particularly unjust because, as Natural Capitalism Solutions pointed out, “the 50 least developed countries contribute less than 1% of global carbon emissions.”

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Energy Agency (IEA), and the World Bank have all recently warned that without urgent, aggressive implementation of robust climate protection, global warming will certainly exceed two degrees Celsius and will be on a trajectory to increase by six degrees Celsius by 2100, which “has catastrophic implications,” according to IEA Chief Economist, Fatih Birol. “Climate change threatens to undermine the delivery and success of any future global development framework,” CONCORD stressed.

Participants identified that major industrial transformation is needed to confront the ecological crises driven by human activities. “Such incumbent industries as fossil fuels, nuclear power generation, toxic manufacturing, and others that have received most of the historic subsidies and are driving the collapse of natural systems must be replaced,” asserted Natural Capitalism Solutions. Participants provided recommendations for:

A. Transforming the energy industry
B. Strengthening small-holder farming through food sovereignty
C. Achieving sustainable consumption and production

A. Transforming the Energy Industry

**Fossil Fuel Extraction and Use Must Be Dramatically Curtailed**

350.org pointed to a report by the Carbon Tracker Initiative, a group of financial and environmental analysts, which establishes that the total carbon potential of fossil fuel reserves owned by private and public companies and governments are equivalent to 2,795 gigatonnes of CO₂ (GtCO₂) – 65% coal, 22% oil and 13% gas. The report also concludes: “Research by the Potsdam Institute calculates that to reduce the chance of exceeding
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47 Natural Capitalism Solutions cited the Global Humanitarian Forum Human Impact Report (2009) for this statistic. This finding is supported by annual data for carbon dioxide emissions per country available from the UN Statistics Division at: http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/SeriesDetail.aspx?srid=749&crid=

48 The OECD Environmental Outlook to 2050: Key Findings on Climate Change, November 2012.


51 “Global warming of 1°C relative to 1880 - 1920 mean temperature (i.e., 0.75°C above the 1951 - 1980 temperature or 0.3°C above the 5-year running mean temperature in 2000), if maintained for long, is already close to or into the ‘dangerous’ zone. The suggestion that 2°C global warming may be a ‘safe’ target is extremely unwise based on critical evidence accumulated over the past three decades.” From: James Hansen, et al. “The Case for Young People and Nature: A Path to a Healthy, Natural, Prosperous Future,” p. 7.

52 http://www.iea.org/publications/worldenergyoutlook/pressmedia/quotes/7/.
2°C warming to 20%, the global carbon budget for 2000-2050 is 886 GtCO₂. Minus emissions from the first decade of this century, this leaves a budget of 565 GtCO₂ for the remaining 40 years to 2050,” and therefore, only 20% of the total reserves can be safely burned.53

However, as 350.org and Natural Capitalism Solutions pointed out, these reserves are massive financial assets, which is why the companies and governments that control them actively resist climate change mitigation efforts. Indeed, the United States and Canada are expanding fossil fuel drilling, mining, fracking and related infrastructure. 350.org and the Council of Canadians highlighted a current regional debate over a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline to transfer tar sands bitumen from Canada and the northern United States to the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. US President Barack Obama stated that the pipeline will only be built “if it does not significantly exacerbate the problem of carbon pollution.”54 350.org argued that it is clear the pipeline will contribute to an increase in carbon emissions, as it will help to enable the tar sands industry to double its production,55 and in carrying 830,000 barrels per day, it will add between 935 million and 1.2 billion metric tons of carbon pollution to the atmosphere over 50 years.56

Although the stranding of fossil fuel assets may be unfathomable to the industries that control them, the alternative, Natural Capitalism Solutions pointed out, “will be devastating environmental and economic dislocations from failing to make the transition,” costing up to 20% of global GDP per year, as identified in the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change.57 350.org highlighted that two investment analysis firms, Impax Asset Management and MSCI, have found that stockholder portfolios that do not contain fossil fuel energy producers are already outperforming those that do. Natural Capitalism Solutions cited a 2013 survey that found “more than half of fund managers surveyed had sold or avoided making investments because of concerns over climate change.”

The looming question is: how should the transition away from fossil fuels use be accomplished?

**Debunking Propaganda About Nuclear Power**

Participants including Global Policy Forum, Social-Ecological Fund NGF, Natural Capitalism Solutions, ETC Group, and Nuclear Information Resource Service were adamant that the answer is not the expansion of nuclear power, because when the full production cycle of this industry is factored – from uranium mining to waste management – it is evident that this technology also carries massive environmental and financial liabilities, and cannot actually contribute meaningfully to mitigating climate change. Nuclear Information Resource Service took note of the SDSN report’s inclusion of nuclear power in a listing of sources of “almost CO2-free electricity generation,” as well as an HLP report reference to the “US-India Partnership to Advance Clean Energy,” which does not identify that a large portion of that agreement is US support of nuclear power expansion in India. Claims that nuclear power is “clean” or “almost CO2-free” energy are unfounded propaganda, Nuclear Information Resource Service asserted.

While atomic reactors themselves are not major emitters of greenhouse gases, the full nuclear power fuel chain produces significant greenhouse emissions. Besides reactor operation, the fuel chain includes uranium mining, milling, processing, enrichment, fuel fabrication, and long-term radioactive waste storage. At each of these steps,
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55 http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/06/05/canada-oil-forecast-idUSL1N0EH11X20130605
56 http://docs.nrdc.org/energy/files/ene_13072301b.pdf
construction and operation of nuclear facilities results in greenhouse gas emissions, which in sum approach those of natural gas – and are far higher than emissions from renewable energy sources, not to mention emissions-free energy efficiency technologies.

Conceding that emissions equivalent to natural gas are an improvement over those of burning coal and oil, Nuclear Information Resource Service added that nuclear power is still unable to benefit the climate, and is wholly unsustainable because:

Major studies (from MIT, Commission on Energy Policy, and International Atomic Energy Agency) agree that about 1,500-2,000 large new atomic reactors would have to be built for nuclear power to make any meaningful dent in greenhouse emissions. Construction of 1,500 new reactors would cost trillions of dollars and take decades, and could only be accomplished with massive public subsidies because private companies and banks consider it a high-risk investment. Operation of 1,500 reactors would trigger expansion of uranium mining, which is highly contaminating to land and water, and disproportionately impacts Indigenous peoples. Uranium reserves would run out in just a few decades and force mining of lower-grade uranium, which would lead to higher greenhouse emissions because extraction becomes more energy intensive. Thousands of tons of plutonium would be produced by the nuclear reactors, posing untenable nuclear proliferation threats. Numerous massive storage facilities would be needed that could isolate more than a million tons of high-level radioactive waste from the environment for 240,000 years (the hazardous life of Plutonium-239). Nuclear waste storage has been under study in the US for more than 30 years, and its development is at a standstill due to the identification of insurmountable scientific flaws with proposed sites and political deadlock. The odds of identifying numerous new scientifically-defensible and publicly-acceptable waste dumps are slim. “Reprocessing” of nuclear fuel is a dangerous myth—this is failed technology that actually increases the volume of waste, while exacerbating nuclear proliferation risks due to the extraction of plutonium.

Natural Capitalism Solutions added that nuclear power is “the most expensive possible answer to de-carbonizing the world at twenty-five cents/kWh compared to energy efficiency at half a cent/kWh.” Further, as Nuclear Information Resource Service identified, subsidizing nuclear power over more inexpensive energy options that could be deployed faster, including systemic energy efficiency, “will result in an enormous ‘opportunity cost’ as timely attainment of climate goals becomes less viable.”

Nuclear power also has social costs. As Social-Ecological Fund NGF and Nuclear Information Resource Service explained, poor and marginalized communities are disproportionately targeted and harmed by nuclear industry operations. “Communities that have less economic development, less power, less ability to call the shots for themselves, and very often, where some corporate entity has already bought off the decision-making process, have been consistently targeted for uranium mines and nuclear waste dumps,” Nuclear Information Resource Service elaborated. “In 22 years we have assisted 29 Native American tribes to stop nuclear waste dumps on their land, which were promoted to them as the only form of economic development offered by the federal government – the dominant society seeking to export their waste to these sovereign nations.”

Although the health effects of low level exposure to ionizing radiation are downplayed by the industry and governments, Nuclear Information Resource Service pointed to a 2006 US National Academy of Sciences report on “Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation” which concluded that “the preponderance of information indicates that there will be some risk, even at low doses,” and there is a linear relationship between dose and cancer incidence. 58 This report also showed that for adults exposed to low level ionizing
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radiation, women experienced 60% higher cancer incidence than men, and boys and girls exposed while under 5 years of age experienced five and ten times the rate of the cancer incidence, respectively, as compared to adults exposed to the same low-level dose.\textsuperscript{59}

Added to these stark realities are the dangerous consequences of major nuclear power plant accidents, such as Chernobyl and the ongoing Fukushima Daiichi catastrophe – a situation which has been progressively deteriorating rather than stabilizing over the past two years, according to a group of 17 internationally renowned nuclear scientists and industry analysts that submitted a letter to this consultation. This group calls on the UN Secretary-General, various UN agencies, and governments to act upon a number of urgent recommendations regarding the Fukushima Daiichi disaster to ensure the protection of public health and safety, including that Japan must work with international organizations to put a worldwide engineering group in charge of resolving the situation.

In light of the Fukushima disaster, Nuclear Information Resource Service noted that in the United States, nuclear industry financial liability for an accident is capped at approximately US$12 billion by the Price Anderson Nuclear Indemnity Act. In 2011, Bank of America/Merrill Lynch estimated that the compensation claims for the ongoing Fukushima Daiichi nuclear catastrophe in Japan would top US$130 billion.\textsuperscript{60} The letter from 17 leading nuclear scientists and industry analysts now calls on the Japanese Government “to admit financial responsibility in excess of $500B USD.”

**A Carbon-Free, Nuclear-Free Energy Sector is Possible**

Nuclear Information Resource Service pointed to a project by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research: *Carbon-Free and Nuclear-Free: A Roadmap for US Energy Policy*, which argues that a reliable and secure, carbon-free energy sector can be created without nuclear power through greatly increased energy efficiency, solar, wind, and biofuels from crops that can be grown on marginal lands or in water. This will require substantial investment, but as Natural Capitalism Solutions identified, “Globally, subsidies to the fossil fuel industry top US$550 billion every year,\textsuperscript{61} and are at least 12 times any subsidies given to energy efficiency and renewable energy,”\textsuperscript{62} and all nuclear power projects have depended on massive subsidies, including loan guarantees and tax credits, and other incentives. Both industries also receive “hidden subsidies” as they externalize social and environmental costs – such as waste management and global warming – that societies bear for them.\textsuperscript{63} If subsidies were structured to meet a basic set of goals around human wellbeing and intact ecosystems, societies would begin to overcome the profound challenges driven by fossil fuel and nuclear energy, Natural Capitalism Solutions explained. “So in a sense, we’re just being bad capitalists,” the organization concluded.

In addition to revision of subsidies, participants including 350.org, Global Policy Forum and European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) advocated for the implementation of a carbon tax. 350.org “supports aggressive policies that put a substantial price on carbon pollution and share the revenues with ratepayers.” Feed-in Tariffs (FiTs) and net metering policy are also essential according to civil society networks. Natural Capitalism
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\textsuperscript{60} http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/03/31/us-tepco-compensation-idUSTRE72U06920110331


\textsuperscript{62} Morales, Alex, “*Fossil Fuel Subsidies Are 12 Times Support for Renewables, Study Shows,*” Bloomberg, 29 July 2010.

\textsuperscript{63} Nuclear Information and Resource Service, “*Externalized Costs and False Subsidies Associated with Nuclear Power.*"
Solutions explained that Germany’s FiTs have “unleashed that country’s renewable energy industry, created jobs and underpinned prosperity”:

In their first four years, FiTs created almost 500,000 new jobs and cut the unit cost of solar panels enough that they will reach grid parity (costing the same as grid electricity) by 2013. The programme added only two to three Euros per month to electricity bills in Germany, roughly US$50 to customers’ electricity bills each year, for a total of €8.6 billion. Deutsche Bank found that far from costing the economy, the savings outstripped the total cost of payments made by households. Had customers bought electricity from conventional coal generation, Germans would have paid an additional €9.4 billion. Renewable energy and energy efficiency deliver 10 times the jobs created per dollar invested as fossil fuel or nuclear plants.

More than half of Germany’s renewable energy generation is owned not by utilities, but by farmers and citizens, added Natural Capitalism Solutions, highlighting that the German town Wildpoldsried is 100% renewably powered, producing 321% more energy than it uses, and selling the excess for $5.7 million each year.

In the US, despite receiving significantly lower finance and policy support as compared to the fossil fuel industry, renewable energy production trends are positive, reported 350.org: “Last year, the US installed a record 3,313 MW of photovoltaic solar. The US solar industry grew 34% from 2011 to 2012, from US$8.6 billion to US$11.5 billion, respectively, according to GTM Research. Wind power generation crested at 60,000 MW in 2012 and is poised to expand in 2013.”

Nuclear Information Resource Service anticipates a vast expansion of decentralized energy generation of various sizes, located close to, and often at, the point of use, in both developed and developing economies, particularly because of the efficiency benefits of this approach. Nuclear Information Resource Service cited a study by the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, which states that the US economy is “about 14% energy efficient, with the other 86% wasted.” Decentralized energy production reduces energy waste, as it enables appropriately scaled, site-specific resource use (solar, wind, or hydro according to potential), and decreases transmission and distribution distances, reducing significant line losses, Nuclear Information Resource Service explained. In addition, people are less wasteful when they produce the power locally, because they are more aware of the systems that use it. Nuclear Information Resource Service referred to remarks by the CEO of NRG Energy, one of the largest power generating companies in the US, who acknowledged that the electricity grid will become increasingly irrelevant as customers move toward decentralized homegrown green energy.

The post-2015 development agenda must prioritize continued expansion of truly clean energy sources, particularly solar and wind power, and promote distributed power generation, participants emphasized.
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European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) underscored that transformation of any sector requires a “just transition” for workers. “We take climate change and planetary boundaries seriously, but we want to follow the paths that are the most equitable, the most fair in terms of social impact. The transition will only be supported by citizens if public authorities provide answers and concrete solutions to all workers. It’s important to think in terms of a path, and to find a bridge between the existing economies and the ones we want to create.”

