

## Constructing a Post-2015 Review and Follow-Up Mechanism

INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT ATD FOURTH WORLD

Intervention at Informal interactive hearings with representatives of Non-governmental Organizations, Civil Society, Major Groups and the Private Sector on the Post-2015 development agenda  
26-27 May 2015

[Thanks and introduction]

ATD Fourth World grounds its work in the will of communities afflicted by poverty. All of our positions come from research carried out alongside these communities.

In places like Madagascar, we work with families that have no legal identity. In New Orleans we work with families that have been excluded from the workforce for years. Yet, working with them to evaluate policies was more than an exercise in social inclusion and participation; it was a truly professional work. We *learned with* these communities, and now we better understand the impact of various policies on them.

Beyond that, we uncovered many “why’s”. Why are anti-slum policies in Manila resisted by slum-dwellers? Why are conditional cash transfers problematic for marginalized communities in Brazil? Why are health centers not decreasing maternal mortality for indigenous communities in Bolivia?

This is knowledge that exists but is ignored, expressed by voices that are unheard, and people that are left behind.

When evaluating policies and recommendations ATD Fourth World asks, “What might this mean for a person living in poverty?” We need to understand how a follow-up mechanism for the post-2015 agenda can impact communities living in poverty, whether in high or low-income countries.

**We believe that for these groups, a review and follow-up mechanism can do two critical things: provide a political basis for accountability, and enhance the contribution of communities to the review process.**

In many of the countries where we work, legislation protecting people living in poverty exists. Yet too often people lack the resources or access to demand accountability before the law. With a review mechanism that commits their governments to leave no one behind, people living in poverty will have a new avenue—with

global reach—by which they can work to secure their essential services and protections and, challenge social exclusion and discrimination.

Language from the Secretary General’s synthesis report grasps this idea: *If we are to succeed, the new agenda must become part of the contract between people, including civil society and responsible business, and their governments—national and local.*

Yet in order for the review to serve this purpose, people living in poverty and the organizations that work with them have to be viewed as partners in development. The act of holding government accountable should not be viewed as a shaming exercise but rather as a constructive one. If a government is falling short on the SDGs, the global community needs to come together to support – not oppose – that government.

A critical step for that change in paradigm is to welcome the inputs of civil society organizations, and of communities themselves, to reporting that will take place at the various levels of this review mechanism, including the global. Furthermore reports like national reports, the global sustainability report, and additional stakeholder reports should include data produced by communities affected by development policies.

So, we propose the following concrete language:

*Member states will implement national mechanisms for participatory monitoring that can complement standard initiatives for national-level review*

And

*A national stakeholder report with contributions from national non-governmental actors will form part of main written inputs on individual country progress*

Now that we understand the added-value of a follow-up and review mechanism, and some of its vital components, we are worried by the conversations we heard at last week’s intergovernmental negotiations. The inclination of member states to use language of “principles” in the September Summit Outcome instead of concrete “mechanisms” or “actions” weakens the potential review framework.

**In this regard, we propose a few pieces of language to re-strengthen the follow-up and review section of the document, especially its global component:**

Firstly, we encourage member states to borrow from resolution 67/290 and use language orienting the global review towards a

*“dynamic and **action-oriented agenda**, ensuring the appropriate consideration of new and emerging sustainable development challenges”*

Second, in an effort to **give the framework definition**, we hope member states will clearly link its global thematic reviews to other ongoing review “platforms”, as the SG synthesis report states:

*While such thematic reviews could be carried out under the auspices of the HLPF, they would rely on relevant coordination and review “platforms.”*

Finally – and we understand that this is our most ambitious proposal—we emphasize that this global component of the review mechanism must aim to **implement actions and commitments**. The global review’s added value is that it can mobilize resources and people at a global scale for a universal, ambitious and comprehensive agenda. This is the one thing that the other levels cannot accomplish, and it must be highlighted with language like:

*“with the aim of enhancing engagement and implementing commitments”* which come from resolution 67/290

Or,

*“to help to identify challenges and bottlenecks, and to mobilize action to address them.”* From the SG report

We hope member states will consider delving more deeply into the definition of this mechanism so that it can truly serve as a support for vulnerable people around the world.