

INDIA CIVIL SOCIETY ANALYSIS OF THE POST-2015 UN PROCESSES



India Civil Society Analysis of the Post-2015 UN Processes

The thirteen sessions of the Open Working Group (OWG) were the last crucial milestone in a long and complex process that was set in motion by the United Nations since early 2012 to arrive at recommendations on how the new development agenda would be framed when the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) expire in 2015. The process saw many other key moments and milestones on the way – the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons outreach through meetings and consultations; the My World Survey; the Sustainable Development Solutions Network input; the national consultations that were held across the country; the Non-Governmental Liaison Service input; and the President of the General Assembly debates and high level events. While all these were formal processes, civil society globally also revved up and shaped the evolving discourse through myriad actions and initiatives.

From India, *Wada Na Todo Abhiyan* has been at the forefront of mobilising public and political engagement with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in India and aims to make these goals more socially just, equitable, sustainable and inclusive. Our engagement in shaping the new development agenda is guided by our understanding on the need to ensure that inputs from the Global South shape the contours of the new evolving agenda for development as with over 85% of the people surviving on less than \$1.25 a day concentrated in the Global South (Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, East Asia and Pacific), it is critical that the aspirations and expectations of the voices from the Global South is integrated into the discourse of influencing how development would be defined for all post-MDGs post-2015.

As we stand at the crossroads wherein one long, open and consultative process of civil society and multi-stakeholder input is coming to an end and the inter-governmental process is about to commence, we share our vision of what the post-2015 development agenda must have and analyse the recommendations of the Open Working Group outcomes – which would be the main input into the post-2015 discussions. We have also put together our assessment of the other two critical processes undertaken by the UN – the UN High Level Panel of Eminent Persons (HLPEP) Report¹ and the UN Secretary General Report to advance UN development agenda beyond 2015².

As the 69th Session of the UN General Assembly begins, civil society actors representing the global South³ call for stronger focus on a rights-based approach in the post-2015 development agenda to counter and eliminate poverty, social exclusion and injustices.

1 http://www.un.org/sg/management/pdf/HLP_P2015_Report.pdf

2 <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/A%20Life%20of%20Dignity%20for%20All.pdf>

3 Names of organisations / networks are at the end of the document

Prologue

It is our firm understanding that the post-2015 development discourse must be defined by the following **Five Principles**:

The existing MDGs have largely ignored the universality, indivisibility, inter-dependence and inter-relatedness of **human rights**. If the post-2015 development agenda is to remain relevant, it must emphasize on the fundamental inalienability of human rights as the macro frame to locate within it specific goals and targets.

Inequalities, discrimination and social exclusion, particularly caste, ethnic and gender inequalities, have always been inadequately addressed. The evolving development agenda in the post-2015 frame needs to focus on diagnostic, i.e. structural reforms, rather than prescriptive measures. In this context, it becomes necessary to ensure that all prevalent macroeconomic policy directions that fosters and perpetuate inequalities and social exclusion be reviewed through the lens of intersectionalities including discrimination based on caste, religious, sexual and gender identities. Widely-accessible, non-discriminatory, participatory and quality basic public services including in health, water and sanitation, education and housing, comprehensive services for survivors of violence, among others must be ensured. Excluded communities, especially women, must be involved in planning and setting their agendas, engaged in budget formulations and also of development schemes that are of benefit to the community and focus on the most vulnerable – such as single women, survivors of violence and children.

A **gender-transformative, gender-inclusive and gender-responsive** policy frame guided by principles of gender equality and equity is essential to advance and achieve full potential of all women in all spheres of life, namely, economic, social and political. For this, generation of across-the-board gender-disaggregated data, fair representation of women on all decision-making platforms, equitable ownership and control over productive resources and a world free of violence and harassment against girls and women, where justice can be accessed and women claim their dignity, autonomy and bodily integrity, and where prevailing masculinity norms are challenged is sought.

The principle of a **sustainable development pathway**, when seen from the lens of the majority of the population of the globe, and the dangers of climate change, would mean in real terms year round access to basic necessities of food, shelter and livelihood for all men and women to survive with dignity and to secure these basic necessities even in the wake of climate variability. The goal must not be merely to alleviate poverty but to ensure ‘well-being’, where economic and environmental sustainability are simultaneously ensured and the world acts together to reverse global warming and deal adequately with its impacts. To achieve this would imply a bottom-up perspective to the development trajectory. The vision of a low carbon society is an opportunity for us to make development choices, especially since we have large populations in developing countries which have yet to have access to basic energy.

The principle of **‘just’ governance** must translate into the government being responsive to the needs of the people. There is a need for greater transparency, accountability and participation in terms of economic policymaking. ‘Just governance should be the cornerstone of governance reform and adequate institutions, capacities and resources need to be allocated to ensure implementation. This principle needs to apply not only to public institutions but to the private sector, to global governance institutions and to the developed world to ensure a level playing field.

Foregrounded by these principles, we have collectively identified 15 Key Concerns that would need to be addressed by the post-2015 development agenda – these can be accessed from our previous document⁴.

4 http://www.un-ngls.org/IMG/pdf/Indian_Civil_Society_Response_to_OWG_Document.pdf (Please refer to pages 8-9)

I. Analysis of the Outcome Document of the Open Working Group (OWG)

1. An Overall Assessment

We welcome the chapeau text that frames the 17 proposed goals and reiterate our call for a greater emphasis on foregrounding it in a “human rights approach” to ensure ‘no one is left behind’ this time round. Furthermore, as activists promoting right to development and human rights for all, we are happy to note the language to reference private sector in implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) has been better nuanced since the previous document (paragraph 14).

We welcome reference in the chapeau to strive for a just, equitable and inclusive world (paragraphs 4 and 7). Specific mention of the most marginalised is also heartening; however, we note that discrimination due to descent does not find mention among the various categories mentioned (paragraph 4). This is particularly vital in the Indian context as instances of discrimination are descent-based, i.e. due to caste and tribal descent.

Related to this is that even though the chapeau talks of inter-generational solidarity to address discriminations of various kinds, the articulation of the proposed SDGs do not adequately address challenges of social exclusion and absence of basic human rights of the most disadvantaged, such as women, children, the older people, migrants, religious minorities, indigenous people, persons with disabilities and young persons.

It is noteworthy that the chapeau makes unambiguous reference to the **principle of common but differentiated responsibilities**, which is in line with our recommendation⁵ to factor in the north-south divide that continues to dictate global development.

