

Reflections on HLP post 2015 report - by far not good enough!

The High Level Panel of Eminent Persons report to UN Secretary General proposes 12 global goals that are not ambitious enough, do not question the inherent inequalities of the current economic systems, and fail to bring the necessary change to end poverty now!

*Reflection on the High Level Panel post 2015 report
By members of the Women's Major Group¹*

This critical analysis by the Women's Major Group members² on the High-level Panel (HLP) of Eminent Persons report, released on May 30th with recommendations for the Post 2015 Development Agenda³, notes the report as a starting point for discussion, but not good enough. The Women's Major Group is concerned about the narrow set of goals and the predominance given to the corporate/business sector in the "new" development agenda. We look to the world's governments to be far more ambitious and focused on addressing the root causes of inequality, injustice and poverty inherent to the existing economic paradigm, as they negotiate the next sustainable development framework in the Open Working Group on SDGs and the Post 2015 Development Agenda.

Contents

- **Goals setting; too reductive** to allow for sustainable development
- **A new 15-year time-frame; delaying** essential human rights even further!
- **Contradictions;** between goals and business-as-usual economic model
- **Human rights - inconsistent** application
- **Critical analysis of selected specific Goals and Targets and Means of Implementation**
 - GOAL 1 *End Poverty*: too narrow in scope, too one-dimensional
 - GOAL 2: *Empower Girls and Women and achieve Gender Equality*: some positive targets, but lacks women's rights as underpinning the entire development agenda
 - GOAL 3: *Provide quality education and life-long learning*: lacks girls' priorities
 - GOAL 4: *Ensure Healthy Lives*: some positive targets, but fails to address social and environmental determinants of health
 - GOAL 5 *Ensure Food Security and Good Nutrition*: should recognize women's role in food sovereignty
 - GOAL 7: *Secure Sustainable Energy*: utterly insufficient and likely to have negative impact on female poverty
 - GOAL 8: *Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth*: Fails to call for global social protection floor and the right to decent work

¹ The Women's Major Group (www.womenrio20.org) brings together 400 organisations and individuals working on sustainable development from a women's rights perspective at local, national, regional and global level

² Members of the Women's Major Group who authored and have endorsed are listed at the end

³ <http://www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/UN-Report.pdf>

- GOAL 9: *Manage Natural Resource Assets Sustainability*: too limiting in defining nature as an asset
- GOAL 12: *Global Enabling environment and Catalyse Long-Term Finance*: entirely insufficient on finance, trade and climate protection
 - Nothing 'New' about proposed Global Governance and Global Partnership for Development
 - No accountability of corporations
 - Financing for Gender Equality should be a priority – it is not in the HLP report
- **Concluding:** This report should not be taken as a basis for development of the Post 2015 agenda

Goals setting; too reductive to allow for sustainable development

Before analysing the specific goals and targets, the Women's Major Group notes that the "goal setting" exercise of the Millennium Development Goals and now of the post 2015 development agenda is in itself problematic. The MDGs were a donor driven approach, to focus development funds on a few key 'deliverables' and as such goes against the human rights approach, in which rights are universal and indivisible.

The Women's Major Group and other civil society representatives had criticised the Millennium Development Goals for not taking a human-rights based approach to development. Targets aimed, for example, to "reduce" by 50% the number of people in poverty, or without drinking water, rather than ensuring that all people's human rights to food, water, health, education, and social protection were met. Often, development funds were only used to achieve MDG targets, and anything outside the targets – for example, access to drinking water in schools – would not be funded, as it was not "counted" as achieving MDG-7 by the statisticians.

The report of the High Level Panel on Post 2015 makes an effort to respond to this criticism, and introduces goals which aim at 'universal coverage' and to 'leave no-one behind'. Amongst the 12 illustrative goals we find "eradicate absolute poverty" and "end hunger", "end child deaths", "provide universal health", "ensure universal sexual and reproductive health and rights", "universalise primary and lower secondary education" and "universal access to water and sanitation." However, the overall problem of the Goals approach is that it limits focus on only a small number of goals (8-12) and only a few targets per goal (4 per goal, 54 targets total). Even though this appears better than the MDGs, it still results in prioritizing **'just a few human rights, while ignoring others.**

This approach also prevents ***an integrated approach to development*** and reinforces development silos. Gender equality is one of the pre-requisites for sustainable development, and as such specific efforts to achieve gender equality need to be included in all goal areas, with, at least one or more specific gender targets per goal. The 54 targets identified are just not sufficient. The goals approach is too reductive to achieve sustainable development.