As part of the path-finding for transformation, significant capacity for technology assessment is essential at national, regional, and international levels, argued ETC Group. With regard to international capacity for technology assessment, ETC Group called for the UN Center for Science and Technology for Development to be strengthened, and for the UN Centre on Transnational Corporations to be reinstated. “Without such capacity, we will be walking blind into the future with no ability to tell which of the so-called ‘clean technologies’ really are clean, and which are not.”

B. Strengthening Small-Holder Farming Through Food Sovereignty

The energy and agriculture industries are intertwined. The agriculture industry is now both a consumer and a producer of energy resources. As Idle No More explained, just as fossil fuel and nuclear energy practices damage basic life sustaining resources for many communities – particularly Indigenous peoples – so do the unsustainable practices of large-scale agriculture.

Idle No More and ETC Group conveyed that industrial agriculture causes extensive harm to natural habitats and biodiversity, including by clear-cutting forests and contaminating land, water and atmosphere. Large-scale agriculture is heavily dependent on fossil fuels, including for transport, heating and cooling, equipment operation, and the synthesis of pesticides and artificial nitrogen fertilizer. Synthetic nitrogen fertilizer is a dangerous pollutant; it degrades soil, creates dead zones in lakes and oceans, contaminates drinking water, and releases nitrogen oxides – greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming, smog and acid rain. Its overuse has resulted in the transgression of the planetary boundary for the global nitrogen cycle.

Increasingly, industrial agriculture is using genetically modified crops that are designed to resist agro-chemicals, which has led to increased use of herbicides due to the spread of resistant weeds, and thereby increased soil and water pollution. Many other concerns about the use of genetically modified crops exist, and ETC Group pointed to the report, “GMO Myths and Truths: An Evidence-Based Examination of the Claims Made for the Safety and Efficacy of Genetically Modified Crops,” by Earth Open Source. Six countries in the European Union currently apply safeguard clauses on the cultivation of genetically modified organisms: Austria, France, Greece, Hungary, Germany and Luxembourg.

In addition, Idle No More and ETC Group underscored that industrial agriculture for biofuel production drives land grabs – violating human rights – and deforestation, which exacerbates global warming. In light of evidence that biofuel production from food crops is driving up prices of staple foods and adding greenhouse gas emissions to the atmosphere equivalent to the burning of fossil fuels, the European Parliament recently voted to cap European Union use of such biofuels for transport at 6% in 2020.

73 Idle No More is a mass movement of indigenous peoples in North America that has inspired international solidarity. Written contributions to the consultation on behalf of Idle No More were provided by Priscilla Settee, Professor of Native Studies at University of Saskatchewan, Canada, who has done extensive research on Indigenous Foods and Food Sovereignty, among other subjects.
75 http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo/safeguards/index_en.htm
76 Reuters, “Food price fears push EU lawmakers to put a lid on biofuels growth,” (11 September 2013).
Idle No More stressed that industrial forms of agriculture, which are embraced by “food security” initiatives, undermine small farmers. But, “the world’s 3 billion or so Indigenous and peasant producers – rural and urban, fishers and pastoralists – not only feed a majority of the world’s people and most of the world’s malnourished, but they also create and conserve most of the world’s biodiversity and are humanity’s best defense against climate change,” identified ETC Group. Therefore, the post-2015 development agenda must promote and support small-holder farming, according to several participants, by integrating the model of “food sovereignty.”

The concept of food sovereignty was defined by the Via Campesina movement in 1996, and incorporates six principles: food as a basic human right; agrarian reform; protecting natural resources; reorganizing food trade; ending the globalization of hunger; social peace; and democratic control. Idle No More explained that Indigenous people’s food systems exemplify food sovereignty: “In our many communities of origin, biological diversity lends itself well to a tremendous abundance of traditional foods, and Indigenous peoples throughout Canada, as well as other regions of the world, have developed distinct cultures based on traditional harvesting strategies and practices including: hunting, fishing, gathering and cultivating culturally important plants, animals and fungi in their respective traditional territories. This is in contrast to the highly mechanistic, linear food production, distribution, and consumption model applied in the industrialized food system.”

Industrialized agriculture is taking food production out of the hands of communities, including through land grabs; communities also lose access to arable land and water due to resource grabs by the energy and extractive industries. Thus, Idle No More conveyed, for Indigenous peoples, food sovereignty is inextricably linked to “historic claims to the hunting, fishing and gathering grounds in their respective traditional territories.” In accordance with the right to free, prior and informed consent, which is enshrined in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international agreements, Indigenous peoples have the right “to approve or disapprove any incursions on their land especially as it affects food sovereignty,” asserted Idle No More. “This includes oil exploration, forest clear-cuts, dams, mining, road development, bombing test sites and other colonial practices that strike at the heart of food’s sacred nature and reduces Indigenous capacity to gather culturally appropriate foods.” Idle No More described that despite national and international guarantees of these rights, “in our own lands we have been charged and jailed for practicing traditions and challenging life destroying forces.”

In line with Indigenous people’s food systems, ETC Group advocated that agriculture should adopt “what farmers’ organizations would call wide-tech” approaches, which involve evaluating the “ecological context where a farm is operating” and designing solutions – including appropriate technologies – that can work sustainably with the ecosystems involved. Natural Capitalism Solutions added that the UN Food and Agriculture Organization has recognized the value of organic and agro-ecological approaches to sustainable agriculture, and now has an Organic Agriculture Programme. Civil society networks urged the post-2015 development agenda to promote these practices.

C. Achieving Sustainable Consumption and Production

Civil society networks appreciated the HLP and SDSN reports’ recognition that business-as-usual cannot continue in light of accelerating ecological crises, and their associated calls for more sustainable production and consumption patterns. However, questions arose regarding how the reports’ promotion of economic

77 The six principles of food sovereignty as defined by Via Campesina are described in detail in this document.
growth as the key driver of development can be reconciled with sustainable consumption and production. Canadian Center For Policy Alternatives noted the SDSN report’s recommendation that living standards and economic growth must be decoupled\textsuperscript{78} from unsustainable resource use and pollution. This recommendation did not go quite far enough though, according to Canadian Center For Policy Alternatives, because it is necessary to specify that for economic growth to be sustainable, it must be “intensive growth, which means using a fixed set of resources defined by planetary boundaries with greater efficiency.”

CONCORD identified that the European Union has introduced new policies and regulations around resource efficiency. However, “using things more efficiently doesn’t necessarily reduce the demand or the amount of consumption, because the consumption can still grow,” explained this civil society network. Therefore, post-2015 development strategies must “go beyond resource efficiency to resource sufficiency,” advocated CONCORD and the Northern Alliance for Sustainability (ANPED). Recognizing that this is a politically difficult subject, particularly for high income and growing middle-income countries because it has implications for lifestyles, CONCORD invoked that “in a world of planetary boundaries, we will need to think about redistribution and fair shares in terms of access to resources.” In other words, as Global Policy Forum articulated, the concept of planetary boundaries has to be reconciled with economic, social, and cultural rights, and particularly women’s and children’s rights. CONCORD noted that the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports shied away from making necessary recommendations to reduce unsustainable consumption levels in developed countries.

“Transforming the US$70 trillion global economy is the real challenge for the post-2015 development goals,” acknowledged Natural Capitalism Solutions. “Convincing money managers, central bankers, and conventional economists that alternatives to their Wall Street world are a more plausible version of the future will need a very powerful story, indeed.” Natural Capitalism Solutions argued that this story is emerging from alternatives, including: impact investing, the circular economy, the sharing economy, slow money, complementary currencies, the cooperative movement, economic democracy, and local stock exchanges. Citing the Third Millennium Economy project, Natural Capitalism Solutions pointed out that as ecological challenges become crises, incumbent industries will become more willing to consider alternative proposals.

Natural Capitalism Solutions pointed to the report Towards the Circular Economy, which argues that “a subset of the EU manufacturing sector could realize net materials cost savings worth up to US$630 billion per year towards 2025” by transitioning to a circular economy, “an industrial system that is restorative or regenerative by intention and design.” The report elaborates that the circular economy “replaces the ‘end-of-life’ concept with restoration, shifts towards the use of renewable energy, eliminates the use of toxic chemicals, which impair reuse, and aims for the elimination of waste through the superior design of materials, products, systems, and, within this, business models.”\textsuperscript{79} Natural Capitalism Solutions asserted that the circular economy must be a foundational element of the post-2015 development agenda.

ANPED and Social-Ecological Fund NGF said that a key to achieving sustainable consumption patterns is changing mindsets, which begins with education, but extends to social and economic innovation – organizing

\textsuperscript{78} The SDSN report defines “decoupling” as follows: “Decoupling means a drop in primary resource use and pollution as economic growth proceeds. It is achieved through a combination of new technologies (e.g. photovoltaic electricity and wind power substituting for fossil fuels), investments in energy efficiency (e.g. reduced losses on the power grid, improved insulation for homes), the dematerialization of production (e.g. the shift from vinyl albums to online music and from books to e---books), and proper economic incentives for individuals, businesses, and governments. Resource efficiency (more output per unit of resource input) is a necessary but not sufficient condition.” p. 39.

society differently. US-SEN highlighted the growth of the “sharing economy” in many countries: systems that enable shared access to goods, services, data and talent, thereby reducing consumption. US-SEN also highlighted the importance of localizing the economy, which shortens the supply chain, thereby reducing the carbon footprint of production. Localized economy can also foster responsible stewardship, US-SEN added, as producers have a stake in the welfare of the local social and natural environment, but this requires more than localization – the economies must ground themselves in principles of solidarity, participatory democracy, equity and sustainability. Since not everything can be produced locally, US-SEN acknowledged, fair trade and ethical consumption can help to ensure that workers and the environment are respected elsewhere. Public purchasing can support responsible consumption and local production. ANPED advocated for expansion and improvement of public transportation, and the establishment of energy standards for products, accompanied by phase-out regulations to ban products that do not meet the standards (along the lines of incandescent light bulb bans that many countries have implemented).

To ensure natural resources are not over-consumed, US Solidarity Economy Network and Global Policy Forum pointed to models for “caring for the commons” such as common-pool resource management, in which a community or village democratically manages its local resources, ensuring sustainability, as well as equitable use and distribution of benefits. Participants were strongly opposed to the commodification of the commons, through measures such as Payment for Ecosystem Services, which cannot deliver on conservation because it ignores the complexity of ecosystem functions and subjects nature to market pressures. Global Policy Forum advocated that the post-2015 development framework should include targets to protect the global commons.

It must become the norm to factor environmental and social costs into decision-making, CONCORD emphasized. Natural Capitalism Solutions identified that the corporate sector is picking this up, and that organizations such as the Global Reporting Initiative, the International Integrated Reporting Committee, and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board are integrating sustainability considerations into normal financial accounting. Natural Capitalism Solutions explained that companies can capture the economic advantages of sustainability by:

1) Eliminating waste and implementing more efficient use of resources;
2) Redesigning industrial processes and the delivery of products and services to do business as nature does, using such approaches as biomimicry, cradle to cradle, and the circular economy;
3) Managing all institutions to be regenerative of human and natural capital, implementing the concept of ecological economics.

Many business schools are now teaching these principles, continued Natural Capitalism Solutions, and many corporate leaders are implementing them, realizing that sustainable practices are better for business: more than 48 studies show that the companies leading in sustainable practices are financially outperforming their less responsible competitors. Therefore, Natural Capitalism Solutions argued, “prioritizing sustainability will strengthen, not inhibit economies.” The post-2015 agenda must reinforce the arc of this transition, and orient all development efforts toward full respect for ecological sustainability.

---
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IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

In line with civil society networks from other regions, participants from Europe and North America asserted that existing international human rights agreements compel participatory governance, accountability and transparency for all stages of policy-making and implementation, in accordance with access rights: the rights to direct participation in government and public affairs, access to information, and access to justice and administration. Consultation participants noted that the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports all include goals for “good governance,” along with targets related to increasing participation, accountability and transparency. However, contributors argued that each of these reports failed to recommend what is most needed to ensure the attainment of those objectives: a rights-based approach for the post-2015 development agenda, and robust accountability mechanisms. Indeed, several civil society networks contended that some of the prevailing recommendations in the three reports would actually undermine participation, accountability and transparency in sustainable development processes. Of particular concern was the reports’ heavy promotion of public-private partnerships and voluntary initiatives, without associated proposals for strong accountability mechanisms. Civil society networks insist on robust accountability in the post-2015 agenda, and maintain that a rights-based approach is essential to enable it.

European and North American participants presented perspectives on:

- A. Employing human rights accountability mechanisms in the post-2015 agenda
- B. The risks of over-emphasizing public-private partnerships
- C. The need for binding corporate obligations instead of voluntary initiatives
- D. Transparency for budgets, business practices and trade agreements
- E. Observance of participation rights

A. Employing human rights accountability mechanisms in the post-2015 agenda

Participants identified that lack of accountability has hampered achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). As Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) identified, accountable governance is fundamental to ensuring delivery on commitments. To “strengthen the fabric of accountable governance,” it is critical to employ human rights accountability mechanisms, advised CESR. Center for Reproductive Rights agreed, explaining that human rights institutions have proven effective in clarifying State obligations with respect to protecting and fulfilling human rights, and in holding States accountable for those commitments.

“The collectively agreed norms that human rights standards articulate provide a foundation for performance standards that all States should be expected to implement,” asserted CESR. In accordance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, CESR elaborated, “the obligation of conduct requires that States ‘take steps’ (including legislative, judicial, administrative, financial, educational and social measures) ‘within the maximum extent of available resources’ with a view to achieving the full realization of economic, social and cultural rights, and to monitor and report on progress and to objectively justify any backsliding.”

---
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To meet human rights accountability obligations, CESR continued, States must show that their policy commitments, processes and efforts comply with substantive and procedural human rights principles at all stages (planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation). CESR illustrated how States can demonstrate this:

- **Policy commitments** include: whether the State has ratified relevant international human rights treaties without reservations and established a domestic legal framework that gives effect to them; whether policy statements and strategy documents refer to human rights standards and principles; and whether States apply these standards.

- **Policy-making and implementation processes** must observe the rights of access to information, to participation in public affairs, and to the freedoms of expression, assembly and association.

- **Regarding policy efforts**, States must ensure that policies are designed and implemented to meet the human rights criteria of availability, accessibility, acceptability (including affordability) and quality (AA AQ). Indicators for measuring policy efforts should address financing, public expenditures, planning, coordination and human resources policies for the given sector.

