

## **Submission in follow-up to HRC resolution 19/34 “The Right to development”**

### **ECLAC**

1. Document A/HRC/15/WG 2/TF/2/Add. 2, represents a thorough and responsible effort to assemble a set of elements referring to a myriad of instruments, mandates, policies, decisions of different nature, either binding or not all of which have various degrees of disaggregation, applicability, levels of accountability and monitoring mechanisms therefore making any attempt of systematization, complex and difficult to implement under a sole umbrella.
2. As mandated by the Working Group, the document focuses to a great extent on Millennium Development Goal 8 although it seems that the broad and comprehensive nature of the right to development would need further explanation of the decision to concentrate on MDG 8 so as to be able to evaluate the pertinence of the present criteria and sub-criteria.
3. Certainly Human Rights Council Resolution 12/23 of 30 September 2009 indirectly reinforces the need for widening the scope of proposals by incorporating the following in letter b) : “including the priority concerns of the international community beyond those enumerated in Millennium Development Goal 8”
4. It seems that in the effort for the widening of the scope of proposals, while naturally discussing the valuable inputs of the document mentioned in 1, some thinking must be given to the operational aspects of this monitoring (considering the comments made in number 1) and the way in which, once a decision on criteria and sub-criteria is adopted and endorsed by the HRC, the Working Group will collect and analyze the information considering that many inputs will be provided by reporting mechanism of international human rights instruments and by the comments/proposals of the respective monitoring bodies.
5. In terms of some practical proposals, it seems that exploring some pilot cases could be helpful in view of the many features involved in the work. It is possible that some of the countries acting as pilot cases for the Delivering as one efforts might be interested in playing this role, specially for instance Uruguay which is an active participant in various human rights processes and initiatives. Depending on the outcome of this process, relevant Regional Commissions could be convened, as appropriate.
6. The Working Group document rightly and soundly includes a criterion referring to “contribute to an environment of peace and security “considering the substantial and mutual links between peace and development and the growing demands on the Organization vis-à-vis this crucial issue. This is an area in which ECLAC could also contribute to further thinking upon its experience with the work of Uruguayan contingents deployed in various UN missions which are being trained in different approaches of the right to development so as to assess the possibility of widening their contribution in this field in future mission configurations.

13 March 2012