

d.i.e

Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik



German Development  
Institute



Federal Ministry  
for Economic Cooperation  
and Development

**PEGNet**

International Workshop

**“The Millennium Development Goals and Beyond: Reflections on an  
International Development Agenda after 2015”**

**Workshop Report**

21-23 November 2011  
Bonn, Germany

Organised by the German Development Institute/ Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik (**DIE**)  
in cooperation with the Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (**PEGNet**)  
and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development  
(**BMZ**)

## Introduction

*"When the MDGs were first articulated, we knew that achieving them would, in a sense, be only half the job." (Ban Ki-moon, 2011)*

The Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals have become a **universal framework for development** and international cooperation, inspiring development efforts that have improved the lives of many people around the world. With this in mind, responsibility has to be assumed to **undertake everything possible to achieve the MDGs**. But the deadline is fast approaching and with four years to go until 2015 and despite considerable progress in some dimensions, the challenges ahead loom large. As the UN secretary-general acknowledged, the **world needs to look beyond 2015**, even though progress on the Millennium Development Goals has been fitful. A core issue is how development policy in the future could best contribute towards addressing the pressing challenges by the continued existence of poverty and threats to human wellbeing. Further, **challenges such as climate change, fragile statehood and unstable markets** will become increasingly relevant. These complex problems entail equally complex decision-making processes. An effective development policy framework should accommodate the insights on how to reconcile our way of life with the necessity to ensure ecological, economic and social sustainability.

In the lead-up to 2015, the international development community is embarking on two parallel processes: on the one hand, evaluating the success of the MDG agenda – were the goals met? – and on the other hand, discussing possible instruments and targets that will provide a framework for development policy after 2015. The international workshop "**The Millennium Development Goals and Beyond: Reflections on an International Development Agenda after 2015**", organised by the German Development Institute/ Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (**DIE**) in cooperation with the Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (**PEGNet**) and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (**BMZ**), was meant to contribute to this discussion about the future of the development policy beyond the Millennium Development Goals.

The workshop gathered together policy makers and participants from civil society, academia and think tanks as well as from international organisations, both from developed and developing countries. All these **different actors had to actively join in** the discussion from an early stage on in order to **reach a broad and internationally supported agenda and finally consensus** on a post MDG framework.

This **documentation is structured according to the workshop programme**. It gives an overview of the four sessions from the first two days, briefly summarising the presentations and the subsequent discussions. Furthermore, the documentation reflects the group discussions and brainstorming for a post-MDG-framework on the third day. Besides the names of the presenters, the **documentation of the discussions is held anonymous**.

## Workshop Programme

### Monday, 21 November 2011

- 14:00-14:30 *Welcome and introductory remarks*  
Imme Scholz, Deputy Director of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn  
Jutta Kranz-Plote, Head of the “MDGs, Poverty Reduction, Social Protection, Sectoral and Thematic Policies” Division, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn  
Rainer Thiele, Head of the “Poverty Reduction, Equity, and Development” Research Area, Kiel Institute for the World Economy, Kiel
- 14:30-16:30 *Session 1: The need for a new global development agenda*  
Phil Vernon, International Alert, London:  
*Working with the Grain to Change the Grain: Moving beyond the MDGs*  
Malcolm Langford, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, Oslo:  
*Post-2015: Pathways, Targets and Indicators*  
Lord Mawuko-Yevugah, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg:  
*Beyond the Rhetoric of Development Partnerships and Towards the Construction of Equal and Inclusive Global Development Agenda*  
*Discussant:* Timo Voipio, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFAF), Helsinki  
*Moderator:* Markus Loewe, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
- 16:30-17:00 *Coffee break*
- 17:00-19:00 *Session 2: The content of a new global development agenda*  
Vinay Kumar Singh, National Academy of Direct Taxes, Nagpur, India:  
*Emphasize Capacity Building, Inputs and Processes to Achieve Greater Impact of MDGs*  
Gabriele Köhler, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex:  
*Human Security: a framework for deepening the MDGs*  
Jan Rieländer, OECD Development Centre, Paris:  
*Social cohesion: A useful framework for assessing social progress in fast growing countries?*  
*Discussant:* Paul Ladd, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York  
*Moderator:* Melanie Wiskow, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
- 20:00-22:00 *Joint dinner at “Die Bastei”*

## **Tuesday, 22 November 2011**

- 08:30-13:00 *Session 3: Measuring progress towards the goals*  
Simon Lange, University of Göttingen:  
*Getting Progress Right: Measuring Progress towards the MDGs against Historical Trends*  
Nicole Rippin, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn:  
*The Issue of Inequality: Multidimensional Poverty Indices on Trial*  
Sabina Alkire, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), University of Oxford  
*Key and missing components of multidimensional poverty measurement*  
*Discussant:* Carola Donner-Reichle, Asian Development Bank (ADB), Manila  
*Moderator:* Rainer Thiele, PEGNet and Kiel Institute for the World Economy, Kiel
- 11:00-11:30 *Coffee break*
- 11:30-13:00 *Focus group discussion*  
*Moderator for Group 1:* Erik Lundsgaarde, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn  
*Moderator for Group 2:* Maria Ziegler, BMZ and German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn  
*Moderator for Group 3:* Helge Arends, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
- 13:00-14:00 *Lunch*
- 14:00-16:00 *Session 4: The way towards a new consensus*  
Jan Vandemoortele, Independent Researcher, Bruges, Belgium:  
*How to formulate the post-MDG agenda without strong UN leadership?*  
Adeyeye Adewole, Ondo State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria,  
*MDG, Excruciating Poverty in African Developing Countries and the Challenge of a new Global development Framework: A Case for Global development Regulatory Organization*  
Claire Melamed, Overseas Development Institute, London:  
*Creating consensus: political opportunities and barriers for a post-2015 agreement on development*  
*Discussant:* Hildegard Lingnau, Development Co-operation Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris  
*Moderator:* Silke Weinlich, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
- 16:00-16:15 *Summary and farewell address for presenters*  
Alejandro Guarín, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn

## **Wednesday, 23 November 2011**

08.30-09:00 *Welcome*

Jutta Kranz-Plote, Head of the “MDGs, Poverty Reduction, Social Protection, Sectoral and Thematic Policies” Division, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn

*Introduction and wrap-up of day 1&2*

*Facilitator: Adrian Taylor*

09:00-10.30 *Exchange of ideas on a follow-up framework of the MDGs from the perspective of bilateral and multilateral organisations*

10.30-11.00 *Coffee break*

11.00-12.30 *Presentation and discussion: Suggestions for a new goals system after 2015*

Dr Meera Tiwari, Head of International Development Studies, University of East London, UK

*What should the post 2015 development framework look like*

13.00-14.00 *Lunch*

14.00-16.00 *Break-out groups discussing questions such as*

*How should the process of defining a post-2015 framework be organised?*

*Who are the main actors? How can an inclusive consultation process be conducted?*

*What are possible core global goals and how could national targets be defined?*

*How can the achievement of the goals be measured?*

16.00-16.30 *Summary and farewell address*

Jutta Kranz-Plote, Head of the “MDGs, Poverty Reduction, Social Protection, Sectoral and Thematic Policies” Division, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn

## Monday, 21 November 2011

### Session 1: The need for a global development agenda

#### **Phil Vernon, International Alert: *Working with the Grain to change the grain: Moving beyond the MDGs***

There is a need for an alternative post millennium framework by moving from a result-based to a **vision-based** and on **societal progress focused conceptual approach** to development.

- **'Vision'**: Equal access to political voice, equal participation in a vibrant and sustainable economy, equal access to justice and equality before the law, freedom from insecurity, mental and physical well-being, presence of institutions and values that support and enable equitable progress and peace
- How to get there has to be decided rather at a local than at a global level and by respecting **lessons learnt from history**
- Needed: **Negotiations (political pressure) + Incentives for the elite + Leadership =** "Working with the Grain to Change the Grain".

#### **Malcolm Langford, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights: *Post-2015: Pathways, Targets and Indicators***

The aims of a new development agenda are an **overarching approach to development**, a prioritizing in certain **areas of attention** and need as well as **clear standards for all countries** and **accountability**. All four aims push in similar and different directions simultaneously.

- **6 ways to 'fix' the MDGs:**
  1. Participative approach: civil society has to be included in the process of formulating the MDGs
  2. The target system has to address all areas of the human rights agenda
  3. Inclusion of marginalized groups
  4. Adjustment on national/local conditions (set fair targets and a progressive realization in relation of the development status of a country)
  5. Guidance for human-rights-protection in order to prevent perverse incentives
  6. Need for accountability (Mechanism to incentivise and pressure)
- Improvement of the MDGs through new targets including social security, global targets, adjusted targets according to capacity (e.g. GDP-based targets), raising (or lowering) standards (like free primary education, adequate access to water and sanitation) and equality-sensitive targets (e.g. regional or income based).

#### **Lord Mawuko-Yevugah, University of the Witwatersrand: *Beyond the rhetoric of Development Partnerships and Towards the Construction of Equal and Inclusive Global Development Agenda***

The critical analysis of international development cooperation calls for a **holistic international framework** that comprehends the importance of the **civil society and social adjustment** on the MDG agenda.

- The 'new' global development architecture (MDGs, PRDPs, NEPAD) are not promoting the interests of poor women and men in the South, but the vested interests of the Northern businesses, incl. aid industry and Southern elites

- A new global development paradigm should aim at **addressing democratic deficits** in development policy making
- Need for **home-grown strategies** and solutions with **citizens as ‘means and ends of development’**.

### **Discussion:**

The participants coherently agreed on the **necessity of a global development agenda beyond 2015**. They discussed the assessment of the MDGs and the effectiveness of goals in general and criticised several factors: the MDGs have been often misinterpreted as planning goals and they implicate some **inconsistencies in the goal system** (outcome/impact/output/relative/absolute level). The participants claimed that the current agenda of the MDGs fails to capture the broader dynamic of development (particularly **growth and employment**, but also **human rights, empowerment and dignity**). They furthermore claimed that the MDGs do not cover the entire range of the **Millennium Declaration which addresses several additional fields** (e.g. the political and social dimension of multidimensional poverty, democracy and good governance, environmental protection, peace and security) as well as the requirement to make globalisation inclusive and equitable.