Center for Reproductive Rights explained that the accountability for policy and implementation is ultimately achieved through the expertise of existing political and legal human rights institutions at the international level, and at national and local levels through courts, independent ombudspersons and political monitoring bodies. CESR added that administrative and social mechanisms, as well as systems to ensure the quality of services, are also critical for ensuring accountability at the national and local levels. With regard to the international level, CESR outlined some ways in which human rights mechanisms strengthen accountability: UN and regional monitoring bodies “require States to justify their development performance in the light of human rights principles, such as progressive realization and non-discrimination; scrutinize whether adequate national mechanisms of redress exist; issue recommendations for strengthening domestic accountability, and offer forums for raising and negotiating grievances.” US Human Rights Network added that stakeholders, including individual citizens, can use the enforcement mechanisms of the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) for accountability. This body of independent experts monitors implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination by its State parties, through a reporting procedure, an early-warning procedure, and the examination of inter-state and individual complaints.

The post-2015 agenda should not only integrate human rights accountability mechanisms, but also should strive to improve their effectiveness, advocated CESR and Center for Reproductive Rights. It should direct States to “ratify the full spectrum of human rights treaties and their optional complaint procedures, withdraw the reservations that impede their implementation, and commit to the comprehensive, timely and regular submission of reports,” emphasized CESR. Center for Reproductive Rights stipulated that the post-2015 agenda should “contain obligations to strengthen international mechanisms for monitoring human rights, such as UN treaty monitoring bodies, UN special procedures, like the Special Rapporteurs, and human rights-based intergovernmental processes.” CESR identified that States must ensure that all people can access national accountability mechanisms, including information and assistance regarding legal and other remedies.

---
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Recognizing that new post-2015 accountability mechanisms will be proposed, CESR highlighted that the post-2015 agenda should avoid unnecessary duplication of existing international human rights accountability mechanisms, and, “Any new global review mechanism for post-2015 development commitments should explicitly refer to international human rights treaty standards, and should ensure rigorous independent review, effective civil society participation and high-level political accountability.”

B. The Risks of Overemphasizing Public-Private Partnerships

Several participants were critical of the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports’ perspectives on implementation for the post-2015 agenda. According to Global Policy Forum, these reports did not adequately address the need for structural reform of fiscal and regulatory policies, and instead exhibited a “partnerships euphoria” through repeated advocacy that post-2015 development objectives will be delivered by public-private partnerships or multi-stakeholder partnerships. “These proposals build on the notion that governments will not be able to solve global problems by themselves,” expressed Global Policy Forum. “Collaboration projects including business representatives and sometimes civil society organizations are seen as pragmatic, solution-oriented, flexible, efficient and unbureaucratic – all attributes frequently lacking in purely intergovernmental projects and processes,” the organization elaborated. “The basic problem is that the assessments of the advantages of global partnerships are for the most part not based on empirical research and a thorough power and interest analysis of the actors involved.”

European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) argued, “If the discussions regarding the public-private partnerships are purely framed in terms of quantitative financial needs, it will lead to a business-driven policy framework.” If part of the money for a partnership project must be provided by the private sector, ETUC explained, “then you have to create what technocrats call enabling environments, which means a policy framework that at the end of the day appeals to those that are expected to provide the money.” According to ETUC, “This always leads to commodification, privatization, and land grabbing etc. Of course there are financial needs that must be met, but we also have to stress in the debate the need to defend accountability, democratic control of natural resources, and the role of public services.”

Global Policy Forum further contended that because the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports extensively promote partnerships as well as growth-oriented development strategies, “the relationship between public institutions and the private sector becomes embedded in the logic of the proposed agenda.” Global Policy Forum extrapolated, “Taking into account the current patterns of economic and political power, following these recommendations could lead to the weakening of public institutions, the further strengthening of business actors and the political marginalization of other social actors in the post-2015 agenda.”

Global Policy Forum presented a detailed assessment of “risks and side-effects” of multi-stakeholder partnerships that the organization asserted “must be considered in any careful analysis of the approach”:

1. Growing influence of the business sector in the political discourse and agenda-setting: Critics fear that partnership initiatives allow transnational corporations and their interest groups growing influence over agenda setting and political decision-making by governments.
2. Risks to reputation, choosing the wrong partner: It is particularly problematic for the UN to collaborate with partners whose activities contravene the UN Charter and UN norms and standards. This is especially true of
partnerships with those transnational corporations accused of violating environmental, social or human rights standards.

3. Distorting competition and the pretense of representativeness: Project-related public private partnerships between international organizations and individual companies in particular, are generally exclusive. These partnerships can distort competition, because they provide the corporations involved with an image advantage, and also support those involved in opening up markets and help them gain access to governments. The selection of partners is also problematic in many multi-stakeholder initiatives. Often, the initiator of a partnerships rather than respective stakeholder groups nominates representatives to the partnership bodies.

4. Proliferation of partnership initiatives and fragmentation of global governance: The explosive growth in partnerships can lead to isolated solutions, which are poorly coordinated, contributes to the institutional weakening of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and hinders comprehensive development strategies.

5. Unstable financing – a threat to the sufficient provision of public goods: The provision of public goods becomes increasingly privatized, it will become dependent on voluntary and ultimately unpredictable channels of financing through benevolent individuals or private philanthropic foundations.

6. Dubious complementarity – governments escape responsibility: Instead of considering partnership initiatives as complementary to inter-governmental processes, they are often promoted as replacements of intergovernmental agreements.

7. Selectivity in partnerships – governance gaps remain: Partnerships only develop selectively and concentrate on problems in which technical solutions lead to relatively quick wins (vaccination programs, promoting renewable energy systems). Long-term structural problems such as building up a health system or overcoming gender inequality are only peripherally touched.

8. Trends toward elite models of global governance – weakening of representative democracy: Inasmuch as partnerships give all participating actors equal rights, the special political and legal position occupied legitimately by public bodies (governments and parliaments) is sidelined.

Social-Ecological Fund NGF added that in the post-Soviet region, due to a “high level of corruption in the region,” public-private partnerships “are counterproductive to transparency and accountability.”

“It’s important to bring the State back into the debate and to stress the role of governments and public authorities,” asserted ETUC. “And nowadays, this is often missing in the discussion.”

C. The Need for Binding Corporate Obligations Instead of Voluntary Initiatives

“We have seen one factory disaster after another, fires and building collapses, which have killed in the last several years more than 1,500 workers in Bangladesh and Pakistan,” Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) decried; this in spite of the voluntary corporate responsibility programmes operated by individual apparel brands and retailers. While these initiatives have served as the primary mechanism to address severe labour rights problems in global manufacturing supply chains for over the past 15 years, WRC stressed that the model has failed due to their voluntary nature and lack of accountability and enforceability mechanisms; non-transparent inspection processes; and increasing pressure by brands and retailers to produce at the lowest prices. WRC further suggested that “with the absence of regulations by the Bangladeshi government, factories have an overwhelming incentive to ignore workplace safety and have the knowledge that they can do so with impunity vis-à-vis the local regulatory context.” WRC underscored the need to push for binding and enforceable agreements between global corporations and labour unions, and highlighted the recently signed Accord on Fire and Safety in Bangladesh – the first legally binding agreement between international labour organizations, non-governmental organizations, and retailers engaged in the apparel industry – which seeks to maintain minimum safety standards. While this agreement serves as a positive model, it is not enough,
emphasized WRC: “These private agreements are only a substitute for what we really should have, which is effective regulation of corporate behaviour by governments.”

However, the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports promoted voluntary approaches, without robust accountability mechanisms, as participants including Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives, CESR, CONCORD, and Global Policy Forum highlighted. “The [HLP] report suggests integrated social and environmental reporting for large businesses, but argues for a voluntary ‘comply or explain’ regime under which companies would either report or explain why they are not reporting,” CESR identified. “To be effective, any integrated reporting regime must be mandatory for all large companies.” CONCORD echoed, “If the private sector is seen as a key actor in the delivery of the post 2015 framework, mechanisms will have to be in place for reporting and transparency which go beyond voluntary initiatives towards corporate accountability.” This network continued, “It will be important to avoid the mistakes made in Johannesburg at the World Summit on Sustainable Development where partnerships were established and recognized as delivery mechanisms by the UN, but no formal monitoring or evaluation took place.” With regard to corporate accountability, CESR invoked the value of a rights-based approach for the post-2015 framework: “Human rights norms are unequivocal in requiring that governments set up systems which guarantee the private sector respect human rights universally.” Robust corporate accountability mechanisms are particularly important because, as Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives underscored, entrenched corporate interests “are highly mobilized and determined to protect their own profit-oriented business model.”

CONCORD and Global Policy Forum drew attention to the value of country-by-country reporting – “the breakdown of a company’s financial performance for each country of operation or trading presence,” and the mandatory transparency requirements associated with this disclosure. CONCORD and Global Policy Forum highlighted that the EU and US require country-by-country reporting from extractive industries, to curtail tax avoidance and the exploitation of natural resources. These civil society contributors advocated for the requirement of such disclosure to be expanded to other industries.

Global Policy Forum also raised that that post-2015 agenda discussions on binding norms for transnational corporations have so far focused on the “Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations ‘Protect, Respect and Remedy’ Framework,” as a “first step.” However, Global Policy Forum stressed that these principles are not as strong as the Draft Norms on Business and Human Rights that fed into them. In GPF’s view, the draft norms should be used as a model “to reach more binding and regulatory rules for transnational corporations in the post-2015 context.”

D. Transparency for Budgets, Business Practices and Trade Agreements

CESR expressed appreciation for the HLP report assertion that “we need a transparency revolution, so citizens can see exactly where and how taxes, aid and revenues from extractive industries are spent,” but called for the post-2015 agenda to outline additional fiscal policy areas that need greater transparency (as well as public participation), such as budgeting and procurement. InterAction also stated that budget transparency is critical, and should involve “the publishing of budgets, the ability of local civil society to engage in a budget process, and the degree to which those budgets focus on different populations.” InterAction recognized that this is
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domestic issue, but advocated for the post-2015 agenda to promote adherence to transparency norms for this arena.

ETC Group identified that industrial information must be much more open and accessible, because it is critical for understanding markets – and controls within them, as well as corporate concentration. According to ETC Group, what is now referred to as “confidential business information” used to be known in decades past as “restrictive business practices,” because it was recognized that corporate cartels often form through joint venture arrangements and cross-licensing of intellectual property. “Appropriate government agencies should individually examine all intellectual property, know-how and joint venture arrangements to eliminate restrictive business practices,” asserted ETC Group. “Enterprises should be required to make publicly available any information previously regarded as ‘confidential business information’ that is relevant to determining market share and defining inter-firm arrangements such as strategic alliances and joint ventures.”

Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives emphasized the need to address “a complete lack of transparency” in bilateral and regional free trade agreements such as the transpacific partnership, and the various bilateral agreements. These trade agreements “are basically locking in the business as usual path and preempting alternative approaches,” warned Canadian Center for Policy Alternatives. “As we confront the growing problems of inequality and the environmental crisis, it’s important that these agreements become far more deferential to national government regulation and to other instruments of international law, which are more weakly enforced than the whole trade and investment treaty regime.”

**E. Observance of Participation Rights**

Many civil society networks emphasized the need for the post-2015 development agenda to be defined, implemented and monitored through fully participatory processes in which all voices are heard. Natural Capitalism Solutions asserted that governments, businesses, and civil society should all have legitimate seats at decision-making tables. The post-2015 development agenda should “require and facilitate public participation, including that of independent CSOs through shadow reporting and other monitoring and evaluation mechanisms,” asserted Center for Reproductive Rights. Further, the post-2015 agenda should call for active support of civil society participation in all development processes, including through education and capacity-building, advocated US Human Rights Network.

CESR suggested several mechanisms to assess the adequacy of participation in processes: indicators that measure the range and number of participatory forums; the public’s awareness of them; the regularity of consultation; attendance rates; the social composition of those who attend; the extent to which recommendations made by participants are considered and acted upon by the authorities; and perceptions of satisfaction among the stakeholders and the public.

“The ability to express one’s views and grievances peacefully, freely and without fear is a fundamental human right, an imperative for effective development processes, and central to most people’s conceptions of a dignified life,” invoked CESR. “The freedoms of expression, association and assembly, and the freedom from fear, are as essential as freedom from want and are interconnected in practice.” Full and meaningful participation is central to the effectiveness and legitimacy of development efforts, CESR asserted.

---
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I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

An essential precursor to defining the post-2015 agenda in the African context, according to respondents including Office Africain pour le développement et la cooperation (OFADEC), is analysis of the drivers of poverty on the African continent, including the diversion of resources and “huge loss of money” caused by “unequal contracts, capital outflows, and lack of efficiency.” Africa CSO Platform on Principled Partnership (ACP) cited the 2013 Report of the Africa Progress Panel chaired by Kofi Annan, which links poverty in Africa to economic injustice, exploitation, corruption, and poor governance, and “a global systemic failure of our economic and political models.” The solutions to poverty lie in measures that address its underlying causes, including “pro-development, pro-poor, fair and just economic/trade related policies at global, regional, and national levels,” stated Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI).

Several networks challenged the promotion of growth- and market-driven development in the reports by the Post-2015 High-level Panel (HLP), Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Global Compact. “These reports make the point that economic growth reduces poverty,” Africa Youth Economic Forum (AYEF) elaborated, “and at least for the African region, that’s proving not to be the case.” High rates of economic growth, driven by the recent commodity boom, have not ensured job creation or comprehensive social protection, AYEF continued. The African Women’s Development and Communication Network (FEMNET), on behalf of the African Women’s Steering Committee on Post-2015, proposed that the post-2015 agenda should encapsulate “a vision that redresses the gaps in employment to ensure equitable wealth and ownership redistribution, access to and control over resources and a transformative gender sensitive fiscal system.”

Drawing on the synthesis report of a regional meeting on “Structural Transformation in the African Context,” Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD) and Third World Network (TWN) – Africa recommended the creation of a goal on economic growth that is “qualified, and tracked, by its distributive impacts” in vertical, horizontal, and demographic terms.  

