



Transparency, Accountability
& Participation in Post-2015

Post-2015 intergovernmental negotiations (Intergovernmental negotiations on the outcome document) 22-25 June 2015:

Background programme/documents/statements can be found at:

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/negotiationsoutcome1>

Summary of key highlights:

- There were numerous calls to change the title of the document, with some Member States proposing crowdsourcing it.
- Issues raised included:
 - Concern about picking and choosing some goals to prioritize in the declaration and the preamble, such as the nine objectives proposed by the Co-Facilitators, and consequently, whether the preamble should remain or be removed in the document.
 - The relationship between the FfD3 outcome document and the MOI chapter of the post-2015 outcome document.
 - The need to strengthen the environmental dimension of sustainable development in the declaration.
 - Whether the entire OWG outcome document (including the preamble and reservations) should be included in the outcome document.
 - The need to reference a better and “fit for purpose” UN system to help countries respond to development challenges and support the implementation of the agenda.
 - The need to reference the positive aspects of migration for sustainable development in both countries of origin and recipient countries.
 - How to develop a common understanding of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR).
- There was emerging consensus that the declaration should be short and accessible and highlight the transformative nature of the agenda.
- In the discussion on goals and targets, the G77 called for including the report of the OWG in its entirety in the text, including the chapeau and the reservations.
- They also warned against reopening the targets to technical “tweaking.”
- Developed countries asserted that: the Co-Facilitators’ introduction to the goals and targets is largely sufficient; there is no need to include the chapeau or reservations; and the technical tweaking of the targets is necessary because Heads of State cannot agree

on unfinished text or endorse targets that are not aligned with international conventions and the Rio+20 outcome document.

- In the discussion on follow-up and review:
 - While many delegations appreciated the text, some said it was too prescriptive, and others questioned the references to the roles of and interlinkages between national, regional and global follow-up and review processes.
 - There was support for a process that is voluntary, country-led, multi-level, transparent, inclusive, and evidence-based.
 - There was overwhelming support for stakeholder participation in national-level follow-up and review.
 - India stated they are uncomfortable with the term “accountability” and called for the removal of the word “meaningful” from the Follow-up and Review section of paragraph 14 during the follow-up and review segment.
 - While support was voiced for the High-level Political Forum on sustainable development as the “apex” of the review framework, there were different interpretations of what the global-level review would look like and the nature of the Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR).
 - There was also concern about the UN developing guidelines for national reports and review processes, as opposed to leaving this to governments.
- In the discussion on MOI some Member States welcomed the zero draft’s indication that the MOI targets are only included as a “placeholder” pending the FfD3 outcome, many others said the two processes are distinct and that the FfD3 agreement will not be sufficient to ensure implementation of all the SDGs and targets.
- The Co-Facilitators noted that they would produce a “final zero draft” within the next couple of weeks, before the final, two-week negotiating session that begins on 20 July 2015.

Key highlights from Member States Interventions:

- Costa Rica called for the participation of civil society, private sector and parliamentarians and add references to how citizens should be part of the process.
- Egypt stressed to avoid new language in Goal 16 during the general statements and declaration segment.
- Latvia stressed the principles of **transparency, accountability and participation** should be included in the zero draft during the general statements and declaration segment.
- Republic of Korea stressed good governance, based on **transparency, accountability and participation** should be more highlighted in the zero draft during the general statements and declaration segment.
- **India stated they are uncomfortable with the term “accountability” and called for the removal of the word “meaningful” from the Follow-up and Review section of paragraph 14 during the follow-up and review segment.**
- Germany stated the **involvement of Major Groups and civil society**, the private sector, the scientific community and the UN system at all levels of the review architecture will be crucial for us to be able to get the full picture and truly know whether we are on

track towards achievement of the goals. Therefore they very much welcome that this is clearly stated in the zero draft during the follow-up and review segment

- Palau called for the follow-up and review section should strengthen accountability between states and citizens, supported by environment that enables active and meaningful participation of all stakeholders.
- Mexico stated for a transformative development agenda which should constitute the basis of the global review mechanism it should include transparency, accountability and participation of major groups.

