

UN-NGLS Civil Society Consultation for the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

December 2012-January 2013

Introduction

At the request of the Secretariat of the [UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda](#) (#Post2015HLP), the [UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service \(NGLS\)](#) conducted an online consultation to gather inputs for consideration to inform the Panel's meeting in Monrovia, Liberia, taking place from 30 January – 2 February 2013. This consultation, conducted through the #Post2015HLP civil society consultation web page at www.worldwewant2015.org/Post2015HLP, received almost 800 responses from 134 participating organizations, international networks and individual respondents through online submissions and email.

In late November 2012, the #Post2015HLP released a set of [24 framing questions](#) that the Panel is to consider over the course of its work. With guidance from NGLS, the Panel's Secretariat selected and re-organized approximately two-thirds of these framing questions for this civil society consultation, avoiding repetition of consultation topics already covered in the [October / November 2012 civil society consultation](#).

The selection of questions was organized under two main themes:

- A) The shape and content of a post-2015 development framework;
- B) Partnership and accountability for development.

Please find the list of consultation questions in the Table of Contents. They are also posted at www.worldwewant2015.org/Post2015HLP, with links to view the responses, and are available as a PDF document [here](#).

Through quotations and summaries of the submissions and discussions, this report provides an overview of principal civil society recommendations on each of the consultation questions. Each question has been reported upon in a stand-alone section of this synthesis report, and therefore there is some overlap and repetition in the content of responses across the 13 questions. This overlap should be seen as an indicator of what respondents perceive as critical to the discussion. The themes that recur throughout the synthesis report are identified in the Executive Summary.

Due to the limited timeframe and online nature of the consultation, this report does not attempt to represent the full range of civil society and other stakeholders' views on the post-2015 development agenda. NGLS has made every effort, however, to portray the breadth of perspectives reflected in the online consultation. NGLS acknowledges the high quality and wide scope of the contributions received during this consultation, and thanks all participants for their responses. To access these contributions, or to have an overview of contributors, please click on the relevant link:

- (1) [List of Contributors to the consultation](#)
- (2) Compilation Document of responses to the consultation questions: [Spreadsheet File](#) [PDF File](#)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary of Consultation Findings	3
A. The shape and content of a post-2015 development framework	9
1) From the Millennium Development Goals, what lessons can be learned about designing goals to have maximum impact?	9
2) How should a new framework address the dimensions of economic growth, equity, social equality and environmental sustainability? Is an overall focus on poverty eradication sufficiently broad to capture the range of sustainable development issues?	11
3) What elements should be included in the architecture of the next framework? How can the SDG process be aligned with the post-2015 process? What is the role of the Sustainable Development Goals in a broader post-2015 framework?	13
4) Mindful that poor and vulnerable people may not have the capacity to participate directly in an online consultation, the following question that the Panel is considering is also posed for individuals and civil society organizations who engage with these constituencies directly and regularly: “What issues do poor and vulnerable people themselves prioritize?”	16
5) How should a new framework address resilience to crises?	18
6) How should a new framework reflect the particular challenges of the poor living in conflict and post-conflict settings?	21
7) How can we universalize goals and targets while being consistent with national priorities and targets?	24
8) What time horizon should we set for the next phase in the global development agenda (e.g. 10, 15, 25 years, or a combination)?	25
B. Partnership and accountability for development	27
1) How can a new framework tackle the challenges of coherence and coordination among the organizations, processes, and new mechanisms that address issues that are global in scope?	27
2) How can we build and sustain global consensus for a new framework, involving Member States, the private sector and civil society?	29
3) How specific should the Panel be with recommendations on means of implementation, including development assistance, finance, technology, capacity building, trade and other actions?	31
4) How can accountability mechanisms be strengthened? What kind of monitoring process should be established? What elements would make it effective? How to account for qualitative progress?	33
5) How can transparency and more inclusive global governance be used to facilitate achievement of the development agenda?	35
Acknowledgements	37
Annex - Elements to be included in the architecture of the framework	38

Executive Summary of Consultation Findings

“The next framework should address the three dimensions of sustainable development in an integrated way and be universally applicable,” advocated WWF International, in line with the vast majority of contributors. There was nearly full consensus among submissions that what is needed is a global framework flexible enough to allow for adjustments according to regional, national, and local needs, priorities, and budgets. The inclusion of the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities” is essential and would signal a major improvement over the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), according to several respondents.

Many contributors, including the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID), Social Watch, and the International Disability and Development Consortium, indicated that the new development framework must embrace a holistic, rights-based approach, and that principles of equality, equity, non-discrimination and inclusive participation must underpin its policies and practices.

The rights-based approach should be guided by the full range of human rights obligations already agreed to by UN Member States, including civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. This would enable the framework to be “truly effective in transforming the lives of all those living in poverty,” according to Amnesty International, and would help ensure that marginalized groups and others facing discrimination, whether in terms of gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, or other factors, are included in development gains. The submissions expressed much support for stronger accountability mechanisms in the post-2015 development framework, and advocated for constructive interaction between the existing human rights accountability mechanisms (at the national and international level) and the post-2015 monitoring, review and accountability infrastructure.

Human rights of participation were emphasized by many, not only for getting the framework right at the national and international levels, but also for quality implementation. Many respondents underscored that the design of the post-2015 framework should be an iterative process involving regular, meaningful, and inclusive participation of all stakeholders, particularly the poorest and most marginalized people whose needs and rights this framework must support.

Respondents insisted that the design of the framework must address structural and root causes of poverty, inequality, economic volatility, and unsustainable development, as well as “the core factors which exacerbate the vulnerability of impoverished and marginalized populations,” as specified by the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development and echoed by the European Youth Forum and Save the Children. Particular emphasis was placed on ensuring that equality, non-discrimination and empowerment are incorporated consistently throughout all goals and targets in the new framework. Many organizations called for the new development framework to promote decent job creation, education, and social protection for the poorest and most marginalized people to build resilience.

Contributors called for the post-2015 framework to supplement income and economic growth measures of development with broader indicators of human well-being; many were highly critical of “economic growth” for its own sake. Examples were given from emerging economies where fast growth patterns translated in fast-rising inequalities, economic insecurity, greater marginalization, and accelerated environmental destruction. “Rethinking the prevailing economic model” was a recurring theme. Organizations called for the future framework to promote measures for financial reform, and emphasized the need to implement equitable measures to protect the environment.

Many organizations asserted that drawing a distinction between sustainability and development agendas is an artificial, misleading and even harmful division; contributors therefore called for a unified, inclusive and transparent process that leads to a single post-2015 development framework.

Below are short summaries of the contributions received for each of the consultation questions.

A. The shape and content of a post-2015 development framework

A1) From the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), what lessons can be learned about designing goals to have maximum impact?

The strengths and shortcomings of the MDGs have brought to the fore important lessons that – according to the respondents – should be considered when designing goals to have maximum impact. A number of organizations criticized the MDGs for creating a very narrowly defined and siloed development agenda, and asserted therefore that future goals should bring in a more comprehensive and coherent vision of development, which focuses not only on selected “ends,” but also addresses structural issues which may hinder development (e.g. issues related to macroeconomic policies, climate change, peace and security). Respondents stressed that future goals should be holistic, concrete, mutually supportive, easy to communicate, attainable, and aspirational but realistic. These goals should be relevant to, recognized and owned by all countries and take into account differing levels of development. Because the MDGs emphasize quantity over quality, they have failed to address problems faced by marginalized groups, and have concealed and perpetuated inequalities within and between countries, contributors stressed. Future goals, therefore, should be more than “just an accord between rich and poor governments,” and result from the needs of people experiencing poverty and its impacts. The post-2015 framework should be rooted in human rights and equality principles; reflect the root causes of and multidimensional nature of poverty; and promote good governance and democratic institutions, including through robust monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

A2) How should a new framework address the dimensions of economic growth, equity, social equality and environmental sustainability? Is an overall focus on poverty eradication sufficiently broad to capture the range of sustainable development issues?

An overall focus on poverty eradication, while an essential dimension of the new framework, was widely seen as too narrow to address the broad range of sustainable development issues. Most contributions insisted on the need for an integrated framework and many suggested that the full range of human rights obligations provide the basis for a more holistic approach, especially if these can be expanded to include the rights of future generations and to a healthy environment. The prevailing economic model should be rethought to address the structural causes of poverty, inequality and environmental degradation, contributors stressed; proposals were made to transform economic and social systems for a more sustainable and equitable future, including through non-market based approaches.

A3) What elements should be included in the architecture of the next framework? How can the SDG process be aligned with the post-2015 process? What is the role of the Sustainable Development Goals in a broader post-2015 framework?

Contributors resoundingly called for the post-2015 development framework to be anchored in human rights, guided by the range of obligations already agreed to by Member States. Respondents contributed elements of an extensive, though not exhaustive, list of suggested dimensions to be included in the framework. These include: gender equality and women’s empowerment; disability support for people of all ages; risk management and vulnerability reduction; peacebuilding and non-violent resolution; education; social protection; decent work; access to clean and sustainable natural resources and basic services; and policy coherence for development, among other proposals. There was widespread agreement among the contributions that the post-2015 and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) processes must be integrated; Save the Children, for one, suggested the September 2013 General Assembly Special Session on MDGs as an ideal moment for the combination of the two processes. Contributors see development and sustainability challenges as “intrinsically linked” – as the Population

and Sustainability Network articulated – and accordingly want the UN processes seeking to address them to be unified.

A4) Mindful that poor and vulnerable people may not have the capacity to participate directly in an online consultation, the following question that the Panel is considering is also posed for individuals and civil society organizations who engage with these constituencies directly and regularly: “What issues do poor and vulnerable people themselves prioritize?”

Many submissions asserted that this particular question must be addressed directly to the poor and vulnerable people themselves, for example through mass grassroots consultations and other off-line means of facilitating citizens’ input. There was wide agreement on the crucial need to ensure that the voices of poor and vulnerable people and communities are heard, particularly in determining their needs and executing their rights. “It is essential that Southern voices lead the process for the creation of a new global development framework,” Health Poverty Action urged, while their “collective power, knowledge and resilience” must be acknowledged, the Association for Women’s Rights in Development underscored. The core priority issues that emerged include: decent productive employment opportunities; food and better nutrition; quality health care; affordable quality education; sustainable access to water resources, both for drinking water and sanitation; access to decent and affordable housing; efficient and affordable energy; a clean environment and equitable use of natural resources; security, both personal and community; access to land; combating the impacts of climate change; participatory governance and decision making; as well as access to information. Many contributors indicated that the new development framework must embrace a holistic, rights-based approach, and that principles of equality, equity, non-discrimination and inclusive participation must underpin its policies and practices. Such an approach, they argued, would ensure that the most marginalized can benefit from development and growth, and become active agents of change.

A5) How should a new framework address resilience to crises?

Many contributors identified that the post-2015 development framework must include a focus on strengthening resilience to crises, including: failure of (financial) market mechanisms; environmental degradation including climate change; natural disasters; severe food shortages; energy shortages; and conflict. Save the Children called for the integration of the agendas of environmental sustainability, development and disaster risk reduction, and in particular the outcomes of the review of the [Hyogo Framework of Action](#). Respondents expressed the conviction that the post-2015 framework must adopt a rights-based approach and promote equity to build comprehensive resilience. A number of contributions called for the future framework to promote measures for financial reform, including incentives, taxation, transparent financial regulation, banning speculation of food commodities, and the reform of international financial institutions. Organizations including Social Watch called for the promotion of decent job creation, education, and social protection for the poorest and most marginalized people. Many contributions highlighted the need to build environmental resilience, including by addressing the development challenges posted by climate change. Finally, respondents advocated building food security and food sovereignty as important elements of community resilience.

A6) How should a new framework reflect the particular challenges of the poor living in conflict and post-conflict settings?

As violence and conflict are rooted in human insecurity and deprivation, fragile and conflict-affected States face severe obstacles in reducing poverty and achieving development. The post-2015 framework, therefore, must effectively address the particular challenges of people affected by poverty in conflict and post-conflict settings, in part through promoting governance, justice, equity, and peace. Incorporating gender equality and implementing a human rights-based approach, including sexual and reproductive health and rights, was advocated by several respondents. Six international organizations referred to the

Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) of the [New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States](#), agreed at the Busan Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, which identified five foundational conditions for development and aid effectiveness in fragile and conflict-affected countries: legitimate politics (a State for all); security (safety for all); justice (equity for all); economic foundations (jobs for all); resources and revenue management (services for all). The international community should provide targeted support and solidarity, contributions emphasized, through ensuring access to basic needs, supporting civil society, investing in youth, stabilizing health systems, and promoting restorative and/or transitional justice.

A7) How can we universalize goals and targets while being consistent with national priorities and targets?

