

A Feminist Perspective on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

Ana Ines Abelenda¹

World leaders and diverse development actors are currently embroiled in a series of negotiations around a new global development agenda to follow the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) once they expire in 2015. The Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) has been heavily involved in seeking to shape the new agenda to ensure that it adequately addresses human rights, including women's rights and gender equality. The negotiation process has been complex, frustrating at times for civil society and women's rights advocates, yet a historical opportunity to re-shape global understandings of development in the struggle towards social, economic, ecological and gender justice. As the world navigates a context of multiple intersecting global crises coupled with increasing inequality and militarism, it becomes clear that business as usual is not an option. A paradigm shift is needed. This position paper presents a feminist analysis to help unpack what is at stake for people and the planet by pushing the envelope on the kind of world we want to live in. This approach is one which both AWID and the author believe is key to systemic change. A mere look at the "shopping list" of goals and targets currently on the negotiating table is not enough. Feminist and progressive social movements must not bypass the opportunity to challenge the systemic root causes in the current economic system that continue to undermine women's autonomy and the achievement of human rights for all.

Background: The Notion of Development at the Crossroads

A report by Oxfam International released in January 2014 asserts that 85 of the world's richest people own the equivalent of the wealth of the poorer half of the world's population.² Massive economic inequality has become the global status quo. Not only extreme

and persistent between the global North and the global South, but increasing and entrenching within countries of the North and South alike. Globalised inequality does not mean that some regions do not still suffer disproportionately from the specific legacies

and continued application of colonialism, occupation or global economic apartheid. Africa, Asia and Latin America are richly endowed with mineral assets that are essential for the development and industrialised growth of a large part of the planet, yet the vast majority of globally impoverished peoples are from and living in the global South.

There are those who persist in asserting that economic growth, facilitated by giving free reign to corporations and business, can sustain a tide that will (eventually) raise all boats.³ The belief in the so-called "trickle-down effect" yet remains.⁴ However, it is unmistakable that the policies of privatisation and liberalisation that have been the hallmark of the neo-liberal model driving the global economy, the financial system, and aid and development policies over the past three decades have sustained a trajectory of deepening inequalities, gender injustice and environmental destruction that the world can ill afford.⁵ The notion of development that has prevailed for the past decades, built for the most part upon the premise of limitless economic growth, is thus going through an ideological crisis.

This assertion is at the background of deliberations taking place at the United Nations (UN) in the run up to 2015 when a new set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will be agreed to succeed the MDGs. This scenario presents a renewed opportunity for progressive civil society and women's rights advocates in particular to challenge the systemic root causes of the failing development model to date and demand a framework less focused on economic growth figures and more on people's wellbeing, environmental sustainability and gender justice.

The UN legitimacy as the only true democratic space for decision-making on global

standards for development is also at stake in the post-2015 negotiation process. The increasing co-optation – by powerful groups of countries like the G8 and G20 or influential corporate sector gatherings like the World Economic Forum – of the power to set global development priorities, often with little or no participation of the most impoverished countries and even less so of civil society, is a significant concern.

Across its history, the UN has made great strides in building global consensus and commitments around universal development frameworks and rights: like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, the Declaration on the Right to Development 1986 and notably during the conferences of the 1990's that marked the advancement of the women's rights agenda.⁶

The post-2015 process is thus a key opportunity for the UN to reclaim its global leadership in development agenda-setting with an ambitious outlook that has human rights at the centre and that addresses the structural causes of impoverishment, oppression and exploitation. In this effort, the UN must ensure a truly participatory process that brings all actors to the table on an equal footing.

The Unfinished Business of the Millennium Development Goals and Lessons Learned

Thousands of analyses and reports have been written on the achievements, gaps and failures of the MDGs.⁷ Without aiming to add to the pile, here I shall look briefly at their unfinished business from a women's human rights perspective as a way to draw lessons for the current state of negotiations on the post-2015 agenda.

