



## After 2015: Promoting Pro-Poor Policy after the MDGS – The Plenary Presentations and Discussion

Michael Tribe\* and Aurélien Lafon†

**Abstract:** The main conclusions from the plenary sessions of the Policy Forum can be summarised as follows: 1) Focus must still remain on achieving the MDGs; 2) Developing country ownership of the new framework is essential and the approach must therefore be Southern-led; 3) The obligations of the developed countries towards the achievement of the MDGs need clarification; 4) International income and wealth redistribution should be a ‘right’ (‘automatic’ rather than discretionary) including international redistributive taxes; 5) International inequality and its reduction should be given more emphasis; 6) Ethical and moral perspectives need emphasising within a global social justice, rather than a purely indicator-driven, approach; 7) ‘Fragile’ states and global uncertainty need special treatment; 8) The ‘quality’ of MDG achievements, rather than ‘quantities’, needs emphasising; 9) The science and technology capacity of developing countries is critically important; 10) Processes which deliver the quantitative indicators (MDGs) require more emphasis – such as Global Governance. 11) Serious research is needed to ensure the debate is well informed.

The objective of this report is to provide a record of the presentations by invited speakers at the Policy Forum, of the questions and comments by distinguished participants from the floor, and of responses by the main speakers. The summary is based on detailed notes from the Plenary Sessions, supplemented by audio recordings, PowerPoint presentations and background papers.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* Honorary Secretary, Development Studies Association of the UK and Ireland  
([m.a.tribe@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:m.a.tribe@bradford.ac.uk))

† Project Officer, European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes  
([lafon@eadi.org](mailto:lafon@eadi.org))

**Plenary 1 – What has been the impact of the MDG paradigm on poverty reduction and what does that mean for an MDG plus agenda?**

**Chairman – Lawrence Haddad (President DSA and Director IDS, Sussex)**

Professor Haddad thanked the organisers for providing a strong framework for the day's discussions. He suggested that there are contradictions between some MDGs and a failure to recognise success effectively. Should there be more MDG indicators or fewer? Should there be more emphasis on the implementation process, or on achievement of impacts? Should there be more emphasis on accountability? What are the meanings of 'process' and 'impact' in the MDG context? Can there be a better discourse about 'process' and 'impact'?

The theory of change is important – what do we think the MDGs are trying to achieve? Are the media effectively connected to the MDG process? How aware are the public of the MDGs? What is the role of civil society? What data problems exist? What are the preconditions and assumptions behind the theory of change? Have things been included within the MDG targets because they are easy to measure? Is there an indicator-led evaluative process? Finally, should there be MDGs or not?

**Salil Shetty (Director, United Nations Millennium Campaign) – Respecting the rights of poor countries and people**

- a) The MDGs should be de-linked from the international aid system;
- b) MDG-related action should be 'local' rather than technocratic and statist;
- c) Monitoring and reporting needs a higher priority;
- d) It is necessary to identify what has worked and what hasn't worked.

There is a problem in discussing what is to happen 'after 2015' while people are experiencing great difficulty with the credit crunch. What do we do before 2015? How do we do better the second time round? How does this relate to a 'donor driven' agenda? The MDGs represent a counterpoint to the Washington Consensus.

The MDGs have limitations: They are a public good; Problems with their formulation and conceptualisation; A tendency to be technocratic with a statist view of the world; Human rights are not included; No targets for the developed high income countries; No view of 'justice'; Political economy is ignored; A focus on success rather than on the implications of

failure to achieve the targets; The balance between quantity and quality in the achievement of the targets is important.

**Figure 1 – MDG Outcomes have been very significant**

- Over 300 million people taken out of poverty since 2000
- Three million fewer children die each year – total below ten million for the first time
- More than 30 million additional children in school
- Two million people living with HIV have ARV access
- TB, malaria and access to water: big advances

Source: Salil Shetty's PowerPoint presentation

Achievements include: Forty countries have had debts cancelled; Aid has increased substantially; Major advances on the control of tuberculosis and other significant diseases. Many very poor countries are doing well on the goals (See Figure 1). Note the 2009 MDG Report (United Nations, 2009).

