

**Intervention by Kate Donald, Center for Economic and Social Rights and co-convenor
of the Post-2015 Human Rights Caucus.
Inter-governmental negotiations on follow-up and review, 20th May 2015**

Imagine this: representatives of States from across the world get together to do a peer review of the impact that their laws and policies are having on their populations. Morocco recommends that the United States tackle the stubbornly large size of its homeless population. India suggests that Bhutan improve implementation of its access to information law. Brazil recommends that the UK establishes a national strategy on violence against women. All of this informed by reports by the countries themselves, UN agencies and civil society.

This is not a crazy fantasy. This happens in Geneva every year, at the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council. In the 8 years since it started, every single Member State has voluntarily submitted to this peer review.

The UPR isn't perfect. But it is a process and a model that can offer us many lessons for the post-2015 follow-up and review. CESR, Center for Reproductive Rights, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch are proposing a peer review component under the HLPF- I'd be happy to share more details with any of you outside of these 2 minutes. One crucial function of this global-level review would be to examine cross-border challenges – in particular the responsibilities of the rich countries to create an enabling environment for SD, including by aligning their tax, trade, investment and aid policies.

The September outcome document won't be able to outline the whole ecosystem of monitoring and accountability necessary for successful, empowering implementation of the SDGs, but it should lay down the principles and expectations that all States implement truly participatory planning and review processes at the national level, guided by their human rights obligations. Moreover, it should outline a mechanism under the HLPF which can honestly and transparently review successes and setbacks, based on inputs and report by States, civil society, and existing thematic mechanisms (including the human rights bodies). If we really want to 'leave no one behind' this time around, it is unthinkable to exclude the voices and experiences of the most disadvantaged. For this we will need resources, political will, and support, including a trust fund for their participation. Some may say all of this will cost too much, but it will certainly cost less than failing to achieve the SDGs and doing irreparable damage to our planet.