



**TOWARD A POST-2015  
DEVELOPMENT  
PARADIGM (II)  
JUNE 20-24, 2011  
BELLAGIO, ITALY  
CONFERENCE  
REPORT**



# TOWARD A POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM (II)

20–24 JUNE, 2011

BELLAGIO, ITALY

CONFERENCE REPORT



 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Copyright © 2011 by The Centre for International Governance Innovation

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Centre for International Governance Innovation or its Operating Board of Directors or International Board of Governors.



Copyright © 2011. This work was carried out with the support of The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI), Waterloo, Ontario, Canada ([www.cigionline.org](http://www.cigionline.org)). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution — Non-commercial — No Derivatives License. To view this license, visit ([www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/](http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)). For re-use or distribution, please include this copyright notice.

First published in 2011.

Cover and page design by Steve Cross.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
CONFERENCE REPORT: SHAPING THE NEXT GENERATION OF DEVELOPMENT GOALS	7
Introduction	7
Criticisms	8
Criteria	8
Rationale, Pros and Cons Leading to the post-2015 Goals	9
Summary: The Post-2015 Goals	10
About the Authors	10
BACKGROUND PAPER: TOWARD A POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM	11
Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger	11
Achieve Universal Literacy	11
Health: Improve Productive Life Expectancy	11
Improve Human Security	12
Climate Change: Limit CO <sub>2</sub> to Four Tonnes per Capita	12
Achieve Universal Connectivity: Economic Services — ICT, Electricity, Transportation	13
Promote Empowerment	13
ENABLING INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES TO FULFILL POTENTIAL	15
Enabling Environment and Infrastructure	17
Enabling Institutional Arrangements and the Provision of Public Goods	17
Controversial Issues	18
Communication and Promotion	19
WORKS CITED	20
AGENDA	21
PARTICIPANT LIST	24
ABOUT CIGI	25
CIGI MASTHEAD	26

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the meeting in Bellagio was to:

- Propose options to reframe the debate on development and provide some concrete propositions regarding post-2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and targets;
- Design a mechanism to enhance participation, transparency and accountability of these new goals, providing for continuing input from the beneficiaries to set their own priorities and rate the effectiveness of development interventions;
- Design a communication strategy to influence decisions on the post-2015 paradigm;<sup>1</sup> and
- Identify possible future activities for the group meeting in Bellagio.

The world requires a new vision for the goals of global development as never before. A new paradigm must be found to lift us above the current view of development as the production line for human machines, to one that can bring hope to the despondent, courage to the weak, justice to the wronged and healing to the hurt. The approach needed is about enabling the world community to take shared responsibility to lead productive and creative lives with dignity, to realize their rights, while fulfilling their obligations to respect others. Such development is sustainable if it is accomplished through the responsible use of resources — sharing the wealth fairly — to ensure that collective needs are met, but without compromising the needs of future generations.

Even if the United Nations (UN) is successful in achieving some of the goals in the current round of MDGs established in 2000 with a target date of 2015, there is still much to be done in world development, both in the so-called developed and developing countries. Future

<sup>1</sup> The ideas formulated at this meeting will be fed to the UN High-level Panel on Global Sustainability, which is tasked with finding a new blueprint for a sustainable future, and will also be delivered to the UN Economic and Social Council's Committee on Development Policy, which is addressing questions such as: Which MDGs' targets should be introduced in the post-2015 era? How best can the macroeconomy and inequality be addressed in the post-2015 package? How can the environment better be incorporated in the goals? The conclusions and recommendations will also be presented to the preparatory processes for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) General Assembly in November 2011, the G20 work on development and the UN Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro, 2012.

development goals must be truly global — applying to both developed and developing countries. Globally agreed minimums in goods, norms and standards must be reached, while leaving space for individual nations to take responsibility for setting their own developmental targets, based on the needs and aspirations of their own citizens and taking into account their own context. The conference participants believe countries will be more likely to remain committed to targets if they select them themselves. Such an approach avoids the one-size-fits-all dilemma, where goals are too general and abstract — either too ambitious or not ambitious enough. Indicators must be developed to objectively assess results. Attention should be given to disaggregating indicators and results that are based on gender, urban or rural, identity groups and income bands, in order to unmask inequalities that hide behind more generalized statistics.

The new development paradigm and goals should not be handed down from above. Those who are directly affected should have a say in how they want to live and what is needed to enable development. A new mode of accountability is required to accompany this new paradigm, placing the poor, vulnerable and marginalized at the centre of the policy and practice considerations that shape their lives. Globally, we must strive for improved transparency and trust in our institutions, both nationally and internationally.

