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1. The Addis Action Agenda "reiterate[s] the need for gender mainstreaming, including targeted actions and investments in the formulation and implementation of all financial, economic, environmental and social policies." In the year of Beijing+20, reiterating the need is not enough. Moreover, while the Doha Declaration called for gender mainstreaming in development policies, including financing for development policies (Para 4, Doha Declaration), the draft Action Agenda is shifting this understanding: while it expands the scope from FfD policies towards environmental and social policies it, negatively, drops the development policies reference and refers to "investments" instead of "dedicated resources".

2. “We are committed to women’s and girls’ equal rights and opportunities in political and economic decision-making and resource allocation” (para 41 the Addis draft/ language agreed in Rio+20, Para 240, Future we want). However, specific mention of commitment to resource allocation should be linked to the realization of women’s human rights and advance gender equality, otherwise it is not clear to which purpose the resources will be allocated. Moreover, it is really weak because it does not call for dedicated, “adequate and sufficient” resource allocation.

3. “We recommit to adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation and transformative actions for the promotion of gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment at all levels, ensure women’s equal rights, access and opportunities for participation and leadership in the economy and to eliminate gender-based violence and discrimination in all its form” (Para 6, draft). Mix of agreed commitments (Para 31, the Future We Want) and Targets 5.c, 5.5 and 5.1 of the Open Working Group SDG report. However, the target on care is not included.

4. Under domestic resource mobilization, governments agree to “promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws, social infrastructure and policies for sustainable development, as well as to enable women’s full and equal participation in the economy, and their equal access to decision-making processes and leadership” (Para 21, AAAA draft), weakening the scope of policies to the ones who are able to promote at the same time, sustainable development and enable women's participation in the economy.
5. Para 41. After strong debate during the negotiations, paragraph 240 of the Future We Want that states to “resolve to undertake legislation and administrative reforms to give women equal rights with men to economic resources, including access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, credit, inheritance, natural resources and appropriate new technology” was incorporated into the Draft Action Agenda. “Full” should be included along with “equal rights”, while an explicit reference needs to be made to guaranteeing women’s and girls economic rights in order to recognize inherent entitlements of women as full and equal citizens that are subjects of human rights. Instead of “access to ownership”, governments should guarantee women’s and girl’s rights to full and equal access to, ownership and control over resources including the right to inheritance but also to land titling.

Examples of contradictions on developed countries position on GE:

- On the paragraph noting that global multi-stakeholder partnerships have been successful in the field of health, including the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and Gavi, the G-77/China proposed text noting the importance of developing and strengthening national health systems through the critical support of an enabling global economic system, as highlighted by the Ebola crisis. The US supported the part on developing and strengthening national health systems and, along with Australia, opposed the part on “through the critical support of an enabling global economic system.” The US opposed text calling for a commitment to substantially increasing health financing, and proposed replacing “ODA” in this paragraph with “development assistance”.

- Private sector: The EU called for reference to: enabling environments for private sector participation; regulatory frameworks to encourage entrepreneurship; sustainable procurement practices; corporate social responsibility; and natural capital accounting. He said the EU could not support mandatory integrated reporting on environment, social and governance (ESG) frameworks for large companies.

- The US called for emphasis on financial inclusion, avoiding targets on reducing remittance costs without due evidence, a limited role for governments in private sector development, and a strong enabling environment for infrastructure instead of a new global initiative.
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