A new 15-year time-frame may delay the promotion and protection of human rights!

The goals and targets methodology has a further main disadvantage; it may delay the realization of essential human rights and women's rights. While the realization of economic and social rights can be progressive, governments have the obligation to ensure minimum levels of economic and social rights

protections for all people now, without retrogression, and to allocate the maximum available resources to fully realize these rights. The protection of civil and political rights, and women's rights to equality and non-discrimination, cannot be delayed. However, by linking rights to the availability of funds and setting 15-year time horizons for their achievement, may give an excuse for further delay in fully respecting, protecting and fulfilling human rights.

The universal commitment to **end poverty** which appears ambitious at first glance, is actually mere lip service if **its achievement is delayed until 2030**. This means tolerating yet another generation of 2 billion people living in poverty, when it would be feasible to eradicate absolute poverty now.

Contradictions; between goals and business-as-usual economic model

A further serious problem of the report is the **lack of coherence between the current economic paradigm which the report does not question, and the illustrative goals** that are developed. To give an example, how will Target 5-a "End hunger and protect the right of everyone to have access to sufficient, safe, affordable and nutritious food" be made consistent with Target 12 - a "Support an open, fair and development friendly trading system, substantially reducing agricultural subsidies, while improving market access of developing countries products". Developing local sustainable agriculture and empowerment of women peasants in developing countries requires support, including via fiscal incentives, and even protection measures.

A Global Sustainable Development Agenda. We note positively that the report recognizes that to durably eradicate poverty, development has to be sustainable, socially just and within the planet's carrying capacity. It also recognizes that people living in poverty suffer first and worst from environmental disasters like droughts, floods and harvest failures. **However, the targets often contradict this overall aim.**

The report **fails to recognize the failures of the no (ecological) limits to "growth" paradigm** that underlies the current economic system, promoting corporate profits over the wellbeing of people. The report does not provide an explanation on how States will connect, measure and simultaneously address complex issues of ecological loss and damage, community sustainability and economic viability and does not recognize the role of developed countries in contributing to historical emissions and the inequitable impacts (geography, gender, economic) of climate change.

Beyond Gross Domestic Product and removing perverse subsidies. We note that the report sets a target for all countries to add environmental and social measures to its national accounting, to go beyond GDP and recognizes the need to abolish (inefficient) subsidies for agriculture and fossil fuels, but forgets the need to abolish fishery subsidies and does not distinguish between the role of subsidies in rich countries and low-income countries (where they may actually be useful).

But the report **neglects to set a target for a true reform of the monetary, financial and trade rules globally** that would ensure enough fiscal policy space at the national level to implement all the envisioned recommendations. Without seriously reforming the economic and social systems that can create the necessary enabling environments for national governments to actually provide their people with the services that they need, and the human rights that they are entitled to, we will not create transformational change for women, men, young people or for the planet.

Finally, the report neglects to **address the destructive nature of the extractives sector**, depleting natural resources of developing countries and displacing communities, while taking almost all revenues abroad and leaving irreparable damage to the environment and public health. The Women's Major Group addressed the destructive role of the extractive industry sector in its letter to the HLP meeting in Bali; a sentence from this letter has found its way into the annexes of the report (pg 62), but this has not been addressed by the HLP.

Human rights - inconsistent approach

At a certain moment in the consultations leading up to the report, it seemed as if the HLP members did not even dare to use the term "human rights." We note positively that the report recommends to include the protection and fulfilment of some human rights, including the right to freedom of speech, association, and peaceful protest (10b); the right to access to independent media and information (10b and d); public participation in political processes and civil engagement at all levels (10c); access to justice (11b); and the right to food (5a).

Even though human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent⁴ the report focuses on the achievement of just a few human rights - and prioritizes civil and political rights over economic, social and cultural rights. The report misses the critical opportunity to concretely frame its recommendations in terms of fundamental human rights; promote human rights-based approaches in its implementation; and link the strong human rights accountability mechanisms that already exist with governments' development obligations as duty bearers.

In the area of women's rights, the report misses the opportunity to include a target on enforcing laws and policies that promote gender equality and eliminating laws, policies and practices that discriminate against and are harmful to women and girls. Included in this is the need to enact economic and social policies that contribute to achieving gender equality and align with human rights principles. This application of a human rights framework to the design of development priorities is largely missing in the report and is a vital and critical step to reach girls and women and achieve the goals envisioned.

