



**General Assembly**

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/HRC/12/28  
30 July 2009

Original: ENGLISH

---

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL  
Twelfth session  
Agenda item 3

**PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF ALL HUMAN RIGHTS,  
CIVIL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL  
RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT**

**Report of the working group on the right to development  
on its tenth session\* (Geneva, 22-26 June 2009)**

**Chairperson-Rapporteur: Arjun SENGUPTA (India)**

---

\* Late submission.

## CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1 - 4	3
II. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION .....	5 - 7	3
III. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS .....	8 - 37	4
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	38 - 48	10

### **Annexes**

I. Agenda .....	14
II. List of attendance .....	15

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The open-ended Working Group on the Right to Development convened its tenth session in Geneva from 22 to 26 June 2009, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 9/3.
2. The Working Group was established by resolution 1998/72 of the then Commission on Human Rights and decision 1998/269 of the Economic and Social Council with a mandate: (a) to monitor and review progress made in the promotion and implementation of the right to development as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, at the national and international levels, providing recommendations thereon and further analysing obstacles to its full enjoyment, focusing each year on specific commitments in the Declaration; (b) to review reports and any other information submitted by States, United Nations agencies, other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations on the relationship between their activities and the right to development; and (c) to present for the consideration of the Commission on Human Rights a sessional report on its deliberations, including advice to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) with regard to the implementation of the right to development, and suggesting possible programmes of technical assistance at the request of interested countries with the aim of promoting the implementation of the right to development.
3. The high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development was established by Commission on Human Rights resolution 2004/7 and Economic and Social Council decision 2004/249, at the recommendation and within the framework of the Working Group, in order to assist it in fulfilling its mandate. By Commission resolution 2005/4, the task force was requested to “examine Millennium Development Goal 8 on a global partnership for development and suggest criteria for its periodic evaluation with the aim of improving the effectiveness of global partnerships with regard to the realization of the right to development”. The Human Rights Council, in its resolution 9/3, decided that the criteria should be “extended to other components of Millennium Development Goal 8”.
4. Council resolution 9/3 and General Assembly resolution 63/178 endorsed the workplan for the implementation of the mandate of the high-level task force for the period 2008-2010 as outlined in paragraph 43 of the report of the Working Group on its ninth session (A/HRC/9/17).

## II. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION

5. The session was opened by the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, Kyung-wha Kang.
6. At its first meeting, on 22 June 2009, the Working Group re-elected by acclamation Arjun Sengupta (India) as Chairperson-Rapporteur<sup>1</sup> and adopted its agenda (A/HRC/WG.2/10/1/Rev.1) and programme of work (see annex I).

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sengupta was first elected as Chairperson-Rapporteur on 10 September 2007 following the resignation of Ibrahim Salama (Egypt), who had chaired the Working Group since February 2004.

7. At the session, the Working Group considered the report on the fifth session of the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development, held in Geneva from 1 to 9 April 2009 (A/HRC/12/WG.2/TF/2).

### **III. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

#### **A. Opening statements**

8. The representative of Cuba, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, recalled that the fourteenth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Havana in September 2006, had called for the elevation of the right to development to the same level and on a par with all other human rights, as well as its full operationalization through the elaboration of a convention. The gap between developed and developing countries continued to grow while obstacles to its realization remained, such as debt burdens, failure to comply with official development assistance commitments, lack of democracy in decision-making in international trade, financial and monetary institutions, and unilateral coercive measures. Millennium Development Goal 8 held the key to the achievement of all the other Millennium Development Goals. Taking note of the report of the task force, the representative said that in accordance with the task force's work plan, the Working Group should not engage in negotiations on the revised criteria at the current session but rather focus on providing advice on further improvement of the criteria.

9. The representative of the Czech Republic, on behalf of the European Union (EU), reiterated the support of the European Union for the work of the task force and its commitment to the realization of the right to development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. States had the primary responsibility for the realization of the right to development, and the criteria should focus on the national sphere, including good governance, social justice, equity and participation. The European Union supported a human rights-based approach to development, wherein the focus must be on the rights of individuals. The task force should develop benchmarks and indicators, but should not examine new partnerships.

