arrow
briefs

THE ASIA-PACIFIC
RESOURCE & RESEARCH
CENTRE FOR WOMEN

championing
women's sexual and
reproductive rights

2016
www.arrow.org.my

SRHR IN THE 2030 AGENDA:

LOOKING BACK, MOVING FORWARD

SRHR IN THE 2030 AGENDA:

LOOKING BACK, MOVING FORWARD

ISBN 978-967-0339-25-2
2016

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

Any part of the text of the publication may be photocopied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, or adapted and translated to meet local needs, for non-commercial and non-profit purposes. However, the copyright for images used remains with respective copyright holders. All forms of copies, reproductions, adaptations, and translations through mechanical, electrical, or electronic means should acknowledge ARROW as the source. A copy of the reproduction, adaptation, and/or translation should be sent to ARROW. In cases of commercial usage, ARROW must be contacted for permission at arrow@arrow.org.my

ASIAN-PACIFIC RESOURCE AND RESEARCH CENTRE FOR WOMEN (ARROW)

1 & 2 Jalan Scott, Brickfields, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 50470

Telephone (603) 2273 9913/9914
Fax (603) 2273 9916
E-mail arrow@arrow.org.my
Web www.arrow.org.my
Facebook http://www.facebook.com/ARROW.Women
Twitter @ARROW_Women
Youtube youtube.com/user/ARROWomen
Pinterest arrowomen

PRODUCTION TEAM

Overall Supervision: Sivananthi Thanenthiran, Maria Melinda Ando & Tabinda Sarosh
Production Coordinator: Mangala Namasivayam
Author: Luisa Emilia Reyes Zuniga
Reviewers: Maria Melinda Ando, Mangala Namasivayam & Sai Jyothir Mai Racherla
Copy Editor: Aleah Taboclaon & Maria Melinda Ando
Graphic Designer: Nicolette Mallari
Cover Photo Credit: Shutterstock

CONTENTS

4 Preface

6 I. Introduction

10 II. The New Global Agenda

12 III. The Challenge of a Comprehensive Agenda: The Three Dimensions of Sustainable Development and Their Geopolitics
12 – Environment
13 – Economic
15 – Social

17 IV. Gender Equality and SRHR on the Negotiations Tables
18 – High Level Panel of Eminent Persons Report on Post-2015
18 – The Open Working Group
20 – The Secretary General Report
20 – The General Assembly

21 V. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
21 – Preamble
21 – Political Declaration
22 – Goals and Targets
22 – Means of Implementation and the Global Partnership
23 – Follow-up and Review

25 VI. Taking Action: SRHR for Sustainable Development—Global, Regional, and National—Beyond September 2015
25 – Indicators
25 – Implementation and Regional Bodies
26 – Follow-up and Review
27 – National and Local Level

29 Bibliography

29 Endnotes

PREFACE

The year 2015 was critical for the global development and human rights communities. The Millennium Development Goals were coming to an end, and the UN system embarked on an ambitious negotiation agenda to ensure that the post 2015 development agenda would be, in comparison to the MDGs, a fully-agreed upon development agenda by all Member States.

The process was sparked by the 2010 High-Level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on the MDGs, as requested by the Secretary-General, to initiate thinking on a post-2015 development agenda. In 2012, after the Rio Conference, Member States launched the process to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which would build upon the Millennium Development Goals and converge with the post-2015 development agenda. An Open Working Group (OWG) on Sustainable Development was established, composed of the five United Nations Regional Groups and 30 Member States which carried out a series of 13 sessions from March 2013 until July 2014, over a 17 month period. A set of 17 goals and 169 targets were proposed for consideration. The inputs were synthesised into a report which served as a basis to the intergovernmental negotiations in the lead up to the Summit in 2015.

Some early successes for the SRHR movement out of this OWGs include the inclusion of targets on maternal mortality reduction, ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health services, ending child/early/forced marriages, violence, harmful practices, and ensuring reproductive rights.

Of course, for us, edgy sexual and reproductive rights activists, these targets are simply no-brainers. But in the inter-governmental negotiations where language on SRHR and women's rights are used as trading chips for language on economics and politics, these could be seen as significant gains. The original MDGs had nothing more than maternal mortality reduction.

After the OWG sessions and report, the President of the General Assembly appointed two co-facilitators, one from Kenya and the other from Ireland, to lead those informal consultations and inter-governmental negotiations which ran from January to July 2015. At the same time, the Financing for Development consultations, a follow-up of the Monterrey and Doha conferences, were being held across the corridor. Though this was not part and parcel of the original post-2015 development agenda process, somehow these two became intertwined and the fate of one influenced the other.

The post-2015 process also identified the need to have an accountability avenue for the implementation of the SDGs, and formed the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development to provide follow-up and reviews of the implementation of sustainable development commitments and, the post-2015 development agenda, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Additionally, the process included the necessity of having the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), to provide necessary statistical support for the elaboration of the post-2015 development agenda. The Commission formed the Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), which includes the national statistical offices (NSO), and the regional, international organisations and agencies as observers, to develop the indicator framework. This indicator framework would be potentially endorsed at the 47th session of the Statistical Commission in 2016.

ARROW and the 15 partners of the EU project on ensuring universal access to SRHR have been articulating the need for the inclusion of the SRHR agenda in the new development agenda from the beginning of the process at national, regional and international levels. This work will continue and the partnership will sustain its strategic work to ensure that universal access to SRHR remains high on the development agenda in the Asia Pacific region and that national and international policy and decision-makers are improving SRHR policies and investments to benefit the underserved and most marginalised groups, especially women and girls.

As an essential part of the process, it is critical that the learning from this process is well documented. In line with that we hope that this publication will provide a guide for SRHR advocates to identify entry points for national, regional and global advocacy as well as providing guidance on key elements such as Means of Implementation, and Financing for Development, that should be monitored so that SRHR stays relevant, meaningful and transformative.

The ARROW team, especially Maria Melinda Ando and Mangala Namasivayam, worked closely with Emilia Reyes, who was also an advocate working the Women's Major Group, to enable the documentation of these learnings. We hope this will be useful to the communities working on women's rights, gender equality, and sexual and reproductive health and rights.

We have our work cut out for us—although the UN Summit in Sept 2015 adopted the 17 goals, it was widely acknowledged by all that much more work lies ahead in moving these ambitious goals from paper to practice. We need to continue our advocacy efforts to sustain and capitalise on gains made during the post-2015 negotiations. The task of ensuring the formulation of indicators and developing a global mechanism that is practical, segregated, context-specific, rights-based and accountable is a huge challenge amidst competing priorities and technical challenges.

We also need to continue demands for collective commitment in FfD platforms—to stop illicit flows, to modify unfair trade regulations, to punish tax evasion and promote progressive taxation, and the need for good accountability and monitoring and regulatory mechanisms for all sectors. ARROW will continue to build capacities of national partners to ensure that advocacy gains made at the global level are sustained and implemented at the national level, not only in the areas of gender equality and SRHR, but also in the areas of accountability, means of implementation, and financing.

Sivananthi Thanenthiran
Executive Director

I. INTRODUCTION

We live in an interconnected world. Today, more than ever, local action impacts the global dimension; events that take place in one country or one region may impact the reality of the rest of humanity. Some challenges, such as extreme poverty, climate change, and hunger, among others, are experienced worldwide, not just in selected countries. We are living in a time when collective action is required to face the challenges that humanity is facing.

In this context, three major processes have been undertaken by countries all over the world to promote a joint response: the climate change negotiation, the financing for development process, and the sustainable development platforms. The three are interconnected and are at the core of the developmental agenda for the coming years.

What does sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) have to do with these three processes? What is its place in the Post-2015 Agenda, or, as it has been called now, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development? This paper is meant to present that co-relation, and at the same time, to present the windows of opportunity to pursue an ambitious agenda for substantive implementation.

MAKING THE CASE FOR SRHR

This paper is expected to provide the linkages between the sexual and reproductive health and rights agenda within the framework of the sustainable development process. At the same time, this is also meant to help advocates to identify opportunities to further promote the inclusion of SRHR in legal and programmatic frameworks at the local, national, and regional levels. In every section of the document, the points of entry for concrete action at different levels are highlighted to help the involvement of advocates in accordance with their interest and experience.

In the past years, fragmented agendas have led to partial results that, in the best of cases, improve the situation of some population groups but do not change the structural challenges that humanity faces as a whole. Countries are trying to acknowledge the interconnectedness of the agendas, the need to find complex solutions for complex problems, and the linkages between three dimensions: economic, environmental, and social. Under this light, civil society has insisted that human rights, gender equality, and sustainability criteria are the frameworks under which these three dimensions should meet.

Sexual and reproductive health and rights is a compound notion encompassing different elements.

