



Australian
National
University

Goals for people

Robin Davies

29 August 2013

**Development Policy Centre
Crawford School of Public Policy, ANU**

1



**ERADICATE EXTREME
POVERTY AND HUNGER**

2



**ACHIEVE UNIVERSAL
PRIMARY EDUCATION**

3



**PROMOTE GENDER
EQUALITY AND
EMPOWER WOMEN**

4



**REDUCE
CHILD MORTALITY**

5



**IMPROVE MATERNAL
HEALTH**

6



**COMBAT HIV/AIDS,
MALARIA AND OTHER
DISEASES**

7



**ENSURE
ENVIRONMENTAL
SUSTAINABILITY**

8



**GLOBAL
PARTNERSHIP FOR
DEVELOPMENT**

The Millennium Development Goals

- Eight largely pre-existing aspirational goals and 21 targets originally negotiated in disparate policy communities throughout the 1990s
- First drawn together by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (1996), which was attracted to the idea of explicitly linking aid to desired results
- Later, in the UN context (2000), provided with a common baseline year (1990), a common target year (2015, with one exception) and a set of indicators, and presented as mutually enabling and integrated for the purposes of application and measurement—‘the goals and targets are inter-related and should be seen as a whole’ (standard UN formulation)
- Took shape slowly, with adjustments continuing up to 2008, and also took hold slowly and to different degrees in countries’ aid and development policy narratives, but eventually became far more prominent in discourse than had been expected
- Several MDG targets, though no goals in their entirety, achieved (poverty, water, slum dwellers), one missed (biodiversity), and the probability of achieving the rest ranges from reasonably likely to absolutely impossible
- The final goal, MDG8 on ‘the global partnership for development’, different in kind from the other seven in that it sets out some of the obligations of developed countries toward developing countries (likewise part of MDG7 with respect to the global commons) and lacks quantitative targets.

Framework adequacy criteria

1. Relevance

Are any goals are either missing or so poorly specified as to miss matters of fundamental importance?

2. Coherence

Do the goals display narrative consistency and are they mutually reinforcing?

3. Effectiveness

Does the framework have motive force for governments and relevant non-governmental actors, such that they do things they would not otherwise have done?

MDG framework: adequacy

1. Relevance


- Omissions 
- Enablers 

2. Coherence

- Narrative consistency
- Exceptions: MDGs 7 & 8 


3. Effectiveness

- Low ambition
- Procrustean.



MDG framework: omissions

- equitable growth
- peace, security and respect for human rights
- effective, transparent and accountable governance
- access to energy and 'connectivity' through physical infrastructure
- access to family planning services.




Bill's annual letter, 2012

“The MDGs were coherent because they focused on helping the poorest people in the world.

The groups that needed to work together on the MDGs were easy to identify, and they could be held accountable for cooperation and progress.

When the UN reaches agreement on other important goals like mitigating climate change, it should consider whether a different set of actors and a separate process might be best for those efforts.”




MDGs 7 & 8

7. Ensure environmental sustainability

- Integrate principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse the loss of environmental resources
- Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss
- Halve the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation
- Improve the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020


8. Develop a global partnership for development

- Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system
- Address special needs of the least developed countries, landlocked countries and small island developing States
- Deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt
- In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries
- In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications technologies



Possible MDG impact areas

- Development-related discourse
- Donor and partner country practices
- Resource mobilisation and allocation
- Development outcomes.







MDGs: summing up


- The MDGs, though full of holes, have captured the imagination of politicians and other public policy makers, and to some extent of the broader population
- In part because they exhibit a reasonable degree of narrative consistency, if one ignores two of the seven goals
- They probably aided resource mobilisation and influenced resource allocation, though they might simply have reflected trends
- They might or might not have affected outcomes but they certainly weren't constructed in a way that would lead one to expect that
- The way global targets were simply read across to the national level severely limited their effectiveness in national settings.