On the **gender equality** goal, we are concerned that sexual rights of half of humanity continues to be denied and the ambition is inadequate as critical aspects related to framing gender-responsive policies, i.e. promoting gender-responsive budgeting, have been removed. We are also worried that gender concerns are not main streamed in proposed SDGs 12⁶, 14⁷ and 15⁸. Further, referencing to timelines is removed only from the gender goal ostensibly to ensure the targets are fast-tracked and expedited earlier than 2030; this rationale escapes the rest of the Outcome Document worrying us if this is only to give countries leeway to not address this critical concern more centrally.

We welcome that the goal focusing on **reducing inequality within and between countries** has been retained but are concerned with some of the targets that are significantly watered-down. To address inequality more comprehensively, reducing wealth inequality (e.g. the relation of the richest 10% to the poorest 40%) would be critical.

We welcome that the goal on ‘**Peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice, effective and capable institutions**’ has been retained as this will prove to be one of the transformative blocks for the post-2015 agenda. Specifically, we are happy to note the centrality to access to justice but call for re-introduction of ‘rule of law’ in the goal. We also welcome the new language in the goal title to include ‘accountable and inclusive’ institutions.

While we welcome that **climate change** finds substantial mention in the chapeau with reference to limiting the global temperature rise to below 2 degrees, which was a compromise arrived at among countries that were divided on its inclusion within the goal itself. While most other goals have 6-7 targets, SDG 13 on combating climate change has only 3 with additional 2 targets on Means of Implementation (MOI); the second MOI target reflects

5 Accessible here: http://www.un-ngls.org/IMG/pdf/Indian_Civil_Society_Response_to_OWG_Document.pdf (please refer to Page 10, paragraph 3)

6 SDG 12: *Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns*

7 SDG 14: *Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development*

8 SDG 15: *Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.*

our recommendation to mainstream gender concerns in the climate change agenda. We amplify our call for more concrete targets on emissions reduction.

We welcome that the goal on **sustainable consumption and production** has been retained and note considerable improvement in language around role of developed economies.

While we thank that the Co-Chairs retain our suggestion to re-articulate the emphasis around **economic growth** by also addressing concerns of “inclusive and sustainable development”, we reiterate our concern that the economic pillar has been over-emphasised with another goal on industrialisation and infrastructure. On the other hand, the necessary foregrounding of all goals in a human rights perspective remains absent.

We again thank the Co-Chairs for factoring in our suggestion to incorporate both a standalone component for overarching instruments as well as individual **Means of implementation** (MOI) for each goal. However, both the revised goal as well as MOI within all goals seems significantly watered down.

While agreeing with the Co-Chairs that the SDGs are indicative of a global consensus and will stand the test of time (Co-Chair’s Letter⁹), we would like to emphasise that the repeated referencing within most goals to national policy spaces leaves for a lot of ambiguity. As it is, the attendant indicators elaborating these 169 targets will be developed nationally so the recurring mention seems rather superfluous.

The UN Millennium Declaration had sought collective responsibility to ensure human dignity, equality and equity and to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for people across the world to ensure its benefits and costs are evenly shared. From a global south perspective, we are concerned that the post-2015 SDG agenda will not succeed if these are not adhered to now. More specifically, we refer to the development cooperation that must ideally be between governments of developed and developing countries, with the developed countries leading in providing resources and the means of implementation. We also reiterate the concern over the declining role of the state and its implications for the partnerships with non-state actors that are being explored to operationalise many of the goals that are in most cases, fundamental rights. Hence, we call upon you to see that the post-2015 SDGs are truly transformative and forward-looking.

2. Observations on Goal Formulations

[In Blue: Recommendations for re-insertion from previous version\(s\) of OWG Document](#)

[In Red: Additional recommendations](#)

Sustainable Development Goals

[**Alternative SDG 1:** End poverty and reduce inequality in all its forms everywhere]

[**Alternative SDG 2:** End hunger, achieve food sovereignty and nutrition security for all, and promote sustainable agriculture]

[**Alternative SDG 3:** Ensure healthy lives through universal public health care and promote well-being for all at all ages]

[**Alternative SDG 4:** Ensure inclusive and equitable quality public education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all]

9 Accessible here: http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4518SDGs_FINAL_Proposal%20of%20OWG_19%20July%20at%201320hrsver3.pdf

5. Attain gender equality, empower women and girls everywhere

[Alternative SDG 6: Ensure the right to water, availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all]

7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

9. Promote sustainable infrastructure and industrialization and foster innovation

10. Reduce inequality within and between countries

11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, socially-inclusive and sustainable

12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

[Alternative SDG 13: Tackle urgent action to combat climate change, disaster risk reduction and its impacts*]

14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

[Alternative SDG 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, halt desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss]

[Alternative SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, rule of law, and build responsive, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels]

17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

Particularly from a developing South perspective, we would like to focus on following ‘misses’ and specific points of concern with reference to the goals and targets as outlined in the Outcome Document:

1. **Goal 1** (*End poverty in all its forms everywhere*) does not make any mention of inequality in its present articulation. We also note that the markers to measure extreme poverty (at \$1.25 a day) remain woefully inadequate. Recent analysis¹⁰ highlights how this has been more of a case of creative accounting and a more realistic estimate might be anywhere between \$5-10 a day. Even if we fail to agree on the marker for now, a more useful and reliable indicator would be calorific intake standards that are already benchmarked and can link achievements in this goal to Goal 2 on ending hunger. At the target level, referencing to national definitions (1.2 and 1.3) is worrisome as indicators would any way reflect national priorities.
2. **Goal 2** (*End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture*) needs to bring back reference to securing food sovereignty to make any impact and the watered-down language - ‘*improve nutrition*’ - needs to be changed to ‘*ensure adequate nutrition*’. Additionally, although the goal mentions addressing trade distortions in world agricultural markets, we call for attending to the small producers in developing countries more specifically as a MoI within 2.b.

Further, 2.c focuses on food price volatility without referencing the need for public food stockholding especially in developing countries that have a large poor and underfed population. This becomes essential to ensure access to food and guarding against global and domestic food price volatility which hurts both poor producers and consumers. With the recent National Food Security Act (NFSA) in India it is necessary to support public food stockholding with necessary subsidies on both consumption and production but the latter is now being challenged by WTO rules.

10 <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2014/08/exposing-great-poverty-reductio-201481211590729809.html>

3. In **Goal 3** (*Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages*), it is critical to recognise that universal health care is tax-financed, either as part of Goal 3 or within the proposed MoI, as without this clarity, we might be looking at an insurance-based model. The universal and publicly (government) financed health care must be provided through well-funded public services that are free at the point of use and accessible to the most marginalised.

We call for healthcare not health coverage (3.8) as the latter is more about insurance and less about tax-financed provisioning. Also, the term ‘essential health care’ is technically invalid. The term ‘essential’ limits the scope whereas the term ‘universal healthcare’ is cognizant of a set of minimum standards.