One of the major criticisms of the MDGs as the tools for achieving development is that

the framework does not include a consideration of the larger macroeconomic context, in particular, the global financial and economic structural crisis and its impact on the implementation of those goals. By isolating development from the macroeconomic context, the MDGs have indirectly legitimised neoliberal policies⁸ as a basis for funding and implementation of the development agenda, rather than as part of the problem. As a consequence, the free-market economy which is promoted by International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and free trade agreements both outside and inside the sphere of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and which benefits transnational corporations and powerful countries, continues unperturbed while threatening sustainable development and human rights. For example, a report released by Eurodad in 2012 states that

“In 2010 external investments to the private sector by IFIs exceeded \$40 billion. By 2015, the amount flowing to the private sector is expected to exceed \$100 billion – making up almost one third of external public finance to developing countries.”⁹

At the same time, according to data from the World Bank and Fortune Magazine, the revenues of mega-corporations Royal Dutch Shell, Exxon Mobil and Wal-Mart were larger than the GDP of 110 national economies, or more than half the world's countries.¹⁰ The revenues of Royal Dutch Shell – known for its practices violating human rights in Nigeria in the 1990's and responsible for contamination, leaks, explosions and other toxic events at many of its operations around the world¹¹ – were on par with the GDP of Norway and dwarfed the GDP of Thailand, Denmark and Venezuela.

The Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development agreed by governments in

2002 provided the financing framework for the MDGs and confirmed a market approach to development and its financing.¹²

Another aspect that is considered problematic by many civil society organisations and women's rights advocates – and thus to be avoided going forward – is the fact that the MDGs agenda was not defined through a participatory multi-stakeholder dialogue, but through a top-down process where decisions on priorities were taken behind closed doors amongst powerful countries and institutions.¹³ This lack of participation by civil society undermined democratic ownership and provided little institutional space for citizens around the globe to demand accountability to their states for the progress made on those goals.

Specifically regarding gender equality and women's rights, the MDGs missed the opportunity to fully integrate key women's rights instruments and significant inter-governmental agreements like the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women 1979 (CEDAW), or the Program of action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). Therefore, the MDGs addressed women's rights from a mere superficial level leaving out crucial aspects like the full achievement of sexual and reproductive rights, or the recognition of women's unpaid work as a key obstacle for the achievement of gender equality.¹⁴

Of course, the MDGs framework addresses important urgent issues like improving girls' access to education, women's political participation, addressing maternal mortality and stopping the spread of HIV and AIDS.¹⁵ However, it fails to link these to the profound root causes of gender inequality, in particu-

lar to women's sexual and bodily autonomy and misogynistic norms and practices.¹⁶

Despite these shortcomings, there have been positive results in the advancement of women's rights using the MDGs, particularly from the experience with funding for MDG 3 (relating to gender equality and women's empowerment). The attention brought by the targets has created a strategic opportunity to extend greater dialogue between governments, the donor community and women's rights organisations allowing richer analysis on the barriers to women's full enjoyment of rights. AWID's experience has been that MDG 3 has played an important role in galvanising financial and institutional support for women's rights and gender equality. AWID's own research on the Dutch MDG3 Fund demonstrates the lasting positive impacts of allocating specific funds to the advancement of women's rights, particularly for women's rights organisations and movements as opposed to relying on gender mainstreaming alone to provide the needed changes for women on the ground.¹⁷

Whether looking at the MDGs from a glass half-empty or glass half-full perspective, the inclusion and implementation of the full body of women's human rights in the global development agenda is an unfinished business that cannot be forgotten when moving forward in any new agenda that aims to improve and replace the old framework.

Who Shapes the New Agenda? Women's Rights Organising for Transformation

While there have been considerable efforts and resources invested in consulting civil society including women's organisations both online and face-to-face across regions in the initial stages of the post-2015 process,¹⁸ the current phase of intergovernmental nego-

tiations leading up to 2015 is shrinking the space for participation. The official UN discourse is that of an unprecedented multi-stakeholder process but just how much of it is really a "pantomime" of CSOs participation remains to be seen now that decision-making moves to private rooms and small committees where only a maximum of 30 government representatives are allowed in.¹⁹

As feminist activists have learned from many UN contexts where women's rights are discussed (for example at the 58th session of the Commission on the Status of Women held March 2014 in New York),²⁰ a roll-back on hard won gains is a real possibility in the face of increased presence and influence of conservative and fundamentalist forces in international policy fora. Indeed, as the UN attempts to build international consensus around a new development agenda, the complex array of interests and influence between states, the corporate sector and civil society with fundamentalist agendas²¹ against the advancement of rights are creating significant pressures on feminist gains.

