AND DEVELOPMENT WITH GENDER EQUITY

equit INSTITUTO
Genero Economia e Cidadania Global

rebrip
Rede Brasileira pela Integração dos Povos

OXFAM
Brasil

Introduction

Graciela Rodriguez[1]

This text was prepared to provide a locus for the debate around the current challenges to facing gender inequalities in the BRICS, in light of the action that is now being developed by the so-called New Development Bank, the BRICS Bank. Thus, it starts from an analysis of the geopolitical reconfiguration of where the block operates. We will first identify important changes in the order that was intended as multipolar, with the creation of the BRICS, particularly concerning the role China has had worldwide.

We will then provide a brief discussion of Brazil's role, in a context of profound changes in the orientation of the country's foreign policy.

The second part of the text will provide an overview of the historical process of women's participation in the BRICS space, locating the 2014 Fortaleza Summit as an important initial landmark to build a feminist agenda in the realm of the block.

Our timeline will then focus on the recent opportunity and need for the creation of the BRICS Feminist Observatory, which is currently mobilizing to contribute and influence the BRICS's New Development Bank actions from the viewpoint of gender issues, both in their internal policies and in their operations and criteria for approving projects.

We will finally discuss the importance of the NBD, developing questions and proposals for the Bank to really become a new international financial institution committed with reducing inequalities in the Global South and promoting sustainable development,

[1] Graciela Rodriguez is the coordinator of the Equit Institute, a member of the AMB – Articulação de Mulheres Brasileiras (Network of Brazilian Women) and of the REBRIP – Rede Brasileira pela Integração dos Povos (Brazilian Network for the Integration of the Peoples).

including women as subjects of rights in all countries where it operates.

The BRICS: a strategy to join globalization or to promote a multipolar order?

In recent decades, the process of economic and financial globalization has experienced robust and rapid expansion. Given the nearly indisputable US hegemony in the 1980's, and also in the 1990's abreast with the symbolic fall of the Berlin wall, the world witnessed the progressive growth of multilateralism in the global arena. Internationally, this new multipolar perspective came clearly through the new disputes around a new worldwide geopolitical reconfiguration.

It was in this new context of multiple political players that, in 2006, the interests of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa converged to form the block of the BRICS countries. By virtue of their economic weight, as well as the size of their monetary reserves, the BRICS enjoyed a rapidly increasing bargaining power and an influential role in setting up the global financial architecture. In addition to that, since they took a critical stand against the international financial system and a realignment of the global geostrategy, the block pick up in strength.

Nevertheless, and after the 2008/9 economic and financial crisis, the neoliberal agenda reinstated the weight of their expansionist power as well as the incremental growth of their economic domain and political control.

Thus, against the background of multiple BRICS driven emerging powers, we have witnessed, from 2012 into the future, the inception and forwarding of a new global hegemonic dispute, now shaped by the size and increasing economic footprint of China, which has boasted remarkably fast international expansion.

Having played an important joint support role, one of concomitantly mitigating and strengthening the Chinese grip on multilateral disputes, the BRICS have witnessed this same grip to rapidly extrap-

Source: Economist.com

olate the block, setting off from it and showing off, all so very often, in the so-called G2—the US and China.

The current competition for a leadership position as the world's biggest economy between those two giants has somehow provided the highlights and afforded political weight to this clash, which has picked up strength from the recent US victory of Donald Trump, his protectionist discourse and his warfare tone.

As a matter of fact, the two economies have, in the past decade, put up a dispute of dramatic contours for the whole of the planet. The US, by overindulging its warfare spirit in the control of vast territories, particularly in the Middle East where it tries to maintain a commandeering position; and China, by a stunning increase of their investment footprint in the Asia-Pacific region as well as in Africa and, more recently, in Latin America.