4. **Goal 4** (*Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all*) does not clarify the mode of financing this goal. Further, scholarships for higher education delivered within developed countries and subsidizing seats in the north (4.b) are over-emphasised and would have negligible or no effect at improving the educational status worldwide.

The emphasis must be on ‘public’ as evidence from OECD countries shows that sustained public provision on education is critical for improved education outcomes. Further, as part of 4.a, reference is necessary to the need for qualified, professionally-trained, motivated and well-supported teachers by increasing substantially the recruitment, development and training and retention of the education workforce, especially in LDCs.

5. As already noted, the removal of timelines from **Goal 5** (*Attain gender equality and empower all women and girls*) is disconcerting. The goal does not ensure sexual rights even as language on reproductive rights makes to the final document which was also a big win for the women’s rights groups’ advocacy. However, concerns persist. Three instances: one, a target on evaluating gender-responsiveness of policy commitments through gender responsive budgeting has been removed. Two, the watered down language on addressing burden of unpaid work is bothersome. Three, specific reference needs to be made to the most-marginalised among women, e.g. women and girls with disabilities.

Also, SDGs 12¹¹, 14¹² and 15¹³ do not mainstream gender concerns and this would negatively impact the overall gains that might be made as without addressing women’s rights to sustainable development.

6. For **Goal 6** (*Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all*), the means of implementation is sketchy and appears to be entirely technology and business-driven in terms of international cooperation with just one MoI target (6.b) referring to strengthening community participation. Further, there is a need to foreground the goal more in line with climate resilient water resources management.

With reference to 6.a, the support through international cooperation must be nuanced to make it people-centric while adopting appropriate and sustainable water and sanitation related knowledge including processes and technologies including water harvesting for artificial recharge.

7. In **Goal 7** (*Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all*), we are concerned that the progressive target (7.4 in 13th OWG Working Document) on phasing out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies has been removed. The well-drafted target that was also sensitive to the poorest must be re-considered by member states during the next phase of inter-governmental negotiations. We also urge the countries to bring in to the ambit of this goal the need to attend to reducing wasteful use of energy, particularly in developed countries.

8. **Goal 8** (*Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all*) unduly emphasizes economic growth which would anyway be a priority focus area for all countries rather than addressing gaps in sustainable development. Further, crucial to distributing benefits of growth is to sustain income growth of the bottom 40% to reduce income inequalities.

Previous iterations of the goal had progressive language that called for promoting greater resource efficiency of economic activities, including through sustainable supply chains, according to national circumstances

11 *Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns*

12 *Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development*

13 *Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss*

and capacities. Also, previous text of this goal sought to explore the possibility of a broader system of capital accounting looking beyond GDP and incorporating social, human and environmental capital. We call for re-inclusion of both of these under this goal.

9. **Goal 9** (*Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation*) fails to clearly outline accountability and monitoring mechanisms that would be applicable for the industry. It does not feature even as part of Goal 9's MoI.
10. In **goal 10** (*Reduce inequality within and between countries*), 10.1 refers to achieving and sustaining income growth of the bottom 40% at a rate higher than the national average. Additionally, the goal must also address and reduce economic, social, and environmental inequalities of opportunity and outcome among social groups through reducing wealth inequality between richest 10% and poorest 40%. A related recommendation is reducing income inequality so that the post-tax income of the top 10% to be no more than the post-transfer income of the bottom 40%.
11. The focus of **Goal 12** (*Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns*) seems to lie mainly in the domain of developing countries and countries in transition. However much more thought needs to go into downsizing consumption patterns in developed countries for them to be sustainable, particularly in relation to lifestyle concerns. We need to arrive at a middle path of defining 'well being' that all human beings can and should have access to and hence the need to work towards development of indicators which define 'conspicuous consumption'.
12. In **goal 13** (*Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts*), we are concerned with the watered-down language to the modified text. A critical concern lies with attributing country responsibility for emission reductions which has always been a bone of contention between countries. Unless there is a convergence in this regard, the problem of unsustainable CO₂ emissions will continue. Additionally, concrete measurable indicators such as holding temperature rise by 1.5°C are necessary to be mentioned even in the goal and not just the chapeau.
13. **Goal 14** (*Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development*) must also address eliminating subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and over-fishing, and refrain from introducing new such subsidies, taking into account the need of developing countries, notably least developed countries and SIDS. There is a pressing need to implement integrated and participatory coastal management to increase resilience of coastal ecosystems and coastal communities.
14. **Goal 15** (*Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss*) must also look into phasing out use of chemicals in agriculture, industry, and settlements, that lead to irreversible ecological degradation and the poisoning of wildlife.
15. In **goal 16** (*Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels*), while welcoming the centrality to access to justice, we would urge changing 'effective' to 'responsive' as efficiency function only addresses the question of whether the institutions function at all / properly and do not reflect on whether the institutions are framed in a rights-perspective and promote social justice for all. We welcome in the goal title, the changed emphasis to 'accountable and inclusive institutions' as opposed to the previous language 'capable institutions'. Also critical is the extent of accountability mechanisms inbuilt in these institutions to ensure greater monitoring, which then make the systems more responsive.

The Outcome Document under SDG 16 does not have reference to internally displaced persons. Access to information although retained does not include critical aspects of data related to public finance, transactions between state and private sector especially related to extractives sector - a key determinant of violence and conflict in most developing countries. We welcome the progressive language in 16.8 and more specifically 16.a as it reflects on participation of developing countries' role in international decision making.

16. **Goal 17** (*Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development*) in its present articulation is a lot like MDG 8 (Develop a global partnership for development) that did

not outline specific, measurable and time-bound commitments for developed countries. The Group of 77 and China's Common Position Document on MoI for SDGs¹⁴ contain useful recommendations more from a developing country perspective.

In Finance, we propose strengthening language and focussing more on domestic tax systems, tackling tax evasion and avoidance, and specific reference to the \$100bn climate finance target, and support for a Financial Transaction Tax. We also recommend additional language to ensure effective regulation and supervision of international financial markets and institutions, including controls over international capital flows to ensure the efficiency and stability of such flows. This needs to be included either under Finance within SDG 17 or under the Inequality MoI where it was included in previous draft but got deleted subsequently.

Focusing on Trade, instead of a rules-based, open multilateral trading system (17.10), we propose this be through fair, equitable and development friendly rules and protection of national policy space in bilateral, plurilateral trade and investment agreements. As with the proliferation of bilateral and plurilateral trade and investment agreements, which are more challenging and threatening for development, it seems myopic to limit proposals only to the multilateral frameworks, the latter nonetheless being our preferred option. Within Policy and institutional coherence, the new agenda must also put in place a legally binding multilateral code of conduct for Trans-National Corporations (TNCs) to secure social responsibility and accountability and prevent restrictive business practices.

