



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/4/WG.2/TF/2
13 February 2007

Original: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
Fourth session
Working Group on the Right to Development
High-level task force on implementation
of the right to development
Third session
Geneva, 22-26 January 2007

REPORT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL TASK FORCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT ON ITS THIRD SESSION

Chairperson-Rapporteur: Stephen Marks

Summary

This report, submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 1/4, contains the summary of the proceedings, as well as the conclusions and recommendations of the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development for the consideration of the Working Group on the Right to Development.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1 - 3	3
I. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION	4 - 24	3
A. Opening of the session	4	3
B. Election of the Chairperson-Rapporteur	5	3
C. Adoption of the agenda	6	4
D. Attendance	7 - 13	4
E. Documentation	14	5
F. Statements by Member States and institutions	15 - 24	5
II. SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS	25 - 52	6
A. The African Peer Review Mechanism	30 - 37	7
B. The ECA/OECD-DAC Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness	38 - 41	9
C. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness	42 - 48	10
D. Lessons learned for a methodology to apply the criteria	49 - 52	12
III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	53 - 92	13
A. Conclusions	54 - 87	13
B. Recommendations	88 - 92	20

Annexes

I. Agenda	21
II. Criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships from a right-to-development perspective	22
III. Suggested initial implementation checklist for the criteria	24
IV. List of documents	26

Introduction

1. At its fifth session, in February 2004, the Working Group on the Right to Development agreed to recommend to the Commission on Human Rights that it establish a high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development, within the framework of the Working Group, in order to assist it in fulfilling its mandate as reflected in paragraph 10 (a) of Commission resolution 1998/7. At its seventh session, in January 2006, the Working Group agreed to recommend to the Commission to extend the mandate of the Working Group and the high-level task force for a further period of one year (see E/CN.4/2006/26, paras. 76 and 77).
2. In its resolution 1/4 of 29 June 2006, the Human Rights Council decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group for a period of one year, requested the high-level task force to meet with a view to implementing the relevant recommendations contained in the report of the seventh session of the Working Group, and requested the Working Group to meet for a period of five working days in the first three months of 2007.
3. The high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development convened its third session in Geneva from 22 to 26 January 2007. As requested by the Working Group, the mandate of the task force was to consider the criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships - as identified in Millennium Development Goal 8 (MDG 8) - from the perspective of the right to development, with a view to operationalizing and progressively developing them, thus contributing to mainstreaming the right to development in the policies and operational activities of relevant actors at the national, regional and international levels, including multilateral financial, trade and development institutions (E/CN.4/2006/26, para. 77).

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION

A. Opening of the session

4. The high-level task force was opened by Ms. Maria Francisca Ize-Charrin, Director, Operations, Programmes and Research Division, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), followed by the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Right to Development, Mr. Ibrahim Salama (Egypt), who mentioned the important events relating to the right to development, which reflect a growing interest in the topic from different quarters. These included the commemorative conference organized by the Egyptian National Council for Human Rights in Cairo on 2-3 December 2006, which was attended primarily by national actors, and the expert meeting organized by the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Geneva, on 30 November 2006, attended by national development agencies. He noted the widespread support for the right to development in the new Human Rights Council, which promised considerable potential for the process to continue making progress. In conclusion, he introduced the members of the task force and representatives of the trade, development and financial institutions present.

B. Election of the Chairperson-Rapporteur

5. At its first meeting, on 22 January 2007, the high-level task force elected by acclamation Stephen Marks (United States of America) as Chairperson-Rapporteur.

C. Adoption of the agenda

6. At the same meeting, the task force adopted its agenda (A/HRC/4/WG.2/TF/1) and programme of work. The agenda as adopted is contained in annex I.

D. Attendance

7. The following members of the high-level task force attended the session: Solita Collas Monsod (Philippines); Stephen Marks (United States of America); Margaret Sekaggya (Uganda); Nicolaas Schrijver (Netherlands); and Jorge Vargas Gonzalez (Colombia).

8. Representatives of the following trade, development and financial institutions and organizations participated as experts: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO).

9. The Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group attended the meeting. The following experts also contributed to the work of the task force: Chris Stals (African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Panel of Eminent Persons), Susan Mathews (University of Tilburg) and Margot Salomon (London School of Economics).

10. Representatives of the following States members of the Human Rights Council attended the meeting of the high-level task force as observers: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Canada, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, France, Germany, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay, Zambia.

11. The following States were also represented at the high-level task force as observers: Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belarus, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chile, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Palestine, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe. Holy See was also represented.

12. The following United Nations bodies and intergovernmental organizations were represented: African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) secretariat, APRM National Governing Council Ghana, Organization of la Francophonie, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA).

13. The following non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were represented by observers: Asian Indigenous and Tribal People Network (AITPN), Franciscans International, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, International Service for Human Rights (ISHR), New Humanity and the University of New South Wales.

E. Documentation

14. The high-level task force had before it a number of pre-session and background documents to inform its deliberations. A complete list of documents is attached at annex IV.

F. Statements by Member States and institutions

15. In a statement on behalf of the European Union (EU) and associated countries, the observer for Germany commended the excellent work done by the high-level task force to support the Working Group on the Right to Development in the exercise of its mandate, and in particular its efforts to maintain a more practical focus in approaching the right to development by elaborating the criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships. He further expressed appreciation for the selected partnerships to be considered at the present meeting, which demonstrated considerable potential for synergies and lessons learned. In this regard, he suggested the potential benefits of examining bilateral partnerships, as well as partnerships based on a formal legal agreement on development cooperation, such as the Cotonou Agreement between the EU and the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States. The observer also welcomed references to a possible analysis of links between the right-to-development criteria and a human rights-based approach to development.

16. In a statement on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), the observer for Cuba welcomed the convening of the task force meeting, and expressed NAM's continuing support for the approach adopted by the Working Group at its fifth session in 2004, as well as for the work of the high-level task force. Twenty years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development, the international community continued to grapple with effective implementation of this inalienable right. Referring to the XIV NAM Summit held in Havana in September 2006 and General Assembly resolution 61/169 on the right to development, she reiterated NAM's call for the elevation of the right to development to the same level as other human rights, including through the elaboration of a convention on the right. The observer concluded by expressing hope that the debate would reflect an enhanced focus on the right to development aspects of the implementation of Millennium Development Goal 8 (MDG 8), premised on international cooperation.

