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Special Message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations

BAN Ki-MOON
Secretary-General, United Nations

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

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

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

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

The World Federation of United Nations Associations and its members have played a critical role in progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. We continue to count on your active support and development. After all, people around the world not only need the basics such as food, water, shelter, education and health care, they also need dignity, peace, justice and the opportunity to express their concerns and shape their future. This is crucial to ensuring that everyone can live in freedom from want and freedom from fear and fulfill their potential within the finite resources of our planet.

In any walk of life—work, education or personal relationships—one must be able to learn and adapt. We all require, in 15 years’ time we will look back at this process as a truly transformative contribution to the United Nations and the wider world in which we live. To do this, we must strive to transcend boundaries, go beyond the current development frameworks and look to change the status quo.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RIO+20**
The outcome document "The Future We Want" initiated the OWG Process.

**UN LEVEL**

**HIGH-LEVEL PANEL**

**REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL**

**REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS CONSULTATIONS**

**NATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS**

**CIVIL SOCIETY**

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

**WORLD WE WANT**
Consultations have been ongoing since April 2014 and will continue through 2015.

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

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

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

**INTER-GOVERNMENTAL SYNTHESIS REPORT**

**SECRETARY GENERAL SYNTHESIS REPORT**

**UNG A ADOPTION OF OUTCOME DOCUMENT**

**INTER-GOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS**

**69TH PGA THEMATIC DEBATES**

**70TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUMMIT FOR ADOPTION OF SDGS**
Those in conflict or emerging from conflict significantly lag behind many in achieving MDG targets, exemplified by only 20 percent of fragile and conflict-affected countries being on course to meet the poverty target.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Post-2015 and the SDG Framework**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**DEVELOPMENT, INSECURITY AND INTERVENTIONS IN KENYA**

Evans Onieygo

Director of Caritas Maralal, Kenya.

Caritas Maralal implements a series of livelihood, WASH, education, and capacity building projects, ensuring that aspects of peace building are mainstreamed through each activity. Its work covers most regions of Samburu County.

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

Development work by my office in Samburu County has to focus on a wide range of issues in order to be effective. Livelihood, education, water and health projects are integrated with strong elements of peace promotion in order to ensure communities are not dependent on interventions. It also stress the importance of peaceful cooperation between the diverse communities in the region, such as the Samburu, Pokot and Turkana. Activities that foster this relationship contribute to creating a more resilient society that has an increased capacity to prevent minor conflicts evolving into perpetual violence. This community capacity for cooperation creates a more conducive society in which development can prosper.

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

The importance of ensuring that development and peace building work in tandem cannot be overstated. Engaging conflicting communities in activities that clearly add economic value to their lives is a powerful motive to work toward peace. If linked as described, the detrimental nexus of underdevelopment and insecurity can be transformed into peace and prosperity that benefits all.
poverty, the panel recommended that the new development agenda carry forward the spirit of the MDGs. Noting that the creation of a single, sustainable development agenda is crucial, the panel proposed five big transformative shifts for the post-2015 development agenda in an attempt to address the flaws of the MDGs. These included:

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

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

Each goal must be widely applicable in countries with different levels of income, and in those emerging from conflict or recovering from natural disaster.
Community to “strive for a bold new agenda” not only the many links and urged the international development of placing peace and security in the world of Peaceful Societies, reiterated the importance on April 24-25, 2014 titled Ensuring Stable and post-2015 development agenda. The events provided an opportunity for member states to debate the substantive topic of themes decided by the President of the General Assembly (PGA). It was also an opportunity for the civil society Major Groups to provide recommendations and input into the overall post-2015 process. The 2012 United Nations conference on sustainable development, known as Rio+20, brought together thousands of participants from the private sector, civil society representatives such as the Major Groups, NGOs, world leaders and other groups to shape approaches to reduce poverty, advance social equity and ensure environmental protection. It was under these auspices that the outcome document “The Future We Want” was adopted, which sought to solidify the view that the eradication of poverty remains the “greatest global challenge facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development.”

This comprehensive document reiterated the importance of acknowledging that aspects of the creation of peaceful societies are necessary factors for sustainable development to flourish when it stated, “Good governance and the rule of law, at the national and international levels, as well as an enabling environment, are essential for sustainable development.”

“Good governance and the rule of law, at the national and international levels, as well as an enabling environment, are essential for sustainable development.”