The architecture of 12 future goals was proposed by the participants at the workshop, which relate to adequate livelihoods and income levels, sufficient food and water, appropriate education and skills, good health, gender equality, security, resilient communities, connectivity, empowerment, sustainable management of the biosphere, rules of the world economy and good global governance. These goals are framed deliberately in positive terms and clustered into three sets, relating to: the essential endowments necessary for individuals to achieve their fuller potential; the protection and promotion of collective human capital; and the effective provision of global public goods.

Goals can be useful for uniting the world behind a common purpose, providing direction and catalyzing increased investments and progress in issue areas critical to world development. We must reach agreement on such goals for the journey beyond 2015, as we are approaching a series of tipping points in world development.



# CONFERENCE REPORT: SHAPING THE NEXT GENERATION OF DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Barry Carin and Mukesh Kapila

*An ideal set of global targets is one that expresses the many dimensions of human well-being yet includes a limited number of targets; a set that addresses the complexity of development yet exploits the charm of simplicity; a set that embodies agreed principles yet allows for quantitative monitoring; a set that reflects global priorities and universal standards yet is tailored to the domestic situation and local challenges; a set that specifies the destination yet spells out the journey for getting there...composing such an ideal set is challenging. It has to combine comprehensiveness with conciseness; complexity with simplicity; principles with measurability; universality with country-specificity, ends with means. This is a tall order for any task; it is practically impossible when it comes to setting targets that require universal acceptance and a political consensus among governments and world leaders. (Vandemoortele, 2011)*

## INTRODUCTION

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) convened a meeting of development experts, representatives from international organizations and research institutes, and policy and governance experts to discuss a post-2015 development paradigm. The group met for four days, June 20–24, at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Bellagio Center in Italy.

The principal purpose of the meeting was to develop options for what could succeed the MDGs. Preliminary options were circulated prior to the meeting, based on discussions from the first Toward a Post-2015 Development Paradigm meeting held in February 2011 in Geneva, Switzerland. The discussions in Bellagio focused on how to frame certain development challenges and which elements of complex issues to include in order to improve the proposed options for post-2015 goals. This report provides some background information, proposes a future set of development goals, and summarizes issues that had a strong degree of consensus among participants and those that were more controversial.

The current eight goals are broken down into 21 quantifiable targets measured by 60 indicators, and were

adopted by 189 countries during the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000. They are to be achieved by 2015. The MDGs were designed to address the needs of the world’s poorest people:

- Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education
- Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women
- Goal 4: Reduce child mortality
- Goal 5: Improve maternal health
- Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability
- Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

The MDG approach has made a difference in rallying the world behind a moral purpose, providing direction and spurring increased investment and progress in certain development areas. Much progress has been made. The number of children unable to attend primary school has been cut by half. Nearly as many girls as boys are now attending school. The appalling number of children who died before their fifth birthday has been reduced by one third. The immunization rate against measles has increased and polio is on the verge of eradication. The number of children sleeping under anti-malaria bed nets has jumped from two to 22 percent. The worst aspects of the debt crisis have been addressed and the level of foreign aid has increased. As a result of strong economic growth, especially in Asia, overall poverty rate in developing regions fell from 46 percent in 1990 to 27 percent in 2005. Further, the number of people receiving antiretroviral therapy increased tenfold to four million in 2008. The UN *MDG Progress Report* published in 2010 provides clear evidence that targeted interventions, sustained by adequate funding and political commitment, have resulted in rapid progress in several areas.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See UN (2010). *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2010*. Available at [www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/MDG%20Report%202010%20En%20r15%20-low%20res%2020100615%20-.pdf](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/MDG%20Report%202010%20En%20r15%20-low%20res%2020100615%20-.pdf).

On current trends,<sup>3</sup> however, several of the MDGs will not be realized, and several reviews have indicated mixed progress. We should not maintain the status quo (the eight goals and their targets and indicators) nor merely extend the time frame beyond 2015 with new values for the same set of targets. The MDGs have been criticized for ignoring global causes of poverty, for not being ambitious enough and for being a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach.

## CRITICISMS

The MDGs have been criticized because they do not address global problems such as inequality, failing states, lack of democracy, unbalanced trade and climate change — and even if the MDGs are met, 900 million people will still be living on less than US\$1 per day. The use of averages and aggregates masks inequality. The MDGs have also been criticized because global aspirations are interpreted as national targets for all countries — it is senseless for all countries to have identical objectives and measuring sticks. The consequence is that high performing countries that start at a very low level, are labelled as failures because they miss the target. The MDGs “oversell” what aid can produce and, hence, increase pessimism about development assistance. There is no accountability implicit in the MDGs. Interlinkages among goals are ignored — no notice is taken how they might interact.

