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IN JULY 2014, THE OPEN WORKING GROUP of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals proposed 17 goals to help drive action for a better future for people and our planet. Included among these goals is a proposal to “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.”

This initiative builds on the General Assembly’s longstanding recognition of the mutually reinforcing nature of peace, human rights, rule of law and development. After all, people around the world not only need the basics such as food, water, shelter, education and health care, they also need dignity, peace, justice and the opportunity to express their concerns and shape their future. This is crucial to ensuring that everyone can live in freedom from want and freedom from fear and fulfil their potential within the finite resources of our planet.

The proposed goal includes targets on violence, access to justice, organized crime, corruption, effective, accountable and transparent institutions and inclusive and participatory decision-making. These are universal concerns. No region is free from violence and crime. No country has fully achieved equal access to justice for all.

The importance of these dimensions of development has clearly emerged through the My World survey, organized by the United Nations and partners. Categories such as “honest and responsive government” and “protection against crime and violence” have ranked in the top 10 among all demographic groups in every region of the world.

The World Federation of United Nations Associations and its members have played a critical role in progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. We continue to count on your active support in the implementation of the post-2015 development agenda, which Member States will adopt in September 2015.

Let us work together to build a future of peace, justice, sustainability and dignity for all.
The eagerly awaited Synthesis Report on the post-2015 development agenda from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, has brought together a huge body of work by the UN Secretariat, member states and civil society from all around the world to set the scene for intergovernmental negotiations in 2015. During the first seven months of 2015, the UN and member state governments will commit to a new set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the next decade and a half.

The importance of these negotiations should not be underestimated. If they fulfill their mandated requirement, in 15 years’ time we will look back at this process as a truly transformative contribution to the United Nations and the wider world in which we live. To do this, we must strive to transcend boundaries, go beyond the current development frameworks and look to change the status quo.

Serious attention will need to be paid to solving the glaring weakness of the MDG framework: the oft-mentioned developmental failures of conflict-affected countries. As the development community has been consistently reminded, states that experienced high levels of conflict and/or violence have consistently failed to achieve MDG targets and, in some cases, have experienced a development regression. In any walk of life—work, education or personal relationships—one must be able to learn from the past and adapt for the future. The development community should not be an anomaly to this rule.

With the Synthesis Report in hand, this publication serves as a critical reminder to all stakeholders that a strong goal on Peaceful and Inclusive Societies must remain on the list of proposed SDGs. The consensus outcome document from the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG) recognized the importance of this. Consensus cannot, and should not, be ignored.

The inclusion of a goal on peaceful societies in the post-2015 development agenda is half of the battle; ensuring that it includes realistic, measurable and desirable targets is the other.

Working to ensure that peace is represented in the post-2015 development agenda has been a long process and has provided many sleepless nights, as it was one of the most contentious issues in the OWGs. Yet as we turn the corner onto the homestretch, a foot must remain strongly on the gas. Having a transformative foundation for the next generation of development work depends heavily on our ability as a world community to iron out all the remaining faults before September 2015.

Inside, you will find an initial article detailing a brief overview of the history, the current agenda and the future steps to be taken in this process. This will be followed by a series of reflective pieces from a collection of esteemed individuals. Together these short contributions will offer different nuanced perspectives from a range of expert origins. Adding to an already lively debate, it is my pleasure to bring you the third edition of our ACRONYM journal at this most timely occasion.
Post-2015 Timeline

**OPEN WORKING GROUP**
After 13 Sessions, the outcome document proposed 17 Sustainable Development Goals

**RIO + 20**
The outcome document “The Future We Want” initiated the OWG Process

**UN LEVEL**

**HIGH-LEVEL PANEL**

**REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL**

**REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS CONSULTATIONS**

**CIVIL SOCIETY**

**MY WORLD**
is a United Nations global survey for citizens

**68TH PGA THEMATIC DEBATES**
The Post-2015 Development Agenda: Setting the Stage!
The Post-2015 Development Agenda: Setting the Stage!

The consultations have been ongoing since April 2014, and will continue through 2015.

69TH PGA THEMATIC DEBATES
Delivering on and implementing a transformative post-2015 development agenda

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS
Starting in January, member states will convene for up to ten negotiating sessions, concluding in July 2015.

70TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUMMIT FOR ADOPTION OF SDGS
The Millennium Development Goals

During the 1990s, the development world began to consider an adventurous concept: Could a list of international development goals lead to the eradication of extreme poverty in the world? As this idea began to take hold, the turn of the millennium became a convenient rallying tool to put rhetoric into practice. This ambitious decision, to harmonize development around the world, became an ongoing process that featured crucial inputs from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and the UN. There had been many calls for coordination of development efforts by the UN and OECD before, but these organizations worked on different priorities, which ultimately led to different approaches. As momentum for cooperation gathered, the focus fell heavily on the need to combat extreme poverty.

The groundswell of support for the streamlining of the development world came to a fore at a Millennium Summit at the United Nations Headquarters in September 2000. This three-day meeting of world leaders focused on a range of issues, none more central than the future of development. During the Summit, then Secretary-General Kofi Annan urged forward a set of goals and agreements that would focus on the prima facie importance of sparing “no effort to free our fellow men and women from abject and dehumanizing poverty.”

This vision became the basis for what is known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Listed in the figure on the right, these goals adventurously target halving the world poverty by the year 2015. These MDGs, agreed upon by member states, were included in the Millennium Declaration outcome document from the

These 8 MDGs have been the main focus for development efforts since their inception in 2000.
Those in conflict or emerging from conflict significantly lag behind many in achieving MDG targets, exemplified by only 20 percent of fragile and conflict-affected countries being on course to meet the poverty target.

Millennium Summit. This seminal and comprehensive piece reviewed the entire United Nations architecture, including the role of peace and security, and the linkage with development. Despite the prominent inclusion of peace and security in the Millennium Declaration, the MDGs that were eventually agreed upon featured no mention of peace, stability or security, and instead focused on more traditional conceptions of the development world, as seen by the agreed goals in figure A.

Mandated for 15 years, the MDGs became synonymous with the UN and changed the way the development sector operated around the world. They became a spark to galvanize attention on poverty reduction and in doing so achieved monumental steps in many corners of the planet. These steps, reported and documented each year in a report by the Secretary-General, have proved the value of an international framework with a common agenda.

Serving as a milestone in global and national development efforts since their inception in 2000, the MDGs represented the possibility of forging global agreements around a limited set of measurable objectives. Seen as one of the strongest elements of the MDGs, the easy marketability and concise nature did not overcomplicate matters. A new set of goals, targets and indicators should seek to emulate the MDGs in remaining similarly durable and relevant. A limited number of goals, measurable indicators and a defined timeline resonated well with politicians and implementers. Furthermore, the final goals provided policy guidelines without being an overcomplicated blueprint. These factors ensured that the MDGs, despite their flaws, still remain relevant today.

As noted, the MDGs galvanized action to eradicate poverty, inspired development efforts and advocacy and achieved tangible advances in many countries across the globe.
Despite the success of the MDGs for some, the inability to take into consideration different development requirements for conflict countries is seen as the key reason that partial failure exists. Those states in conflict or emerging from conflict significantly lag behind many in achieving MDG targets, exemplified by only 20 percent of fragile and conflict-affected countries being on course to meet the poverty target. In fact, all of the world’s seven countries that are unlikely to meet a single MDG have been affected by high levels of violence. Furthermore, by 2015, more than 50 percent of the total population in extreme poverty will reside in places affected by conflict and chronic violence.