ACORD and TWN-Africa also referred to this synthesis report to explain that the “call for economic transformation in Africa derives from the need to put an end to the perverse process which transfers Africa’s wealth elsewhere,” in part through shifting the system of production from extraction to one with higher
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value-added in the African context. Participants’ views on how to achieve this transformation focused on the following inter-related issues:

A. Financing development  
B. Policies to regulate transnational corporations and nurture domestic entrepreneurship  
C. Alternative development models: social and solidarity economies  
D. Policy space within the global trade and financial architecture  
E. The connection between demilitarization and development

A. Financing Development

How the post-2015 development agenda, and development in general, should be financed was the subject of much discussion. While emphasizing that the traditional donor community should continue to be held accountable for their long-standing aid commitments, several networks made the point that official development assistance (ODA) is based on “a partnership of dependency” (ACORD) and is dwindling due to the global financial crisis and resultant austerity policies (SEATINI). Therefore, African Youth Panel (AYP) asserted, greater priority should be placed on enhancing domestic resource mobilization. Taxation, particularly progressive taxation of citizens and fair and accurate taxation of transnational corporations (TNCs), was advocated by SEATINI and other organizations as key to addressing inequalities. TWN-Africa and ACORD called for the post-2015 development framework to include a goal on African national capacity to finance development through its own resources, thereby reducing dependency and promoting democratic and accountable States. TWN-Africa and ACORD referenced the outcome document of a regional meeting on “Raising Resources to Finance the Post-2015 Development Agenda” recommendation that the post-2015 framework should include domestic resource mobilization targets related to: increasing tax to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) ratio (recognizing different starting points of different countries); progressive taxation; and corporate tax.

The regulation of financial transfers “is absolutely necessary” for the sake of development, AYP asserted. Africa Trade Network pointed to the problem of “financial arrangements that encourage capital flight and a lot of illicit flows of money and capital out of the economy of Africa. Quoting the outcome document of the meeting on financing the post-2015 agenda, TWN-Africa and ACORD cited that 60% of illicit financial flows derive from commercial activities, the bulk of these from trade-mispricing: “i.e. the illegal use of transfer pricing by TNCs, mis-invoicing of imports and exports and the deliberate mis-recording of trade pricing.”

TWN-Africa and ACORD emphasized the need to regulate illicit flows, tax havens and tax secrecy, and pointed to the AU/ECA High-Level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa (the Thabo Mbeki Commission) as a source of recommendations to the international community and the UN on these matters.
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support for the SDSN report’s proposal that “rich countries should take the lead in curtailing abusive transfer pricing and work to close havens that encourage tax evasion and capital flight,” (page 25) as well as for a transparent and independent evaluation system for all businesses. According to OFADEC, African governments must also develop regional agreements to reverse the “race to the bottom” in national tax concessions to foreign corporations.

**B. Policies to Regulate Transnational Corporations and Nurture Domestic Entrepreneurship**

Participants highlighted that the “democratic developmental State” must regulate foreign investments and nurture domestic enterprises and productive capacities to generate employment. While acknowledging that “investment is key in providing employment and stimulating growth,” civil society networks including SEATINI highlighted that appropriate policy and regulation are essential to ensure that private investment truly contributes to development and avoids potential “decapitalisation, crowding out of small and medium enterprise (SMEs), environmental degradation (especially investment in the extractive sector), and tax dodging.”

TWN-Africa asserted the importance of “State policy and action [to] nurture local private enterprise,” in Africa. The Secretariat of the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities (SADPD) mentioned the need for “State development finance institutions that will absorb and manage the risks and barriers that come with financing for populations who cannot access private financing or banks.”

State responsibility in public service provision was positioned by several organizations as an essential alternative to an overreliance on corporate finance for development. TWN-Africa referred to the “insistence on private sector leadership in financing [as] an ideological stance and an ahistorical stance” that benefits large foreign companies rather than the African democratic developmental State.

Africa Trade Network shared Africa-specific examples of “initiatives which lead toward structural transformation of our economy, away from dependence on raw materials toward an economy that involves everybody, from the grassroots all the way to the bigger companies.” These include initiatives of the African Union that aim to guide national policy, including the African Union Continental Free Trade Area agreement, the Africa Mining Vision, and the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). Africa Trade Network contributed the following explanation of the Africa Mining Vision as a policy framework that addresses the extractive industries sector:

The Africa Mining Vision (AMV) tries to change the dominant paradigm of investment in the mineral sector, wherein the wealth generated is taken away by the TNCs, with very little left for development initiatives or the local economy. AMV seeks to create a platform for broad-based economic development to generate wealth and create jobs. AMV policies presuppose a number of interventions, including revenue capture, management and expansion, and therefore changes in the proportion of revenue that is captured by nation States in Africa vis-à-vis TNCs. These policies also ensure that the mining sector catalyses economic development in other sectors, and that more opportunities are created for African enterprises and workers. AMV policies also try to improve the governance mechanisms around the mining sector so that communities and constituencies benefit.

Africa Trade Network positioned the AMV as an example of an initiative that can help to achieve structural transformation toward justice for Africa.

---
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Another example was highlighted by Coordination des ONG Africaines des droits de l'homme (CONGAF): a provision in the constitution of the Republic of Guinea (Title XVII, Article 149) that requires parliamentary approval before the conclusion of international trade or investment agreements. Particularly relevant in avoiding what CONGAF calls “the squandering of the country’s resources,” Article 149 also requires that transfers of territorial rights (including to multinational mining companies) cannot take place without the consent of the affected communities.

C. Alternative Development Models: Social and Solidarity Economies

In terms of concrete alternatives to the predominant development model, RAESS and AYP call for the incorporation of the social and solidarity economy (SSE) into the post-2015 agenda. This type of economy is based on cooperation between networks of producers, distributors and consumers rather than exacerbated competition, and socially beneficial and equitable reinvestments rather than profit maximization. According to RAESS, “this kind of economy has a great role to play in the global South and among many African countries,” as it can contribute to women’s empowerment, the creation of decent work, especially for young people, support small-scale agriculture, and meet other local priorities based on local realities.

SSE initiatives are growing in Africa, typically bringing together cooperatives, social enterprises, mutual associations (such as credit unions, or micro-health insurance schemes), foundations, trade associations and unions and other civil society groups that undertake economic activities with social and/or environmental goals while respecting basic principles of solidarity, equality and democratic management. Most SSE networks in Africa firmly distinguish themselves from the formal public and private “capitalist” economy. In Mali, for example, a member of RAESS (a national network of over 40 organizations) established different criteria for economic actors to be part of SSE. This included not only internal criteria of democratic management, but also “external” criteria, such as that surpluses must be reinvested for the development of activities that meet local development goals, and that organizations must continuously experiment new ways to promote social and environmental goals within the community.

In Morocco, a national network of argan oil-producing cooperatives contributed to the economic and social empowerment of thousands of women employed in this scheme, through basic education, participation in management and a basic social insurance scheme. Another agricultural cooperative in the country went from 40 farmers to thousands of members in just a few years, providing today a wide range of social and economic services that farmers could not provide for themselves individually. In Benin, a national SSE network member of RAESS promoted socially-oriented economic activities in a range of pilot villages that enabled the collective definition of local territorial projects corresponding to local priorities and needs. Even when these processes take time to take root, they lead, for example, to the creation of credit unions and rotating funds channelling local savings for local job creation, micro-insurance health schemes that have helped to sharply reduce infant mortality, and other activities that have contributed to women’s empowerment, including in decision-making.

Though they still get very little visibility, these examples abound in different parts of Africa, but require the right kind of institutional, legal and financial support to scale up. According to the coordinator of RAESS, a key element in this regard is the facilitating role that local authorities and other stakeholders should play to bring the various SSE networks (producers, distributors, consumers and others) together to map out common objectives, capacities and needs over the long term, and help muster the untapped collective resources within a territory to meet sustainable development objectives.
D. Policy Space Within the Global Trade and Financial Architecture

SEATINI underscored that African governments require adequate policy space (room for manoeuver to pursue democratically-defined development policies and strategies calibrated to meet national conditions and needs). Several organizations indicated that the international financial architecture and institutions including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) constrict the ability of national governments, in the words of Africa Trade Network, “to have the political space they need for equitable and effective governance of economic policy.” Global policy for finance, investment, debt and trade must shift to be conducive to development, SEATINI asserted. TWN-Africa and ACORD also called for a rebalancing of “the relationship between the African State and the international community” and the shifting of international architecture to respond to national and regional circumstances and priorities, and to catalyze productive investment. 98

On related issues pertaining to the global trade architecture, ACP challenged the HLP report’s emphasis on open or free trade, asserting, “Countries still have a responsibility to protect their nascent industries from exploitation by open markets and big businesses, and should be allowed to ensure small farmers and small businesses benefit in small local markets.” SEATINI emphasized the need to shift trade agreements toward justice at global, regional, and national levels, and to address “the democratic deficit in the global trade-related institutions,” including the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank. The multilateral trading system must be strengthened, “taking into account the full participation of all Member States,” SEATINI continued. Africa Trade Network added that the post-2015 agenda must avoid “reinforcing the negative trends of trade and development that have held the continent back [...] and] constrained the space for development.” In particular, Africa Trade Network highlighted the example of export taxes as necessary “to discourage the export of products, especially in their raw and unprocessed forms, in global markets so that they will be available for domestic processing and transformation,” providing the examples of Ghana’s export tax on scrap metal and Kenya’s on leather.

The perennial issue of the need to overcome unsustainable debt was also discussed. ACP stated that the reports leave out that “that much of what we call development is debt-induced growth.” ACP cited the statistic that developing countries’ emerging markets carry a debt burden of 224% of their GDP, a significant global economic reality that should be taken into account in the post-2015 development agenda.

FEMNET and Africa Youth Empowerment Initiative (AYEI) emphasized that the post-2015 agenda should pay particular attention to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action. AYEI commended the HLP’s inclusion of “Transform Economies for Jobs and Inclusive Growth” as one of its five transformative shifts, “because the LDCs need to be empowered to overcome dependency.”

E. The Connection Between Demilitarization and Development

The issue of militarization in Africa was identified by several participants as contributing to conflict, violence including against women, the destabilization of communities, as well as major shortfalls in financing for development. Femmes Africa Solidarité (FAS) called for a target to shift government resources away from military spending and toward the provision of social services, as a complement to international finance commitments. Presentation Novitiate for Africa raised the issue that international small arms trade contributes to conflict in Africa. ACP asserted, “Preventing conflict requires international support,” and the post-2015 development agenda should address this issue.

98 This contribution was drawn from the aforementioned report submitted by ACORD and TWN-Africa on the Africa regional meeting on “Structural Transformation in the African Context: Reflections on Priorities for the Post-2015 Development Agenda.” p. 4
agenda must address the political, economic and social factors that cause conflicts, at both national and global levels.

Civil society networks expressed appreciation for the HLP and Global Compact reports’ inclusion of goals for peaceful and stable societies. SADPD and ACP, however, advocated for peace and security concerns to be more broadly incorporated into the post-2015 agenda objectives of incentivizing good governance and ending poverty. Réseau des Plates-formes nationales d’ONG d’Afrique de l’Ouest et du Centre (REPAOC) insisted that there can be no development without peace and no peace without development, and cited the need for strengthening the rule of law, and for national and international peacebuilding with the support of all stakeholders. A critical foundation for peacebuilding is equitable representation in governance, identified CONGAF. AYEI, RAESS and CONGAF highlighted that stability is fostered by meaningful participation of women, youth and all ethnic groups in all spheres of governance and all dimensions of society. Additionally, FAS emphasized that women’s participation in conflict prevention and resolution has proved indispensable, citing the examples of women’s involvement in dialogue, mutual understanding, reconciliation and cooperation in conflict resolution in Burundi, Liberia, Senegal, and in Sierra Leone’s Women’s Situation Room for peaceful elections.

ACORD’s contribution to conflict transformation is their Community Social Peace and Recovery (CSPR) Model, which supports communities to negotiate sustainable peace between each other, and involves the signing of “social contracts” as well as joint implementation of peace and recovery projects. Through dialogue, the CSPR Model helps communities to overcome fear and stereotypes, and “to learn to understand each other and agree on modalities for peaceful coexistence and non-violent alternatives to conflicts.” ACORD is implementing the model in a number of countries, including Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, South Sudan, Burundi, Uganda, and Guinea.

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

Extreme poverty is still with us since inequalities, especially in poor countries, are increasing. The majority of the poor are becoming poorer while the few rich are becoming richer.... National policies can play a key role in mitigating the widening gap. - SEATINI

Participants emphasized unequivocally that the post-2015 development agenda must be grounded in fundamental human rights and take concerted measures to amend, in the words of FEMNET, “the social, cultural and political dynamics that account for both vertical and horizontal structural inequalities” at all levels. ACP expressed surprise that the human rights framework was not mentioned among the five transformative shifts of the HLP report, reiterating that “the United Nations has already outlined fundamental rights and responsibilities that need immediate attention.” Consultation contributors acknowledged the references to rights included in the post-2015 reports to the Secretary-General, but as FEMNET articulated, civil society networks seek “much more ambitious and transformational recommendations” to “comprehensively address key structural and systemic barriers” to human rights. Participants also emphasized the principle of international solidarity and the obligations of international cooperation in the realization of human rights for all as a foundation for the post-2015 agenda.

Many highlighted the need to strengthen the role and capacities of States to deliver on human rights obligations, including:
A. The Rights to Decent Work and Social Protection

Participants urged greater investment in the productive sectors both to provide employment and as a measure to address inequality. “Let the post-2015 agenda focus on empowering people at the local level, because those are the people that are living in poverty,” urged OAY; organizations including RAESS and AYEF advocated the incorporation of the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) principles of decent work into job creation and existing employment. Jobs must be created for people living in poverty and marginalized people, including those living with disabilities, for “any meaningful socioeconomic transformation,” asserted SADPD. AYEI called for a clear framework for creating jobs for young people, and FAS added that ensuring youth employment is important not only for development but also for conflict prevention. To increase youth employment, OAY identified that policies and finance should seek to expand: entrepreneurship, access to loans, and Information Communications Technology (ICT). OAY commended M-Pesa – a mobile money system in wide use in Kenya – for creating empowerment, employment, and infrastructure in support of development. ACORD indicated that means of production, such as land and credit, are “very important for people to be able to improve their livelihoods.”

Building and strengthening social protection systems was seen as fundamental in promoting integration and equality in society, and as REPAOC emphasized – an essential first step in bridging security and development concerns.