Indeed, since the beginning of this century, China has increased overseas investments, initially in neighboring countries, then in Southeast Asia and in the Pacific region, to eventually start a solid

footprint in African territory. As of 2013, the Chinese government goes for more ambitious pathways, launching the so-called "New Silk Route"[2], so now in May 2017 President Xi Jinping launches once again this ambitious project, which involves, initially, the creation anew of the old Middle Ages routes crisscrossing several of the Asian regions all the way to Europe, not "intent on conquering but rather on promoting trade and prosperity", as stated in his discourse.

It is a proposal for billionaire Chinese investments that will concentrate disbursements for infrastructure, transport, telecommunications and others, in addition to an aid program for participants in a Route that extends over 60 odd countries and involves 2/3 of the global population. If the project comes to fruition, this will be an unprecedented initiative seeking to expand the Chinese economy between 2017 and 2030, with estimated investments around 27 trillion dollars, an equivalent to 30 Marshall Plans, which recovered Europe after World War II.

Though the BRICS have apparently little to do with implementing this initiative from the strategic and political point of view, the NDB—the New Development Bank created in 2014 within the realm of the BRICS—is already playing an important role, relative to its size, funding infrastructure and energy, initially in the very BRICS countries but soon to increase its area of influence to other countries, particularly in Africa and Latin America.

In its turn at the other end of the global dispute, having managed to ensure survival of its hegemonic role by promoting the financial globalization launched in the 1980's when the US economy stumbled to remain as the global hegemonic center, the North American economy has also been attempting to secure a position. Efforts from the days of the democrat governments to maintain the country's role as a dynamic center of the world economy by means of the technological advancement promoted by Silicon Valley high-technology electronics and computer companies may experience some delay or

[2] https://www.economist.com/news/china/21701505-chinas-foreign-policy-could-reshape-good-part-world-economy-our-bulldozers-our-rules

even contradictions in face of Trump's heralded protectionism. This dispute is in boiling effervescence, encouraged as it is by alleged Russian support to the exotic US president's campaign, involved in hazy news of influence peddling to and business with Russian billionaires rising out of dirty ashes after the Soviet state collapse in the late 1990's. Amuse as it may, it could eventually be relevant when the time comes to fathom the future of international geopolitics and the fight for the hegemony of the world economy.

The strife for economic control of the world is shaping the new looks of global geopolitics and remaking what may have been a short transition from a multilateral perspective to reconfiguring what had traditionally been a hegemony, depending on who wins this clash of titans. What may mean the US resuming its prominent position may also be a tipping point for this hegemonic control. It is an open game. What role may the BRICS come to play?

Initial design of the BRICS and a new global political moment

In this sense, the BRICS and, particularly, their Bank, created and designed at a different political moment, may take on new roles.

The BRICS's political and economic guidelines have not been clearly defined at this new moment yet and have therefore been the subject of much controversy, not only by the governments of member countries but also by the interests of international corporations and increasingly by civil society entities. To say the least, the global crisis has hit the BRICS countries too and, thus, their growth rates have also dropped, as has been the case in more developed countries as well.

Many were the reasons promoting these important changes worldwide. The new Brazilian government, for instance, having resulted from an institutional coup d'état and chosen to resume alignment with the US, after Hilary Clinton's defeat, will now show how frustrated it is to abandon the prospect of that revival and the possibility of engaging in trade agreements and in the overall liberalizing

logic, which is currently sailing to global uncertainty winds mustered by the new tenant in the White House. It will now weave new foreign policy away from that which was practiced by the previous administration in a decisively unexpected scenario. When it comes to the BRICS, that government faces having to participate in a block it would not have promoted nor would it like to participate in, as it also faces being one of the founding members of the BRICS Bank, which is now developing solid investment conditions in the country.

At the same time, the evolution of Chinese investment in Brazil has been virtually doubling every year, and China is currently leading the roll of Brazil company acquisitions, where it ranks higher than the US, which dropped 13.2% from 2015 to 2016. The BRICS Bank thus becomes highly relevant in tapping from this Chinese investment footprint, and even in driving some of these investments to a certain extent.

However, the future of Brazilian development in the coming years is potentially linked to this massive input of Chinese capital and to the future of global disputes.