The report falsely equates the rights of business with human rights. The real priorities of the 'new' and ambitious agenda are exposed when the report recommends that businesses have the same rights of women, men and children, to that of business, regarding land and property rights (target 1b). This creates conditions for more land-grabbing, when the opposite is necessary: a target that redistributes assets from corporations to women, indigenous peoples, people living in poverty, and other groups that are marginalized. .

Rights of migrants not adequately addressed

Chapter 3 (p. 18) of the report notes, "the universal human rights and fundamental freedoms of migrants must be respected." Their economic contributions to both origin and host countries are also acknowledged.

Aside from this small section, the report does not have any substantive proposals on migrants. Their contributions to society, aside from economic, are not acknowledged; neither are the challenges and discriminations they face. The concept of "leave no one behind" as it stands in the report does not seem

⁴ 1992 Vienna Declaration, Paragraph 5

to explicitly cover migrants. Citizenship and migration status, as well as the irregularity or legality of the migration, have great impact on migrants' access to social protection and services, particularly health services, including sexual and reproductive health services, and education. Citizenship and migration status need to be included among the factors for discrimination, together with gender, sexual orientation and gender identity, ethnicity, disability, age, geography, income level, race or other status, throughout the report. Equal rights and access to services should be for all, whether citizens, migrants, asylum seekers or refugees.

Critical analysis of selected specific Goals and Targets and Means of Implementation

Below we discuss examples of the illustrative goals and targets, which contain some positive elements but also many glaring shortcomings.

GOAL 1 *End Poverty*: too narrow in scope, too one-dimensional

The HLP Report would be satisfied with eradicating only the most extreme form of income poverty – under \$1.25 per day. We know from the MDGs that in many instances extreme poverty persists even with double that income, as witnessed most recently by the food price hikes which hit low income households the hardest. The income poverty line also ignores specific economic burdens depending on the country and situation (e.g., extra costs where harsh winters exist or in remote areas where access to food, other commodities, and services is unreliable and more costly). More importantly, an income-based indicator gives partly wrong information on who is living in poverty, and if any progress is being made. As the majority of people living in poverty are women, and many of them are engaged in the informal and precarious sectors, or depend for their livelihoods on access to natural resources of the commons, women's poverty is often invisible with such an income indicator.

GOAL 2 *Empower Girls and Women and achieve Gender Equality*: some positive targets, but lacks women's rights as underpinning the entire development agenda

Firstly, we note positively that the report includes concrete recommendations on women's and girls' empowerment and gender equality, including specific targets to:

- Prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against girls and women (target 2a);
- End child marriage (target 2b);
- Ensure the equal right of women to own and inherit property, sign a contract, register a business and open a bank account (target 2c); and
- Ensure universal sexual and reproductive health and rights (target 4d).

We are ***not convinced by the wording of target 2d*** to “Eliminate discrimination against women in political, economic, and public life”, it should have been formulated as “ensuring gender equality in political, economic and public life”, because ending discrimination is just a first step towards equality, and not enough to assure women's and girl's empowerment in all areas of society.

It does not build on internationally agreed normative framework of women's rights as human rights⁵.

In several places women's human rights are eroded by giving businesses the same rights and privileges: Target 1b of the 'Ending Poverty' goal, states, 'Increase by x percent the **share of women** and men, communities **and business** with secure rights to land, property and other assets.' In many countries, violations of women's and community rights to land, food, water, are a direct result of land-grabbing and other privileges given to private businesses.

Weak gender analysis and failure to address women's rights as a cross-cutting issue. The report notes that it addresses women and girls in a cross-cutting way, however, at close scrutiny, neither the narrative nor the goals and targets framework go far enough in identifying how women's and girls' experiences of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination result in deeper experiences of poverty, deprivation and social marginalization; how women and girls face unequal and unfair burdens in sustaining the well-being of their societies and economies in both the wage and the care economy; and how women face multiple violations of their human rights that obstruct their equitable participation in economic, social and political life. The majority of the world's poor are women; women are primarily employed in the informal economy and work triple burdens in underpaid wage work, household-related work, and the care economy. In low income countries they face a high risk of dying in childbirth and malnourished; women are more likely to die as a result of natural disasters than men; women have far less access to or rights to land, property and other assets; and women are not adequately covered by most social protection systems. Yet women are not explicitly addressed under the goal to end poverty in either the narrative or the proposed targets, or other goals.