There was general consensus among submissions that what is needed is a global framework flexible enough to allow for adjustments to regional, national, and local needs, priorities and budgets. Most submissions expressed that this global framework should be grounded on a set of principles derived from UN agreements and conventions signed by all Member States – specifically those on universal human rights – thereby guaranteeing consistency between global and national levels. A few submissions stated that a number of themes (e.g. eradication of extreme poverty) and cross-cutting development issues (e.g. gender equality) could also be included in the overarching global framework without undermining consistency between global and national goals, targets, and priorities. The inclusion of the principle of universality with “common but differentiated responsibilities” is essential and it would signal a major improvement over the MDGs, according to several contributors.

A8) What time horizon should we set for the next phase in the global development agenda (e.g. 10, 15, 25 years, or a combination)?

Respondents preferred various options from amongst the potential time horizons for the post-2015 development framework – ten years, fifteen, or 20 to 25, with the largest number advocating a combination of timeframes. Regarding a time horizon of ten years, Development Initiatives made the case that 2025 “presents a universally powerful, achievable and measurable” milestone towards the elimination of poverty. A fifteen-year horizon was advocated for adequate transformation (“time to change a generation”) while allowing meaningful progress to be measured and evaluated. Several organizations called for long-term interval or phased planning; specifically, Population Matters suggested a ten-year horizon for sectoral targets, and 25 years for “overarching sustainability ‘themes.’” The European Youth Forum wrote, “A long-term timeframe would provide direction to the long-term goals, offering more time to achieve them as well. Combined with intermediate targets, [this] would at the same time ensure greater accountability.”

B. Partnership and accountability for development

B1) How can a new framework tackle the challenges of coherence and coordination among the organizations, processes, and new mechanisms that address issues that are global in scope?

Contributions suggested tackling the challenges of coherence and coordination among the organizations, processes, and mechanisms that address global issues, primarily through: the UN system, providing adequate resources to civil society, and information-sharing. The World Youth Alliance, Oxfam India, and others advocated situating the post-2015 framework within the existing infrastructure, monitoring and accountability systems, and the range of obligations already undertaken by States in the international human rights framework. The UN system – through the General Assembly, individual agencies, the High-Level Political Forum, or a new Sustainability Council – was positioned as central in leading efforts towards a coordinated and effectively-implemented post-2015 agenda. According to several organizations, an important element of achieving consensus is the “serious reform” of international financial institutions, including the IMF and World Bank, towards “advancing human rights and

international solidarity as part of a more equitable and appropriate global governance system.” Other suggestions for ensuring coordination and coherence included effective cooperation between countries over the sustainable management (including transboundary management), use, and protection of shared natural resources, and the clear alignment of the Panel’s work with the intergovernmental process on SDGs.

B2) How can we build and sustain global consensus for a new framework, involving Member States, the private sector and civil society?

On process, the submissions reflected wide agreement that to build and sustain a global consensus, the new framework must use a multi-stakeholder, genuinely participatory approach that includes all groups and individuals that will be affected by this development process: governments, the private sector, civil society, and particularly marginalized groups that have been most hard hit by poverty and that were left out of the formulation of the MDG framework. This all-inclusive multi-stakeholder approach should be used at every stage of this initiative: wide consultations should be held with all stakeholders beginning with the formulation of the framework and its policies, and meaningful engagement must continue during implementation, monitoring, evaluation and review of programmes under the new framework. Furthermore, the process should be open, transparent, and fully participatory. On substance, several submissions called for the inclusion of issues that are key to the UN’s development work, but that were not included in the MDG framework in 2000: governance, respect for human rights, international norms and standards for labour and environmental protection.

B3) How specific should the Panel be with recommendations on means of implementation, including development assistance, finance, technology, capacity building, trade and other actions?

Participants expressed highly diverse views as to how specific the Panel should be with regard to recommendations on means of implementation. Some argued that it was essential to be as specific as possible in order to have a meaningful framework, while others felt that too much integration would be either unrealistic or counterproductive. Contributors distinguished between means of implementation that support an enabling international environment (such as tax cooperation and a financial transactions tax) which should be specific, and national-level recommendations which should focus on strong participatory rights to ensure local people are involved in deciding the most appropriate means and how these should be implemented.

B4) How can accountability mechanisms be strengthened? What kind of monitoring process should be established? What elements would make it effective? How to account for qualitative progress?

Overall, the submissions reflected much enthusiasm for stronger accountability mechanisms, and several recognized that this would constitute a major improvement over the MDGs. Many submissions proposed a system of “multiple accountability” that would include all stakeholders – donors, governments, civil society, the private sector – and all beneficiaries, with particular emphasis on the inclusion of marginalized social groups (including women, youth, persons with disabilities), that would be operational at all levels (local, national, regional and global). Accountability mechanisms should be tailored to the needs and capabilities at each level and for different groups of stakeholders, contributors emphasized. CIVICUS and the International Planned Parenthood Foundation highlighted the valuable role of civil society as an independent agent in ensuring effective monitoring. A well-functioning monitoring process, according to respondents, is transparent and makes information freely available to all stakeholders at all operational levels (local, national, regional, and global). Oxfam India suggested that process indicators be used to improve qualitative evaluations. The International Movement ATD Fourth World recommended another essential tool for qualitative evaluations: reports from beneficiaries, in particular from the most socially marginalized, on how development programmes impact their lives.

B5) How can transparency and more inclusive global governance be used to facilitate achievement of the development agenda?

Contributors regard openness as most essential to increase the probability of success of the post-2015 development agenda, including in terms of access to information and reports by and for all stakeholders; governance; and participation at every stage of the development process, from priority setting to decision making, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Openness was advocated as critical for the meaningful inclusion of those that the framework intends to benefit so that they can provide inputs at every stage. To boost transparency and improve the inclusiveness of global governance to better serve the post-2015 development agenda, respondents advocated an expanded role for civil society organizations as independent agents and partners in planning, implementation and monitoring of government policies. Submissions also reflected specific, concrete suggestions to build transparency and effective governance for the post-2015 development agenda.

A. The shape and content of a post-2015 development framework

A1) From the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), what lessons can be learned about designing goals to have maximum impact?

Many contributions associated the MDGs with substantial progress for millions of people, including vulnerable groups such as youth, children and women. At the same time, many respondents cautioned that the MDGs have also been responsible for uneven success and not enough change. The strengths and shortcomings of the MDGs have brought to the fore important lessons that should be considered when designing goals to have maximum impact.

A core strength of the MDG framework, according to several contributors, is that it derives from its focus on a limited set of concrete, common human development goals, combined with measurable and time-bound targets and indicators that are clear, simple, easy to understand and communicate. The MDGs also provided a shared agenda and unified vision for development; created a sense of urgency; catalyzed action; increased emphasis on global aid effectiveness; and galvanized global efforts to meet the needs of the poorest. "While often critiqued for their over-simplistic nature, the MDGs have served a purpose in popularizing development approaches and targets which might otherwise not have held such importance," ACTION affirmed.

On the other hand, a number of organizations criticized the MDGs for creating a very narrowly defined and siloed development agenda, and for focusing on deliverables to the exclusion of addressing structural factors that cause and perpetuate poverty, instability and vulnerability. "Creating separate goals in the MDGs without clearly articulating synergies between the individual goals has resulted in missed opportunities for efficiencies and coordination," as the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development underscored. For maximum impact, respondents asserted that future goals should bring in a more comprehensive and coherent vision of development, which focuses not only on selected "ends," but also addresses structural issues which may hinder development (e.g. issues related to macroeconomic policies, climate change, peace and security).

Respondents stressed that future goals should be holistic, concrete, mutually supportive, easy to communicate, attainable, and above all aspirational but realistic. These goals should be relevant to, recognized and owned by all countries. As Medsin-UK explained, although the MDGs may have been achievable on a global scale, they failed to recognize the challenges that particular countries faced in trying to meet the goals. As a result, future goals must take into account differing levels of development throughout the world. As articulated by Action on Armed Violence, "Future goals must reach beyond traditional development thinking to become higher sustainable goals that apply to all countries alike. From those overarching goals, countries at national and also sub-national level need to develop specific, relevant and targeted indicators against which to measure their achievements."

Additionally, many contributing organizations recommended that future goals be supported by simple, measurable, time-bound and appropriate targets and performance measurement (e.g. staged, process- and outcome-based) indicators that are both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Goals, targets and indicators should be differentiated at national and sub-national level and should allow for disaggregated data collection along the major fault lines of inequalities and inequities. "Measuring economic growth without also evaluating equitable distribution is neither a development goal nor a useful indicator," the Housing and Land Rights Network of Habitat International Coalition admonished.

Because the MDGs emphasize quantity over quality, they have failed to address problems faced by marginalized groups, and have concealed and perpetuated inequalities within and between countries, contributors stressed. Sightsavers highlighted that “governments have in some cases focused efforts and resources on the ‘easiest to reach’ groups rather than tackling the root causes of marginalization and inequality,” and World Vision International observed that “many countries were able to claim success in reaching targets while leaving their hardest-to-reach people no better off.” Future goals, therefore, should be more than “just an accord between rich and poor governments, where people living in poverty have little ownership or transformative potential themselves,” in the words of Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR). According to the contributions, goals should be based on the felt needs of the beneficiaries and not the needs perceived by government. Therefore, the post-2015 framework should be driven by a needs assessments approach and result from real, timely and relevant consultations with people who live, suffer and struggle with poverty and its impacts on a daily basis.

Many of the above-mentioned shortcomings in the MDG framework resulted, in the view of many contributors, from the fact that the MDGs did not promote or derive from a rights-based approach and instead were formulated through a top-down approach with no participation from the most disadvantaged people. To maximize impact, future goals will need to be rooted in the fundamental dignity of the person, human rights and principles of equality and empowerment for all. They should be designed in such a way that they can be practically employed by the poor and marginalized to transform aspirational commitments into real improvements in their living conditions. Various organizations insist that, at minimum, the post-2015 framework must be grounded in the principles and language enshrined in international human rights declarations and conventions. In addition, as voiced by Special Olympics International, future goals must assign equity and justice targets to high risk, difficult to reach populations. Contributions presented specific recommendations regarding the adoption of a human rights-based approach in their answers to several subsequent questions, particularly A2 (“How should a new framework address the dimensions of economic growth, equity, social equality and environmental sustainability?”); please see page 11.

The post-2015 framework should also ensure ownership across society, not simply at the level of government, but also at the level of citizens, national and international civil society institutions, and as suggested by some, the private sector (through public-private partnerships). Moreover, as addressed in the contributions to question A4 (“What do the poor and vulnerable themselves prioritize?”), the framework should recognize that people living in poverty are a huge potential force for solving the staggering problems of poverty, and accordingly, the framework should increase their voice in decisions regarding finance, programme conception, and project implementation, and enhance their capacity to become actors of development, including through volunteerism, people-to-people development and cooperatives.

Finally, the post-2015 framework should incorporate robust monitoring and accountability mechanisms that establish ways to hold all States accountable to comply with their commitments; avoid corruption; and protect, respect and fulfil economic and social rights, including through the use of maximum available resources. A few contributions noted that this should go hand in hand with regulatory reforms or incentives in the areas of financial services, trade, agriculture, taxation, security and debt that undermine progress in sustainable human development and human rights. The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) underscored that accountability is not limited to States alone, but also to influential non-state and supra-state actors as well as to national and local governments. As the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development urged, corporations must also be held to account for adherence to financial and environmental regulations and human rights. Section B4, on effective monitoring and accountability, elaborates on these points.

A2) How should a new framework address the dimensions of economic growth, equity, social equality and environmental sustainability? Is an overall focus on poverty eradication sufficiently broad to capture the range of sustainable development issues?

In addressing these twin questions, an overwhelming number of contributions emphasized that an overall focus on poverty eradication – while an essential dimension of the new framework – would be too narrow to capture the range of sustainable development issues, especially if poverty is understood only in terms of income poverty. A number of criticisms of an overarching focus on poverty eradication alone were shared, including the following:

- It would place most of the emphasis on developing countries and exclude the range of fundamental changes needed in developed countries where poverty is more diffuse (Association des Etats Généraux des Etudiants de l'Europe (AEGEE), Anglican Alliance);
- Poverty reduction can be pursued in manners that can be highly damaging to the environment (Population Matters; WWF International);
- In particular, it does not in itself deal with the fact that we are currently exceeding the planet's annual replenishment capacity (WWF International);
- It would tend to deal with the symptoms rather than the structural or root causes of poverty and other challenges such as growing inequalities and unsustainable patterns of consumption and production (World Youth Alliance, Medsin-UK, LDC Watch).

