



2023 Financing for Development Forum

Session: Integrating National Financing Frameworks - national actions to raise financing for the SDGs

Statement by Fuimaono Ofoia, Samoa Umbrella for Non-Governmental Organisation and Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations on behalf of Civil Society FfD Mechanism (including the Women's Working Group on FfD)

20 April 2023

1. If a country is undertaking an INFF, then the INFF's analysis and recommendations should be fully coherent with the country's priorities for global discussions on more systemic financing issues. The "country's priorities" should be democratically determined, and should fully reflect the views of rights holders – particularly those furthest from power, usually through the intermediary of representative civil society organisations and people's movements. For example, if in global discussions a country is calling for reforms to global economic governance, then the INFF should refer to these calls explicitly, and should highlight relevant evidence on the country's financing situation that can provide additional corroboration for why such reforms are needed.

Doing no harm

2. All reforms proposed by INFFs should be evaluated for the potential risk of human and ecological harm (including harms that may occur indirectly if, for example, a country's debt situation becomes unsustainable). The assessment should explicitly consider the risks of contravening binding obligations under the treaties to which the country is party : this includes treaties on human rights (for which the Guiding Principles on human rights impact assessment of economic reforms should be a reference), treaties on the environment and on climate change. Rights holders should be meaningfully involved in the risk assessment process, in line with the following recommendation.

Meaningful participation of rights holders

3. Rights holders, usually through the intermediary of representative civil society organisations and people's movements, should be able to participate meaningfully in all stages of INFF decision making. Such participation should ensure, among others, that :
 - The enabling environment makes it safe for civil society organisations to express their views freely : if such an enabling environment is not in place, this means that the INFF cannot be regarded as democratically owned, and should be treated with scepticism by external stakeholders.

- The civil society organisation(s) that take part in the process are, collectively, representative – including representing those who are furthest from power. In addition, human rights obligations to consult with specific populations (for example persons with disabilities) must be upheld.
- The distinctive role of representative civil society organisations and peoples' movements is not conflated with the role of other stakeholders such as the private sector through 'multi-stakeholder' processes.
- Civil society organisations are not asked to undertake INFF-related activities that may conflict with their fundamental accountability role. For example, engaging civil society organisations to « popularise » the INFF may make it more difficult for them to offer independent criticism.