B. The Right to Education

Nations must increase resources for education, including higher education and training, to empower people and increase employment, particularly for young women, espoused AYEF and several other participants. “There is a need to conceptualize education as central to a goal of structural transformation based on a shift from low to a high skilled workforce,” explained AYEF. OAY referenced the importance of building skills through technical and vocational education, particularly in the context of widespread youth unemployment. Measuring quality education as well as the number of children in schools will be important in a post-2015 context, OAY continued. Based on their consultation with the Oroko group in Cameroon, Global Environment Facility NGO Network - Central Africa emphasized the importance of elementary schools, higher education and research institutions including libraries and laboratories with sufficient staff and public oversight, as key instruments to ensure widespread development.

C. The Rights to Health, Water and Sanitation

Universal access to sanitation and water, particularly in homes, schools, workplaces and health centres, is an essential aspect of development in Africa, according to African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation (ANEW). In recognition of the human right to water and sanitation and its “life and death” importance, this network advocated access for all, accountability, and transparency in water and sanitation services, regardless of cost. ANEW urged Member States to implement a stand-alone goal on universal access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene, as crucial for development and for the reduction of expenditure on curative health. The post-2015 framework must emphasize the need for increased health coverage, indicated Global
Environment Facility NGO Network - Central Africa, particularly with regard to childbirth, nutrition, and diseases including malaria and HIV/AIDS.

**D. Protecting and Empowering Marginalized Groups**

Many emphasized the need for the State and other actors to combat discrimination and foster the empowerment of marginalized groups, including: women and girls; youth; Indigenous peoples; people with disabilities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning and intersex (LGBTQI) people; migrants; people working in the informal sector; small-scale farmers; fisherfolk; unemployed people; people living in urban poverty; survivors of gender-based violence, and other groups who face discrimination.

**Gender equality and the rights of women**

Gender equality and women’s rights arose as a focus from many respondents. Several networks commended the HLP for its commitment to gender equality and women’s rights as expressed in its standalone goal on gender equality. FAS and FEMNET advocated that the post-2015 framework, in addition to the standalone goal, should incorporate gender equality targets and indicators throughout the goals, and address interlinkages within the accompanying narrative.

AYEF and others stressed the need to infuse a rights-based approach into the language around women’s employment. Merely promoting the incorporation of women into the formal, wage-earning economy for the sake of growth instrumentalizes them, this network asserted. Instead, civil society networks argued, the post-2015 agenda should emphasize women’s rights by addressing exploitative labour conditions while advocating for increased formal employment of women.

Respondents including Presentation Novitiate for Africa welcomed targets on limiting violence against women and girls but pushed for zero tolerance as recommended by the HLP and SDSN reports, rather than the Global Compact report’s proposed target to halve the number of violent acts, in recognition of women’s and girls’ human rights to live free of violence.

A rights-based approach to gender equality also requires ensuring women’s access to land and resources, as FAS identified: “Particularly in the context of increased foreign and national investment in resources in Africa, the target to increase the share of women with secure rights to land and property should be elevated above that of business.” FAS cited the statistic that in Africa as a whole, “Women produce 60 to 80% of food, but own not even 2% of land”; the post-2015 agenda should therefore incorporate women’s right to access land and loans, as a significant contributor to the development of the agricultural sector.

Women’s unpaid care work must be comprehensively addressed by the post-2015 development agenda, asserted consultation contributors. FEMNET wrote: “It is impossible to achieve a transformational development until economic policy [...] recognizes the importance of care economy and how it contributes to the ‘productive’ economy.” FEMNET specified that the post-2015 framework should recognize, reduce, and redistribute unpaid work between men and women, in part through reinforcing the responsibility of States to invest in social services including child care, elder care, and healthcare.

Within the discussions of gender equality as it pertains to health, FEMNET underscored that sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) must be guaranteed in order to “address an important structural barrier to gender equality.” While appreciating the references within the HLP and SDSN reports to SRHR, FEMNET
recommended adding a target to guarantee services, including to adolescents, and identifying specific measures to achieve this target. AYEF added that States should contribute more to social infrastructure including education and healthcare, to “ensure youth [...] have control over their sexual and reproductive health and rights.”

**Empowering youth**

AYP called for the post-2015 development agenda to address the unique perspectives and rights of youth in a similar manner to the way it addresses gender equality, recommending the creation of a UN body on youth along the lines of UN Women. OAY quoted the Special Advisor of the UN Secretary-General on Post-2015 Development Planning, Amina J. Mohammed, as saying that young people will be the main beneficiaries and the implementers of the post-2015 agenda, asserting that therefore youth should be incorporated into the levels of leadership. For Africa as a region and for the LDCs as a group, AYEI recommended the development of a youth engagement plan for post-2015, while Dynamique OSCAF called for increasing the capacity of young people to claim their rights. AYP referred to the African Youth Charter, a document of the African Union undergoing ratification by African States, which promotes the rights of young people on the African continent, and “gives direction for youth empowerment and development at continental, regional and national levels.”

**Indigenous peoples’ rights**

Presentation Novitiate for Africa called for the post-2015 agenda to enshrine the right to self-determination of Indigenous peoples, as well as collective rights to land, territories and resources as agreed under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Legislature and institutional mechanisms must be put in place, respondents asserted, to recognize these indivisible rights.

**Rights of persons with disabilities**

Persons with disabilities should be directly included in all provisions of the post-2015 framework that deal with inequality, stated SADPD, and the agenda should mainstream disability across its indicators. Referring to the concept in the HLP report of “Leave no one behind,” this group and several others called for legislation to protect people with disabilities from discrimination and exclusion, along the lines of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the African Disability Protocol, and other relevant instruments.

**Equal rights amongst ethnic groups**

In view of the challenge of ethnic tensions within many countries on the continent, CONGAF proposed the establishment of monitoring processes to help ensure that different ethnic groups are fairly represented in the different spheres of government and the State.

### III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources

African civil society networks expressed particular concern about the increasingly unsustainable and inequitable exploitation of the continent’s rich reserves of natural resources, particularly by the extractive and agricultural industries. Referring to the profound impacts of climate change, these networks also called for much greater levels of climate finance, to enable countries to address the challenges of climate change mitigation and adaptation. A shift in policies, along with increased follow-through on implementation,
including delivery of financing commitments, are required to address these challenges. Participants called on governments to:

A. Align extractive industry activity with sustainable development objectives
B. Support small-holder farmers through policies that promote food sovereignty
C. Deliver climate justice

A. Align Extractive Industry Activity with Sustainable Development Objectives

A post-2015 agenda grounded in principles of justice and equity should specifically address the management and protection of natural resources, according to Pan-African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA). It is often claimed that the entry of industry into a region helps to provide economic opportunity and improve the standard of living for communities. However, SEATINI highlighted that because Bilateral Investment Agreements prioritize investor rights at the expense of host countries, and most poor countries are ill-equipped to negotiate, international investment in industries such as the extractive sector has led to environmental degradation and crowded out small and medium enterprise in areas of operation. In line with this analysis, Global Environment Facility NGO Network - Central Africa found during a consultation of 239 Oroko villages in Cameroon that no economic benefit to communities resulted from extractive and agricultural industry exploitation of their resources (including crude oil, cocoa, coffee, timber and others), while treasured rainforest was destroyed without “proper consultation with the communities.” PACJA explained that “contracts are signed at the level of ministry without taking into consideration the expectations or concerns of the local people – in some cases, contracts signed push people away from their land.” Instead, PACJA called for “a culture of participation, justice and information in Africa.” Dynamique OSCAF asserted, “Multinational corporations should contribute to the development of the areas in which they operate.” The AU Africa Mining Vision, described in section I of this report, seeks to support this objective by linking development objectives with local, national and regional policy making on mineral extraction. In addition, as noted in section I, CONGAF suggested that Article 149 of the Guinean constitution, which requires that transfers of territorial rights (including to multinational mining companies) cannot take place without the consent of the affected communities, could be a model to be emulated in other countries.

B. Support Small-Holder Farmers Through Policies that Promote Food Sovereignty

Civil society networks also called for a shift in agricultural policies and approaches in order to ensure sustainability and the observance of human rights. Land-grabbing by corporations is an issue in the agriculture sector as well as the extractive sector; people’s land rights, including the right to make decisions about land use, must be protected, respondents emphasized. Governments and agribusinesses should recognize pastoralist community rights to collective ownership of land, AYEF advocated, arguing that the post-2015 agenda should place smallholder farmers “at the centre of interventions in a manner that will secure food sovereignty.” The concept of food sovereignty was defined by Via Campesina in 1996, and incorporates six principles: food as a basic human right; agrarian reform; protecting natural resources; reorganizing food trade; ending the globalization of hunger; social peace; and democratic control.99 SEATINI urged that the post-2015 development agenda must promote policies, including at the international macroeconomic level, that will support smallholder farmers, rather than multinational corporations, because the “commodification of food and the control of seeds by big business, and the liberalization of trade leading

99 The six principles of food sovereignty as defined by Via Campesina are described in detail in this document.
to dumping of value added agricultural products in poor countries” deepens poverty and hunger; it does not resolve it. To meet the goal of eliminating hunger, CONGAF also advocated for active support to smallholder farmers, as well as ensuring that enough land is used for local staple food production rather than monocultures for exports. In addition, CONGAF called on governments and international organizations to support “mutual help” networks, such as networks of small informal traders that make essential foodstuffs available at low prices in poor marginalized areas, including slums, that are far away from the closest food markets.

As part of its work to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), ACORD promotes food sovereignty by engaging small-scale family farming households with government policy makers in order to help increase government investment in local food production and sustainable agriculture. ACORD also encourages small-scale farmers to participate in agricultural policy-making forums and the development of National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs).

C. Deliver Climate Justice

“Climate change is one of the most challenging threats to sustainable development in Africa,” according to the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA). “Although the continent contributes only about 3.8% of total greenhouse gas emissions, its countries are among the most vulnerable to climate change in the world. This vulnerability derives from multiple stresses coupled with low adaptive capacity.”

Citing the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, the UNECA states that major impacts that threaten the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and sustainable development in the region include:

- Increasing water stress and water-related conflicts;
- Constrained agricultural production and increasing food insecurity;
- Increasing energy constraints, further compounding challenges for industrial development;
- Rising sea level degrading livelihoods and the environment in coastal areas;
- Loss of biodiversity, forests and other natural habitats, threatening the well-being of millions of people, whose livelihoods depend on biodiversity resources;
- Expanding range and prevalence of vector-borne diseases, adding to the challenge of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, affecting mostly the poor who live in deplorable conditions and lack access to health care; and
- Increased risks of conflicts, instability and security threats, associated with massive population migrations induced by extreme climate events

AYEF asserted that the post-2015 development agenda must “recognize that climate change, and the impact it is having on ecological systems, is affecting livelihoods and the well-being of communities.” To be sustainable, the post-2015 agenda must mitigate climate change, consultation participants emphasized, including through addressing unsustainable consumption and production patterns, particularly in the global North. Organizations including Global Environment Facility NGO Network - Central Africa also called for the promotion of carbon-free sources of energy, suggesting the expansion of solar energy and hydropower in Africa. Critically, as

SEATINI contributed, the post-2015 agenda must underscore the urgent need for Member States to conclude an international climate change agreement, which should “lead to binding commitments by developed nations to reduce GHG emissions, focus on non-market mechanisms to address climate change, and ensure that developed countries provide funds and technology to poor countries to adapt to climate change.”

**A Focus on Climate Finance for Africa**

As PACJA identified, tackling climate change mitigation and adaptation will require significant financial and technological resources, which should be provided by developed countries following the agreed principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.” In multiple UNFCCC conference outcome documents, developed countries have committed to provide new and additional, adequate and predictable funding to developing countries. However, as PACJA described, “the flow and access to climate finance by developing countries from developed countries remain a challenge, constraining actions at all levels, especially community levels, and increasing the risk of more severe climate change impacts.”

SEATINI added, “The current scale and system of climate finance is insufficient to sustain the levels of action needed to address climate change today, let alone to meet the intensified challenges in a decade’s time.” PACJA echoed this assessment, maintaining that, “The Copenhagen Accord’s limiting of financial needs to US$100 billion per year by 2020 is arbitrary and below what science and equity demands.”

PACJA further explained that adaptation funding is the priority for Africa, due to its vulnerability to climate change on a multitude of fronts, but the significant majority of currently available financing from developed countries is for mitigation. Multiple UNFCCC outcome documents – including the outcome of the 2012 Doha conference – have specified that finance must be balanced between mitigation and adaptation, so corrective measures are urgently needed. Regarding allocation of resources in Africa, PACJA specified that decision-making and programming “must be country-led and supported by developed countries.”

According to PACJA, allocation of climate change adaptation resources in Africa should prioritize:

- food security including through provision of technologies and infrastructures that address post-harvest losses in farming communities;
- natural and physical infrastructure necessary to manage water and keep it clean, including for provision of water harvesting;
- protection of coastal communities from rising sea level;
- health;
- comprehensive disaster management including floods and drought;
- and other social protection measures

In the UNFCCC negotiations, proposals for the mobilization of climate finance focus heavily on the role of the private sector. “Although private finance has a role to play,” SEATINI expressed, “it is unsuitable for many vital

---

101 Article 3 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) states: “The Parties should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof.” [http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/items/1355.php](http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/items/1355.php). These principles have been reiterated in multiple UNFCCC conference decisions, including Decision 1.2 of COP18 [http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2012/cop18/eng/08a01.pdf](http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2012/cop18/eng/08a01.pdf).


103 All statements by Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) in this section on climate justice are drawn from a report the organization produced and submitted to the consultation: “Are They Really Financing Climate Change in Africa.” (2010).
adaptation interventions especially those involving country based adaptations and basic livelihood services, such as water and food security that have limited or no commercial returns.” Climate finance must be “derived from stable and predictable public sources in climate debtor countries,” and new and additional to existing ODA commitments, maintained PACJA.

“Climate finance must also be free of any conditionality that might restrict Indigenous peoples’ and local communities involvement in decision making and the design and implementation of related activities, both nationally and internationally,” PACJA identified, particularly because “at all stages, the meaningful involvement of local communities, Indigenous peoples, women and youth will be vital to the success of measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change.”