17. The observer for India associated himself with the statement by NAM, wishing the task force success in its work. He looked forward to concrete contributions to the Working Group's next session.

18. The observer for Bangladesh expressed appreciation for the task force's work to date, and assured continued full support by his delegation. He emphasized the need for work on the right to development and international development cooperation to be mutually reinforcing.

19. The observer for Indonesia endorsed the remarks made on behalf of NAM, and welcomed the work of the task force on the right-to-development criteria. He expressed hope that discussions would continue to show progress, without questioning or reinterpreting the right to development. He mentioned prioritizing ways and means to elevate the right to development to a par with all other human rights, including the elaboration of a legally binding instrument.

20. The observer for China, in welcoming the meeting and continued progress on the mandate, referred to the importance of operationalizing the right to development, and paraphrased the new Secretary-General, Ban Ki-Moon, by saying that the true measure of success of the United Nations is not how much is promised, but how much is delivered to the ones who are most in need.

21. The observer for Algeria made a statement on behalf of the African Group, adhering to the statement on behalf of NAM, welcoming the session, stating the need for concrete results, and the implementation of a genuine partnership. He concluded with a pledge of the African Group's full support to the proceedings of the task force.

22. The observer for South Africa associated himself with the statement on behalf of the African Group, India and China. He said that, in efforts to find an answer to the question why development partnerships were not delivering to those for whom these partnerships were created, it was important to maintain a focus on Africa. In conclusion, he called for an open and frank discussion during the deliberations.

23. The UNDP representative stated that the realization of many global commitments needs to be supported by additional resources and demands accountability, management for development results, transparent processes and strategic partnerships. He also pointed out that due to increases in aid, allocations need to be aligned to national policy, planning and budgeting cycles. Regarding UNDP's objective to enable countries to articulate and implement nationally defined MDG-based development strategies, he highlighted different constraints in scaling up aid and identified its role to facilitate the donor recipient country relationship, as well as support for national capacity-building. Relying on the right-to-development criteria, he noted the need for significant reduction in trade-distorting domestic support in OECD countries. He also mentioned that special and differential treatment should also provide developing countries with necessary policy flexibilities in addressing important development challenges.

24. The World Bank representative spoke on recent trends within the institution, which is demonstrating an ever-increasing interest in exploring and elaborating links between development and human rights, including the right to development. He referred to a recent World Bank publication, *Development Outreach*, on the theme of development and human rights, as well as to the endorsement by its general counsel of a legal opinion by his predecessor concerning human rights. He further mentioned that the World Bank's senior management is actively reflecting on the question of how Bank policy could be rendered more effective, and be focused more towards the principles underpinning the right to development. He also referred to the recent establishment of a Justice and Human Rights Trust Fund, a joint initiative by the World Bank and Nordic countries to fund Bank-related activities on human rights. In conclusion, he expressed hope that the process of awareness-raising among World Bank professionals would continue and intensify and that the criteria might in the future be applied to Bank initiatives.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS

25. The task force agreed to focus on each of the three partnerships selected for consideration, with presentations made by representatives of the relevant institutions involved and comments made by members of the task force, followed by a discussion that included

observers. The three days of public deliberations would be concluded with a discussion on the assessments of the aforementioned partnerships and on the methodology for the application of the criteria. The task force would then meet for two days in closed meetings to discuss and adopt its report, with conclusions and recommendations, to be presented to the Working Group on the Right to Development at its eighth session.

26. Stephen Marks, Chairperson of the task force, noted a common call in the opening statements for close collaboration on this subject and emphasized that this pilot project on right-to-development criteria was a first endeavour, aiming to achieve the ambitious objective of deciding on a strategy and defining a methodology, reflecting the interests of all involved.

27. He introduced the main theme of the session, namely to apply the criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships from the perspective of the right to development to three partnerships: the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness in the context of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Among the reasons for selecting these partnerships were that they were raised during the task force's second meeting, focusing on the elaboration of the criteria. They were flagged as interesting initiatives in terms of development partnerships with monitoring mechanisms for implementation. Some of the principles of the Mutual Review show close linkages with those underlying the right to development, such as mutual accountability and ownership.

28. The Paris Declaration was selected, as it had made significant and methodological advances to monitor international partnership commitments that partly overlap with those identified by the Working Group. Its implementation process could provide an important opportunity for integrating human rights and aid-effectiveness principles and for ensuring that, combined, these principles might enhance the objectives of the right to development.

29. Finally, APRM was selected as a good example of a South-South cooperation process entirely driven and owned by Africa and hailed by many as possessing considerable potential to influence the discourse on development in Africa. The Chairperson concluded by introducing APRM as the first partnership to be considered.

A. The African Peer Review Mechanism

30. Chris Stals (South Africa), member of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Panel of Eminent Persons, presented the achievements and objectives of APRM, of which the mandate is to ensure that the policies and practices of participating States conform to the agreed political, economic and corporate-governance values, codes and standards contained in the Declaration on Democracy, Economic and Corporate Governance of NEPAD. He described the various stages of the process, and focused on the key objectives of APRM divided into four focus areas: democracy and political governance; economic governance and management; corporate governance; and socio-economic development. The latter is of particular relevance to the right to development, including objectives such as: promotion of self-reliance and the

capacity for self-sustaining development; acceleration of socio-economic development towards poverty eradication; access to water, energy, finance, markets and information and communication technology (ICT) in rural areas; progress towards gender equality; and encouragement of broad-based participation.

31. With 75 per cent of the total African population as members of APRM, the process has been implemented in Ghana, Rwanda, Kenya, Mauritius, Nigeria, South Africa, Benin and the United Republic of Tanzania to date. With Ghana's experience, the country to reach the most advanced stage of the process, the Panel had the opportunity to prove that APRM's idealistic objectives can work. Chris Stals concluded with some lessons learned, such as proper preparation before commencing the process, full consent of all actors concerned, and the need to avoid overpoliticization of the process by focusing on technical dimensions.