Despite these critics, the participants agreed on the existence of **strength of the present MDGs** such as their **great mobilizing power** (awareness rising as well as the financial resource allocation), the result-based and time-bound orientation and the **simple and comprehensive approach** to development, drawing people’s attention on development issues. Some participants underlined that we shouldn’t devaluate what the MDGs stand for: they are the most visible expression of the UN ever made regarding the fight of poverty. However we have to look at the gaps and try to address and capture them in the post millennium framework. Those are particularly the values existing in the Millennium Declaration but not included in the target system (e.g. **freedom, peace building**) but also **sustainability and vulnerability, social cohesion, emergence of new economies** and their role in the development agenda. The majority of the participants agreed on the fact that there is **no need for a completely new agenda** and that a post 2015 system of goals should therefore continue to derive its legitimacy from the **Millennium Declaration** which can be used as a **basic document** for a new framework and can be furthermore extended with goals and values that are not included yet.

In this context the participants argued that **peace building** and fragility aspects have become more central, so that the new framework should focus additionally on **fragile states** in order to promote equity for all citizens, especially those most in need. The new framework should be also calling for justice in international trade and reducing the barriers for the markets of developing countries to grow.

## Session 2: The content of a new global development agenda

### **Vinay Kumar Singh, National Academy of Direct Taxes: *Emphasize Capacity Building, Inputs and Processes to Achieve Greater Impact of MDGs***

The MDGs do not tell us anything about the extent to which **global efforts have contributed in achieving** them. They impose accountability on states to achieve certain targets but **fall short of helping them in finding a way to do so**.

- For the new framework we have to **put greater emphasis on process that lead to human development** in our agenda.
- We need **global commitment** for enhancing capacity in policy making and to achieve peace, free trade and global financial stability, thereby we should promote **local implementation of national policies** by using **local resources**.
- **Developing means for capacity building** of local functionaries and establishing means for cost effective accreditation may be the way forward in **improving actual ground level implementation** of global commitments and national strategies.

### **Gabriele Köhler, Institute of Development Studies: *Human Security: A framework for deepening the MDGs***

A deepening of the MDG agenda can be achieved by **including human security**, both as a **conceptual approach** and as a **framework** to address and redress the complex vulnerabilities facing communities, households and individuals.

- Policies addressing **income and wealth inequalities** and **social exclusion** are required **globally**
- Maintaining the MDGs but making them more explicitly **rights-based and participatory**, prioritizing **economic and social equity** and **environmental sustainability**, as well as insisting on the **centrality of employment** and **decent work**.

### **Jan Rieländer, OECD Development Centre: *Social cohesion: A useful framework for assessing social progress in fast growing countries?***

The MDGs' exclusive focus on poverty and basic services does not adequately address many challenges faced by middle income countries (e.g. rising inequality, joblessness and a sense of frustration).

- **Social Cohesion** as a framework: A society is "cohesive" if it works towards the well-being of all its members, fights exclusion and marginalisation, creates a sense of belonging, promotes trust, and offers its members the opportunity of upward social mobility
- Use of **subjective measures** as a critical component for any Post-MDG framework (measure of well-being may yield additional information to that brought by objective living circumstances)
- Measuring the **three key dimensions of social cohesion** – **social inclusion** (poverty, inequality, satisfaction with living standards), **social capital** (interpersonal and societal trust) and **social mobility** (chance to change ones position in society) - requires material and subjective well-being data.

## Discussion:

Many participants focused on **income equality, inclusive growth and employment as major issues of development** that are not adequately treated in the current MDGs and that therefore a new framework should be able to address. Inequality could be tackled with new targets or changed monitoring of existing targets.

The majority of the participants emphasized the need for **social protection floors** which assure a basic minimum of a global set of social rights and services and upon which every country can build on according to its needs. The fact that a social discourse was included into the **G20 agenda** only shows the urgency of this subject and the global willingness for political change. The question of how this vision on social progress can be linked with something to measure is still ongoing.

A broad agreement has been on the important role of middle income countries as the **emerging south** and the growth they promote, demanding to 'renew the rules of the game' by recognizing that the lines between developed and developing, north and south, donor and recipient-countries are increasingly blurring in a globalised world. Furthermore those countries should share their experiences and inspire other developing countries in their development process by promoting initiatives like **south-south learning**. In this context it was also argued that the **MDGs' exclusive focus on poverty and basic services** do not adequately address many challenges faced by the emerging countries since higher average income, better health and education does not automatically mean higher satisfaction (e.g. the dissatisfaction of people in Tunisia). Therefore one has to look at **inter-country differences** between regions, groups and individuals in order to determine and support those excluded from the promised benefits of growth.

Most of the participants shared the opinion that instead of having quantified global goals we should have **qualified global goals that are quantified nationally (national level target setting)** as well as additional goals that would be only obligatory for specific countries according to their needs (e.g. fragile states). Measures and strategies should be thus conceived and monitored locally in order to **strengthen accountability** between governments and citizens and to have a **greater impact on the national level**. At the same time there was a consensus about the need for **global targets** that are valid and binding for all countries and that address collective action problems around **global public goods**. Some participants argued that, as we are all linked in the process of development, the developed countries also have to fight against poverty and inequality amongst their own population and people living in developed countries have to change their lifestyles in order to bring forward **the MDGs for all countries** (e.g. aggregated national commitments on CO2 emissions).