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

A majority of African networks raised the issue that imbalances in global governance must be corrected to ensure accountability in development planning and implementation, and called for measures to ensure the enforceability of the post-2015 development agenda. They advocated:

- A. Empowering Africa in global governance
- B. A stronger role for the UN (vis-à-vis the G20 and IFIs)
- C. More accountable and participatory national governance
- D. Implementation of international and national agreements for accountability
- E. More comprehensive tools for monitoring and evaluation

A. Empowering Africa in Global Governance

TWN-Africa asserted, “The creation of separate, unaccountable sites of global policy-making like the G20 and the G8 has significantly weakened the position of African countries, Africa as a continent, and therefore the representation of African people’s interests” in the multilateral sphere, and for this reason the post-2015 development discussion must include “corrective discussion about the minimum basis of credible global governance.” According to Africa Trade Network, “Governance should be reconceptualized in a way that increases the leverage of African people and African government in a global arena and that restructures the international architecture of global policy,” particularly in the areas of finance and trade. Africa Trade Network elaborated, “African countries must be able to regulate foreign investment, and to direct it so that it will be complementary to Africa’s own initiatives.” Accordingly, global development architecture, including the post-2015 development framework, “must be responsive to national and regional conditions and priorities,” conveyed ACORD and TWN-Africa.104

B. A Stronger Role for the UN

Several organizations emphasized the need to strengthen the legitimate role of the United Nations in holding various international bodies accountable for their policies and actions. SEATINI advocated that the UN’s purview should be expanded beyond its convening power to take up “the democratic deficit in global

104 This contribution was drawn from the aforementioned report submitted by ACORD and TWN-Africa on the Africa regional meeting on “Structural Transformation in the African Context: Reflections on Priorities for the Post-2015 Development Agenda.” p. 4.
governance.” Africa Trade Network contended that because the World Bank and the IMF are in fact part of the UN system, the UN should be able to subject them to oversight and support regional efforts toward self-defined development. SADPD and SEATINI suggested that the UN’s role should also include enforcing agreed conventions and ensuring accountability at the global level, of governments and of multinational corporations.

C. More Accountable and Participatory National Governance

According to ACORD and TWN-Africa, the post-2015 agenda must be “rooted in a focus on participatory democracy, service delivery, human rights, the accountable use of public resources, social protection of the weak and poor, gender equality and better economic governance.” To ensure accountable leadership, “we urgently require capacitated and inclusive national and regional legislative organs [that] take on board the needs of the poor” and enable judicial review and upholding of their rights, asserted SADPD. ACORD pointed to the recently-adopted national constitution of Kenya as a positive example of transparency and a means for citizens to hold their government accountable with regard to recruitment, use of resources, and taxation.

PACJA emphasized that the post-2015 framework must help to ensure participation by “the majority of people, who are the poor people,” in all spheres of governance and decision-making. “The world needs an operational sustainable development framework that can mobilize all key stakeholders,” agreed SEATINI. CONGAF expressed that the needs and perspectives of the people closest to the problems, such as food crises, must influence the agenda beyond consultation. “It is not enough to say inclusiveness,” PACJA insisted; “the onus is also on the decision-makers to build the capacity of people to articulate their issues and participate effectively in decision-making, so that there will be accountability” in the development framework. SADPD echoed, “Poor people should not be only followers in the debate, they have to meaningfully participate in leadership, and also to ensure that the leadership that we have within our countries is accountable to them.”

Referring to civil society participation as a right, RAESS and AYEF asserted that civil society should hold “a place in the formal process, directly engaging with States.” OFADEC emphasized the important role of African civil society in applying their expertise to regional development, and FAS and ACP pointed toward the need for an appropriate enabling environment for civil society participation to help ensure accountability. FEMNET commended the HLP’s recognition of the importance of civil society participation in the “designing, realizing, and monitoring of the post-2015 development agenda” and called for the inclusion of women and women’s movements in consultations and in the agenda itself. Women must also participate in decision-making processes, FAS added, identifying that the “severe lack of women’s involvement in decision-making processes” must be corrected to enable good governance.

D. Implementation of International and National Instruments for Accountability

The post-2015 development framework should employ existing international and national agreements to “ensure that we move the agenda forward toward implementation rather than diluting the language for easy consensus,” stated FAS. Steps toward accountability include making existing mechanisms accessible to people living in poverty (SADPD) and the establishment of a charter to provide a minimum baseline for establishing international contracts (OFADEC).

Some additional mechanisms for holding governments and international actors to account raised by consultation participants include: the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against

103 Ibid., p. 3
Women (CEDAW); the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action; UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security; the African Charter on Elections and Democracy; the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD); the African Peer Review Mechanism; the African Union Commission for Human and People’s Rights; and the African Charter and Court on Human’s and People’s Rights.

E. More Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and measurement of development were frequently addressed by consultation contributors. “Evaluation of progress made in the post-2015 process should use a qualitative approach, as relying on statistics alone may hide a myriad of problems,” asserted RAESS, citing the “Arab Spring” and the current financial crisis as evidence of the need to revamp development assessment. ACP suggested the incorporation of new measurements of poverty beyond GDP, such as “social well-being” and relative poverty, as outlined in the SDSN report. The importance of adequate, transparent, and accurate data was highlighted by several participants, many of whom appreciated the HLP’s call for a “data revolution.” ACP called for improving the quality of available statistics and information for monitoring and accountability, in part through new technology, crowd-sourcing, and improved connectivity. Several civil society networks, including SADPD, called for the disaggregation of data by disability, age group and gender. As ACORD and TWN-Africa conveyed, the post-2015 development agenda “will serve Africa well if it provides the incentive to promote and effectively monitor both democratic as well as developmental governance.”

106 Ibid., p. 4
I. Rebalance Power Relations for Justice

The consultation with Arab civil society networks revealed that the post-2015 agenda should constitute a major departure from the prevailing development model pursued in the region over the last three decades. Participants echoed the Post-2015 High-level Panel (HLP) report’s call for transformative change, but found the narrative part of its report, in many respects, not coherent with the recommendations. Participants viewed the HLP’s recommendations as mostly disconnected from the realities of the Arab region and from systemic flaws that have led to rising inequalities, crises and social unrest in the region and around the world.

The Tunisian Platform for Economic and Social Rights noted that the HLP report did not integrate in its analysis the implications and ramifications of the global economic crisis and the recent advent of protests ranging from the popular uprisings in the Arab region (“Arab spring”) to various “Occupy” movements around the world. “Citizens in Arab countries took to the streets to say that the current economic and political systems had failed them,” noted the Civil Society Declaration of the Arab Regional Consultation on the Post-2015 Agenda.107 This reality, participants stressed, must be reflected in the planning toward the post-2015 development agenda.

A Flawed Development Model Contributed to the “Arab Spring”

Some participants welcomed the proposals for a goal to eradicate poverty in the HLP, Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Global Compact reports, citing that this improves on the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Goal 1 to only halve poverty. However, participants warned that an overall “goals approach” can prove counterproductive if it does not integrate a full understanding of the flaws of the prevailing development model and aim to address its consequences, which they described in terms of widening inequalities and social injustice. Many participants explained that people in the Arab region were motivated to take to the streets not only by the undemocratic and corrupt nature of the regimes in place, but also by the sense of social exclusion and exploitation resulting from the development policy orientation that had been pursued under these regimes – often at the instigation of external partners, including international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Variously described by participants as the “Washington Consensus” or “neoliberal” model, the policy package of these institutions typically involved liberalization, deregulation and privatization, export- and foreign investment-led growth, as well as a reduced role of State in the economy and in providing essential social services.

107 The Arab Regional Consultation on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda was held in Beirut on 14 March 2013 (ESCWA, UN House). The Declaration of Civil Society Organizations from the Arab Region on the Post-2015 framework is available at: http://css.escwa.org.lb/sdd/2134/declaration.pdf
According to Arab NGO Network for Development (ANND), evidence that these policies increased inequalities and performed poorly for job creation manifests in reduced productive capacities – insufficient to generate enough decent jobs – and a shrinking share of wages within Gross Domestic Product (GDP). “While many Arab economies experienced an average annual real economic growth above 5% during the last 20 years, growth in productivity was less than half of that and negative in some cases,” explained ANND. This network continued, “Many Arab countries have witnessed a significant decline in manufacturing capacities, and deindustrialization trends.... Overall, the structural economic problem in the region has been stagnating shares of agriculture and manufacturing, and rapidly expanding concentration in low, value-added services activities.” In addition, foreign direct investment (FDI) has also been traditionally concentrated in low, job-generating sectors, like mining and real estate.

ANND further noted that “wage depression,” reflected in the regress of wages as a share of national income, “has been associated with the kind of investment and trade policies that have prioritized export-oriented sectors.” This wage depression reflects “violations of economic and social rights,” “a rush to the bottom in terms of labour rights and safeguards,” and the “marginalization of citizen participation in the economic cycles and national growth trajectories.”

Prior to the popular uprisings in the Arab region, amidst abounding evidence of these prominent problems, there were “promising indicators in some of those same countries in rates of economic growth and the achievement of the MDGs,” noted the Civil Society Declaration. Because the MDG framework tracks progress in silos, it was blind to critical factors that led to the protests, contributors asserted. For example, while indicators showed progress on the education and health goals, the MDGs did not focus attention on whether the dominant economic model in use was producing enough quality jobs. Therefore, the Civil Society Declaration suggested that the post-2015 development discussions should prioritize “analysis of key issues and means of implementation to tackle them.” It also emphasised the importance of linking the various sectors by adopting comprehensive policies, instead of implementing separate and fragmented strategies in each sector.

**An Agenda for Equity and Social Justice**

Participants called for developments paths in the region that align with internationally agreed human rights obligations of States, including civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights (as discussed further in sections II and IV). Development policies and activities should substantially reverse the above-mentioned trends by reviving productive capacities, generating sustainable and decent employment, and redressing inequalities and wage depression. Contributors stressed the need to shift from the current “rentier economic model” prevailing in the majority of the Arab countries to “productive economies” (see below).

Civil society networks acknowledged that this fundamental change is particularly challenging in the Arab context, where many countries are faced with political and economic instability, corrupt and undemocratic regimes, social upheaval, civil war, and/or foreign occupation. The Discussion Paper for the Arab Regional Consultation on the Post-2015 Agenda observes that Arab civil society faces a daunting task to develop new thinking and contribute to the post-2015 development framework in this climate. As noted by Palestinian NGO Network, “there cannot be any development process under occupation and without the presence of peace, stability and security.” A new “social contract” is needed between the State and the citizen, this network continued, allowing freedoms and choices – both collectively and individually.

---

Through their Civil Society Declaration, many Arab civil society networks called for a transition from undemocratic “rentier” States (authoritarian regimes that can “buy” political support with large revenues derived from strategic resources or locations, such as oil and gas or military bases) to “democratic developmental States,” capable of implementing the transformative agenda described above. To make the transition possible, participants asserted that the post-2015 development agenda must help drive the fundamental changes required to rebalance power relations at national and international levels. Towards this end, Member States must:

A. Reform the trade and investment architecture
B. Reform the financial architecture and macroeconomic framework
C. Enact redistributive policies for equity and social justice
D. Establish peace and security

A. Reform the Trade and Investment Architecture

Participants were concerned that the HLP, Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and Global Compact reports give a prominent role to the private sector to drive change and development. According to the National Civic Forum of Sudan, there is a “contradiction” between the reports’ determinations that a business-as-usual trajectory is not sustainable and that transformative shifts are required, and their recommendations, which transfer many responsibilities to the private sector that should be in the hands of capable democratic developmental States. National Civic Forum asserted that the “rise in prices and the deterioration of privatized services show that the State is not worse” than the private sector in service provision, and that national consultations conducted in Sudan strongly encouraged a strengthened role of the State in development. In a similar vein, Espace Associative emphasized the role of the State in driving the “radical shift in economic structures” needed to diversify sources of wealth production.

Participants expressed a similar degree of concern that the HLP report identified foreign trade and investment as a driver of transformation in a post-2015 development agenda. Historically, contributors explained, foreign investments in the region have concentrated in low value-added sectors with little job creation potential, while export-led growth has exercised a downward pressure on wages. Citing the HLP report’s proposed goal 12 target of “encouraging stable, long-term private foreign investment,” one participant observed: “Experience of developing countries reveals that it is not the quantity of foreign investment that matters for development purposes, but it is the ability of governments to steer investment policy and the investment legal framework to address national development priorities and needs.”

Of particular concern was the range of international trade and investment agreements, especially bilateral investment treaties (BITs), which governments in the region have signed with the expectation of attracting more FDI. Though it is now well established that there is no correlation between BITs and the attraction of FDI, countries are paying a heavy price for having signed these agreements. “The investment rules established through the BITs have had severe impact on the regulatory space and capacities of developing countries,” ANND explained, pointing to the particular example of “the system of investor privileges and investor-State dispute settlement rules that ignore the responsibilities of investors and marginalize the primacy of international human rights law.” Likewise, Tunisian Platform for Economic and Social Rights denounced the fact that these treaties give rights, but no obligations, to foreign investors, and require duties only from the host country.
It was also noted that Arab country-recipients of FDI have not witnessed significant spill-overs of technology that could serve endogenous production of added-value goods and services. Under the framework of such agreements, those countries are destined to remain consumers of technology rather than producers and exporters of it.

In calling for a major review of these agreements in order to remove obstacles to the “right to regulate” in the public interest, ANND proposed, “The post-2015 development framework ought to be the scene for questioning and evaluating trade and investment policies based on their contribution to progress on development goals, including their contribution to employment and productivity.” In addition, ANND highlighted the need to re-think the legal instruments that provide foreign investors with substantive legal protection and have them amended from a human rights-based perspective rather than from an “investor protection mentality.”

Espace Associative observed that the HLP report champions “open and fair trade,” but does not offer proposals for how to reconcile conflicts between open trade rules and fair trade rules. Some contributors asserted that the post-2015 framework must, therefore, foster mechanisms for the implementation of open and fair trade, whereby economic and social rights are placed at the forefront. For Anti-Corruption and Integrity Network (ACINET-Non-Governmental Group), “free trade should not be at the expense of domestic production and the ability to foster local industry.” On this matter, ANND emphasized the importance of giving serious weight, operationalization and legal status to Special and Differential Treatment (SDT) in the next phase of negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO), providing sufficient flexibilities to adjust trade policies to protect livelihoods and foster domestic productive capacities – not only for the group of Least Developed Countries (LDCs), but for all developing countries.