Problems include: a major economic crisis in addition to food and energy crises; child mortality is lagging behind; quality is important; and the quality of education and aid can be poor. The total global amount spent on arms in 2008 was \$1.5 trillion, implying significant resourcing choices. In developing countries the corruption issue often has to be addressed head-on, and mindless civil and international wars are 'burning' large amounts of money. Funds are available, but we often make the wrong choices.

**Enrico Giovannini (Chief Statistician, OECD)**

- a) We need to focus on the concept of equitable wellbeing;
- b) Information needs to be effectively transformed into knowledge in the era of online networking;
- c) We need a new narrative.

There is a danger that the MDGs could become a straitjacket, with a contrast between national and international levels of discussion, process and analysis. The MDGs do not have a negative role, but the absence of a clear conceptual framework is an issue. Although a single paradigm would be a great achievement, the knowledge-policy interaction has not been subjected to sufficient critical review. There are also issues of ownership, data, commitment and accountability.

The MDGs are a public good, but so are statistics and indicators. Is there too much attention to data and not enough to process? The original meaning of the word 'statistics' is 'the science of the state' – statistics can help societies to make decisions. Indicators often don't match the associated concepts – but international organisations are making progress. Politicians tend to quote only statistics which are favourable to them. The United Nations Statistics Commission focuses on statistical capacity building, aiming to improve the quality of developing country statistics – with significant success.

Statisticians have frequently been brushed aside by politicians, perhaps contributing to the lack of a sound conceptual basis for the MDGs. However, they are regarded as a 'model' by policy makers. In the monitoring of the MDGs, and of socio-economic development in general, emphasis tends to be on production of data rather than of *Information, Knowledge and Policies*. The logical chain linking these three elements has been broken. There is unclear ownership of data – and of accountability – a type of 'creative ambiguity'. Richard Manning (2009) has recently emphasised that we know little about the impact of the MDGs on this chain, and little about the impact of the chain on the MDGs.

Within Game Theory a Non-repeated Game is very different from a Repeated Game. An essential guide for the future is an information set relating to what has worked, and what has not worked. This would narrow down and rationalise the discussion, and help establish a conceptual framework. An important contemporary developmental feature is the very rapid global transmission of ideas and information.

### **Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (Professor in International Affairs, New School, New York) - MDGs and the international development agenda**

- a) The MDGs need to be internalised within the policy systems of developing countries;
- b) Elements of a human rights approach need to be added to the MDGs;
- c) Most importantly an explicit goal for the reduction of inequality needs to be added.

What is the MDG paradigm? Is it within the paradigm of liberalism? Is it related to a paradigm of policy and planning or of partnership? Do the MDGs represent a form of global citizenship? The main objectives of the MDGs are to end poverty and to improve the human condition – the motivation is the marginalisation of poor people, and the marginalisation of countries from globalisation, and the basic policy thrust should be a search for a more inclusive form of globalisation that spreads the benefits more widely.

**Figure 2 – Main Features of the Washington Consensus and of the MDGs**

	<b>Mainstream 1990s (Washington Consensus)</b>	<b>UN conference agenda (MDGs)</b>
<b>Policy priorities</b>	WC/macroeconomic stability; social investments; economic governance	Inclusive globalisation; social investments; economic governance; pro-poor growth; democratic governance
<b>Development paradigm</b>	Neoliberalism (WC/globalisation)	Basic needs, human development/capabilities; human rights; developmentalism
<b>Partnership paradigm</b>	Ownership & mutual accountability; MDGs; PRSPs; PRGF/HIPC	Ownership & mutual accountability; MDGs
<b>International Norms</b>	Free market competition	End poverty; level playing field; equitable globalisation