Some characterize the MDGs as being statist and technocratic in their conceptualization, as well as being driven by a donor-led reductionist agenda that pays little attention to locally owned definitions of human dignity and well-being, or the crucial global enabling factors.

Other criticisms focus on the methodological inadequacies of the targets and indicators. Poverty is too narrowly conceived as income-based. MDGs are criticized for an overemphasis on primary education, ignoring the importance of post-primary education. The universal education target is deficient — enrolment does not measure learning; literacy does not measure the wider range of cognitive skills or depth of understanding. Separation of child and maternal health goals reinforce the fragmentation of effort. The vertical focus on specific so-called killer diseases leads to duplication and excludes other targets; there is a lack of integration with improved health services. The environmental sustainability goal was a collection of unconnected targets, some general, some precise, which lack integration with other MDGs. Interlinkages among goals are ignored — no notice is taken of how they might interact. The poverty goal

<sup>3</sup> A status report can be found at: [www.un.org/millenniumgoals/reports.shtml](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/reports.shtml).

target was not clearly associated with a mechanism that delivers outcomes (Waage et al., 2010). In any case, targets were imposed from the top down.

## CRITERIA

Participants agreed there should be definite global goals and consistent measurement of local and regional progress, but targets should be set nationally and subnationally. Suggested criteria for goals included:

- Motivate commitment and action;
- Maintain measurability to provide for accountability, but include quality considerations;
- Embed equality of opportunity;
- Provide for empowerment, include enabling factors (higher participation by people in those things that affect their everyday life);
- Provide for transparency and accountability;
- Include intermediate outcomes and interim targets;
- Include some global challenges everyone faces; and
- Introduce sustainability considerations.

It was noted that Todd Moss frames the criteria somewhat differently.<sup>4</sup> Goals should be: bottom up, not global top down; based on ambitious yet reasonably achievable expectations; aimed at intermediate outcomes;<sup>5</sup> warning markers rather than operational goals; and able to identify success. In any case, the intended beneficiaries must be included in the process of setting the post-2015 development goals. Government accountability to these goals is problematic without awareness and community ownership.

When considering post-2015 goals, the following should be taken into account:

- Equitable growth is essential. Formulate goals for conditions that will enable growth of all quintiles;

<sup>4</sup> See Todd Moss (2010). “What’s Next for the Millennium Development Goals?” *Global Policy*, May. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1758-5899.2010.00024.x/full>.

<sup>5</sup> Aiming at intermediate outcomes (immunization rates rather than child mortality) focuses attention on accountability, but efforts centred on achieving process-related goals distract attention on actual impact.



- Frame development as freedom and justice — a persuasive, forward-looking story — with economic growth interacting with the Human Development Index, centring on education and market access;
- Provide the ingredients for development — education, infrastructure, capacity building<sup>6</sup> and better governance arrangements to stimulate growth. Discard “get the institutions right and get out of the way,” the current prevailing paradigm; and
- Do a better job on inequality — disaggregate by more than age, sex and urban or rural.<sup>7</sup>
- To emphasize the importance of income growth for the bottom quintile;<sup>9</sup>
- To suggest that gender needs its own goal, because “mainstreaming” across goals means it gets lost; and
- To re-emphasize MDG Target 1b: “Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people.”

We agreed with Lao Tzu’s aphorism — “If you do not change direction, you may end up where you are heading.”

## RATIONALE, PROS AND CONS LEADING TO THE POST-2015 GOALS

The list below is the suite of options that have been identified based on discussions that took place in Bellagio and Geneva.<sup>8</sup>

It was agreed:

- To frame collective global goals, but propose that targets be set and adopted at the country level;
- To suggest minimum benchmarks to be achieved by all countries, in relation to each global goal;
- To finesse the difficult debates around ends versus means, it was agreed to frame goals as enabling conditions, for rich and poor countries alike, with one set of goals for individual capabilities, another set on sustainability, environment and climate change and another set on institutional arrangement and the provision of public goods;

The participants decided to organize the new goals loosely into three categories, related to: individual capabilities and freedoms; the sustainability of economic, social and cultural activities and their impact on the ecosystems and on climate change; and institutional arrangements and the provision of public goods.<sup>10</sup>

The concept is that these are global goals, but based on their circumstances, individual countries should decide on the targets and indicators for each goal.<sup>11</sup> Given the time limitations of the meeting, only the surface of indicators that could be the basis of the targets was skimmed; the search for a limited number of measurable and relevant indicators for each goal will require the involvement of stronger “sectoral” and “statistics/survey” expertise. The participant group agreed that all indicators should be disaggregated by gender, income, urban/rural and vulnerable groups. Wherever possible, there would be a global minimum standard that all countries would achieve. This approach recognizes that poverty is an ubiquitous problem.