Aware that collective voices united are stronger than a myriad of separate voices, women's rights networks and gender equality advocates across regions have been organising and strategising as a collective movement on the run up to 2015 to jointly influence the negotiation processes within the UN. The Women's Major Group (WVG),²² for example, currently comprises over 500 women's human rights, environment and development organisations, activists and academics, and has substantively engaged in the post-2015 consultations and negotiations since they began to take shape at the Rio+20 Summit in July 2012. The structure of the major groups was born out of the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit held in Brazil in 1992, where governments recognised women as

one of the nine important groups in society to achieve sustainable development.²³ A series of different thematic advocacy teams within the WMG, allowed for consistent input to the 13 sessions of the Open Working Group on SDGs and the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing,²⁴ both processes that took place during 2013 and well into 2014.

The Post-2015 Women's Coalition²⁵ represents another collective of women's rights and gender equality advocates across regions engaged in the post-2015 process. Initiated by a group of like-minded organisations previously connected through the Gender Equality Architecture Reform Campaign and other international advocacy efforts focused on the realisation of women's rights and gender equality, the coalition gathers feminist, women's rights and development, grassroots and social justice organisations working to challenge and reframe the global development agenda.

In February 2014 a Feminist Strategy Meeting was organised by the Center for Women's Global Leadership, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, International Planned Parenthood Federation – Western Hemisphere Region, Realizing Sexual and Reproductive Justice Alliance, and Women in Europe for a Common Future. The three-day meeting brought together representatives of feminist and women's rights organisations and networks working on sexual and reproductive rights and health, environment, agriculture, economic and social rights, peace and security, gender-based violence and women's human rights, with the aim of producing a shared vision and strategy toward 2015. The meeting resulted in a joint statement "Gender, Economic, Social and Ecological Justice for Sustainable Development – A Feminist Declaration for Post-2015" ("the

Feminist Declaration").²⁶ The Feminist Declaration calls for a truly transformative post-2015 agenda based on gender, economic, social and ecological justice.

The mobilisations by women's rights and feminist advocates described above, in which AWID has been an active participant and supporter, have been crucial in pushing for progressive language in the proposal put forward by the Open Working Group on SDGs. Far from settling for a gender equality goal as the minimum common denominator, women's movements demand more ambition to really push forward a transformative agenda. They are aware that any set of goals agreed on will only be good intentions on paper if they do not come hand in hand with solid monitoring and accountability frameworks and concrete funding based on human rights and justice principles.

The 17-goal Proposal of the Open Working Group on SDGs

The General Assembly's Open Working Group on SDGs concluded its mandate in July 2014 producing a final outcome report, also known as the "zero draft", with a proposal for 17 sustainable development goals to submit to the 68th session of the UN General Assembly as part of the post-2015 process.²⁷ Below I offer a glimpse at some of the key aspects of the Open Working Group's proposal, analyse these targets from a feminist lens and reflect on the gains and battles ahead for women's rights advocates.

What Has Been Gained?

In a statement released on 24 July, the WMG welcomed the zero draft "as a significant step forward" and considered it "a commendable achievement" that the document was adopted especially given the "complex negotiation

process amidst sharp differences and disputes among member states”.²⁸

Indeed, the inclusion of a stand-alone goal on gender equality and empowerment of women and girls (Goal 5) is a sign of hope. It currently includes key issues previously disregarded in the MDGs framework, including: the elimination of all forms of violence and discrimination against women; addressing early and forced marriage and harmful practices against women and girls; universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights; recognition of unpaid domestic and care work; and women’s equal rights to land and economic resources.

The fact that gender equality and women’s rights are addressed in different goal areas was also an important gain. Key areas beyond the stand-alone goal that include gendered targets include equal rights to education and life-long learning (Goal 4); a right to decent work (Goal 8.5); and equal pay for work of equal value (Goal 8.5).

The inclusion of a stand-alone goal on inequalities within and between countries is also a positive outcome as this is imperative to addressing the root causes of impoverishment. Similarly, the targets that seek to reverse the trend towards ever growing income inequalities by reforming global financial systems and fiscal measures are critical to shift the global system that perpetuates impoverishment.