The links to gender equality and women's empowerment must **go beyond recognizing women as a vulnerable group to ensure women's full and equal enjoyment of rights**, participation in all aspects of planning and decision-making and incorporation of valuable knowledge and experiences.

GOAL 3 Provide quality education and life-long learning: lacks girls' priorities!

Provide quality life-long education is a very important goal and a fundamental pre-requisite for achievement of other goals. However, the report should explain that it is a right, and that the right is to universal access to education.

No consideration of the need for girls to complete secondary education. While gender parity in primary education may have been achieved, girls are far less likely to complete secondary school education than boys, undermining their right to education, and with far-reaching consequences for their own development and well-being, as well as that of their families and communities. Girls who do not complete secondary education are more likely to be forced into early marriage; experience early pregnancy and childbearing; and are less likely to be able to exercise their economic rights, ensure sustainable livelihoods, or access employment. There is also no consideration to the need for girls to complete secondary education or access tertiary education or other forms of employment training or livelihood skills to have access to decent work and social protection. There is absolutely no gender analysis or specific recommendations focused on ensuring girls can receive the sexuality education that provides them with the knowledge about their bodies and their rights that they need in order to

5. Women's Major Group Statement, Bonn: http://www.womenrio20.org/docs/final_Women%20Statements_Endorsements-2.pdf

negotiate relationships. Finally, women's and men's literacy and adult education are not sufficiently addressed and targets for quality education and life-long learning should be developed and oriented to equity, universal access and quality.

GOAL 4 *Ensure Healthy Lives*: fails to address social and environmental determinants of health

Ensure healthy lives is a laudable goal, and we welcome the targets calling for universal sexual and reproductive health and rights, which is critical for gender equality and a priority for women. The inclusion of non-communicable diseases, such as cancer, and the continuing focus on reducing the burden of disease from HIV, TB and malaria are also welcome.

Fails to address social determinants of health: The report does not adequately address how social determinants of health, including environmental health, contribute to many of the poor health outcomes that the panel aims to address. Food and nutrition, security, water and sanitation, and other environmental and occupational factors can have specific negative health consequences for women and girls, including for their sexual and reproductive health. While the report acknowledges that universal health coverage is an important step toward achieving the targets, it does not adequately analyse how other barriers can impede or facilitate women's and girls' access to critical health services, such as laws and policies, social and cultural norms and practices, weaknesses in health systems, or lack of information or individual empowerment. The report also does not address public financing of health services or the quality of services and the need for public control over public services and to halt the promotion of privatization. To ensure universal and quality health services, a tax justice and tax reform strategy should be a target for sustainable development.

Fails to address environmental determinants of health. A main cause of non-communicable diseases is likely to be related environmental pollution factors. For example, UNEP's global chemicals outlook 2012 estimated 2 million people get ill, and 800,000 die each year from pesticides and harmful chemicals. There is no reference to environmental determinants of health in the HLP report. On the contrary, the report speaks of "insecticide-treated bed-nets" for malaria control, most likely referring to DDT treated bed nets. DDT is known as one of the most dangerous insecticides, and WHO⁶ has established that malaria can be ended without use of DDT.

Would benefit from more information on SRHR. In the section on health, where SRHR is mentioned, it would be beneficial to describe what services are meant. We want these services to be of quality (as in accessible, available, appropriate), comprehensive across a woman's lifecycle and across various locations – home, community and health facilities – as important to reduce adolescent, maternal, newborn and child mortality and morbidity and improve women's reproductive health. This would include provision of the full range of contraceptives (including emergency contraception), services to ensure maternal health and nutrition, emergency and comprehensive obstetric and postnatal care services, interventions for maternal morbidities including uterine prolapse, services for safe abortion and management of abortion complications, infertility treatment, access to medication and treatment for STI and HIV and reproductive cancers, and appropriate referral systems. Services and programs for SRHR, HIV and AIDS and gender based violence need to be inter-linked, gender-sensitive, rights-based, disability-friendly, and available even in times of conflict, disasters, migration and displacement⁷.

⁶ WHO has set a target to phase out DDT use in combatting malaria latest by 2020, earlier if possible.