Reproductive health is defined in the Beijing Platform for Action in section C, paragraph 94, as: "A state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, in all matters relating to the reproductive system and to its functions and processes. Reproductive health therefore implies that people are able to have a satisfying and safe sex life and that they have the capability to reproduce and the freedom to decide if, when, and how often to do so. Implicit in this last condition are the right of men and women to be informed and to have access to safe, effective, affordable, and acceptable methods of family planning of their choice, as well as other methods of their choice for regulation of fertility which are not against the law, and the right of access to appropriate healthcare services that will enable women to go safely through pregnancy and childbirth and provide couples with the best chance of having a healthy infant. In line with the above definition of reproductive health, reproductive healthcare is defined as the constellation of methods, techniques, and services that contribute to reproductive health and well-being by preventing and solving reproductive health problems. It also includes sexual health, the purpose of which is the enhancement of life and personal relations, and not merely counselling and care related to reproduction and sexually transmitted diseases."[1]

Reproductive rights are addressed in Section C, Paragraph 95: "Reproductive rights embrace certain human rights that are already recognised in national laws, international human rights documents, and other consensus documents.

These rights rest on the recognition of the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing, and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so, and the right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health. It also includes their right to make decisions concerning reproduction free of discrimination, coercion, and violence, as expressed in human rights documents. In the exercise of this right, they should take into account the needs of their living and future children and their responsibilities towards the community."

"The promotion of the responsible exercise of these rights for all people should be the fundamental basis for government- and community-supported policies and programmes in the area of reproductive health, including family planning. As part of their commitment, full attention should be given to the promotion of mutually respectful and equitable gender relations and particularly to meeting the educational and service needs of adolescents to enable them to deal in a positive and responsible way with their sexuality. Reproductive health eludes many of the world's people because of such factors as: inadequate levels of knowledge about human sexuality and inappropriate or poor quality reproductive health information and services; the prevalence of high-risk sexual behaviour; discriminatory social practices; negative attitudes towards women and girls; and the limited power many women and girls have over their sexual and reproductive lives. Adolescents are particularly vulnerable because of their lack of information and access to relevant services in most countries. Older women and men have distinct reproductive and sexual health issues which are often inadequately addressed."[2]

Sexual and reproductive health is defined in Section C, Paragraph 56: "The human rights of women include their right to have control over and decide freely and responsibly on matters related to their sexuality, including sexual and reproductive health, free of coercion, discrimination, and violence. Equal relationships between women and men in matters of sexual relations and reproduction, including full respect for the integrity of the person, require mutual respect, consent, and shared responsibility for sexual behaviour and its consequences."[3]

"Reproductive health eludes many of the world's people because of such factors as: inadequate levels of knowledge about human sexuality and inappropriate or poor quality reproductive health information and services; the prevalence of high-risk sexual behaviour; discriminatory social practices; negative attitudes towards women and girls; and the limited power many women and girls have over their sexual and reproductive lives."

Problems and aims related to reproductive health and sexuality are more thoroughly addressed in the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD).

With regards to sexual rights, even though there is no definition in an international instrument, there is a definition in the Latin American regional chapter of ICPD Programme of Action (PoA) that appeared in the Montevideo Consensus in 2013. These are defined as follows, in the operative paragraph 34, in which Member States agree to: "Promote policies that enable persons to exercise their sexual rights, which embrace the right to a safe and full sex life, as well as the right to take free, informed, voluntary, and responsible decisions on their sexuality, sexual orientation, and gender identity, without coercion, discrimination, or violence, and that guarantee the right to information and the means necessary for their sexual health and reproductive health."[4]

SRHR, thus, is a compound definition of several interrelated elements that are crucial to the well-being of all persons, women and men, of all ages and in various human conditions. This is why they are fundamental to fulfil any human rights commitment.

SRHR are at the core of the three dimensions of sustainable development: the social, environmental, and economic dimension.

The social dimension aims to achieve the well-being of all persons, with the health of the human body and its sexuality needs (in terms of education and health, but also of freedom, justice, opportunities, and other spaces of fulfilment) at the core of the priorities. No person lives in abstraction. Human bodies determine the way in which we interact socially. For example, persons with disability have specific needs that require measures to ensure they are not excluded; the age of a person is crucial to determine the type of action a government will make; a male baby will have different needs than those of an adult male. This is why human bodies determine the way in which governments are mandated to fulfil their commitments in regard to human rights. It so happens that the space in which governments need to guarantee human rights is in the geography of human bodies. Aspects such as sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, and others, are part of the complexity of human lives, and as such, they require a comprehensive approach. At the individual level, its relevance is clear. Socially, it is evident as well that at some point, human bodies become objects of public agendas due to the influence on population dynamics (e.g., population growth, population movement—displacement, migration, and other phenomena). Thus, the need to guarantee SRHR for all persons has a dimension that concerns the well-being of societies as well, and therefore they are at the centre of the mandates of States.

"SRHR are at the core of the three dimensions of sustainable development: the social, environmental, and economic dimension."

With the environmental dimension, population dynamics relate as well with the way in which we engage with our surroundings, in particular, and our planet, in general. Our needs, our patterns of consumption and production, and our uses and practices all leave an imprint on the planet. Above all, the need to fulfil and guarantee the human rights of all persons, women and men, while acknowledging that we live in a planet with resources that are at risk of depletion, is a challenge that needs to be faced with a comprehensive response. Otherwise, women's rights will be violated either by restrictive measures on their bodily autonomy, or by a reinforcement of their reproductive role above their own choices. Governments have to find ways in which the rights of all persons, women and men, are guaranteed while at the same time a healthy planet is being ensured. For instance, if a government considers that there is an over-consumption of resources in a given territory, they may opt to restrict the number of children a couple may have, instead of addressing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption.

"SRHR and its link to the sexual division of labour are precisely the point of convergence for many realities that all persons face, because gender roles determine the productive and reproductive activities of women and men."

In the case of the economic dimension, it is a fact that women perform most of the unpaid domestic and care work, and therefore they subsidise the entire economy. That is to say, due to gender roles, women are assigned to do domestic chores and to take care of children, the elder population, people with disabilities, those with chronic illness, and even adult males. Time-use surveys conducted in many countries worldwide have found that the value produced by unpaid domestic and care work can range from the 20% to the 40% of the National Gross Income, depending on the methodology used.[5] When women perform these tasks, they have to leave aside the exercise

of their human rights, such as their right to education, their right to work, and even their right to rest. The pressure upon women to perform domestic work is such that society expects women to fulfil them first, and then to pursue their dreams and live their life second. SRHR and its link to the sexual division of labour are precisely the point of convergence for many realities that all persons face, because gender roles determine the productive and reproductive activities of women and men.

For all these reasons, SRHR remains at the centre of the Sustainable Development Agenda, and therefore is a crucial element that needs to be secured in the commitments that Member States will make in the processes that are defining the face of our current societies. The years 2015 and 2016 will be historic opportunities to connect the dots between the challenges we have and the creative solutions that we can promote at the local, national, regional, and global level. Evidently, given that SRHR are also rooted in the most fundamental beliefs against fundamental rights of all persons, in all the diversity of the human experience and across the span of life, it is an agenda that has met so far with numerous challenges. This will not be different in the process to follow, but it is a reality that needs to be acknowledged from the start. This document will try to help in the attempt to connect the dots, to present the main angles of the current global processes, to highlight the linkages with SRHR and, further, to emphasise the opportunity for advocacy work at the global, regional, and the national level, bearing in mind the differentiated realities of local contexts.

II. THE NEW GLOBAL AGENDA

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is the result of an intergovernmental process called Post-2015 Agenda that stems from two different legal instruments.

Firstly, its background derives from the Millennium Declaration[6] and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).[7] To inaugurate the new century, the Secretary General of the United Nations called the governments to join in a collective effort to eradicate extreme poverty. The effort started in the year 2000 and it would, it was expected, successfully end by 2015. The focus of the eight goals centred towards providing universal primary education; promoting gender equality and women's empowerment; reducing infant mortality and improving maternal health; combating HIV and IDS, malaria, and other illnesses; ensuring environmental sustainability; and creating a global partnership for development.

However, as the years passed by, it was clear that structural challenges kept governments from meeting these goals, and other obstacles—such as climate change—were worsening the conditions of populations across the world. The MDGs were actually only addressing effects rather than causes, and therefore the actions they promoted were only superficial. They were only meant to address developing countries and therefore reproduced the North-South and donor-recipient dynamic. By doing that, the MDGs also conditioned the global funding for development, and thus deviated the flows from national priorities and reduced the policy space of developing countries.