Other key gains in the current framework include the goal on peaceful inclusive societies and its targets on participatory decision making, as well as that on access to justice and reducing arms flows. Unlike the MDGs, the Open Working Group proposal presents standalone goals on ecosystems (Goal 15), oceans and seas (Goal 14), sustainable con-

sumption and production patterns (Goal 12) and on climate change (Goal 13.b) that recognise the role of women.

What Is Missing?

In spite of the concrete recommendations from civil society organisations and some progressive governments, the report misses the opportunity to envision structural transformation. It does not refer to concrete mechanisms for the leverage of alternative visions for development. Nor does it call to change the global economic system and dismantle the existing systems that channel resources and wealth from developing countries to wealthy countries and from people to corporations.

In the statement released on 24 July 2014 mentioned above, the WMG reacted to the final outcome report with a list of “eight red flags” to signal the areas where the official proposal is still not sufficiently ambitious or transformative and fails to fulfil the entire spectrum of women’s right standards, principles, commitments and norms. These flags are:

- Absence of human rights;
- Sexual and reproductive health targets do not go far enough;
- Concentration of power and wealth imbalances that deepen poverty and inequalities within and between countries are not sufficiently addressed, and the agenda lacks targets to reverse this trend;
- There are no provisions to reduce and redistribute women’s unpaid care and domestic work;
- The call for more productivity based on technology in Goal 2 fails to recognise that women are key for sustainable natural resource management;

- Insufficient attention to women's role in peace and justice;
- Enthusiasm for private sector financing and public-private partnerships lacking references to their accountability;
- Missing recognition of fair and equitable access to technology, including addressing intellectual property barriers.

In addition to these flags, the following areas of concern are worth noting ahead of the negotiation phase of the post-2015 process. Any development agenda must be geared towards the progressive realisation of human rights for all and ensure the use of the maximum available resources for their achievement and fulfilment without retrogression. Secondly, to seriously address structural poverty and inequality, decision makers must look beyond cash transfer processes and into reframing the role of the state, ensuring an equitable distribution of wealth, services and resources, social protection, decent work and sustainable modes of production and consumption. Furthermore, innovative funding mechanisms need to ensure that policy coherence between different kinds of policies, such as those regarding aid, financial regulation and trade, are aligned to national development plans and to internationally agreed human rights obligations and commitments. And lastly, a comprehensive assessment of existing and future partnerships among different stakeholders for implementation of the post-2015 agenda should be carried out through a governance model that ensures ex-ante transparency and accountability. Stronger commitments are needed from governments to implementing and enforcing clear rules for corporations and financial actors' accountability, in alignment with human rights and for the protection of the environment.

Where Is the Money?

In addition to the necessity of developing a transformative development agenda incorporating a global consensus on clear goals for development justice, implementation is critical to making the agenda effective and this will invariably be linked to the funding possibilities. Debates around the means of implementation have been the predominant bottleneck in post-2015 negotiations.²⁹ Curiously, substantial discussions around financing for development in the post-2015 agenda will likely not take place at the General Assembly next month but are being pushed back to July 2015 when a meeting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia is set to take place to follow up on the process of Financing for Development started in Monterrey in 2002.

Large parts of civil society and women's rights organisations are calling for structural transformation to financing which demands looking well beyond aid and into changing the global financial architecture.³⁰ This implies dealing with illicit financial flows that drain public reserves and translate into fewer national resources available to improve access to key areas such as education, health-care, or social protection. It also means taking bold steps on fiscal policies including, for example, the introduction of an international financial transaction tax to raise public revenue, and debt cancellation.

The development assistance model that emerged out of colonial relationships and is driven by a logic that prioritises markets and economic growth seems to be deep-rooted. AWID is noting that recent international processes have strongly affirmed the roles of diverse stakeholders in development: not just traditional bilateral donors and multi-lateral institutions, but also South-South coopera-

tion actors, private sector actors, philanthropic institutions, individual philanthropists and civil society organisations.