FUTURE WE WANT, 2013
The Open Working Group: Finding Peace in the Process

The Climate at the OWG

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

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

Sweden was a strong advocate for a stand-alone goal on peace and security, noting that it was not just a goal for conflict-affected states but also a global aspiration: “A goal on peaceful societies would be a truly universal goal. No country is free from violence.”

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

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

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

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

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

SOVEREIGNTY
Some states argued that meeting some of the targets under the peace goal would infringe on their national sovereignty; hindering their ability to deal with internal issues as they see fit. However, as the agenda is a voluntary non-binding one, it is difficult to see the infringement on sovereignty as a strong reason for not engaging with the peace and stability goal in a more substantive manner.

“A goal on peaceful societies would be a truly universal goal. No country is free from violence.”
SWEDEN, OWG 11

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

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

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

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

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

SOVEREIGNTY
Some states argued that meeting some of the targets under the peace goal would infringe on their national sovereignty; hindering their ability to deal with internal issues as they see fit. However, as the agenda is a voluntary non-binding one, it is difficult to see the infringement on sovereignty as a strong reason for not engaging with the peace and stability goal in a more substantive manner.
**Goal 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

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

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

Excerpt From WFUNA Position Statement, June 2014

**Additional Targets**

- 16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children.
- 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.
- 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.
- 16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration.
- 16.b Promote and enforce nondiscriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.
Perhaps more importantly, support for this approach was codified by the majority of African states in the formation of the Common African Position. The stipulation by the CAP to make peace and security one of the six pillars of African development priorities ruffled the idea that a peace goal was strictly a Western agenda. The reaffirmation that “peace and security is essential for the achievement of the continent’s development aspirations” provided clout for the push toward codifying a stand-alone goal in the SDG list.

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

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

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

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

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

The Outcome Document

After the final OWG session entered the early hours on Saturday, July 19, a consensus document did not appear in the cards. This was until the outcome document that finally emerged after consultations overrun by almost 24 hours issued a comprehensive list of 17 SDGs, complete with 189 targets. The culmination of 13 sessions, spanning some 16 months, not only included goals on climate change and gender, but also a specific goal on peace and security (Goal 16) which aims to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels,” was apparently almost consigned to the annals of history at one point during the final OWG. The significance of making the final consensus agreed list is an important accomplishment for the large community pushing for a peace goal.

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

What started out as a loosely mandated process—originating from Rio+20 and pushed...
The final document makes no reference to reducing the global arms trade, neglects to recognize the importance of the perceived freedom from fear and violence, excludes any mention of promoting a culture of nonviolence and fails to incorporate vital concepts such as the support for reconciliation processes.

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

On the other hand, it is exactly this imperfection that has provided the strong impetus for calls to reopen negotiations. As seen in the WFUNA proposal (see figure 1) and many other contributions from other civil society groups or NGOs, the final ascribed list of targets within Goal 16 are underwhelming to one degree or another. The final document makes no reference to reducing the global arms trade, neglects to recognize the importance of the perceived freedom from fear and violence, excludes any mention of promoting a culture of nonviolence and fails to incorporate vital concepts such as the support for reconciliation processes. Furthermore, many of the targets are unsatisfactory as they are either too unrealistic (i.e. ending all forms of violence against children), too open-ended (i.e. substantially reduce all forms of corruption and bribery) or fail to promote accountability and easy measurement.

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

As we enter the New Year, Synthesis Report in hand, these debates will undoubtedly take center stage. Should proponents of the peace goal be happy with our lot or should we strive to produce a truly transformative goal? Risks on one side: risks on the other.
The Road Ahead: Tenuous or Transformative?

Goal 16: Stay, Mainstream or Both?

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

CLUSTERING GOALS?

The push by some member states to reduce the 17 goals into a more manageable list could have repercussions for Goal 16. One advocate for this approach, Prime Minister David Cameron of the U.K., proposed at the UNGA that 17 goals may be too many, with something akin to 10 or 12 goals. Yet, it must be noted that at the same time, the U.K. has been pushing for a greater inclusion of the rule of law in the SDG framework, and thus it becomes less clear whether reducing goals would mean no place for a peace goal.

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

Thinning 17 goals into four or five major clusters would be an ambitious move, considering the diverse range of topics covered throughout the document.