Suffice that the institutional coup d'état currently experienced by Brazil was, to a major extent, encouraged by foreign reasons, it is now revealing a comeback to dependent development—something that appeared to be on the road not to be taken! Which is not the case, now that the entire logic behind legislative and executive changes promoted by the illegitimate current administration is geared to resume growth in connection with maintaining export flows of natural resources and raw materials and deindustrialization of important sectors, much to the interest of transnational capital and, more recently, with a view towards depending upon the interest of massive Chinese investment. Not to mention the impact on jobs and a relentless comeback of high inequality rates, in line with the traditional Brazilian agro-export model!

In their turn, and as initially conceived, the BRICS could have played an important role for the future process of Brazilian development in connection with a national or regional development strategy, perhaps with some power to steer the Bank's loans and to control

the Chinese entrance in the region. Given the new directions the current Brazilian administration is taking, the NDB will certainly vouch for the rentier vocation of Brazilian export-prone agribusiness.

Given that NDB's possibilities are now reduced to the current administration's political pragmatism, in face of not being able to discontinue the international agreement with the BRICS countries that have eventually created the Bank, the Brazilian government will try to benefit from whatever investment advantages that financial institution might bring.

This is why it might be an unworthy effort to think about genuine possibilities for a Brazilian development right now and how the BRICS Bank could contribute to it.

We could very well think about the impacts NDB funding will promote, which will be driven, to a great extent, by the interests, particularly investments, of the Chinese, and so much so for the Russian and the Indian. As it is, incidence upon the Bank, governance rules, transparency and loan policies will become important issues to be closely monitored by civil society, as they move in reverse from Brazil's current difficulties.

The rules and safeguards around social, environmental, labor, employment, gender and other impacts call for in depth debates in the realm of civil society, in search for influential power over the Bank in its early stages of operation, which has already begun with rather scarce social participation.

We hereby present this brief synthesis of the BRICS's situation, the process of creating the NDB and the challenges therefrom, as a framework for analysis because we are interested in discussing gender inequalities in the BRICS countries and the possibilities and perspectives to overcome them. Undeniably brazen in all the block's countries, said inequalities are cornerstones for their productive models. It is just so that NDB's entire "infrastructure for sustainable development" funding policy will have to recognize the importance of overcoming the profound gender inequalities rampant in the BRICS countries as a condition to move along the perspective of sustainability.

Gender inequalities in the BRICS countries

In recent decades, women's role in the world, particularly in the so-called Global South countries, has been changing significantly, even more so when it comes to their increasing participation in the jobs market and in the spheres of power.

Advancing industrialization, especially with the early comprehensiveness of globalization, has transformed the productive structure and afforded "continuity to the urbanization process and, in addition to the reduced fertility rates also observed in less developed countries, these elements have increased women's possibilities of finding jobs. The urban-industrial society has triggered a change to all social classes, worldwide"[3].

However, most women have not broken up the interdependency between family life and professional life; thus, the invisibility of domestic female labor remains, as do the inequalities that qualify their productive inclusion. Women all over the world are confronted with common problems, including domestic and sexual violence, no ensured sexual and reproductive rights, unequal pay between men and women, greater women's footprint in informality, to name but a few of the forms in which inequalities appear, particularly gender discriminations in patriarchal societies. These issues abound in the BRICS countries, which are no exception to the rule and rather present data that reveal deep-rooted gender inequalities.

Development in the Global South and gender inequality

Given this reality, we will develop this analysis on the basis of particularly two aspects that are notoriously strong contributors to explaining inequalities between men and women: invisibilized domestic labor, and unequal insertion in the jobs market.

[3] Pereira de Melo, Hildete. "A construção da igualdade no Brasil" in "Desenvolvimento e Gênero no Sul Global" – Instituto EQUIT. 2015.