Some key highlights:

During the General Statements and Declaration Segment:

Co-Facilitator Macharia Kamau (Kenya)

- Presented the post-2015 zero draft, and outlined that:
 - The synopsis is intended to be easily communicated in a manner that can be managed by the public and the media.
 - The declaration is meant to be short, accessible, and highlight issues without turning them into “a laundry list”.
 - The section on SDGs and targets tries to reflect the request of delegations to replicate the entire set of goals and targets agreed in the Open Working Group (OWG) process.
 - The means of implementation (MOI) and the global partnership section includes some indicative language and clearly indicates that the section is a placeholder waiting for the outcome of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD3).

During the Declaration:

South Africa on behalf of the G77 and China:

- Preamble:
 - Stated it does not add any value to the entirety of the text.
 - Called the Co-Facilitators to remove this part from the document.
 - Stated there should be no attempt to present a competing list of development priorities in the form of the preamble.
- Declaration:
 - Emphasize the need to address poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon, and therefore in accordance with SDG1, believe that the declaration should be consistent in stating that poverty should be eradicated "in all its forms and dimensions" in order to truly leave no one behind.
 - Equally the mention of the Rio principle number seven namely, Common But Differentiated Responsibilities, policy space, condemnation of foreign occupation and the right to development should, inter alia, be lauded. Also like to reaffirm the principles of territorial integrity, national unity and political independence of countries.
 - Identified some area of concern in the declaration such as the distortion of the CBDR in the context climate change (paragraph 27) that calls for "historic responsibilities for all states." Hold the firm view that developed countries must assume their historic responsibilities and address issues of mitigation and adaptation as it is the developed country partners that have been disproportionately contributing to climate change and attendant challenges largely precipitated by the phenomenon, which undermine our efforts to achieve

sustainable development. The responsibility cannot be for "all states" as developing countries are responsible for a relatively inconsiderable margin of green-house gas emissions. Similarly, the mention of shared responsibility in paragraph 29 contradicts the essence of the principle of CBDR.

- Believe that the issue of migration requires re-calibration as it is reflected in the text as a negative phenomenon while there are mutual benefits for both sending and receiving states. Additionally the Group is deeply concerned at the continued loss of life of migrants. The agenda must recognize that the phenomenon of migration, while it presents humanitarian challenges in some situations, it could contribute significantly to development if properly managed.
- There is also need for recognition in the text that there are different visions and tools of development and sovereignty over natural resources. The Declaration should also emphasize the importance of regional cooperation and inter-connectivity. In addition the issue of Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns (SCP) is usually caveated with "developed countries taking the lead." In this regard they call on the Co-facilitators to reflect this kind of formulation in line with the Johannesburg Plan of Action and The Future We Want.
- The Group is concerned at the omission of the need to condemn the 'unilateral coercive measures against developing countries' whose grave effects make it impossible for the targeted developing countries to meet their development needs. Call on the Co-facilitators to reflect this issue as this trend is indeed a matter of concern to the Group. Unilateral actions constitute aggression of international impact and have unintended consequences for populations in targeted countries.
- Stated the SG synthesis report cannot serve as a basis of the negotiations on the new agenda.

Africa Group:

- Called for deletion of Preamble.
- Concern about the disproportionate emphasis on human rights in the declaration.
- Stated they are not in favor of re-opening the OWG report to do "technical proofing".
- Called for the OWG report should be entirely included in the post-201 agenda, including the Chapeau.
- Highlighted global indicators will be the ones that will receive most attention from the global community. Regional and national indicators will not receive the same attention.
- Referring to MoI, emphasized developed countries should be called to fulfill their commitments. Addis Ababa outcome will be a supplementary not a replacement for this section. Also it Important to include technology innovation - should be strengthened in this section.
- Referring to Follow up and Review, emphasized we should focus on universal goals (SDGs should be applicable to all countries). Called to respect national policies and priorities. In addition, detailed discussions on the regional level should be done at the

regional level and by their member organizations. Stated they are reluctant to mention ECOSOC on the longer-term of the UN positioning - depends on the SG report.

European Union:

- Called for the removal of the Annexes.
- Welcomed the inclusion of civil society in this new phase of negotiations.
- Welcomed the inclusion of the preamble but elements needs to be more developed.