10. The representative of the Netherlands took the floor to support the position taken by the European Union and noted its efforts to promote development through international cooperation and assistance. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also supported the position of the EU and appreciated the task force's transparency. Her Government was committed to the realization of the right to development but had yet to be convinced of the value of a legally binding convention. The representative outlined the Government's active role in promoting the right to development through engagement at the national and international levels and gave examples of development programmes. She welcomed the focus of the task force on putting individuals at the centre of development, on vulnerable groups and promoting gender equality, on best practices developed by both donor and recipient countries and on evidence of the impact of human rights approaches to development.

11. The representative of the United States of America, expressing support for the work of the task force, emphasized that the right to development meant essentially that each individual had the right to develop his or her intellectual or other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of human rights. The representative outlined the various

initiatives her Government had implemented through international cooperation and assistance in order to address the challenges of climate change and to contribute to greater food security, greater access to health care, and access to water and sanitation. The United States supported the approach of the task force, which recognized the indivisibility of human rights, equality, transparency, participation, democracy, rule of law and good governance and placed them at the centre of development.

12. The representative of Pakistan shared the concern that more than 22 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development and 16 years after the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, there had been little progress towards the realization of the right to development. The Working Group's session was taking place against a backdrop of ongoing financial and economic crisis, which had exposed the vulnerabilities of developing countries in overcoming such challenges. The present crisis had once again proven the need for policy space for developing countries to exercise the right to development when such challenges occurred. Pakistan welcomed the efforts of the task force in developing the criteria with a view to finalizing it next year.

13. The representative of Brazil highlighted the heavy burden that the current financial and economic crisis was putting on developing countries, especially the poor. Trade distortions impacted negatively on the social and economic sectors in developing countries and the assistance provided by many developed countries did not match the vast needs of the developing countries; in any case, the developed countries had yet to live up to the commitment of devoting 0.7 per cent of GDP to official development assistance. In that regard the criteria relating to the enabling environment should be couched in terms that reflected the need to break the cycle of dependency.

14. The observers for the Indian Council of South America, the Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition and the International Council for Human Rights drew the attention of the Working Group to the situation of indigenous peoples and expressed the hope that the interests of indigenous peoples would be considered in the work of the task force. They suggested that the task force should draw on specialized expertise from relevant non-governmental and international organizations and agencies such as Transparency International and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in the revision of the criteria and development of the sub-criteria.

#### **B. Review of progress in the implementation of the right to development: consideration of the report of the high-level task force**

15. Stephen Marks, Chairperson-Rapporteur of the high-level task force, presented the report on the fifth session of the task force (A/HRC/12/WG.2/TF/2). The report contained a review of the implementation of the workplan of the task force for the period 2008-2010, including continued dialogue with the selected global partnerships reviewed at its previous sessions and assessment of additional global partnerships in the areas of access to essential medicines, debt relief and transfer of technology, as well as dialogue with the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR). He also presented the interim draft version of the right-to-development criteria, as work in progress.

16. The work of the task force had been greatly facilitated by the high quality of new expert members, although the task force could benefit from more assiduous participation by some of the institutional members. The Group of Twenty (G20) Summit had taken place in London at the time of the April 2009 session of the task force, just as the United Nations Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development was taking place in New York during the present session of the Working Group. While growth, stability, openness of markets, trade flows, debt sustainability, private capital flows and aid were of major importance to the right to development, neither of these events appeared to attach the same importance to the core values of the right to development as the Working Group. Mr. Marks welcomed the participation of the High Commissioner in the World Conference and expressed the hope that the Conference would consider the impact of the economic downturn on human rights and the right to development.

17. As regards the first part of the report of the task force dealing with the assessment of partnerships, the Chairperson explained the methodology used in its assessment process, the lessons learned from partnerships reviewed and how that review served in the refinement of the criteria. The task force was currently dealing with 11 partnerships, 4 dealing with aid and trade with which it had had a dialogue over several years; 3 dealing with access to medicines and transfer of technology in the health field with which a dialogue had been established this year; and 4 concerned with transfer of technology relating to climate change and intellectual property, as well as debt relief and regional trade, with which it was planning to engage pursuant to the Working Group's request at its last session. He was particularly impressed with the openness and receptiveness of the health-related partnerships during missions by the task force and consultants and the quality of the input from the institutions responsible for the Cotonou Agreement and debt relief during the last session of the task force.