Mechanisms and sources of development financing and philanthropy are becoming increasingly diversified, but economic growth and return on investment are the priority, with human rights and wellbeing taking a backseat. Yet the context is complex precisely because of the increasing diversity of actors and agendas taking part. Just as states cannot be treated as a monolithic actor, neither can these new funding “partners”. These actors represent a range of agendas and experiences, with powerful groups coming from both traditional donor countries and emerging economies, and thus presenting complex challenges and diverse opportunities in terms of leveraging support for gender equality and women’s rights.³¹

If donors continue to channel resources only to those approaches that produce quick, “measurable” results by working on the symptoms of gender inequality – like individual access to resources – then fewer women’s rights organisations will be able to work effectively or adequately on root causes in their multiple dimensions.

The international community has the opportunity to play a critical role in influencing how far we can advance on gender and social justice. The wealth of experience of the women’s rights movement must be used to inform the best strategies and initiatives to be supported.

Alternative Development Strategies: An Elusive Debate

At the beginning of this article I noted how debates around the post-2015 could be an opportunity for feminist organisations and

activists to challenge the mainstream development model based on limitless economic growth. There are timid hints at this idea in the proposals of the Open Working Group when referring to ensuring sustainable production and consumption patterns (Goal 12). But the reality is that the official proposal chose to ignore diverse alternative strategies coming from peoples’ movements and communities like experiences with agro-ecology, solidarity economies, *Buen Vivir*, or communal resource management and chose instead to look for innovation coming from technical private sector experts.

The current dominant economic paradigm grounded in the legitimisation of “market based development”, privatisation and liberalisation is increasingly being challenged for its role in perpetuating inequality, impoverishment, and environmental destruction.³² The conditions under which multi-national corporations are operating, imposed and promoted by international financial institutions and the extraction of resources being negotiated and accepted by “developing” country governments demonstrates that sovereignty and self-determination remain elusive goals. Extractivism, proven to cause the impoverishment of the majority, is still part and parcel of development frameworks.³³ Extractivist models provide only limited development gains in resource rich countries, with selective sectors developed through specific industries useful for providing lucrative returns to corporations and capital exporting countries creating skewed economic “growth” unnoticeable in development indices. Women are disproportionately impacted by extractivism, particularly in resource rich developing countries. For example, WoMin conducted a collection of six case studies on Sub-Saharan Africa,³⁴ where women are responsible for 60% to 80% of domestic food

production, documenting the displacement of poor peasant communities, the majority of them women, and the increased burden on women's shoulders to care for sick workers and family members, resulting from polluted soils and waters.

In the struggles for the protection of lives and livelihoods, increasing numbers of the most severely impacted are exposing the naked truths of the results of three decades of privatisation and liberalisation imposed on their countries in the name of development. Privatisation of public services has dramatically reduced access to adequate education, health care, water and energy, with disproportionate negative impacts on women around the world. The feminization of impoverishment is a result of the compounding effects of multiple oppressions experienced by people gendered as women and exploited as poor.³⁵ Women's position in the global economy continues to be one of gender-based exploitation with their work undervalued in domestic subsistence, reproduction and in unwaged household production.³⁶

Social movements, scholars and activists in many parts of the world are making the connections between the ways in which the global economy functions and the urgent social, environmental and political crises facing humanity. Increasingly, people in every region of the world are protesting the negative impact of those crises on their lives. They are also resisting the narrowing of space and opportunities for the democratic determination of the ways in which their societies meet the needs of people and ensure the wellbeing of present and future generations. These voices of resistance insist that deep structural transformations, grounded in the principles of justice, human rights, women's rights, and environmental sustainability are required.

Conclusion

The outcomes of a new international development consensus must go beyond seeking agreement on shopping lists of band-aid solutions to advance collective strategies that address the demonstrated failures of current development models. It must go beyond negotiations that trade rights against development, that speak in Southern development and Northern aid dichotomies, to one that acknowledges a need for deep global structural transformation. It must seek to bring about just and healthy economies, which form the basis for the realisation of the fulfilment of the full gamut of rights and freedoms, including economic, social and women's rights, rather than merely attempt to make the existing order appear less egregious in its exploitation.