II. Analysis of the UN High Level Panel Report on Post-2015 Development Agenda

1. An Overall Assessment

On 30 May 2013, the UN High Level Panel made public its Report that shares its recommendations for a new global development framework commencing in year 2015 when the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in their present form will cease to exist. With an umbrella message that the post-2015 development agenda must be 'universally applicable to all', the Report outlines five transformational shifts and indicates twelve formulations in the nature of new goals with some detailing of attendant targets within each.

We commend the Panel for their efforts to reach out to a diverse set of stakeholders and make the process participatory, which was a point of discontent with the way the current MDGs were formulated, and appreciate parts of its intent but also have some serious concerns around the fundamentals of the Report. At a glance, the huge shift as the Report states is of "partnership", i.e. of turning to the private sector as well civil society "within market principles", making us quite worried and wary.

Further, this big shift comes without a clear articulation of corporate accountability; it is limited to government "prompting" the multinationals, suggestions for companies to internally strengthen their mechanisms, "integrated reporting" and corporations being accountable to their shareholders (which they anyway are). Moreover, even as the report calls for "data revolution", which is welcome, it remains silent about who all come within its ambit. Furthermore, public accountability when it comes to public goods seems vague.

Critical from our standpoint is that the role of state and that of state institutions are clearly minimised in the new entrepreneurial governance frame that underpins the HLP Report, and yet it is the only "partner" which is addressed when it comes to issues of corruption, data revolution, and public accountability. Within such a framework which is clearly neoliberal at its core, a number of things get tricky, for instance, "Leave No One Behind"; is it strengthening of the rights framework or are we looking at a shift to "meeting needs framework"? Some positives in terms of the Panel's recommendations include highlighting human rights and concerns of the socially excluded (albeit muted), and clear formulations to focus on ending violence against women, ending child marriage and equal rights for women to own and inherit property, peace, accountable governance, and curbing

¹⁴ <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4209G77%20common%20position%20MOI.pdf>

tax evasion and illicit financial flows, as also the inter-linkages between the social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development, if the new development framework is to succeed. The Report also clearly talks of civil society role in political decision-making and incorporates much of the language that originates from the civil society.

While this is cause for cheer, delving deeper into the Report makes it clear that much of the perspective and detailing that is essential to make for concrete actionable recommendations is missing. Worrisome also is the inadequate focus on inequality (particularly income inequality) that could have been articulated as a stand-alone, universal goal rather than leaving it to the national policy space. Attention to key intersectionalities that affect not only gender inequality but also as perpetuating inequality remains muted in the suggested new development frame. Inadequate attention to public provisioning of basic entitlements is another let-down.

One of the chief expectations from the Panel was to suggest the means to implement the global development goals. The Panel while rightly stresses on domestic resource mobilisation among other things, also contradicts the very principle of public finance for development by proposing private capital as a source of long-term finance for developing countries. As experiences from developing countries, such as Brazil, show that reducing inequality and expanding benefits of development are possible only through strong government interventions.

2. We welcome that...

- The report suggests that the international community must not merely reduce, but end, poverty for all groups, and ensure that “neither income nor gender, nor ethnicity, nor disability, nor geography” determine people’s access to essential services and enjoyment of human rights.
- Universality of development as a human right, the basic premise of inclusion and social justice, is highlighted as the guiding framework of the document.
- A stand-alone goal on empowering girls and women for gender equality, and specific targets on maternal mortality and sexual and reproductive health and rights.
- It says, “The next development agenda must ensure that in the future neither income nor gender, nor ethnicity, nor disability, nor geography, will determine whether people live or die, whether a mother can give birth safely, or whether her child has a fair chance in life.” This is a very welcome acknowledgement of the exclusion of marginalised groups, especially people with disabilities. The document also acknowledges the Millennium Declaration and the failure of the MDGs to reach the most marginalised.
- The call for global partnership based on the principles of equity, sustainability, solidarity, and respect for humanity is appreciable.
- The report also pays attention to environmental protection in order to eradicate poverty, of which, the most vulnerable and marginalized suffer.
- The new development framework acknowledges the criticality of improving governance systems and stable and peaceful societies by formulating new goals for these.
- The Panel’s call for a “Data Revolution,” in which development data and statistics are not only strengthened, but also disaggregated along gender, geographic, income, and other lines, is a powerful step towards ensuring that development policies benefit all groups. Moreover, the requirement that targets be met for all “relevant income and social groups” in order to be considered achieved increases accountability and impetus for governments to craft and invest in policies that benefit those on the margins.
- On resource mobilization, there is a clear admission of the need to address corruption, step up domestic resource mobilization, clear mention of the need to do away with illicit flows, tax evasion and increase stolen-asset recovery.

3. We are concerned that...

- The Panel has not tackled inequality directly by way of a separate goal. Having a separate goal would have underscored not just the ‘why’ but also the ‘how-to’ to address inequality. Addressing inequality through “national policy in each country, not global goal-setting” is a potentially harmful strategy, given that countries have different perceptions and standards of what levels of income inequality are acceptable. Moreover, research done over the past few decades has shown the negative impacts of neo-liberal policies and privatization resulting in deepening inequalities. Therefore, we advocate for the Panel to devise a universal definition of inequality, and the methods of measurement in order to guide and hold national governments accountable, e.g. the Palma ratio.
- The language of human rights, non-discrimination and social inclusion becomes greatly diluted gradually in the document. The leaning towards a charity-based approach to development will adversely affect the most disadvantaged, including scheduled castes (SCs), scheduled tribes (STs), religious minorities and persons with disabilities. While young people’s issues have been considered as cross-cutting, there is need to see them not as beneficiaries, but as leaders and change agents, including young women.
- In terms of lost opportunities, what comes as the biggest dampener is the absence of a commitment to free and universal health coverage. Without addressing these basic challenges to a decent quality of life for all, adoption of a human rights frame seems inadequate.
- Despite disability being mentioned as a cross-cutting concern, there is no reflection of this fact in the report. Neither the goals nor the indicators mention disability. This is a pressing concern as the UN itself notes that people with disabilities comprise 20 percent of the world’s poorest.
- Ageing and rights of the elderly do not find any mention in the document. They are a section of the population that is most vulnerable to abuse and deprivation.
- There is a lack of clarity as to how does sustainable development bring peace when justice is missing from the overarching framework. Further, there can be no sustainable development and peace without tackling issues of demilitarization and disarmament and working towards a ‘nuclear arms’-free world.
- Given the developmental impact that corruption has, and more so, in developing countries, merely stating “swift reduction” in corruption is in no way a pointer to “zero tolerance” to corruption; a zero-target approach would have been reassuring in this regard. While the emphasis on domestic resource mobilization is welcome, recommendations for more progressive tax regimes would have tremendously strengthened this suggestion. As is common knowledge, the absence of progressive tax policies leads to widening inequalities in developing country contexts. Further, letting off developed countries with a cursory suggestion to meet their commitment towards Official Development Assistance (ODA) to the tune of 0.7% of Gross National Product (GNP) and that they find ways to “reduce” illicit flows and tax evasion is not sufficient; here too, a zero-target approach would have been encouraging.