⁷ KL Call to Action 2012 http://arrow.org.my/APNGOs/KL_Call_to_Action.pdf

GOAL 5 Ensure Food Security and Good Nutrition: should recognize women's role in food sovereignty

The HLP report makes the linkages between poverty as a cause of food insecurity and affordability of food as being a primary concern. It is important to understand these linkages and their mutually reinforcing nature, and this was adequately covered in the report.

Additionally, the report highlights the link between undernourished women and undernourished children. Women who suffer from food insecurity and related conditions such as stunting, wasting and anaemia are more likely to give birth to undernourished children with low birth rates who are more prone to stunting, wasting and anaemia, as well as other health complications.

We miss, however, **a critique of the whole concept of food security**. Women's and peasant movements use the concept of food sovereignty instead, which asserts the right of people to define their own food systems and puts people who produce, distribute and consume food at the centre of decisions on food systems and policies, rather than the corporations and market institutions they believe have come to dominate the global food system. Women in many regions of the world are key to ending hunger, in some regions producing up to 80% of the food for their families.

The report **lacks an analysis as to the role that transnational corporations play in food insecurity**, through genetically modified crops and seed patenting. Instead, there is an emphasis on utilising new technologies and shifting to large scale sustainable food production. It is important to note that pesticides and other technologies that tend to be pushed by transnational corporations and used in large-scale food production have a strong impact on sexual and reproductive health, particularly of women who tend to be more frequently employed as agrarian workers. These impacts include reproductive cancers, loss of fertility and menstrual problems.

Moreover, while the link between undernourished women and undernourished children is highlighted, this is only in the context of children's welfare. As such, the proposed goal for food security and nutrition only includes reducing stunting, wasting and anaemia in children under 5; it **is unacceptable that there is no target for assuring women's food sovereignty, health and nutrition security**. Food security and nutrition are crucial concerns for women, as these are linked to women's health, including their sexual and reproductive health. Patriarchal and cultural norms in many of our contexts, mean that women eat least and last. As such **many women are undernourished**, which has consequences particularly during pregnancy, increasing the risks of complications during childbirth. In India, 19% of all maternal deaths are thought to be related to nutritional anaemia and this figure is reflected across many parts of the global South.⁸ While a focus on children is also important, it should not be at the expense of women.

GOAL 7 Secure Sustainable Energy: utterly insufficient and likely to have negative impact on female poverty.

⁸ANSWERS & CHETNA, Monitoring Nutritional Anaemia: India's Commitments to the ICPD Programme of Action 15 Years on. In, , Reclaiming & Redefining Rights: Thematic Series 4 Maternal Mortality and Morbidity in Asia, ARROW , 201

Targets for renewable energy are utterly insufficient. The Report contradicts itself when it sets a target for renewable energy and energy saving (in buildings) which is utterly insufficient to achieve climate protection whilst ensuring sustainable development. The Women's Major Group calls for **a specific target to ensure access to safe and renewable energy for households.** If renewable energy technology is not accessible by households, the benefits to women and girls will be limited. Small-scale mitigation projects for households and rural communities cannot compete against large-scale development project that are often proposed by huge multinational corporations. Entirely missing are also sustainable agricultural practices that help protect small-holder farmers (often women) and provide for climate mitigation (drought, crop failure, etc.)

At the same time, we are **cautious of how renewable energy is defined.** With the current flawed definition of renewable energy used in international forums, generic renewables targets such as in the HLP report can be used to justify massive increase in mega hydro dams as well as biofuels and biomass from vast new monoculture plantations, involving displacement, hunger, human rights abuses and deforestation. Women are often disproportionately affected by land-grabbing as a result of such types of large-scale destructive energy programmes. Further, CO2 reductions cannot and should not come from high-risk technologies that create irreversible damage to our health and the planet, such as nuclear, tar sands, shale gas, geo-engineering or the like. Energy policies and investments should have human rights-based safeguards, so that 'modern' energy and efforts for CO2 reductions cannot be based on high-risk technologies that create irreversible damage to our health and the planet, such as nuclear, tar sands, shale gas, geo-engineering or the like.

GOAL 8 Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth: Fails to call for global social protection floor and the right to decent work.