The global perspective taken by the participant group marks a significant shift from the previous development paradigm, which was dominated by donor-recipient arrangements and aid budgets. Although this approach may risk removing the obligation of rich developed countries “to help” poorer developing countries, it empowers countries to define, measure and achieve their own development.

<sup>6</sup> There is no political appetite for the traditional capacity-building approach. The most promising development approaches (microfinance, community budgeting) have been developed outside the traditional framework.

<sup>7</sup> The Gini coefficient is inadequate. The Gini coefficient can mask the inequality because you can see greater percentage of income going to the middle class, but the poorer people are still poor. Each goal should have a sub-focus and target the bottom 10 percent. The example for the poorer results for minorities was Chinese girls’ increase in secondary school enrollment since 1990 — 80 percent for Han, only 50 percent for non-Han, a sorry result that bested the experience for minorities in many other countries.

<sup>8</sup> See [www.cigionline.org/publications/2011/3/toward-post-2015-development-paradigm-1](http://www.cigionline.org/publications/2011/3/toward-post-2015-development-paradigm-1).

<sup>9</sup> Consistent with the official list of MDG indicators (1.3 Share of poorest quintile in national consumption). Note importance of “not walking away from the past” — we want change with moderation.

<sup>10</sup> This taxonomy was proposed by Francisco Sagasti.

<sup>11</sup> For example, Canada and Malawi would not have the same health indicators or targets, although both would be aiming to improve the health of their citizens.

## SUMMARY: THE POST-2015 GOALS

The meeting resulted in agreement on a proposed architecture of 12 new development goals. These goals are framed deliberately in positive terms and grouped into three sets of four goals.

The first set of goals covers the essential endowments necessary for individuals to achieve their fuller potential:

- Goal 1: Adequate livelihoods and income levels for dignified human existence.
- Goal 2: Sufficient food and water for active living.
- Goal 3: Appropriate education and skills for productive participation in society.
- Goal 4: Good health for the best possible physical and mental well-being.

The second group of goals are concerned with protecting and promoting collective human capital:

- Goal 5: Security for ensuring freedom from violence.
- Goal 6: Gender equality for enabling males and females to participate and benefit equally in society.
- Goal 7: Resilient communities and nations for reduced disaster impact from natural and technological hazards.
- Goal 8: Connectivity for access to essential information, services and opportunities.

The third set of goals deals with the effective provision of global public goods:

- Goal 9: Empowerment of people to realize their civil and political rights.
- Goal 10: Sustainable management of the biosphere for enabling people and the planet to thrive together.
- Goal 11: Establishing rules for managing the world economy for the fairly shared benefit of all nations.
- Goal 12: Good global governance for transparent and accountable international institutions and partnerships.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### Barry Carin

Barry Carin is a senior fellow at CIGI and adjunct professor and former associate director of the Centre for Global Studies, at the University of Victoria in the School of Public Administration. From 2006 through 2009 he was editor of the journal *Global Governance*.

Prior to joining CIGI, Barry Carin served as high commissioner of Canada to Singapore and as assistant deputy minister of trade and economic policy in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. He was Canadian representative on the executive committee of the OECD, assistant deputy minister for strategic policy and planning in the Department of Employment and Immigration and was director of effectiveness evaluation in the Treasury Board Secretariat.

He has a Ph.D. in Economics from Brown University and an Honours B.A. in Economics and Political Science from McGill University.

### Mukesh Kapila

Dr. Mukesh Kapila is under secretary general for national society and knowledge development at the IFRC. He has served in many senior roles at the IFRC since 2006.

Dr. Kapila has been a special adviser to the UN in Afghanistan and to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Other leadership roles he has fulfilled include UN resident and humanitarian coordinator and UNDP resident representative in Sudan, director in health action in crises at the World Health Organization and senior policy adviser to the World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery. Prior to this, he was the head of conflict and humanitarian affairs at the UK Government Department for International Development and also served the UK National Health Service.

Dr. Kapila was born in India and is a citizen of the United Kingdom. He qualified in medicine and public health from the Universities of Oxford and London. He was honoured for international service with a CBE and has also received the Dr. Jean Mayer Global Citizenship Award from the Institute for Global Leadership.

# BACKGROUND PAPER: TOWARD A POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

*Barry Carin and Mukesh Kapila*

To stimulate discussion at the June 20–24 meeting in Bellagio, a background paper was prepared. It suggested seven goals to initiate our discussion.