Source: Compilation by Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and reproduced from her presentation

The origins of the MDGs are diametrically opposed to the Washington Consensus with the basic principles as Equity, Global Partnership, and Human Well-being. There have been shifts in policy priorities: *High priorities* are growth, income poverty, governance; *Weaker priorities* are employment and hunger; and *Neglected priorities* are democratic governance, global technology and pro-poor growth. Alongside neoliberalism the ‘basic needs’ paradigm of the 1980s and 1990s amounts to a human rights approach and since the 1960s ‘development’ has been regarded as a process whereby developing countries structurally transformed themselves and catch up with developed countries.

It is significant that cultural diversity, and the principles of accountability, democracy and social values are rarely mentioned. The MDGs can be seen as a Faustian bargain: they have a powerful message but have tended to become the message itself.

Plenary 1 Questions were put by Simon Trace (Practical Action), Heather Grady (Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalisation Initiative), Jean-Luc Maurer (EADI and Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva), Claire Melamed (ActionAid), Frazer Goodwin (European Public Health Alliance), Sandeep Chachra (ActionAid India), Dennis Lucey (University of Cork), and two others.

If the MDGs had worked the indicators would have changed, but little evidence was forthcoming from the presenters; Trade does not have an equitable basis; Water supply does not have an ‘affordability’ dimension; A social protection package is needed; MDG 1 has done best – why?; The maternal mortality goal has done least well – why?; Inequality, insecurity and voicelessness are still major issues; If equity issues are accepted then limits on wealth accumulation are needed; Resilience and sustainability of gains needs to be built

into the MDGs; The MDGs were developed at a time of high overseas development assistance – but it then dropped seriously; Has there been detailed analysis of whether the MDGs have led to improvements in the target indicators?; The MDGs, and the ‘After 2015 agenda’ are in the context of the United Nations reform process; Where does debate on political economy come in?; What are the roles of labour remuneration and incomes to small-holders?; Increased hunger is projected but has it been lost from the discussion?

#### Salil Shetty’s responses

The US administration is of key global significance, although the MDGs represent a global compact with shared responsibility. President Obama has accepted the MDGs while President Bush did not. Are new indicators and targets needed? The UN tends to change slowly – particularly when agreement has been achieved with difficulty. There are enough targets which have not been achieved and which can be worked on beyond 2015. The MDGs may encourage a more heterodox policy-oriented approach. Successful developing countries have adapted the MDGs to national needs and have rejected the ‘donor-driven’ approach. Poorer people need to have preferential access to resources for poverty reduction. The MDGs have increased aid flows because they have outcomes to which the home ‘constituencies’ of the donor bodies can respond. Public opinion and public pressure are important, for example the ‘Make Poverty History’ campaign and Jubilee 2000. International norms have been influenced by the MDGs although in a constrained way. MDGs need to be ‘localised’. We haven’t learned enough from the past through research and consultation with practitioners and policy communities.

#### Enrico Giovannini’s responses

It is impossible to judge whether the MDGs have had an impact – there is a problem with the development of counterfactuals so that the focus may best be on outcomes. The quality issue is important. Political leaders have learnt how to misuse statistics. A recent Worldwide Gallup Poll included 50 indicators of ‘wellbeing’, suggesting an unfocussed approach. There is a danger that politicians may increasingly use ‘soft’ survey data (for example the Gallup Poll results) rather than relying on hard economic data.

#### Sakiko Fukuda-Parr’s responses

Distinguish between outcome indicators and input and process indicators. There is a danger of a ‘gimmick’ approach, and a need for a bottom-up, rather than a technocratic top-down,

approach. It is necessary to focus on means rather than ends. There is a need to add human rights and wellbeing objectives to the MDGs. The donors need to accept a changed set of priorities – but are reluctant to do so. Support for the productive sector is neglected – e.g. industrialisation policies, economic infrastructure.