Civil society groups and organisations are making efforts to confront the increasing dominance on local and global public policy by the corporate sector and international financial institutions and the narrowing of democratic political space for challenging economic models that maintain and deepen inequalities. In the post-2015 negotiations many women's rights and feminist organisations are challenging the persistent neoliberal assumptions within development discourse and practice that perpetuate inequity and impoverishment and that entrench gender inequality and injustice.

The status of the majority of women in all societies – our struggles, our knowledge and experience – not only provides insight into the ways in which exploitation and impoverishment function today, but also the possibilities for transforming this status to serve life and the wellbeing of planet and peoples, today and for future generations. There are pockets of peoples' movements across the

world that have taken up the task (some with their governments, others in opposition to them) of determining their path of development. The task of reformulating the world's advancement towards equity, justice, rights and sustainability is daunting but one which we cannot afford not to take on for ourselves and future generations.

It is time to acknowledge with humility and with hope that transformative change is possible. Multiple and concurrent systemic crises (energy, food, finance and climate) pose serious and difficult challenges for governments, development practitioners and donors, activists and policy-makers to mitigate the social impacts in the short and medium terms. It is critical that global

negotiations situate their responses to the immediate crises within a longer-term perspective that provides a genuine basis for optimism to move the world beyond the fatalism of the era of MDGs. Negotiations regarding models of development, financing for development, and democratisation of public policy must be carried out in light of the recognition of the increasing concentration of corporate power within societies and global institutions, with concomitant lack of accountability, as well as the impacts of economic policies of privatisation and liberalisation that have been the hallmark of the neo-liberal ideology driving the global economy, the financial system, and aid and development policies over the past three decades.

-
- 1 With input from Hakima Abbas, Lydia Alpízar, Nerea Carviotto, Molly Kane and Alejandra Scampini. The Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) is an international, feminist, membership organisation committed to achieving gender equality, sustainable development and women's human rights. Ana Abelenda has worked at AWID since 2011, currently as Programme Coordinator in the Economic Justice & Financing for Women's Rights Area. Through sustained advocacy and knowledge building, she has struggled to put women's rights and gender equality at the centre of macroeconomic and development policies globally.
 - 2 Oxfam International, *Working for the Few: Political capture and economic inequality*, 178 Oxford Briefing Paper, 20 January 2014.
 - 3 See for instance the Global Compact report that claims that "business is the heart of virtually any widespread improvement in living standards". UN Global Compact, *Corporate Sustainability and the United Nations Post-2015 Development Agenda*, 17 June 2013, p. 16.
 - 4 The report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the post-2015 Development Agenda also supports this idea when it asserts that "with slightly faster growth and attention to ensuring that no one is left behind we can eradicate extreme poverty altogether". See *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development - The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, 2013, p. 32.
 - 5 See, for example, the works of Joseph Stiglitz, Diane Elson, Naila Kabeer and Shahra Razavi documenting the effects of liberalisation in increasing inequality worldwide and impacting women disproportionately.
 - 6 I refer here to the landmark UN conferences that resulted in the Beijing Platform for Action (1995), the ICPD Program of Action (1994), the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action (1993), and the UN Conference on Environment and Development (1992), to name a few.