UN post-MDG processes

- A High-Level Panel (**HLP**) of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, which released its report on 31 May 2013 (expert/political view)
- The Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (**SDSN**), which released its report on 6 June 2013 (view from the scientific community)
- The UN System Task Team (**UNTT**) on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, which released an initial and scene-setting report in May 2012 (view from 'the system')
- A UN Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, which is still in its 'stocktaking' phase and will report in 2014, but issued a progress report on 26 July 2013 (view from UN member countries)
- The UN Global Compact Participants, who released a report with their perspectives on 17 June 2013 (view from the private sector)
- An Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing, established in June 2013 and asked to report in 2014
- A series of global, regional and national consultation processes, including the global 'My World' online survey.


Four post-MDG frameworks

- High-Level Panel (**HLP**) of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda: report of 31 May 2013 
- Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (**SDSN**): report of 6 June 2013 
- UN System Task Team (**UNTT**) on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda: initial report from May 2012 
- Centre for International Governance Innovation in cooperation with the Korea Development Institute: report from early 2013 elaborating the **Bellagio** goals. 



A NEW GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP: ERADICATE POVERTY AND TRANSFORM ECONOMIES THROUGH SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on
the Post-2015 Development Agenda






SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
SOLUTIONS NETWORK
A GLOBAL INITIATIVE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

An Action Agenda for Sustainable Development

REPORT FOR THE UN SECRETARY-GENERAL


6 June 2013



UN SYSTEM TASK TEAM
ON THE **POST-2015** UN
DEVELOPMENT AGENDA


Realizing the Future We Want for All

Report to the Secretary-General





**POST-2015
DEVELOPMENT
AGENDA: GOALS,
TARGETS AND
INDICATORS**
SPECIAL REPORT



Post-MDG frameworks: points in common

- Universal goals
- Topical gaps
 - Jobs and growth
 - Governance, peace and security
 - Environmental sustainability
- Tactical gaps
 - Inequality
 - Vulnerability.



**H.E. Dr. Susilo Bambang
Yudhoyono, President of
Indonesia
Co-Chair**





**H.E. Ellen Johnson Sirleaf,
President of Liberia
Co-Chair**



**The Right Honourable David
Cameron MP, Prime Minister
of the United Kingdom
Co-Chair**

HLP framework: features (1)

- The HLP report proposes five ‘transformational shifts’, twelve illustrative international development goals and 54 related targets, four or five per goal 
- The transformational shifts are shifts of perspective relative to the MDGs, at least with respect to four of the gap areas: inequality, sustainability, jobs and growth, and governance and security
- The fifth shift relates to a ‘new global partnership for development’, corresponding to the existing MDG8, though it is hard to distinguish the new global partnership from the old one
- These shifts of perspective are systematically reflected in the illustrative goals, which include dedicated goals for growth and employment, peace and stability, and good governance and effective institutions
- A headline feature is the adoption of an ‘end-poverty’ target, combined with an approach to inequality that establishes complementary, nationally-defined poverty reduction targets and also declares no human development target met unless it is met by the most vulnerable groups.



ILLUSTRATIVE GOALS AND TARGETS



1. End Poverty



2. Empower Girls and Women and Achieve Gender Equality



3. Provide Quality Education and Lifelong Learning



4. Ensure Healthy Lives



5. Ensure Food Security and Good Nutrition



6. Achieve Universal Access to Water and Sanitation



7. Secure Sustainable Energy



8. Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth



9. Manage Natural Resource Assets Sustainably




10. Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions



11. Ensure Stable and Peaceful Societies



12. Create a Global Enabling Environment & Catalyse Long-Term Finance



HLP framework: features (2)

- Environmental sustainability, only weakly present in the MDGs, gets two goals, relating to sustainable energy and sustainable natural resource management
- There is no climate-related goal but the final goal, on the global partnership for development, includes a target reflecting the existing global consensus that the global average temperature increase should be limited to two degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels
- At the level of goals, the HLP framework drops nothing that was already in the MDGs but consolidates the health goals, very substantially beefs up the education and gender goals and introduces a separate water and sanitation goal
- The HLP's goal 12 more or less echoes MDG8 on trade, aid and technology, adds in new but vaguely specified targets relating to climate change, the global financial system and illicit financial flows, and drops MDG8's targets relating to least-developed and landlocked countries, debt and affordable medicines for neglected diseases
- Quantitative targets for each goal, the HLP proposes, should either be set at zero or some other minimum standard, or else in most cases set at the national level.