The Report remains in the conceptual world of economic growth and market forces, with merely the assuaging attribute that such growth be "inclusive". The Report is oblivious to the requirements for radical change in the functioning of global value chains which re-create poverty and ill-being on a daily basis. The Report does not propose universal access to decent work, nor equitable access to assets such as land, water, IPRs. There is no mention of the falling share of wages in GDP that has characterised the past decade in so many countries. Instead, the Report backs the neoliberal policy of flexible labour markets – as though unemployment were labour's fault by being so inflexible. It recommends business start-ups as a solution to ever increasing numbers of unemployed and working poor. These are market-fundamentalist responses to deep structural faults – and have proved not just wrong, but pernicious for the majority of the world's population, in particular for women. Women are the majority of those living in poverty and working in precarious jobs, and therefore the foremost beneficiaries of social protection and decent jobs, as shown by the more than thousand textile workers killed in the first months of 2013, in majority women and girls.

GOAL 9 Manage Natural Resource Assets Sustainability: too limiting in defining nature as an asset

The title of goal 9 is dangerous and can lead to increased poverty and inequalities. The title of the goal 'manage natural resource assets sustainably' ignores the fact that ecosystems do not necessarily have to be managed, they can also be conserved through set-asides as sacred sites or for other ethical, cultural, environmental or other purposes. The role of women, indigenous peoples, small farmers and small scale fishers in conserving and restoring soils, coastal and marine territories and other ecosystems is not

sufficiently recognized; throughout the document these groups seem to be treated as victims of environmental degradation only, rather than active actors in sustainable livelihoods. The role of traditional knowledge is particularly important for ecosystem conservation and restoration. The report fails to recognize that territories and areas conserved by Indigenous Peoples and local communities play a key role not only in forest conservation, but in soil, coastal and marine conservation, and in ecosystem conservation in general, and that these territories and areas should be legally and politically recognized and supported.

Women's traditional knowledge should instead have been recognized. Women — in all their cultural diversity as indigenous people, afro-descendants, peasants and fisherwomen — have a collective but differentiated traditional knowledge about natural resources that is crucial to the future sustainable management and conservation of those resources. This expertise has been built upon years of often invisible or unpaid work, that has been key to the livelihoods of entire communities.

At the same time prioritising sustainable use approaches,⁹ including community-based natural resource management and policies that give resource and tenure rights to women, is vital for women. This would allow them to increase the benefits they derive from natural resources, with significant implications for poverty eradication. This approach involves promoting conservation based on a long-term vision of the sustainable use of nature, maximizing the value of common pool wild resources, and increasing local governance over natural resources.

Forests are not plantations, as the report seems to suggest. Without a proper definition of 'forests', a target on "reforestation" is extremely problematic as it could include the expansion of monoculture tree plantations. Direct and indirect replacement of natural forests by monoculture tree plantations is one of the main threats to the world's biodiversity. In this respect, it is also crucially important to ensure a 'land degradation neutral' or 'net deforestation' approach does not lead to offsetting natural forest loss and soil degradation in one location through tree planting, including with invasive and/or exotic species, elsewhere. We are also concerned about the emphasis on valuation, partnerships, REDD+ and other 'green economy' approaches under goal 9, which trigger the commodification and corporate take-over of nature to the detriment of women and other groups. The rights of Mother Earth, which are recognized by the UN General Assembly, are ignored in the report.

Missing; redirect perverse subsidies to protect biodiversity. We welcome that the report acknowledges the importance of vital ecosystems like forests, and that there are concrete targets proposed to safeguard ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, and to reduce deforestation, soil erosion, and desertification. It is positive these areas are combined. The recognition that more corporate accountability and a concrete target on sustainable government procurement are needed to achieve the goal of sustainable management of 'natural resource assets' is welcome as well. We also welcome the acknowledgement that biodiversity loss is irreversible, and that maintaining forests and other essential ecosystems 'with many different species' is essential for livelihoods. However, a reference to the existing Aichi targets of the Biodiversity Convention is missing, including the important target to redirect perverse incentives. Sustainable consumption and production patterns are essential as well, and both

⁹ "Use, if sustainable, can serve human needs on an on-going basis while contributing to the conservation of biological diversity", Sustainable Use Policy Statement, IUCN, 2000, http://www.iucn.org/about/union/commissions/sustainable_use_and_livelihoods_specialist_group/resources/res_supolstat/

regulatory approaches and education and awareness raising are key in this respect.

No critical growth analysis, nor reform of trade, financial, extractives and investor sectors. The report also neglects to target a true reform of the monetary, financial and trade rules globally that would ensure enough fiscal policy space at the national level to implement all the envisioned recommendations. Without seriously reforming the economic and social paradigms that can create the necessary enabling environments for national governments to actually provide their people with the services that they need, and the human rights that they are entitled to, we will not create transformational change for women, men, young people or for the planet.