Aside from the failure to achieve noticeable results in conflict-affected countries, the final version of the MDGs could have been strengthened in a variety of other ways. For some, the post-2015 development agenda is seen as an opportunity to reaffirm and recommit to norms and values outlined in the Millennium Declaration, as the framing of the MDGs separated peace and security, development and poverty, environment, human rights and democracy and good governance. Additionally, the MDG framework was not universal in nature, as it only applied to “developing countries” and disregarded development problems relevant in developed states. Yet perhaps the most important failure was the lack of ownership in the formation process of the MDGs by the most affected constituencies. For many, this lack of consultation was a major reason that at times there were major gaps between implementation needs, available resources and related political will. More so, while the establishment of time-bound goals that specifically focused on development and poverty were welcomed, it could be argued

DEVELOPMENT, INSECURITY AND INTERVENTIONS IN KENYA

Evans Onieygo  
Director of Caritas Maralal, Kenya.

Over the years, insecurity has been the main hindrance of development in Samburu County in northwest Kenya. Cases of highway banditry and cattle rustling, the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, hundreds of lives lost as a result of interethnic clashes and persistent gender-based violence are recurrent problems. The killing of 42 policemen in Baragoi by heavily armed raiders in 2012 highlighted the deterioration of security in the county. Such insecurity not only has human cost, but also fuels extreme poverty and food insecurity, affecting the access to markets, schools, hospitals, water points and pastures.

Development work by my office in Samburu County has to focus on a wide range of issues in order to be effective. Livelihood, education, water and health projects are integrated with strong elements of peace promotion in order to ensure communities can progress. Our development interventions stress the importance of peaceful cooperation between the diverse communities in the region, such as the Samburu, Pokot and Turkana. Activities that foster this relationship contribute to creating a more resilient society that has an increased capacity to prevent minor conflicts evolving into perpetual violence. This community capacity for cooperation creates a more conducive society in which development can prosper.

Over my nine years working as a peace builder in the region, there is no doubt that development levels on the whole have risen. While there are many areas still suffering the hardships of underdevelopment and the constant insecurity of violent conflict, there is reason to hope. Two villages, Amaiya and Longewan, which were no-go areas at the height of the clashes in Samburu, are now thriving with a series of intercommunal development projects under way. In the north of the county, in Baragoi, partnerships with other organizations have led to a series of peace education camps for Turkana and Samburu children.

The importance of ensuring that development and peace building work in tandem cannot be overstated. Engaging conflicting communities in activities that clearly add economic value to their lives is a powerful motive to work toward peace. If linked as described, the detrimental nexus of underdevelopment and insecurity can be transformed into peace and prosperity that benefits all.
that the framework had oversimplified the significance of other crucial phenomena featured in the Millennium Declaration.

In light of the shortcomings of the MDGs in reaching their goals and with the MDGs coming to an end in 2015, a strong momentum has begun to ensure the new development agenda will become universal. The world in 2015 looks very different than it did at the start of the millennium with political and economic transitions, increased international interconnectedness and many new worldwide threats and challenges. In a General Assembly (Resolution A/65/1) meeting in 2010, the UN Secretary-General was mandated to begin exploring the agenda that would come to replace the MDG framework.

Post-2015 and the SDG Framework

Seen as the first step on the long road to a new goal framework, the 2010 MDG Summit—which was aimed at reviewing the progress of the MDGs—featured a key commitment from UN member states to begin the process of advancing development past the current mandate. This process to replace the MDGs came to be known as the post-2015 development agenda.

Coinciding with this, the Sustainable Development Goal stream, initiated by the outcome document of the Rio+20 meeting in June 2012, aimed to produce a comprehensive and inclusive process geared toward transforming the development world. A complex and often confusing process, replacing the MDGs has largely followed these two main streams.

The Rio+20 outcome document entitled “The Future We Want” committed world leaders to make every effort to achieve the MDGs while launching a process to determine and define SDGs coherent with and integrated into the post-2015 development agenda. One of the crucial follow-up processes, the OWG, seen as a key outcome of Rio+20, has grown to become one of the foremost inputs into the entire process.

Working in tandem with the SDG process, the post-2015 stream featured inputs from a High-Level Panel (HLP), General Assembly thematic meetings convened by the President of the General Assembly, civil society initiatives and regional and intergovernmental commissions.

These streams have since converged after the UN General Assembly (UNGA) adopted the outcome document of the OWG. This document posited the proposed SDGs as the basis for intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda starting in January 2015. This, together with the Secretary-General Synthesis Report, will guide discussions for the remainder of the process. The final talks and resultant decision will be made by heads of states at the UN Summit in September 2015. All other processes will remain as inputs to the discussions throughout the year—how, exactly, is yet to be seen.

UN HIGH-LEVEL PANEL OF EMINENT PERSONS

In July 2012, the Secretary-General launched his High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons to provide guidance and recommendations on the post-2015 development agenda. The panel was chaired by then President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono of Indonesia and President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf of Liberia, together with Prime Minister David Cameron of the United Kingdom. The further 27 members included representatives from the private sector, academia, civil society and local authorities. Tasked to publish a report that reflected new development challenges, the panel utilized inputs from the global consultations and the results from online and offline platforms (The World We Want and My World), as well as other constituent bases around the world.

On May 30, 2013, the UN Secretary-General received the landmark report from the panel. The report recognized that the post-2015 development agenda should be universal, applicable to countries in the global north and south alike and infused with a spirit of partnership based on equity, cooperation and mutual accountability.

Given the success of the MDGs in reducing
poverty, the panel recommended that the new development agenda carry forward the spirit of the MDGs. Noting that the creation of a single, sustainable development agenda is crucial, the panel proposed five big transformative shifts for the post-2015 development agenda in an attempt to address the flaws of the MDGs. These included:

1) Leave no one behind.
2) Put sustainable development at the core.
3) Transform economies for job and inclusive growth.
4) Build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all.
5) Forge new global partnerships.

Bold commitment in these five areas, according to the panel report, would allow the international community to keep the promises made under the MDGs, raise the bar where experience shows more can be done and, perhaps most important, address issues that were missing from the previous framework. In order to do this, the report strongly recommended that “each goal must be widely applicable in countries with different levels of income, and in those emerging from conflict or recovering from natural disaster, whilst additionally being grounded in the voice of the people, and the priorities identified during consultations, especially children, youth, women and marginalized and excluded groups.”

The contribution of civil society has almost certainly had a major role in shaping the current conversation and will continue to be a vital tool throughout 2015. In a recent interview with Beyond 2015, Ambassador Csaba Kőrösi, Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations, the role of civil society was endorsed to the highest degree: “The civil society…were the most vocal participants. They were the most ambitious actors, the most vocal actors and the most critical actors, and their criticism was very valuable…. Without a very strong push from civil society on the climate goal, on human rights, on peace and security as a component of sustainable development and transparency of the functioning of our institutions, we would not have been able to achieve those transparency goals that we have today, even in their present imperfect shape. You did a very good job!”
REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

The major contribution from five Regional Commissions—the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)—was a report in 2013 that proposed a joint regional perspective on the ongoing global debate on the post-2015 UN development agenda. Emanating from a meeting in Beirut in October 2011, each Regional Commission agreed on the necessity for a joint report to present the future development options beyond 2015. Tasked at identifying key regional priority areas for the post-2015 development agenda, the report stipulated that “only an honest and committed effort by all to listen to the voices of the people” will take us out of the vicious cycle of poverty, exclusion, conflict and instability.” Consultations by the regional commissions will continue through 2015, with these processes expected to be completed by April.

“Only an honest and committed effort by all to listen to the voices of the people will take us out of the vicious cycle of poverty, exclusion, conflict and instability.”

REGIONAL COMMISSIONS REPORT, 2013
The president of the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly, H.E. Dr. John W. Ashe, held a series of high-level and thematic debates during 2014 in what was dubbed “Setting the Stage!” for the post-2015 development agenda. The events provided an opportunity for member states to debate the substantive topic of themes decided by the President of the General Assembly (PGA). It was also an opportunity for the civil society Major Groups to provide recommendations and input. One of these, a thematic debate on April 24-25, 2014 titled Ensuring Stable and Peaceful Societies, reiterated the importance of placing peace and security in the world of development. Speaking in the opening session of this debate, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon noted the many links and urged the international community to “strive for a bold new agenda that fills the gaps of the MDGs, builds on lessons and successes and guides us in new and promising directions.”