18. He concluded by mentioning the activities the task force envisaged in the coming months with regard to the Development Agenda of the World Intellectual Property Organization, the Climate Change Conference and MERCOSUR, and underlined the importance of cooperation with those institutions so that the task force could extend its study and criteria to the components of Millennium Development Goal 8 that had not yet been covered, as requested by the Human Rights Council.

### **1. Global partnerships**

19. During the general discussion on the report of the task force, the representative of Cuba (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) welcomed the continued review of the existing global partnerships and the review of new partnerships, while pointing out that the focus of the review should shift from evaluating their compliance with the criteria towards learning lessons for the improvement of the criteria. The revised criteria contained in the report continued to focus on the national dimension of the right to development. Since the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development in 1986, adequate attention had not been given to its international dimension. Human rights mainstreaming was not the objective of the right to development; it was rather to enhance national capacity in terms of resources to ensure the enjoyment of all human rights. The right to development belonged to both individuals and peoples.

20. The representative of the Czech Republic (on behalf of the European Union) expressed reluctance to support assessments of new global partnerships. With regard to the revised criteria, the European Union attached importance to those relating to social justice and equality, non-discrimination, participation and good governance, among others. The EU agreed that expert input would be required for the criteria and sub-criteria to be methodologically rigorous. The global economic and financial crisis and climate change should be considered within the framework of the existing criteria.

21. Other delegations expressed the view that while the implementation of Millennium Development Goal 8 was essential to the right to development, a broader scope of that right should be borne in mind. A number of delegations expressed the view that given the limited time remaining in phase III of its workplan, the task force should focus on the partnerships previously selected for evaluation, noting that the mandate of the task force was to take stock of the experiences of selected partnerships in order to refine and finalize the criteria and sub-criteria, rather than contributing to improvement of the partnerships.

22. Several delegations questioned the need to continue a dialogue with previously assessed partnerships, raising the issue of its added value and inputs for the refinement of the criteria. Dialogue should be limited to the partnerships planned for phase III. In that context, several delegations disagreed with the proposed technical mission to the African Peer Review Mechanism and the assessment of the Caribbean Forum of African, Caribbean and Pacific States-European Community Economic Partnership Agreement (CARIFORUM EPA) and other economic partnership agreements under the Cotonou Agreement.

23. Clarifications were also sought on the recommendations made by the task force with regard to the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Development Agenda and the Clean Development Mechanism. The task force was not expected to provide input to the WIPO Development Agenda or a related conference organized by WIPO, while a dialogue would be useful for the refinement of the criteria. A delegation explained that the objective of the WIPO Development Agenda was mainstreaming development into intellectual property issues; it was therefore not limited to transfer of technology. The representative of WIPO welcomed the attendance of the task force at the Conference on Intellectual Property and Public Policy Issues to be held on 13 and 14 July 2009.

24. The Chairperson of the task force characterized the pilot application of the criteria to the partnerships as a means of improving the criteria as requested in Commission on Human Rights resolution 2005/4, as well as of integrating the right to development into the thematic areas of Millennium Development Goal 8. In that context, reference was made to his recent dialogue with the secretariat of the World Health Organization Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property, which demonstrated the value of the criteria. With reference to General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions calling for the effective implementation of the right to development through mainstreaming the right into policies and programmes of international development, trade and financial institutions, the Chairperson also highlighted the values of a dialogue with partnerships based upon the criteria in identifying entry points for successful operationalization of the right to development.

25. With respect to the Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property, a delegation emphasized the importance of the Global Strategy and Plan of Action, urging the task force to synthesize into the criteria the affordability and access dimensions of health care and medicines, as well as flexibilities envisaged in the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement. A civil society representative underlined the importance of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples for the realization of their right to development, including for the protection of indigenous knowledge.