Although a few contributors including the Wellbeing Foundation Africa felt that a single framework focused on economic, social and environmental issues would be too complex, most participants strongly emphasized the need for an integrated approach. A wide range of inputs insisted that this integrated approach should be underpinned by the full range of already-agreed human rights obligations, including civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Poverty, in its broader dimensions, would be addressed through ensuring human rights. For example, the Center of Concern suggested: “notions of empowerment and vulnerability, that a pure income-based approach to poverty measurement would miss, are captured by resorting to the human rights framework.” The [Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights](#), recently adopted by the UN Human Rights Council, “should be considered as an important tool for ensuring that the new development agenda is firmly anchored in respect for human rights,” the International Movement ATD Fourth World proposed.

Implementing sustainable development through the international human rights framework

Many argued that the full implementation of all human rights would be the most effective way to deal with other sustainable development challenges as well. If human rights were truly implemented and respected, they could serve as an “ethical lens” through which economic and other policy could be judged, asserted the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID). The human rights framework would provide a comprehensive tool for accountability, especially to help ensure that marginalized groups and others facing discrimination, whether in terms of gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, or other factors, are included in development gains.

For some organizations, however, genuine implementation of existing human rights obligations cannot be treated in isolation from what they see as the need to address conflicting “corporate rights” and “rights of capital” when these may undermine human rights and sustainable development objectives. Social Watch, for example, argued: “Transnational corporations may nowadays sue governments at international fora for any change in the rules, including health regulations, that affect their actual or planned profits.... There is an urgent need to rebalance rights – that is, to reclaim human rights as the normative foundation of policy, and to roll back the rights of capital in relation to the rights of people.”

CARE International and the International Planned Parenthood Foundation (IPPF) advocated a transformative rights-based approach vis-à-vis gender equality, which CARE framed as “a key driver of poverty”; the organization called for both a central goal on gender equality and women's empowerment

and the mainstreaming of gender factors within all other goals through gender-related indicators and targets. For example, IPPF advocated the inclusion of “policies that increase access to reproductive health services and increase gender equality particularly those that increase women’s access to education and participation in the work place” as part of the framework’s overall principles of human rights, empowerment, justice, and gender equality.

In addition, contributors including ActionAid International suggested that existing human rights need to be expanded to include the rights of future generations and to a healthy environment.

A number of contributors, including the Beyond2015 network, strongly endorsed the approach taken by the UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, which suggested that the new framework should be underpinned by the three principles of: (a) human rights; (b) equality; and (c) sustainability.

The role of economic growth

Participants including Tearfund and Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, were highly critical of “economic growth” for its own sake. Examples were given from emerging economies where fast growth patterns translated to fast-rising inequalities, economic insecurity, greater marginalization, and accelerated environmental destruction. “Rethinking the prevailing economic model” was a recurring theme. For some, including Sightsavers, it was a quest for economic and social justice through a range of redistributive measures and proactive policies, such as: implementing the universally accepted concept of “social protection floors” and the four pillars of the [Decent Work Agenda](#) developed by the International Labour Organization (ILO); redistributive and progressive taxation; the economic empowerment of women through greater land rights and access to credit; investing in children; strengthening the rights of indigenous peoples; empowering disabled people to enter the workforce; or more meaningful support measures for least developed and other vulnerable countries.

The International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), among others, emphasized the need to implement equitable measures to protect the environment, whether through the promotion of decent “green jobs,” embedding the value of biodiversity and ecosystems services to human well-being in public and private decision making; or redesigning laws, policies, institutions and public participation and accountability mechanisms to ensure sustainable, equitable access to, and benefits from, natural resources; and shifting away from resource-intensive, wasteful consumption and production patterns.

Some respondents recommended that the new framework draw from some of the values that underpin non-market based economies, such as reciprocity, collectivity, solidarity and harmony with nature. AWID suggested that experiences to learn from include: the “living well” paradigm (*buen vivir* in Spanish) in the Ecuadorian and Bolivian context, involving an indigenous worldview of achieving a balanced life, in harmony with other human beings and nature; “food sovereignty,” a concept advocated by grassroots farmers’ movements that challenges corporate-driven agribusiness and is grounded on the rights of people to decide their own food and agricultural systems to enjoy healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods; or the concept of “degrowth,” which may be better understood as the reduction of unsustainable portions of the economy (use of fossil fuels, air transport, cars, etc.) while supporting the “growth” of sustainable alternatives, such as organic agriculture, renewable energy, or sustainable transport.

Universal goals and targets?

Several organizations including Human Development Foundation grappled with the challenging question of whether and how an integrated development framework could be expressed in terms of universal goals and targets. World Vision International, among others, commented that while universal goals and targets are important, it is essential that people at the national level be able to define their own goals and targets

of what economic and social well-being and sustainability should look like – as locally-tailored benchmarks against which progress can be monitored.

Respondents disagreed over whether, in the spirit of an integrated approach, there should be universal goals (i.e., on equality, environmental sustainability, disability, or disaster and conflict prevention), or whether these themes should be mainstreamed into the different dimensions. Save the Children noted that it would support a goal geared at environmental sustainability, for example, while warning that this approach “only goes so far in delivering integration and does little to address the risk that activities undertaken under other goals may undermine environmental sustainability and compromise the potential to eradicate poverty forever.” It suggests that one way forward is to ensure that each goal contains environmental (and conversely social) dimensions to it, as in the organization’s proposed “Hunger Goal,” which includes targets on sustainable food production, distribution and sustainable water use. Similarly, World Vision International argued: “a single goal on inequality would miss the point that it is multidimensional, mutually reinforcing and can’t be tackled in isolation,” and suggested that measures to combat inequality should be woven throughout the goals.

The post-2015 framework in national contexts

Contributors discussed the challenge of how to ensure that new goals and targets do not replicate the same problem with national averages (as in the MDGs), which can leave out those hardest to reach or mask worsening conditions within some groups. A human rights approach based on affirmative action for the most marginalized, combined with disaggregated indicators, would help deal with this problem, stated a number of contributors. Other potentially effective ways forward included the idea of “zero goals,” proposed by Save the Children: for example, by a certain date, no one should suffer from hunger.

Finally, many contributors emphasized the governance dimensions of the new framework. CIVICUS asserted that “the new framework needs to be underpinned by democratic institutions designed to prevent the capture of national and international agendas by narrow vested interests.” Human rights of participation were emphasized by many, not only for getting the framework right at the national and international levels, but also for quality implementation – and dealing with very practical problems, such as the lack of statistical capacities to monitor new indicators, which the involvement of local people in qualitative assessments could at least partially address.

A3) What elements should be included in the architecture of the next framework? How can the SDGs process be aligned with the post-2015 process? What is the role of the Sustainable Development Goals in a broader post-2015 framework?

What elements should be included in the architecture of the next framework?

Many respondents emphasized that the design of the architecture of the post-2015 framework should be an iterative process involving regular, meaningful, and inclusive participation of all stakeholders, particularly the poorest and most marginalized people whose needs and rights this framework must support. As Slum Dwellers International observed, “A growing consensus in a range of fields such as economics, political science, and sociology confirms the need for inclusive institutions as the basis for sustainable development.”

In line with many other contributors, WWF International advocated, “The next framework should address the three dimensions of sustainable development in an integrated way and be universally applicable.” The organization added, “Any future set of goals must apply to all countries while taking into account national differences and capacities. Differentiated responsibilities need to add up to a coherent global picture.” The World Youth Alliance recommended that the framework also include “key practices that serve to guide countries to identify their own development priorities and solutions.”

Respondents insisted that the design of the framework must address structural and root causes of poverty, inequality, economic volatility, and unsustainable development. Particular emphasis was placed on ensuring that equality, non-discrimination and empowerment are incorporated consistently throughout all goals and targets in the new framework, and that development is not merely equated with economic growth. As described by the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID), the framework should encourage equitable processes to shift patterns of production and consumption. It should also incorporate the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, advocated respondents including the Campaign for People's Goals on Sustainable Development.

The framework must promote accountable mechanisms for fully inclusive participation that enable all stakeholders, including civil society and particularly poor and marginalized people, to "jointly formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate development-related policies and actions" through partnerships at national, regional and global levels, as articulated by the European Youth Forum.

Contributors resoundingly called for the post-2015 development framework to be anchored in human rights and guided by the range of obligations already agreed to by Member States; this would ensure that the framework is "truly effective in transforming the lives of all those living in poverty," according to Amnesty International. This organization detailed how this approach should be realized, explaining that it should include: (a) the establishment of timelines for fulfilling minimum essential levels of economic, social and cultural rights globally and for each country; (b) clear and time-bound pledges by States in a position to provide assistance to ensure that there is adequate international co-operation assistance available where such assistance is necessary to ensure the realization of at least minimum essential levels of economic, social and cultural rights for all; and (c) a commitment to strengthen national, regional and international systems for data collection on levels of access to water, sanitation, health, education, food and social protection to ensure that they fully assess quality, availability, physical accessibility and affordability. Amnesty International concluded by emphasizing the importance of disaggregating data at least according to gender and the other most relevant grounds of discrimination, including ethnicity and disability.

The Beyond2015 network shared its conception of the new framework, which in its view should contain the following elements:

1. A statement of the vision and principles on which the framework is founded;
2. A statement of purpose that lays out in simple and ambitious terms the most important outcomes that the new framework should achieve;
3. A theory of change that explains how the new framework will realize the outcomes that the statement of purpose prioritizes, taking into account the interconnectedness of the different dimensions of development;
4. Goals that are selected and justified collectively based on the theory of change and specific criteria.

Beyond2015 further stipulated that "the framework needs to lead to (or be supported by)":

1. Concrete commitments from identifiable actors to allocate sufficient resources for achieving the development goals;
2. "Do no harm": Concrete measures aimed at reforming global rules and practices that can be shown to hinder the achievement of the development goals;
3. A mechanism for comprehensive and rigorous measurement of progress on the goals, including disaggregation to represent differentiated progress among various populations, especially those populations most affected by poverty and injustice;
4. Clear responsibilities assigned for all actors to take the necessary actions to achieve development goals. All countries should be required to take action on the goals, though the actions should not necessarily be the same;
5. Accountability: All actors should have a clear mechanism available to hold each other to account.

Contributors called for several specific dimensions to be addressed within the architecture of the framework. This list, located in the Annex, is not a comprehensive representation of civil society priorities for elements of the post-2015 development architecture; rather, it is an account of the dominant elements proposed through contributions to this consultation question.

What is the role of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in a broader post-2015 framework?

All contributors saw the objectives of the SDGs as complementary to those of the post-2015 framework, and many identified strengths that SDGs would bring to development efforts. WWF International highlighted, “As part of one global framework, SDGs, mandated by 193 countries at Rio+20, would serve primarily two purposes: they have sustainability at their core, and are universally applicable.”

“The proposed ‘triple bottom line’ of sustainable development (economic development, environmental sustainability and social inclusion), encompasses the same underlying factors that determine population health,” observed Medsin-UK. The organization continued, “Currently many development, climate change and health targets are undermined by economic policies and trade agreements and the power of multinational corporations. For this reason, future goals must extend to all aspects of global governance.”

In line with Medsin-UK’s contribution, Oxfam India stated, “There is a strong correlation between structural violence, poverty and environmental degradation,” and advocated for the SDGs to be integrated into a global post-2015 development framework. This organization elaborated that “it is now a widely recognized fact that decreasing availability of fresh water, land degradation and deforestation are undermining the livelihoods of many people, especially those living in absolute poverty. Moreover, it has been proven that poor people suffer disproportionately from adverse conditions brought about as a result of climate change.” Invoking the need to respect planetary boundaries, Oxfam India advocated that sustainable development “in principle, safeguards and promotes responsible economic development practices.”

How can the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) process be aligned with the post-2015 process?

Contributors see development and sustainability challenges as “intrinsically linked” – as the Population and Sustainability Network articulated – and many asserted that drawing a distinction between the sustainable development and development agendas is artificial, misleading and even harmful. Accordingly, they want the UN processes seeking to address these agendas to not only align, but to unify in an inclusive and transparent process that leads to a single post-2015 development framework. As the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) advocated, “The Sustainable Development Goals and the post-2015 agenda processes should be integrated and result in one, strong and globally owned set of goals.”

Save the Children warned, “Running two processes risks the continued separation of the development and sustainable development agendas, despite their overlapping objectives. Not bringing them together will compromise one of the stated objectives of the Rio+20 outcome document: to make progress on the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development.” Development Initiatives argued that it is difficult to justify the cost of running these two high-level political processes in parallel, and this approach “would hinder linkages between the two agendas and potentially lead to competing, rather than mutually reinforcing, goals; may induce policy fatigue that in turn reduces the level of ambition; and will endanger meaningful stakeholder participation by splitting attention and resources between the two processes.”