32. In the afternoon, a representative of the APRM secretariat gave its perspective on the process, complementing the presentation by Chris Stals, and focused on the various obstacles faced, such as limited capacity and financial resources. The APRM representative further mentioned that the resulting national plan of action would ideally provide an occasion to create a single reference document on growth and poverty reduction strategies, on the basis of which a country can undertake action.

33. The Executive Secretary of the APRM National Governing Council Ghana (NAPRM-GC) reported to the task force members and observers on the Ghanaian experience of the APRM process, emphasizing the political commitment and will of the Government to make the APRM process a success. He spoke about the methodology employed by the NAPRM-GC, the structures to manage the process, and efforts to ensure education, sensitization and creation of ownership of APRM among the population. He concluded with a reference to the challenges, such as initial funding, ensuring non-partisanship of the process, and wide information dissemination.

34. The representative of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) spoke on the work of his organization to support the APRM process in the continent. He stressed the unique features of APRM, as a self-monitoring and voluntary mechanism for peer review based on mutual trust, with the ambitious goal of changing the nature of the debate on development in Africa. The process further aimed to strengthen internal accountability mechanisms and to enhance stakeholder participation. At the country level, the process is already revealing that citizens perceive economic, social and cultural rights, as well as the right to development, as their entitlements. In his view, APRM was reflective of a human rights-based approach to development, as States undertook certain obligations on the basis of the plan of action resulting from the process. He concluded by stating that the right-to-development criteria should be about enhancing two dimensions of accountability: the domestic accountability on resource allocation, and the accountability within international development partnerships.

35. Margaret Sekaggya, member of the task force, presented comments on APRM, highlighting the best practices within the process, such as the sharing of experiences and peer learning among African countries, the ownership and self-assessment dimensions, the inclusion of key regional bodies in the process, and broad-based stakeholder participation. She also

mentioned its exemplary role as a South-South partnership premised on realizing the Millennium Development Goals, and its importance in promoting other such partnerships through concerted efforts to enhance the coherence of global economic systems and their effectiveness in supporting development, hence complying with the definition provided by MDG 8.

36. Among the issues which could be strengthened from the perspective of the criteria were: failure of the process to fully integrate a human rights-based approach in the sense of having human rights as a systematic perspective throughout all four APRM focus areas, and the need to elaborate possible measures to be taken in the event that a country under review does not comply with the outcomes of the review. In conclusion, she stated that, as a relatively new initiative, APRM is one of the most widely supported and most promising initiatives in Africa, and would greatly benefit from support by the international community.

37. In the ensuing discussion, issues that were highlighted were: the decisive role of political will of Governments in the process; the potential of establishing closer links between the APRM process on the one hand, and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process and other poverty-reduction initiatives on the other; the actual extent of broad-based participation given practical constraints during implementation; the value-added of a rights approach; and the need to enhance support capacity and resources to address the increasing work volume. Finally, in response to the question whether APRM qualified as a global development partnership in terms of MDG 8, the clarification given was the relationship between NEPAD as the vision for a development agenda for Africa and APRM as the implementation and monitoring mechanism to ensure Africa-wide coherence in macro-level development policies. In this regard, APRM encompassed all levels of development - national, regional and international, aiming to prepare the national level for more effective regional and international cooperation and dialogue.

B. The ECA/OECD-DAC Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness

38. The representative of OECD spoke on the current state of play with respect to the Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness. Since its inception in 2003, important headway had been made by both OECD and African partners in getting to a common point of understanding on the priority focus areas of development action, namely on governance and infrastructure. In his view, a strategic shift of focus from a purely technocratic approach towards a more participatory one to include civil society was positive, and that there was great potential to find congruence with the right to development. He concluded with a reference to a forthcoming OECD action-oriented policy paper on human rights and development, which will be of significant importance to the work on the Mutual Review, and possibly to the work on the right to development criteria.

39. In his comments on this partnership, Nicolaas Schrijver, member of the task force, mentioned that OECD countries demonstrate a gradual willingness to have their development policies scrutinized at an international level. He highlighted the fact that other policy areas than development aid performance are encompassed, such as: African agricultural performance and trade; political and economic governance; capacity development; aid flows and quality; and

policy coherence in both African and OECD policies on MDGs. In his view, the Mutual Review has added value, both in terms of substance and high-level political support it enjoys. Furthermore, it can elaborate related processes in the context of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the EU and ACP countries, the APRM and consultative processes.

40. He further pointed out that there is no evidence of human rights mainstreaming, including the right to development, in the Mutual Review, nor specific attention for the needs of the vulnerable and marginalized. However, he saw some scope for recommendations to take human rights concerns more explicitly into account and in this regard, partners could build on human rights standard-setting achievements in Africa, as well as on efforts within OECD to advance understanding on linkages between human rights and development. He concluded by saying that the explicit recognition in the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development of the importance of human rights, including the right to development (para. 11), a document which in part inspired the creation of the Mutual Review, could be an incentive to OECD countries to perceive the right to development less cautiously.

41. During the discussion on the Mutual Review, the main issues raised related to the question of how human rights, including the right to development could be meaningfully included into the process. The following considerations were raised in relation to this question: the need to move away from politicized and inaccurate perceptions of the right to development and towards operationalization; the potential of moving forward in this regard in light of general recognition of obligations for all parties involved in a partnership; and the need to “unpack the elephant”, in the sense of elaborating more clearly the specific obligations arising from the right to development and their implications for both donor and partner countries.

C. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

42. Prior to the presentation on the Paris Declaration, the WTO representative made a brief statement, addressing current trade negotiations and aid related issues. He highlighted that the interest of developing countries is at the basis of the Doha round of WTO trade talks, and that trade and development are inextricably linked, as trade can play an important role in alleviating poverty. He emphasized elements of convergence and gains stemming from the negotiations, which are at the core of MDG 8, referring to measures for free market access, transparent and simple application of rule of origins. He also underlined the stronger role being played by African countries, as reflected in areas and activities under WTO. Reference was made to the WTO dispute settlement mechanism, where complaints were increasingly being filed by least developed countries (LDCs), and a commensurate increase in use of the WTO advisory centre's services.

