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The UN development system: important, yet inconspicuous to Civil Society

By Sarah Dayringer

The United Nations – a 70-year-old institution – has reached an inflection point and like other institutions, is facing challenges in rapidly demanding times, challenges to which it must adapt in order to survive. Some Member States are asking if this important institution will maintain its relevance and credibility. They’re asking whether the UN development system will be able to be country-led and to deliver to all countries, and in particular demonstrate its commitment to implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The UN to discuss Inequality and Taxes

In addition to its full programme (see below), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations has called for a special meetings in the first six months of 2016 to accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (ASD). The issues to be addressed require ambitious policy changes at national and global levels if the 2030 ASD is to be realized: Inequality and Tax Matters.

Technology and SDGs

One of the concrete commitments from the Addis Ababa Action Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 ASD) is the Technology Facilitation Mechanism (TFM). Spearheaded by Brazil and France, the development of the TFM has been described by Sérgio Rodrigues dos Santos of Brazil, as a “testimony to the strength of multilateralism through collective action.”

For more, see globalpolicywatch.org | Follow Global Policy Watch on Twitter
In the Footsteps of Dag Hammarskjöld

On 16 February 2016 Egyptian diplomat Boutros Boutros-Ghali died aged 93. He was so far the only Secretary-General of the United Nations, who served in office one term only (1992-1996). In his homage, Henning Melber (among other things Policy Advisor to Global Policy Forum) remembers the first African Secretary-General and draws a comparison between him and Dag Hammarskjöld. "As different as Hammarskjöld and Boutros-Ghali might have been in their background, their socialization, their character and personality, as much alike was their approach as regards the independence of their office."

Better Regulation - TTIP under the Radar?

The EU’s “Better Regulation” agenda, despite being less known than TTIP, seeks to improve Europe’s competitiveness by reducing the regulatory costs for business through instruments that closely resemble those discussed under TTIP. In a new report, the European Environmental Bureau, Bread for the World and Forum Umwelt & Entwicklung raise concerns over the “Better Regulation” project proposed by the Juncker Commission. According to the organizations, such a measure to curb regulation is unlikely to achieve its primary aim of improving Europe’s competitiveness. Efforts to reduce the burden of environmental regulations on business will simply subsidize Europe’s least competitive businesses by allowing them to dump part of their production costs on the environment, leaving taxpayers and citizens to pay for this through increased health care costs and efforts to clean up the environment. The “Better Regulation” agenda fails to take into consideration the benefits to society as a whole deriving from regulation. Addressing global challenges will require the EU to adopt new, effective and often legally binding policies. A blanket requirement to offset any regulatory burden arising from new policies by slashing regulatory burdens elsewhere irrespective of the benefits arising would seriously hamper these efforts. Both under TTIP and through its unilateral “Better Regulation” agenda, the EU’s governance system is changing significantly with a stronger role for well resourced regulated industries to write their own rules.

Indicators of success: how best to measure Agenda 2030

Four months have now passed since Agenda 2030 was agreed at the UN in New York. Targets have been set under each of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, but the crucial matter of designating indicators to measure progress remains in the balance. In a new article, the Center of Economic and Social Rights reflects on the difficulties to choose indicators that really measure progress of the Agenda 2030. CESR is concerned over those indicators that have already been defined by the Inter-agency Expert Group on SDG Indicators, as several of them may lead to skewed and/or inadequate tracking of progress. This reality is problematic because indicators are not only measures by which progress can be judged; they also focus attention on particular groups or issues and create incentives for policy action. If an indicator is reductive and of questionable relevance, then it implicitly allows governments to get away with doing little to achieve the target, and this in turn undermines accountability.
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