

PGA Hearings with Civil Society

Statement by Nana Koomah Brown-Orleans

Trade Union Congress, Ghana (Workers and Trade Unions Major Group)

Madam Moderator, Your Excellences, Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues,

The vision for global development is at a critical juncture, and the need to move beyond business as usual is stronger than ever. The development agenda is ambitious and the challenges it poses seem enormous. To meet this ambitious objectives of the sustainable development agenda it is imperative that the follow up and review process demonstrates the same level of ambition.

On Monitoring, Review and Follow up, we recommend the following:

The SDG must be informed and set against internationally agreed norms and standards, which ultimately underpin the post 2015 framework, such as international human rights commitments and ILO labour standards. This should be reflected in the indicators; they must be rights-based and consider implementation from the perspective of both duty-bearers and rights-holders. Member states should report on the implementation of all targets, including the so-called means of implementation targets.

Global accountability is crucial to ensure fairer and more equitable governance in development, which ensures better policy coherence for development. The HLPF as the main body for review at global level should seek to integrate existing accountability mechanisms. We highlight the ILO framework as a 'living' example on how accountability mechanisms can work at global level through to the national level. The ILO supervisory machinery has four parts. First, are the objectives or the ratification of ILO Conventions, second is a periodic review, which looks at the application of ratified conventions in different countries, third is a representation or complaint mechanism, where issues can be raised with the ILOs governance, and fourth is a remedy mechanism where technical assistance and social dialogue are used. This will be very difficult to replicate in the High Level Political Forum but it should at least inform the global accountability mechanism and national review systems

of the international development agenda and be drawn upon as a good practice.

At the national level the review processes must be fully and genuinely participatory. In this light, social dialogue, bringing together the social partners, employers' and workers' organizations, is an excellent example of how to ensure ownership of policy processes at the national level. Social dialogue is not pre-ordained and requires both the political will and an environment that welcomes it. As a prerequisite, it has to allow both workers and employers organizations to exist and function equally. This begins with respect for fundamental freedoms of right to association and right to collective bargaining, representative and independent employers and workers organizations, sound industrial relations practices, functioning labour administrations, including labour inspection, and respect for the "social partners". Effective social dialogue can strengthen economic and social governance, stimulate *inclusive* growth and combat inequality and can foster stable and peaceful societies through social cohesion and dispute resolution, while also enhancing accountability and democratic ownership.

Giving the new financing context and within it's the importance of using several different types of finance in synergy (domestic, international, public and private), we take great interest in the how to ensure that the private sector contributes to sustainable development. This agenda call for decent work for all by 2030. If we are meant to achieve this ambitious goal the follow up and review must integrate effective mechanisms to hold business accountable.

There are many instruments already well developed which seek to ensure private sector alignment with broader international standards and objectives, from the ILO Multinational Enterprises Declaration and OECD Guidelines to MNEs to the ILO Conventions and Supervisory Machinery. Unfortunately, what these instruments often lack is enforceability. Integrating these existing instruments into a follow up and review mechanism would be one way to include provisions which seek to assess private sectors contribution to

sustainable development objectives, including through respect and adherence to international standards in areas of labour and environment.

We are also concerned that the biggest interest of involving business in development to date relates to investment in infrastructure, the delivery of aid through private partners and a wholesale promotion of PPPs. We insist that PPPs should be excluded entirely from the delivery of public services like education, health and water and sanitation—these sectors should be “ring-fenced”.

In sectors where PPPs are considered, they must be subject to intense scrutiny and review, follow strict criteria or guidelines, and show real added value versus traditional forms of public procurement. Procurement mechanisms should ensure that the private sector benefits local economies and does not infringe on the right to development by imposing conditions, but instead it supports all aspects of the sustainable development agenda.

The OECD Principles for Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships should be utilized to the fullest when making decisions on whether to use PPPs.

Thank you.