26. In relation to the recommendation of the task force relating to a dialogue with MERCOSUR, the representative of Paraguay, speaking on behalf of MERCOSUR and associated States, informed the Working Group that the issue had been discussed at the last meeting of high officials responsible for human rights and ministries of foreign affairs, and a response to the invitation would be communicated to the task force as soon as an official position had been received from the capitals.

27. With reference to the issue of debt relief, some delegations proposed that the task force should interact with the independent expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, the independent expert on the question of human rights and extreme poverty and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises with a view to reviewing the impact of debt burdens and related issues on the right to development.

28. The Chairperson of the task force made a presentation on an informal chart he had prepared at the request of various delegations showing the linkages between each of the revised criteria, the relevant article of the Declaration, the previously endorsed criterion and the specific development partnerships which had been assessed from the perspective of the right to development and had contributed to the development or refinement of the criterion concerned. Also at the request of delegations, the Chairperson distributed informal lists of illustrative sub-criteria accompanying the revised criteria which had resulted from the work undertaken by a consultant to the task force, as well as from the expert meeting on methodological issues relating to the measurement of compliance with the right to development. It was noted that those lists were not considered by the task force as sufficiently developed to be shared with the Working Group but were distributed as a non-paper with the sole objective of providing some idea on the nature of the sub-criteria to be developed by the task force. Such lists were not discussed nor officially considered by delegations.

## **2. Right-to-development criteria**

29. The Chairperson of the task force explained how the task force had approached the elaboration of criteria and operational sub-criteria or indicators for the implementation of the right to development. The methodology used in the formulation of criteria had evolved in light of the evaluation of partnerships the task force had examined. However, the primary sources of the interim draft list of criteria (as listed in annex IV to the task force report) were the Declaration on the Right to Development and the criteria as endorsed by the Working Group in 2006. The task force also considered as secondary sources the commissioned expert studies and recommendations of an expert meeting on methodological issues held in January 2009.

30. The Chairperson further explained the basic approach to refining the criteria according to the principle that they should reflect distinct attributes that represented an exhaustive reading of the normative content of the right to development. Thus, the criteria were arranged around the components of comprehensive human-centred development, an enabling environment, and social justice and equity. The sub-criteria would provide indicators and benchmarks for measuring the extent to which relevant stakeholders had addressed the concerns of each criterion. While the task force had decided not to share draft sub-criteria until the criteria had been finalized and the formulation of quantitative and qualitative tools of measurement had been developed with the aid of professionals in the relevant fields, some examples were provided at the request of delegations.

31. The representatives of the Czech Republic (on behalf of the European Union), the United States, the Netherlands, Brazil, Cuba (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Bangladesh, Argentina, Paraguay, Ecuador, South Africa, the Philippines, Mexico, Germany, India, Canada, the United Kingdom, Pakistan and Senegal expressed their views on the refinement process undertaken by the task force. Some expressed concern that the criteria placed too much emphasis on a human rights-based approach to development at the national level and that not enough attention was given to international cooperation, market access for developing countries, debt relief and non-imposition of conditionalities. For those countries, implementing the right to development did not mean mainstreaming human rights in the development process, but mainstreaming development throughout the developing world in order to allow States to have the necessary resources to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights by all; that should be the approach to follow in the elaboration of the criteria. In their view, critical issues such as poverty, lack of human and financial resources and access to technology, hunger, poor health, low levels of education, inadequate housing and unemployment were essential to the right to development and should be reflected in more balanced criteria. For others, the rights of individuals to develop their potential were paramount to the realization of the right to development, which should not be addressed as a collective right of States. For those countries, the criteria dealing with good governance, non-discrimination, participation, transparency and the rule of law were vital.

32. Several delegates addressed the significance of the root causes of conflict, conditions for sustainable and durable peace, the fight against poverty, social exclusion, promotion of employment, income for all and social safety nets in the criteria. One delegation explained how it had restructured its external debt and obtained debt relief and suggested that the task force should draw on the work of relevant special procedures. For another delegate, not all types of debt of developing countries were unsustainable, and debt relief alone could not ensure the realization of the right to development. Another addressed issues of access to medicines and technology transfer, which should include a role for the private sector and private-public partnerships. There were other vehicles for development beyond mandatory technology transfer.