GOAL 12 Global Enabling environment and Catalyse Long-Term Finance – entirely insufficient

Deep financial and trade reform not addressed: The finance recommendations of the report are utterly insufficient, and it does not recommend the deep financial and trade reform necessary to achieve the goals. The report does not address the impact of transnational corporations and businesses and their role and power that they exert nationally and regionally which often goes in detriment of the realization of Human Rights. On the contrary, in target 12.b the report calls on “stable, long-term private investments” which can be interpreted in many ways, including a further weakening of States faced with unfair bilateral investment treaties.

The post 2015 recommendations in the report do not address the systemic risks produced by poorly regulated financial flows and financial markets. The panel does not call for re-evaluation and reform of existing international institutions—IMF, WB, WTO—or the creation of new ones to correct global economic imbalances, enforce accountability, and promote stability. The report does not address the fact that the poorer developing countries do not have an equal voice in financial decisions.

Climate change as a critical and cross-cutting issue and should be framed within the planetary boundaries. The report recognizes that climate change is a threat to humanity, that people living in poverty are most affected, and that it is better to address it now than deal with the consequences later. The report sets a target (12 c) to stay below 2 degrees Celsius global temperature increase, which is a first step. But it is not enough. Two degrees of global temperature increase will not allow for a stable climate and effects today are already putting the survival of entire countries and millions of people at great risk, as well as reversing existing development gains.

While climate change is highlighted as a cross-cutting issue, ***the report does not include critical inter-linkages in terms of women's rights and gender equality, and climate change.*** The illustrative targets related to energy, agriculture, transport, deforestation and food security, which are indicated as means to address climate change, need to clearly articulate the connections or they will not be prioritized. Examples include ensuring women's access and control of natural resources, promoting women's role in sustainable energy solutions, drawing on and safeguarding women's traditional knowledge, and integrating sustainable agricultural practices that help protect small holder farmers (often women) and provide for climate mitigation (drought, crop failure, etc.).

We also call for a stronger recognition that climate change has differentiated effects on women and men which require ***translation into prioritized targets and efforts*** regarding women's adaptation to climate change, gender-sensitive strategies and women's access to adaptation and disaster risk reduction

finance.

Financing for Gender Equality should be a priority – it is not in the HLP report

As has been clear in the MDG review processes, limited financing has been a major barrier to advancing development goals. This report does not address this vital issue. There is no specific recommendation to allocate resources for advancing women's rights and gender equality.

We appreciate efforts to define clear financing targets to achieve the goals, but we believe the report should also have given attention to how funding is delivered in ways that maximize its impact. Research from recent years has shown that effective financing for gender equality moves away from fragmented, short-term funding cycles towards longer term partnerships of predictable, flexible, and multiyear support.

Further, the report fails to highlight the need to secure resources for the diversity of actors engaged in this work, including civil society and rights holders, and among them, women's organizations and movements, who are doing some of the most impactful and innovative work in this field, holding the line on past gains, pushing for new policy and behavioural changes, providing critical services, and holding governments accountable for their commitments. Securing resources for women's organizations and movements is clearly a key lever for sustainable change to advance gender equality and women's rights at different levels. Yet this is missing from the report.

Finally, we believe current debates on financial policies cannot happen separately to the framing of a development agenda post-2015. We urge strong recommendations to accelerate progress and include this aspect in further thematic, regional, national and intergovernmental consultations that are already being planned by the UN.

Nothing 'New' about proposed Global Governance and Global Partnership for Development

There is nothing new about the "Global Partnership for Development" proposed in the report (chapter 2). The focus seems to be largely on foreign private investment and domestic sources, with recognition of the role of Official Development Assistance (ODA) from developed countries. Although there is still a role for development assistance in the appropriate context, ODA is insufficient. Particularly in a context of financial crisis, cuts in aid delivery and dramatic changes in the financial development landscape, there is a need to do a better assessment. All experience with market-based financial mechanisms show that women are at a disadvantage, and that women living in poverty need public funding programs to move out of the poverty spiral. The new post 2015 should take into consideration these changes.

Regarding policy coherence, we acknowledge that the report sees the need for "reforms in the international financial architecture" and ways to "create a more open, more fair global trading system" (p.15, chapter 3). However, we regret that the report falls short of explicitly recommending policy coherence and the alignment of trade and financial systems with a human rights framework, preferring to stress their contribution "to real economic growth" (p.15). The result is only vague commitments for reform.