Other frameworks (1)

- The Bellagio and SDSN frameworks contain broadly similar goals
- Like the HLP framework, the SDSN framework includes an end-poverty target and a commitment to monitor the development progress of the poorest and most disadvantaged groups
- The SDSN framework proposes a stronger inequality target—namely, to halve the proportion of households with incomes below 50 per cent of the national median
- The Bellagio framework is interested primarily in indicators—on the basis that a target should merely fix the desired quantity of whatever is measured by an indicator—so does not propose targets and therefore, in particular, proposes no poverty reduction target, zero or otherwise.

Other frameworks (2)

- In a conscious departure from the MDG framework, all three frameworks (HLP, SDSN and Bellagio) envisage including a substantial number of targets that are neither zero nor global targets, which must be set at the national level—in the case of the HLP framework, 26 of 54 targets are flagged as candidates for setting at the national level
- The SDSN framework differs from the HLP and Bellagio frameworks in other relatively minor respects: it includes an explicit climate change mitigation goal and gives peace and security a rather lower profile
- The less-developed UNTT framework identifies four key ‘dimensions’ or goal areas for a post-MDG framework as inclusive social development, inclusive economic development, environmental sustainability and peace and security, while consigning various possible goals (governance, infrastructure) to a back-seat ‘enabler’ category

HLP framework: adequacy

1. Relevance

- Poverty
- Vulnerability

2. Coherence

- Public policy goals
- Three levels of public policy: national, international & global

3. Effectiveness

- Zero targets
- Nationally defined targets.

HLP framework: summing up

- The HLP framework is a more complete catalogue of the things that are on everybody's minds, but it replicates or even aggravates some core problems with the MDG framework
- Its relevance is weakened by the fact that it makes central the elimination of a type of poverty that is all but vanishing anyway, and fails to recognise the centrality of action on vulnerability
- Though enabling goals are important, the framework's coherence is reduced by the blending of ends (goals for people) and means (public policy goals)
- The framework's effectiveness is seriously hampered by its use of zero targets, which by definition every country must somehow meet, and by its reliance in other cases on national targets which create no momentum for global progress.

The rules of the post-MDG game

- Ends and means
- Goals for people
- Goals for public policy
- Target-setting.

Goals for people

- Decent work and the things that work provides (income, food, clothing, shelter and identity)
- Good health
- Quality education
- Social security
- Freedom from discrimination, violence, exploitation and oppression
- A benign, stable natural environment for themselves and their children.

Goals for public policy

- The provision of various global and regional public goods important for development
- The mobilization, from domestic and international sources, of adequate financing for development together with the achievement of policy coherence for development
- Support for national public infrastructure, including effective public institutions.

The post-MDG game: summing up

- The principal goals that define the post-MDG framework should be goals for people, which articulate what they have a right to expect in life
- Goals for public policy, which are enabling goals, are also important and should be placed in the foreground, but separated from the principal goals for the purposes of negotiation and communication
- The goals for public policy should be articulated at three levels of public policy—national, international and global—and not lumped together under ill-fitting or vague headings such as ‘global governance’ or ‘the global partnership for development’
- All goals, both principal and enabling, need to have demanding but realistic global targets attached, as this was the animating idea behind the MDGs
- Such targets should be non-zero and absolute
- Corresponding targets should be set through appropriate deliberative processes at the national level, with gaps between national targets and global targets quantified, monitored and used to inform dialogue and resource allocation.

www.devpolicy.org