According to Ipas, “The SDGs and post-2015 development framework should be merged as soon as possible as the parallel processes are confusing and hinder coordinated civil society involvement in defining the new development agenda.” Further, organizations such as the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) call for these processes to converge with other relevant international commitments including those contained in the Monterrey Consensus, as well as forthcoming outcomes of the 20th

anniversaries of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

Oxfam India called for “greater transparency in the inter-governmental SDG process, about which very little is known to civil society groups.” The only contributing organization that offered concrete suggestions regarding how the processes should be merged was Save the Children: “The two processes should be brought together at the September 2013 UNGA MDG Summit or if that is not feasible and the OWG [Open Working Group on SDGs] continues beyond September 2013, the General Assembly could mandate the group to facilitate negotiations on the details of a comprehensive post-2015 framework, incorporating the three dimensions of sustainable development and agreements reached on the HLP report at the September UNGA Summit.”

A4) Mindful that poor and vulnerable people may not have the capacity to participate directly in an online consultation, the following question that the Panel is considering is also posed for individuals and civil society organizations who engage with these constituencies directly and regularly: “What issues do poor and vulnerable people themselves prioritize?”

“Generations live and die in poverty in a vicious, never ending cycle. Their voices are not stifled, they are not silent: they are just unheard. For the impoverished, the most important need is an opportunity. They want a society of equal opportunity. They want a society that does not dehumanize them and leave them to fend for themselves; they want a society that considers them one of their own.” – Human Development Foundation

Many submissions asserted that this particular question must be addressed directly to poor and vulnerable people themselves, for example through mass grassroots consultations, as the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development proposed, and other off-line means of facilitating citizens’ input: “This means of working,” Restless Development identified, “actively engaging with target groups, empowering them to express their priorities and placing these front and centre of the development agenda – will not only encourage buy-in from those the framework has set out to serve, but it will also ensure that efforts are being channelled to the right issue areas.” Others respondents felt it was dangerous to “second guess” the priorities of people affected by poverty. For Medsin-UK, “We would have a lot of misconceptions about what is prioritized.... The local issue of the ‘poor and vulnerable’ or even inequity of service provision in the UK is completely different to the same issue on a global level.”

Respondents reflected wide agreement on the need to apply a human rights-based approach as a means of lifting poor and vulnerable people and communities out of poverty. Another common thread was the need to see the poor and vulnerable people as agents of change, and, as the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) observed, acknowledge “their collective power, knowledge and resilience.” According to Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, it is paramount that these groups be perceived as active rights-holders and be meaningfully involved at all the stages of the post-2015 development framework, which AWID urged “must start from financial commitment to meaningfully include them in the process.”

Poverty eradication is a matter of justice and human rights

The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) articulated that many individuals and communities most directly affected by poverty and deprivation see the eradication of poverty as a matter of justice and human rights: “In their experience they see no distinction between types or categories of deprivation and disparity, as lack of access to health, education and housing often goes hand in hand with risks to their physical security and intense forms of discrimination... [including] daily stigmas, penalization, and often retributions when they attempt to organize to exercise their rights.” This was echoed by Save the

Children, which indicated that these populations often “face a disproportionate burden of economic, environmental and health adverse events or shocks, and have the fewest resources to cope with them.” For CIVICUS, a key priority area to secure fulfillment of the needs of the poor and vulnerable is to ensure the establishment of independent complaints mechanisms to highlight grievances with regard to access to public services and entitlements.

Many submissions reflected not only the crucial need of ensuring that the voices of poor and vulnerable people and communities are heard, but also, as International Disability and Development Consortium urged, that “they have a voice in determining their needs and executing their rights.” According to Anglican Alliance, “The biggest challenge for people is to get national and global decision-makers to listen and then act.” For Health Poverty Action, “It is essential that Southern voices lead the process for the creation of a new global development framework... At this significant time in the development agenda, developing a framework without comprehensive input from poor and marginalized communities would be unwise and highly regrettable.”

Ensuring effective participation and empowerment

A number of respondents underscored elements needed for the effective participation and empowerment of the poor and vulnerable, including, as Health Poverty Action indicated, addressing the “huge democratic deficit” in the involvement of these groups. For All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI), this entails access to clear and accurate information; participation in decision-making processes (whether community projects, government policies, or personal decisions); self-empowerment through the removal of inequalities; and the ability to make choices for themselves. Slum Dwellers International called for State authorities to invest in the capacities of community organizations, and to enter into meaningful partnership with community organizations, while Ikra Educational Training Centre (IETC) highlighted the central role that women and girls have in building resilient communities across Africa, where a bottom-up approach is crucial. Several respondents highlighted the need to prioritize, involve and empower children and youth, especially those at risk. According to Family For Every Child: “The evidence presented demonstrates that children have clear priorities and a vision for the future that must be taken into consideration when developing global frameworks such as the post MDGs.”

Many submissions drew attention to different groups who face multiple forms of disadvantage and discrimination and require special attention, including women; children, in particular those living on the street, outside of parental care, or institutionalized; the elderly; people with disabilities; and indigenous people. For the Association of Small-scale Agro Producers in Nigeria, small-scale farmers are particularly vulnerable and merit additional support. A number of respondents, including Anglican Alliance, International Planned Parenthood Federation, World YWCA, and the Global Forum on MSM and HIV, also mentioned hard-to-reach groups, including sexually diverse populations, survivors of sexual and gender-based violence, migrants, refugees, people who have been trafficked, sex workers, people who use drugs, and prisoners.

What the poor and vulnerable prioritize

“It is our experience that the vulnerable populations that we work with are seeking no more and no less than their basic human entitlement to the endowments of education, health care, nutrition and personal security. While the specific needs of the poor and vulnerable groups may vary depending on location, experience, age or other attributes, their prioritization is the same as many other groups: safe and healthy families, control over their bodies and futures, access to economic opportunities and personal and community security.”

– International Planned Parenthood Federation

The submissions underscored the following as core priorities essential to the well-being of the poor and marginalized:

- **Decent productive employment opportunities**, including the right to work and security at work, as well as addressing youth unemployment, seen as a critical enabler for the priority issues that follow.
- **Food and better nutrition**, including access to affordable food, and food justice and food sovereignty;
- **Health**, including the right to access quality health care services without financial barriers;
- **Education**, including affordable quality education, and post-primary education for women and girls;
- **Sustainable access to water resources**, both for drinking water and sanitation, and water for small-scale farming and food production;
- **Shelter**, including access to decent and affordable housing;
- **Efficient and affordable energy**;
- **Clean environment and natural resources**, ensuring sustainable and equitable use of natural resources, including water, land and forestry;
- **Security, both personal and community**, including safety and protection issues, access to jurisdiction, combating government and police corruption, freedom from violence, particularly for those living in conflict or fragile States, as well as areas prone to climate-based shocks;
- **Access to land**, including issues of ownership, better availability of land and security of tenure, with emphasis on the rights of women;
- **Combating the impacts of climate change**, in particular providing communities with the resources and expertise to adapt to the changing climate and make their lives and livelihoods resilient;
- **Participatory governance and decision-making**, including in the design and implementation of the new framework, through good governance, community participation in local decision making and human rights promotion, and ensuring that women have equal voice in decision-making processes;
- **Access to information**, including the right and means to access clear, accurate information.

The way forward

Many contributors, including AWID, Social Watch, and the International Disability and Development Consortium, indicated that the new development framework must embrace a holistic, rights-based approach, and that principles of equality, equity, non-discrimination and inclusive participation must underpin its policies and practices. According to the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE), based in Uruguay, a key element must be to secure forms of consultation, debate and engagement. Such an approach, the organization contended, would ensure that the most marginalized can benefit from development and growth, and become active agents of change.

A5) How should a new framework address resilience to crises?

As Save the Children articulated, “poverty is as much about precariousness as it is about assets,” and “economic, environmental or social shocks can entrench poverty and existing inequalities.” Therefore, the organization argued, resilience is fundamental for development. Many organizations, such as the Trades Union Congress (TUC) UK, Oxfam India, Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) and Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, identified that the post-2015 development framework must include a focus on strengthening resilience to crises, including: failure of (financial) market mechanisms; environmental degradation including climate change; natural disasters; severe food shortages; energy shortages; and conflict.

Several organizations and individuals emphasized that the framework must focus on anticipation and prevention of crises, and address their root causes. The Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable

Development contributed, “It is important to note that the financial, food and climate crises are all strongly interlinked, with the drive for short-term profits and growth promoting risk taking and excessive use of credit in finance, protectionism in developed country agriculture and food price speculation, and the environment’s relegation to resource base and dumping ground.”

The new framework will also “need to address the core factors which exacerbate the vulnerability of impoverished and marginalized populations,” as specified by the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development and echoed by the European Youth Forum and Save the Children. These factors include inequality and social discrimination, lack of participation in decision making, and limited access to resources, education, healthcare and employment.

Save the Children further called for the post-2015 process to integrate the agendas of environmental sustainability, development and disaster risk reduction, and in particular the outcomes of the review of the [Hyogo Framework of Action](#), a plan that details “the work that is required from all different sectors and actors to reduce disaster losses.” Dóchas recommended “more structured links between relief, rehabilitation and development,” as well as consideration of the impact of an array of national, regional and international policies on resilience – including agriculture, trade, energy (biofuels), natural resources management and disaster preparedness policies.

“Strengthening resilience requires a range of measures, from reducing greenhouse gas emissions, to factoring disaster and climate risks into economic and development policy, to ensuring effective national policy and regulatory risk management to address the drivers of disaster risk,” explained Oxfam India. “Given that Disaster Risk Management (DRM) cuts across development sectors, ministries and economic policy – involving multiple stakeholders at all scales – it should be both mainstreamed into a broad range of development activities and supported by a dedicated, technically sound and efficient coordinating instrument,” the contribution continued.

Human rights, equity, and inclusive planning and management

Many organizations hold the conviction that the post-2015 framework must adopt a rights-based approach to build comprehensive resilience, including AWID, who wrote, “Human rights and equity shall be key to generate resiliency. This interrelationship should be at the core of the new framework.” Several other organizations identified that in times of crisis, closer attention must be paid to the needs of the most marginalized people, who are often left out or left behind by responses. According to Beyond2015, the framework should “place responsibility on each international intervention to respond to the diverse needs of the population regardless of their sex, age, caste, ability, ethnicity, etc., and ensure an inclusive and participatory approach in the design, delivery and evaluation of programmes.”

“Policies must be community-driven and community-centric, with communities empowered to voice their concerns from national to international level to influence policies and practices that build resilience and protect and fulfill their rights,” ActionAid International underscored. The World YWCA added, “It is also important to build capabilities and livelihoods so that communities have the internal capacity to respond in times of crisis and to ensure that women are equitably involved in both crisis response and preparedness.” As the Saint Kitts and Nevis chapter of the International Federation of Medical Students’ Associations observed, “Resilience depends on the existence of a well integrated social support system that links governments, civil societies, communities, and their individuals in a deliberate effort to prepare for, mobilize the requisite resources, and minimize/forestall potential negative outcomes of foreseeable changes ahead of time.”

Financial Reform

A number of organizations called for the future framework to promote measures for financial reform.

The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) stated, “Three key issues for inclusion in the new framework to prevent instability and volatility in development are: a) the need for more effective and transparent financial regulation, both domestically and globally; b) the reform of tax systems and policies at the national and international levels to ensure more resources are generated and allocated fairly for the purpose of development and human rights fulfilment; and c) more truly equitable mechanisms of global economic governance, especially in the trade, debt, monetary and finance sectors.”

The International Planned Parenthood Federation recommended: “The future framework should provide incentives to both donor and recipient countries to make progress on tax reform, for example through a target for increasing the proportion of developing country expenditure financed through tax.”

TUC emphasized the need for meaningful reform of the international financial markets including “a ban on or strict regulation of speculation in essential food commodities.” The organization also proposed the establishment of “a price stabilization system enabling developing nations to purchase energy at relatively stable prices.”

Among many other recommendations, AWID called for the reform of international financial institutions, including “elimination of loan policy conditionalities so that countries could choose to use counter-cyclical policies to protect living standards, trade, and employment.”

Education, Decent Jobs, and Social Protection

Many organizations called for the new development framework to promote education, decent job creation, and social protection for the poorest and most marginalized people to build resilience. The World Youth Alliance identified that educated people are better equipped to be civilly engaged and to face situations of crisis. The International Council for Adult Education (ICAE) stated that governments should “commit to global stimulus packages that create full, decent productive employment including teachers.”

“Building strong and robust public social protection systems within the limits of the available resources is a key tool for addressing people’s vulnerability and promoting their resilience to crises, including the consequences of climate change and other environmental crises,” Social Watch asserted. Along with many other organizations, Social Watch called for the instatement of a global social protection floor as a minimum step. CESR expanded upon this idea: “Given current consensus on the overwhelming need for a universal social protection floor, a Global Fund for Social Protection, as proposed by human rights experts, is an appealing mechanism for sustainably and cooperatively financing social protection for all in a climate of increased funding volatility in this critical area.”

Environmental Resilience

“Environment resilience is a fundamental precondition for human resilience and indeed, crises in general,” stressed the All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI). Its contribution continued by stressing that “The post-2015 development framework must therefore pay due regard to the symbiotic relationship between humans and the environment, and focus equally on their respective needs.”