## ERADICATE EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER

There is no unimpeachable way to characterize the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger. The current goal — “eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” (and the targets)<sup>1</sup> — is criticized for defining outcomes rather than opportunities to achieve outcomes; for being limited on the structural causes of poverty, weak on social justice and donor led; and for distorting impacts (transient vs. chronic poor) (Sumner and Tiwari, 2011). The indicators for delivering current targets are criticized for inaccuracy and bias in measuring the incidence of poverty. Problems include overlooking inequalities, little monitoring, ambiguous indicators, lack of data, problems of national ownership, poor measurement of hunger and methodological difficulties (Waage et al., 2010).

Notwithstanding the weaknesses of the current formulation, one can argue that “eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” is the worst formulation, except for all the others. In the post-2015 version of the MDG goals, countries should endorse the global goal and agree to propose (and publish and monitor) their own national contribution. National targets should be devised, mainstreaming discrimination and the situation of vulnerable groups. Inequality should be addressed by setting national and regional targets explicitly for the lowest quintile of the population.

## ACHIEVE UNIVERSAL LITERACY

In the quality versus quantity debate the relevant distinctions are between inputs and outputs, and between outputs and outcomes. School funding is an input; students in school and student/teacher ratios are outputs. The purpose of education is to equip students with the basic skills so they can transition into adult life with the core competencies to contribute to the political, social and economic aspects of their society. The relevant outcome is a literate, numerate society. It is much

1 Halving the proportion of people whose income is less than US\$1 per day, achieving full and productive employment for all and halving the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.

easier to measure “bums in seats” than it is to measure the literacy and numeracy levels of a population. The International Adult Literacy Survey is a key assessment tool; it can be administered through household surveys. The Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality has developed surveys to assess their education system — specifically students’ science and math skills. There are a number of additional assessments — for example, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), administered mainly in industrialized countries by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, tests 15 year olds’ math, science and reading skills.<sup>2</sup> In 2011, over 60 countries will participate in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study, which measures math and science knowledge at the grade four and eight levels.<sup>3</sup> The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization oversees several nationally devised surveys for measuring literacy levels such as the Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey.<sup>4</sup>

## HEALTH: IMPROVE PRODUCTIVE LIFE EXPECTANCY

There are currently three different health goals: reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; and combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. While accurately representing three major health challenges facing the developing world, these goals omit the health problems of the developed world. Health should be consolidated into one goal that addresses both developed and developing countries’ health priorities. The downside is a dilution of the focus on the three MDG issues, risking a decrease in the investments for addressing those critical challenges. By selecting a broader health goal, however, countries can adopt targets that are most relevant to their current realities and frame their health policies based on their own priorities.

The World Health Organization (WHO) index on Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) could frame the health goal. DALYs are the sum of years of potential life lost due to premature mortality and the years of

2 See <http://nces.ed.gov/timss/>.

3 See [http://www.uis.unesco.org/ev\\_en.php?ID=6409\\_201&ID2=DO\\_TOPIC](http://www.uis.unesco.org/ev_en.php?ID=6409_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC).

4 See [http://www.who.int/mental\\_health/management/depression/daly/en/](http://www.who.int/mental_health/management/depression/daly/en/).

productive life lost due to disability.<sup>5</sup> “One DALY can be thought of as one lost year of ‘healthy’ life. The sum of these DALYs across the population, or the burden of disease, can be thought of as a measurement of the gap between current health status and an ideal health situation where the entire population lives to an advanced age, free of disease and disability” (World Health Organization).

The DALYs index provides statistics on health concerns in both the developed and developing world. The indicator accounts for communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, TB, and diarrheal and childhood diseases, among others, as well as non-communicable conditions such as cancers, cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, and diabetes.

## IMPROVE HUMAN SECURITY

Human security refers to the protection of individuals. It is a people-centric (versus state-centric) approach to conceptualizing security. Broadly defined, it can incorporate many threats, including traditional security threats such as war to more development-focused threats such as health, poverty and the environment. The United Nations Development Programme’s 1994 Human Development Report proposes seven components of human security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security. A narrower definition restricts the parameters of human security to violent threats against the individual, including drug trade, landmines, ethnic discord, state failure, trafficking in small arms, crime, and domestic violence (Owen, 2004).

Human security means, at a minimum, freedom from violence and fear of violence. The human security goal should focus on peoples’ freedom from the threat or fear of violence. Freedom from violence, and economic, food, health, and environmental security are all building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood.<sup>6</sup> These are also essential for development.

The challenge in designing a human security goal is choosing measureable indicators. Minority Rights Group International maintains a database of “peoples under threat,” specifically designed to identify the risk of genocide, mass killing or other systematic violent repression, unlike most other early warning tools, which focus on violent conflict as such. Its primary application

5 See [http://www.who.int/mental\\_health/management/depression/daly/en/](http://www.who.int/mental_health/management/depression/daly/en/).