In addition, the PGA convened a High-Level Stocktaking event in September 2014 that brought together key processes from his presidency and allowed further input for civil society and intergovernmental bodies. During 2015, the president of the 70th General Assembly will follow where his predecessor left off and convene a number of high-level and thematic debates to input into the overall post-2015 process.

**HIGH-LEVEL AND THEMATIC DEBATES OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE 68TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

The United Nations Development Group (UNDG), which was established by the Secretary-General in 1997, has had a key role coordinating UN development activities since its inception. In collaboration with the UNDP, the UNGD has facilitated national-level consultations on a post-2015 development agenda in more...
than 70 countries so far. In order to facilitate a global conversation whereby each citizen can make their voice be heard, the initiative My World Survey (MWS) was established. This online survey allows participants to indicate their personal development priorities and has been used to inform many other processes. Additionally, the UNDG organized a set of 11 inclusive thematic consultations around the world. Titled The World We Want (WWW), these consultations have featured contributions from a wide range of stakeholders, including governments, civil society, the private sector, media, universities and think tanks. Each thematic consultation was led by two or more UN agencies aiming to explore the role key themes could play in a new development framework. Two of the thematic consultations, one on Conflict and Fragility and the other on Governance, represent the increased role that civil society around the world has played in shaping the inclusion of these concepts in the post-2015 agenda. MWS is projected to remain open until the adoption of the new agenda, while the WWW consultations will continue until April 2015. Both of these processes will continue to provide inputs into the final decision. To date, over 5 million participants have already contributed to the MWS and WWW consultations.

RIO+20 AND THE OPEN WORKING GROUP

The 2012 United Nations conference on sustainable development, known as Rio+20, brought together thousands of participants from the private sector, civil society representatives such as the Major Groups, NGOs, world leaders and other groups to shape approaches to reduce poverty, advance social equity and ensure environmental protection. It was under these auspices that the outcome document “The Future We Want” was adopted, which sought to solidify the view that the eradication of poverty remains the “greatest global challenge facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development.” This comprehensive document iterated the importance of acknowledging that aspects of the creation of peaceful societies are necessary factors for sustainable development to flourish when it stated, “Good governance and the rule of law, at the national and international levels, as well as an enabling environment, are essential for sustainable development.” Furthermore, the explicit mention of sustainable development requiring effective, transparent, accountable and democratic institutions at all levels contributed to the changing face of development thinking.

“The Future We Want” document included a recommendation to initialize a process to determine new transformational goals to replace the MDG framework. Rio+20 did not elaborate specific goals but stated that the SDGs should be limited in number, aspirational and easy to communicate. Leading to the creation of a 30-member intergovernmental OWG, Rio+20 sought “an inclusive and transparent intergovernmental process...that is open to all stakeholders.” Tasked with developing a proposal for a set of SDGs, the OWG process, which spanned 13 sessions across 16 months, has been lauded as an inclusive, thorough and ambitious input into the post-2015 conversations.

Thanks in large part to the previously mentioned inputs from civil society, the regional commissions and national consultations that consistently advocated for peace and security and its potential inclusion in the post-2015 development agenda, it has become one of the central debates throughout the OWG.
The Climate at the OWG

Key processes in the lead-up to the commencement of the OWGs had all placed significance on the inclusion of aspects of peace, security and good governance in the post-2015 development agenda. The OWG was to be the real litmus test for these concepts, as the process became more and more member state-centric. The OWG, complete with 30 seats, actually featured the contribution from 73 member states, with many seats comprising partnerships between two or more states known as troikas. The widespread geographical, political and economic nature of the OWG members, coupled by the relative transparency of the process, quickly saw blocs and alignments emerging on many key controversial issues. Perhaps the most highly debated, the peace goal produced some of the biggest rifts between the 30 member seats of the OWG.

While virtually every participant in the OWG noted the link between development, peace and security, opinions greatly differed on the role these issues should be given in the next development agenda. Strong proponents of the inclusion of peace, security, the rule of law and good governance began to fall largely into two camps, those pushing for one goal and those pushing for two.

Sweden was a strong advocate for a stand-alone goal on peace and security, noting that it was not just a goal for conflict-affected states but also a global aspiration: “A goal on peaceful societies would be a truly universal goal. No country is free from violence—not my own country—and all countries therefore have an interest in promoting freedom from violence and peaceful societies” (OWG 11). Similarly, Timor-Leste, itself a state that has grappled with conflict, stressed the global importance of such a goal: “They are not simply crosscutting issues or [a] means of implementation; they are the essence of any progress...[which is] why we have consistently advocated for a goal on building peaceful, stable societies and capable institutions” (OWG 10).

Working in tandem, member states supporting the inclusion of two stand-alone goals vocalized...
THE PEACE GOAL: MAJOR CONTENTIONS DURING THE OWG

Laura Ribeiro Rodrigues Pereira
UN Liaison and Advocacy Officer, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC). GPPAC is a member-led network of civil society organisations active in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding across the world.

NOT THE DEVELOPMENT MANDATE
Some states were of the opinion that including language on peace and security would fall outside of the “three pillars” approach set by the Rio+20 outcome document. However, the document did highlight the overall importance of peace and security and human rights, and the agenda is not strictly bound by the recommendations of this document. Some also argued that the UN Security Council already deals with peace and security issues, and therefore, the development agenda was not the place to deal with them. This argument confuses the issue, as the council does not deal with everyday forms of violence and conflict.

PERCEPTION THAT DEVELOPMENT IS A ZERO-SUM GAME
Some were concerned that adding new issues to an already stretched agenda would divert attention away from long-standing development priorities such as eliminating extreme poverty and may result in the diversion of funds from these priorities. Those supportive of a peace and stability goal argued that such a goal would contribute to the long-term sustainability of development efforts and create more resilient societies that in turn help to prevent the outbreak of conflict and violence in the first place. This would secure the investments made in development efforts and result in more funds being available.

SECURITIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT
Another fear is that a goal on peace and stability could lead to official development assistance (ODA) being funnelled away from poverty reduction strategies toward security-related concerns instead. This would allow for donor countries to pursue other agendas through the provision of security assistance under the guise of development, thereby “securitizing development.” However, if the true objectives of the goal—as expressed by its civil society proponents—are preserved, the goal should not lead to greater militarization.

RULE OF LAW TARGETS NOT UNIVERSAL
Some states argued that the targets on rule of law are too focused on Northern priorities and do not relate well to a universal agenda. Even when the rule of law targets did relate to a country’s specific development needs, it was argued that they only dealt with one side of the problem, leaving aside concerns over international rule of law and governance issues that have hindered pro-poor development strategies.

SOVEREIGNTY
Some states argued that meeting some of the targets under the peace goal would infringe on their national sovereign space, hindering their ability to deal with internal issues as they see fit. However, as the agenda is a voluntary non-binding one, it is difficult to see the infringement on sovereignty as a strong reason for not engaging with the peace and stability goal in a more substantive manner.
Participants at a workshop hosted by UNA-South Africa show their support for the inclusion of peace in the post-2015 agenda.