43. He referred to lack of resources and expertise in some countries, as shortcomings in the trade negotiation process. Measures have, however, been taken by WTO members to provide effective support and aid. In December 2006, the Director-General of WTO reported to member States that resources (approximately US\$ 35 to US\$ 45 million) were to be allocated in coming years. Three levels of monitoring of aid effectiveness were considered: tracking of provided funding, monitoring of activities on the ground, and monitoring at national level.

44. Comments prompted by the WTO statement concerned the following: the nature and type of WTO complaints by LDCs; the need to address more closely the impact of trade and trade negotiations on the right to development; the implications of an aid-for-trade mechanism; the significance for the right to development of the reference in the preamble to the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization to “sustainable development” and to the “need for positive efforts designed to ensure that developing countries, and especially the least developed among them, secure a share in the growth in international trade commensurate with the needs of their economic development”; and finally, the need for “ex ante” poverty analysis and social impact assessments to be considered as useful tools for evaluating the impact of any kind of reform impacting on the state of development on the ground.

45. On the third partnership considered, the representative of OECD spoke about how the Paris Declaration relates to the right to development, enumerating four reasons why the Declaration could make a difference: broad consensus; monitoring of progress; effective accountability; and follow-up mechanisms. This roadmap for change is organized around five principles (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability), accompanied by 12 indicators of aid effectiveness, 12 targets to encourage progress, and country-level targets. He emphasized that the Declaration is a compromise among countries, and does not address every aspect of aid; for example, the document is not policy prescriptive. He concluded that the links between the Paris Declaration and the right to development were to be found in the stress on emancipating countries from external dependence and enhancing good governance, thus making it desirable for the development and human rights communities to work together on their mutually reinforcing strategies.

46. Solita Collas Monsod, member of the task force, welcomed the Paris Declaration from the perspective of both donor and partner countries, aiming to improve the quality of aid in light of pledges of increased quantity, in recognition of challenges related to management and efficiency of procedures, as well as problems concerning tied aid. Strong features were the identification indicators for progress, a timetable and targets, together with arrangements for monitoring and evaluating performance.

47. However, an assessment based on the right-to-development criteria, four issues of concern arose. First, despite the emphasis on country ownership, only 4 of the 56 partnership commitments and 1 of the 12 indicators concern ownership. The second issue concerns the theme of managing for results, with six partnership commitments, but only one indicator of progress and a relatively weak 2010 target. The third is the non-systematic inclusion of gender throughout the Paris Declaration framework, with only one reference to gender (para. 42). The fourth issue concerned the fact that untied aid was the only indicator with no target for 2010, merely stating as a benchmark “continued progress over time”.

48. Task force members and observers raised a number of important issues in the discussion on the Paris Declaration. Some reinforced the potential of the criteria to contribute towards enhancing its effectiveness; others raised the need for long-term aid continuity and predictability, aid-absorption capacity and the fact that, as a non-binding document, non-compliance with the Declaration would not result in any sanctions. Particular emphasis was placed on the value of the studies commissioned by OECD from the Overseas Development Institute relating human rights to each of the five principles of the Paris Declaration.

D. Lessons learned for a methodology to apply the criteria

49. After highlighting the main issues discussed in the first two days, the Chairperson-Rapporteur introduced Jorge Vargas Gonzalez, member of the task force, who presented some reflections regarding a strategy to apply the right-to-development criteria. He stated that the aim of this right was to close the gap between more and less developed countries and between rich and poor, to create a large middle class. He identified the right to development as an ecosystem acting simultaneously and reciprocally at different levels, national, regional and international.

50. Mr. Vargas Gonzalez outlined that the following criteria should be taken into account to achieve the right to development at the national level: accountability, political representation, division of powers, institutionalism and transparency. He also referred to the private sector and the regulation of markets. He pointed out the need for progressive and redistributive fiscal policy, as well as indexes including on MDGs, gender equity, child rights, health and education. In conclusion, he referred to the need for economic integration, South-South cooperation and peer self-evaluation (e.g. the APRM strategy), at the regional and international levels.

51. The ensuing discussion involving task force members and observers focused on the following issues: the need to cover a wider range of areas, particularly those encompassed by MDG 8 and which received less attention; possible linkages of the right to development with poverty reduction activities; and the definition of global partnership. Particular attention was paid to further refining the criteria. In this regard, the criterion on “the extent to which a partnership respects the right of each State to determine its own development policies, in accordance with its international obligations” was discussed at length. First, the need to clarify the content of “international obligations” was highlighted. Furthermore, sub-criteria were suggested for this criterion, namely: whether a partner country’s national development plan was used as the point of departure for the partnership’s policies; the trend of the percentage of untied aid; and the requirement, contained in article 2 (3) of the Declaration on the Right to Development, that the national policies in question must “aim at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals, on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of the benefits resulting therefrom”.

52. In concluding its first efforts at applying the criteria to global partnerships, the task force members recognized three highly promising trends. First, there is the genuine collaboration and commonality of purpose among the members of the task force representing key development, finance, trade and technical-cooperation institutions, on the one hand, and the independent experts, on the other. Secondly, they recognized the keen interest expressed by representatives of the partnerships considered by the task force to take steps in order to make the policies and practices more attentive to the right-to-development issues, which emerged from the review. Thirdly, there is the commitment expressed by member States to encourage the task force in its practical approach to operationalizing the right to development through assessment tools for global partnerships from the perspective of this right. The combined impact of these trends could lead towards the ultimate objective of contributing to the transformation of the principles underlying the right to development into development practice.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

53. Having completed a preliminary review of three partnerships and heard the views of the delegations and other observers at the session, the task force has reached the conclusions and recommendations that are set out in the paragraphs below.

A. Conclusions

54. Consistent with its approach to move the right to development from general principles and political commitments to specific operational tools for development practice, the task force recognized the value-added of developing concrete criteria based on the right-to-development framework and applying them to global partnerships for development. The application of these criteria facilitates current and future partnerships to explicitly factor essential elements of the right to development into their respective operational frameworks. This effort to operationalize the right takes into account both the normative human rights considerations and the empirical evidence that demonstrates the advantages of applying the criteria.