**Plenary 2 — What are the key meta-processes shaping development over the next 10-15 years and what do they imply for an MDG plus agenda?**

**Chairman: Jean-Luc Maurer (President EADI and Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva)**

This plenary had an orientation towards ‘processes’ rather than ‘outcomes’. Margaret Thalwitz of the GDI apologised for her absence, and Alfred Nhema kindly agreed to make a presentation in her place.

**Charles Gore (Special Coordinator Cross-sectoral Issues, Division for Africa, Least Developed Countries and Special Programmes, UNCTAD)**

- a) The MDGs should not be abandoned, but could and should become ‘rights’;
- b) A new consensus is needed, not based on the MDGs but on sustainable productive capacity;
- c) Wellbeing (poverty reduction) objectives should be built in, including taxes based on global transactions.

The significant game change is the financial crisis – not simply instability. There are contradictions in the current development trajectory and in the associated paradigm. The MDGs are not a development paradigm, but simply a set of indicators. The Keynesian model – with a focus on international development consensus – broke down at the end of the 1970s. The MDGs (as indicators) are essentially the Washington Consensus with a Human Face – based on the concept of ‘Development Partnership’. The weaknesses of this position are: Market Fundamentalism with a neo-liberal approach; Radical global income inequality; Global interdependence without accountability; A socio-institutional mismatch.

**Figure 3 – The Nature of Radical Global Income Inequality**

- Richest 1 per cent of people receive as much as poorest 57 per cent (50 million richest receive as much as 2.7 billion poorest) (Milanovic, 2005).

- Poorest 40 per cent of world population receive 5 per cent of world income ('failed states').
- No world middle class – 17 per cent of world population (75 to 125 per cent of world median income) have 7 per cent of world income.
- Globalisation of expectations without globalisation of opportunity.

Source: Charles Gore's PowerPoint presentation

Consider the Kondratieff cycle – a 55 to 60 year cycle which consists of: 'Summer' – 30 years of growth with inflation; 'Autumn' – Crisis; 'Winter' – 30 years of decline and deflation; 'Spring' – Crisis. The way out of the Kondratieff Winter is technological innovation – and the development of productive capacity. This has implications for an MDG Plus Agenda, with adaptations needed for climate change, and for global inequality. A key issue is 'globally sustainable development'.

### **Alfred Nhema (Chief Executive, Pan African Development Centre)**

- a) Take account of local, regional and international dimensions;
- b) African countries need to learn from other parts of the world;
- c) Promote a 'bottom-up' approach.

The MDGs have incentivised African governments towards poverty reduction strategies. The African Union (AU), the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) all emphasise achievement of the MDGs. There is pressure for a new definition of development, with the MDG Africa Steering and Working Group exemplifying this. The challenge to Africa is greater than anywhere else in the world.

There are new threats and opportunities. Examples are: Governance, Environment and Food Security; There is a need to combine MDGs with local measures and indicators through domestic politics and processes; There are demands for new 'actors' to be added to the system – including the BRICs, South Africa and Venezuela; How will the aid architecture deal with new threats, opportunities and challenges?



**Richard Morgan (Director of Policy and Practice, UNICEF)**

- a) Rethink the urban versus rural paradigm in an integrated perspective;
- b) Address the issue of physical protection as part of human development;
- c) Promote local ownership of development goals.

Many of the MDG indicators relate to children, but the MDG discourse itself has little reference to children. Refer to the Millennium Declaration of September 2000 (United Nations, 2000: paragraph 19). Between the Declaration and the final version of the MDGs some references to children have been lost, including special assistance for orphans.