These are certainly not the only aspects to consider in trying to understand the situation of gender inequalities in the BRICS countries; however, we shall consider them initially and, in the process of elaborating an understanding of these inequalities, we will certainly find cultural, educational, professional, gender violence, and rights enforcement aspects, among others, that have an impact which is both negative and synergic to achieving greater equality between men and women.

We know that a two-directional focus, as referred by Nancy Fraser, recognizes the existence of links between the economic realm and the realms of cultural representation, since in the case of inequalities between men and women we cannot conceive of social and economic asymmetries without causal relations with the way in which social patterns of representation are developed.

In looking at the economies from the viewpoint of domestic labor performed mostly by women, we observe that their invisibility has meant that this type of activity remained outside that which is considered economically productive and, consequently, outside the proposals of development models and policies.

This is why feminist studies have developed an analysis framework known as "economy of care", which will account for two types of labor: that which is performed unremunerated in the homes, and that of everyday care activities (in the public or private sector) related to the market as remunerated activities. Both types are crucial for the wellbeing of people, and inevitable for economic development; and these are the reasons why we will consider them as we face the development problem in the BRICS countries.

On the other hand, women's participation in the jobs market corresponds to another important aspect in the development of nations, especially in more recent decades and in Global South countries.

"Remarkably, all major productive performances of recent decades in the globalized world have happened because of a massive incorporation of women in the jobs market, which has helped reduce global wage levels along this period of time. From this perspective, and particularly for their unequal conditions in society, poor women

have experienced major difficulties facing globalization processes and economic liberalization. This is why, in many countries which include the BRICS, they are among the main 'losers', and that backs the statement that inequalities underlying men and women's relations have been an important and functional factor enabling this salary drop. [...] It was exactly in development countries that this strategy of increasing capitalist production on the basis of new forms of incorporating and exploiting large amounts of labor, particularly female labor, was most successful"[4].

Another important element of verifying gender inequalities in our societies is found in the salary gaps between men and women, still present in all BRICS countries, revolving around 60-70% and with greater emphasis in India and Brazil—both countries with a strong bias of female participation in the informal labor sector.

Thus, women's productive participation in less developed countries, particularly in the BRICS countries, continues to reveal deep gender inequalities that must be faced in discussions around the sustainability of social and economic development. Women's situation in the jobs market and employment policies will be another focus for our debates around development with sustainability in the BRICS.

As we recognize these two issues that are common to our member countries, we consider that the realm of the BRICS—countries that are remarkably important in the battle for the future of Global South development—offers an opportunity to elaborate debates around inequalities, at the same time it may help us strengthen civil society in those countries to face the social ills.

A brief history of Women's participation in the BRICS process

Since the appearance of the BRICS and the debates around their counter-hegemony role, or at least their counterpoint position against

[4] Rodriguez, G."As mulheres, o desenvolvimento e os BRICS" in "Desenvolvimento e gênero no Sul Global". I. EQUIT. Rio de Janeiro. 2015.

the unilateral system of world power, we believe it is crucial to fight for the block's political and economic future. To that end, we soon understood that civil society involvement in those countries would be necessary. In our case, participation of women's and feminist movements of the BRICS countries would be essential. Especially to contribute to the construction of a networking process focused on criticizing the current international division of labor, the development model of the BRICS countries as well as the development model of other Global South countries, and the South/South cooperation strategies.

Since the Heads of State Summit Meetings started, we have kept abreast of the debates and definitions, mostly based on the experience amassed from the IBAS Forum (India, Brazil and South Africa), which had been developing ever greater institutionality since 2005 and had created a Women's Working Group that enables a number of other enriching meetings, processes and debates between civil society and governments.

So, when the BRICS meetings process started, we were mindful of the monitoring effort and the opportunity that said process meant to us in terms of learning from, discussing among and liaising with women from those countries, given the political importance the "emerging countries" were acquiring worldwide.

These were the reasons why, when the 6th BRICS Summit were held in Fortaleza, Brazil (July 14-16, 2014), local social movements organized a civil society meeting of the BRICS countries.