55. If its mandate is continued, the task force would deepen its work on the criteria, through both a deeper analysis of the three partnerships examined above and evaluation of additional partnerships dealing with other domains of international cooperation, as identified under the Millennium Development Goal 8. Drawing on experience gained from refining and applying the criteria would be conducive to the elaboration of a comprehensive and coherent set of standards to assess the implementation of the right to development and to recommend improvements in the practice of global development partnerships.

56. Its initial effort to apply the criteria at its third meeting has demonstrated that even the current broadly worded criteria enabled the task force to assess both the extent to which essential elements of the right to development are already reflected in the global partnership frameworks and the value-added that the right to development framework brings to these partnerships. However, first it is necessary to clarify the identified criteria by relating them to an implementation checklist. Such an implementation checklist would contain sub-criteria and performance benchmarks, to be elaborated upon at a later stage and to be agreed upon in specific partnership contexts.

1. Pilot application of the criteria

57. The task force recalls that the right to development criteria, as agreed by consensus at the seventh session of the Working Group, are based on the Declaration on the Right to Development and, in the spirit of article 9 (1) of that Declaration,¹ are indivisible. Therefore, in applying them to development partnerships, all the criteria are relevant, even though it is appropriate to take full account of the historical, political, and legal context of each partnership and of the countries that participate in them.

¹ Article 9.1 reads “All the aspects of the right to development set forth in the present Declaration are indivisible and interdependent and each of them should be considered in the context of the whole.”

58. The initial pilot application of the criteria to these partnership arrangements and the constructive dialogue with representatives of the institutions monitoring the partnerships demonstrated the utility of the criteria and the willingness of the institutions involved to consider ways in which their work might be enhanced by giving greater attention to considerations based on the right to development.

59. The task force stresses that this exercise was intended to be on a pilot basis, and has therefore yielded only tentative assessments as to the conformity of the partnerships considered with the criteria. However preliminary these initial findings may be, the task force is of the view that useful lessons can be drawn with respect to each of the partnerships reviewed. Accordingly, the task force drew the following preliminary conclusions regarding the partnerships examined, based on the presentations during the meeting and background documentation provided.

(a) African Peer Review Mechanism

60. The task force was encouraged by the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) as an internal and regional accountability mechanism widely supported in the African continent and in particular by its ownership and self-assessment dimensions. Notwithstanding the fact that its primary focus is not on global development partnerships as prioritized by the task force, the system offers an avenue for constructive dialogue among peers to rectify the identified shortcomings with assistance from participating States, donor Governments and agencies.

61. At first application of the criteria, the task force identified a number of issues which could be taken into consideration as a basis for an ongoing dialogue to enhance APRM's contribution to realizing the right to development. First, notwithstanding the place of human rights in the NEPAD Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance, human rights, including the right to development, are not featured as much as they could be as an integral part of all APRM objectives. Secondly, the competence and independence of the Panel of Eminent Persons are critical factors that can enhance the quality of individual country reviews. Thirdly, the active and meaningful participation of a wide range of civil-society organizations, including those representing the poorest, is potentially one of the most positive right-to-development features of the mechanism. Finally, possible measures to be taken by peers in case of non-compliance by a country under review have not been made explicit.

62. Although APRM is faced with challenges at this early stage, it is one of the most promising African development initiatives to emerge for some time, and a valuable vehicle to advance NEPAD's objective of socio-economic emancipation across the continent and globally. The ideas of ownership, independence peer-review and self-assessment enhance the potential of APRM's effectiveness in bringing about change where the laws and practices of the countries concerned fall short of the standards reflected in the right to development criteria and the African Union's own legal framework for human rights, in particular the African Charter of Human and Peoples' Rights, the first international treaty to provide for the right to development. The task force therefore notes with appreciation that all participants at the meeting who were involved in the APRM process, both at the regional and at the national level, welcomed a continued dialogue on how the right-to-development criteria could be further encouraged within the APRM process.

(b) ECA/OECD-DAC “Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness in the context of NEPAD”

63. In the view of the task force, this process of mutual review as a joint North-South undertaking is innovative and worthwhile, in terms of both substance and through the high-level political support it receives - sometimes even at the level of Heads of State and Government. Furthermore, this mutual review can build upon and elaborate related processes in the context of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the EU and ACP countries, the APRM, and processes within the Bretton Woods institutions, such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process.

64. A preliminary assessment by the task force has led to the following findings: first, this procedure complies in large measure with several right-to-development criteria, namely those relating to national ownership, accountability and sustainability. Secondly, there was less congruence with the criteria relating to the incorporation of human rights and the right to development in national and international development policies. Thirdly, the mechanism did not focus specifically on the poor and most marginalized. Finally, the active and meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders was not evident. The task force noted that in efforts to mainstream the right to development, the partners can readily build upon regionally determined and owned human rights standard-setting *acquis* in Africa (the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, work of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and the provisions of the new African Union Constitution), as well as on a forthcoming OECD Action-Oriented Policy Paper on Human Rights and Development.

(c) Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

65. The Paris Declaration is a welcome development from the perspective of both donor and partner countries, as it aims to improve the quality of aid. A preliminary assessment based on the criteria reveals the following main issues of concern: (a) a relatively weak focus on ownership and managing for results, when it comes to the pledging of commitments and identification of corollary indicators, despite the fact that these constitute two of the five major themes; (b) the cursory reference (para. 42) and non-systematic inclusion of the gender dimension throughout the Paris Declaration framework; and (c) the fact that the issue of untied aid is the sole indicator without a target for 2010.

66. The task force notes that the OECD has commissioned valuable research papers by the Overseas Development Institute, demonstrating significant potential for correspondence and mutual enforcement between the Paris Declaration and human rights, including the right to development. Mutual accountability and ownership appear to be the principles with respect to which the right-to-development criteria, human rights thinking and practice have the greatest potential to contribute to the Paris Declaration achieving better development outcomes. Furthermore, other research undertaken for the OECD-DAC Gender Network has shown that there is more scope for systematic inclusion of gender considerations throughout the Paris Declaration. Finally, the issue of tied aid is central to the right-to-development framework, particularly in light of the ownership of partner countries and policy coherence, and should be considered in order to reflect the interests of all parties in a partnership.