Some participants also emphasized the need for industrialized countries to meet their long-standing commitments to phase out the large agricultural subsidies they provide especially to agro-industrial sectors, as these have been flooding developing country markets with subsidized food products, sold at less than the market price, which undermines the livelihoods of small farmers – putting many out of business.

### B. Reform the Financial Architecture and Macroeconomic Framework

Arab civil society networks were extremely critical of the macroeconomic frameworks that international financial institutions, such as the IMF, have been promoting in many Arab countries before and after the recent revolutions. As part of a wider phenomenon affecting developing countries in other regions, participants noted that imbalances of power in global trade negotiations were exacerbated by loan conditionalities requiring unilateral trade liberalization. These conditionalities were imposed on the premise that more competition from cheaper imports would make the national economies more efficient, but the social and economic impacts that accompany such liberalization were disregarded, including the flooding of domestic markets with (often artificially cheap) imports, employment losses in the affected sectors, and threats to food security. ANND added that other conditionalities include: macro-economic policies that tend to contract the economy to meet low inflation targets, rather than expansionist policies to generate employment; attracting foreign investment; and increasing openness to trade and (often unstable short-term) capital inflows.

After the Arab revolutions, the international financial institutions asserted that the economic model they promoted had failed in the region due to poor implementation by undemocratic and oppressive regimes. Civil society networks rejected this argument, and assigned responsibility for the failure to the shortcomings of the
economic model itself. Within this context, the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights indicated that the IMF is continuing to pursue the same agenda, advocating policies such as further privatization and cuts in food subsidies. Some participants argued that the economic model remains unchanged, citing various documents, such as the report by the IMF presented to G8 in May 2011 shortly after the revolutions, in which it advanced recommendations for opening up trade in services to more competition, as well as liberalization of capital flows and investment.

ANND proposed that “the role, governance and accountability of these institutions should be re-examined. Their work programmes should reflect and work towards operationalizing the human rights-focused agenda and enabling the post-2015 framework. This is crucial for addressing the democratization of global economic governance.” Issues of accountability are discussed further in section IV.

Additional proposals for financial architecture reform, as well as for financing for development more generally, were mentioned in the Civil Society Declaration. These included: fiscal regulations securing control over capital volatility and mobility; a financial system oriented towards the real economy and serving the needs of small producers and consumers; debt forgiveness; and implementation of developed countries’ long-standing commitment to dedicate 0.7% of Gross National Income to Official Development Assistance (ODA).

C. Enact Redistributive Policies for Equity and Social Justice

Arab civil society networks expressed concern about continuing promotion of policies that could further increase inequalities in the region. This manifests, they explained, in calls for more “regressive” tax regimes, such as increases in value-added tax (VAT) that fall disproportionately on the poor, cuts in food and fuel subsidies; tax incentives for foreign investors; and further dismantling of labour rights to make markets in the region more “competitive.” A number of participants warned that such “business as usual” policies have adverse impacts on economic, social, and political conditions. Specifically, increased indirect taxes deteriorate purchasing powers and worsen standards of living. Moreover, given the unstable social and political situations in the Arab region, particularly following the popular revolts, international institutions in the post-2015 framework must consider the specificities of countries when designing recommendations for national policies. In other words, fiscal consolidation and other measures aimed at achieving reforms and macro-economic stability, such as cutting subsidies for food and oil, must not be prioritized at the expense of social and economic rights. In this context, other mechanisms of redistributive policies could be adopted, and would serve better in the realization of rights.

These mechanisms include, as outlined by ANND, the need for automatic exchange of information between developed and developing countries, and country-by-country reporting of corporate earnings needed to combat tax avoidance and track down illicit transfer pricing by transnational corporations that shift their profits to off-shore centres and tax havens. In addition, Espace Associative and the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights proposed a range of redistributive fiscal and regulatory measures that would help reduce inequalities. These include:

- Progressive taxation on income and wealth;
- Reduced taxation on primary products, such as food, to protect the purchasing power of lower income groups;
- A “non-fixed corporate tax” that supports micro-, very small-, small- and medium-sized enterprises;
- Increasing the minimum wage, and reducing the higher wages paid in the public sector to reduce the wage gap;
- Expanding social protection programmes.
D. Establish Peace and Security

Participants emphasized that the pursuit of inclusive development and the establishment of peace and security are mutually reinforcing. Civil society networks described that long-lasting conflicts, as well as new conflicts spawning in the region, cause instability and diversion of resources; they called for large amounts of military funding to be redirected toward social expenditure and sustainable development. Participants proposed mechanisms to prevent, limit, and ban small-arms trade in the region. They advocated for the elimination of all nuclear weapons in all regions of the world, per the UN Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), as well as chemical weapons, as an essential step to rebalance power relations and reduce tensions. They also called for stronger regional cooperation and coordination, including sound mechanisms for conflict resolution and peace-keeping.

To a large extent, participants addressed peace, security, militarization and occupation in the context of human rights and fair distribution of natural resources in the region, and therefore discussion of these subjects will continue in section II and III.

II. Fulfill Human Rights and Overcome Exclusion

Well-being and dignity for all people must be the ultimate objective of sustainable development, ANND asserted. Comprehensive approaches are needed not only to overcome poverty, but also to ensure equality and justice. Therefore, participants from the Arab region emphasized that the post-2015 development agenda must take a rights-based approach. It must call for Member States to comply with existing human rights obligations agreed in several international conventions, and to fulfill economic, social, cultural, political and civil rights for all people. Consultation contributors stressed that to enable progress toward sustainable development objectives, in accordance with international human rights agreements, States must:

A. End foreign occupation
B. Reform security policies to respect civil and political rights
C. Fulfill human rights toward equitable empowerment of all people
D. Obligate the private sector to respect human rights

A. End Foreign Occupation

Civil society networks emphasized that in the Arab region, an essential precondition for progress on human rights, and thus development, is the absence of foreign occupation. ACINET described that, in the name of security, militarized occupying forces restrict fundamental freedoms, including the rights to access to information, freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. Occupying forces also restrict the freedom of mobility, causing negative social and economic consequences. As such, ACINET stated, “We cannot talk about clear development goals under occupation.”

Long-lasting tensions across the Arab region, involving conflicts and political crises in many countries, create dangerous conditions and cause poverty, inequity and inequality. Civil society networks agreed that development cannot be realized in the absence of peace, security and stability, and that democratic governance is a prerequisite for fulfilling and sustaining human rights.
Participants stressed that although the promotion of democratic governance has been a stated objective of foreign occupations in several Arab countries, the occupying forces restrict freedom of movement for people and commerce, violating human rights and causing social and economic harm. ACINET explained that free movement facilitates economic recovery and reduces unemployment and poverty, and such restrictions impair development. ANND affirmed that foreign occupations have been destabilizing development efforts across the Arab region.

Citing the ongoing foreign occupation of Palestine, and earlier occupations of Iraq and Somalia, civil society networks asserted that international laws regarding occupation and peoples’ right to self-determination, including the Geneva Conventions must be upheld. For the post-2015 development agenda to support the Arab region, it must incorporate these recommendations, participants insisted. In addition, several civil society networks stated that the UN Security Council must be reformed in order to ensure full application of international human rights laws in the Arab region. Many participants considered the Security Council to be “selective” or “biased,” and criticized it for applying “double standards” when making decisions that involve human rights and security issues.

B. Reform State Security Policies to Respect Civil and Political Rights

Several civil society networks conveyed that state security policies and associated militarization across the Arab region are restricting civic space. As Tunisian Platform for Economic and Social Rights described, this often manifests as infringements on basic rights and freedoms. ANND detailed that rights to association and freedom of speech are often violated. Lebanese Physically Handicapped Union (LPHU) added that discrimination on religious grounds is common. Within this context, civil society organizations in the Arab region suffer from multiple hindrances to securing an “enabling environment” that allows for effective civic assembly and democratic practice.

Participants from the Arab region also raised particular concerned about crackdowns on civil society activities due to political dissent or the fight against terrorism. The representative of one organization informed the participants on the consultation teleconference that they had just received an order of closure from security authorities, which this organization attributed to its role in monitoring and critiquing the government’s approach to development. Participants echoed that the backlash against civil society persists in several Arab countries and constitutes a violation of the rights to freedom of expression, participation and peaceful assembly. National Civic Forum noted that such realities necessitate reform of State structures and institutions, including security forces, and underscore the need for international measures to promote respect of political and civil rights and participation in public-policy making.

C. Fulfill Human Rights Toward Equitable Empowerment of All People

As civil society networks indicated, if development is not fully inclusive, it perpetuates exclusion. Accordingly, participants advocated for comprehensive development policies and programmes to realize the human rights to education, health care, decent work, social protection, and equality and non-discrimination. Reforms are needed in the Arab region to empower people equitably, contributors stressed, with particular attention paid to ensuring equality for women and people with disabilities.

Human Rights Information and Training Center and Réseau Mauritanien Pour l’Action Sociale advocated for the post-2015 development agenda to prioritize education. Réseau Mauritanien Pour l’Action Sociale emphasized
the need for a focus on improving the quality of education, “because, in the past, an improvement in the quantity of education happened at the expense of quality.”

With regard to health care, ACINET contributed that a lack of financial resources resulting from economic recession has limited national achievement of the MDGs on health, which impacts poor and marginalized people hardest. In line with this observation, ANND urged the post-2015 development agenda to address issues, such as health and education, by promoting responsible national and international economic policies that foster equity.

Many participating civil society networks, including Tunisian Platform for Economic and Social Rights, ACINET, LPHU, Palestinian NGO Network, and Human Rights Information and Training Center, highlighted the urgent need to address unemployment in the Arab region. Palestinian NGO Network explained that 25% of people in Palestine are unemployed, and in Gaza this number rises to 40%. ANND specified that it is critical for the post-2015 development agenda to promote the Decent Work Agenda of the International Labour Organization (ILO), and calls for the creation of sustainable and decent jobs. Governments must also ensure the right to social protection for all citizens, added ANND.

Citing that 10% of the world’s people are living with disabilities, and that 83% of these people are unemployed, LPHU urged the post-2015 development agenda to advance “the right to work within a dignified life for all,” and called on all Member States to ratify the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. LPHU asserted that development goals are not achieved unless they are achieved for all, and therefore the post-2015 agenda must mainstream the rights of people living with disabilities across a framework for development.

Several organizations also highlighted the need to mainstream the rights of women throughout a development framework. ACINET conveyed that during the process of national consultations for the post-2015 agenda in Palestine, gender equality and women’s empowerment have been raised with several ministries, helping to advance systemic understanding of these issues. This is particularly critical because, as Réseau Mauritanien Pour l’Action Sociale identified, poverty has a greater impact on women.

E. Obligate the Corporate Sector to Respect Human Rights

Civil society networks observed that the HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports promote an increased role for the corporate sector in development. However, participants noted that performance criteria for the private sector were not mentioned in any of the reports. ANND asserted that international human rights standards provide these criteria, and drew attention to the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework, which were endorsed by the UN Human Rights Council in 2011. ANND urged the conversion of these guidelines into binding international obligations, and UN supervision of private sector activities, including transnational corporations, to ensure their respect for human rights.

This point will be discussed further in section IV, along with the extra-territorial human rights obligations of States spelled out the Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations in the area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

---

109 Measures to increase employment are discussed in detail in Section I.
III. Ensure Equitable Distribution and Safe Use of Natural Resources

As with Asia, Latin America, North America, and Africa, participants from the Arab region face natural resource challenges in the areas of agriculture, extractive industries, and energy. They also face significant water shortages. Participants advocated for similar approaches to address the issues inherent with these sectors, including:

A. Food Sovereignty: A Right and a Key to Sustainable Agriculture
B. Reduce Pressure on Natural Resources

A. Food Sovereignty: A Right and a Key to Sustainable Agriculture

ANND indicated that Arab countries have witnessed a recent increase in poverty among rural populations, whose livelihoods often depend on farming. Resource management is hampered by land grabbing, overgrazing, overexploitation of water and land resources, and deforestation. Rapid increases in population and consumption patterns are resulting in increased food demand and hastened land degradation. These factors exert pressure on the region’s ability to achieve sustainable development and secure the basic rights of the most vulnerable populations.

Most Arab countries are net-food importers, and significant budget allocations are used to cover import bills instead of investing and enhancing national agricultural production. Farmers’ access to seeds is increasingly restricted due to the expansion of corporate control in this area. Moreover, water – one of the most strategic resources in the region, but also one of the scarcest – has been under significant stress as water resources have been degraded. This, in turn, threatens ecosystems and biodiversity, leads to soil degradation and intensifies the challenges facing the agricultural sector, and impacts the entire economy.

Given these challenges and compounded by the absence or weakness of policies that frame and support investment in agriculture and food production, ANND indicated that food security and food sovereignty remain vulnerable in the region. For that reason, it is essential to review trade and investment agreements impacting land and agricultural production, including by endorsing the stockholding and food aid proposal from the G–33 group of developing countries to the WTO, which calls for new rules on public stockholding for food security purposes and on domestic food aid, as well as enacting national regulations on water usage, with a view toward protecting the rights of small-scale farmers, enhancing national and sustainable production, and limiting the scope for land grabbing and control of agricultural land by the private sector.

Espace Associative focused on the importance of diversification of economic activities, stressing the importance of rebuilding and investing locally in the agricultural sector as a means to address food sovereignty and food security challenges. This organization noted that such transformation, aligned with building productivity in other sectors, depends on an enhanced role of the State in designing and implementing productive policies.
B. Reduce Pressure on Natural Resources

Natural resources, especially water, are unevenly distributed in the Arab countries with some regions in rural areas lacking access to water services and clean drinking water; the same problem exists for energy with some areas lacking electricity services. ANND linked these issues to the many structural problems facing the Arab region, which include corruption, bureaucratic obstacles, inefficient planning, and poor infrastructure. These need to be urgently addressed, for water in particular. Resources are significantly lacking. ANND pointed out that in countries that subsidize water, people lack awareness about the importance of good management of water resources which leads to unjustifiable consumption on a daily basis.

Undertaking projects of desalination and investing in renewable energy in a transparent and supervised manner can be a viable option to follow, if appropriate measures, including impact assessments, are taken to counter any negative effects. For development projects in the region, social, economic and environmental conditions must be comprehensively assessed.