Alongside, in the framework of that Meeting and in partnership with the AMB, the EQUIT Institute also held the **1st Women's Forum of the BRICS Countries**, on July 15th.

The purpose was to contribute for a liaison among organized women's movements from the BRICS countries and feminist networks and organizations from other countries, particularly from Latin America. And there we discussed future actions that could include incidence upon governments and upon the logics of South/South cooperation. That was a debate space intended to discuss the perspective of women's rights as well as the social and gender inequalities that pervade the reality in those five countries. Despite their cultural

and political singularities, those inequalities share many of the crucially important themes for the enforcement of women's rights.

In Brazil, this effort is organized around the Brazilian Network of Women (*Articulação de Mulheres Brasileiras* – AMB), a national feminist, anti-racist and anti-capitalist network. To welcome the Women's Forum, the AMB mobilized their activists, and to facilitate their participation in Fortaleza, they organized a Feminist House, which was a boarding and a conviviality center that also offered training on feminist policymaking and international networking, and also on the organization of public manifestations of women organized together with other social movements.

Gathering more than 130 Brazilian women from all over the country and another 25 participants from the other BRICS countries, we held this 1st Forum of Women from the BRICS Countries. So, within the framework of a "Dialog on Development from the Peoples' Perspectives", organized by the social movements, the 1st Forum of Women was held. This Forum included discussions on the impacts the development model adopted by the BRICS countries (as well as by most Global South countries) have been causing on the life of women: poverty, inequalities—including gender inequalities—and immense wealth concentration. Fights and resistance efforts looking at sexual and reproductive rights, fights against gender violence, access to public services, social and environmental justice, and policies to adapt to and mitigate climate change, to name but a few of the issues with major impacts upon women from the South were discussed and prioritized in an attempt to generate converging actions. The purpose of that Forum was to create a common agenda with proposals made from a feminist perspective in order to push national governments and the block as a whole.

This Forum was one of the activities in civil society's parallel event and approved a call upon women's and feminist organizations from Brazil and the BRICS countries to continue this initial network that started in Fortaleza to fight for the block's sense and future, as it must include women if it is to build social justice and true development with sustainability.

In the BRICS's Forum of Women, several themes were included for debates that revolved around the fight for women's rights, sexual and reproductive rights, inequalities and income concentration, social and environmental justice, rural policies and food sovereignty, economy of care and migrations, among others. However, in terms of a common agenda for follow-up, some ideas were outlined around the need to elaborate the debate on the BRICS development strategies, which must include public policies of "care" as one way to fight social, economic and gender inequalities.

Along those lines, when the 1st Forum of Women was held, we considered that the BRICS Bank—which was formally formed as an outcome of the Fortaleza Summit—could play a key role in the debate around the concepts and a proper future for the development of South Countries, which are plagued by common issues that connect poverty and social, environmental and gender injustices in a remarkable manner.

Civil Society Forum during the BRICS Summit in Fortaleza. Bank approval. Newspaper The People. Pg 23. Thursday 17 July 2014. Fortaleza- CE. Brazil.

The NDB and the definitions of infrastructure and sustainability

On that occasion, we also warned that "the BRICS Bank should bear in mind the aspects of social and community infrastructure from the perspective of the so-called sustainable development to prioritize access to drinking water, basic sanitations, preventive health, preschool education, impacts of climate change, and so on, meaning the care policies that must be undertaken socially to overcome the current sexual division of labor and its resulting over-exploitation of women's labor".[5]

Women's views contribute to bringing to the Bank the need to understand infrastructure from the perspective of collective social needs, such as physical bases for the implementation of essential public services that are crucial to overcome poverty and to fulfil governmental commitments with the Sustainable Development Goals of the Agenda 2030. Only by including the perspective of a feminist economy will there be a new understanding of social infrastructure—if it happens not to be incorporated, we will witness the same old traditional view of business infrastructure that only proposes the implementation of mega-projects, ports, highways, airports, and so on, stuff that usually cause social conflicts, environmental impacts, and destruction to territories and populations, particularly to the women.