To address these issues, a new call was made in 2013 under the General Assembly to renew the commitment for another series of goals, recalling as well the achievements made by the MDGs. Two bodies were created: a High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda and a United Nations Task Team on the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The former would propose a set of recommendations on how the new goals could be framed. The latter would promote inclusion and global consultation, facilitating the participation of multiple stakeholders and, at the same time, bringing legitimacy to the process, thus aiming to develop ownership over the outcome. In May 2013, the Panel released a report that was presented to Member States of the United Nations. The Task Team is important because its mandate was to promote thematic, national, and regional consultations. This was part of a strategy to legitimise the process and to detach from the practices that were criticised during the MDGs.[8]

Secondly, the Post-2015 Agenda also stems from the mandate under Rio+20. In June 2012, the United Nations member countries met in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to agree on the need to develop a series of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). A new intergovernmental body, the Open Working Group (OWG), would propose to the General Assembly and the Secretary General a set of goals and targets. An Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing would also start with a process to devise the pathways to finance the SDGs. With regards to implementation, a High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF-SD) was devised as a body to monitor and review the sustainable development agenda. The first session to discuss this Forum was carried out during the 68th General Assembly. The OWG delivered its proposal of SDGs in July 2014, and they were accepted in September 2014 by the General Assembly as an important basis to pursue a final decision in 2015. In the first semester of 2015, the final negotiations took place to agree on a set of pillars: a Preamble and the Declaration; the SDGs, targets, and the pathway of definition for indicators; the Means of Implementation (MoI) and the Global Partnership; and the Follow-up and Review mechanism (HLPF and the regional and national mechanisms).

Parallel to these processes, the ICPD, one of the most important global platforms to guarantee women's human rights, especially in what concerns sexual and reproductive health and rights, kept on its own track and its own field of discussion within the United Nations under the ECOSOC body called the Commission on Population and Development (CPD). The CPD is the commission in which a yearly gathering of Member States ratifies the commitments of the ICPD and its PoA, and promotes

further revisions for their implementation. That is to say, the Agenda 2030 was a new process under the United Nations, but some agendas, such as SRHR, already had a platform for discussion within the UN. As such, the CPD was actually celebrating its anniversary, and there was an important expectation in what was called "ICPD beyond 2014," an Agenda that was meant to guarantee and review the permanence of the commitments made in this platform. However, given the political and financial implications of the Post-2015 process, the ICPD, as well as Beijing and other instruments of the 90's, are now under threat to be relegated to a secondary place. The reason is simple: it is expected that both the global political will and the financial resources will be shifted to fulfil the 2030 Agenda for the next 15 years. Actually, ICPD beyond 2014 passed without much ceremony and without strong commitments on behalf of the Member States. Nevertheless, it is clear that the paradigm shift that ICPD brings in terms of linking human rights of people at the centre of population dynamics and development must not be left aside.

As the ICPD agenda has advanced, the links with sustainable development have become more evident. However, the 2015 CPD session was met with many obstacles and, for the first time, it ended without an agreed outcome. This means that in the past, there was a negotiated document every year in which a revision was made in order to go further with the commitments. This time, however, governments could not agree on the larger issues of the agenda, and a regressive position was risking what was gained in the past years in terms of commitments. In the end, only a broad reference to the meaning of ICPD beyond 2014 was made, but that was it: there was no ambition to go further in the guarantee of sexual and reproductive rights for all persons. Precisely the year in which the decision would tie the CPD with the Post-2015 agenda, the difficulty to reach a consensus was a major obstacle. This is not to say that everything is lost: there is still room to integrate the agenda in the follow-up and review process (especially at the regional level), but a strong and concentrated advocacy effort needs to be set in place. This is a major element to bear in mind in terms of advocacy for the next stage in the process.

III. THE CHALLENGE OF A COMPREHENSIVE AGENDA: THE THREE DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The social, environmental, and economic dimensions are at the core of a sustainable development agenda. The proper balance among them has been the major challenge for the Post-2015 process, given that different interests are behind each and every one of them. The geopolitics, as we knew it in Beijing and Cairo (two of the most important global instruments to promote women's human rights and gender equality) when fighting for a progressive agenda, has changed. In the past, countries of the Global North were quick in promoting some of the most progressive topics in the social dimension.

"Given that the Agenda 2030 is universal, it will require all countries not only to implement it, but also to report on it. This is a major shift from the MDGs, which still conveyed traditional donor-recipient logic in that only the recipient countries reported back, but donor countries were never held accountable. Accountability is therefore a big battlefield in which implementation as well as finance should be placed as priority."

Thus, sexual and reproductive health and rights had many champions in the European Union, North America, and other developed countries. In contrast, developing countries were more reluctant to agree on progressive stances, and the most ambitious outcomes were challenged yearly by those positions. However, given that the Agenda 2030 was meant to address the interlinkages between the social, economic, and environmental dimension, developed countries soon found themselves speaking on behalf of regressive positions (such as refusing to grant migrant population human rights, or against promoting labour rights). In contrast, developing countries were promoting a more comprehensive position in which the three dimensions were intrinsically linked. We are therefore facing a new geo-political dynamic, in which the world seems to change the face of the allies and those who oppose the advancement of the full guarantee and fulfilment of human rights.

Given that the Agenda 2030 is universal, it will require all countries not only to implement it, but also to report on it. This is a major shift from the MDGs, which still conveyed traditional donor-recipient logic in that only the recipient countries reported back, but donor countries were never held accountable. Accountability is therefore a big battlefield in which implementation as well as finance should be placed as priority. Developed countries will now need to enhance their transparency practices and be accountable to the world as well in their social, environmental, and economic practices, not only in what concerns their own national policies, but also in those fields in which inequalities between countries are related. In this context, in which developed countries are not only used to report implementation on any kind, they feel that their major interests are at stake.

A. Environmental Dimension

In terms of the environmental dimension, the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) clearly addresses a major responsibility to those countries that have had unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, as well as an excessive reliance on fossil fuel and nuclear sources of energy, placing the rest of humanity in an ongoing hazard. For developed countries whose economic prosperity relied in industrialisation for many years, their historic responsibility is now weighing in them to lead the path towards a clean sustainable development. This means that developed countries are now at the centre of global scrutiny, and that is something that these countries do not like.

The financial agenda behind climate change (mostly in the Green Climate Fund arena) has also been an important battlefield due to the unfulfilled financial flows commitments on behalf of developed countries. Evidently, the countries that suffer most of the impacts of climate

change are the most progressive in their positions. This is the case of the Small Islands and Developing Countries (SIDS), the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), CELAC (Community of Latin American and the Caribbean States) and AILAC (Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean), as well as the overall position of the G-77. However, it is also evident that a dispute between emerging economies and developed countries is in place. Countries like those belonging to the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China), among others, are reluctant to contribute in the same scale as developed countries. The principle of Right to Development has been proposed to address this problem, but voices from civil society (especially from environmental organisations) warn that it is not enough to obtain commitments from developed countries, and emerging economies need to commit to a shift towards a sustainable consumption and production pattern.

"Given that the climate change and the sustainable development agendas promote a shift in the consumption and production patterns, many economic interests are challenged by these aims. Due to this, it is expected that the implementation phase meets many obstacles by those forces that refuse to change because they don't want to lose traditional sources of profit, such as extractive and automotive industries and fossil fuel economies, among others."

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the main platform to discuss climate change, and at the 2015 Paris Climate Conference (COP 21), it was expected that a climate agreement made out of voluntary pledges fulfil the need to remain below 2 degrees of global warming. An Agreement was indeed made in December 2015 with the hope to remain under 1.5 degrees of global warming, but the terms in which this was agreed leave room to wonder whether the aspirations will be met or not. To the eyes of a large community within civil society, the Paris Agreement is not ambitious enough to pursue the radical change that is needed in the current economic model. The relation to the 2030 Agenda is clear—there are indeed many goals related to the environmental dimension; goal 13 specifically refers to climate change—and it remains to be seen how countries will implement their commitments in both platforms. Given that the climate change and the sustainable development agendas promote a shift in the consumption and production patterns, many economic interests are challenged by these aims. Due to this, it is expected that the implementation phase meets many obstacles by those forces that refuse to change because they don't want to lose traditional sources of profit, such as extractive and automotive industries and fossil fuel economies, among others.

B. Economic Dimension

In the economic dimension, the MoI discussion merged with the Financing for Development (FfD) platform (derived from the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Declaration, both of which were meant to address systemic global issues after the financial crisis at the beginning of the century). It is the hope of civil society that the merging of the discussion does not end up merging their mechanisms of follow-up and review. In the year 2016, more clarification will be made in this regard, and it is another space for advocacy that needs to have both regional and global engagement.

In line with what occurred in the environmental dimension, developed countries were reluctant to fulfil their commitments in terms of systemic solutions, like promoting a strong multilateral framework to deal with the North-South dynamic, establishing a strengthened partnership under the UN (so that governance is ensured in each of the dialogues that are central to all countries, such as the need to strengthen policy space), and changing the paradigm of economic, financial, and commercial transactions, among others. Instead, the agenda promoted

by developed countries was much more focused on strengthening aid, so as to maintain the donor-recipient relation between the Global North and the Global South. There is a much-needed paradigm shift that goes well beyond aid to address structural barriers to the sustainable development of developing countries, such as, but not limited to, the need to address illicit flows and tax dodging, as well as sustainability of debt.