**WFUNA’S PROPOSED GOAL—ACHIEVE PEACEFUL SOCIETIES, FREEDOM FROM VIOLENCE AND GOOD GOVERNANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>By 2030, reduce by X% the number of violent deaths per 100,000 and reduce the number of people from all social groups affected by all forms of violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>By 2030, significantly reduce international stresses that drive violence and conflict, including illicit trade in arms and conflict commodities, and the violent impact of drugs and human trafficking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reduce by X% the annual production of small arms and light weapons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>By 2030, there is an increase in the capacity of sub-national and local governments fostering peaceful societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>By 2030, there is an increase in the capacity and access to non-violent, peaceful, inclusive and constructive mechanisms to mediate and reconcile tensions, grievances and disputes within society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>By 2030, there is an increase by X% of people from all social groups feeling safer and having more confidence and trust in the security forces, the police and other legitimate security provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>By 2020, increase the distribution of information and education on a culture of non-violence and peace by X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>By 2030, ensure an increase of legal empowerment and effective remedies to injustice in all social groups with access to, and trust in, effective, accountable and impartial justice provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ensure, by 2030, that there is an increase among all social groups in the enjoyment of legal identity, freedom of speech, expression and association, peaceful protest, civic engagement and access to independent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Monitor and gradually reduce perceptions of fear by all social groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>By 2030, there is an increase in access, participation and representation in decision-making processes at all levels, with particular attention to women and children, young people, the poor, the most marginalized and people in vulnerable situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Reduce by X% bribery and corruption and ensure that all those involved at local, national, regional and international levels are held accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>By 2030, ensure that there is an increase in the effectiveness, accountability and transparency of public institutions at all levels, and that both public and private institutions are responsive and accountable to citizens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except From WFUNA’s Position Statement, June 2014
Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

**Targets**

16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.

16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime.

16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacities at all levels, in particular in developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime.

16.3 Promote the rule of law at national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.

16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.

16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms.

16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance.

**Additional Targets**

16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children.

16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.

16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.

16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration.

16.b Promote and enforce nondiscriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.
Perhaps more importantly, support for this approach was codified by the majority of African states in the formation of the Common African Position. The stipulation by the CAP to make peace and security one of the six pillars of African development priorities rubbished the idea that a peace goal was strictly a Western agenda. The reaffirmation that “peace and security is essential for the achievement of the continent’s development aspirations” provided clout for the push toward codifying a stand-alone goal in the SDG list.

In addition to the member states sitting in the OWG, the opportunity for input was additionally granted to Major Groups at the UN. This decision, codified in “The Future We Want” outcome document of Rio+20, was made under the understanding that the meaningful involvement and active participation of Major Groups, as well as all relevant decision makers in the planning and implementation of policies, would help create a more representative agenda. A strong advocate for a goal on peace and security and its overall inclusion in the SDG framework, the Major Groups’ written contribution to the final OWG attested to “the importance of freedom, peace and security, respect for all human rights, including the right to development and the right to an adequate standard of living, including the right to food, the right to water and sanitation, the rule of law, good governance, gender equality, women’s human rights and women’s empowerment and the protection, survival and
development of children to their full potential and the overall commitment to just and democratic societies for development.”

It goes without saying that these controversial topics were not unanimously supported. The resistance (explained in more detail in figure 3) largely originated from a few key member states with varying motivations behind each objection. During the 10th OWG session, Brazil emphasized the importance of Rio+20, recalling that the outcome document “rests on three pillars—economic, social and environmental,” and suggested further that there was “no intergovernmental consensus on the addition of a fourth peace and security pillar.” Additionally, concerns were raised that a peace goal would militarize development, could place conditionality on aid and focused too heavily on rule of law issues in developing countries.

India affirmed many of these arguments, further suggesting that the OWG should not “depart from [the] mandate” given by Rio+20. Furthermore, while India was happy to recognize the importance of development to create an environment for peace, it was less willing to concede that peace was necessary for development.

The troika consisting of China, Kazakhstan and Indonesia took a slightly different approach, arguing that “there are other important institutions and forums to discuss [the] issues within the peace and human rights pillars of UN,” stressing that the SDGs should be solely development focused. Additionally, they questioned the role of rule of law in the debate, noting: “There is no one-size-fits-all model for rule of law and it is hardly goal-able and properly measured” (OWG 10).

A similar train of thought by the seat occupied by Iran posited that a focus “solely on the internal aspect would lead to further conditionalties and even politicization and securitization of the issues at hand, as well as overgeneralizing a one-size-fits-all format” (OWG 11). These contentions provided the major roadblock for proponents of the peace goal and ensured that deliberations would continue right up until the very end of the process.

The Outcome Document

After the final OWG session entered the early hours on Saturday, July 19, a consensus document did not appear in the cards. This was until the outcome document that finally emerged after consultations overran by almost 24 hours issued a comprehensive list of 17 SDGs, complete with 169 targets. The culmination of 13 sessions, spanning some 16 months, not only included goals on climate change and gender, but also a specific goal on peace and security. Goal 16, which aims to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels,” was apparently almost consigned to the annals of history at one point during the final OWG. The significance of making the final consensus agreed list is an important accomplishment for the large community pushing for a peace goal.

Co-chaired by the Permanent Representatives of Hungary, Ambassador Csaba Korosi, and Kenya, Ambassador Macharia Kamau, the OWG transformed the post-2015 development agenda in a way that many did not foresee. Over the 13 sessions, each seat had an active role in the conversation as the co-chairs drove the process forward.

What started out as a loosely mandated process—originating from Rio+20 and pushed
through by the Secretary-General—has become a central contribution to the post-2015 scene. The outcome document has been widely welcomed, with significant praise for the inclusive, widespread and ambitious set of goals recommended. The plaudits extended to the entire OWG process, noting the importance of such an inclusive consultative input. In the weeks and months following the release, it has emerged that many key member states wish to use the recommendations of the outcome document as the key document for the basis of the intergovernmental negotiations in the months leading up to the adoption of the SDGs.

Capturing this momentum, the UNGA agreed in Resolution A/RES/68/309 that the outcome document of the OWG “shall be the main basis for integrating SDGs into the post-2015 development agenda.” This resolution, in a plenary meeting on September 10, 2014, was not the initial purpose for the OWG, which was seen as being one of many inputs into the post-2015. The elevation of this outcome document into the crucial lynchpin for the final 12 months of the process has been a major game changer for many involved in the debate.

Past solely being just the basis, there are calls by member states to leave the outcome document closed. The G77 and China, along with the African Group, have spearheaded this move, arguing that the outcome document sufficiently represents an inclusive process, with the consensus nature of the document being crucial. Additionally, active members of the OWG, such as India and Brazil, have noted that the preservation of the “delicate balance” of the outcome document should be seen as a powerful motive to avoid the dangers of renegotiation.

However, there are many member states that, while recognizing the importance of the OWG process, still believe there is work to do. Indicating that there are areas that could still be strengthened, it appears that the consensus agreement of what is included within the outcome document has not been replicated with consensus over what exact role it will play. The U.K., U.S. and Australia have each specifically
The final document makes no reference to reducing the global arms trade, neglects to recognize the importance of the perceived freedom from fear and violence, excludes any mention of promoting a culture of nonviolence and fails to incorporate vital concepts such as the support for reconciliation processes.

referred to the OWG outcome document as the “starting point” for negotiations—with many other states holding a similar vision for the future of the process.

The “open or closed” debate will most likely be revisited in early 2015 as intergovernmental negotiations intensify. For a hotly contested issue such as the peace goal, this debate has increased significance. There are those who view the mere existence of Goal 16 as nothing short of a miracle, cautioning strongly against allowing the opportunity for any dissenting voices to move for its removal from the SDG list. Setting the outcome document proposals in stone would guarantee a peace goal no matter how imperfect it may be in its current form.

On the other hand, it is exactly this imperfection that has provided the strong impetus for calls to reopen negotiations. As seen in the WFUNA proposal (see figure 1) and many other contributions from other civil society groups or NGOs, the final ascribed list of targets within Goal 16 are underwhelming to one degree or another.

The final document makes no reference to reducing the global arms trade, neglects to recognize the importance of the perceived freedom from fear and violence (see figure 1), excludes any mention of promoting a culture of nonviolence and fails to incorporate vital concepts such as the support for reconciliation processes. Furthermore, many of the targets are unsatisfactory as they are either too unrealistic (i.e. ending all forms of violence against children), too open-ended (i.e. substantially reduce all forms of corruption and bribery) or fail to promote accountability and easy measurement.