The question of the need of **sustainable development goals** and how to integrate them in the present MDGs has been discussed controversially. In the context of climate change, **the results of existing negotiation processes** have to be taken account of, particularly the results of the **Rio+20 Summit**. But the question how exactly the future MDGs can be consistent with those of other goals systems like the Paris Agenda, the Busan Process and the Rio+ Agenda, is still in consideration and could not be answered effectually for the moment.

**Tuesday, 22 November 2011**

### **Session 3: Measuring progress towards goals**

**Simon Lange, University of Göttingen: *Getting Progress Right: Measuring Progress towards the MDGs against Historical Trends***

The MDGs will incentivise policy-makers if the targets are **agreed-on, country specific, relevant, measurable and realistic**. It was argued that the most important numerical targets within the framework of the MDGs are **unrealistic for the poorest countries when interpreted as country-specific goals**. As a consequence, the current system undermines accountability and ownership.

Therefore an alternative approach of evaluating progress towards **non-income MDGs** that allows a sensible appraisal of countries' progress was proposed.

- In the process there have to be estimated **transition paths** towards high levels of achievement for three non-income MDG indicators: **under-five mortality, primary completion, and gender equality in education**
- The **Performance Index** is based on a **comparison of actual to expected changes**.

As a result, the performance measure indicates that **progress is considerable** even for several countries which were previously judged to be “off-track”. And realistic goals for the post-2015 framework should be derived on the basis of transition paths, because **development takes time**.

**Nicole Rippin, German Development Institute: *The Issue of Inequality: Multidimensional Poverty Indices on a Trial***

**Deprivations are closely interrelated** which means that the process of achieving the MDGs can be accelerated by addressing the goals simultaneously rather than separately. The **Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) reflects overlapping household deprivations** related to MDG 1, 2, 4 and 7 as a tool for simultaneous approach to the MDGs and comprises three equally weighted dimensions: **health, education and living standards**  
Strength and weakness of the MPI:

- + It can be decomposed by region, population sub-groups and dimension and it is very **easy to understand** and calculate
- The MPI **ignores the correlation between the poverty indicators** (1) is **unable to capture inequality among the poor** (2) and is only able to capture two components of poverty: Incidence and Intensity, but **misses Inequality** (3)

To compensate the weaknesses of the MPI the **Correlation Sensitive Poverty Index (CSPI)** was created and it weights each household according to the number of weighted items that it lacks. The **CSPI is able to capture the correlation between the poverty indicators** and it **captures inequality among the poor**. The CSPI avoids the inflation of poverty rates for poorer countries and puts a greater emphasis on the neediest of the needy in those countries than the MPI.

**Sabina Alkire, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI): *Key and missing components of multidimensional poverty measurement***

The MDGs focus on important dimensions like living standards, health, education, gender, but ignore parts of poverty like work, freedom of choice, security and empowerment. **A key constraint in 2015 will be the missing of data for measurement** regarding to these indicators as well as lack of high-quality internationally comparable indicators. But, the interest in institutionalizing broader measures of poverty and well-being spans developed and developing countries.

The **strength of multidimensional measures** is that

- they **show who is deprived** in what at the same time which the MDGs cannot
- they **give an overview**, an above-the-fold, at-a-glance view of the trends – **nationally and often by region**
- Alkire/Foster measures **can be broken down by region and by indicator**, to show how change happens
- the indicators, dimensions and cut-offs are flexible

MDG measures need to anticipate the data requirements – especially for a ‘baseline’ in 2015 and it is possible to include brief 5-min modules on **work, violence, empowerment, and relationships**.

**Discussion:**

To consider how to measure progress towards the goals, the **great work of the MPI** was emphasised regarding to its **inclusion of a big number of measures**. But notwithstanding the **missing of how to measure deprivation like disability and isolation** was criticized and a neutral global organisation for measurement was claimed in the discussion. **Perspective and challenges** for a Post-MDG framework are **employment, the role of the private sector** as well as **participation and transparency**. It was also claimed to focus on **sub-regional goals**.

A main part of the discussion focused on the question how we could **include subjective poverty measures**. Even though the participants mainly supported the idea of having an added value through the inclusion of subjective poverty measures like well-being, they have been sceptical about an adequate and **representative validity of subjective poverty measures**.

Issues like the **need of comparable data on a global level** to measure progress as well as the importance of **national preferences, capacity building** regarding to statistics and measurement and **ownership came up repeatedly** in the discussion. Concerning this matter, **five trade-offs** seemed to be relevant in the discussion: (1) between **aspiration and realism**; (2) between coverage of **what is important to the people vs. what we can measure**, (3) between how **to go into household details** and **having** single powerful national numbers, (4) between the national level and a single global project and (5) between **complexity and appeal**.

A big issue in the discussion was the **problem of data availability** and the focus on data realism was brought up. Therefore, to have better abilities for measuring change in countries an **annual survey on national level** was suggested. As well as the **use of modern technology** like smart phones and social networks, because of the enormous **significance of the internet for future measures**.

## Session 4: The way towards a new consensus

**Jan Vandemoortele: *How to formulate the post-MDG agenda without strong UN leadership***

The post-MDG-goals have to be **clear, few and measurable** and the traditional donor countries have to move away from their donor perspective, because the discussions in the developing countries are crucial. In this context, **dangers facing** the Post-MDG-Agenda are (1) **perfectibility**, (2) **overload**, (3) the **imbalance of donors to recipients** and (4) **prescription**.

If the post-MDG framework has to have the **necessary legitimacy**, it must emerge from a process whereby the **United Nations** is perceived. Therefore the UN Secretariat will have to perform three pragmatic tasks:

1. being a convener of national debates;
2. being an aggregator of ideas and proposals;
3. being a gatekeeper for the new targets.

One aspect in particular that needs to be handled differently beyond 2015 is **equity**. There is a **link between low/high levels of inequality and low/high levels of social problems**. Equity needs to be embedded into the core of the development narrative, but the post-2015 framework **should not include a separate target on inequality**.

**Adeyeye Adewole, Ondo State University of Science and Technology: *MDG, Excruciating Poverty in African Developing Countries and the Challenge of a new Global development Framework: A Case for Global development Regulatory Organization***

The **poverty situation in Africa** has **not changed substantially** since the implementation of the MDGs. It includes e.g. **increasing national debts**, massive unemployment due to lack of skills, **high incidence of governance crisis, corrupt practices** and food insecurity. With apparent failure of MDGs development agenda given the African experience, it is important to come up with an alternative agenda that underpins the following:

- **Basic needs** like education, health, food security, democracy, environment
- Focus on **sustainable well-being** on key global development issues
- A new global development agenda must develop a **global compliance mechanism**

From the African perspective, the MDGs' have been a waste of time and resources; therefore there has to be established a **Global Development Regulatory Organization (GDRO)** as a post MDGs 2015 agenda to plan, organise and regulate global sustainable development.

**Claire Melamed, Overseas Development Institute: *New global political frameworks and the eradication of extreme poverty and deprivation***

There are **two challenges** for a new political framework that have to be accepted

Challenge 1: **Who benefits from progress** and who not?

- There is progress in all indicators in most countries, but **gains have not been equally distributed**
- Even in countries and regions where targets are being met, there are considerable **differences in improvements between urban and rural populations**, and worse than average outcomes for some **ethnic and religious groups**.

## Challenge 2: **What is progress?**

- A **range of issues are not included** in current metrics for poverty monitoring – such as the threat of violence, or emotional issues such as the humiliation involved in being poor – turned out to be high on the agenda of poor people
- The **priority given by poor people** to different dimensions of poverty often **does not reflect what donors prioritize** through their spending.

Three principles, on which there is likely to be consensus, could form the basis of a new agreement: (1) **universality and inclusiveness**, (2) **building resilience and reducing vulnerability** and (3) **building national economies**.

### **Discussion:**

A broad agreement has been on the need for a **holistic approach**, on the importance to embed equality and on the inclusion of new targets as well as on the significance of a **two-level-approach**. Especially the issue of **inequality** was a frequently discussed topic in all discussions and one participant focused on inequality as a multidimensional problem like the socio-economic background or gender inequality and criticized the narrow view on inequality in access to services. In this sense, there was mentioned that the **G 77 will not accept future goals if there is not a definite goal for rich countries**. And one participant commented that governance can tackle income equality or inequality of access, but it has to be mapped out and a future framework needs to be more precise on equality.

Another big issue in the discussion was the **funding of development assistance** and most participants coincided that the **ODA will come to an end**. Some proposals for future funding were e.g. **redistribution within countries, international taxes** and the upcoming importance of the **emerging countries, philanthropic foundations** and **the private sector**. But there was also a strong view to get new deals between emerging donors, traditional donors as well as fragile states.

In the discussion a huge consensus on the significant role of the UN in the further process of elaborating and negotiating a follow-up framework of the MDGs came up. Nevertheless some participants expressed that politics have to be **home grown** in order to be accepted and applied and that therefore all **partner countries, civil society and the private sector have to be involved** in the discussion and implementation process. It was also mentioned that **the expectations on the UN system have to be reinforced**. The analytical work will start later but first of all, there will be at least **50 national level consultations** with the people to strengthen the quality and acceptance of a framework. The importance of a better communication to the public was mentioned repeatedly during the discussion.

### **Summary and farewell address**

The summary and farewell address has been very thought-provoking. It was asked, **how much of the improvement of the living conditions can be explained by internal processes of change, and how much by international development efforts**. How many of these positive trends would have happened anyway, in the absence of the MDGs? It was mentioned that the thinking about these difficult questions might allow all participants to understand the true reach, as well as the limitations, of meetings such as these. And that there is certainly a role for international collaboration to make this world a better place for all. **Understanding more precisely what that role is might make this collaboration more effective**.

## **Wednesday, 23 November 2011**

### **I. Exchange of ideas on a follow-up framework of the MDGs from the perspective of bilateral and multilateral organisations**

#### **Introduction to the format and setting**

Following two days of discussion with experts from academia, on the third day over 30 participants predominantly with policy making functions discussed the implications and consequences of what they had heard. Given the quality of the input and their knowledge of the situation, it was possible to develop some initial thoughts on what it may be possible to achieve.

#### **The perceived main learnings from Monday and Tuesday**

The main learning's at this stage were still mostly questions, however, these questions are already a good indicator of where the debate might be going, and where more work is needed.

#### **Should there be a successor to the MDGs?**

There was a general consensus on the need to have a post 2015-agenda, but:

- Do other ministries and our political leaders also take this for granted?
- What is the mood in emerging and developing countries? How do we engage them best?

#### **Should equality be included?**

Most participants said yes, but the challenges are:

- What aspects of equality really concern us?
- How can equality best be measured?
- Can this best be done by qualifying existing indicators, or does it need new indicators?

#### **How wide should a reform be undertaken?**

On this point the group was clearly torn. On the one hand:

- Should the new MDGs really become an overarching framework for development?
- Should issues such as equality, sustainability and employment be included as explicit goals in themselves?

On the other hand:

- The beauty and success of the MDGs have precisely been to keep them short and understandable for all, so how can we avoid overloading the boat?
- How can we keep the MDGs in synchronicity with other UN processes, e.g. Rio plus 20?

#### **What is the new narrative?**

We need good arguments to convince leaders of the need to keep the focus post 2015, so:

- What is the narrative that carries this story?
- Can this narrative spur the creation of a new goals system, or just prolong the current one?

#### **How should the goals be expressed?**

A number of questions were brought up dealing with the nature of the measurement of goals:

- Should we only be measuring outcomes and not output or input indicators?
- Should there be more focus on using qualitative scores, not just quantitative ones?
- How can we get the data we need, or should we accept data constraints?

### **Are we the right people to push this forward?**

- Should we not “de-aid” the MDG agenda?
- Are our (rich country aid) organisations really the right ones to drive a new agenda forward?

### **Exchange of ideas on a follow-up framework of the MDGs**

One part of the workshop fuelled a broad debate on **new challenges** for a follow up framework. Here participants drew attention to the fact that the world has not stood still since the adoption of the MDGs. We **face new challenges** and we need to be “United for Common Challenges” such as **poverty reduction, food security, climate change, environmental resilience, disaster reduction, or population growth**.

This perception of new challenges seems to be one of the reasons why the current MDGs will not be sufficient for the period after 2015. In addition, the fact that rich countries are no longer “calling the shots” and that there are emerging economies that will be a major part of any new global agenda draws some attention.

### **How much should the MDGs be reformed?**

On this question, most actors present seemed to favour the idea that the **MDGs should be reformed**, and perhaps even considerable, rather than to keep the status quo for a global system post 2015.

However, **concerns** were expressed **about overloading the MDG agenda** and thus diluting it. Precisely because the MDGs have a narrow focus on poverty, they draw attention: how can we make sure that **poverty remains the central issue when including other items?** The idea emerged that rather than introducing additional goals and new targets for equality, sustainability and employment, we should adapt existing indicators to take account of these issues. One participant proposed that anyone suggesting to add a new goal should also be forced to indicate which existing goal they wish to delete.

### **What about equality then?**

The question returned as to **what aspects of equality really concern us?** After all we need to distinguish between:

- inequality of access, which can prevent human potential from developing and deter growth;
- Inequality of outcome, which may actually spur some to try and improve.

The debate then shifted to trying to identify issues of equity more than of equality, and hence things that would prevent social mobility. Moreover, in the light of the conversation of not wishing to overload the MDG boat, some thought turned towards **integrating equity indicators into existing targets**. For instance this could be done by introducing specific targets for improvements in the lot of the bottom quintile in the existing goals.

### **What processes are in place?**

- The Rio+20 could be a landmark to start the discussion,
- The UN Secretary General wants a discussion with stakeholders
- The Importance of using social media to open up the debate has been recognised
- There are ideas for holding national conferences
- In any case the process has to be inclusive and engaging from the beginning to not lose the support

### **The Global-Local dimension**

All agreed that we cannot get around the fact that **national resources and good governance are essential in poverty reduction**, and hence the transmission belt between the global and national level is important. So can the **global framework really influence national or local politics?**

- Yes, if we **ensure that countries have indicators they can track down**. These indicators thus have to be understandable for everyone, but will then drive national or local debates;
- But there is also a **danger of trying to impose an international system** that national governments do not understand or which they cannot apply.

### **How to measure progress?**

Following this logic, we have to rethink how to measure those dimensions and how to measure progress. Measurement is never easy:

- **Internationally agreed goals are a much better basis for measurement and comparison**, but **countries cannot always provide the necessary information**: a major issue here are the different institutional capacities.
- It gets much more **problematic** when we try to introduce **life quality indicators** which are subject to polling data. Whilst qualitative data of all sorts would add a tremendous depth of understanding, it is perceived as being much less neutral than quantitative measurement. Here there was clearly no consensus as to how quickly such indicators could be used.

## **II. Suggestion for a new goals system after 2015**

### **What are the goals of the new MDGs?**

The participants of the workshop discussed **possible goals of the new global framework** and **what the goals should include**. Nobody dissented that **poverty reduction** should remain an overarching aim, but what should be the relation to other goals, targets and measures like:

- Mobilising ODA support and other financial resources?
- Promoting development?
- Inspiring leaders?
- Create national level accountability and incentives?
- Encouraging better technical measurement of progress?
- Promoting new ideas/narrative?

Most participants considered a **combination of encouraging political accountability, encouraging better technical measurement** and **inspiring new ideas** as the most appealing option. However, there was also a debate on whether the first of these two goals are mutually reinforcing or antagonistic.