Accountability – corporations are off the hook

In terms of **multiple accountability** the HLP recognizes multiple actors involved in development and the need to "include monitoring and accountability mechanisms involving states, civil society, the private



sector, foundations, and the international development community" (p.13). We miss the fact that – unlike in the UN sustainable development processes – civil society is not addressed in its diversity, with reference to women and other important groups of civil society (youth, indigenous peoples etc.).

However, the report fails to recognize the need for stronger regulatory frameworks, especially for the corporate sector **and instead relies on the “willingness** on the part of large corporations as well as governments to report on their social and environmental impact in addition to releasing financial accounts.” (p.17).

The business-oriented language is very clear in the definition of 'accountability' in the High Level Panel Report, where “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” (2013, 23, italics added). However, corporate shareholders' interests are not the same as citizen's interests, as profit is their primary declarative interest. Indeed, the reality is that business has been busily creating more and more access, leverage and lobbying capacity into national, regional and global political systems. This is why, even where the report identifies CSOs as partners, but fails to design mechanisms for accountability that will ensure the meaningful participation of women's and social movements. As the 120 mentions of business in the report testify, the role of the private sector is over-emphasized. The private sector needs more regulation and accountability, but we should not prioritize business partnerships for sustainable development, nor give business rights and priorities over that of women, men and children

The accountability proposal to have peer review through the use of the data revolution will be an important step, but not enough guarantee political commitment nor improve good governance. For example, poor reproductive health outcomes also indicate weak health system governance. Challenges in health system governance include addressing the gap between policy development and policy implementation exacerbated by weak monitoring and evaluation systems, as well as inequitable health financing. Out of pocket or self-financing is the largest source of healthcare financing in South Asia and South East Asia. There is an increasing trend of privatisation of service provision and the unloading of responsibility by national governments who are constitutionally mandated to provide universal health care. Connected to this is also a lack of adequate mechanisms and implementation of private sector regulation. Unfair trade policies also affect access to lifesaving medicines and must be abolished. These issues have not been included in the narrative nor are they addressed in the goals and targets.

Issues of governance in relation to health include accurate reporting of data and functional health information systems. The experience of our partners from Bangladesh demonstrates that documenting of maternal deaths is significantly flawed. Persons responsible for keeping records of maternal deaths are instructed unofficially and sometimes pressured to “keep” the number as low as possible. Record keepers, who are part of the health service delivery system, fear that the numbers might reflect on their professional performance. How will national roadmaps deal with such issues of accountability?

There is a need to capture **qualitative data** which is as important as statistics to substantiate claims of progress in meeting targets. Presently, this is also not reflected in the HLP document.

We reiterate the importance of using existing human rights accountability mechanisms as tools for the accountability of this agenda.



Concluding: This report should not be taken as a basis for development of the Post 2015 agenda. Instead the human rights architecture and environmental standards must be the core of a global sustainable development agenda. It must also include concrete means of implementation that prioritize public financing over public-private partnerships in order to realise states obligation to allocate the maximum availability of resources for universal human rights, social justice and environmental sustainability.

To sign on contact:

Women's Major Group (WMG)¹⁰

Contact@WomenMajGrp.org and secretariat@wecf.eu

www.womenrio20.org

@Women_Rio20

¹⁰ **Drafting team includes:** Alexandra Garita, Resurj *Mexico*; Gabriele Koehler *Germany*; Sascha Gabizon WICF *Netherlands*; Shannon Kowalski, International Women's Health Coalition, *USA*; Almuth Ernsting Biofuelwatch *UK*; Gillian Bowser *USA*; Nicole Bidegain DAWN *Uruguay*; Alejandra Scampini, AWID, *Uruguay*; Noelene Nabulivou DAWN, *Fiji*; Simone Lovera, Global Forest Coalition, *Paraguay*; Eleanor Blomstrom, Women's Environment and Development Organization, *USA*; Vivienne Solis, Coopesolidar, *Costa Rica*; Elina Doshanova, Social Eco Fund, *Kazakhstan*; Maria Melinda Ando - Asian-Pacific Resource & Research Centre for Women (ARROW), *Malaysia*; Yveline Nicolas, ADEQUATIONS, *France*, Marcella Balara, ICAE – *Chile & Uruguay*.