While the reopening could lead to the strengthening of less than satisfactory targets, it could also work in the reverse. There is always the potential that renegotiation might lead to the weakening of targets, or even the removal of some completely. Some have argued that in comparison to other goals in the outcome document, the targets in Goal 16 are relatively streamlined and a great deal less wordy than some. Reopening could lead to the insertion of further complexities, which could ultimately lead to reducing the effectiveness—and the ability for easy implementation—of Goal 16. If the outcome document remains closed, as many predict it will, there is still much negotiation to take place— Influencing the agenda’s narrative, the declaration and the means of implementation. For a strong peace goal, these aspects of the agenda must correspond and complement the targets outlined in Goal 16.

As we enter the New Year, Synthesis Report in hand, these debates will undoubtedly take center stage. Should proponents of the peace goal be happy with our lot or should we strive to produce a truly transformative goal? Risks on one side; risks on the other. ■
Goal 16: Stay, Mainstream or Both?

Every major process—Rio+20, High-Level Panel, MWS, WWW and the OWG—has offered support for the inclusion of peace and good governance in the post-2015 development agenda. The anticipation that a version of Goal 16 will make the final adopted document is a testament to the strong participation of a wealth of supporters from civil society, policy makers, academics, member states and other stakeholders. However, the options that remain available for the peace goal are still vast—and, quite frankly, depend heavily on how much the basis document will be reopened or restructured, or how many last-minute changes capitals enforce on their negotiating teams in New York. Below are a few possibilities of influential factors that could shape the breath of inclusion for issues of peace and good governance.

CLUSTERING GOALS?

The push by some member states to reduce the 17 goals into a more manageable list could have repercussions for Goal 16. One advocate for this approach, Prime Minister David Cameron of the U.K., proposed at the UNGA that 17 goals may be too many, with something akin to 10 or 12 being preferred. The communicability of the MDGs was one of the great positives of the framework, and thus, in order to make the new agenda more digestible and by association easier to implement, it is thought that slimming the goals down could be a plus. However, as it is one of the most controversial goals in the outcome document, it does not take a massive leap of faith to imagine that any road to reducing the amount of SDGs would run directly through Goal 16. Yet, it must be noted that at the same time, the U.K. has been pushing for a greater inclusion of the rule of law in the SDG list, and thus it becomes less clear whether reducing goals would mean no place for a peace goal.

In order to make the list of goals more marketable, there has been indications that there may be a move to cluster issues together. Thinning 17 goals into four or five major clusters would be an ambitious move, considering the diverse range of topics covered throughout the document. The idea that this would recapture the concise nature of the MDG framework, whilst ensuring that each issue was covered, makes sense. However, 17 goals were ultimately decided for a reason: Each one was deemed to have real merit for the sustainable development agenda. For some, it did not matter how many goals were recommended in the outcome document of the OWG; what ultimately mattered was getting the right ones in. If a cluster process de-emphasizes the goal framework by diminishing the significance of each stand-alone area, it
Thinning 17 goals into four or five major clusters would be an ambitious move, considering the diverse range of topics covered throughout the document.

could dilute the effectiveness of the overall agenda. Trying to unravel, and re-ravel, this process could lead to a watering down of the peace goal.

TARGETS

If the outcome document is indeed reopened, the peace goal could be in danger of becoming politicized. Whilst the current targets may be imperfect, they were ultimately agreed in consensus by member states. In a United Nations that is divided on so many other issues, the importance of consensus cannot be underestimated.

Yet, concerns have begun to emerge that any attempts to strengthen the peace goal could be seen as a political move that would derail the entire goal. The rhetoric emerging from the Arab Group that the goal should include a target on ending occupation will be seen by some

FREEDOM FROM VIOLENCE: A VENEZUELAN PERSPECTIVE

Erly Muñoz, Freedom from Violence Coordinator, United Nations Association of Venezuela (UNA-Venezuela). UNA-Venezuela is one of 6 UNAs involved in the WFUNA-led Freedom from Violence Project, advocating for the inclusion of peace and security issues in the post-2015 development agenda.

The absence of war does not automatically produce peace in a society. Debates surrounding the inclusion of peace in the new development agenda have commonly misrepresented this concept, assuming that a goal on peaceful and inclusive societies will only have significance in countries affected by armed conflict. Violence in domestic contexts can hinder development progress just as much as a war can.

The Venezuelan context is a perfect example of this. Huge oil reserves, free and public education since 1870, accessible health care, extensive arable land, a rich legacy of flora and fauna and large water reserves, among other resources, exist throughout the country. Health, education, housing, food and gender equality programs have all been implemented as part of the government’s agenda to achieve the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Social aid has increased, and a heightened focus has been placed upon the poor living in vulnerable conditions. The level of poverty, according to the National Institute of Statistics (INE), has been reduced from 59.6 percent in 2000 to 21.2 percent in 2012, and the level of extreme poverty has declined from 18 percent in 2000 to 7.1 percent in 2012.

All these facts and figures should point toward a well-developed state, but sadly, that is not the Venezuela I know.

These statistics alone do not tell the full story. The Venezuelan Observatory of Violence (OVV) provides crucial figures that development practitioners must not ignore. Estimating the number of homicides in 2013 to be 24,763 (79 deaths per 100,000 inhabitants), the OVV has reported an increase in homicides every single year since the MDGs began. While the Venezuelan Ministry of Interior, Justice and Peace estimates a lower rate of 39 deaths per 100,000 inhabitants in 2013, these figures fall within the range that the UNDP would consider an epidemic.

High levels of violence and insecurity have severely hampered the supposed development progress, resulting in a reality that looks somewhat different from the rosy picture painted by official development indicators. Distrust in the security institutions—and the lack of freedom to walk down the street go to school and/or leave the house at night for fear of violence—prevent many from experiencing the full benefits of sustainable development.

If money, time and effort continue to flow into the development sector without due attention to ensuring that individuals and communities can live a life free from violence, then the next 15 years will repeat the last.
member states as dangerous territory into which to move. On the other hand, the inclusion of a reference to terrorism in target 16.a, has raised eyebrows for many, too. The inclusion, or exclusion, of a human rights perspective in Goal 16 has been criticized by many, while a consistent push by several key member states to further reflect the rule of law may well also be a key issue in the negotiating battleground in 2015.

**MAINSTREAM INTO OTHER AREAS (CROSSCUTTING ISSUES)**

References to peace and good governance, such as the inclusion of education that focuses upon “human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence,” exist at various other points throughout the proposed SDG framework. These, like the targets in Goal 16, can be strengthened to further represent the complexity of the inherent link between development and peace building.

The connection between the onset of conflict and resource scarcity, water management, education levels and inequality needs to be accurately represented in the final document.

There were occasions during the OWG process when it looked as though mainstreaming of peace building and good governance approaches were to replace the peace goal entirely—a move that would have been catastrophic for the overall agenda. The argument, that peace was nothing more than a crosscutting issue, would have severely limited the scope of relevance in the post-2015 agenda. While there
are areas of the outcome document that could still include reference to a peace-building approach, there is no precise way of predicting how the climate of intergovernmental negotiations might impact upon these. In an ideal world, the connection between the onset of conflict and resource scarcity, water management, education levels and inequality needs to be accurately represented in the final document.

As 2015 unfolds, each of these factors will most likely enter negotiations in one form or another. The reconciliation of these issues will produce a much clearer vision for how the finished article will look. Beyond the focus on the specifics of the goal and target framework there are many other issues that, in one way or another, will have repercussions on the overall body of the post-2015 development agenda.

Key Issues Remaining

Despite the lengthy process to replace the MDGs, key parts of the puzzle still need to be negotiated and agreed upon. Financing, measurement, means of implementation, branding and the role of the data revolution will all be intensely discussed over the coming months. Each of these issues has importance for the peace goal in a variety of different ways.

MEASUREMENT

Concerted efforts in recent years by institutions such as the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) have been hugely influential in debunking a commonly stipulated myth that peace is not measurable. The Mo Ibrahim Foundation and other national statistic bureaus across sub-Saharan Africa can be seen as leaders in a statistical revolution that is capable of specifically pointing to indicators that are crucial for concepts such as good governance and rule of law. These examples should be publicized and fairly represented in the overall framework of the new development agenda.