Disputes over the concept of sustainability also bring about major challenges, as it also brings about an understanding of development, since development has come about on many occasions in Global South countries with tragic impacts. An important part of the

[5] http://www.cartacapital.com.br/economia/as-mulheres-o-desenvolvimento-sustentavel-e-os-brics-2820.html

Banco dos Brics.

Brasil pediu a separação entre presidência e conselho

De acordo com o embaixador Carlos Cozendey, "as peças do tabuleiro" foram mexidas para assegurar um equilíbrio na composição do Banco dos Brics

Carlos Cozendey (de terno preto) em debate

process of pushing the NDB is certainly to qualify the concept concerning the Bank's intervention in funding development.

It is not only a matter of having a gender eye looking at the criteria that guide the Bank's loans to prevent unwanted effects, but also adding hope and developing indicators to monitor positive as well as negative impacts on gender inequalities.

This was an initial debate, and the launching pad for white paper ideas that will allow us to think about the BRICS and gender issues together.

The BFW opportunity

The ensuing Summits in Russia and China did not allow for a continuity of the Forum, because of the difficulties organizing public expressions in those countries. This is why the call for a Rio de Janeiro meeting to brainstorm and design a BRICS Feminist Watch in September 2016 became a challenging new opportunity for us where we would bring efforts together to achieve common proposals for the women in the BRICS countries.

So, in March 2017 we got together to take the first steps in planning the BRICS Feminist Watch strategies, when we managed to outline the main themes that this network should undertake along the path of consolidating information, research work, concrete actions and challenges to overcome on the road to facing the severe gender inequalities affecting the BRICS countries.

We are now building national networking spaces and the potential proposals, concerning Brazil, with entities and organizations connected with the country's women's and feminist movements. We already have some background, but it is, nevertheless, a new challenge.

The New Development Bank (NDB) and funding for gender equality

We have already decided that the BRICS Bank will be, initially, the focus for our attention, an attempt to find the paths that will allow us to influence their standards, though at a very early stage.

In Brazil, NDB loans will be managed by the BNDES (the National Bank for Social and Economic Development). The BNDES will therefore be important for the definition of criteria on where to make investments and on previous studies and impact assessment, despite the ever-increasing implications of internal changes, not only social but also private fundraising for their operation.

At the same time, the BNDES has afforded low relevance to their gender policy as far as funding goes, or to their loan granting criteria

or related impacts, and we could say they have had but one concern with the diversity of human resources, which is to incorporate women in their staff. Along these lines, the NDB have not yet mentioned any gender inequalities concern beyond incorporating women in their staff but at least think about infrastructure and sustainability that might contribute to a future of gender justice.

We now need to further develop our understanding of the Bank's role and the possibilities to act in funding "the infrastructure and sustainable development" (as the Bank sets out in their objectives).

Beyond the issues that concern the whole of social movements and include aspects such as transparency and access to information, criteria and determinants for funding, sources of funds, social environmental safeguards, the institution's financial health, among others that ought to fall within the scope of attention of women in the BRICS countries, we have specific aspects that must be detailed and structured as specific proposals.

We must thus ask ourselves the following questions:

How will this infrastructure impact women? How does the Bank see sustainable development, and does that mean incorporating a gender perspective? How can we advance in defining the concept of sustainability? What impacts would funding that does not contemplate gender have among the variables to be considered? What impacts will it have on the Agenda 2030 and complying with the objective of gender equality (Objective 5)? What are the NDB's responsibilities concerning achievement of the SD goals, an agenda that is supposed to guide international actions towards overcoming gender inequalities in a fairer and more balanced world? How can we contribute to conceiving development that will outline pathways for a more effective incorporation of women's issues and for overcoming inequalities?

We know that we will not make do with technical solutions only, that they will have to be social too, as the UN Women have pointed out on the basis of data from the last (2017) follow-up report on the Sustainable Development Goals for 2030. So the NDB needs to ground their decisions on broad perspectives that will enhance vi-

sions for action and for the prevention of inequalities and that will include cultural aspects rather than only economic ones.