6 See <http://www.humansecuritygateway.com/showRecord.php?RecordId=35203>.

is civilian protection.<sup>7</sup> The overall measure is based on a basket of 10 indicators.<sup>8</sup> Another database of security information is the Global Peace Index (GPI).<sup>9</sup> The GPI gauges ongoing domestic and international conflict, safety and security in society and militarization in 149 countries and includes several indicators, including the likelihood of violent demonstrations and perceptions of criminality. If available, national, regional and local data on peoples’ ability to move freely, their ability to access government services, gender-based violence, and the number of people physically harmed from or affected by armed violence could also serve as stand-alone indicators for human security. Another approach could be a customized list of proposed targets that countries, regions and/or communities could adopt based on the security issues of greatest concern.

## CLIMATE CHANGE: LIMIT CO<sub>2</sub> TO FOUR TONNES PER CAPITA

Climate change is a consequence of the demand for fossil fuel energy that our current lifestyles require. There is a general consensus, accepted by political leadership, that it is imprudent to allow global warming to exceed 2 degrees Celsius. The arithmetic is that the 2 degrees limit results in a maximum atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> of 450 parts per million. Perhaps the neatest approach is to translate the global maximum concentration into annual global allotments and then into per capita terms. Then all countries would commit to make best efforts to contribute to not exceeding this global limit. World population is estimated to be 8.2 billion in 2030, with the 450 ppm trajectory yielding a target of some 32 billion tonnes of emissions or fourtonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per capita. The arithmetic results in a target maximum atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> of 450 ppm, which translates into 18 billion tonnes per year in 2050. With a world population of 9 billion in 2050, the consequence in per capita terms is that emissions must then decrease to two tonnes per year.<sup>10</sup> In contrast to the other MDGs, the per capita

7 See <http://www.humansecuritygateway.com/showRecord.php?RecordId=35203>.

8 These include indicators of democracy or good governance (from the World Bank), conflict indicators (from the Center for Systemic Peace and other leading global conflict research institutes), indicators of group division or elite factionalization (from the Fund for Peace and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), genocides and politicides (from the State Failure Task Force data), and the country credit risk classification, as a proxy for trade openness (published by the OECD).

9 See <http://www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi-data/#/2010/scor>.

10 Another way to frame the objective is that “to meet commonly



approach is more stringent for developed countries. It has the advantage of being consistent with Indian and Chinese positions in global climate change negotiations.

## ACHIEVE UNIVERSAL CONNECTIVITY: ECONOMIC SERVICES — ICT, ELECTRICITY, TRANSPORTATION

The current goal on global partnership (Goal 8) includes a target to “make available benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications.” The post-2015 version would expand on this target and reframe it as a goal — “connectivity” — beyond access to information and communication technology (ICT) to include reliable electricity, and access to transportation. Connectivity is an ingredient for economic growth: it allows rural dwellers to reach cities and markets; ensures functioning of day-to-day business; and provides access to markets, government services, and information and knowledge.

There are sustainability and equity challenges in defining this goal:

- Can we provide electricity through cleaner and more sustainable sources of energy?
- What are the impacts of a road through the Amazon?
- How do we encourage access to ICT by the poorest people?

Targets and indicators will have to be drafted in a manner that empowers people and provides mechanisms for them to take agency over their own path of development, while avoiding environmental damage and exacerbating inequities. Targets addressing connectivity must take into account the different ways in which different communities and societies access technology. For example, the target should not be the number of mobile phone contracts or the number of people owning a mobile phone nor the number of phones/computers per 1,000 people. The target should reflect the number of people with reasonable and affordable access to a mobile phone or computer and the Internet.

---

discussed abatement paths, carbon productivity must increase from approximately \$740 GDP per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e today to \$7,300 GDP per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2050...if we are to maintain current growth levels while keeping CO<sub>2</sub>e levels below 500 parts per million by volume (ppmv), a level that many experts believe is the maximum that can be allowed without significant risks to the climate.” See [www.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/Carbon\\_Productivity/index.asp](http://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/Carbon_Productivity/index.asp).