FINANCING

Processes such as the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF), which spanned five sessions from August 2013 until August 2014, have led the way on reshaping the financing structure for the new SDG framework. The outcome report, delivered by the committee to the UNGA, provided an analytical framework for financing sustainable development, proposing a variety of policy options from which states could choose while suggesting areas for advancement of the global partnership for sustainable development. Emphasizing the need to “place money where it is needed and let countries determine their futures,” the report pointed to the huge amount of money wasted, coupled with the need to allow country-specific contexts to shape decisions. Without a sound financial structure in place, Goal 16 and others will be just fancy words on paper.

BRANDING

One of the most underappreciated qualities of the MDGs was their ability to be easily and effectively branded. Eight short and well-defined goals with an associated recognizable icon allowed the MDGs to be featured on posters, flyers, shopping bags and various other paraphernalia. Keeping with 17 goals—and 169 targets—would pose considerable difficulties to emulate such a formula. However, if the SDGs are to be truly universal and transformative, they need to be known and they need to resonate in every corner of the globe. In the My World Survey, over 2 million voters recognized the importance of both “an honest and representative government” and “the protection against crime and violence,” which stresses the importance of these issues to people from all corners of the world. If these issues are to be not only included in the final goal structure, but successfully
implemented as well, a way must be found to brand and market the SDGs in every country and region in a way that makes individuals who voted feel that their priorities are represented.

DATA REVOLUTION

Seen as a game changer, the data revolution is one of the major revolutionizing processes that will set the SDGs apart from the MDGs. A wealth of different ICT tools has changed the way development can be implemented and measured. Integrating these aspects coherently and comprehensively will be vital for a transformative agenda.

This was noted as being vitally important by the High-Level Panel report; the recognition of it was further codified by the Secretary-General in his creation of a series of an advisory group of experts to deal with the issue. In a draft report, a 24-member group of experts from civil society, the private sector, academia, governments and international organizations has assessed various opportunities linked to innovative new methods, technical progress and the surge of new public and private data providers to strengthen conventional statistical systems and to further the drive for accountability at the national, regional and global levels.

MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

In the outcome document of the OWG, an entire goal was dedicated to this question, with Goal 17 aimed at setting the basis for a stronger means of implementation and a reinvigorated global partnership for sustainable development. This goal is very welcomed, but must be strengthened if it is to provide the necessary direction for implementation. Of course, means of implementation is inherently connected with the other four issues discussed above. If targets cannot be measured, they will not be implemented; if they are not a manageable size or well known, they will not be implemented; and if a data revolution is not successfully incorporated, implementation will suffer. If impact is to be real and tangible, implementation ultimately relies on the financing available.

The Synthesis Report

The culmination of almost five years of activities, events, processes and consultations, the Secretary-General’s Synthesis Report brought together the many aforementioned inputs from around the world. This report is seen as the main piece produced by the Secretariat to outline a vision for the next development agenda and, indeed, beyond.

Within the initial preamble, the report recognizes the role that ‘armed conflict, crime, terrorism, persecution, corruption, impunity and the erosion of the rule of law’ have had in contributing to the failure of development around the world. Additionally, the work of the many advocates for the peace goal is recognized: “the public discourse has underscored the call for the urgent need to recognize and address the trust deficit between governments, institutions and the people. Providing an enabling environment to build inclusive and peaceful societies, ensure social cohesion and respect for the rule of law will require rebuilding institutions at the country level to ensure that the gains from peace are not reversed.” Furthermore, the recognition that “all must be free from fear and violence, without discrimination,” is an important factor that was not included in the OWG outcome document.

Using the outcome document from the OWG as the basis for the report, the Secretary General’s synthesis report explicitly recommends that the 17 goals remain in place, but suggested ‘the possibility to maintain the 17 goals and rearrange them in a focused and concise manner.’ The Synthesis Report proposes an approach that the long list of goals and targets through the integration of six essential elements, which
The recognition that cohesive, and peaceful societies, has such a prominent role in creating the transformation that is being sought, is an important aspect that will need to be recognized in the final agreed framework.

taken together, will enable a concise final framework. These six essential elements are believed to “underscore the urgency of a universal call to commit to a set of principles that, applied together, can bring about a truly universal transformation of sustainable development.” It is rewarding to see, for advocates of a goal on peaceful societies, that one of these six elements is titled Justice: to promote safe and peaceful societies, and strong institutions.

However, as it has been noted on multiple occasions, there is a danger that focusing of 6 key elements may dilute the significance of the actual 17 goals. The many advocates for the inclusion of a goal on peace may wish that peaceful societies was pushed to the forefront as one of the essential elements, as justice is only one aspect of peaceful societies – and does not necessarily entail the same approach. Secondly, while the synthesis report pays attention to the need to rebuild post-crisis countries, the final agreed framework will be found wanting, if there is no explicit reference to the need to address the root causes of violence and conflict. Yet, perhaps peace advocates will take the road of Paul Ladd, Head of the UNDP Post-2015 Development Agenda Team, who recently suggested that civil society may not wish to ‘lose the good for the sake of the perfect.’

After years of working in silos, the UN SG highlights the development agenda as an opportune time to “integrate the broader United Nations agenda, with its inextricably linked and mutually interdependent peace and security, development, and human rights objectives.” The recognition that fostering cohesive and peaceful societies will have such a prominent role in the transformation that is being sought, is an important aspect that will need to be recognized in the final agreed framework. Creating peaceful societies must not only coincide with the development agenda but must be wholly linked as an essential element towards the achievement of sustainable development.

The route towards agreeing this final framework, promises to be interesting and eventful. Retaining his role from the OWG, the President of the General Assembly has appointed Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya, to lead “open, inclusive and transparent consultations” alongside David Donoghue, Permanent Representative of Ireland. Specifically mandated as the co-facilitators, they must organize the “modalities for the intergovernmental negotiations and the remaining issues related to the Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda.” The co-facilitators, via the document Food for Thought, have proposed an intergovernmental process that is “open, inclusive and transparent and which builds on the working methods used very successfully by the OWG.” Currently 8 four-day negotiation sessions have been proposed, commencing on January 19 and culminating with a final outcome document in late July.

Additionally, a number of other events for 2015 have begun to start shaping up. The President of the 69th UN General Assembly, H.E. Mr. Sam Kutesa, will be hosting at least four post-2015 relevant thematic debates and high-level events throughout the year. These include:

- February 2015: High-level thematic debate on the means of implementation.
- March 2015: High-level thematic debate on advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women.
- April 2015: High-level thematic debate on reconciliation.
With the initial release of the Secretary General’s Synthesis Report, it is at this opportune point that we have the time to reflect on the important questions that still remain.

- May 2015: High-level thematic debate on the peaceful settlement of disputes and strengthening cooperation between the UN and regional organizations.

In addition, the draft resolution presented to the General Assembly in September 2014 indicates that the PGA will organize and preside over two days of informal interactive hearings before June 2015 with representatives of NGOs, civil society organizations, Major Groups and the private sector. These consultations, along with the aforementioned intergovernmental negotiation process, will feed into a summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda that will be held September 28 to 30, 2015, in New York as a high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

With the initial release of the Secretary General’s Synthesis Report, it is at this opportune point that we have the time to reflect on the important questions that still remain.
Achieving peace requires more than the absence of violence; it requires progress in addressing the drivers of violence and strengthening foundation for peace.
OVER 1 BILLION PEOPLE LIVE IN conflict-affected and fragile states. They are also among the world’s poorest. By 2015, more than 50 percent of the total population in extreme poverty will reside in places affected by conflict and chronic violence. Conflicts have evolved in nature, from wars between states to a much more complicated form, triggered by a wide range of factors, including political, economic, social and environmental issues.

Achieving peace requires more than the absence of violence; it requires progress in addressing the drivers of violence and strengthening a foundation for peace. The complex interactions between all these drivers require a comprehensive approach that addresses all dimensions—development, politics, security and justice. A deficit in addressing any one of them will undermine progress made in the other and swing the pendulum back to an even worse state than before.