The MDGs say little about 'people', and have insufficient emphasis on processes and strategies by which goals are to be achieved and human rights realised. Previous speakers have quite rightly spoken about social protection, but physical protection is also of paramount importance to children. This point has been lost between the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs. The urban paradigm is also important, with serious reflection about the significance of urban settlement patterns. We need to look beyond the rural paradigm alone to an integrated balanced one. The issue of failing states is another which needs more emphasis. 'Failed states' which sign up to the MDGs often lack legitimacy and impact.

Local ownership is a crucial principle, associated with the basic needs and human rights approaches. New information technologies give new potential to localisation within development processes. There is concern over the exclusive use of household sample surveys in monitoring and evaluating MDG achievements. The results-based management system needs to be re-visited with design of better evaluation systems and use of participatory evaluative methods. Investment programmes should support the processes through which people survive, grow, learn and develop, as well as the infrastructure that facilitates these processes.

Plenary 2 Questions were put by: Louis Kasekende (African Development Bank); Enrico Giovannini (OECD); Geof Wood (University of Bath); Joanne Green (CAFOD); Marc Levy (European Centre for Development Policy Management, Netherlands); Astrid Walker-Bourne (HelpAge International); Guy Collender (London International Development Centre); Margaret Mayo (Goldsmiths College, University of London); and three others.

How are revenues from global taxation to be distributed?; Might aid dependence increase?; Is there a need for a new vocabulary?; How are social aspects integrated into sustainable development?; The results-based approach to development management neglects socio-political structures and institutional frameworks; Where do grassroots social movements fit in to the MDGs?; What is the meaning of meta-processes?; Is it possible to de-couple economic growth and environmental impact?; Political economy is missing from the presentations – with no mention of power relations; Words such as ‘justice’ can get lost in ‘translation’ between the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs; Should we be referring to poverty reduction or to poverty elimination?; The 21<sup>st</sup> century has enormous issues of climate change and population dynamics; There is a major communications dimension – how many people know about the MDGs and outcomes?; Is there any escape from the dominance of rural development?; How can we accommodate conflicting priorities?; What is the link between peace, security, conflict resolution and achievement of the MDGs?; What are the implications for countries which started from different positions? Do we need two tiers?; What are the implications of the ‘drive from the North’ for educational targets and working with civil society?

#### Charles Gore’s responses

Global taxation raises the issue of aid dependency – aid is needed in the short run (with good aid management policies), but not in the long run. New paradigms are required for global sustainable development; For example – in Mali there are 175,000 people joining the labour force every year at present, peaking at about 400,000 per annum by 2045, and representing a serious employment creation challenge. The MDGs put everybody into the same global social space. Global numbers and the single global social space are powerful (refer to Milanovic, 2005).

#### Alfred Nhema’s responses

The NEPAD peer reviews took ‘forever’ – such protracted reviews should be avoided. There are significant peace and security issues – note the importance of terrorism. Greater African commitment to transnational issues such as climate change is needed. This commitment should go together with greater South-South cooperation.

#### Richard Morgan’s responses

Should goals be set by one group of people and applied to another group of people? The significant under-nutrition of Indian children has been a major shock. It is currently about double the rate for sub-Saharan Africa at around 43 per cent. Is personally in favour of rural development with concerns for disempowerment and the implications of rapid urban population growth. Local initiatives are important.

### **Plenary 3 – Towards an MDG plus agenda**

**Chairman: Andrew Steer (Director General of Policy and Research, DFID)**

#### **Louis Kasekende (Chief Economist, African Development Bank) – Pro-poor Policies After MDGs in Sub-Saharan Africa**

- a) We still have a long way to go to achieve the MDGs
- b) There is a need to focus on fragile states;
- c) Broaden Goal 7 to include sustainability: Divide MDG 1 into wealth creation and lowering inequality;
- d) A higher level of public expenditure/ODA is needed for basic social services;
- e) Prioritisation, sequencing and coherence of financing are important.
- f) Targets are a means rather than an end in their own right.
- g) There is a need to mitigate the risks of external shocks