FREEDOM FROM VIOLENCE: A VENEZUELAN PERSPECTIVE

The absence of war does not automatically produce peace in a society. Debates surrounding the inclusion of peace in the new development agenda have commonly misrepresented this concept, assuming that a goal on peace and security can only be achieved through the end of violence. While the current targets may be seen as a political move that would derail the entire goal, the rhetoric emerging from the Arab Group that the goal should include a target on ending occupation will be seen by some as undermining.

Yet, concerns have begun to emerge that any attempts to strengthen the peace goal could be seen as a political move that would derail the entire goal. The rhetoric emerging from the Arab Group that the goal should include a target on ending occupation will be seen by some...
The connection between the onset of conflict and resource scarcity, water management, education levels and inequality needs to be accurately represented in the final document.

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

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

**DATA REVOLUTION**

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

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

**The Synthesis Report**

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

Within the initial preamble, the report recognizes: “the public discourse has underscored the call for the urgent need to recognize and address the trust deficit between governments, institutions and the people. Providing an enabling environment to build inclusive and peaceful societies, ensure social cohesion and respect for the rule of law will require rebuilding institutions at the country level to ensure that the gains from peace and development are not reversed.” Furthermore, the recognition that “all must be free from fear and violence, without discrimination,” is an important factor that was not included in the OWG outcome document.

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

If impact is to be real and tangible, implementation ultimately relies on the financing available.

**MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

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

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

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

- **February 2015**: High-level thematic debate on the means of implementation.
- **March 2015**: High-level thematic debate on advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women.
- **April 2015**: High-level thematic debate on reconciliation.

**The Synthesis Report**

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

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

After years of working in silos, the UN SG highlights the development agenda as an opportune time to “integrate the broader United Nations agenda, with its inextricably linked and mutually interdependent peace and security, development, and human rights objectives.”

The recognition that fostering cohesive and peaceful societies will have such a prominent role in the transformation that is being sought, is an important aspect that will need to be recognized in the final agreed framework. Creating peaceful societies must not only coincide with the development agenda but must be wholly linked as an essential element towards the achievement of sustainable development.
With the initial release of the Secretary General’s Synthesis Report, it is at this opportune point that we have the time to reflect on the important questions that still remain.

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

In addition, the draft resolution presented to the General Assembly in September 2014 indicates that the PGA will organize and preside over two days of informal interactive hearings before June 2015 with representatives of NGOs, civil society organizations, Major Groups and the private sector. These consultations, along with the aforementioned intergovernmental negotiation process, will feed into a summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda that will be held September 28 to 30, 2015, in New York as a high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly.
OVER 1 BILLION PEOPLE LIVE IN conflict-affected and fragile states. They are also among the world’s poorest. By 2015, more than 50 percent of the total population in extreme poverty will reside in places affected by conflict and chronic violence. Conflicts have evolved in nature, from wars between states to a much more complicated form, triggered by a wide range of factors, including political, economic, social and environmental issues.

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

In order to achieve sustainable development and realize “the world we need,” the three pillars of the United Nations’ work—peace and security, development and human rights—must work in tandem. However, each one of the three pillars must hold itself up on its own. The development pillar cannot carry the weight if the other two pillars collapse. Neither should one agenda be allowed to undermine another by diverting resources or redefining development assistance. This applies not only in areas affected by armed conflict, where the restoration of peace and security is an overriding imperative, but in all societies, including those with significant levels and often multiple and hidden forms of violence and injustice.

The post-2015 development agenda provides an opportunity to address the underlying causes of conflict and strengthen conflict prevention and peace building by pursing development in an integrated and sustainable way for people and planet.
Small-scale violence and the continual threat thereof—just like the large-scale violence of wars, civil wars and local insurrections—is a terrible burden upon the poor and a grave impediment to efforts to improve their lives.

PARTICIPATING IN A RECENT research project on how poor people themselves conceive poverty, I was surprised by the great emphasis our interlocutors put on violence.1 Being exposed to violence in one’s own household and daily life is a prominent and pervasive part of what it means to be poor. Such violence reflects governance failures endemic in developing countries: predatory elites who do not care about their poor compatriots and even profit by driving them off their land or coercing them into exploitative conditions as factory workers, day laborers, domestic servants or sex workers. Small-scale violence and the continual threat thereof—just like the large-scale violence of wars, civil wars and local insurrections—is a terrible burden upon the poor and a grave impediment to improve their lives. The Sustainable Development Goals must recognize and suitably highlight this reality.