According to Save the Children, building resilience “requires that environmental shocks are treated as recurrent and natural events that affect production and livelihoods by expecting, preparing for and mitigating them, and adapting multi-year development finance streams to be agile enough to deal with crises when they occur.”

Many organizations highlighted that the post-2015 framework must address the development challenges posed by climate change. WWF International asserted, “All future development interventions (goal driven or other) should be climate smart (i.e. not contribute to emissions, address adaptation and resilience).” This organization also pointed out that “a growing number of organizations are working to integrate and build capacity for ecosystem management for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation: see

for example the [Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction](#)” (PEDRR). Healthy and well-managed ecosystems reduce disaster risk by acting as natural buffers or protective barriers, according to recent work of the PEDRR, and also build local resilience against disasters by sustaining livelihoods and providing important products to local populations.

Disaster Risk Reduction

AIDMI, which “has witnessed the dynamics between poverty, vulnerabilities and disasters when responding to local communities’ calls for assistance during the 2008 Kosi floods in Bihar, the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, the 2011 Cyclone Thane in Tamil Nadu, and the 2009 Cyclone Alia in West Bengal,” asserted that for the post-2015 framework to help communities become resilient to shocks such as disasters, it must incorporate human rights and self-empowerment approaches. AIDMI stated that it has successfully used these approaches, including capacity building, risk management and vulnerability reduction, to help communities overcome vulnerability to disasters.

Several respondents, such as the Association of Small-scale Agro Producers in Nigeria (ASSAPIN), called for disaster risk reduction policies to be implemented at national, state and local levels.

Food Security and Food Sovereignty

The Housing and Land Rights Network of the Habitat International Coalition asked the High-level Panel to follow the outcomes of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization’s [High Level Expert Forum on Food Security in Protracted Crises](#).

The Women’s Environment and Development Organization highlighted that resilience to crises will depend not just on food security, but also on food sovereignty.

A6) How should a new framework reflect the particular challenges of the poor living in conflict and post-conflict settings?

As violence and conflict are rooted in human insecurity and deprivation, according to the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development, fragile and conflict-affected States face severe obstacles in reducing poverty and achieving development. The post-2015 framework, in the view of World Vision International, must address conflict more effectively than did the MDGs, and should therefore emphasize governance, justice, equity and peace through goals and targets. Economic and social rights must also be protected and enforced in conflict and post-conflict situations, according to the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), to support transitions to peace and equitable governance.

Acknowledging the unique challenges of development for the millions of people living in conflict or post-conflict situations will be essential in outlining the process, content, and implementation of the new framework, several organizations stressed. Peace and security should be understood as preconditions for development, according to the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, while the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) and International Movement ATD Fourth World call for expanding the definition of conflict to include people living in vulnerable environments and extreme poverty. Environmental organizations including WWF International expressed the importance of the role that natural resources play in conflict; several organizations advocated understanding the causes of conflict and peace more broadly, through research, policy analysis, and data disaggregated by gender, location, age, and other factors.

Human rights and gender equality as guiding principles

Guiding principles for addressing conflict through a new framework include a human rights-based approach and the incorporation of gender equality into all strategies of response. Health Poverty Action, for example, called for the adoption of a rights-based approach linked to accountability, empowerment, participation, non-discrimination, and attention to marginalized groups, while the Center for Women's Global Leadership highlighted the need for the framework to promote human rights while recognizing the unique and specific ways that women, men, and human rights defenders are affected by conflict situations. ActionAid International recommended an explicit focus on the rights of women and marginalized people to peace and stability, and ensuring access to justice for those affected by gender-based violence during and after conflict. The fulfillment of sexual and reproductive rights, including access to contraception and safe abortion, was emphasized by AWID and the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE) as particularly necessary in the context of sexual violence in war.

Acknowledging context and ensuring an inclusive and participatory approach

AWID called for the post-2015 development framework to recognize the “differential and disproportional impact of armed conflict and complex humanitarian emergencies on the lives and rights of women and adolescents,” while Social Watch and CARE International advocated setting country-level, context-specific priorities, strategies, mechanisms, and processes to address the unique conditions and history of each setting of conflict or post-conflict. Beyond2015, Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, and FORUM requested that this framework be equipped to respond to the diverse needs of each national population regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, etc., while ensuring the planning and implementation of socially just and culturally acceptable processes, policies, and laws. Strengthening institutional capacity to address cycles of structural violence, with both short- and long-term horizons, and through understanding local power dynamics and complexity was mentioned as a priority by organizations in Benin, El Salvador, and Switzerland.

An inclusive and participatory approach in the design, delivery and evaluation of programmes towards peace and post-conflict reconstruction and in decision making at all levels was recommended by many organizations including Beyond2015 and World YWCA. According to the St. Kitts and Nevis chapter of the International Federation of Medical Students' Associations, the new framework “needs to have the people most affected involved in the deliberations, discussions, and most importantly, in the establishment of its statutes and regulations at every step of its creation process.” The meaningful participation of communities, particularly women and adolescent girls and including at the grassroots level, in the negotiation of peace accords and in building resilient States was called for by ActionAid International, CARE International, and Restless Development. International Movement ATD Fourth World asserted that people most affected by conflict need the opportunity to contribute to building peaceful solutions and have their ongoing efforts recognized.

The framework “must promote an inclusive development process which explicitly recognizes the rights of all socio-cultural groups, minorities, indigenous peoples, and religions over their natural resources and respects their right to define their development aspirations,” emphasized the Campaign for People's Goals on Sustainable Development. Sightsavers stated that in situations of conflict and post-conflict, marginalized populations – such as people with disabilities – must not be excluded from service provision or from fulfilling their potential for economic and social development. GCAP Senegal called for transparency, openness, and access to information for all, while the Anglican Alliance advocated engagement with women, young people, and faith communities in processes of peace and reconciliation.

The role of governance in addressing and preventing conflict

The new development framework should promote inclusive, accountable, democratic, and equitable governance as an essential underpinning of the reduction of conflict and fragility, suggested Save the Children. Saferworld outlined key challenges to peacebuilding and development, listing several dependent factors: the ability of States to manage revenues and perform core functions effectively and

accountably; transparency, accountability and controls on corruption; fair access to social services and resources; shared economic growth and opportunities for decent livelihoods; and ensuring equality, reconciliation, and tolerance between social groups. European Youth Forum and Saferworld both emphasized the need to end impunity and ensure access to justice for all, to prevent reoccurring violence. Development Initiatives asserted that the framework “should explicitly promote transparency on all resources in conflict-affected countries,” including those related to extractive industries and military/security expenditures; the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development and ICAE agreed, calling for States to rechannel military expenditure to social expenditure and adopt disarmament policies and bans on selling arms to countries engaged in armed conflict.

Six international organizations referred to the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) of the [New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States](#), agreed at the Busan Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, which identified five foundational conditions for development and aid effectiveness in fragile and conflict-affected countries: legitimate politics (a State for all); security (safety for all); justice (equity for all); economic foundations (jobs for all); resources and revenue management (services for all). More broadly, CIVICUS, AWID, and FORUM called for the upholding of existing international human rights commitments through the new framework’s shared commitment to international legal agreements and the rule of law at all levels. “If all of the UN commitments and agreements that have been made were fulfilled,” Commons Action for the UN elaborated, “most of these challenges would rapidly disappear.” Respondents advocated the implementation of all existing agreements, including UN Security Council Resolutions 1325, 1820, 1888, and 1889 on women, peace, and security.

International aid and investment

Many contributors highlighted the role of the international community in “creating mechanisms for targeted international support and solidarity to protect vulnerable and marginalized groups in conflict situations” (CIVICUS); “reaching populations that may not be priorities for their governments or where the State does not have capacity” (Development Initiatives); and providing resources to “address the specific urgent needs and guarantee the protection of people living in conflict and post-conflict situations” (LDC Watch, AWID, and Beyond2015). CARE International called for effective linkages of emergency relief and longer-term development in situations of conflict, while organizations including Wellbeing Foundation Africa and World Youth Alliance requested international assistance for access to basic needs including nutrition, water, sanitation, housing, and education. An NGO from Cameroon, Centre d’Accompagnement des Alternatives Locales de Développement, suggested that the post-2015 framework create a special fund specifically for individuals living in poverty in situations of conflict and post-conflict.

Respondents including World YWCA and AWID made concrete suggestions for the framework to direct investment towards civil society, including women’s organizations, for development in conflict and post-conflict situations, as these organizations are “a key mechanism to hold government to account, defend rights, and advocate for change,” according to ActionAid International. Slum Dwellers International contributed that investing in social cohesion, including through community organization and social institutions, is important “to recover the bonds that are shattered in conflict.” Investing in youth education and economic recovery will create “a more enfranchised youth population within fragile states who could positively contribute to their transition into peace and prosperity,” Restless Development asserted. Health Poverty Action called for supporting health systems in developing countries, particularly in fragile States and difficult environments, to benefit all communities. Finally, FORUM, Anglican Alliance, and the Housing and Land Rights Network of Habitat International Coalition suggested investing in restorative justice and/or transitional justice, including effective mediation programmes that adapt traditional community strategies to contemporary challenges that contribute to conflict.

A7) How can we universalize goals and targets while being consistent with national priorities and targets?

There was nearly full consensus among submissions that what is needed is a global framework flexible enough to allow for adjustments according to regional, national, and local needs, priorities, and budgets. Most submissions indicated that this global framework should be grounded on a set of principles derived from UN agreements and conventions signed by all Member States (e.g. human rights), thereby guaranteeing consistency between the global and national levels. A few submissions expressed that a number of themes (e.g. eradication of extreme poverty) and cross-cutting development issues (e.g. gender equality) accepted unanimously by all UN Member States could also be included in the overarching global framework, without undermining consistency between global and national goals, targets and priorities. Some believed global goals are useful, while others preferred defining more specific goals and targets at the national and local levels, by the communities intended to benefit from this framework.

Human rights and guiding principles

Respondents most frequently mentioned principles related to human rights, multiple accountability, transparency, democracy, and national and local ownership with responsibility for delivery rooted in the State. By far the single most frequently mentioned was respect for human rights. For Social Watch, the relevance of human rights is clear:

Universal goals for human dignity have already been approved in 1948 as essential part of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. It is a legal obligation of all States to promote and protect these rights and it is an obligation of all States in a condition to do so to cooperate with others. This principle has already been established in the UN Charter of 1945, where “all Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization” for the achievement of “higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.” This was reaffirmed 25 years ago by the Declaration on the Right to Development: “As a complement to the efforts of developing countries, effective international co-operation is essential in providing these countries with appropriate means and facilities to foster their comprehensive development.”

In short, this framework should aim at the full implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). ActionAid International goes further: “Nearly all countries have signed onto the UDHR, the ICESCR (International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), and other important human rights documents. They therefore should prioritize policies and programmes that allow for the progressive realization of those rights. The core of these policies should be about investing in a long-term jobs creation strategy.”

The inclusion of the principle of universality with “common but differentiated responsibilities” is essential and would signal a major improvement over the MDGs, according to several respondents. For example, according to BioRegional, “There should only be one set of global development goals, which must be based on the principle of universality and applicable to both developed and developing countries.” For the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development, “Goals and targets developed for the post-2015 agenda should be universal[,] meaning applicable to all countries and not just developing countries[,] but it must be coupled with the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacity. Each goal can be set according to common principles but targets, timelines, and indicators can be differentiated according to the country’s particular priorities and circumstances.” Tearfund provides specific examples of national goals that are relevant and differentiated according to development levels:

- “Under global goals on sustainability and equality, high income countries might have targets to reduce carbon emissions and consumption, invest in additional funding for climate finance as well as targets to address financial transparency and meeting its aid commitments.

- Under global goals on access to health and education, middle income or emerging countries could consider targets to improve access to sanitation and to secure the completion of education, while on sustainability adopt targets for investment in green growth.
- As well as having specific health and education targets under global goals, lower income countries might also set targets to improve transparency in extractives or, under a global goal on inequality, set targets to increase the number of women active in public life or getting equal access to land and services.”

A handful of submissions requested that the new framework redress significant inconsistencies between global and national goals and policies that surfaced during the implementation of the MDGs in the areas of trade, investment and international development (for the Centre d’Etudes et de Recherche pour une Population Dynamique in Benin) and education (Director of the UNESCO Education for All Global Monitoring Report).

Additional ideas worth pondering

Development Initiatives asserted that “a post-2015 [framework] should include a commitment by all governments to incorporate an international minimum income guarantee as one of a number of policies aimed at protecting the lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable. Delivery of this commitment will be achieved at national level through a variety of policy interventions chosen by the national government – including through creation of livelihoods, cash transfers, insurance and social protection schemes to protect the incomes of the poorest.”