4. Observations on Goal Formulations

GOAL 1 To begin with, adoption of \$1.25 a day seems an inadequate marker to measure extreme poverty given that the new frame is looking up to 2030. The Report notes that “Continuing on current growth trends, about 5% of people will be in extreme poverty by 2030, compared with 43.1% in 1990 and a forecast 16.1% in 2015. With slightly faster growth and attention to ensuring that no one is left behind we can eradicate extreme poverty altogether.” Making growth a pre-condition to eliminating poverty reflects the Report’s adherence to a neoliberal macroeconomic frame.

End Poverty

Worrisome also are setting of 2015 country poverty lines as markers for the ensuing 15-year period which hardly translates to ending poverty and that the Report continues to talk in terms of proportionate numbers being moved above the poverty line. The Panel while only hinting

to inequality ought to have set out specific indicators for nation states to report on measures adopted to address inequality, for instance, linking caste-based exclusion to inequality. Civil society recommends the need to address extreme wealth accumulation to end poverty and inequality. Further, eradicating extreme poverty needs a more analytical approach. For instance, raising the bar from \$1.25 to \$2 or \$4 will not address the issue of ‘conversion handicap’ of persons with disabilities.

GOAL 2
Empower Girls
and Women and
Achieve Gender
Equality

The upfront attention to the issue of violence against women in the Report is welcome. However, it would be useful to highlight the link between violence against women and increased militarization, small arms industry resulting in increased violence within the home and outside. Also, the Report does not take into account the various intersectionalities that confront women facing multiple discriminations and make them even more vulnerable to violence, abuse, neglect and deprivation, for instance the women from the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes in India. Despite having a goal on gender, the gender analysis seems weak as it does not talk about causes of poverty or gender inequality. While Goal 4 articulates universal sexual and reproductive health and rights as a target, linking this with Goal 2 would have been useful. Further, the issue of sexual and reproductive rights of women and girls with disabilities need to be clearly articulated, especially the question of forced sterilization.

The consensus arrived at through the adoption of recommendations of the Commission on the Status of Women could also have bolstered the articulation. For instance, the need to address the differential impact of trade policies on women and men and the focus and impact of development assistance specifically targeting gender equality should have been addressed in the Report.

GOAL 3
Provide Quality
Education
and Lifelong
Learning

We welcome inclusion of both early childhood education and lower secondary education (although these too need to be made universal) as also the move beyond enrolment to completion. While education issues are embedded in other goals, like in water and sanitation in schools, elimination of all forms of violence and discrimination against children (extendable onto issues like child labour), end to child marriage, it creates a rather skewed situation where access to water and toilets in schools is a target but trained and professional teachers is not. A critical omission is that quality has been restricted to learning outcomes. Furthermore, with the two education targets being seen as global minimum standards, it would be critical to understand the implications of regular learning outcomes measurement on an on-going basis at a global level and this will not come without costs. While the Report mentions teachers and overall environment of schools, this is missing from the actual targets.

On the question of financing, it would have been useful to highlight the ‘how to’ by way of tax based financing or public provisioning. The Report does not discuss equity and inclusion in education although it does flag the need for universality. Exclusion has been seen predominantly in terms of gender and income and does not really come up systematically. For instance, the fact that children with disabilities are more likely to be the ones out of school needs to be taken into account.

GOAL 4
Ensure
Healthy
Lives

Despite concerted civil society demands, it is disheartening that universal health coverage does not feature as the umbrella goal. This goal notes the important role that the social, economic, and environmental factors play in determining health outcomes but fails to provide an exhaustive list of these determinants. While the Panel seems to have thought beyond the current set of MDG targets for health, it has failed to reverse the mistake of current MDGs. The focus on outcome is indeed essential but the means to achieving the desired outcomes have greater significance. The Panel has conveniently remained silent on what kinds of inputs, especially financial and health systems are needed to achieve these targets/ outcomes. The global

health community has been unanimously calling for Universal Health Coverage (UHC) as ‘the’ health goal in post-2015 framework. UHC as a goal would have meant that every individual – irrespective of disease, illness, gender, ethnicity, social biases, and disability – obtain the health services s/he needs, without suffering financial hardship and discrimination.

Particularly noticeable is the absence of education, gender equality and political stability. Like the goal on education, Goal 4 does not address or provide guidelines for ensuring better quality of health care nor the concerns pertaining to discrimination and exclusion in accessing basic quality health services. Exclusive breast feeding is widely recognised to be “an unequalled way of providing food for the healthy growth and development of infants” (WHO), and prevents millions of deaths by protecting children from diseases such as pneumonia and diarrhoea and it still does not find a mention under this goal or in the report. For a development framework that is interested in addressing preventable deaths in both resource-poor and affluent societies, the omission of an easy and cost-effective strategy such as exclusive breastfeeding is a big miss.

All countries that recognise the advantages of using an integrated strategy for addressing maternal and child health recognise the importance of adolescent health in itself and as a determinant of health outcomes later on in life. However, the issue is only provided with a cursory treatment in the report, and is entirely focused on adolescents’ sexual and reproductive health rights at the cost of looking at their right to health and well-being as a whole. The presence of a zero goal on ending preventable infant and under-five deaths and the absence of a zero goal on ending preventable maternal deaths is difficult to understand. Surprisingly, mental health does not feature in this goal even though the WHO says that more than 450 million people are affected.

GOAL 5
Ensure Food
Security and
Good Nutrition

Even though the report as a whole recognises malnutrition as being one of the leading killers of children under the age of 5, and understands the difference adequate nutrition can make to the life of an individual and countries, it doesn’t propose a target on malnutrition. Addressing hunger is only one part of the problem, the other parts such as exclusive breastfeeding, provision of micronutrient supplements and supplementary nutrition etc. need to be tackled as well if we are to make a breakthrough in the present world where over 165 million children globally are chronically malnourished. Nutrition interventions are also known to be more effective when they are integrated into early childhood care and education programmes but the report does not make this important linkage either under this goal or under the education goal that mentions pre-primary education.

