

Oral statement Friday 18, 2016 morning
Delivered by Kate Lappin on behalf of Civil Society organisations present

We would like to respond to the discussions this morning around amended indicators

- In relation to 2.b we would like to stress the importance of measuring the existence of distorting export subsidies, particularly of developed countries and not on import tariffs. The Doha round is clearly about export subsidies, not imports or domestic subsidies. It's important to measure the most distorting forms of subsidies that are **not** usually in the form of export tariffs but in subsidies. We also think the indicator should recognise the principle of special and differentiated provisions in existing WTO instruments in the data guidance note.
- In relation to 3.8.2 - we appreciate that comments submitted regarding the inappropriately high level of 25% out of pocket expenses was taken into consideration. We remain concerned that other aspects of the target are not captured and in relation to 3. b that medicines have been narrowly defined by some member states during the discussions as survival medicines despite the comprehensive WHO approach of essential medicines. Given the TRIPs agreement referred to in the target provides for the production of generic pharmaceuticals we also suggest that the availability of generic medicines for all eligible medicines should be included in the reformulated indicator.
- In relation to 5.6.2 - we support the position of UNFPA and UN Women and hope that member states understand that the international instruments compel states to provide sex specific obligations that go beyond non-discrimination but are designed to overcome entrenched disadvantage. While we agree that it is important to promote sexuality education of boys and men, the indicator currently focuses on laws and as such should remain focused on women as they are the ones most impacted by the lack of protection of their human rights to exercise their sexuality, reproduction and bodily autonomy.
- Further, while we are pleased to see the upper age limit removed, we remain concerned that "adolescents under 15 are excluded in the current formation. It is critical that they have access to sexual and reproductive health care, information and education.
- On 8.b.1 while we agree that the indicator required overhaul to be more fit for purpose, we believe it only captures half of the target as currently framed. The indicator needs to report more broadly on national level employment strategies and not only on youth. Perhaps more useful would be to monitor this target through the ILOs Decent Work Country Programme framework, while adding also including the specific emphasis on youth employment.

We thank the IAEG for considering proposals for additional indicators. Civil society has proposals to make in this regard, for example adding an additional indicator to 16.9 to reflect the universal nature of the target, and we respectfully request that there is sufficient consultation relating to missing indicators as there has been limited time for discussion today and we have significant contributions to make. Thank You.