In order to achieve sustainable development and realize “the world we need,” the three pillars of the United Nations’ work—peace and security, development and human rights—must work in tandem. One of the main inputs into the post-2015 development planning process, the proposal of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals constitutes a momentous step in our common efforts to build a more secure, just and sustainable future for all. It is a unique and first-of-its-kind outcome, both in terms of what was discussed and how the discussions were conducted.

Taken in their totality, the goals proposed reflect an integrated, universal and transformative agenda, which builds and expands on the lessons learned from the Millennium Development Goals to address the many and interlinked challenges the world faces today. Filling a notable gap in the MDGs, the proposed SDG framework is underpinned with a goal on promoting peace, justice and institutions.

To achieve such an ambitious agenda, defining solid means of implementation will be critical. A major departure from the MDG framework, the post-2015 agenda will indeed reside in its moral legitimacy, inclusiveness and capacity to mobilize and persuade. While the exact arrangements remain to be determined, there is a broad recognition that it will be crucial to have a framework for mutual horizontal accountability at the national, regional and global levels—with the High-Level Political Forum playing a key role. In order for all stakeholders to take evidence-based decisions and allow for real-time monitoring, a data revolution will also be essential.

2015 will be a key milestone for humanity and our future. The new agenda to be adopted in September 2015 is our chance to set the world on a sustainable path to a common destiny and shared responsibility.
A hugely important impediment to development, violence deserves a prominent place in the SDGs. But we must attack its root causes in systemic features of our global order, which only the more powerful countries can reform.

Small-scale violence and the continual threat thereof—just like the large-scale violence of wars, civil wars and local insurrections—is a terrible burden upon the poor and a grave impediment to efforts to improve their lives.

Both SDG drafts have recognized the importance of violence by assigning it a separate goal: Goal 11 in the draft by the High-Level Panel and Goal 16 in the draft of the Open Working Group. But both drafts fall short by proposing that governments should simply agree to specified reductions: “Reduce violent deaths per 100,000 by x and eliminate all forms of violence against children” (HLP 11.1), “significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere” (OWG 16.1) and so on. Such formulations express mere wishes, which are easy to endorse because they require no commitment. For such wishes to come true, they must be converted into genuine goals through a clear assignment of responsibilities to specific competent actors. A goal requires an agent or agents whose goal it is and who takes responsibility and is held responsible for its achievement.

One may reply that the assignment of responsibilities is implicit: Each country must achieve the required reduction within its own national territory. But this would be a morally implausible and politically ineffective assignment. It gives the poorest countries the largest tasks, and it completely overlooks how violence and corruption in developing societies are incentivized and facilitated by foreign factors that members of this society cannot control.

One example is the international arms trade, which greatly amplifies violence in the developing world. To curb this trade, the world’s arms-exporting countries must shoulder key responsibilities: to accept constraints on whom they sell arms to, to accept substantial penalties when weapons they sold fall into the wrong hands and to accept a tax on all arms sales, both to discourage them and to raise revenues for an international fund to mitigate violence and its effects.

Another example is the might-makes-
The interdependence of sustained peace and sustainable development underpins our collective well-being and prosperity. It is recognized in the mutually reinforcing pillars of the UN system itself: peace and security, development and human rights. It is articulated in the text of many international agreements, including the Millennium Declaration and “The Future We Want”—the Rio+20 outcome document. Most recently, it featured prominently in the deliberations and report of the Open Working Group.

The report of the Open Working Group provides a solid basis for the intergovernmental negotiations for the post-2015 development agenda. It is the result of an inclusive process that drew on an innovative, constituency-based system of representation. In addition to the contributions of member states, there was extensive outreach with civil society, business and other experts. The passionate and informed discussions moved many debates forward, but were never intended to be the final word. There is much yet to be done to finalize the post-2015 development agenda. The synthesis report of the Secretary-General is anticipated to provide a timely and helpful reflection on the various inputs to date. But ultimately it will be up to member states to determine how we will collectively eradicate extreme poverty and chart the world on a course to sustainable development.

That is why Timor-Leste will continue to advocate for a goal on peaceful societies and effective institutions, based on the rule of law. These are essential elements to access basic services, get decent jobs and live in harmony with our natural resources.

The proposals clearly show that the Working Group recognises that in order to achieve any meaningful sustainable development, individual states and the global community as a whole will need to have an appropriate orientation and underlying governance systems.

The post-2015 development agenda presents an historic opportunity to right many of the wrongs that have impeded our collective development journey. Our experience of the Open Working Group shows that the more inclusive the global conversation, the closer we will come to realizing our goals.

The post-2015 development agenda presents an historic opportunity to right many of the wrongs that have impeded our collective development journey.
It would be invidious if the process of creating the new Sustainable Development Goals became a competition with different interests trying to have their “pet” goal included. But at times it becomes a little like that, and we begin to hear discussions about how many goals are practical and what goal will be left out if another goal is included.

Fortunately, the report of the Open Working Group has tried to avoid that kind of competitive bargaining, as can be seen in its own description of the goals it has proposed: “These goals constitute an integrated, indivisible set of global priorities for sustainable development.”

The proposals clearly show that the Working Group recognises that in order to achieve any meaningful sustainable development, individual states and the global community as a whole will need to have an appropriate orientation and underlying governance systems. Without this basis, it is likely that any set of specific targets will not be met or only partially met.

So we need to see them as a whole, each supporting and facilitating the achievement of the others. I was very aware of this type of approach when I was thinking of policies that would enhance the well-being of the people of Sri Lanka, and it has been reinforced for me in my role as co-chair of the Shared Societies Working Group of the Club de Madrid. The focus of this project is to identify ways to overcome social division and hostility and to build cohesive peaceful, sustainable and prosperous societies in which all people, regardless of their race, religion, language or color, feel at home and are able to play their full part in the development of the society.

We have been keenly aware that such a society has all kinds of benefits in economic and social terms and is more efficient and effective in ensuring that people have the opportunities and services they need, including access to health services, education and so on. We find it useful to talk of a virtuous cycle in which progress on one front creates the dynamic for progress in others that in turn help to energize the development process.

However, we are all too aware of a vicious cycle that propels societies downward: Intergroup hostility leads to conflict, leading in turn to economic decline, poverty and insecurity, all of which create greater intergroup tensions and conflict.

We can intervene to break the cycle at different points. We can improve the economy, we can work on peace building, we can provide new services. In our Shared Societies Project, the members of the Club de Madrid believe that ensuring social inclusion and full participation are key elements. Ideally we are working to change the downward spiral at many different points.

The Sustainable Development Goals aim to break that cycle in a holistic way, so in thinking what needs to happen from the Secretary-General’s Synthesis Report until the High-Level meeting next year, we can look at what has been left out and needs to be included. For example, we can identify the benefits of including a goal or target on peace building.

But even more important, we need to ensure that we retain the overall concept of an integrated set of goals to create an inclusive shared society that realises the future we want for all. And we need to be alert that any additions or deletions do not affect that concept. And thirdly, the states that are negotiating the final set of goals need to keep in mind (and be reminded, if necessary) that this concept should govern their thinking in assessing if changes might be needed to strengthen the goals and what proposed changes might weaken them.
As the post-2015 development agenda moves forward, there is increasing understanding that in order to make genuine progress on poverty and well-being, policymakers must address the factors that constrain development, particularly violence and conflict.

Evidence such as the 2011 World Development Report highlighted that almost no fragile or low-income country met MDG targets. This fragility is widespread, with the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) finding that 500 million people live in the 11 least peaceful countries, with 200 million living on less than $1.25 per day. Meanwhile, the global economic impact of violence reached $9.8 trillion last year, with the biggest impact being in the least peaceful countries, further highlighting the effects of violence on development.