In its turn, how will the Bank be able to help countries implement public policies on gender, on fighting violence against women—an extremely severe problem in all countries of the block—or on enforcing national care systems that will enable the BRICS countries to advance towards overcoming unequal access to the jobs market for women.[6]

When it comes to funding projects, how will the Bank create mechanisms to prevent the many women's rights violations, often committed by the companies? How could the Bank strengthen not only governmental actions but also civil society actions as well as actions by women's organizations to enable enhancements to the gender perspective? What equal requirement parameters must the countries comply with?

Guidelines for an NDB gender policy

We initially thought of establishing three types of guidelines:

1. Guidelines set to strengthen the women's footprint, especially with training in feminist economy and/or in gender categories, to compose the Bank's staff;
2. Guidelines for public policies on gender concerning the BRICS countries (and then for the countries where the Bank will operate) that will seek to prevent multiple violence—economic, social and institutional—against women and society advancement to overcome gender inequalities;
3. Guidelines to strengthen civil society and, particularly, women's organizations in terms of gender in the BRICS countries and in the societies where there are projects funded by the Bank.

[6] https://elpais.com/elpais/2017/07/12/planeta_futuro/1499884497_743637.html - "Guía para mejorar la vida de mitad de la humanidad".

Developing those guidelines will imply various tasks. Committing to them will certainly be in connection with understanding that the NDB will reach over the need to define development with the inclusion of women in order to be effective sustainable. There is no sustainability in social time or space without the incorporation of women in their diversity of economic contributions—remunerated or not—such as in the broadly understood unremunerated domestic labor in the BRICS countries.

- We know very well that assessing data from situations of deep inequality as is the case of women in the BRICS countries, which are already available in some but need to be updated in others, will be a first priority task.
- As a matter of urgency, as well, we will need to assess how committed the countries are with the standards of current international agreements (such as CEDAW, the Beijing Platform, the ILO framework conventions, among others), which will have to be met by the Bank in every country, with potential for use as funding contingencies.
- Experiences from national development banks will have to be sought, whether positive or negative. Knowing the Brazilian BNDES experience would be important to subsidize parameters. That knowledge involves those bank's sets of standards and staff needs as well as gender criteria for the selection of projects to be funded, with required monitoring of gender impacts from funding, safeguards for credit, and so on.
- Public debates around the Bank's understanding of what infrastructure and what sustainable development will the NDB leverage financial resources.
- NDB analyses and normative standards will have to incorporate studies and evaluations of human rights violations by companies funded by the national development banks and others in the various BRICS countries as well as any other country where they may receive funding. In the case of Brazil, various studies and reports have come out to the public in paradigmatic cases such as the mega-projects for the FIFA World Cup or the construction of hydro-

electric power plants such as Santo Antônio and Jirau and, particularly, Belo Monte, on the Xingu River, and cases of support to national companies abroad, such as the Mozambique infrastructure funding of the Brazilian agribusiness sector, among others.

- Include recommendations based on the countries' periodic reports for CEDAW compliance in the process of selecting projects for funding. Also, human rights reports developed in the case of Brazil by the Human Rights Platform.
- Keep track of the Intergovernmental Working Group results for development and the UN Human Rights Council voting of the UN Binding Treaty for transnational and other companies around human rights.
- At the global level, the civil society has been developing a campaign against the impunity of transnational companies, http://www.stopcorporateimpunity.org/?page_id=8435&lang=es, which is a broad platform for tracking, networking and reporting of rights violations by companies, where cases of BRICS Bank funding could be tracked.

In summary, a broad range of questions and proposals could guide the common job of preparing the incidence of women's and feminist movements in the BRICS countries about the NDB.

September 2017.

Developed by:
Instituto EQUIT

Texts:
Graciela Rodriguez

English Version:
Karen Lang

Graphic Design:
Letra e Imagem Editora

Support: