



Follow up and review

Good evening. I am part of a Mexican feminist NGO called Gender Equity, and I'm happy to speak here on behalf of the WMG.

We may not know it, but we live in a new era. Under that new framework, fractals are my favourite metaphor, and are very pertinent now for our current purpose. As you know, we've assumed that we live in a world of Euclidian geometry for centuries. Humans feel comfortable with symmetry: circles, squares, rectangles, rhomboids, are very smart. They're human inventions for an artificial world. So perfect, that is actually far away from how actual life is. But today we must recognise we live in a more complicated world, one of systems effects: where the perfection we strive to create has complicated and often-inequitable impacts. Today, we have at our hands the fractal geometry. It's an irregular geometry, made out of complex numbers. What is interesting is that the numeric equation is the basis of the entire system: you can have a series of complex numbers, and it is not only until you ask a computer to display the graphic of that equation, that we would see a fractal: an image with a basic structure that is recurrent and imperfect. Nevertheless, it comes with infinite beauty. When you try to change a part of the image, it will resist. However, by changing a small part of the equation (a plus for a minus, a three for a five), the entire graphic will change. The systems we have created in business as usual have generated unjust and unsustainable structures and ways of being. But today we have tools that can change the equation. FfD is the full equation that needs an ongoing process, and the P-2015 signals the points of entry to speed up some modifications to our image: the image with which we clearly foresee and create a more just and sustainable world.

Financing for Development, FfD, is a normative framework for a very much needed process of global governance reform in the world in terms of systemic issues and balancing economic and financial dynamics. The P-2015 is the conjunction of political wills to accelerate the fulfillment of a dream, and it comprises some specific points of entry. Civil society is certain that the P-2015 is not by far the perfect agenda, and when we compare it with our Beijing Platform for Action and ICPD Programme of Action, for instance, we know it is far from being fully encompassing in regard to gender equality, the full realization of women's human rights and their empowerment.

However, we support the effort by governments to walk a joint path towards sustainable development. Thus, as civil society we are eager to see the complementarity and integrity of both platforms, FfD and P-2015, and that they are both implemented in the next years.

For us, the FfD platform should change the rules in which the world functions. It has the potential to promote a transit towards a world that is not based in donor-recipient dynamic but one that recognizes historical responsibilities. A world in which governments are not being taken hostage by the private sector and unregulated capital flows. In which trade treaties are not preventing states to promote clean and safe industry, or in which decent work is not a reason for which foreign capital will leave a country. In which Africa and Latin America are not regions from which illicit flows exceed the amount of ODA that enters through official channels, and therefore in which our Southern regions stop being creditors of the North. In which the dignity and wellbeing of people is valued more than the repayment of interest on loans. In which tax contributes to a fairer society and the developmental role of the State. In which it is acknowledged that unpaid domestic and care work performed by women generates the 60% of the value that is generated in the world, and therefore is shared and redistributed. So, for us, the specific MoI for a time-bound post-2015 agenda does not reflect the potential or the full mandate of FfD. It goes well beyond 2030 and sets the path for structural and ongoing changes.

For us, the P-2015 is a call for urgent action and we therefore embrace it fully, and even expect that the future indicators process will find a way to further increase the ambition and depth of our goals and targets. We want an innovative agenda with full recognition of the treasure that is to have indigenous knowledge and technologies, to recognize the rights of all persons of all ages, of all conditions in all geographic locations. We know that a multi-level architecture is needed: national-level review will support dialogue between people and government to address gaps and develop relevant programmatic and legal frameworks. Regional reviews can provide space for shared learning. Global reviews at the HLPF will provide a sense of overall progress with a universal peer review mechanism. We are hopeful Universality is the key word for implementation, and we expect leading examples from both North and South governments, grounded on common but differentiated responsibilities as well as the full realization of human rights and gender equality.

Given that both platforms have different aims, they should both have differentiated efforts for follow up and review. The WMG has shared its proposal under the HLPF – that the FfD and P-2015 processes have different follow-up and review mechanisms- and I would invite you to read it fully. As of FfD, it needs further elaboration:

We envision an institutionalized mechanism for FfD under the United Nations, with which there is a possibility of:

a) A more democratic and inclusive governance than the one that can be found in the G-20, OECD or IFIs.

- b) A mechanism under the umbrella of Human Rights, so that we can fully unpack what would a sustainable development process with a human rights framework mean.
- c) A proper space to dutifully address the financial needs of the gender equality, social development and Human Rights conferences of the 90's.
- d) A space under the principles of sustainable development, as well as common but differentiated responsibilities (CBCR) including universality, responsibility and differentiation.
- e) It should include meaningful and institutionalized civil society representation, and report to the UN General Assembly, and the High Level Political Forum in linking to SDGs.
- f) Financing for development must increase the resilience of populations against economic shocks and the management of financial flows and especially financial crisis must be done according the full respect of human rights frameworks. The FfD follow-up process should be comprehensive tackling systemic issues, enact normative guidance and principles for private financial flows and debt, as well as trade and development linkages.
- g) Financing for development should promote gender equality and the full realization of women's rights in taxation, development cooperation, private sector accountability, debt and trade as well as in the entire macro-economic dimension, including the redistribution of unpaid and domestic care work.

The P-2015 can have a positive influence on the FfD follow up process, so we suggest that environmental sustainability and resilience towards natural disasters and situations of conflict should be integrated into development finance frameworks through the lens of the Right to Sustainable Development in all forms of development financing. The integration of Rio + 20 principles into the FfD process means a stronger focus on three aspects of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental). In both structures, we need institutional civil society participation. One in which we learn from good practices, such as Rio, the UNFCCC model and ESCAP's Regional Civil Society Engagement Mechanism. Broad references to "stakeholders", makes it far too easy to conflate private sector and other non-governmental actors with rights holders and civil society constituencies, but it fails to ensure accountability for private sector.

The WMG has been concerned with the role of the private sector, and this is why we send a strong message to Member States to strengthen the role of State, so that no negative social and environmental impact is derived from it. This is why an ex ante assessment evaluating the suitability of private sector actors for this agenda should be promoted both under the FfD and the P-2015 platforms for follow up and review. A Member State suggested last week that governments should devise a mechanism to make accountable civil society. We would welcome such methodologies, because thus they can be applied in reciprocity to measure the immense impact the private sector has nationally, regionally and globally. We would then again be proud as civil society that we are exercising our social and civil rights by walking this path with our governments and asking for a full accountability of their duties. This is, after all, the fractal we want to modify and live in from now on.