### **Go glocal?**

As was already discussed, the **global goals must have a local impact**. Hence the conversation turned to fixing local goals that are inspired by global ambitions (glocal goals):

- Clearly it will be impossible to get global agreement to such local goals in advance and **consensus on key concerns at the global level is an essential element** for the whole process

- However, to tackle multidimensional poverty at the national level, it makes sense to use the MDGs as a starting point. Hence one offering could be made to all countries: donors will finance you **to build your own strategy with your own goals which are derived from the global ones**, much as say Vietnam or Cambodia have done.

### **What principles should the new MDGs be subject to?**

A few simple principles were proposed that the post-2015 framework should be subject to:

- They should engage all actors
- They should stay simple and concise
- They should be made relevant to the new (geo-economics/political) context
- They should offer measurable targets

### **III. Main points of the breakout groups**

Each of the four working groups was given a provocative thesis to discuss, and (dis)agree with. Each group came back with an extensive presentation, so only a few highlights are retained here:

#### **1. Thesis: “Forget equality. It is too hard to deal with it.”**

The group did not seem to agree, although the complexity of the matter was fully recognised:

- There should not be a separate inequality target, but it has to be part of a global framework
- There needs to be a local and global dimension: equality is also a big issue in developed countries
- These indicators need to provide incentives for government to do something about inequality, hence they must be well chosen
- One option is to help provide governments with toolbox
- We will need a variety of mechanisms for measuring equity

#### **2. Thesis “Rich countries should clean up their own doorsteps first”**

There is truth in this statement, but it is clearly not an “either we do this, or we help developing countries”. It must be that we do our own homework and help the others at the same time.

- How can we make the next generation genuinely universal, covering North as well as South? Is it really the countries of the North, or the global elite which should be interrogated here? How should developed countries behave? Is it our life styles that need to change the most?
- One key problem is that many of developed countries’ other policies – which are not in the remit of ODA – are big causes of externalities for emerging and developing nations. E.g.: Trade; Immigration; Tax; GHG emissions; Arms; Land grabs...
- Would it be possible to better engage/interest the emerging nations if developed nations put something here on the table? Or would we just prolong the negotiations unnecessarily? The open question is can we identify some kind of global win-win-situation with a more extended agenda of this variety?

#### **3. Thesis: “Millionaires should pay for the new MDGs”**

It was felt that this would not happen, although their contributions would be welcome. So who else should help pay?

- Given that poverty is no longer mainly in poor countries, there is a need to involve the middle classes of emerging and rich economies. National taxation is thus as a key: but does it have to be the traditional one of income tax? There is talk of national and International taxation: e.g. Tobin tax, carbon tax. But that may not be used for MDG purposes
- Is ODA dying? Will the harder nosed (self-interest) of emerging economies be a good thing?
- What about foundations? How to mobilise private sector support: PPP, taxes, decent wages, education/training, social welfare...?
- How to leverage and lower cost of remittances?
- What about innovative sources such as cheaper renewable energies freeing up budgets?

It was also felt that we may wish to compare the attractiveness of the Paris Agenda with that of the China Approach: some poorer countries seem to find the latter much more appealing.

#### **4. Thesis: “Developing/Emerging countries should draft the new MDGs, not the rich countries/IFIs”**

Certainly there is a need for a bottom-up participative process to accompany this next phase: This must be a transparent bottom-up participative process:

- “People’s assemblies” which allow views to be crystallised?
- Involve NGOs and private sector too?
- Use modern technologies to gather the inputs?
- Have a global televised debate?
- Need for a strong gatekeeper to sieve the ideas?
- Seek regional agreements before global?
- Ensure bridges to other on-going global processes?
- Create three headed dragon (one person from each of: developed, emerging and developing countries) to make the final calls?

#### **IV. Summary and open questions**

We consider the **workshop a great success**, which was only possible because of the dedicated engagement of all participants. As a result, there are **more questions than answers**, but as said before, we are only at the beginning of our discussions. Some of the questions are:

##### **How can we sharpen the existing dimensions of the MDGs?**

- We need a new, sharper, narrative
- We should focus more on outcomes, and less on means
- We should look at reconceptualising some issues (e.g. think quality not quantity)
- We should be both more and less ambitious in the targets we set next time (depending on the issue and whether it is global or local)
- We should think of the financial mechanisms we hope to mobilise
- Better goals need better data. Identify how we can deliver this data better
- We can better articulate the global with the local:
  - o Use the MDGs as an umbrella from which national goals can be derived
  - o Use aggregate indicators globally but more precise indicators nationally

- Accompany the process of local goal development – do not just hope it happens
- Allow countries to take account of their starting points

### **Should we include new dimensions?**

Many other dimensions play into poverty, and MDGs may not be sustainable without them:

- Equity/social cohesion/equality;
- Environment;
- Economy/employment;
- Governance;
- Disarmament;
- ...

But there is a very serious risk of overloading the boat if we include more issues:

- should we perhaps remove an existing one for every new goal we introduce?
- We can have a bigger declaration (covering more items) but also have a limited list of goals linked to it which are publicised (equivalent to Millennium Declaration and the MDGs)
- We can integrate equity by taking existing metrics and applying the equity measurements to the progress of the bottom quintile
- We need to build active bridges to other on-going processes e.g. Rio

### **One more word on equity/equality/social cohesion**

There is considerable consensus that:

- these issues are now much more important, as perceived and measured inequalities seem to be growing;
- one could introduce them into the existing set of goals (rather than setting up a new goal);
- this social floor should be universal: it is increasingly of relevance in developed countries as well as in developing ones;

However, it is hard to say that equality is always and everywhere bad – it can be an inspiration to success, but this implies social mobility. Perhaps the focus should be more on equity?