(d) Preliminary concluding remarks on the three partnerships assessed

67. In conclusion, based on deliberations during its third meeting, the task force is of the view that there is considerable room for improvement in terms of rendering these partnerships compliant with the right-to-development criteria. At the same time, there are a number of areas where a human rights perspective, and in particular one based on the right to development, could contribute to improving these partnerships. Mutual accountability and ownership, among the key principles of all three partnerships, are considered two such areas. Furthermore, the criteria highlight important gaps in the areas of non-discrimination and focus on the poorest and most marginalized, adequate stakeholder participation, and human rights impact assessments, social safety nets, and the extent of support from international donors in this area.

68. The task force would welcome continued dialogue with these three partnerships, in order to explore further their perceived strengths and weaknesses from the perspective of the right-to-development criteria, and also to enhance the lessons the task force thus far has learned from these processes, for the purposes of further refining the criteria themselves.

2. Refinement of the criteria and other methodological considerations

69. The task force considered several preliminary methodological issues which needed to be addressed with a view to enhancing the rigor with which the criteria are applied. During the discussions in plenary session regarding the application of the criteria to the selected partnerships, three concerns emerged. One concerned the overlap among the criteria, due in part to the interrelated and indivisible nature of human rights as emphasized in articles 6 (2) and 9 (1) of the Declaration on the Right to Development. The second was that operationalizing the criteria required the application of some form of qualitative and quantitative measures, such as the aforementioned subcriteria and performance benchmarks to facilitate determination of the extent to which the criteria had been met by partnership stakeholders. And thirdly, some criteria may need redefining so as to avoid ambiguity and overlaps.

70. Notwithstanding these concerns, it was felt that any amendments of the criteria should be done in a comprehensive manner, upon completion of the piloting exercise, because of their indivisibility, as explained above. Consistent with the normative structure of the Declaration on the Right to Development, their application by partnership stakeholders might be greatly facilitated if they were reordered or regrouped in a more logical fashion and accompanied by an implementation checklist that would facilitate a more in-depth analysis of global partnerships in their specific context.

71. It was determined that some criteria had to do with establishing an enabling environment for development, others with processes, and finally some with the desired development outcomes themselves. The task force also deemed it desirable to further refine and progressively develop the criteria by identifying, as mentioned above, sub-criteria and performance benchmarks. The task force sees merit in moving towards a tripartite conceptual framework for rights-based indicators, which is increasingly used in the human rights world, namely with a focus on the structural features conducive to the enabling environment or structure, along with criteria of

process and outcome. This approach underscores the fact that the right to development can be measured both qualitatively and quantitatively in many ways like other human rights, with a view to ensuring its effective implementation. Therefore, the task force rearranged the criteria in order to make them more consistent with this way of thinking, with a view to evolving a measurable framework for periodic assessment of global development partnerships. The criteria appear, reordered, in annex II.

72. In addition to the reordered criteria, the task force included in annex III a provisional and illustrative implementation checklist, which does not depart from the agreed-upon criteria, but rather makes them more useful in eliciting specific information for the review of global partnerships. A solid implementation checklist is necessary in order to evaluate development environments, processes and outcomes. Many pertinent implementation criteria are already in use and readily adaptable for present purposes.

73. In this context, the task force has identified several salient features of the three development partnerships examined which it believes could usefully be reflected in the review of others. Among these are mechanisms of domestic accountability, self-assessment, and regional peer review and monitoring, which should be reflected in the implementation checklist. Further examination of other partnerships would provide the opportunity to identify features that could constitute best practices, appropriately reflecting a right-to-development framework.

74. In applying the criteria on a pilot basis to the three partnerships, the task force concluded that it would be necessary to elaborate a coherent methodology to apply the criteria in a manner that would identify additional examples of good practices and practical steps to enhance the right-to-development compliance of global partnerships. In this way it could build a conceptually and methodologically rigorous operational framework, in line with the concern for practical and action-oriented outcomes expressed by the Working Group in recent years.

75. The task force also considered that building upon comparative experiences in the actual implementation of other monitoring frameworks would help ensure two objectives: first, the application of the criteria could avoid unnecessary duplication of monitoring efforts, and second, the distinctive attributes of the right to development in a practical sense would be revealed. These considerations guided the selection of the processes considered by the task force at its present meeting.

76. Thus, the refinement and application of the criteria provided an initial and qualitative assessment of the three partnerships revealing the potential strengths and gaps in these partnerships from the right-to-development perspective. This corresponds to the recommendation by the Working Group and Human Rights Council that the task force operationalize and progressively develop these criteria. The gain in assessing global development partnerships are also of value to actors in the relevant partnerships themselves, who might integrate them into their own evaluation processes.

77. The task force's initial assessments of these three processes show promise for aligning global development partnerships with the requirements of the right to development. The exercise further indicates that the criteria would benefit from further elaboration, both in terms of

the structure of the criteria, and of the methodology for their application. The primary objective of such elaboration would be to render the criteria practically applicable to assess global development partnerships, including by actors in the relevant partnerships themselves. Furthermore, other development partnerships could take into account the lessons learned, particularly the gaps revealed by the assessments undertaken so far. These gaps may relate to the content of these existing partnerships, but also to issues that justify partnerships covering areas of MDG 8, which deserve more support and attention by international donors.

3. Follow-up to the review of global partnerships

78. The task force considers that the right-to-development criteria must be applied to all issues of global development partnerships, including trade, aid, debt, technology transfers, migration, and other issues identified in MDG 8. To this end, it would be desirable to review and apply each of these criteria to the widest possible range of issues, leading to identification of additional global development partnerships.

79. The preliminary results of the assessments of the three partnerships examined so far convince the task force that follow-up work would be beneficial to the parties involved and to the Working Group's efforts to promote effective implementation of the right to development. In this way, a gradual step-by-step approach would build upon the current work while lessons are drawn from reviewing other partnerships. In light of the interest expressed by the representatives of the initiatives reviewed in exploring how the task force's considerations might be accommodated, it would be useful to continue the dialogue with the three partnerships, including maintaining contact with the relevant secretariats and monitoring developments.

80. Having regard to its limited resources and the need to achieve demonstrable and maximum impacts, the task force favours a strategic focus and approach in applying the criteria to global development partnerships. Subject to the results obtained at the initial stage, consideration should be given to extending the piloting exercise to a wider range of dimensions of MDG 8, as analysed at its second meeting (E/CN.4/2005/WG.18/TF/3, paras. 57-79). The central importance of trade, debt and technology transfer was noted, along with that of bilateral arrangements. The task force devoted particular attention to the WTO and other international trade mechanisms, including the negotiations of the Doha Round.

81. Moreover, while recognizing the priority of the development concerns of sub-Saharan Africa, the task force felt that, at some point in the application of criteria to assess global partnerships from the right-to-development perspective, attention should be given to partnerships involving other regions. In this regard, the task force considered the potential value of reviewing relevant regional arrangements, such as the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Organization of American States (OAS). The task force particularly considered ASEAN, as an interesting example of intra-South-East-Asian cooperation, covering an expanding number of policy areas and currently establishing cooperation with other countries in the region such as Australia, China and the Republic of Korea. The OAS Inter-American Council on Integral Development also constituted an interesting candidate for applying the criteria, as the right to development is enshrined in the OAS Charter.

82. The task force also discussed the possibility of considering bilateral partnerships, some of which involve significant flows of resources and potential implementation of the right to development. In this context, the task force felt that bilateral partnerships, while important, may need to be considered at a later stage, given the availability for assessment of other, more appropriate, strategic partnerships and its present resource constraints. The PRSP also provides the opportunity to examine the place of right-to-development concerns within a wide geographical range and as part of a highly significant form of global development partnerships.

83. Keeping in mind the above strategic approach, however, the task force is of the view that priority should be given to the additional partnerships outlined in the paragraphs below for continuation of the piloting exercise in the near future.

Cotonou Partnership Agreement ACP-EU

84. The European Union and associated States suggested evaluating the Partnership Agreement between the EU and the ACP States as a global partnership for development from a right-to-development perspective. This agreement, commonly known as the Cotonou Convention, builds on 25 years of experience in development cooperation between the EU and ACP countries under the successive Lomé Conventions.

85. In 2000, the Cotonou Convention was concluded to cover a period of 20 years, with more specific periods for financial assistance to the ACP States (Financial Protocol to be renewed every 5 years) and for trade arrangements (to be made WTO-compatible). Apart from trade and aid, the cooperation under the Cotonou Convention encompasses a wide area of policy fields, including human rights, good governance, environmental conservation and peacebuilding. As a partnership agreement of a wide-ranging nature and involving more than 100 States, the Cotonou Convention and the practice based upon it could, in the view of the task force, be an interesting partnership for further study and evaluation.

Africa Action Plan

86. In late 2005, the President of the World Bank announced that sub-Saharan Africa was its priority, given the serious state and chronic nature of the development and human rights challenges in that region. The World Bank, along with a number of other multilateral and bilateral donors, promised substantially increased levels of assistance to its development partners. In order to deliver this increased assistance more effectively, the Bank prepared the Africa Action Plan (AAP), which was approved by the Executive Board in September 2005, a comprehensive strategic framework for supporting the development of the continent's poorest countries. Implementation of the plan has now been in progress since then, and will be reviewed by the Development Committee during the IMF/World Bank spring meetings in April 2007.

87. Given the preponderant role of the World Bank in the development of Africa and the influence of its thinking and operations on the African donor community at large, its partnership should be critically scrutinized. Accordingly, the Bank should therefore be invited by the Working Group to allow the Africa Action Plan and its partnership with the Governments of sub-Saharan Africa to be evaluated against the criteria on the right to development.

B. Recommendations

88. The task force recommends that the criteria be further applied and refined using the reordered list in annex II. It also recommends that more specific elements be considered for the implementation checklist, along the lines of the preliminary suggestions contained in annex III.

89. The task force recommends that a dialogue continue with APRM, the ECA/OECD-DAC Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness to elaborate on areas of potential congruence and synergy of each respective partnership with the right to development, as well as on existing gaps in light of the criteria. The task force recommends undertaking technical visits to the respective institutions involved, in order to discuss how the integration of the criteria in the work of the partnerships could be effected and to assist the task force in further refining the criteria.

90. In implementing the follow-up work on operationalizing the right-to-development criteria, the task force recommends the continuing active participation of international financial and development institutions, including the World Bank, UNDP, IMF, UNCTAD and WTO, as well as other relevant specialized agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations. As a high priority, the task force is particularly interested in pursuing cooperation with the World Bank, as well as UNDP with regard to its work on inclusive globalization.

91. With respect to future work on assessing global partnerships, should the Working Group request the task force to continue applying and refining these criteria, the task force recommends that it proceed in several phases. Phase I could cover work in 2007 relating to further specification and elaboration of implementation checklists and follow-up with the three development partnerships considered in the present session, and include one additional partnership. Phase II would cover the task force's work in 2008 to apply the criteria to a limited number of further partnerships. Finally, phase III would encompass the work done in 2009, consolidating and following up on existing partnerships and possibly considering yet another set of partnerships, leading towards a definitive version of the criteria.

92. The task force recognizes the need to explore additional strategic and representative partnerships in the context of MDG 8. In this regard, the task force recommends that priority be given initially to the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between ACP countries and the EU, and the World Bank's Africa Action Plan. Scaling up thereafter in accordance with the work in the phases mentioned above, the task force recommends that further additional partnerships be examined in the light of the criteria.

ANNEXES

Annex I

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session.
2. Election of the Chairperson.
3. Adoption of timetable and programme of work.
4. The criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships - as identified in Millennium Development Goal 8 (goal 8) - from the perspective of the right to development:
 - (a) Introduction on the topic and guiding parameters for discussions;
 - (b) Interactive discussion.
5. The African Peer Review Mechanism:
 - (a) Presentations by relevant experts and participants;
 - (b) Interactive discussions on the theme.
6. The ECA/OECD-DAC Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness:
 - (a) Presentations by relevant experts and participants;
 - (b) Interactive discussions on the theme.
7. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness:
 - (a) Presentation by relevant experts and participants;
 - (b) Interactive discussions on the theme.
8. Lessons learned for operationalizing and progressively developing the criteria.
9. Adoption of the report, including conclusions and recommendations.