Sustainable agricultural production and increased access to irrigation for smallholders is emphasized with due attention to post-harvest loss and infrastructure support. However, considering the lack of awareness amongst farming communities in the developing and least developed countries, one vital point that the Panel seems to have overlooked is access to and informed choice on quality seeds and other inputs. Globally, although it is recognised that among smallholders, women farmers merit special attention, the Report misses mentioning women farmers entirely leave alone recommending any succour. From the global South perspective, it is disappointing to note that rights of farmers do not get discussed at all. Subsuming their specific concerns within umbrella goals for agriculture is unjustified when an alarming number of farmers are committing suicides in countries like India where a majority of the population still depends on agriculture for livelihood.

GOAL 6
Achieve
Universal
Access to Water
and Sanitation

We welcome the universal access to water as a stand-alone goal. We hope that the indicative list to ensure universal access to water that mentions only homes, schools, health centres and refugee camps will be expanded further to also include urban slums, work sites, etc. It is encouraging that the Report addresses the question of sustainable water supply through the sub-targets on fresh water supply, increased water efficiency in agriculture, industry and urban areas, and water recycling.

Sanitation access at homes is not being made universal with the Panel's sheepish admission that, "we do not believe this would be attainable." Lack of safe access to sanitation leads to increased violence against women (as research shows the link between increased violence and lack of safe public spaces) and stigmatization, and, by not making this universal, the Panel fails to address this critical linkage, thereby making us question the premise of its conviction to eliminate all forms of violence against girls and women (in Goal 2).

GOAL 7
Secure
Sustainable
Energy)and

Given the anticipation on how well the Report would integrate the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to MDGs, it has attended to the sustainability question by formulating two goals focusing on sustainable energy and sustainable natural resource management. We welcome the goals as both concerns are extremely critical to ensuring a "planet-sensitive" approach. Particularly noteworthy are recommendations to phase out fossil fuel subsidies (in Goal 7) and to maintain country-level government and corporate environmental database. The Panel has observed that 70 % of fresh water is being used for irrigation and calls for reducing this usage pattern by increased water-use efficiency. However, sustainable practices such as rainwater harvesting which is also important for mitigating impact of climate change are not considered by the Panel.

GOAL 9
Manage
Natural
Resource
Assets
Sustainably

Reading more closely, we find that the energy goals are not coherent with sustainable development and not ambitious enough. Given the extent of energy poverty and the target of holding rise in global average temperature to below 2 degree Centigrade, doubling renewable energy share in total energy till 2030 is too little too late. The Report advocates improvement of energy efficiency in agriculture and promotion of 'sustainable agriculture' but nowhere approaches sustainable agriculture as pathways away from use of high fossil-fuel consuming inputs. The expected radical approach on energy to promote sustainability and equity is missing. Missing also, specific to the global South, are recommendations linking women and energy access, given that women are better energy managers and suffer the most in the event of inadequate supply.

Although the Panel has put forth some progressive targets under managing natural resource assets, it overlooks the role and rights of indigenous communities and other natural resource dependent poor. The emphasis on the economic value from natural resources almost overshadows the rights and dignity of the very people who are also counted as beneficiaries from this resource base.

GOAL 8
Create Jobs,
Sustainable
Livelihoods
and Equitable
Growth

The specific focus on youth while discussing job creation is welcome. However, by the UN's own admission, vulnerable employment has decreased only marginally in the last twenty years and youth (and women) comprise a majority in this category (UN MDG Report, 2012). Thus, by not attending to the issue of vulnerable employment in this goal (apart from a muted mention of women in vulnerable employment within Goal 2), the promise made to the youth does not count for much.

Further, by stating the need for both "good jobs and decent jobs" in the new development agenda under Goal 8 without the necessary clarity that is required might only lead to poorly-conceived national policies on employment. A critical omission has been leaving out any discussion around the issue of equal wages for all. Further, women's unpaid work needs to be addressed specifically and ways devised to ensure that this is factored into socio-economic planning. Also, women-led livelihood initiatives must be supported with long-term investments, skills development and social protection. Specific to the global South, wage disparity has been one of the determinants of continued widening inequality and it is unclear how the Panel proposes to leave no one behind without addressing this key concern.

GOAL 10
Ensure Good
Governance
and Effective
Institutions

We strongly welcome the Panel's attention to governance by way of incorporating a separate goal. Given the crises and failures in governance worldwide, focusing on governance by proposing access to independent media and information, right to information, access to government data and public participation in political processes is greatly encouraging. Clearly one of the successes of civil society activism, its articulation has raised hopes for concerted follow-up action at the national level. More emphasis on ending corruption, greater detailing of the oversight mechanisms and methods of participatory governance would have significantly reinforced this goal.

The High Level Panel's focus on good governance and effective institutions is commendable, especially the focus on the public's right to information. However, it would have been desirable if the issue of public accountability was not seen just within the framework of corruption, but was recognized as a target in its own right.

GOAL 11
Ensure Stable
and Peaceful
Societies

Another welcome inclusion to the new development framework is the focus on peace as a precondition to development. Calling for elimination of violence against children is particularly laudable in the context of developing and less developed countries where children are subject to multiple forms of violence given their exploitation through prostitution, child labour in extremely hazardous circumstances, and through practices such as child soldiers and camel jockeys to name a few. Although the Report briefly notes economic reasons as one of the attendant causes of violence, some more actionable detailing in terms of steps to address economic inequalities and redistribution of resource allocation might have been welcome. Also, while the Panel highlights the need for implementing small arms control as a step towards mitigation, it fails to make any mention of the resource wars that are at the root of most of the global armed conflicts. The goal fails discussing internal "stressors" like caste violation and other forms of discrimination that stratifies society and induces conflict and violence. Given its allusions to transformation, the "right thing to do" would have been a strong message to the global North to own up their role in these natural resource wars and play a more mature role in balancing the power equations globally.

GOAL 11
Create a Global
Enabling
Environment
and Catalyse
Long-Term
Finance

Despite generating a lot of buzz around the need for creating a Global Enabling Environment through effective means of implementation, the Panel fails to concretely attend to the financing question. This is limited to merely talking about the developed countries' ODA target of 0.7% of Gross National Product and recommendations for curbing illicit financial flows, tax evasion. Setting zero-targets to end illicit financial flows and tax evasion such as those recommended by the Financial Action Task Force would have been truly 'transformative'.

What is probably the most bothersome is the near-unanimous vote to private sector as an option to finance the new development frame. Related also is the synonymous reference to WTO and fair trade even though civil society has actively rallied against most of the unfair trade practices adopted by WTO which saw many developing and less developed countries lose their bargaining power against the global North. Notable also is the lack of attention to the need for greater corporate sector accountability.