Statistics are an issue in terms of both quantity and quality (refer to Enrico Giovannini's presentation). Progress has been made in both respects but there is still a long way to go. Targets need to be linked with policy instruments (and vice versa) for Pro-Poor Policies, with a continuing need to improve donor coordination. Projects need to be better integrated into national development plans and policies (OECD, 2005). The MDGs will still be relevant after 2015, but they need re-thinking. For example, in Kenya income inequality has led to social tensions and political upheaval a move 'backwards' – inequality breeds instability. The economic growth rate has fallen, with asymmetrical responses to external shocks jeopardising 10 years of 'progress' within six months. It is necessary to find a way to mitigate external shocks.

- 1) Divide MDG 1 into two parts: i) Wealth creation as a prerequisite for redistribution, with a balance between infrastructure, health and education; ii) Lower inequality can promote stability.

2) Focus on fragile states – such as the Congo, Sudan, Sierra Leone and Somalia. There is a risk of growth achievements being lost – for example Guinea Bissau and the drugs trade. How do we address this? A good policy environment is a precondition for the achievement of the MDGs. Aid needs to be allocated to fragile states before they become failed states.

**Figure 4 – Better Definition of Policy Instruments**

- There is no clear mapping from policy instruments to targets
- no information on the sensitivity of targets to instruments
- no defined intermediate targets
- fewer targets = easier implementation and monitoring
- Lack of adequate control over policy instruments:
  - poor policy alignment
  - weak harmonization of aid policies

Source: Louis Kasekende's PowerPoint presentation

3) Broaden Goal 7: include Sustainable Growth with better definition of policy instruments. Reconsider the balance between investment in social and economic infrastructure and align instruments with targets. Significant threats to sustainability include climate change and external shocks.

**Claire Melamed (Head of Policy, Action Aid)**

- It is developing country governments which need to deliver the MDGs;
- Funding mechanisms need to shift from uncertain 'aid' to more predictable redistributive mechanisms such as the Currency Transaction Tax (previously known as the 'Tobin Tax') providing funds based on rights rather than charity.

All of the issues being discussed need a broad context based in socio-economic structures, with a need to a) mobilise resources for development and b) to create the right incentives. Two overriding issues are i) Power and Politics and ii) Inequality. There is a need to look beyond aid for a new and better narrative on 'after the MDGs' in order to provide incentives for 'development'. Achieving this type of change is a slow process.

There has been some success with resource mobilisation (for example the Gleneagles Agreement in 2005). Incentives, targets and the organising framework are important, but the current agenda has been less than successful, ignoring the key realities of gender and power. We need to better understand the blocks to poverty reduction. Distributional issues

have tended to be 'slipped under the carpet'. There is a significant gender issue: women produce the most food but consume the least. Power relations, and 'politics' are not adequately reflected in the MDGs and there is a need to move towards a 'Global Welfare State'.

Statistics should focus less on averages, and more on distributions around the averages, with a higher profile for an underlying narrative about redistribution and increased attention devoted to individual rights to minimum levels of services and income. 'Rights' for individuals to a standard of living need to be established, not as 'charity' but as domestic government and international obligations.

**Yehualashet Mekonen (Coordinator, Information and Statistics, African Child Policy Forum) – Why development should be seen from the individual person's perspective**

- a) Targets should not be 'universal';
- b) Indicators should be qualified in terms of quality;
- c) Population dynamics need to be taken into account more effectively;
- d) Long-term capacity building programmes on Science and Technology are needed;
- e) Policy space should be emphasised.

The presentation started with a description of the African Child Policy Forum and its annual report (2008). The proportion of poor in Africa is approximately 50 to 60 per cent. Child poverty is a particular problem and is increasing in Ethiopia, for example, where 28 per cent of children under the age of five years are underweight.

**Figure 5 – The Current Status of Poverty in Africa**

- Increase in the absolute number of people living in poverty
- Child poverty is very serious concern
- Incidence of poverty higher among children than adults
- In Ethiopia: child poverty was 3 percentage-points higher in 2004/2005.