Two submissions, from Health Poverty Action and Medsin-UK, proposed the adoption of a new global goal for universal health coverage.

The Center for Women’s Global Leadership questioned the potential structure of the framework itself: “Are goals the best method for achieving the eradication of poverty and/or the achievement of human rights?” The organization added, “The new framework must acknowledge and address the differential impacts of economic and development policies on women, men, boys and girls, and on individuals and communities, taking into consideration issues related to class, race, gender, sexuality, language, disabilities, and regions.” Disaggregating data accordingly will make clear where inequalities and social exclusiveness lie, respondents stated.

Special Olympics International indicated that the adoption “of a validated and widely accepted human suffering index or essential life functions index might provide reasonable latitude for national variations that still reflected commitments to progress. In association with a very few core universal indicators, this could be a powerful characterization for many purposes.”

A8) What time horizon should we set for the next phase in the global development agenda (e.g. 10, 15, 25 years, or a combination)?

Respondents preferred various options from amongst the potential time horizons for the post-2015 development framework – ten years, fifteen, or 20 to 25, with the largest number advocating a combination of timeframes. The International Planned Parenthood Foundation (IPPF) suggested that a flexible timeframe is necessary to set goals specific to each country, “to acknowledge national diversity and ownership over country strategies” and thereby improve outcomes of the post-2015 framework. Social Watch reminded the Panel that the realization of a rights-based approach depends on each country’s specific conditions and means in line with its obligations according to the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights to “progressively achiev[e] all human rights ‘to the maximum of available resources’”; therefore, the contribution continued, “The establishment of a single deadline makes no sense from a human rights perspective.”

Regarding a time horizon of ten years, Development Initiatives made the case that the milestone of 2025 for the elimination of economic poverty “presents a universally powerful, achievable and measurable” step towards the elimination of all poverty. ActionAid International also preferred this time horizon, emphasizing that the examples of Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay show that once policies have been enacted that limit poverty, it can be erased somewhat rapidly. Pointing to the shorter timespan as a rallying point, International Disability Alliance asserted that Member States need to be fully committed to act swiftly in aligning national policies to the new framework, and others agreed that the ten-year timeframe would provide clear, focused ambition for a range of actors. ActionAid International added that within this ten-year frame, a two-year time span should be included for the “complete phase out of all economic policies that violate human rights (including most ‘free trade’ policies, liberalization policies and other policies that put downward pressure on wages including agricultural wages).”

A large number of contributors advocated a fifteen-year horizon, for adequate transformation (“time to change a generation,” in the words of White Ribbon Alliance for Safe Motherhood) while simultaneously allowing meaningful progress to be measured and evaluated. Pauline Rose, Director of UNESCO’s Education for All Global Monitoring Report, phrased the time period as “long enough to see change happen, while not too long to lose sight of [the goals’] importance.” Fifteen years is short enough, according to Saferworld, to convey “the sense of urgency that befits a truly ambitious new global framework”; the relative shortness of this timeline maintains pressure on development actors and builds political will, according to WWF International and Ipas.

An individual contributor suggested 25 years as the overall timeframe, with easily achievable SMART targets every five years. This long-term approach, also preferred by Oxfam India and World YWCA, promotes stability and effective outcomes. WWF International mentioned that this extended timeline might prove the most realistic for achieving an ambitious post-2015 agenda.

In outlining a potential combined approach, the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) articulated the “need to balance long-term vision for genuinely transformative change with short-term, interim targets at the national and global levels to drive continuous political incentives and accountability.” Multiple time horizons depending on the desired outputs was preferred by Slum Dwellers International, rather than the MDG approach of one uniform timeframe. “If institutional goals are to be a part of the next framework,” the organization continued, “then the agenda must be based on [a] time horizon that articulates how these institutions change over time.” CIVICUS, Commons Action for the UN, Siglo XXIII, and the Association of Small-scale Agro Producers in Nigeria all called for interval or phased planning. Population Matters suggested a ten-year horizon for sectoral targets, and 25 years for “over-arching sustainability ‘themes.’” Succinctly summarizing the argument in favour of a combination of time horizons, European Youth Forum wrote that “a long term time-frame would provide direction to the long-term goals the world seeks to achieve, offering more time to achieve them as well. Combined with intermediate targets, [this] would at the same time ensure greater accountability.” To enable accountability through measuring, Special Olympics International explained that a “master scorecard” could reflect the multiple timelines for both national and sub-national populations, “as long as goals are explicit, measurable and reasonably related to the process that is needed.”

B. Partnership and accountability for development

B1) How can a new framework tackle the challenges of coherence and coordination among the organizations, processes, and new mechanisms that address issues that are global in scope?

Many respondents indicated the importance of this issue; according to Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, “The principle of policy coherence for development must be placed at the very heart of the post-2015 development agenda.” Referring to the recent UN Conference on Sustainable Development (“Rio+20”), the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development stated that a precondition for coherence and coordination is that “all stakeholders acknowledge the need to move away from current unsustainable modes of production and consumption and make real commitments (as opposed to nominal gestures) to cooperate to achieve equitable and sustainable development.”

Achieving coherence through the existing human rights framework

World Youth Alliance, Oxfam India and others advocated situating the post-2015 framework within the existing infrastructure, monitoring and accountability and systems, and the range of obligations already undertaken by States in the international human rights framework. The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) elaborated, “As universally-recognized norms and bottom-line standards of conduct, international human rights standards and operational principles offer a unique yardstick with which to evaluate legal and policy coherence at both global and national levels to ensure all countries and all sectors work in complementarity.” In addition to using human rights mechanisms to avoid duplication and focus on implementation, the post-2015 framework should be driven by a human rights-based approach grounded in equality and non-discrimination, asserted the International Disability Alliance.

Institutional structure for coherence and coordination

Defining the overarching institutional structure to coordinate activities and implementation by all stakeholders formed a priority for several contributing organizations, including LDC Watch and Save the Children. CIVICUS expressed the view that “oversight of the new framework and its attendant mechanisms should vest in a single global institution, while implementation can be undertaken by multiple institutions.” Expanding this concept further, the Housing and Land Rights Network of Habitat International Coalition argued that coherence would be best achieved through democratization and the creation of space for diverse, multi-sectoral, regionally-representative participation at all levels. The intergovernmental framework must also facilitate coherence and coordination in national contexts, respondents asserted, especially regarding accountability. Save the Children pointed to several examples of global accountability mechanisms – the [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#) and its Optional Protocols, and the [Commission on Information and Accountability](#) of the Every Woman Every Child initiative – which could be built upon in designing a coherent post-2015 framework.

The UN system was positioned as central in leading efforts towards a coordinated and effectively-implemented post-2015 agenda. Trades Union Congress (TUC) UK, for example, suggested that UN agencies should ensure coordination of the implementation and monitoring of specific elements of the framework by theme – UNESCO for primary education, WHO for health, etc. The Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance preferred the UN General Assembly as the most appropriate body to provide guidance and promote coherence, while Commons Action for the UN recommended the new High-level Political Forum established by the outcomes of Rio+20 to lead on an integrated approach in partnership with the UN

Development Group and others. Social Watch advocated the creation of a UN Sustainability Council, along the lines of the Human Rights Council and with a similar Universal Periodic Review (UPR) system to oversee reporting. “The council’s remit would extend to all dimensions of sustainability,” Social Watch elaborated, “while its jurisdiction would extend to all multilateral bodies, including the international financial institutions.”

The Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) called for a “serious reform” of the international financial institutions (IFIs) including the Bretton Woods Institutions – the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank – and their realignment towards “advancing human rights and international solidarity as part of a more equitable and appropriate global governance system.” In their role as financiers of development, IFIs should integrate social and ecological considerations into their projects, wrote WWF International, while Dóchas emphasized that the post-2015 framework should “encompass the impact of rich countries’ policies in areas such as trade, agriculture, energy, tax and financial regulation, etc.” Recognizing the “importance of fiscal policy, public finance management, and predictable and sustainable public resources,” Social Watch contributed the concrete recommendation of creating a UN Inter-governmental Commission for Tax Cooperation to set standards and close this governance gap.

Contributors placed high value on the role of civil society and community organizations in promoting coordination and coherence for the post-2015 development agenda. NGOs from India, Uruguay, and Cameroon called for the support and resourcing of civil society organizations, to enable them to monitor progress and hold governments and other development actors to account. In terms of specific steps towards making this happen, Commons Action for the UN recommended the creation of a global support fund to ensure civil society involvement, and the Housing and Land Rights Network of the Habitat International Coalition requested formal, binding mechanisms for civil society participation. The role of NGOs in implementation was highlighted by FORUM as “a uniquely effective avenue for the creation of constructive relationships... to achieve sustainable development outcomes.” Medsin-UK took this a step further, suggesting that organizations that have contributed to the post-2015 consultations be approached as implementing partners of the interventions suggested. In general, Slum Dwellers International emphasized the importance of inclusive institution-building and inclusive community development through partnerships with community organizations, “to deepen the inclusive development agenda” and promote coherence.

Information-sharing for coordination and networking

An essential tool for coordination and coherence referenced by many contributors is information-sharing, specifically through mapping or identifying existing commitments and activities, to encourage cohesion and illustrate potential areas of duplication. Restless Development advocated identifying gaps in knowledge and promoting multi-sectoral inputs, and WWF International agreed that “institutions must have the information, power, and capacity” to address trade-offs between their short-term and longer-term needs. A shared system of data-reporting that includes the disaggregation of data would provide an analysis of power and policy, including of external obstacles to mobilizing and investing resources in “rights-realizing ways” (CESR), and would create “a clear picture of how all key issue areas feed into and impact upon each other,” according to Restless Development. European Youth Forum wrote, “Dialogue mechanisms for policy decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, involving all relevant stakeholders [...] and structured at local, national, regional, and global level, are key enablers in regard to coherence and coordination.”

Other suggestions for ensuring coordination and coherence included effective cooperation between countries over the sustainable management (including transboundary management), use, and protection of shared natural resources (WWF International) and the clear alignment of the Panel’s work with the intergovernmental process on SDGs (BioRegional). Finally, Restless Development emphasized the strengths of working through networks to generate cross-sector partnerships, to “allow stakeholders with

different capacities to support each other in the design of content and goals that are complementary” as part of coherent and coordinated post-2015 development agenda.

B2) How can we build and sustain global consensus for a new framework, involving Member States, the private sector and civil society?

In general, the submissions mainly addressed process issues, while only a few focused on substance issues.

On process, the submissions reflected wide agreement that to build and sustain a global consensus, the new framework must use a multi-stakeholder, genuinely participatory approach that includes all groups and individuals that will be affected by this development process: governments, the private sector, civil society – and also marginalized groups that have been most hard hit by poverty and that were left out of the formulation of the MDG framework.

Building consensus through an inclusive, multi-stakeholder approach

An all-inclusive multi-stakeholder approach should be used in every stage of this initiative: wide consultations should be held with all stakeholders beginning with the formulation of the framework and its policies, and must continue during implementation, monitoring, evaluation and review of programmes under the new framework. The process should be open, transparent and fully participatory.

Many submissions highlighted the need to work more closely with grassroots organizations for a more effective design and implementation of the framework. A few respondents made reference to the significant contributions of particular groups, such as women, youth, persons with disabilities, and faith institutions. For example, for the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID), “Grassroots women leaders from community-based organizations are key stakeholders in the development of a post-2015 development agenda and should be enabled to negotiate for their own development priorities throughout this process.” Restless Development indicated that they were working on a paper on youth engagement and forms of best practice to be shared with the High-level Panel. The Anglican Alliance articulated that “Because faith organizations are embedded in local communities, they can play a unique role in building the global consensus for a new framework.” Furthermore, “faith-based organizations should be explicitly and separately recognized, rather than being included under a general non-governmental sector,” the Alliance recommended.

Contributors stipulated that the role of each stakeholder should be defined as clearly as possible, including responsibilities. For example, the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development urged that “it is critical... that the new framework articulates the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors in supporting aims to be achieved.” In this context, the role of the private sector appears as the most controversial. While its positive contribution to the production of goods and services is recognized, several submissions called for mechanisms to ensure that private, for-profit companies act in a way that is consistent with respect for human rights, international norms and standards for labour and the environment, among others. As expressed by ACTION, “the private sector should be involved at an early stage in the new framework in order to go beyond social and corporate responsibility and to clarify both the role and the responsibility of the different private sectors. Binding mechanisms should be set up with standards linked to human rights, decent working conditions, social protection, and fiscal evasion with strong accountability mechanisms.”

Several international organizations and networks called for support for civil society to participate effectively in this process. In this context, FORUM asserted that “A basic principle for building consensus should be that CSOs [civil society organizations] and communities should be assisted to genuinely participate in decision making and implementation of ideas that directly affect their lives and the future of

their communities. The role played by CSOs in partnerships for development was not recognized in the MDGs.... This needs to be addressed in the post-2015 framework, in line with the Busan Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness where participants ‘agreed to implement fully their respective commitments to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors.’”