- 7 Aside from the vast analysis in reports produced by UN Agencies such as UN Women, UNDP and UNICEF, among others, a detailed analysis on the subject matter can be found in the expert paper prepared by AWID, "Have the Millennium Development Goals promoted gender equality and women's rights?" published by UN Women, in collaboration with ECLAC, *Expert Group Meeting, Structural and policy constraints in achieving the MDGs for women and girls*, EGM/MDG/EP.12, October 2013.
- 8 Some of these policies include promotion of free trade, privatisation, reduced government spending on social programmes, increases in spending on subsidies to business and security, deregulation of businesses, no curbs on foreign investors, low taxes on the wealthy and corporations, minimal labor and environmental protections, no subsidies or supports for poor people and sectors, etc.
- 9 Kwakkenbos, J., *Private profit for public good? Can investing in private companies deliver for the poor?*, Eurodad, May 2012, p. 3.
- 10 White, S., *The Top 175 Global Economic Entities*, 11 August 2012, available at: <http://dstevenwhite.com/2012/08/11/the-top-175-global-economic-entities-2011>.
- 11 For more details, see Mattera, P., "Royal Dutch Shell: Corporate Rap Sheet", *Corporate Research Project*, 18 April 2013, available at: <http://www.corp-research.org/royal-dutch-shell>.
- 12 See, for example, Floro, M., Çagatay, N. et al., *Gender Issues and Concerns in Financing for Development*, IN-STRAW Occasional Paper No. 3, March 2004.
- 13 For further analysis on the complex history of the birth of the MDGs, the key actors involved and their re-formulation across years, see Hulme, D., *Governing Global Poverty? Global Ambivalence and the Millennium Development Goals*, Brooks World Poverty Institute and University of Manchester, May 2009.
- 14 For a more detailed explanation on the gaps of the MDGs regarding women's rights see AWID, "Women and the Millennium Development Goals", AWID, 12 February 2008, available at: <http://www.awid.org/Library/Women-and-the-Millennium-Development-Goals>.
- 15 These commitments can be found in Goal 3 (Promote gender equality and empower women); Goal 5, target 5.A - Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio; and Goal 6 target 6.A (have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS).
- 16 See, for example, Woods, Z., *Sexual and reproductive health: A foundation for achieving the MDGs*, United Nations, Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), EGM/BPFA-MD-MDG/2005/EP.9, 8 February 2005.
- 17 Batiwala, S., *Women Moving Mountains: The Collective Impact of the Dutch MDG3 Fund*, AWID, December 2013.
- 18 For more information on the consultation processes and civil society participation at the national, regional and international levels, see the briefs prepared by UN-NGLS, available at: <http://www.un-ngls.org/spip.php?article4363>.
- 19 For instance, the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing that concluded its mandate in August 2014 comprised only 30 experts nominated by regional groups. Consultations with civil society, including the Women's Major Group were scarce but for a few multi-stakeholder outreach events. More information is available from the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1558>.
- 20 For further reading on the politics at play at the 58th session of the Commission on the Status of Women, see Tolmay, S., and Scampini, A., *CSW58 - Too Much Time Spent Pushing Back*, AWID, 4 April 2014.
- 21 See, for example, Horn, J., *Christian Fundamentalisms and Women's Rights in the African Context: Mapping the Terrain*, AWID, 2009, pp. 9-10.
- 22 More information on the Women's Major Group, its membership, positions, analysis and statements presented at different UN spaces is available at: <http://www.womenmajorgroup.org/>.
- 23 *Ibid.*
- 24 More information about these intergovernmental tracks of negotiations and their outcomes is available from Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, above, note 19.
- 25 More information on the Post-2015 Women's Coalition, its membership, positions, analysis and statements presented at different UN spaces is available at: <http://www.post2015women.com/>.
- 26 The full text of the Feminist Declaration and the list of signatories as of 15 February 2014 is available at: <http://www.wecf.eu/download/2014/March/FeministsPost2015Declaration.pdf>.

- 27 The outcome document is available on the Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform above, note 19, at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/focussdgs.html>.
- 28 Women's Major Group, *Women's '8 Red Flags' following the conclusion of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*, 21 July 2014.
- 29 Third World Network, *SDG negotiations reveal the hard fight for means of implementation*, 24 July 2014.
- 30 For instance, the Righting Finance Initiative, of which AWID is a part. Further information is available at: http://www.rightingfinance.org/?page_id=2.
- 31 See Miller, J., Arutyunova, A., and Clark, C., *New Actors, New Money, New Conversations: A Mapping of Recent Initiatives for Women and Girls*, AWID, January 2014.
- 32 See above, note 5.
- 33 Extractivism is the appropriation of huge volumes of natural resources or their intensive exploitation, most of them exported as raw materials to the global market. Further research on this phenomenon is available at Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Sustainability, "Extractivism and Development in Latin America: A collection of article from Blog NuSo", available at: <http://www.fes-sustainability.org/en/extractivism-and-development-latin-america>.
- 34 WoMin, *Women, Gender and Extractivism in Africa: A Summary Of WoMin Papers*, 2013.
- 35 Chen, M., Vanek, J., Lund, F., Heintz, J., Jhabvala, R., Bonner, C., *Progress of the World's Women 2005: Women, Work and Poverty*, UNIFEM, 2005.
- 36 *Ibid.*