Developing countries, however, have said that aid will not be sufficient and we need a world in which the financial and economic dynamics are changed to become more just and fair. The MoI agenda that is expected to address financial needs, technology management or transfer, and capacity building, was the subject of one of the most contentious debates. For developing countries, this is an agenda that depends on the willingness and commitments of developed countries to deliver the sufficient MoI for implementation in the South. The G-77 strongly voiced this position in the Post-2015 platform. For developed countries, this agenda was avoided by shifting the actors, and they placed it more in terms of South-South cooperation (arguing that the North-South divide is no longer in place), national budgets—so that the global responsibility will be left aside—and a private sector opportunity.

There was strong pressure to include the private sector as the main actor to finance the implementation, and the agreed language in this regard is worrisome. For starters, the terminology is blurred. The term "stakeholders," used to define the actors engaged in the process, gives no room to distinguish different types of non-state actors (such as civil society, intergovernmental agencies, and the private sector). Moreover, Member States have been insisting in enhancing the role of Public-Private Partnerships which reduces the scope of the State to fulfil its commitments. That is to say, private resources blended with the public, leaving room for many conflicts of interests, and there is a high possibility that the private sector will keep the benefits and the public sector will pay the damage.

"Developing countries, however, have said that aid will not be sufficient and we need a world in which the financial and economic dynamics are changed to become more just and fair. The MoI agenda that is expected to address financial needs, technology management or transfer, and capacity building, was the subject of one of the most contentious debates."

The FfD platform then becomes crucial: it is under that roof that systemic global issues are addressed in an intergovernmental manner. Civil society has emphasised that rather than leaving single countries to solve their challenges (and thus fall prey to the private sector), countries need to address globally the real obstacles local economies face. Thus, there is a broad list of demands that civil society and developing countries presented in the FfD platform: to stop illicit flows, to modify unfair trade regulations, to regulate the so-called "fiscal paradises," to punish tax evasion and promote progressive taxation (those who are richer pay more taxes), and to promote accountability on the social and environmental impacts of the private sector, among others.

An interesting discussion is also on the table when it comes to FfD, related to the Official Development Assistance (ODA) that flows from developed to developing countries, because ODA indeed is important to support the implementation of many agendas in the South, but it is a fact that FfD is the instrument to move beyond ODA. That is, FfD is the only global platform with the potential to change the rules of the financial and economic global game, so that in time, ODA will no longer be needed.

FfD is important as well because that is the platform from which the human rights instruments of the 90's are financed, including Beijing and Cairo. It is evident that

the Post-2015 is important, but it is not sufficient to achieve the changes that are needed in the three dimensions of sustainable development. Each of the chapters of the FfD platform addresses specific fields of the economic, financial, and commercial agendas: domestic public resources, domestic and international private business and finance, international development cooperation, international trade as an "engine" for development, debt and debt sustainability, addressing systemic issues, science, technology, innovation and capacity building, data, monitoring, and follow-up.

"The follow-up and review of FfD, in relation to the new international architecture for FfD, is then another space for advocacy at the regional and global level, so that civil society has an institutional space for meaningful participation in the years to follow."

It is quite clear that all these elements are intertwined in a complex way to address the challenges of the current world. The best example is Goal 5 on gender equality: it encompasses only six targets and three segments for the MoI. As it is, with no clear mandate to mainstream gender equality with the other goals and targets, it is quite clear that Goal 5 cannot replace our comprehensive agendas for women's human rights, including Beijing, Cairo, and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), among others. From a comprehensive point of view, both Post-2015 (addressing specific issues) and FfD (the systemic instrument to change the rules of the game) are needed to achieve the full realisation of women's human rights. The follow-up and review of FfD, in relation to the new international architecture for FfD, is then another space for advocacy at the regional and global level, so that civil society has an institutional space for meaningful participation in the years to follow.

C. Social Dimensions

As for the social dimension, contentious issues are still in place. Geopolitics in this field is perhaps more changed than in others. Maybe the clearest sign of a global change in this regard occurred during the 46th CPD session in 2013 where the theme focused on "New trends in migration: demographic aspects." Usually, under the traditional geopolitical map, Northern countries were allied with the progressive feminist advocates: they were always willing to push for ambitious language on women's human rights. However, for the first time in 2013, developed countries refused to include strong language on human rights to guarantee migrant population's access to services. That is, it was seen in that session that as long as commitments in a global instrument were all rhetorical or did not affect their policies, Northern countries have no problem with an alliance with the feminist agenda. However, when it comes to change in any respect to their own policies and framework, the North presents the same resistances as the South, but in a more perverse way, because they have the economic power to put pressure on Southern countries to follow their lead.

It is evident that in the case of this substantive issue, the challenge was to guarantee the human rights of Southern migrant people—women and men[9]—whose situation takes them to the North. Developed countries wanted a general reference to the recognition that all persons have human rights, but not the recognition that the States need to guarantee the fulfilment of those rights independently of their geographical condition. Portability of rights (a person is bearer of their own human rights regardless of the place they are in) was the most fought battle that year, and, to the surprise of the feminist advocates, the North stopped being an ally then. Developing countries carried the more progressive voice, and they fought the fight with dignity. From then on, this geopolitical setting would be more and more evident.

In the Post-2105 and in FfD, developed countries used the gender equality agenda in a utilitarian manner as a bargaining chip with the advocates (expecting the support

of the feminist movement with no regard to the economic and environmental pillar) or with the private sector (presenting gender equality as a way to improve business profitability). Southern countries (especially developing countries), thus, have become the greatest allies for the feminist advocates, but then that is only true as long as developed countries refrain from buying their positions with immediate (but temporary) relief to their economic or environmental crises.

Evidently, the same resistances against women's human rights from usual countries in the South were met as well, so it was central to devise a mapping of Northern and Southern allies and address them with different messages. It is clear that the feminist movement is expecting ambitious outcomes in every pillar and in every document, and this is why 2015 has become the most complex scenario of recent years. Differentiated messages were needed to address developed and developing countries if an advocacy strategy was to be effective in 2015 and subsequently in 2016. This is true for the challenges that will be met in 2016, and therefore a comprehensive thematic and geopolitical mapping is required to reinforce advocacy activities.

"Differentiated messages were needed to address developed and developing countries if an advocacy strategy was to be effective in 2015 and subsequently in 2016. This is true for the challenges that will be met in 2016, and therefore a comprehensive thematic and geopolitical mapping is required to reinforce advocacy activities."

IV. GENDER EQUALITY AND SRHR ON THE NEGOTIATION TABLES

As has been said already, gender equality is a means to a different end when it comes to Member States. Some are fully committed to the agenda, but when many interests are at stake, gender equality becomes an issue of medium or low degree of importance in the mind of negotiators. It is sad to say that the agenda of women's human rights in general, and SRHR in particular, are battlefields for the most conservative countries, and they are determined to fight until the very end to refrain the advancement of women. Throughout the Post-2015 process, the feminist movement has seen this happen over and over again.

"...the implementation of the 2030 Agenda can be as wide as a government's will, and therefore there is an opportunity to enhance the ambition at the regional and national levels. This is why an advocacy work in these two fields will be crucial in 2016."

Overall, it can be said that in the 2030 Agenda, there were no specific gains on SRHR. The explanation for this is that the context in which the Agenda was negotiated was one of a regressive backlash, in which every gain of the past was defended from being lost. Therefore, rather than advancing, the battle was made to include agreed language to the 2030 Agenda. The fact that there are references to the overall agenda (with details that will be addressed further in this paper) is important regardless of the fact that there is no advancement. That is to say, the implementation of the 2030 Agenda will be under a general scrutiny; it will receive important financial flows and will be highlighted in every other global platform. So even with the agreed gains, it was important to have the SRHR agenda referred.

As it is then, those advocating for the advancement of the agenda will have to turn to the specific platforms: the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and the Commission on Population and Development (CPD). However, it must be said that this is not necessarily a bad thing: the implementation of the 2030 Agenda can be as wide as a government's will, and therefore there is an opportunity to enhance the ambition at the regional and national levels. This is why an advocacy work in these two fields will be crucial in 2016.

For a bigger picture on the SRHR agenda, the 2030 Agenda is not the best reference. Many references were lost in the way of the negotiation (Comprehensive Sexuality Education is the most heartfelt), and others never made it to the draft (Sexual Rights, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identity). In a platform made entirely of political will, this is no surprise. But the way in which indicators address a comprehensive implementation, and the pressure from citizens across time to strengthen the language in further revisions of indicators, could be other windows of opportunities in the future.

In the following sections, this paper will refer to the process in which the 2030 Agenda was devised across the years, and the challenges that the SRHR agenda faced in that time. This will be useful to see the possible points of entry on specific points, but also to highlight the main obstacles encountered so as to learn from past experiences.