33. Among the other matters raised by delegates was the need to take into account different conditions prevailing in countries, the negative effects of the financial crisis on the ability of developing countries to realize this right, and the challenge of climate change to the right to development, all of which should be reflected in the criteria and sub-criteria.

34. Notwithstanding the differences in emphasis, there was general support for the approach of the task force to reflect both the national and international dimensions of the right to development in elaborating the criteria and to apply a holistic approach to human rights in the

refinement of the criteria. There was also general support for the three components of the right to development reflected in the criteria, with particularly strong support for the attribute relating to social justice and equity. Some delegates attached more importance to the comprehensive approach to development component and others to the enabling environment element.

35. As regards coherence and pertinence of the criteria, several delegates expressed views and offered suggestions on specific criteria. Some concern was expressed about the very ambitious nature of some criteria and whether corresponding sub-criteria could be designed for those criteria. Some suggested that the criteria should be streamlined and duplication avoided, while others considered that one of the components should contain more criteria than the current preliminary draft. Numerous suggestions were made regarding specific criteria, which were noted and would be used by the task force in the next phase of its work.

36. As regards the sub-criteria, it was noted that the work of the task force needed to be balanced and carefully carried out. Some delegations were of the opinion that the Working Group might wish to extend the mandate of the task force beyond 2010 to allow it to finalize its work on sub-criteria; others considered that the extension of the mandate was not for discussion during the present session, and questioned attempts by some to undermine the independence of the task force in the formulation of its recommendations and prejudge the outcome of its work.

37. Wrapping up, the Chairperson of the task force stated that the views of delegates would be fully taken into account in the process of refinement of criteria and elaboration of corresponding sub-criteria.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

38. On the basis of the discussions in the Working Group, the Chairperson-Rapporteur prepared and circulated a draft text for the conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group at its tenth session. The draft text was subsequently discussed, negotiated and amended by delegations. At its final meeting, on 26 June 2009, the Working Group adopted, by consensus, its conclusions and recommendations.

39. After the adoption of the conclusions and recommendations, the representative of Cuba (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) explained its position that: (a) the reference to the relevant provisions of Human Rights Council resolution 9/3 (para. 45) refers to those leading to the adoption of an international legal standard of a binding nature, which in the view of the Non-Aligned Movement, constitutes a convention; (b) “being mindful of the need to ensure efficient use of budgeted resources” (para. 46) does not imply any constraints or conditionalities on the work of the task force; (c) “procedures” (para. 46 (c)) relate to the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, in particular the independent expert on the question of human rights and extreme poverty and the independent expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights; and (d) in relation to paragraph 46 (d), the Movement looks forward to the task force providing criteria related to hunger, poverty, unemployment and financial assistance to developing countries. The representative of the Czech Republic (on behalf

of the European Union) explained its understanding of paragraph 44 as its expectation that the task force at its next session would provide suggestions on further work, including possible further prolongation of its mandate; and that the activities of the task force under paragraph 46 (e) should be undertaken within the framework of the existing criteria.

#### **A. Conclusions**

**40. The Working Group expresses its appreciation to the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development, as defined in the Declaration on the Right to Development, for the work it has carried out in accordance with its mandate. The Working Group takes note of the report of the high-level task force and of its observations regarding the development partnerships considered at its fifth session, as well as the interim draft version of the criteria, submitted as work in progress.**

**41. The Working Group notes the contribution that the application of the criteria through dialogue with the institutions responsible for the identified partnerships has made to the improvement of the criteria and to promoting the implementation of the right to development.**

**42. The Working Group agrees that, in accordance with its workplan endorsed in Human Rights Council resolution 9/3, in phase III (2009), the task force should focus on consolidating its findings and presenting a revised list of right-to-development criteria along with corresponding operational sub-criteria. The task force should continue its study of the ongoing development partnerships on the thematic issues of technology transfer and debt relief with a view to further refinement of the criteria. The task force should also ensure that due attention is given to other issues relevant to the right to development, including, inter alia, poverty and hunger, including in the context of climate change and the current global economic and financial crisis.**