## PROMOTE EMPOWERMENT

There are many definitions of empowerment. For example:

- Empowerment involves challenging the forms of oppression which compel millions of people to play a part in their society on terms which are inequitable, or in ways which deny their human rights. (Oxfam, 1995).
- Empowerment is “a multi-dimensional social process that helps people gain control over their own lives.” (Page and Czuba, 1999).
- The process through which those who are currently disadvantaged achieve equal rights, resources and power. (Mayoux, 2008).
- The UK government communities’ website states, “Community Empowerment is about people and government, working together to make life better. It involves more people being able to influence decisions about their communities, and more people taking responsibility for tackling local problems, rather than expecting others to” ([www.communities.gov.uk/communities/](http://www.communities.gov.uk/communities/)).
- The expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives. (World Bank Sourcebook on Empowerment, 2002)

(quoted in Jupp and Ali, 2010)

“Empowerment is a contested concept and a moving target. It comprises complex, interrelated elements embracing values, knowledge, behaviour and relationships” (Jupp and Ali, 2010). There are approaches quantifying qualitative information generated by people themselves.<sup>11</sup>

The empowerment process is non-linear and depends largely on experience gained from opportunities to exercise rights that are inherently context specific... The non-linear and context-specific nature of empowerment poses a challenge for conventional monitoring, which generally assumes a linear progression and details milestones to be attained... The complex nature of empowerment has led many to conclude that such outcomes are intangible, contextual, individual, behavioural, relational and fundamentally unquantifiable... As empowerment is a value-laden term and the consequence of further

<sup>11</sup> See Dee Jupp and Sohel Ibn Ali (2010), p. 16.

value-laden processes (e.g. participation, demanding and realizing rights), there is no common definition. Furthermore, it is inappropriate for outsiders to pre-determine people's experience of empowerment. (Jupp and Ali, 2010)

Empowerment cannot be distilled into a single meaningful measurable goal: "...empowerment cannot be measured in a way that does justice to its inherent complexity" (Brook and Holland, 2009). Instead the selected post-2015 goals must provide for ameliorating the positions of disempowered groups. This requires involving the most disadvantaged in determining the targets and indicators for pursuing the education, health, security and connectivity goals outlined above. But it can be argued that in this case, the perfect is the enemy of the good. The best route is to encourage national definitions of empowerment — targeting the most marginalized. It would be incongruous to attempt a top-down goal for empowerment.



## ENABLING INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES TO FULFILL POTENTIAL

One concept of freedom is freedom from interference — “let me alone” — characteristic of the comfortably situated. A more positive concept of freedom is “give me a chance.” The comfortable take opportunity for granted. In line with a more positive approach of promoting opportunity, in addition to specific targets to be achieved by developing countries by a certain date, the participants agreed to frame a set of enabling conditions to allow all individuals to fully realize their potential. Note that the following were discussion points for the meeting, out of which the final architecture of 12 new development goals was proposed.

### Goal 1 — Reduce Poverty: Improving Living Standards for the Poor

Indicators on the growth rate of income of the bottom quintile, livelihoods/employment and access to adequate housing need to be established.

There is no unimpeachable way to characterize the goals of eradication of extreme poverty and hunger. The current goal — “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” and its targets — has been criticized as being limited on the structural causes of poverty and weak on social justice, as donor led, and for distorting impacts (transient versus chronic poor) (Summer and Tiwari, 2011). The indicators for delivering current targets have been criticized for being inaccurate and biased in the measurement of poverty incidence. Problems include: a lack of monitoring, ambiguous indicators, lack of data, problems of national ownership, poor measurement of hunger and methodological difficulties (Waage et al., 2010).

Economic empowerment is the main challenge. Income levels are directly correlated to malnutrition and sanitation advances. National targets for increased incomes and provision of livelihoods need to be devised, mainstreaming discrimination and the situation of vulnerable groups. Inequality should be addressed by setting national and regional targets — explicitly for the lowest quintile of the population. Hunger has been removed from this goal so it would not distract from the focus on income generation for improving living standards.

A shortcoming of choosing income growth rate of the bottom quintile is that growth rates can improve while well-being decreases and/or relative poverty increases. In addition, raising the bottom quintile does not ensure people can afford basic needs such as food, housing and medicine. Further, discussion within the group revealed

that poverty is locally contextual, and instead of income growth, access to a basic bundle of commodities required to live a dignified life would be more relevant.

### Goal 2 — Assure Adequate Food and Safe Water: Eradicate Hunger, Reduce Obesity and Ensuring Safe Water for Drinking and Sanitation

Indicators on nutrition, underweight children under the age of five, body mass index, and access to safe water and to sanitation.

While Goal 1 deals with income growth, livelihoods and meaningful employment, food security issues justify a separate goal. Hunger is a major problem around the world. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates approximately 900 million people are undernourished (FAO, 2011). Concurrently, over one billion adults are overweight (WHO, 2011). There are more deaths linked to being overweight than to being underweight. The world needs better management and distribution of its food resources. Targets would include issues that are of concern to rich countries, such as obesity and nutrition, while other countries would focus on underweight children under five years of age. Safe drinking water and sanitation should also be included under this heading.