The Republic of Maldives on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States:

- Underlined concerns that protections and commitments in the zero draft as it is presently summarized in the text is problematic.
- Recommend the title of the zero draft reflect what the agenda stands for – the post-2015 sustainable development agenda.
- Stated not sure about the value added of including the Preamble.
- Stated they do not want to see a reprioritization or reorganization of goals
- Emphasized attempts to cluster processes and documents is not welcome.
- Highlighted the need to ensure system-wide coherence, including interlinkages on follow-up and review.

Benin on behalf of the LDCs:

- Recognize that LDCs would need additional, preferential, concessional and most favorable treatment for their access to markets, finance, technologies, know-how and other resources and differential and flexible treatment in undertaking international commitments and obligations which is called “Differential and Preferential Treatment for LDCs (DPTL)”.

Arab Group:

- Recommend deletion of Preamble.
- Mentioned “foreign occupation” as a major obstacle for sustainable development and human rights violation.
- Highlighted positive impact of migration.

CARICOM:

- Questioned the added value of the Preamble.
- Called for further elaboration of modalities and guidelines to facilitate follow up and review by the HLPF

Tonga on behalf of PSIDS:

- Underlined an essential component of PPP comprises Oceans, Seas and Coastal areas.
- Stressed we must take into account the challenges posed by climate change.
- Underlined the post 2015 process should ensure complementarity with the FfD outcome and not completely rely on Addis.
- Stated they would like to see a technology facilitation mechanism within the document.

Zambia on behalf of the LLDCs:

- Called for the outcome document to reflect the support for the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action, to address the challenges of LLDCs.
- Called for reflection of strengthened international support for ODA.

Thailand:

- Called for a paragraph on the role of the UN development system and their role of supporting member states in the implementation of the post-2015 agenda.
- Stated not clear about value added of the Preamble.

Costa Rica:

- Called for the participation of civil society, private sector and parliamentarians and add references to how citizens should be part of the process.

Colombia:

- Stated the title of the document needs to be reworked.

China:

- Supports the HLPF to function as the follow-up and review mechanism of the post-2015 agenda.

Republic of Korea:

- Stated they believe that multi-stakeholder engagement and participation is crucial to the success of the post 2015 development process.

Switzerland:

- Stated MOI linked to ongoing FfD3 negotiations.

Nigeria:

- State follow-up and review the responsibility of governments.
- Called for openness, meaningful participation and transparency to serve as the basis for follow-up and review.

India:

- Called for a change in the title.
- Called for the chapeau and OWG introduction to be integrated fully into the document.

Venezuela:

- Stated the MOI as presented should not be a placeholders, there should be a clear differentiation between FfD and Post 2015.

Latvia:

- Stressed the principles of **transparency, accountability and participation** should be included in the zero draft during the general statements and declaration segment.

Chile:

- Called for document to include participation of civil society and other stakeholders.

Cuba:

- Stated civil society should be included in follow-up and review in accordance with national legislation.

Egypt:

- Stressed to avoid new language in Goal 16 during the general statements and declaration segment.

Montenegro:

- Stated transparency and accountability needs to be better featured in this document.

Liberia:

- Stated peace and security, transparency and accountability are prerequisites of development anywhere in the world, and should be the bedrock of the SDGs.

Republic of Korea:

- Stressed good governance, based on **transparency, accountability and participation** should be more highlighted in the zero draft during the general statements and declaration segment.

Liechtenstein:

- Stated accountability and the rule of law could be more explicitly presented in the document.

During the Goals and Targets Segment:

South Africa on behalf of the G77 and China:

- The Group is concerned that the introductory part of the SDGs, also commonly referred to as the Chapeau, is delinked from the SDGs and is incorporated in the zero draft as an annexure.
- The Group would appreciate receiving an indication of how the reservations entered by the Member States on the adoption of the SDGs will be referenced in the outcomes document.
- On the proposed revision of targets, they caution against any action that could jeopardize the integrity of the report of the OWG-SDGs in line with the consistent position of the Group.

- The Group reiterated its view that a proposal on indicators should be presented for consideration and appropriate action by concerned intergovernmental bodies.