Specific requests to the High-level Panel (HLP)

For Oxfam India, a “tripartite dialogue between the governments, private sector and civil society” is essential for a sustainable framework. “The HLP should propose and initiate tripartite dialogues at international, regional and national levels through the UN. Such dialogues should be issue-specific and should lead to agreements on the role of each actor and their contribution to achieving the new global goals.” CIVICUS agreed: “Emphasis needs to be placed on a sustained inclusive global dialogue on the new framework between the three actors.”

Save The Children stressed, “The HLP will need to demonstrate that they have listened and reflected a wide range of views including from different geographic regions and sectors, and importantly reflected the views of people living in poverty. A greater outreach effort is required and will help to build trust, as the Panel is currently perceived by many amongst global civil society as not actively seeking the view of poor and marginalized people and groups.”

For the ONE Campaign, the High-level Panel “should recommend that the UN Secretary-General’s report to Member Nations include a quantitative overview of survey-based results, with concrete proposals for ensuring that input from citizens in developing countries forms the core of the new framework.” The ONE Campaign further indicated that “Current data gathering and distribution systems are insufficient to successfully achieve... accountability and so the High-level Panel must make recommendations to begin addressing this now so that by 2016 such a system is in place.”

According to the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), “While both the UN staff and the High-level Panel have shown the will to enable civil society participation in the process, a structured approach to this issue is still missing. In the further phases of the process, especially during the intergovernmental negotiations, civil society’s and private sector’s engagement should be better structured and institutionalized. A useful approach to this issue has been the Major Groups model used by UN DESA, including in the Rio+20 process. This model recognizes the diversity of non-executive stakeholders and ensures a proper representation of each.”

The Role of the UN

According to the Centre for Community Economics and Development Consultants Society, “The post-2015 agenda should stay strongly rooted in the UN to guarantee minimum standards for participation and transparency by all development actors on equal footing.” For AWID, “this is a time for committees such as ECOSOC [Economic and Social Council] and CSW [Commission on the Status of Women] to take a leading role in shaping these processes.”

On substance, several submissions called for the new framework to include issues that are key to the UN’s development work, but that were not included in the MDG framework. These include governance, respect for human rights, and international norms and standards for labour and environmental protection.

Social Watch and ACTION call for “policy coherence for development, taking into account the interdependency of issues.” Saferworld stated, “The post-2015 framework will have little impact on poverty if its designers are not bold enough to include issues of inclusive, responsive, fair and accountable State-society relations, as well as provision of security and justice to poor people. Policy dialogue on this should begin early, be truly global and open to perspectives from North, South, East and West.... The key to agreement on peace and security aspects of the post-2015 framework may depend on cultivating the shared recognition that promoting sustainable peace is in the interest of all States.”

B3) How specific should the Panel be with recommendations on means of implementation, including development assistance, finance, technology, capacity building, trade and other actions?

Contributors to this question provided a very diverse range of responses as to how specific the Panel should be with respect to means of implementation. At first sight, the responses appeared highly divergent.

On one side, many argued that the Panel should be very specific. The Campaign for People's Goals on Sustainable Development, for example, noted: "Recent international agreements have become increasingly vague to achieve general consensus as States try to avoid binding commitments. This has made international commitments meaningless. Recommendations on means of implementation must be specific to ensure that the new framework does not become an empty shell." Likewise, Oxfam India stated: "The Panel should be most specific in its recommendations on means of implementation. The HLP needs to give specific recommendations on how the new goals will be financed." The UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development similarly argued: "Goals must... incorporate mechanisms to hold all countries to account for their specific financial responsibilities." The Housing and Land Rights Network of the Habitat International Coalition also called for the Panel to be as specific as possible – one argument being that it is better to present an ambitious and detailed proposal from the outset, as subsequent negotiations will likely water down that level of ambition.

On the other end of the spectrum (and sometimes for the same reasons), some contributors argued quite the opposite. For example, Save the Children suggested: "It will be helpful to outline that these implementation issues need to be part of a post-2015 framework to provide a basis for future discussions, but the details should be determined through a longer process of debate and discussion after a broad outline of a framework and priority actions are identified. Discussing the implementation issues in detail now risks losing the opportunity for the highest levels of ambition in terms of the vision and recommendations of the types of goals that may be pursued post-2015." Saferworld affirmed that the architects of the post-2015 framework "should not seek to prescribe how each of the goals and targets will be pursued." Population Matters argued: "The more detailed the recommendations on means, the more of a straitjacket they will create, and the more they will stifle innovation." Slum Dwellers International stated: "It is unrealistic to set out specific programmatic details through this Panel."

A closer reading suggests nuances that may explain these differences and offer elements of convergence, however. The first is to avoid confusion between goals and means. The Center of Concern noted: "In the MDG framework, the inclusion of means of implementation under Goal 8, as if they were qualitatively similar to goals that featured 'ends,' led to conceptual confusion." This confusion was compounded by the lack of time-bound targets for the "means" mentioned under Goal 8. The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) noted in this regard that Goal 8 "failed to link commitments with measureable targets, creating a system of double-standards which placed obligations mainly on low-income countries, without adequately recognizing the responsibilities all countries and all actors have through their influence over the development process, both at home and abroad."

Secondly, many who expressed resistance at being overly prescriptive on means of implementation at the national level – notably because of concerns with regard to inappropriate conditionalities and the fact that "one size does not fit all" – were in favour of specifying means of implementation that are part of the "external enabling environment" (actions that must be taken by the international community and/or economically more powerful countries/actors). National-level recommendations, many suggested, should mainly focus on strong participatory rights and monitoring mechanisms to tailor means of implementation to local conditions and needs.

Thirdly, many suggested that means of implementation should feature in a separate category from goals, while some argued that means of implementation related to the “external enabling environment” should be linked to specific time-bound targets or objectives, unlike the existing Goal 8.

Regarding the content of the means of implementation – whether these should be broad or specific – contributions fell into two broad categories: (1) the “what” – the actual nature of the means; and (2) the “how” – the processes by which the means should be implemented.

1) “What” means of implementation?

Issues related to taxes featured high on the list. A wide range of contributors suggested the Panel should make explicit reference to the need for a financial transactions tax (FTT) as a means of generating large amounts of new and additional development finance. Many also mentioned the need for the international community to step up meaningful international cooperation on tax matters to address the problem of large outflows of capital and tax revenue from developing countries notably through tax havens, transfer pricing, and a “race to the bottom” in tax incentives to multinational corporations, among others. Tax cooperation should also include building the capacity of developing countries to mobilize greater tax revenue through progressive and equitable tax systems, respondents argued.

Some contributors expressed concern that “donor rhetoric” is increasingly focused on “leveraging private investment” and there needed to be realistic, legalized ways to achieve the official development assistance (ODA) target of 0.7 percent of gross national income (GNI). European Youth Forum suggested the creation of a Sustainable Development Fund. Many other contributions made reference to the need for technology transfer to developing countries, especially the poorest, as an essential means to sustainable development. Mention was also made of the need for greater debt relief and to meaningfully address unfair international trade and investment rules, including intellectual property rights.

Effective financial regulation to prevent future financial crises that caused major setbacks on progress of the MDGs was presented by Center of Concern as a key means of implementation linked to the “external enabling environment.”

Many participants were concerned that finance does not reach those who most need it. This is partly a regulatory issue and a “how” question, but the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights, based in Thailand, emphasized the value of more “bottom-up” community-driven financial systems – such as through community savings groups and community funds, which can be used very strategically to leverage other resources such as land, infrastructure and cash, as well as build up the managerial and political power of marginalized groups.

2) “How” should the means be implemented?

At the juncture between the “what” and the “how,” many contributors referred to the need for much greater policy coherence at the multilateral level, some arguing that the international financial and trade institutions should be made much more accountable to the United Nations and its General Assembly, on the grounds that the latter are among the most democratic and equitable bodies.

Contributors including CESR and the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development mentioned that a key principle that should underpin means of implementation is the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, reaffirmed at the recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (“Rio+20”). Amnesty International also suggested that States engaging in international cooperation, including technical and financial assistance (whether bilaterally or through international organizations) must be mutually accountable to ensure that such assistance is consistent with human rights. The need to overcome the increasingly unmanageable proliferation of uncoordinated donor-driven aid programmes was emphasized by the International Planned Parenthood Foundation (IPPF). In addition, reference was made to the principles of development effectiveness, democratic ownership and

use of country systems referred to in the outcome document of the Busan Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. Finally, strong rights to participation were frequently mentioned as an indispensable dimension of the means of implementation.

B4) How can accountability mechanisms be strengthened? What kind of monitoring process should be established? What elements would make it effective? How to account for qualitative progress?

Overall, the submissions expressed much support for stronger accountability mechanisms in the post-2015 development framework, and several recognized that this would constitute a major improvement over the MDGs. Many submissions proposed a system of “multiple accountability” that would include all stakeholders – donors, governments, civil society – and all beneficiaries, with particular emphasis on the inclusion of marginalized social groups (including women, youth, persons with disabilities), that would be operational at all levels (local, national, regional and global). Accountability mechanisms should be tailored to the needs and capabilities at each level and for different groups of stakeholders, respondents stressed. Though some submissions praised “mutual accountability” mechanisms, a number voiced a strong warning against them; according to Social Watch, “The monitoring of developing countries’ performance cannot be in the hands of the donors or in the framework of a donor-recipient relationship,” because mutual accountability mechanisms insufficiently address major inequalities, such as the ones that the framework intends to address.

Effective accountability mechanisms

VSO UK proposed that accountability should be a goal unto itself, while World Vision International suggested, “Transparency and accountability should be embedded into the goals or targets that follow the MDGs,” as this would allow better monitoring of progress and ensure development is “citizen-led.” The contribution continued, “Moreover, by incorporating transparency and accountability (rather than creating a separate ‘governance’ goal) we can help ensure that transparency and accountability becomes ‘business as usual’ for development.”

Respondents including Amnesty International asserted that accountability mechanisms could be strengthened by linking them to good governance and human rights principles, legal instruments and mechanisms. The Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) advocated:

The post-2015 development agenda is well-placed to stimulate effective, interactive accountability systems at all levels and through all stages of the policy cycle so that decision-makers are supported and compelled to justify their policy choices and resource allocations. One effective way of achieving this would be to ensure more constructive interaction between the existing human rights accountability mechanisms (at the national and international level) and the post-2015 monitoring, review and accountability infrastructure.

According to Dóchas, the Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organizations, “Grounding the post-2015 framework in human rights standards will reinforce accountability by stressing that meeting commitments is not a matter of charity but of legal obligation.”

Many submissions advised using existing mechanisms that have proven their effectiveness. For Sightsavers:

It is also important to learn from and build on existing efforts to improve accountability, transparency and improve global governance with regard to international development and development effectiveness. As such there is a need to base the accountability mechanism for the new framework on the principles of mutual accountability, as outlined in the [Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action](#).

ACTION agreed, stating, “Strong accountability mechanisms have been set up since the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and a future framework must consider existing mechanisms that have shown results such as the International Aid Transparency Initiative ([IATI](#)).” CESR provided the illustrative example of the UN Secretary-General’s Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health, which the organization described as “an innovative effort to accelerate progress on MDG 4 and 5 through improved monitoring, review and accountability for results.”

Many submissions requested that the High-level Panel provide concrete guidance on the design and implementation of accountability and transparency mechanisms. For example, World Vision International emphasized that “the High-level Panel will need to clearly articulate that transparency and accountability mechanisms need not pit angry citizens against under-resourced governments. The most recent literature... suggests that development outcomes are most enhanced when good governance is addressed as a collective action problem shared by citizens, government, and the private sector.”

The roles of civil society and the private sector

Wide agreement was voiced on the role of civil society as a valuable independent agent. According to CIVICUS, “Monitoring processes should be based on a multi-stakeholder approach with an institutional role for civil society to ensure effective monitoring.” For the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), to ensure effective monitoring, accountability and transparency, “the next development framework should also support independent monitoring by CSOs and other relevant stakeholders locally, domestically, regionally and internationally. This will create mutual and transnational accountability mechanisms.”

In contrast, the role of the private sector was seen quite differently. “Due to their central role in maintaining unsustainable modes of production and consumption, accountability mechanisms must also hold large corporations to account for their adherence to financial and environmental regulations and human rights,” the Campaign for People’s Goals for Sustainable Development urged. “For obligations where there is a gap in effective mandatory accountability mechanisms, such as in the area of the private sector, the post-2015 framework must require new mandatory mechanisms to be put in place,” Oxfam India stressed, while Save the Children advocated a peer review mechanism that “could be established to evaluate firms’ progress towards their commitments on an annual basis, within the UN Global Compact or other appropriate architecture.”