Source: Yehualashet Mekonen's PowerPoint presentation

The impact of climate change will be of increasing importance, with shrinking lakes and reservoirs. The quality of education is an issue, not just the quantity – the pupil to teacher ratio has deteriorated in countries significantly increasing their net enrolment ratio – emphasis on primary education has arguably reduced secondary education standards.

**Andreas Rechkemmer (International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change, United Nations University, Bonn) – MDGs and Global Environmental Change: Governance, Innovation and Learning**

- a) Learn from past socio-technological shifts;
- b) Design a meta-narrative for the future incorporating uncertainty;
- c) Prioritise development of a new global governance system.

The word 'Anthropocene' (disruption caused by human activity to the Earth's climate and ecosystems) is highly relevant to the post-2015 MDGs. A new approach to global governance is needed for the Eco-system and Human Wellbeing. The post-2015 agenda needs to be changed radically with the main issues being equity, the MDGs and climate change. There is also a need to overcome the fragmentation of discourses and to protect ecosystems. Major features of the global condition are a high levels of uncertainty and change.

Plenary 3 Questions were put by: Jasmine Burnley (CONCORD); Lawrence Haddad (DSA and IDS, Sussex); Jan Vandemoortele (former UN staff member); Simon Trace (Practical Action); Tanya Barron (Leonard Cheshire Disability); Matthew Longford (Norwegian Centre on Human Rights); Joanne Green (CAFOD); Ralf-Matthias Mohs (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development - BMZ); Enrico Giovannini (OECD); Andrew Fischer (ISS, The Hague); Stephan-Klaus Ohme (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development – BMZ ); Sandeep Chachra (ActionAid India); Jon Barnes (Panos, London); Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (New School, New York); Miranda Kazantzis (Amnesty International); and three others.

Although there may be agreement on looking beyond aid, what is the political willingness to take forward a reform agenda?; There is an issue over 'doing development differently' with a need to go beyond self-defined development experts and accessing the private sector, religious groups, diplomats, security personnel; The MDGs need to be globalised with developed countries signing up to them as well; Do not rush into anything for 2010 – some stakeholders want to change the MDGs early, but there is a need for adjustment to new circumstances after the financial crisis of 2008/2009; A panel of experts from the South, excluding donors, should prepare a draft 'extension' of the MDGs beyond 2015 – ready for 2012; There are three main questions: global equity and injustice, localisation, and sustainability; We need a systematic approach to minorities, like the UN Conventions, with training attached; Global discourse is needed before establishing a panel of experts; Values

and ethics should be incorporated into the post-2015 MDGs; There will be a new Papal Encyclical in July relevant to the MDGs; Redistribution of capital ownership (wealth) is important; The re-capitalisation of the poor is important; The role of the market needs to be re-considered; There is a need to start action soon on review of the MDGs because the debate has already started; More research is needed on i) new concepts and a new language, ii) new measures (indicators), iii) new government models; New measures (indicators) and standards are needed for development – one of the high priority measures (indicators) is for vulnerability and associated issues; History needs to be unpacked rather than relying on selective memory of particular views and arguments; A feature of the current system is an exaggerated view of the importance of the aid industry; It is necessary to distinguish between the ideological baggage of conditionality and essential elements of development policy; There is need to learn from local governance reform, including decentralisation and 'rights to information' (including 'transparency'); We are in danger of opening Pandora's Box; The current MDGs are linked to the Millennium Declaration and so new MDGs require a new Millennium Declaration; Two major areas needed in post-2015 MDGs are security policy and climate change; Changes to the MDGs should be distinctive; Are governments the best judges of accountability?; More work is needed on human rights issues, data requirements and benchmarks, and human rights; Communication is important; The MDGs have become internationally 'internalised' but they should now be taken out of the aid industry context; Poverty needs to be taken seriously as a human rights issue; Transparency is crucial, including military issues and corporate governance.