During the Follow-up and Review Segment:

Statement on behalf of the G77 and China by the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the UN:

- Believe that this area in the zero-draft requires some work to reflect a balance of views.
- Their view is that the proposal is intrusive as it seeks to prescribe how governments should conduct follow-up and review without giving due regard to the different realities, circumstances and constitutional frameworks in different countries.
- The Group furthermore is of the view that national governments assess their own implementation on a voluntary basis and in light of their respective national realities. What is required is follow up and review arrangements that are flexible enough to take the aforementioned realities into account.
- Recognize the need to ensure system wide coherence and coordination of sustainable development policies, including the need for adequate linkages to the follow up and review of UN Conferences related to sustainable development. These include those on LDCs, SIDS, LLDCs, and countries in special situations, that have been highlighted. This is an important contribution to alleviating the reporting burden on States and duplication of efforts
- The Group of 77 has always maintained that emphasis in this area should be on follow-up on the means of implementation at global level with a focus on ODA commitments, technology transfer, and capacity building. The idea is to create space for our development partners to account on the delivery of the means of implementation while also allowing all states to undertake an assessment of progress in the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.
- Believe that the inputs submitted by the Group in the last session could serve as a basis for the follow-up and review process and can be utilized to address some of these concerns that the Group has expressed today. Resolution 67/214 and 67/290 are very clear on the basic modalities for the follow-up and review.

European Union:

- Welcome this section that promotes accountability to citizens: this concept should be strengthened throughout the section by reinforcing shared responsibility and mutual accountability.

Arab Group:

- Stated the follow-up and review process must be a voluntary and it must be left to states at the national level

CARICOM:

- Called to reference country ownership and country driven approach in follow-up and review.

Tonga on behalf of PSIDS:

- Called for nationally owned, robust and transparent follow-up and review process.
- Encouraged by a peer review mechanisms.

Brazil:

- Emphasized the role of CSOs will be key to follow-up and review.

United Kingdom:

- Stated participatory monitoring should be highlighted in follow-up and review.

Peru:

- Stated they believe that the modalities of participation for non-state actors should be flexible.

Turkey:

- Stated they believe the key component of follow-up and review is principles of transparency and participation.

Philippines:

- Reiterated that the follow-up and review process must be transparent, participatory, and reflect a country's reality.
- Recommended in Paragraph 1 in the declaration section, accountability should be removed.

Palau:

- The follow-up and review process should strengthen accountability between states and citizens.

Ghana:

- The follow-up and review process should be country -led, data driven and involves all stakeholders.

India:

- Stated they are uncomfortable with the term "accountability" and called for the removal of the word "meaningful" from the Follow-up and Review section of paragraph 14.

During the Means of Implementation Segment:

South Africa on behalf of the G77 and China:

- Stated FfD should never replace the MoIs but work and complement this intergovernmental stream of work.

European Union:

- Stated the Addis outcome should constitute the overarching MoI pillar in the post-2015 agreement.
- Stated the best outcome possible in Addis would be to fully integrate it in the post-2015 agenda.

Arab Group:

- Stated the Addis Ababa accord must complement the post-2015 agenda and its Mols and not substitute the agenda.

Maldives of behalf AOSIS:

- Reiterated the FfD must complement and not replace the MoI chapter in the post-2015 agenda.

During Closing Segment:

- The Co-Facilitators noted that they would produce a “final zero draft” within the next couple of weeks, before the final, two-week negotiating session that begins on 20 July 2015.
- The Co-Facilitators expressed confidence that negotiations can be concluded within the planned timeframe.

Meetings with Member States

Key points from meetings with Member States

- Need to balance being “overly prescriptive” in follow-up and review chapter, with many Member States speaking out this week on this very point.
- Most were supportive of the recommendation of “people-centered” nature of the agenda, but mixed reactions on “reaching those furthest behind first,” as a practical issue of Member States fearing commitments that are far too aspirational to be achieved, and being held accountable.
- General support for the value of third-party data in the Post-2015 agenda, but mixed reactions on how this can practically be applied through these processes. Some concerns about “trusting” these sources and comparability of these data sources.
- Broad support for participatory mechanisms for Post-2015 processes going forward.
- Concerns broadly from Member States in negotiations on being “too prescriptive” for follow-up and review processes.