Desalination is already being used widely in the Arab Gulf countries, but infrastructure needs to be improved, and environmental impact assessments need to be conducted, ANND continued. Although desalination increases the availability of water, it also has negative environmental effects, such as chemical discharges and air pollutants. In the Mediterranean region, in general, there is good potential for partnerships and regional cooperation for strengthening the desalination field and stepping up water management projects. Regional plans need to be reinforced, including the Mediterranean Action Plan signed under the auspices of United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), which currently applies to 21 countries. The action plan addresses the issue of environmental degradation of the Mediterranean Sea and supports regional and national plans focusing on sustainable development.

Water is increasingly recognized as a potential source of conflict, contributors stressed. Tensions have been growing between some Arab countries and their neighbours over resources. ANND emphasized that transboundary water issues provide an opportunity for countries to cooperate towards a fair distribution of resources and sustainable development within the region – and reduce conflicts over water access.

C. Shift from Fossil Fuel to Renewable Energy

Regarding renewable energy, participants stressed that national policies need to address climate change, and to take advantage of the Arab region’s great potential for solar and wind energy. Despite the commitment by many Arab countries to reduce the use of fossil fuel energy and to shift gradually to the use of renewable energy during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held in Johannesburg in 2002, participants lamented that few efforts have been made in this regard. There is growing consensus in the region that it is no longer feasible to rely on the exploitation of extractive sources, including oil and gas, especially given increased number of costly, energy-intensive projects, such as desalination. Contributors pointed to projects currently being undertaken in the Arab region, including the Ouarzazate 160-megawatt solar power plant in Morocco, which is scheduled to be completed by 2015, and can be considered a pivotal step in the “Euro-Mediterranean Solar Energy Plan.” While the European Investment Bank (EIB), the French Development Agency, the World Bank, the European Commission, and the African Development Bank have been cooperating
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on the project, ANND noted that this massive project will be implemented without having conducted (or published) a comprehensive sustainability and social impact assessment.

ANND stressed that the “flaws of the prevailing development model” need to be addressed, and changes made accordingly, if the stated global objective for the development of sustainable energy needs can be translated concretely on the ground. For example, Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights (ECESR) described that Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) engaged in the Deauville Partnership with Arab Countries in Transition – an international partnership of States and international financial institutions (IFIs) launched by the G8 – approved financing this year for a new Kuwait Energy Company oil-drilling project in Egypt. ECESR asserted that massive new investments in fossil fuel extraction are made in the region in the name of development, but this runs counter to stated international objectives to move toward clean, renewable energy.

Shifting to renewable energy can help the Arab countries move from “rentier State” to a more “developmental State,” by reducing the pressure on extractive resources such as oil and gas, which are exploited by a handful of elites. Investing in renewable energy also has great potential for job creation, participants added.

Moving away from the “rentier State” model will require inclusive and sustainable national strategies – taking into account all the sectors – based on a reasonable use of national resources. This should be envisioned and implemented as part of the post-2015 development agenda, networks contributed.

IV. Establish Participatory Governance, Accountability and Transparency

Arab civil society networks, through their Civil Society Declaration, proposed that the post-2015 framework adopt a “new social contract between citizens and the State based on the human rights framework and protection of citizenship.” The Discussion Paper observed that Arab civil society “is already embroiled in the difficult task of negotiating a new political order based on a renewed social contract anchored in sound constitutionalism, democratic institutions, social justice, freedom and human rights.” This process, the paper continues, is occurring within the context of “increasing violence and insecurity, rising extremism, frustrated citizenry and fatigue from a transition period that has barely begun. It is also undermined by difficult short-term economic outlooks in transition countries and thus few socio-economic benefits in the short run.”

To develop a new social contract under these conditions, participatory governance, accountability and transparency are essential. In light of the analysis in section I, Arab civil society networks insisted that international institutions must also fully implement these practices. Contributors stressed that the lack of accountability and the democratic deficit of major international institutions, as well as lax regulation of transnational corporations, have contributed enormously to the flaws in the prevailing development model. Civil society networks in the Arab region prioritized the following dimensions of participatory governance, accountability and transparency:

A. Human Rights-based Accountability Mechanisms
B. Accountability in Global Economic and Financial Governance
C. Accountability to Extra-territorial Obligations
D. Binding Corporate Obligations
E. Participatory and Accountable National Governance
F. Defining Post-2015 Priorities and Benchmarks Through A Bottom-up Process
A. Human Rights-based Accountability Mechanisms

Identifying the need to correct the lack of meaningful accountability mechanisms in the MDG framework, the Civil Society Declaration proposed that the intergovernmental processes and mechanisms of monitoring and accountability of the post-2015 framework should be firmly grounded in the existing international human rights instruments, as noted in section II. More specifically, ANND suggested: “the framework of intergovernmental processes and mechanisms for monitoring and accountability that exist at the human rights level, including the Universal Period Review (UPR) of the UN Human Rights Council and mechanisms included within the human rights conventions, should be integrated into the accountability mechanisms” of the new post-2015 framework, “while taking into consideration, and investing in, the reform and strengthening of the UPR process.”

B. Accountability in Global Economic Governance

The Civil Society Declaration argues that in light of the global economic crisis, reform of global governance must be a priority in the post-2015 agenda, “to make it more transparent, democratic and participatory. This requires revising the global macroeconomic policy framework, including of the Bretton Woods institutions, namely the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.” Palestinian NGO Network remarked that it is not possible to talk about an “equal global partnership” in conditions where countries of the South have a weak role and very little voice in the governance of the Bretton Woods institutions. National Civic Forum said that the weaknesses in global governance subject the implementation of global development frameworks to political pressure and selectivity in funding by the more powerful actors.

Lack of transparency in economic and financial governance is a key issue, according to participants. For example, the ECESR noted that the terms of negotiations of loans with the IMF “are not made public or undertaken in a transparent way.” This civil society network described that the national economic plan presented to the IMF in one major country in the region “was not made public until civil society organizations brought forward a case in front of the national administrative court requesting transparency in the terms or negotiations with the IMF.” The eventual public release made clear that the national plan “mirrored the policy recommendations that came in the IMF Article IV consultation report,” released before the revolution in that country, which included recommendations that would increase economic burdens on the average citizen, and particularly poor citizens.

The Civil Society Declaration argues: “Democratization of global governance must aim at enhancing the participation of developing countries in decision-making and the promotion of mutual accountability with efficient and effective access to information.” Further, it continues, “Democratic global governance should be based on the core principles of equal participation and common but differentiated responsibilities.”

ANND proposed strengthening international human rights accountability mechanisms “as tools for oversight on national and international economic policy-making.” This would serve as a step, ANND continued, towards “establishing the human rights approach as a framework to design, monitor and evaluate economic and financial systems (including policies and institutions) at national, regional and global levels.”
C. Accountability to Extra-Territorial Obligations

Closely related to accountability in global economic governance were proposals to apply “extra-territorial obligations” in the areas of economic, social and cultural rights. Although UN Member States have a duty to respect, protect and promote economic, social and cultural rights at the international level, there is a tendency for many governments, especially in developed countries, to interpret their obligations under international human rights law as applying only within their borders. ANND pointed to the Maastricht Principles on Extraterritorial Obligations in the area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Maastricht Principles), which clarify extra-territorial obligations of States on the basis of existing international human rights law. In addition to the “obligation to avoid causing harm,” these principles also stipulate the following:

15. Obligations of States as members of international organizations
As a member of an international organisation, the State remains responsible for its own conduct in relation to its human rights obligations within its territory and extra-territorially. A State that transfers competences to, or participates in, an international organisation must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the relevant organisation acts consistently with the international human rights obligations of that State.

17. International agreements
States must elaborate, interpret and apply relevant international agreements and standards in a manner consistent with their human rights obligations. Such obligations include those pertaining to international trade, investment, finance, taxation, environmental protection, development cooperation, and security.

The Maastricht Principles also detail other provisions for accountability and effective remedy for violations of economic, social and cultural rights.

D. Binding Corporate Obligations

As mentioned in section II, ANND highlighted that various “development partnership” proposals in the post-2015 discussions give a prominent role to the corporate sector, whereby major enterprises are encouraged to invest in development priorities, such as food, water or energy. This “transfer of responsibilities” from the public to private sector, however, is framed in terms of “voluntary commitments” or “good will” initiatives. The HLP, SDSN and Global Compact reports do not offer any proposals for corporate accountability. ANND insisted that the corporate sector must be accountable for its development activities, and this can only be achieved through the application of binding obligations and robust accountability mechanisms, with stringent oversight.

Participants pointed to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations 'Protect, Respect and Remedy' Framework adopted by the UN Human Rights Council and the General Assembly in 2011, but indicated that these need to be supplemented by enforcement measures. These Guiding Principles indeed convey that international human rights law requires States to “protect against human rights abuse by third parties, including business enterprises.” The Principles further specify:

States may breach their international human rights law obligations...where they fail to take appropriate steps to prevent, investigate, punish and redress private actors’ abuse. While States generally have discretion in deciding upon these steps, they should consider the full range of permissible preventative and remedial measures, including policies, legislation, regulations and adjudication. States also have the duty to protect and promote the rule of law, including by taking measures to ensure equality before the law, fairness in its application, and by providing for adequate accountability, legal certainty, and procedural and legal transparency. (Page 3)
Citing that “the risk of gross human rights abuses is heightened in conflict-affected areas,” the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights also puts the onus on States to “help ensure that business enterprises operating in those contexts are not involved in such abuses.” Recommended measures include:

(a) Engaging at the earliest stage possible with business enterprises to help them identify, prevent and mitigate the human rights-related risks of their activities and business relationships;
(b) Providing adequate assistance to business enterprises to assess and address the heightened risks of abuses, paying special attention to both gender-based and sexual violence;
(c) Denying access to public support and services for a business enterprise that is involved with gross human rights abuses and refuses to cooperate in addressing the situation;
(d) Ensuring that their current policies, legislation, regulations and enforcement measures are effective in addressing the risk of business involvement in gross human rights abuses. (Pages 8-9)

E. Participatory and Accountable National Governance

Participants discussed at length the complex process of developing participatory and accountable national governance in the politically unstable context of the region. The Human Rights Information and Training Centre stated, “We must reform the system of participatory governance to bring more political stability and security and prepare the region to move into a new phase. We must develop strong systems to fight corruption, promote transparency and equal opportunities.” Espace Associative added, “There should be on-going accountability. Accountability cannot be left to the electoral process alone, where we have to wait for five or six years to hold our leaders accountable.” Accordingly, Espace Associative underlined the need to elaborate the concept of “democratic participatory governance” to include solidarity movements, and to allow continuous questioning of governments to hold them accountable.

The Civil Society Declaration noted: “As the popular unrest that has swept cities, globally, indicates, citizens and civil society are demanding their right to participate at all levels of decision-making. This entails the recognition of civil society as a key partner in identifying issues, policies and goals and in the implementation of the agendas.” Specifically, the Declaration advocated “mainstreaming participatory processes at various levels of policy-making including the provision of access to information and other channels. In turn, this implies an overhaul of current systems of governance. Clear mechanisms for implementing such policies with benchmarks for their measurement and achievement must be part of the new development framework.”

Under the conditions of social instability that prevail in many parts of the region, the Civil Society Declaration calls for the implementation of “transitional justice mechanisms” to maintain social cohesion where needed.

F. Defining Post-2015 Priorities and Benchmarks Through a Bottom-up Process

The Civil Society Declaration called for a “bottom-up” approach for framing the post-2015 agenda: “The post-2015 process should be participatory, multilateral and inclusive of all involved in promoting development. Developing countries [...] should have a similar pro-active engagement as that of industrialized countries.” While the process should be inter-governmental, the Declaration continued, it should involve all stakeholders and “address the demands of civil society in a sound and comprehensive manner.”

Many participants called for indicators that go well beyond simple measures of income, and to adopt qualitative indicators rather than relying solely on quantitative indicators. ANND suggested that the work of the human rights bodies and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on indicators and
the authoritative interpretations by Special Rapporteurs “are essential assets to be captured in the design of the sustainable development goals (SDGs).”

Participants discussed some of the targets and indicators proposed in the post-2015 reports, emphasizing the limitations of some of these at national levels. The Civil Society Declaration suggested that it must be “explicitly stated that the post-2015 development framework represents objectives for the world as a whole, which are not a scale to measure progress in every country, because national goals should be formulated domestically with the use of global norms as a point of reference.” The Civil Society Declaration continued by proposing that the post-2015 agenda should focus on participatory processes to elaborate and adopt national agendas based on the national priorities and human rights. These processes “must result from an inclusive national dialogue including all the different groups” of society.
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Methodology

UN-NGLS conducted 14 teleconferences with regional and sub-regional civil society networks that are based in Asia, the Pacific, Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Europe, North America, and the Arab States. Calls were conducted in four languages: Arabic, English, French and Spanish. Participants were provided with a guidance note in advance. Each regional teleconference lasted two to three hours, facilitated by UN-NGLS, with an average of seven civil society representatives on each call. A total of 100 regional civil society networks participated in these teleconferences, and many of them sent supplementary written contributions. An additional 20 regional civil society networks that were unable to join a call submitted written input. The 120 regional civil society networks and social movements that contributed to this consultation collectively collaborate with over 3,000 national and community-based organizations.

This report of regional civil society recommendations draws on transcripts of the teleconferences, as well as written contributions received from regional networks via the consultation web page and email. The transcripts were gently edited to remove extraneous words, and to group each participant’s remarks together, although they had originally occurred at various points during the discussion. These edited transcripts were shared with all call participants before the report writing process began, to provide participants with the opportunity to adjust and/or amend their input. The Arabic, Spanish and French transcripts were then translated into English.

Please click on the links below to access the source material for this consultation.

Asia and the Pacific
Asia and Pacific Teleconferences Transcript and Email Submissions – 3 calls
Asia and Pacific Online Submissions

Latin America and the Caribbean
Latin America Teleconferences Transcript and Email Submissions (Spanish) – 4 calls
Latin America Teleconferences Transcript (English Translation)
Caribbean Teleconference Transcript and Email Submissions – 1 call
Latin American and the Caribbean Online Submissions

Europe and North America
Europe and North America Transcript and Email Submissions – 3 calls
Europe and North America Online Submissions

Africa
Africa French Teleconference Transcript – 1 call
Africa French Teleconference Transcript (English Translation)
Africa English Teleconference Transcript – 1 call
Africa Online Submissions

Arab States
Arab States Teleconference Transcript – 1 call