As is the case with any political document conceived out of consensus, the UN High Level Panel Report on the Post-2015 Development Agenda attempts to synthesize a 10-month long process of consulting over 5,000 civil society organisations, alliances and grassroots organisations in 120 countries apart from other stakeholders into a comprehensive framework. Throughout its narrative, it does try (and partially succeeds) to put together a theory that would support the new goal formulations in a bid to address one of the criticisms of the previous set of MDGs. Fresh thinking is evident by way of proposals for peer review of the new framework and some emphasis to the 'process' question.

However, despite the underlying message that the post-2015 development agenda must be ‘universally applicable to all’, there are several instances of the Panel not saying enough to make the developed countries own up their responsibilities in the new development framework and continues to maintain status quo on the role of corporate sector by not giving a clear and strong message to ensure their accountability. Missed out also is the centrality of the human rights lens in the suggested new development framework.

In terms of next steps, we will train our attention at the national government to ensure that the recommendations from the Panel are taken up by the government and strengthened substantially in order to ensure that the new development framework for the country is human-rights based, socially-just, environmentally-just, accountable and inclusive of all.

III. Analysis of the UN Secretary General’s Report on Post-2015 Agenda

The UN Secretary General’s Report titled ‘*A life of dignity for all: Accelerating Progress towards the MDGs and Advancing the UN Development Agenda Beyond 2015*’ released mid-August (dated July 26, 2013) is a treatise converging the recommendations from the various community, online and thematic consultations held globally, the My World Survey, recommendations from the UN High Level Panel, the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, Global Compact, and other inputs from experts and practitioners.

As part of renewing efforts to accelerate progress towards achievement of MDGs and in order to define the new development agenda, the UN SG’s report lays specific emphasis on:

- Inclusive growth,
- Decent employment and social protection,
- Allocating more resources for essential services and ensuring access to all,
- Strengthening political will and improving the international policy environment, and
- Harnessing the power of multi-stakeholder partnerships

We welcome the fact that the Report is foregrounded in the language of human rights and justice. Additionally, the focus is on a new sustainable development agenda with focus on poverty eradication and ending extreme poverty. The three main sections of the Report outline the following provisions:

1. Focuses on achieving MDGs by 2015 through **accelerated measures** (new UN Partnership Facility proposed to build on existing measures), **reviews progress** till date, and **identifies successful policies** / programmes
2. (a) Sets the **vision and transformative actions** for the new development agenda, (b) outlines attendant **monitoring and accountability** frame, (c) need for **goal-setting**, (d) and **process roadmap** to launch the new development agenda (*Special Event on MDGs in 2013 UN GA, Final phase of intergovernmental consultations in 2014 UN-GA, Call to convene UN Summit in 2015 to adopt new development agenda*)
3. Recommends **actionable process roadmap** to member states and the UN system: *UNSG’s Report in 69th UN-GA (2014)*

To achieve a Sustainable Development agenda with the MDGs coming to an end (in their present form) in 2015, the UN SG states that... “...**Sustainable development must be** enabled by integration of **economic growth, social justice** and **environmental stewardship** and must become our global guiding principle”

“Global challenges, local solutions; shared burden, shared gain; this remains the credo of international action for our collective well-being”

We welcome four building blocks that are outlined by the UN SG's Report in accomplishing this vision:

1. The vision of future is anchored in human rights and universally-accepted values and principles as in the Charter of the UN, UDHR, and Millennium Declaration.
2. Set of concise goals and targets aimed at realizing priorities of the agenda
3. Global partnership for development to mobilise means of implementation
4. Participatory monitoring framework and mutual accountability mechanisms for all stakeholders

A moot point that is highlighted in the Report and what we see as critical is that the “...*decisions on shape of the next agenda rests with member states*” which sets the course for future advocacy and is an indicator of the next steps required to build momentum in outlining the new development agenda post-2015.

The UN SG's Report also acknowledges the various consultative processes and discussions that informed his recommendations. These include the national-level consultations, My World Survey, High Level Panel process, Sustainable Development Solutions Network, Global Compact, Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals.

The broad set of recommendations made by the Report hinge on the following aspects:

1. **Universality**; leave no one behind
2. **Sustainable development**; focus on ending poverty
3. **Inclusive economic transformations ensuring decent jobs**, backed by sustainable technologies, to shift to sustainable patterns of consumption and production
4. **Peace and governance** as outcomes and enablers
5. **New global partnership**, recognising shared interests, different needs and mutual responsibilities, and
6. **Being “fit-for-purpose”** – that international community are equipped with right institutions, tools to address challenges at national level

In order to arrive at the vision as outlined to achieve a sustainable development agenda that must be enabled by integration of economic growth, social justice and environmental stewardship, following transformative actions are recommended:

1. Eradicate poverty in all its forms
2. Tackle exclusion and inequality
3. Empower women and girls
4. Provide quality education and lifelong learning
5. Improve health
6. Address climate change
7. Address environmental challenges
8. Promote inclusive, sustainable growth and decent employment
9. End hunger and malnutrition
10. Address demographic challenges
11. Enhance positive contribution of migrants
12. Meet the challenges of urbanisation
13. Build peace, effective governance based on rule of law, institutions
14. Foster a renewed global partnership
15. Strengthen international development cooperation framework

What is heartening is the mention of concrete accountability and monitoring mechanisms that would ensure the above-mentioned transformative actions are carried out / initiated in right earnest. Specifically highlighted among actors whose role would be critical in ensuring accountability are the role of parliaments, governments and the direct engagement of citizens and responsible businesses. The need for better baseline data and statistics to assess quality of outcomes gets underscored even in the SG's Report taking from the recommendations made by the UN HLP Report.

Broadly, we welcome the UN-SG's Report and find it written in a fairly strong 'human rights' language. We also agree on the need to train our attention at the national level now with the Secretary General noting that the outline of the new development agenda will be defined by the member states. Hence, it would be more relevant to pick up specific and actionable advocacy 'asks' and develop a plan of action for engagement with the national level governments to take forward the discussion around shaping the new development agenda post-2015. It is also critical to join forces with other stakeholders such as the legislators, the media, academic community and the community at large to ensure support for our recommendations towards the framing of the new development agenda.