Meeting with France

- Francois Gave and Laure Serra from Permanent Mission of France and Claire Vancauwemberge from French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy (Paris)
- Welcomed the efforts of TAP to produce a common output on behalf of all endorsing organizations. While they were supportive of the idea, they mentioned that there might be some political resistance to the concept of committing to “reaching those furthest behind first,” as it is a massive challenge for Member States, including from the global south, and Member States might be hesitant to commit to be ambitious to that degree, for fear of not meeting these commitments.

Meeting with Japan

- Meeting with Shinobu Yamaguchi, Deputy Director of Global Issues Division for Japan MOFA, (Tokyo)
- Very new to the position – 1 or so months in to the work on Post-2015. Very open to “learning” from us and our experiences and perspectives when it comes to this Post-2015 work. They support our call for people-centered and participatory nature of the follow-up and review process and broader Post-2015 agenda. Also very supportive of idea of including third-party data sources to complement official data, and suggested that we think about what areas can third party data contribute towards specifically, and to compile and suggest best practices and examples of official processes that have harnessed third party data previously. He suggested that this would be a valuable resource for Member States and NSOs that are particularly skeptical of the role of third party data, to show them that it can be trusted and where it has been used in the past.

Meeting with Mexico

- Meeting with Roberto Dondisch, Director-General for Global Issues, Mexico Secretaria De Relaciones Exteriores
- Very elaborate meeting on a wide range of issues, and having worked in the civil society realm in large networks previously, he was very impressed by the efforts we have undertaken to identify key areas and recommendations as a Network. Particularly supportive of the need for increasing capacity of data generation and use, and for comparability. Suggested that the regional level discussions in particular needed to be strengthened in this sense, as it provides an opportunity for countries in similar situations to come together to identify solutions together. Very supportive of the participatory nature of the entirety of the Post-2015 process, and pledged to be the first to speak up in negotiations if attempts were made to limit participation of civil society in next couple of months, or beyond. Was supportive enough of the role of third-party data that he suggested hosting an event in partnership with Mexican government on this very topic around July negotiations.

Meeting with Switzerland

- Meeting with Maja Messmer from Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN and Lynne Calder from Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (Bern)
- Switzerland is very supportive of our positions, particularly regarding follow-up and review and role of stakeholders in Post-2015 processes and follow-up. Highlighted that our reference to leaving no one behind and reaching those furthest behind first has seen some hesitance on behalf of some Member States, as it raises concerns again about data capacity to measure against these ambitions, and issues with increased responsibility to implement these principles in practice. When discussing the indicators process, they had the view that arbitrarily selecting a number of indicators to measure SDGs was unproductive and unhelpful. Additionally, they feared that this work could not even take place through the IAEG-SDGs unless there was a sound framework for how these indicators will be selected. On follow-up and review, they indicated that there is a fear of overloading the agenda and negotiations with too much detail on the follow-up and review chapter, particularly since separate negotiations will have to take place on the operational elements of the HLPF, post-September.

Meeting with Canada

- Meeting with Jonathan Arnold, Head – Post-2015 Task Force, Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development
- Very encouraging meeting, where he expressed his appreciation for the work that has been undertaken by the Network. Very open and receptive to the ideas we presented, and indicated that some of the language from the TAP response had even been taken up by the Canadian delegation, including language on reaching those furthest behind first. However, he posed the question of how we actually implement this principle in practice, as it's a huge undertaking. Stressed that accountability is a high priority of their delegation, and that participation in the HLPF is also an issue they have explored extensively.

Meeting with Georgia

- Meeting with Nino Shekrladze from Permanent Mission of Georgia to the UN
- Encouraging meeting, in which they expressed their appreciation for our work around Goal 16 issues, as it is a priority for their government. Highlighted that measures and reforms have been undertaken by their national government on the issue of corruption in particular, and felt as if their national experience in measuring progress against these national targets could be used through our work going forward. Responses to the Zero Draft from various Georgian agencies will be compiled and synthesized, with TAP's inputs being reflected here where applicable through the Mission's inputs. Expressed a desire to work together going forward, particularly around Goal 16 issues.