"But the way in which indicators address a comprehensive implementation, and the pressure from citizens across time to strengthen the language in further revisions of indicators, could be other windows of opportunities in the future."

High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons Report on Post-2015

In the month of May of 2013, the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons released its Report.[10] In this report, and in the making of it, the relevance and controversy around SRHR was made evident: it would play a central role in the approval or the rejection of the SDGs and the entire Post-2015 agenda. A first version of a draft was leaked a week

before its official release, with a blunt omission of SRHR. Another version soon followed, proving that in previous versions, the agenda was indeed mentioned. Under a strong international pressure by women and feminist groups, the final and official version explicitly addressed SRHR.

However, the substantive weight of this Report faded almost immediately after it was released. Politically, it was dismissed in the intergovernmental spaces almost in the first week (exception made for those countries whose representatives were part of the Panel). Nevertheless, the language of the account of facts around SRHR in the Report is a clear signal of the pressure made by both pro-rights and anti-rights positions. It was also the inauguration of a debate that would be at the core of the Post-2015 negotiation, to decide on its agreement or its overall failure.

The Open Working Group

The last round of negotiations of the OWG was held in July 2014. From the first draft, Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE), and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights in the goals on Health and Gender Equality were present in the documents released by the co-chairs. It was not an easy thing: during the first sessions, many governments called for the inclusion of that agenda. In their "Summaries," however, the co-chairs practically eliminated any reference to it. It required a lot of work on behalf of the SRHR advocates to gain some ground in every draft. On the day prior to the final approval, four parallel sessions were opened to discuss the more contended issues. Those were also used as bargaining chips for the entire agenda: the Rule of law, energy and subsidies to fossil fuels, SRHR, and trans-boundary cooperation.

The SRHR session, presided by Palau, lasted a day and a half. It was a micro-replica of the debates given at CSW and CPD in 2014. That is to say, the most conservative positions were fighting the most progressive proposals. The arguments were strong in either case, and the gaps were so wide that it was feared no agreement would come out of it. It was quite clear that reproductive rights were at stake, and that was the issue of contention among the countries involved during those three sessions. It was never possible to address sexual rights, and even the more moderated language was rejected over and over again. A discreet civil society participation was allowed, although in many occasions, the Vatican, Saudi Arabia, and Iran called for a session closed to observers.

Chad, Iran, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, and the Vatican were the most radical countries in their regressive views by rejecting reproductive rights. That was the entire issue that would be discussed, trying to save reproductive rights language. Argentina, Australia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, and Zambia were the most vocal countries to push beyond the minimum. The session ended with difficulty, with a perpetual threat of getting reservations by Saudi Arabia and Chad (as well as Nicaragua, Iran, and the Vatican). Palau's chairing was at all times very progressive, and that position was useful in the end.

However, given the lack of consensus, the discussion on SRHR after the special negotiation took place went beyond the deadline. The debated topics in a bilateral way were foreign occupation and colonisation, as well as SRHR. Finally, the co-chairs of the OWG (it is said that the Kenyan co-facilitator did it), imposed the language on SRHR, given that Member States could not agree on it. At 2pm, the document was approved by acclamation, and the co-chairs would send it to the Secretary General in their Conclusion Report. The document can be found in the following link: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/focussdgs.html

The gains and the losses of the OWG are as follows:

- A standalone goal on gender equality was achieved. However, the reference to the full realisation of women's human rights was lost in the goal's name. Only gender equality and women's empowerment was mentioned.

- Targets referring to discrimination and violence against women (VAW) have the strongest language (5.1 and 5.2). Their language is actually very ambitious, because they aspire to eradicate VAW as well as all forms of discrimination against women. Target 5.4 referred to unpaid domestic and care work from "reduce and redistribute" to "recognise and value," and it has a conditionality linked to the national context. This is why 5.4 is, right along with the target on SRHR (5.6), perhaps the weakest one. However, the Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) agenda is in the document, in a mix of language that refers to "family and households." Target 5.6 was tied to Beijing, Cairo, and their subsequent revisions. CSE, in Goal 4, was never recovered. An independent reference to sexual and reproductive health was kept in Goal 3 (Target 3.7). In terms of the MoI, 5.a is the only one referring to the social pillar that has a caveat in it, by referring to national laws in matters of access to land rights, inheritance, financial services, and economic resources. This element is very concerning, and it is a sign of the refusal to acknowledge women as subjects of rights in the document. However, this can be solved with a close follow-up on indicators in Goal 1, which has a similar content, but with no caveats. To advocate in terms of national implementation, these elements need to be fully considered.

- It must be acknowledged that Member States negotiated two strong targets in Goal 5 (the eradication of all forms of discrimination on women and VAW) in exchange for a weakened content of the SRHR agenda: it was a gain for a very sad loss. It has to be said as well that there is no possible way discrimination against women or VAW will be eradicated without the full recognition and guarantee of SRHR, and therefore the interlinkages will make the difference when trying to advocate for a process of implementation that is truly transformational.

- In other topics that are also crucial for the full realisation of human rights, climate change got a standalone goal: Goal 13. Given that there is a differentiated impact of climate change on women and men due to the sexual division of labour, gender roles, and existing inequalities, it is crucial to link this agenda to the entire Goal 5.

- Rule of law was an agenda that used to be in the title of Goal 16. It was dropped in the final version, but was kept as a target. Developing countries refused to have it as a core agenda, because they feared that this agenda could be used as a condition by Northern donor countries to impose their vision while transferring finance for implementation.

- Means of Implementation (MoI) were under each objective (as Southern countries wanted) and as a final goal in Goal 17 (as Northern countries would have it).

- The impact of concentration of wealth is missing in the document, even if there is Goal 1 on poverty and inequalities in Goal 10.

- Migrant population language appears in the document in Goal 8, Target 8.8, and Goal 10, Target 10.c, after the last three days of a strong negotiation.

"Given that there is a differentiated impact of climate change on women and men due to the sexual division of labour, gender roles, and existing inequalities, it is crucial to link this agenda to the entire Goal 5."

- Another point of entry for the SOGIE agenda, aside from the obvious addressing of the language on sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, may be found in Goal 16, referred to as the right to guarantee identity of all persons. This is a very big opportunity to promote in the implementation stage a strategic advocacy to enhance the importance of the right to an identity document linked to broader and diverse lenses.

- There is no reference on the human rights defenders in the outcome document. At the regional level, Goal 16 could be a window of opportunity to introduce this agenda during the design of regional indicators.

- Language on indigenous peoples is very weak. In the implementation stage, a link with a more comprehensive approach will need to be promoted.

The Secretary General Report

As the sum of every input generated since 2012 and throughout 2013 and 2014, the Secretary General released its own report at the end of 2014. It should be made clear that the SG Report is not only based on the outcome document of the OWG, but also took into consideration every other input derived from the process that was launched in the revision of the Millennium Declaration. It only mentions SRHR in one section, and it is a minor reference at that. There was no mention at all of CSE. The Report is of relevance because it presents a proposal to systematise the SDGs into six elements (instead of the 17 goals and targets), but these are very narrow and they erase the human rights dimension, addressing "people" instead of subjects of rights. The report can be found in the following link: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/700&Lang=E

The General Assembly

The co-chairs of the OWG sent their report to the Secretary General, insisting that this was the explicit proposal of the Sustainable Development Goals. The General Assembly in September 2014 decided that the intergovernmental process will continue in 2015. In 2015, the International Governmental Negotiations took place every month starting from January until July. From January to May, the discussions addressed at detail one topic each (Political Declaration; Goals, Targets, and Indicators; Means of Implementation; and Follow-up and Review) and in June and July, the final draft was negotiated. The Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development was finally approved on August 2nd, after many informal discussions and many bilateral meetings. It was a very hard process, and its final chapter in 2015 was a formal procedure in the General Assembly in September.

During the final days, SRHR were again a contested issue, and the agreed language was used to maintain the reference on sexual health and reproductive health and rights. In 2016, the discussion will be difficult as well, because the mechanisms for implementation, follow–up, and review and the allocation for the MoI will be decided in further detail.

"Another point of entry for the SOGIE agenda, aside from the obvious addressing of the language on sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, may be found in Goal 16, referred to as the right to guarantee identity of all persons. This is a very big opportunity to promote in the implementation stage a strategic advocacy to enhance the importance of the right to an identity document linked to broader and diverse lenses."

V. THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The year 2015 was the period of intergovernmental negotiations that would approve the new agenda, this time outside the OWG framework. The implications of this in legal terms are that the discussion went beyond the Rio+20 mandate (beyond the Open Working Group), and included the General Assembly dynamic (meaning that every Member State was present in the room, with countries speaking on their own capacity and through their traditional negotiating groups). The sessions took place under the lead of two co-facilitators (Kenya and Ireland). The final document can be seen here: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

A first reaction by the Women's Major Group, the formal space for engagement under the Rio+20 framework for feminist and women's organisations, was released immediately after the release of the outcome document, highlighting the positive and even the lacking elements in relation to gender equality, women, and girls human rights and their empowerment.[11] The reaction can be seen in the following link: http://www.womenmajorgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Press-Release-WMG-re-2030-Agenda-WMG-10Aug2015.pdf

The Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women (ARROW) also developed its own press release from a regional perspective. This could be found in the following link: http://arrow.org.my/response-to-the-outcome-document-of-the-un-summit-to-adopt-the-post-2015-agenda/

Some of the discussions that were on the table during the intergovernmental negotiation reflect the challenges that the world is currently facing, and there are also elements to bear in mind in the implementation phase.

• Preamble

The Preamble contains the so-called "Five Ps": People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnership. This was an agenda that was pushed by the North, pursuing a simplistic approach to a comprehensive agenda. It is thus important that the advocacy work towards implementation do not fall into this simplified language, which is void of human rights references, or the structural causes of inequalities. The SDGs are much more than just five simplified words.

"It is thus important that the advocacy work towards implementation do not fall into this simplified language, which is void of human rights references, or the structural causes of inequalities."

• Political Declaration

The section presents a framework under which the SDGs are agreed upon. It contains a further acknowledgement of principles, the current problems that humanity is facing, and a detailed account on how all the Member States commit to share a vision with regards to each of the parts of the document. It is an important section, because this gives a framework to the SDGs that, without the Political Declaration, would appear to be isolated efforts of public policy. Many topics were discussed and were at risk of being dropped from this section, including gender equality, sexual health and reproductive health and rights, climate change, and references to migrant population, elder people, and middle income countries, among others. There is no recognition of the impact of concentration of wealth, no acknowledgement of systemic causes of inequalities, no recognition of the neo-colonial dynamic that still oppresses countries in the South, as well as a long list of problems that were left out. However, despite the important battles that were lost, the Political Declaration is important because it gives an overview of the current stage in which countries from all over the world can share a common dream and the narrative that comes with it. In each region, the Political Declaration needs to be read in an articulation of their contextual realities.

- **Goals and Targets**

In March 2015 (from the 20th to the 27th), Member States discussed whether the Goals and Targets would be reopened or not. No consensus was achieved, so the co-facilitators presented a proposal. During the March session, Northern countries stated that the SDGs needed to be "communicable," and therefore required to be "edited" to comprise themes under a smaller framework. The G-77 and China clearly said that the OWG outcome was the result of an inclusive negotiation, and therefore they maintained their position that the agenda should be approved as such, fearing that everything that has been gained was at risk of being lost if any goal or target was open for revision.

The co-facilitators presented a list of 19 targets that needed to be reviewed under the "technical" criteria, thus giving way to a discussion of wide implications: why open some targets under certain criteria and not others? Until the very last session, this was a contentious issue. The co-facilitators proposed a clarification of those targets that had an "X" in them (referring to an "X" numerical factor to signal its fulfilment) that, in the end, was more or less agreed in the final moments of the negotiation. The other two criteria that were at stake in the technical revision were: a) that some targets were below international law and, b) that they had a different timeframe than 2030. That was addressed properly in the final session, and, in the end, a full 2030 Agenda was approved with Goals and Targets included. Thus, in the implementation stage, it will be important in the advocacy work to always aim towards the most ambitious agreements, whether they are global or regional, and keep them in mind as frameworks for national provisions.

- **Means of Implementation and the Global Partnership**

This was one of the most important battles. On the one hand, the relation to the FfD platform was crucial. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA)—agreed in July 2015 in the FfD platform—contained the points of entry to deliver the MoI that were supposedly needed to implement the Post-2015 Agenda.[12] However, many things were only agreed in general terms; the ambition was lacking. Actually, the AAAA document was considered by the Civil Society Organisations (CSO) as a very poor instrument that by no means matched the challenges of the Post-2015 Agenda.[13] Furthermore, the agenda was only a minor part of the scope that the FfD platform needed to cover, and therefore the whole scenario was less than ideal. In terms of women's human rights, the Women's Working Group on Financing for Development delivered an assessment of the outcome. Read it on this page: https://wwgonffd.org/2015/07/17/wwg-on-ffd-reaction-to-the-outcome-document-of-the-third-ffd-conference-addis-ababa-action-agenda/

It is true that one important and tangible deliverable from the AAAA instrument is the Technology Facilitation Mechanism. This is a body that will facilitate the technology transfer that is required to achieve a sustainable development process in developing countries. This is a big gain for the Southern countries, although it remains to be seen how it will be implemented. The MoI agreed in the narrative of the Agenda 2030 are bound to the Addis Ababa outcome, and therefore the extent of the interpretation of this issue will be an element of debate in 2016. Some of the MoI agreed in the SDGs are stronger than in the AAAA instrument, but others are weaker. So this is an important field for advocacy in the implementation stage in searching for the highest element of ambition.

"Thus, in the implementation stage, it will be important in the advocacy work to always aim towards the most ambitious agreements, whether they are global or regional, and keep them in mind as frameworks for national provisions."

As per the Global Partnership, countries from both the North and the South similarly insisted in including references of the role of the private sector in the process of implementation. Therefore, it was a demand by civil society to define the Global Partnership as a partnership

between states, and specifically identify who are duty bearers and who are only mandated to implement the agenda. This section specifies the actors that are needed for a comprehensive implementation, and it is concerning the way in which the private sector is seen to have a fundamental role. The references of participation of civil society and other actors are weak, but it is still a point that will need to be addressed further in 2016, and therefore is an important agenda to follow. In national and regional processes, this clarification is crucial.

"The references of participation of civil society and other actors are weak, but it is still a point that will need to be addressed further in 2016, and therefore is an important agenda to follow. In national and regional processes, this clarification is crucial."

Of relevance in this paper are the MoI that are defined in the Goals referred to health, given that they apply as well to link in a comprehensive manner the implementation of the SRHR commitments:

3.a	Strengthen the implementation of the World Health Organisation Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in all countries, as appropriate.
3.b	Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all.
3.c	Substantially increase health financing and the recruitment, development, training, and retention of the health workforce in developing countries, especially in least developed countries and small island-developing States.
3.d	Strengthen the capacity of all countries, in particular developing countries, for early warning, risk reduction, and management of national and global health risks.

And those that apply to Goal 5, the "Gender Equality" Goal:

5.a	Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance, and natural resources, in accordance with national laws.
5.b	Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.
5.c	Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels.

- **Follow-up and Review**

This is the section that points at one of the most relevant definitions of the Post-2015 Agenda and that will have a crucial influence for the next 15 years. A mechanism for follow-up and review will be set in place at the global level: the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF). As was stated in the beginning of this paper, the HLPF started a parallel process alongside the OWG as part of a Rio+20 mandate. However, given that it is a new global body, the sessions that have been held under this framework have

only started to define the general provisions. This is the body that will receive the reports of implementation from Member States; monitor the advance in the progress of goals, targets, and indicators; aggregate the data received at the national and regional levels; and update the legal provisions that will be required as the agenda advances in time.

The HLPF is not legally binding (i.e., it has no legal force), and therefore the countries are not obligated to report in terms of implementation. However, the body will be in charge of providing incentives and technical support in case a country is willing to undergo the process alongside the HLPF. Furthermore, it will be a place to share experiences and good practices.

All these elements are devised under the premise that Agenda 2030 is the result of the sum of political wills, and therefore there is no obligation on behalf of any government to fulfil the main objective. So, regardless of the demand by CSO, and the fierce advocacy in that regard to explicitly devise an accountability body, the HLPF will be a space for "follow-up and review," but with no enforcing capacity to ensure that Member States are held accountable in fulfilling their commitments.

Despite the elements mentioned above, the HLPF is still an important mechanism that, under the right provisions, may have a central role in shaping the face of the global dynamic in the following years. This is why a focused process of advocacy will have to be in place to strengthen the technical provisions of the HLPF in 2016. It will be time to devise a new global architecture to follow up on a global agenda. The HLPF is a hybrid body that is under the ECOSOC mandate, but still reports to the General Assembly, and it is therefore in a unique position to improve the way in which Member States have been engaged in the UN processes so far. Given that developed and developing countries will need to engage in terms of follow-up and review of their implementation processes, this is the first time in history in which a universal agenda will have a body that will require the same from both developed and developing countries.

Under the HLPF are existing provisions that refer to the need to strengthen civil society participation, both in the modality of Major Groups as well as within constituencies as part of the "Stakeholder" definition. These references are quite general, and still require further elaboration to explicitly explain how civil society can have a central and meaningful role in the process of implementation of the Agenda. References to the regional and national processes are in the section, but only in general terms. It is clear that governments were reluctant to give a broad mandate on these two levels, and therefore this is a big priority for advocacy in the months to follow.