**43. The Working Group agrees that the scope of the criteria should go beyond Millennium Development Goal 8 and aim at the implementation of the right to development, taking into account the evolving priorities of the international community.**

#### **B. Recommendations**

**44. The Working Group recommends that the task force on the implementation of the right to development focus on consolidating its findings and presenting a revised list of right-to-development criteria along with corresponding operational sub-criteria and outline suggestions for further work, including aspects of international cooperation not covered until then, for the consideration of the Working Group at its eleventh session.**

**45. The revised criteria and sub-criteria should address the essential features of the right to development, as defined in the Declaration on the Right to Development, in a comprehensive and coherent way, including priority concerns of the international community beyond those enumerated in Millennium Development Goal 8, and serve the purposes set out in all relevant provisions of Human Rights Council resolution 9/3.**

46. In further refining the list of criteria and preparing the corresponding operational sub-criteria, the Working Group recommends that the task force, being mindful of the need to ensure efficient use of budgeted resources, undertake the following activities:

(a) It should draw on specialized expertise, including from academic and research institutions and relevant United Nations agencies and other relevant global organizations and the experience of countries in relation to the promotion of the realization of the right to development. It should also give due attention to the experience gained from the application of the provisional criteria to development partnerships and to the views expressed by Member States;

(b) Regarding target 8.E on access to essential medicines and 8.F on technology transfer of the Millennium Development Goals, the task force should draw on its dialogue with the Intergovernmental Working Group on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property, the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases;

(c) In order to address the concerns of targets 8.B and 8.D on debt relief, the task force should devote time during its next session to an examination, from the perspective of the right to development, of the experience of the institutions responsible for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative, and other institutions and procedures that address the issue of debt relief;

(d) Taking into account the importance of the fight against poverty, hunger and unemployment and the continued need for financial assistance to developing countries, the task force should draw on the expertise and lessons learned from relevant international institutions, including the Bretton Woods institutions, from the manner in which ongoing development initiatives are working in that regard;

(e) In relation to target 8.F on technology transfer, the task force should:

- (i) Attend the Conference on Intellectual Property and Public Policy organized by the World Intellectual Property Organization in Geneva in July 2009, and hold consultations to gather information on the Development Agenda of WIPO in relation to the realization of the right to development;
- (ii) Continue to draw on the necessary expertise from examining the Clean Development Mechanism, including in connection with mitigation of and adaptation to climate change, from the perspective of the right to development and, subject to an invitation, attend the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in December 2009.

**47. Finally, in view of their essential role and valuable contribution, the Working Group urges the institutional members of the task force representing international financial and development institutions, including the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the World Trade Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, as well as the World Health Organization and other relevant specialized agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations, to participate actively in the work of the task force.**

**48. The Working Group appreciates the support rendered by OHCHR to the Working Group and the high-level task force and requests that it continue to provide all necessary assistance to these bodies in implementing the activities mentioned above.**

**Annex I**

**AGENDA**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of the Chairperson-Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of the agenda and programme of work.
4. Review of progress in the implementation of the right to development: consideration of the report of the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development (A/HRC/12/WG.2/TF/2).
5. Adoption of conclusions and recommendations.
6. Adoption of the report.

## **Annex II**

### **LIST OF ATTENDANCE**

#### **States members of the Human Rights Council**

Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt, France, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

#### **States Members of the United Nations**

Algeria, Austria, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

#### **Non-Member State represented by an observer**

Holy See.

#### **United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agencies and related organizations**

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Development Programme and World Intellectual Property Organization.

#### **Intergovernmental organizations**

European Commission and European Union.

#### **Non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council**

##### *General*

Caritas Internationalis, Europe-Third World Centre and New Humanity.

##### *Special*

Arab Commission for Human Rights and Cercle de recherche sur les droits et les devoirs de la personne humaine.

##### *Roster*

Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Indian Council of South America and World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace.

#### **Other non-governmental organizations**

Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition and International Council for Human Rights.

-----