Yet, truly addressing the relationship between violence, peace and sustainable development also requires understanding what sustains peace. Most of the study of peace is in fact the study of violent conflict. Despite the fact that peace is often included across the social sciences, research has focused on understanding the conditions that promote war, violence and aggression. What is known as Positive Peace is much more than the absence of violence; it’s the attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies. These factors act in a systemic way, such that focusing on all factors is important; yet understanding the causality between the different factors is difficult and will vary from situation to situation. Therefore, studying Positive Peace is a concerted attempt to identify positive states and processes, acknowledging that the drivers of peace may not be the same as the drivers of conflict.

IEP has developed conceptual frameworks to define and measure both Negative and Positive Peace. The annual Global Peace Index provides a comprehensive measure of Negative Peace for 162 countries. Whether it is interpersonal violence of a direct physical, sexual and psychological nature committed by family members, acquaintances or strangers, or collective violence driven by cultural, political or economic manifestations, it is captured under the conceptual umbrella of Negative Peace. Conversely, the Pillars of Peace, a framework identified by analyzing 4,700 data sets, indexes and attitudinal surveys, along with applicable literature, describes the set of attitudes, institutions and structures that strengthen a nation’s capacity to build and sustain peace.

Above all, these Positive Peace factors are intertwined with societal resilience. Nations with low levels of Positive Peace are less likely to remain flexible, “pull together,” and rebound in the face of crisis—of crucial importance, as many of the future challenges to peace can be foreseen. It is widely recognized that natural and human-made shocks and stresses will continue to occur due to the structural pressures of fiscal imbalances, increased urbanization and future political tensions. With the growth of these structural risks, building the resilience of nations and cities becomes critical, as does understanding the momentum of socio-systems so as to affect positive change. The interconnected nature of the global community means that improvements in peace in any area of the world have positive flow-on effects globally.

Fortunately, peace has kept its place in the development agenda. Notably, the Open Working Group’s proposed Sustainable Development Goals recognized the intersection of Negative and Positive Peace by including Goal 16. Twelve targets that range from reductions in violence to increasing the inclusiveness and accountability of institutions underpin Goal 16. In reviewing existing global datasets, IEP has found that 11 of these targets can be measured currently by indicators.
There is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society.

Peaceful countries tend to spend less containing violence, freeing up economic resources that can be invested in more productive areas. Further, peaceful environments are associated with greater equality, both economic and gender; stronger business environments; better transparency; and higher well-being. An ambitious development agenda acknowledges that peace is more than simply stopping violence, as peace creates the environment that allows human potential to flourish.

Positive Peace indicators can help orient the post-2015 agenda to more preventative—and ultimately prosperous—aims rather than simply focusing on after-the-fact consequences. A peaceful environment with low levels of violence, insecurity and fear also provides a strong environment for business and investment. Peaceful countries tend to spend less containing violence, freeing up economic resources that can be invested in more productive areas. Further, peaceful environments are associated with greater equality, both economic and gender; stronger business environments; better transparency; and higher well-being. An ambitious development agenda acknowledges that peace is more than simply stopping violence, as peace creates the environment that allows human potential to flourish.

There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict should be a specific target in the larger development agenda. Armed conflicts leave long-lasting scars on children who often witness and are victims of traumatic experiences. Similarly, children in conflict settings are often forced to commit violent acts themselves—for

Positive Peace indicators can help orient the post-2015 agenda to more preventative—and ultimately prosperous—aims rather than simply focusing on after-the-fact consequences. A peaceful environment with low levels of violence, insecurity and fear also provides a strong environment for business and investment. Peaceful countries tend to spend less containing violence, freeing up economic resources that can be invested in more productive areas. Further, peaceful environments are associated with greater equality, both economic and gender; stronger business environments; better transparency; and higher well-being. An ambitious development agenda acknowledges that peace is more than simply stopping violence, as peace creates the environment that allows human potential to flourish.

There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict should be a specific target in the larger development agenda. Armed conflicts leave long-lasting scars on children who often witness and are victims of traumatic experiences. Similarly, children in conflict settings are often forced to commit violent acts themselves—for
example, by being used as child soldiers or indoctrinated by extremist groups—and may have a difficult time finding their place in society after they are released. If we do not address their needs and promote their demobilization and reintegration into communities, they may contribute to the stalling, if not the reversal, of development.

Research shows that children who suffer violence and abuse—common in situations of armed conflict—are less likely to succeed in school and more likely to engage in risky behaviors. Without the right care or psychosocial assistance, children who have been abducted, maimed, used as child soldiers or sexually abused suffer consequences that prevent them from attaining their full potential as productive citizens. Access to justice and reparations is also essential. Real development is not possible where the rule of law and accountability are absent.

In addition to the direct effect on children’s physical and emotional well-being, armed conflicts disrupt children’s access to education and health care. Today’s armed conflicts increasingly see schools and hospitals in the direct line of fire. The attacks on these facilities undermine social and human capital formation and severely compromise prospects for economic development. Development stalls when children’s education is disrupted and their health is jeopardized as a result of armed conflict.

If we fail to protect children affected by armed conflict today, yet another generation is at risk of getting swallowed up by a new cycle of violence, a fundamental barrier to development. This is why I am convinced that placing the protection of children in situations of armed conflict at the heart of development goals will contribute to building stronger and more prosperous societies.

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT
Goals have brought the world a long way since 2000. Countries have been unified around one set of development objectives, and a genuine culture of purpose has been established.

Despite this progress, as negotiations around the post-2015 development agenda continue, no one could deny the enormity of the challenges we are facing. Fundamental to these challenges is the fact that the MDGs failed to incorporate the protection and promotion of human rights.

Support did not reach those many people around the globe who are systematically denied their human rights by their governments on a daily basis. This has been most aptly represented in fragile and conflict-affected states—areas where development aspirations have largely failed. The link between the existence of conflict and violence, persistent underdevelopment and widespread abuse of human rights cannot be ignored in the forthcoming development agenda.

In order to succeed where the MDGs did not, the post-2015 agenda must integrate and embed human rights across all of its goals. At a very minimum, the Sustainable Development Goals must be based on existing human rights standards and not be allowed to fall below them. The inclusion of Goal 16 on peaceful societies represents significant progress—and could be further strengthened if targets represent stronger linkages with universal human rights.

However, to be truly transformative, governments cannot simply sign on to the new SDGs, but must live up to their responsibility to inform their populations about the promises they have signed up for—because, put simply, people cannot claim their rights unless they know them first. Targets that aim to develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels and

People around the world have demanded that the post-2015 framework be built on human rights and the universal values of equality, justice, peace and security. World leaders now have a responsibility to listen to the voices in their own countries.
Support did not reach those many people around the globe who are systematically denied their human rights by their governments on a daily basis. This has been most aptly represented in fragile and conflict-affected states—areas where development aspirations have largely failed.

ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels will help this process.

Although the new agenda will be non-binding, effective systems to measure and evaluate human rights-based goals and targets need to be agreed upon for the post-2015 world, both to allow individuals and communities to hold their states to account for their progress and to assist states to monitor and improve their own performances. Once these systems are in place, it is crucial that people are able to obtain justice if and when their governments don’t deliver. Full respect for the rights already enshrined in existing human rights treaties and standards, and access to remedies where these rights are violated, are vital elements in making sure citizens are able to hold their governments to account for their commitments.

There have been some encouraging signals to date during the negotiations, including calls for a framework that “leaves no country and no person behind”; references to human rights, rule of law, the promotion of peaceful societies, poverty elimination, gender equality and women’s empowerment; and a reaffirmed commitment to the program of action of the International Conference on Population and Development.

But there is still a long way to go until the final agenda is decided in September 2015, and delivering real change where it is most desperately needed can only be solved by recognizing the crucial role that human rights play in this process.

People around the world have demanded that the post-2015 framework be built on human rights and the universal values of equality, justice, peace and security. World leaders now have a responsibility to listen to the voices in their own countries, and to act on their peoples’ aspirations of living with dignity, free from fear and want. The people who stand to gain—or lose—the most from the post-2015 negotiations must not be shut out from the process.
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