#### Responses to the Plenary 3 questions

Louis Kasekende (African Development Bank) – there is currently a certain lack of democracy with the G20 – Africa is not represented for example.<sup>2</sup>

Yehualashet Mekonen (African Child Policy Forum) – adding another 10 years to the current MDGs would not be a big issue.

Claire Melamed (ActionAid) – now is the time to start pushing forward on the future of the MDGs.

#### **Points from the summing up by the Plenary 3 Chairman – Andrew Steer (DFID)**

- It is crucial whilst debating the post-2015 agenda that we remain committed to achieving the MDGs. This must be our first priority.

Process:

- Moving forward a coherent and coordinated approach is needed, The UK/DFID believe the process needs to be Southern-led but is keen to engage/support at both the substance and process level;
- The financial crisis has provided a political opportunity to move in new directions – this opportunity should be actively seized;
- Serious research is needed to ensure the debate is well informed.
- There is a need to synthesise where the current debates are in a number of areas including: the strengths and weaknesses of the current MDGs, (note the recent contributions by Richard Manning (2009)) Global Equity and vulnerability, approaches to measuring Well-Being, Sustainability and Security;

Substance:

- A new and different narrative is needed;
- It is important for the new framework to be motivational and one where commitments can be clearly monitored;
- The new framework needs to be related to and relevant to country plans for local ownership to prevail;
- There is a need to build an integrated approach: combining the political dimensions, environmental sustainability, working with the private sector and citizens involvement to name just a few;
- The link between the MDGs and international development finance is already being debated; on the one hand ideally there should not be a link between the new framework and international financing, however past experience has shown us that the goals can be useful in mobilising resources;

**References**

- African Child Policy Forum. 2008. *African Report on Child Wellbeing 2008*. Addis Ababa: ACPF – accessed on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 from: [www.africanchildinfo.net/](http://www.africanchildinfo.net/)
- Fukuda-Parr, S. 2008. *Are the MDGs Priority in Development Strategies and Aid Programmes? Only Few Are!*. Brasilia: Working Paper 48, October. UNDP International Poverty Centre – accessed on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 from: [www.eadi.org/](http://www.eadi.org/)



- Gore, C. 2009. *The Global Development Cycle, MDGs and the Future of Poverty Reduction*. Background paper prepared for the Policy Forum – accessed on 22<sup>nd</sup> September from [www.eadi.org/](http://www.eadi.org/)
- Manning, R. 2009. *Using Indicators to Encourage Development: Lessons from the Millennium Development Goals*. DIIS Report 2009-01. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Development – accessed on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 from: [www.diiis.dk/](http://www.diiis.dk/)
- Milanovic, B. 2005. *Worlds Apart: Measuring International and Global Inequality*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- OECD. 2005. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2009 from: [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/)
- OECD. 2009. Aid Flows Database – OECD Stats Extract Aid Activities Dataset – accessed on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2009 from [www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/data)
- United Nations. 2000. *The United Nations Millennium Declaration*. General Assembly Resolution 55/2 of 8<sup>th</sup> September 2000. New York: United Nations – accessed on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009 from: [www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm)
- United Nations. 2009. *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2009*. New York: United Nations – accessed on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 from: [www.un.org/millenniumgoals/](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/)
- UNCTAD. 2009. *The Least Developed Countries Report 2009*. Geneva: United Nations – accessed on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 from: [www.unctad.org/](http://www.unctad.org/)

## **Endnotes**

---

<sup>1</sup> The PowerPoint presentations and background papers are available at <http://www.bit.ly/after2015>. Podcasts are available on the EADI webpage at <http://www.eadi.org/index.php?id=1108>

<sup>2</sup> Information about the G20 can be found at [www.g20.org/](http://www.g20.org/) (accessed 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2009).