Annex II

CRITERIA FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS FROM A RIGHT-TO-DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE

Structure/enabling environment

The criteria for periodic evaluation include:

- (a) The extent to which a partnership contributes to creating an environment and supports a process in which all human rights are realized;
- (b) The extent to which partnerships for development promote the incorporation by all parties concerned of all human rights, and particularly the right to development, into their national and international development strategies, and the extent to which partner countries receive support from international donors and other development actors for these efforts; (formerly c)
- (c) The extent to which a partnership values and promotes good governance, democracy and the rule of law at the national and international levels; (formerly e)
- (d) The extent to which a partnership values and promotes gender equality and the rights of women; (formerly f)
- (e) The extent to which a partnership reflects a rights-based approach to development, and promotes the principles of equality, non-discrimination, participation, transparency and accountability; (formerly g)
- (f) The extent to which a partnership ensures that adequate information is available to the general public for the purpose of public scrutiny of its working methods and outcomes; (formerly l)
- (g) The extent to which a partnership respects the right of each State to determine its own development policies, in accordance with its international obligations; (formerly b)

Process

- (h) The extent to which, in applying the criteria, statistical and empirically developed data are used, and, in particular, whether the data are disaggregated as appropriate, updated periodically, and presented impartially and in a timely fashion; (formerly n)
- (i) The extent to which a partnership applies human rights impact assessments and provides, as needed, for social safety nets;
- (j) The extent to which a partnership recognizes mutual and reciprocal responsibilities between the partners, based on an assessment of their respective capacities and limitations;

(k) The extent to which a partnership includes fair institutionalized mechanisms of mutual accountability and review;

(l) The extent to which a partnership provides for the meaningful participation of the concerned populations in processes of elaborating, implementing and evaluating related policies; programmes and projects; (formerly m)

Outcome

(m) The extent to which policies supported by a partnership ensure the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals, on the basis of their active, free, and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of the benefits resulting therefrom, as required by article 2, paragraph 3, of the Declaration on the Right to Development; (formerly d)

(n) The extent to which the priorities set by a partnership are sensitive to the concerns and needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized segments of the population, and include positive measures in their favour; (formerly h)

(o) The extent to which a partnership contributes to a development process that is sustainable and equitable, with a view to ensuring continually increasing opportunities for all.

Annex III

SUGGESTED INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR THE CRITERIA

In the spirit of assisting the partnership stakeholders to assess whether their agreements adhere to the criteria for periodic evaluation of development partnerships from the perspective of the right to development, and making it easier for them to integrate the right to development in the implementation of their global partnership agreements, the following initial implementation checklist is proposed. In this regard, the following must be emphasized:

- The suggested checklist is preliminary, partial and non-exhaustive. The questions on the checklist are to be expanded or modified as experience dictates, or as additional data or measurement methods are made available;
 - The checklist draws on already existing guidelines and analytical tools, and aims to avoid needlessly imposing additional burdens on the stakeholders by “reinventing the wheel”. The elements of the checklist are derived from the international human rights framework, and underpinned by principles found in the right-to-development framework, namely participation, accountability, non-discrimination, equity, transparency and ownership;
 - The checklist is designed to encourage and facilitate self-assessment by partnerships. It is hoped that the checklist will be applied on the basis of reciprocity and mutual responsibility, and will be added to or modified by the stakeholders as needed to further advance the right to development.
1. Do the developing country partners have their own national development strategies and priorities?
 2. Do developed countries respect national development strategies and priorities elaborated by developing countries?
 3. Are the development partners using and fostering national mechanisms in the developing countries to channel aid and other support?
 4. Is there an increasing or decreasing trend in terms of the percentage of untied aid?
 5. Do these national development plans have measurable, time-bound targets, particularly in regard to indicators on advancement of human rights, well-being and equality?
 6. Do accountability mechanisms provide remedies for human rights claims relevant to the right to development, and complaint and oversight mechanisms?

7. Do the partners in a partnership use outcome indicators (such as the Human Development Index, the Gender Development Index, the Gini Coefficient, the Children's Human Rights Index, and the Trade and Development Index), in order to measure progress and ensure accountability?
8. Is non-discrimination guaranteed to all persons and is there equal and effective protection against discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, income, birth, disability and health status, or a combination of these grounds?
9. Are these strategies and priorities owned by all stakeholders within the country, including women, indigenous people, minorities, the poor and other vulnerable sectors of society?
10. Does participation cover preference revelation, policy choice, implementation and monitoring, assessment and accountability?
11. Are there specific mechanisms and institutional arrangements - both at the partnership level as at the country level - in place, through which the marginalized and disadvantaged sectors, particularly women, effectively participate at different stages of decision-making, including review and monitoring?
12. Are these strategies and priorities discussed and approved in institutionalized mechanisms of political representative participation, such as parliament?
13. Are the country's national development strategies and priorities reflected in the Government's budget in its actual allocations and expenditures and in their impact at the community level?
14. Are the development partners providing sufficient and appropriate assistance in support of the country's national development strategy (e.g. is all aid untied)?
15. Are sufficient funds made available for the collection of timely and appropriate data, properly disaggregated, that will assist in the review and monitoring of the performance of the partners and other stakeholders?
16. Are mutual accountability, review and monitoring processes transparent? Is the public adequately informed?
17. Is the Government's budget transparent and easily known and monitored by the citizens?

Annex IV

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Symbol

Title

A/HRC/4/WG.2/TF/1

Provisional agenda

A/HRC/4/WG.2/TF/CRP.1

Background document on the criteria for periodic evaluation of global development partnerships from the perspective of the right to development: initial analyses of the ECA/OECD-DAC Mutual Review of Development Effectiveness in the context of NEPAD, the African Peer Review Mechanism and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