### **Other specific questions worth further investigation**

Should we not talk more about:

- The institutions and institutional architecture?
- What are the means to reach the goals? (growth, jobs, ODA, infrastructure...)
- The links between goals-targets-indicators?
- What are the right ways of measuring equality?
- Different cultural approaches? We should take other views such as the Happiness Index more seriously.
- Could the MDGs actually be global public goods?
- How are we going to tackle people with disabilities? They are, after all, 15% of human kind.

## List of participants:

1. Adeyeye Adewole, Ondo State University of Science and Technology, Okitipupa
2. Sabina Alkire, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), University of Oxford
3. Helge Arends, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Bonn
4. Ute Böttcher, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
5. Maria Carmela Lo Bue, University of Göttingen
6. Jasmin Dirinpur, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
7. Carola Donner-Reichle, Asian Development Bank (ADB), Manila
8. Joshua Eshuchi, University of Bielefeld
9. Alejandro Guarín, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
10. Navid Hanif, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), New York
11. Joachim Heidebrecht, KfW Development Bank, Frankfurt/Main
12. Volker Herzog, German Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
13. Max Bankole Jarrett, AUC-ECA-AfDB Joint Secretariat Support Office, Addis Ababa
14. Eva Jespersen, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York
15. Johannes Jütting, OECD Development Centre, Paris
16. Olaf Kjørven, United Nations Development Group, New York
17. Gabriele Koehler, Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Brighton
18. Simon Koppers, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn
19. Claus Körting, Verband Entwicklungspolitik deutscher Nichtregierungsorganisationen (VENRO), Bonn
20. Jutta Kranz-Plote, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn
21. Michael Krempin, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
22. Paul Ladd, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York
23. Simon Lange, University of Göttingen
24. Malcolm Langford, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, Oslo
25. Hildegard Lingnau, Development Co-operation Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris
26. Kathrin Löber, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn
27. Markus Loewe, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
28. Erik Lundsgaarde, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn

29. Jens Martens, Global Policy Forum Europe, Bonn
30. Hiroshi Matsuura, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokio
31. Lord Mawuko-Yevugah, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
32. Christine Mayr, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
33. Claire Melamed, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London
34. Victoria Newton, Department for International Development (DFID), London
35. Julian Pfäfflin, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ), Bonn
36. Patrick Rabe, European Commission, Brussels
37. Jan Rieländer, OECD Development Centre, Paris
38. Nicole Rippin, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
39. Jaime Saavedra-Chanduvi, World Bank, Washington DC
40. Simin Schabasi, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Bonn
41. Imme Scholz, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
42. Vinay Kumar Singh, National Academy of Direct Taxes, Nagpur
43. Mayuko Takamura, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokio
44. Adrian Taylor, Hamburg
45. Rainer Thiele, Poverty Reduction, Equity, and Growth Network (PEGNet) and Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW), Kiel
46. Meera Tiwari, International Development Studies, University of East London
47. Arend van der Bend, The Cartoon Movement, Amsterdam
48. Dorine van Norren, Advisory Council on International Affairs, The Hague
49. Jan Vandemoortele, Bruges
50. Phil Vernon, International Alert, London
51. Timo Voipio, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFAF), Helsinki
52. Paul Wafer, Department for International Development (DFID), London
53. Silke Weinlich, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ) and German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn
54. Melanie Wiskow, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Eschborn
55. Maria Ziegler, German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ) and German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn

The **German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)** develops the guidelines and the fundamental concepts on which German development policy is based. It devises long-term strategies for cooperation with the various players concerned and defines the rules for implementing that cooperation. In political and financial terms, the main focus is on bilateral official development cooperation and it closely works together with international institutions and partners. The BMZ is headed by the Minister, Mr Dirk Niebel.

The **German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)** is one of the leading research institutions and think tanks for global development and international development policy worldwide. The DIE's unique research profile combines research, consulting and professional training. DIE builds bridges between theory and practice and works within international research networks.

The **Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (PEGNet)** brings together researchers with an interest in issues revolving around the poverty-inequality-growth nexus in developing countries, and links them to the German and international development policy bodies. PEGNet organises international conferences and workshops in order to spread results from research and practical development cooperation, to foster exchange between researchers and practitioners. PEGNet is maintained by the Kiel Institute for the World Economy.

Published by the  
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ),  
Division for development education and information

Edited by  
BMZ Division 310 MDGs, Poverty Reduction, Social Protection, Sectoral and Thematic Policies

Design and layout

Printed by

Photo credits

As at

Addresses of the BMZ office  
Bonn Office Berlin Office  
Dahlmannstraße 4 Stresemannstraße 94  
53113 Bonn 10963 Berlin  
Germany Germany  
Tel. + 49 (0) 228 99 535 - 0 Tel. +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 0  
Fax + 49 (0) 228 99 535 - 3500 Fax +49 (0) 30 18 535 - 2501  
poststelle@bmz.bund.de  
www.bmz.de