Specific aspects in the SG's Report merit attention:

- While the articulation in a rights-based frame is welcome, it needs to be made more central to the entire discussion around the new development frame. Further, although there is reference to the need to address Universal Health Coverage, the modalities to arrive at this goal are not examined in detail and would merit greater attention as there is a clear move across member states to privatize basic entitlements such as healthcare without adequate and concrete safeguards to ensure the private actors are following adequate regulations. Another area that remains critical from the global South perspective is the articulation of concerns of food and nutrition security that does not find mention in the UN SG's Report. A clear rights-based approach in providing for these basic entitlements would be extremely critical, more particularly from developing country contexts.
- We continue to feel a sense of discomfort around the overall leanings towards a corporate entrepreneurial governance frame that dictates the contours of the new development agenda. We find the Report's over-reliance on markets and private actors disconcerting and would have welcomed a stronger positioning of the role played by national governments in concretising the new agenda for development. In this regard, clarity related to accountability mechanisms for the corporate sector need to be emphasized more and better.
- While the report titled 'A life of dignity for all' places the concerns of social exclusion centre stage and we wholeheartedly welcome this focus, we find the discussion around inequality muted and would recommend greater attention to the causes and drivers of inequality.
- Another key concern particularly from the perspective of developing countries / global South is the need to focus on concerns of redistributive justice. While we welcome the Report's affirmations to ensure social justice and advancing towards elimination of injustice globally, it is also necessary to underscore the importance of the redistribution aspect. The single reference in the Report to redistributive economic policies as a reason for success in achieving MDGs in developing countries fails to strike a resonant chord as it only mentions redistributive economic policies (and focuses on contentious policies such as cash transfers), whereas redistributive justice is an overarching principle and goes beyond redistributive economic policies (and certainly not limited to cash transfers).
- There seems to be scant attention paid to concerns that are trans-national in nature, such as water, trade and climate negotiations.
- Another aspect worth noting is while we acknowledge the need to focus on the bottom decile (that lives on less than one dollar a day), it is also necessary to not limit policy provisions only for this segment as a burgeoning population in the global south is traversing the margins between the most marginalised and the most affluent and comprises the majority of those with limited access to resources. Thus, while the top decile

(1 billion) corner over 80% of the world's GDP, there continue to be those in the middle (approximately 4 billion) that are equally deprived in terms of access to resources globally. Thus, it becomes only critical that the new development agenda focuses not just on the bottom decile but moves towards universal coverage.

- We would also welcome some more clarity on the monitoring mechanisms that find mention as the enablers to ensure the transformative actions can be achieved. In particular, it would be relevant to indicate how the data revolution in the developing countries will be resourced in terms of expertise and finances. Further, developing access and quality benchmarks to monitor progress across critical development indicators would be fundamental to ensuring the proposed data revolution goes beyond just generating more numbers but also accomplishes measurable, comparable data to track progress.
- With regard to outlining the means of implementation, while we agree with the SG's Report that in the changed macroeconomic policy framework, the emphasis on South-South cooperation is critical but it is also vital to ensure that this is not done at the cost of reducing the traditional North-South collaborations that remain critical for most developing and less developed countries. The welcome suggestion of the Secretary General to commit to deadlines to honour ODA commitments must be followed through and pursued with member states. On the role of private sector in financing means of implementation, there is a need to provide further detailing on regulatory mechanisms.

Epilogue

As we enter this next phase of intensive and largely closed process of intergovernmental negotiations, civil society stakeholders would need to sharpen and develop a strategic plan of action to engage with the new development agenda-setting process in a relevant manner. For the *Abhiyan*, this is but a milestone that we have reached and we will continue to find meaningful ways to steer and influence the development agenda from a global South, developing country perspective. The five principles that we developed collectively will continue to guide our roadmap for the next phase of strategic engagement.

Drafted and compiled by Pooja Parvati, *Wada Na Todo Abhiyan*

Contributors to the OWG Outcome Document analysis (in alphabetical order):

All India Women's Conference, INDIA (Kalyani Raj)

Centre for Democracy and Social Action, NEW DELHI (Richa Singh)

Centre for Social Justice, GUJARAT (Nupur Sinha)

Confederation of Voluntary Associations, ANDHRA PRADESH (Mazher Hussain)

Equals - Centre for Promotion of Social Justice, TAMIL NADU (Meenakshi Balasubramaniam)

Nine is Mine Campaign, INDIA (Br Steve)

National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights, NEW DELHI (Lee Macqueen Paul, Paul Divakar)

Global Campaign for Education, NEW DELHI (Anjela Taneja)

International Planned Parenthood Association, NEW DELHI (Susmitra Chaudhury)

Jagori, NEW DELHI (Suneeta Dhar)

Jan Swasthya Abhiyan, INDIA (N B Sarojini)

Janvikas, GUJARAT (Gagan Sethi)

Landesa NEW DELHI (Anisa Draboo)

Laya Resource Centre, ANDHRA PRADESH (Nafisa D'Souza)

National Disability Network, INDIA (Dorodi Sharma, Javed Abidi)

Oxfam INDIA (Avinash Kumar, Deepak Xavier, Vanita Suneja)

PRAXIS – Institute for Participatory Practices, NEW DELHI (Sowmya Bharadwaj)

Public Advocacy Initiatives for Rights and Values in India, NEW DELHI (Ajay Jha)

Save the Children NEW DELHI (Shireen Vakil Miller)

Third World Network, NEW DELHI (K M Gopakumar, Ranja Sengupta)

Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, INDIA (Amitabh Behar, Pooja Parvati)

VSO India (Praveen Kumar)

The HLPEP Report analysis is endorsed by (in alphabetical order):

All India Women's Conference
Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, New Delhi
Centre for Democracy and Social Action, New Delhi
Centre for Legislative Research and Advocacy, New Delhi
Centre for Youth and Social Development, Odisha
Christian Aid, India
Disabled People's International, India
Equals – National Center for Social Justice and Empowerment with Special Focus on Disability, Chennai
Environics Trust, New Delhi
India Alliance for Child Rights, New Delhi
Jagori, New Delhi
Joint Operation for Social Help, New Delhi
National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights /Dalit Arthik Adhikar Andolan, India
National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People, New Delhi
National Coalition for Education, India
National Disability Network, India
Nine is Mine Campaign, India
Oxfam India
Pravah, India
Right to Education Forum, India
Save the Children, India
Sightsavers, India
Society for Social Uplift Through Rural Action, Himachal Pradesh
The YP Foundation, New Delhi
Voluntary Action Network India, New Delhi
Voluntary Service Overseas, India
Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, India
Women's Coalition Trust, New Delhi
Women's Research and Action Group, Mumbai
World Vision India

About Wada Na Todo Abhiyan (WNTA)

Wada Na Todo Abhiyan (Hindi for 'Don't Break Your Promise Campaign') is a national campaign launched in 2004 as an outcome of World Social Forum in Mumbai. It is a coalition of over 4000 civil society organisations and networks in the country with the aim to hold the government accountable to its promise to end poverty and social exclusion. WNTA is affiliated to the Global Call to Action against Poverty (GCAP).

For comments / questions, please contact
Saswati Swetlana, E-mail: swetlena@gmail.com

July 2014



WADA NA TODO ABHIYAN
National Secretariat
C 1/ E, Second Floor,
Green Park Extension, New Delhi – 110016
INDIA

www.wadanatodo.net