"These references are quite general, and still require further elaboration to explicitly explain how civil society can have a central and meaningful role in the process of implementation of the Agenda. References to the regional and national processes are in the section, but only in general terms. It is clear that governments were reluctant to give a broad mandate on these two levels, and therefore this is a big priority for advocacy in the months to follow."

VI. TAKING ACTION: GLOBAL, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL ENTRY POINTS

INDICATORS

The UN Statistical Commission presented at the beginning of 2015 a battery of indicators that will reflect how to measure the advancement towards the fulfilment of the goals and targets approved as SDGs. This battery of indicators was to be reviewed by Member States as an example on how indicators would look like, even though its mandate is to produce their official proposal to be approved in 2016. UN agencies gave support to the UN Statistical Commission. In the case of the gender equality and SRHR agendas, UN Women, UNFPA, WHO, and others, delivered their proposals. Indicators are one of the most important agendas for the implementation, and it could be the point of entry to gain what was lost during the negotiation. This is a good opportunity to reinsert Comprehensive Sexuality Education, or to deepen some of the issues that were agreed in broad terms. Moreover, this might be an opportunity to strengthen the human rights framework at the level of implementation.

However, the risk might be that the SRHR is reduced to a merely epidemiological agenda, and therefore a comprehensive implementation will be avoided. Two new bodies will be created with regards to indicators: an Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goals (IAEG) and a High Level Group (HLG). The IAEG will develop the new set of indicators, and will be composed of Member States with international organisations as observers. On the other hand, the High Level Group will be in charge of monitoring the indicators, composed as well by Member States and will have international organisations as observers.

These two bodies will need to have the presence of civil society to ensure the highest ambition is reached in the design and follow-up of indicators. On October 26-28, 2015, in Bangkok, a meeting on indicators was held, taking a step further towards the agenda that needs to be defined by March 2016. This meeting was an opportunity for the Asia-Pacific region to advocate for ambitious indicators with regards to the SRHR agenda, and sets the basis for future work on indicators before the final definition is agreed upon. Specifically, the most contentious indicators are left for the final discussion, and Member States are advancing with the least problematic ones. More details of this meeting can be found here: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/

IMPLEMENTATION AND REGIONAL BODIES

This point is closely linked to the previous one. In some negotiation sessions, it has been said that some indicators will be devised and monitored under the logic of regional implementation. The argument is that some countries would be interested in following up on global indicators, but for those who think that they would prefer to "select" those that are closer to their possibilities and needs, a middle ground would be to find a balance with regional logics of implementation. In the case of the Asia-Pacific region, this would have the advantage that the regional instruments could also be linked to a more comprehensive framework of indicators to implement. Given that ESCAP, the regional body for the Asia and the Pacific region, has opened the door to an official body for civil society participation, the region is in a privileged position to lead the process and set a precedent for the rest of the regions in this regard. The aim of the Asia Pacific Regional CSO Engagement Mechanism (AP-RCEM) is to enable stronger cross-constituency coordination and ensure that voices of all sub-regions of Asia-Pacific (South East Asia, South Asia, North East Asia, Central Asia, Pacific) are heard in intergovernmental processes.[14] Thus, the RCEM will make sure that 60% of the world's people living in the Asia-Pacific region are better represented by civil society and social movements in global negotiations and have a stronger, coordinated, and more effective voice in regional processes.

As the AP-RCEM Communique states: "As a result of a bottom-up and inclusive process, the creation of the RCEM has been initiated, designed, and will therefore be owned by CSOs in Asia and Pacific. It will be an open, inclusive, and flexible mechanism designed to reach the broadest number of CSOs, harness the voice of grassroots and peoples' movements to advance a more just, equitable, and

sustainable model of development. Moreover, it will be a platform to share information and best practices and build capacities of CSOs for better and more effective engagement in the future. Taking into account the diversity of the Asia-Pacific region and the limitations of existing institutional structures for civil society engagement, the CSO Forum in Bangkok defined eight additional constituencies[15] which are currently not included in the existing Major Group structure, as well as five sub-regional groupings." Read the AP-RCEM Communique here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BwlIBYodimgrSzN3THhWM1RhNHM/view?pli=1

> "Alliances between civil societies among the regions must be sought, given the complementarity of some regions from the South (this is the case of the Asia-Pacific region and the Latin American and the Caribbean). ESCAP can be a platform to devise more structural and ambitious implementation frameworks."

The RCEM is an example of the institutionalisation of the participation of civil society in the regional bodies for follow-up and review. It is an example not only in terms of content but also in terms of form, leading the way for other regions to follow. Regional sessions have been held, and they left the general and overall mandate to the HLPF at the global level, including on the role of stakeholders and civil society participation. This was the case of the Asia-Pacific Forum on Sustainable Development held in 2015.

However, the section on Follow-up and Review in the Agenda 2030 is still very broad and there will be a need to go back to the details at the regional and global level in 2016. This is so because some governments (especially in the North) are not ascribed to regional bodies. This is the case, for instance, of the US and Canada. They may be observers in some bodies, but do not ascribe as formal members in them. Others are members of economic groups (such as the OECD), but not of bodies that are engaged in terms of implementation. This is why, in the Follow-up and Review section, Member States are encouraged to define the multilateral group with which they feel more akin in terms of sharing their implementation practices. Some regions are reluctant to strengthen regional bodies. This is the case of some Latin American countries.

These elements are just to highlight that the situation of the Asia-Pacific region, both in terms of its Forum for Sustainable Development, as well as of the institutionalised body for CSO participation (the RCEM) is in a privileged position to lead the way for the rest of the world in terms of good practices. This is why a broader and more ambitious strategy must be made at the regional level, to link as well the regional instruments and thus strengthen the regional documents under CPD and Beijing. Under this scenario, the feminist organisations have a lot to gain, given that the SRHR agenda will be reinforced by a global trend, but with a regional approach.

Furthermore, structural points of entry, such as the sexual division of labour and other macroeconomic issues, may well be more easily addressed at the regional level than at the global one. Alliances between civil societies among the regions must be sought, given the complementarity of some regions from the South (this is the case of the Asia-Pacific region and the Latin American and the Caribbean). ESCAP can be a platform to devise more structural and ambitious implementation frameworks.

• FOLLOW-UP AND REVIEW

To fulfil the mandate of following up and monitoring the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the UN system will have to undergo a process of "fit for purpose." That is, it will make an internal revision of its agencies, to see if there is an institutional capacity to rise to the challenge of implementing the Agenda 2030. So far, the "fit for purpose" process has only been carried out internally, but this is an important opportunity to advocate within nations and regions so that it is a party-driven process as well, and the UN is also subjected to be accountable. Civil

society needs to have a say in the process of reformulation of the role of the UN; this is an imperative therefore for our advocacy efforts in the next years.

"The year 2016 will be a time to question the current multilateral system and, for the first time in many years, we can ask ourselves: what is the multilateral system that we want, as citizens, at the global and regional level, and how come the national and local dimensions will be related to that scheme? It is the role of CSO to dream, and make the dreams come true."

Also, the FfD outcome document this year states that there will be a Financing for Development Forum that will be related to the HLPF. Given that this is a new Forum under the UN, nothing has been decided about this, not even the dates. It is expected to take place around the Bretton Woods Institutions Interactive Dialogue under the UN in April 2016. So during the first quarter of 2016, a new institutional design will have to be made in this regard. This is the opportunity to devise a new institutional architecture linking sustainable development with the financial and economic global dynamic, and therefore civil society needs to assess the best way in which these bodies will relate. Both of these global processes (Sustainable Development and FfD) will also have an equivalent regional body, hence opening a new door for advocacy at the regional level.

The HLPF may be a body to supervise the fulfilment of those agendas related to SRHR, but only in the extent that we advocate, in 2016, for the explicit definition of the linkages with the mandate of Beijing, Cairo, and CEDAW, or at least with the UN bodies that are in charge of its implementation. Also, at the regional level, indicators for follow-up and review will need to link the advancements made in this agenda, so that the global aggregation do not eradicate the windows of opportunity that have so far been opened in each region.

The year 2016 will be a time to question the current multilateral system and, for the first time in many years, we can ask ourselves: what is the multilateral system that we want, as citizens, at the global and regional level, and how come the national and local dimensions will be related to that scheme? It is the role of CSO to dream, and make the dreams come true.

AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

The SDGs present a wide agenda that will be prioritised at the national level. This means that governments will pick and choose the elements that they foresee as achievable, those that are closer to their political vision, and those that are closer to their goals. In every case, the harmonisation of legal and programmatic frameworks will require of civil society a strong process for national advocacy, in order that the comprehensiveness of the agenda is maintained.

With the Legislative Branch

- A mapping of the laws that need to be harmonised at the national and local level for an accelerated implementation of the agenda.

- A mapping of the laws and conventions that are an obstacle for the implementation of the agenda.

- Capacity building of legislators and staff in the legislative branch in terms of the SDGs and the linkage with SRHR for the overall achievement of the objectives of the agenda.