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

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

One example is the international arms trade, which greatly amplifies violence in the developing world.2 To curb this trade, the world’s arms-exporting countries must shoulder key responsibilities: to accept constraints on whom they sell arms to, to accept substantial penalties when weapons they sold fall into the wrong hands and to accept a tax on all arms sales, both to discourage them and to raise revenues for an international fund to mitigate violence and its effects.

Another example is the might-makes-right-principle governing international loans and resource sales.3 Other countries ought not to recognize persons or groups merely because they hold effective power in a developing country, as entitled to borrow in the name of this country and to effect legally valid sales of its natural resources. Doing so, we promote the survival of repressive regimes that lack domestic legitimacy and we also impoverish the country’s people, without their consent, are saddled with repayment obligations and robbed of their natural resources. In addition, we provide powerful incentives to generals and rebel groups to take over the state or to demand pay-offs for not attempting to do so.

A third example concerns the ways in which states facilitate and incentivize illicit financial outflows from developing countries. Multinational enterprises routinely dodge taxes in developing countries by shifting their profits into tax havens, eventually using “tax holidays” to repatriate these profits to their home countries. And rich people in poor countries routinely hide their wealth in secrecy jurisdictions, thus avoiding taxes on their capital gains, interest and dividends. Terrorists, traffickers and other criminals use the same facilities to ply their destructive trades. A crackdown on tax havens and secrecy jurisdictions has begun, but it is crucial to ensure that the developing countries are fully included among its beneficiaries.

A hugely important impediment to development, violence deserves a prominent place in the SDGs. But we must attack its root causes in systemic features of our global order, which only the more powerful countries can reform.

The post-2015 development agenda presents an historic opportunity to right many of the wrongs that have impeded our collective development journey.

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

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

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

We find it useful to talk of a virtuous cycle in which progress on one front creates the dynamic for progress in others that in turn help to energize the development process. However, we are all too aware of a vicious cycle that propels societies downward: Intergroup hostility leads to conflict, leading in turn to economic decline, poverty and insecurity, all of which create greater intergroup tensions and conflict.

It worked: That is why my country was keen to end the Security Council’s engagement in December 2012, and decided not to be included on the agenda of the Peace Building Commission. That is not to say these institutions do not have important roles in maintaining international peace and security. They do, and they are valuable tools to contribute to the confluence of peace and development. But they are a means, not the end, and the longer-term goal of developing peaceful and inclusive societies is well beyond the scope of these bodies alone.

The post-2015 development agenda presents an historic opportunity to right many of the wrongs that have impeded our collective development journey. Our experience of the Open Working Group shows that the more inclusive the global conversation, the closer we will come to realizing our goals.
Truly addressing the relationship between violence, peace and sustainable development also requires understanding what sustains peace. Positive Peace indicators can help orient the post-2015 agenda to more preventive—and ultimately prosperous—aims rather than simply focusing on after-the-fact consequences. A peaceful environment with low levels of violence, insecurity and fear also provides a strong environment for business and investment. Peaceful countries tend to spend less containing violence, freeing up economic resources that can be invested in more productive areas. Further, peaceful environments are associated with greater equality, both economic and gender; stronger business environments; better transparency; and higher well-being. An ambitious development agenda acknowledges that peace is more than simply stopping violence, as peace creates the environment that allows human potential to flourish.

Peaceful countries tend to spend less containing violence, freeing up economic resources that can be invested in more productive areas.

There is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society.

WE ARE FAST APPROACHING 2015, the year in which the eight Millennium Development Goals expire. There is a vibrant debate on the Sustainable Development Goals and targets to succeed the current eight goals. The protection of children has been included in the discussions. There are important reasons why violence against children and, more specifically, the protection of children in situations of armed conflict should be included in our international development aims and efforts. Some of the reasons are intrinsic. A society where the youngest and most vulnerable citizens are not protected from harm will never reach its full potential. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. Similarly, there is now a consensus around the concept that development efforts are most valuable when they are inclusive and when the resulting prosperity is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society. Children affected by armed conflict are among the most vulnerable in the world—they account for the majority in most countries affected by armed conflict. We, as the international community, have the obligation to safeguard them in their families, homes, schools and communities. There are also instrumental reasons why protecting children affected by armed conflict is shared by all. Targeting vulnerable groups specifically ensures that the attained progress benefits all segments of society.
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People around the world have demanded that the post-2015 framework be built on human rights and the universal values of equality, justice, peace and security. World leaders now have a responsibility to listen to the voices in their own countries.

THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT

Goals have brought the world a long way since 2000. Countries have been unified around one set of development objectives, and a genuine culture of purpose has been established. Despite this progress, as negotiations around the post-2015 development agenda continue, no one could deny the enormity of the challenges we are facing. Fundamental to these challenges is the fact that the MDGs failed to incorporate the protection and promotion of human rights.

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

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

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

Support did not reach those many people around the globe who are systematically denied their human rights by their governments on a daily basis. This has been most aptly represented in fragile and conflict-affected states—areas where development aspirations have largely failed.
Amina Mohammed was appointed in July 2012 by the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon as Special Adviser on Post-2015 Development Planning. Mohammed brings to the position more than 30 years of experience as a development practitioner in the public and private sectors, as well as civil society.

She was the CEO/founder of the Center for Development Policy Solutions, a newly established think tank to address the policy and knowledge gaps within the government, Parliament and private sector in development and civil society for robust advocacy materials. Mohammed was also Adjunct Professor of the master’s program for Development Practice at Columbia University in New York.

Prior to that, Mohammed served as the Senior Special Assistant to the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. She worked for the Asian Development Bank from 1991 to 2000.

Chandrika Kumaratunga was the President of Sri Lanka from 1994 until 2005. She was born in June 1945 to a family with a long history of public service. Her father, Solomon Bandaranaike, an Oxford-educated barrister, was elected prime minister in 1956. He was assassinated in 1959. Her mother, Sirimavo Bandaranaike, was elected the world’s first female prime minister in 1960; she served three times as prime minister for a total of 18 years.


Steve Killelea is an accomplished entrepreneur in high technology, the business development and is at the forefront of philanthropic activities focused on sustainable development and peace. In 2000, he established The Charitable Foundation (TCF), which specializes in working with the poorest communities of the world. It aims to provide life-changing interventions, reaching as many people as possible with special emphasis on targeting the poorest of the poor. TCF is active in East and Central Africa and parts of Asia and has substantially impacted the lives of more than 2.3 million people.

Leila Zerrougui was appointed Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict at the Under Secretary-General level in September 2012. In this capacity, she serves as a moral voice and independent advocate for building awareness and giving prominence to the rights and protection of boys and girls affected by armed conflict.

Prior to this appointment she was the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Deputy Head of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO).

As a legal expert in human rights and the administration of justice, Zerrougui has had a distinguished career in strengthening the rule of law and championing strategies and actions for the protection of vulnerable groups, especially women and children.

Zerrougui graduated from the Ecole Nationale d’Administration (Algiers) in 1980. Since 1993, she has held various academic positions at law schools in Algeria, and was associate professor of the Ecole Supérieure de la Magistrature (Algiers).

Sail Shetty joined Amnesty International as the organization’s eighth Secretary General in July 2010. A long-term activist on poverty and justice, Shetty leads the movement’s worldwide work to end human rights violations. Prior to joining Amnesty International, Shetty was Director of the United Nations Millennium Campaign from 2003 to 2010. He played a pivotal role in building the global advocacy campaign for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

From 1998 to 2003 he was CEO of ActionAid and is credited with transforming the organization into one of the world’s foremost international development NGOs. Shetty studied at the Indian Institute of Management in Ahmedabad, India, and at the London School of Economics.
The World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA) is a global nonprofit organization representing and coordinating a membership of over 100 national United Nations Associations (UNAs) and their thousands of constituents. Guided by our vision of a United Nations that is a powerful force in meeting common global challenges and opportunities, WFUNA works to strengthen and improve the United Nations. We achieve this through the engagement of people who share a global mindset and support international cooperation – global citizens.

**Freedom from Violence** | WFUNA’s Freedom from Violence project has worked to build the capacity of key stakeholders to be able to engage in dialogue on the post-2015 development agenda and to advocate for, provide strategic policy options and influence decision makers to include peace, security and conflict prevention.

www.wfuna.org/freedom-from-violence
@WFUNA
#PeacePost2015
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