Monitoring, evaluation, and review

Submissions widely reflected understanding and agreement that a robust accountability system relies on effective mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation and review. A well-functioning monitoring process, according to the responses, is transparent and makes information freely available to all stakeholders at all operational levels (local, national, regional, global).

Respondents mentioned elements needed to improve monitoring, evaluation and review systems, including better data collection, data sharing and analysis, and more data disaggregation (by gender, age, ethnicity, etc.). As explained by Health Poverty Action, “data needs to be disaggregated by various factors including income, gender and ethnicity, to make inequities visible and allow better targeting of vulnerable groups.” To achieve this, many submissions called for support for capacity building at national and local levels and for civil society. According to Save the Children, “Data collection needs investment: a global fund for this purpose should be set up.” The International Planned Parenthood Federation recommended: “the UN Statistical Division should be tasked to produce guidelines and methodology that would help countries design the required surveys, administrative records and other statistical approaches.” The ONE Campaign expanded on this view: “Datasets need to be more accessible and user-friendly – so that citizens, policy makers, parliaments and the media can transparently track investments and outcomes on a regular basis. This will require investment in data collection and the establishment of open data

platforms” for the UN, the World Bank, and other global institutions. For Development Initiatives, “Much more certainty about poverty data – where the poor are, how poor they are and their needs – is absolutely essential if we are to genuinely and efficiently eradicate poverty within a generation.” This organization requested “stronger commitments to statistical and surveying processes, as well as training and technical co-operation,” along with “strong country commitments to resourcing regular surveys and the independence and strong leadership of national statistical agencies.”

Oxfam India suggested that process indicators be used to improve qualitative evaluations. The International Movement ATD Fourth World recommended another essential tool for qualitative evaluations: reports from beneficiaries, in particular from the most socially marginalized, on how development programmes impact their lives. “To strengthen accountability mechanisms and account for qualitative progress,” this organization explained, “those affected by development programmes must be able to participate fully in their monitoring and evaluation. In this way, programmes that are badly planned, badly implemented, or do not serve the interests of those they target are quickly identified.”

B5) How can transparency and more inclusive global governance be used to facilitate achievement of the development agenda?

It should be noted at the outset that most responses acknowledged the close links and potential synergies between the principles and concepts of accountability, monitoring, etc. (issues that were covered in question B4), and transparency and more inclusive global governance, addressed in this question. Indeed, in general, improving one has positive repercussions on the others, and all are necessary to achieve success. Therefore, the responses to B4 and B5 should be considered jointly.

Openness and inclusivity

Contributors regard openness as most essential to increase the probability of success of the post-2015 development agenda, including in terms of access to information and reports by and for all stakeholders; governance; and participation at every stage of the development process, from priority setting to decision making, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Openness was advocated as critical for the meaningful inclusion of those that the framework intends to benefit so that they can provide inputs at every stage.

While some submissions focused on openness in specific contexts and mechanisms, others provided more comprehensive responses, with openness applied to all stages of the process. For example, Restless Development proposed “making materials and data from all high-level meetings and consultations publicly available, and establishing channels for contribution into these so that citizens are aware of all discussions being had and can offer their input throughout the decision-making process.” For the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development, “The process of forming the post-2015 agenda and its subsequent implementation should be open to the general public and accessible to all people. This must take into account barriers facing marginalized groups, for example online publication of information will be of little use to many poor and marginalized communities. Transparency in these processes and in their implementation will enable the people most targeted by developmental goals to direct the development framework and ensure that accountability mechanisms are effective.”

Several submissions referred to transparency and global governance as part of human rights. For Commons Action for the UN, “the achievement of the development agenda should be based on, and the High-level Panel should call for fulfilling, the UN Charter, the Rio Principles, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” Amnesty International expanded on this view: “The High-level Panel should... ask itself how to ensure that the rights of access to information and participation are reaffirmed in the post-2015 development agenda. This should include (a) provision for effective participation in the processes of development – from priority setting to planning to implementation and monitoring – by ensuring access

to relevant information and transparent processes which are inclusive and non-discriminatory; and consult the most affected; (b) commitment for each State to design and implement a poverty reduction framework that involves the active participation of those people living in poverty; and (c) a requirement to respect, protect and fulfill the rights to freedom of expression, association, and assembly.”

The role of civil society

To boost transparency and improve the inclusiveness of global governance to better serve the post-2015 development agenda, respondents advocated an expanded role for civil society organizations (CSOs). For example, the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE) advocated that “CSOs be included in the planning, implementation and monitoring of governments policies. Donors, and the different actors led by partner governments should support the development of proactive structures that involve CSOs in their deliberations, so that CSOs can provide a positive contribution to the political positions and also be an important source of transparency on the effectiveness of the commitments made by governments.” Commons Action for the UN elaborated: “If we want to see real fulfillment of these obligations and agreements then the Panel should call for the development and establishment of a World Civil Society Forum associated with the United Nations, which was the sole individual recommendation coming out of the UN Millennium NGO Forum in 2000.” In this organization’s view this forum would best reflect the problem-solving contributions of civil society.

Specific ideas

- World Vision International recommended that existing transparency frameworks that have proven their effectiveness, such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative ([EITI](#)), be supported by the post-2015 framework.
- To fight corruption, a few proposals called for a policy of open budgets and public disclosure of the use of all project funds by all organizations that receive financing. One individual proposed that “each stage is audited by several different institutions, governments and civil society.”
- Some proposed the use of ombudspersons for increased transparency. For example, Oxfam India defines an “architecture for transparency” as one “including deepening of existing legal and institutional frameworks, empowerment of national Ombudsmen bodies (and equivalent structures globally), provision of structured spaces to challenge government figures through spaces like public hearings, fostering transparency policies worldwide and promoting independent verification of the information through mechanisms like civil society and academia shadow reports and budget tracking reports.”
- At the global governance level, a few comments were made. For the Trades Union Congress (TUC) UK, “The role of the UN and the agencies responsible for global economic governance for the implementation of the new framework should be enhanced through the constitution of a more robust Economic and Social Council and meaningful reforms to the Breton Woods Institutions.... The accommodation of emerging powers such as China, Brazil and India in the decision-making structures will pave the way for greater coordination and policy coherence between and within global governance institutions.”
- For the Campaign for People’s Goals on Sustainable Development, “Inclusive global governance could be facilitated by the creation of multi-stakeholder councils of sustainable development at national, sub-national as well as global levels. There should be a particular focus on providing space for grassroots organizations which represent the poor and marginalized and which face greater barriers to participation.”
- A few organizations indicated that information and governance are so important that they should be individual development goals. Indeed, for Development Initiatives “a specific goal on access to information can act as a proxy against which progress on transparency, participation and empowerment can be measured. Our suggestion of a stand-alone goal also does not preclude measurement of access to information being included as indicators within other thematic goals; in fact we would welcome this addition. But we are concerned that failure to identify access to information as a goal in its own right will result in the post-2015 framework failing, like the MDGs,

to prioritize and deliver on a measure of empowerment. In short, access to information is a prerequisite for transparency, participation and empowerment.” Development Initiatives offers five targets and 11 indicators to support and measure progress towards this goal. For Tearfund, a goal on more open information could include “freedom of information legislation, or progress on fiscal transparency such as the publication of key financial data.”

Tearfund and Save the Children propose a specific goal on governance. Save the Children defines it in this way: “By 2030 Governance will be more open, accountable and inclusive, underpinned by the global targets: i. Ensure all countries have transparent governance, with open budgeting, freedom of information and comprehensive corporate reporting; ii. Ensure all countries have participatory governance, with greater freedom of speech, press and political choice; iii. Ensure all countries have accountable governance, with commitment to the rule of law, more equitable and effective public services, and reduced corruption.”

Acknowledgements

The United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) wishes to acknowledge the Secretariat of the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda for their generous financial support to this project. NGLS is also grateful to the United Nations Millennium Campaign for their guidance and technical support. NGLS would like to thank all of the organizations and individuals that contributed submissions to this process, and acknowledge the quality of the submissions received. The list of contributing organizations can be found [here](#).

NGLS’s objectives are founded on the core values of the UN and are in line with and support the principles of global democratic governance. These values and principles come together in NGLS’s efforts to strengthen civil society’s understanding of and engagement in deliberative processes of the United Nations system while conversely helping the UN to understand and engage in more meaningful ways with civil society.

This NGLS report was coordinated by lead author Susan Alzner; contributing authors included Kathryn Tobin, Susan Brandwayn, Jolanda Groen, Hamish Jenkins, and Beth Peoch. Also supporting this effort were Léa Tamburini and Bernhard Frey.

Annex: Elements to be included in the architecture of the framework

In answering the question “What elements should be included in the architecture of the next framework?” (A3), contributors called for several dimensions to be addressed. This list is not a comprehensive representation of civil society priorities for elements of the post-2015 development architecture; rather, it is an account of the dominant elements proposed through contributions to this consultation question.

Dimensions that should be mainstreamed throughout the framework:

- Equality, non-discrimination and empowerment, including:
 - Gender equality and women’s rights, mainstreamed across all post-2015 development goals, and promoted through an individual goal with targets to address the widespread violence against women and girls;
 - Disability considerations;
 - Support for people of all ages across social, economic and environmental domains;
- Risk management and vulnerability reduction considerations, promoting human and environmental resilience in equal measure;
- Peacebuilding and the nonviolent resolution and prevention of conflict, recognizing the role of natural resources and climate change in these issues.

Specific themes proposed for goals, targets and other measures:

- **Education** including holistic, relevant, lifelong and inclusive learning targets;
- **Social protection mechanisms** including a global social protection floor as well as national mechanisms such as regular income through social (non-contributory) pensions, and investment in primary health-care systems;
- **Decent work** without discrimination in a safe and non-exploitative environment;
- **Access to clean and sustainable natural resources and basic services**, food, water and sanitation and energy, underpinned by healthy ecosystems and the benefits they provide;
- **Policy coherence** for development: goals and/or measures at national and international levels and promoting inter-sectoral and inter-institutional coherence.

Additional dimensions to include in the framework:

Food security and food sovereignty:

- Prioritize agroecological food production for sustainable food security and climate change mitigation and adaptation in the agricultural sector;
- Reduce food waste and post-harvest losses.

Health:

- Quality health care services for identification, treatment, (re)habilitation and disease prevention, including health education and immunization;
- Robust and concerted international action against chronic diseases in low-income and middle-income countries;
- A target for zero tuberculosis (TB) deaths;
- Prioritization of sexual and reproductive health and rights, including family planning;
- High-quality, stigma-free, and affordable maternal health care before, during and after childbirth;
- Renewed commitment to the HIV response (and to ending AIDS), including strengthening the linkages between sexual and reproductive health and HIV prevention and care, and articulating synergies between health, HIV and other areas (e.g. gender equality, nutrition, education etc.).

Housing:

- Equitable access to land, adequate self-determined housing, basic services, public infrastructure, public funds;
- Security of tenure, no forced evictions;
- Non-privatization of public/social goods;
- Non-criminalization of homelessness and resistance to violations;
- Inclusive housing and social services, and a safe and healthy living environment for all, particularly persons with disabilities.

Financial Reform:

- Institute more effective and transparent financial regulation, both domestically and globally;
- Reform tax systems and policies at the national and international levels to ensure more resources are generated and allocated fairly for the purpose of development and human rights fulfilment;
- Step up meaningful international cooperation on tax matters to address the problem of large outflows of capital and tax revenue from developing countries and to build the capacity of developing countries to mobilize greater tax revenue through progressive and equitable tax systems;
- Establish more truly equitable mechanisms of global economic governance, especially in the trade, debt, monetary and finance sectors;
- Ban or strictly regulate speculation in essential food commodities;
- A price stabilization system enabling developing nations to purchase energy at relatively stable prices;
- Eliminate loan policy conditionalities to enable countries to use counter-cyclical policies to protect living standards, trade, and employment.

Transparency, Monitoring and Evaluation:

- Include access to information as a stand-alone goal, and as indicators in other thematic goals, empowering people to exercise their rights, hold governments to account, improve service delivery and reduce corruption;
- Supplement income and economic growth measures of development with broader indicators of human well-being;
- Incorporate the use of different measurement tools, especially those that recognize the complexities of the economy – including the care, precarious and informal economies – where many women work;
- Collect and monitor disaggregated data, using qualitative measures as well as quantitative;
- Introduce health and environmental impact assessments in policy making across departments, with a particular focus on reducing inequalities;
- Include measures to end corruption;
- Hold governments and donors to account when progress is insufficient.

Implementation:

- Include mechanisms to ensure adequate, sustainable, predictable financial resources for structural transformation and poverty eradication in the least developed countries;
- Employ innovative financing mechanisms such as a Financial Transaction Tax;
- Include best practices for using the structures and mechanisms of regional and global support for providing support to the least developed countries.