- Advocacy so that the legislative branch, in the space of its faculties, engage with the budgetary provisions to allocate resources for programs related to SRHR targets and indicators.

With the Executive Branch

- Engage the ministry of foreign affairs so that they integrate SRHR as part of the national agenda when negotiating in the global and regional forums.

- Engage with the ministries of health and women, and build a comprehensive agenda encompassing SRHR and the three dimensions of sustainable development.

- Capacity building of statistical offices at national and local levels, to disaggregate data in all pertinent conditions.

- Capacity building of staff on implementing entities under the human rights framework, gender equality, and sustainability criteria.

- To promote differentiated measures to guarantee that the commitments are fulfilled for all groups of population.

With the Judiciary Branch

- To promote new judiciary interpretations under the sustainable development framework that preserves the well-being of persons within planetary boundaries.

- To mainstream the human rights framework in the judiciary dimension.

With Other Actors

- Engagement with the media to socialise the agenda and promote a comprehensive approach that involves SRHR from the start.

- Engagement with other networks of civil society to promote a comprehensive approach that involves SRHR as a core issue for the achievement of the 2030 Agenda aims.

- Active engagement with diverse groups of population that have been marginalised, so that the ownership of the agenda includes SRHR from the start, and the beneficiaries of those who have been left aside.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addis CSO Coordination Group. "Third FfD Failing to Finance Development: Civil Society Response to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development." July 16, 2015. https://csoforffd.files.wordpress.com/2015/07/cso-response-to-ffd-addis-ababa-action-agenda-16-july-2015.pdf.

Esquivel, Valeria. "Measuring Unpaid Care Work with Public Policies in Mind." UNWomen.org. October 21-24, 2013. http://www.unwomen.org/~/media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/CSW/58/EP3-Valeria-Esquivel%20pdf.pdf.

United Nations. "Millennium Development Goals." n.d. http://www.alliance2015.org/fileadmin/user_upload/MDGs.pdf.

____."Millennium Declaration." UN.org. September 18, 2000. http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf.

____. A new global partnership: eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development. NY: United Nations Publications, 2013. http://www.un.org/sg/management/pdf/HLP_P2015_Report.pdf.

____."Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development." icpdtaskforce.org. August 12-15, 2013. http://icpdtaskforce.org/resources/2013-596-montevideo_consensus_pyd.pdf.

____. Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda). NY: United Nations Publications, 2015. http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome.pdf.

United Nations Population Fund. "Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population Development." UNFPA.org. September 5-13, 1994. http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/programme_of_action_Web%20ENGLISH.pdf.

United Nations Women. "Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action." UN.org. September 1995. http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/health.htm.

ENDNOTES

1 This is the same definition used both in the Beijing Platform for Action and in the ICPD Programme of Action (PoA). See: United Nations Women, "Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action" (September 1995). http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/health.htm. In ICPD PoA its reference is in Chapter 7, paragraph 7.2: United Nations Population Fund, "Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population Development" (September 5-13, 1994). http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/programme_of_action_Web%20ENGLISH.pdf

2 Ibid. In ICPD PoA, the reference appears in 7.3.

3 Ibid. This paragraph does not appear in ICPD PoA.

4 The Montevideo Consensus can be found in: United Nations, "Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development" (August 12-15, 2013). http://icpdtaskforce.org/resources/2013-596-montevideo_consensus_pyd.pdf

5 This field of research has been fully addressed by the economic tradition called the Economy of Rupture, and it has representatives all over the world. Authors of this tradition are Antonella Picchio (who took an active part in the drafting of the Beijing Platform for Action and was the advisor for the macro-economic contents), Rania Antonopoulou, Nilufer Catagay, Valeria Esquivel, Corina Rodriguez, Lucia Perez Fragoso, and others. For an introductory essay on the issues addressed in the unpaid domestic and care work discussion, see: Valeria Esquivel, "Measuring Unpaid Care Work with Public Policies in Mind" (October 21-24, 2013). http://www.unwomen.org/~/media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/CSW/58/EP3-Valeria-Esquivel%20pdf.pdf.

6 United Nations, Millennium Declaration (18 September 2000), http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf. Last visited: 23 April 2015.

7 United Nations, Millennium Development Goals (n.d.), http://www.alliance2015.org/fileadmin/user_upload/MDGs.pdf. Last visited: 23 April 2015.

8 To read more about the process, see: Cuevas, Harris, and Reyes, 'The Post-2015 Process: MDGs and SDGs. The basics for a LAC feminist strategy', Latin American and Caribbean Regional Alliance of Civil Society Organisations, 2014.

9 An important clarification is to say that in this document, we will be using the language that is recognised in international platforms. This is so because in international negotiations, every term has a legal meaning, and different battles take place for each one of them. None of them is taken for granted. For instance, "women and men" are terms that are recognised in international agreements, and even the term "women" is challenged at times (for instance, in the session of the OWG10, an African country suggested that every paragraph that stated "men and women" should be replaced by "men and their wives"). This is an example that there is a regressive battle to recognise women's human rights. Another different battle in the global arena is the one that refers to the agenda of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (the so-called SOGI agenda). This is a very tough fight that is still pending, due to the fact that many Southern countries refuse to accept it as agreed language, and therefore the rights of LGBTTTI persons are not explicitly acknowledged internationally. Therefore, when in this document the term refers to "women and men," it is in the context of what is agreed in the international platforms. The intention of this emphasis is not to take for granted every right that has been gained, and to highlight that there is still a need to advocate for the diversity agenda in every global platform until the human rights of all persons are recognised, guaranteed, and fulfilled.

10 See: United Nations, A new global partnership: eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development, (NY: United Nations http://www.un.org/sg/management/pdf/HLP_P2015_Report.pdf

11 Since the first United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, known as the Earth Summit, it was recognised that achieving sustainable development would require the active participation of all sectors of society and all types of people. Agenda 21, adopted at the Earth Summit, drew upon this sentiment and formalised nine sectors of society as the main channels through which broad participation would be facilitated in UN activities related to sustainable development. These are officially called "Major Groups" and include the following sectors: Women, Children and Youth, Indigenous Peoples, Non-Governmental Organisations, Local Authorities, Workers and Trade Unions, Business and Industry, Scientific and Technological Community, and Farmers. The role of the Women's Major Group is to assure effective public participation of women's non-governmental groups in the UN policy processes on Sustainable Development, Post-2015, and Environmental matters. The Women's Major Group was created at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992, where governments recognised Women as one of the nine important groups in society to achieve sustainable development.

12 The official document can be seen in its entirety in the following: United Nations, Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda), (NY: United Nations Publications, 2015), 1-63. http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome.pdf

13 To see the full CSO response, see: Addis CSO Coordination Group, "Third FfD Failing to Finance Development: Civil Society Response to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development" (July 16, 2015), https://www.globalpolicywatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/20150716-CSO-Response-to-FfD-Addis-Ababa-Action-Agenda.pdf

14 The information that follows referred to the RCEM, is stated in the RCEM communiqué that was released to publicise information about this very same body.

15 These constituencies are the following: (1) women, (2) farmers, (3) fisherfolk, (4) youth, children and adolescents (5) migrants, (6) trade union/workers, (7) people living with HIV, (8) LGBTIQ, (9) urban poor, (10) people displaced by disasters and conflict, (11) small and medium enterprises, (12) science and technology, (13) persons with disability, (14) indigenous peoples, (15) elderly, and (16) local authorities.

ARROW is a regional non-profit women's NGO based in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and has consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Since it was established in 1993, it has been working to advance women's health, affirmative sexuality and rights, and to empower women through information and knowledge, engagement, advocacy, and mobilisation.

ARROW envisions an equal, just and equitable world, where every woman enjoys her full sexual and reproductive rights. ARROW promotes and defends women's rights and needs, particularly in the areas of health and sexuality, and to reaffirm their agency to claim these rights.

This publication is produced as part of the ARROW-implemented project "Strengthening the Networking, Knowledge Management and Advocacy Capacities of an Asian Network for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR)." The project brings together five implementing partners and ten associate partners from across Asia to advocate for universal access to SRHR as a key component of national and global policies and agendas; as well as to work on addressing the key challenge of religious fundamentalisms as experienced across the region.

This project is funded by the European Union.

Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women (ARROW)
1 & 2 Jalan Scott, Brickfields, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 50470

Telephone (603) 2273 9913/9914
Fax (603) 2273 9916
E-mail arrow@arrow.org.my
Web www.arrow.org.my
Facebook The Asian-Pacific Resource & Research Centre for Women (ARROW)
Twitter @ARROW_Women
Youtube youtube.com/user/ARROWomen
Pinterest arrowomen

European Commission
EuropeAid Cooperation
Office Information,
Communication and Front Office
Unit-04 L-41, Office 06/84,
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium

Telephone 322 296 94 97
Fax 322 296 64 97
E-mail europeaid-info@ec.europa.eu
Web http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/

ISBN 9789670339252