This goal evolved from concerns regarding hunger and where to include indicators on nutrition. Some participants wanted to highlight hunger (a poverty issue) rather than nutrition (a health issue). It was decided to give adequate food its own goal. There is a link between hunger and food security, but food security is a bigger issue related to the environment and trade policy, and would be better framed in another category. By using an indicator such as body mass index, both obesity and diet problems could be simultaneously addressed in developed countries, and the problems of hunger and a lack of food in developing countries (the former is a behavior issue while the latter is a development issue).

### Goal 3 — Achieve Universal Literacy: Ensuring Citizens Have the Basic Skills to Contribute to their Societies

Indicators on access and quality — literacy and numeracy rates calculated by percentage completing secondary school x years of education and percentage of girls in secondary school to be established.

The purpose of education is to equip students with the basic skills to transition into adult life with the core competencies to contribute to the political, social and

economic aspects of their society. In the quality versus quantity debate, the relevant distinctions are between inputs and outputs, and between outputs and outcomes. School funding is an input; students in school and student to teacher ratios are outputs. The relevant outcome is a literate numerate society. It is much easier to measure “bums in seats” than it is to measure the literacy and numeracy levels of a population. The literacy rate of 15–24 year olds is one of the indicators of the current MDGs. There are several tests and assessments for measuring learning and education skills, although each country or region should be responsible for how they define and measure achievement.

The weakness in framing “achieve universal literacy” as a goal is that it does not have the same appeal of the original MDG — to achieve universal primary education — which was strongly criticized for focusing on inputs instead of outcomes. Participants at the meeting agreed the emphasis should be placed on quality or achievement. Literacy rates are, perhaps, the best indicator for measuring education, although literacy tests are normally given to students in schools and do not give adequate data for the age cohorts who are not attending schools. The Centre for Global Development had a proposal (in 2006) for measuring the achievement of each cohort (children of a particular age), which automatically requires high attendance if one is to have a high overall achievement for the cohort as a whole. Special attention needs to be given to secondary school completion for girls. Indicators need to address access, quality and learning outcomes (to help stop literate, 12-year-old girls dropping out of school).

#### Goal 4 — Promote Healthier Lives: Reducing Diseases and Preventable Deaths

Indicators on child mortality, maternal health, infectious diseases and non-communicable diseases are required.

There are currently three different health goals: reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; and combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. While accurately representing three major health challenges facing the developing world, these goals omit the health problems of the developed world. Health should be consolidated into one goal that addresses both developed and developing countries’ health priorities. By selecting a broader health goal, countries can adopt targets that are most relevant to their current realities and frame their health policies based on their own priorities. It is proposed that the WHO’s DALYs be employed as a global measure, because it consolidates data from health problems that affect both developed and developing world.

While the concept behind measuring health with DALYs is globally applicable, provides a comprehensive framework, and allows countries to self-select indicators and targets of greatest concern to them, it is too technocratic and loses the motivating element of the original health goals.

#### Goal 5 — Reduce Violence: Protecting Citizens — Particularly Women, Children and Vulnerable Groups — From Violence and the Threat of Violence

Indicators need to be established on domestic violence; violence against women; treatment of migrants, minorities, displaced persons and refugees; people (physically) affected by armed conflict or violence

The Millennium Declaration states that certain fundamental values are essential to international relations in the twenty-first century. Included in these values is freedom from the fear of violence, oppression or injustice (United Nations, 2000). The Declaration makes several statements addressing peace, security and disarmament. The original MDGs evolved from this declaration, but failed to include considerations of peace and security, and were strongly criticized for neglecting these. It has been included in the new set of goals because of its importance for people to live their lives with dignity, and because it requires further thinking and attention.

The policy options are not as clear in this realm as in others — for example, the policies for reducing violence are not as evident as those for improving education or literacy. Domestic violence includes violence against children, but culturally, this is contextual and will be difficult to define in a globally coherent way. Concerns were raised on how we frame, measure and address different kinds of violence. The Mo Ibrahim Index has clustered several “violence” indicators under the category of Safety and Rule of Law. Additional concerns were raised on countries’ willingness to adopt indicators on domestic violence or violence against women, and the challenges with obtaining and tracking data.

#### Goal 6 — Promote Gender Equality: Empowering Women and Eliminating Discrimination Against Women and Girls

Indicators on sexual and reproductive rights, gender parity in schools and employment, political empowerment indicator (present MDGs have percentage of parliamentarians) and women’s property rights should be established.

For development to be sustainable, it must involve all members of societies. The empowerment of women

combats poverty, hunger, disease and stimulates economic activity. Gender equality deserves its own goal, because if it were incorporated into another goal, the indicators would not be explicit enough. Issues of equality underpin every goal, but women's rights should be discussed on their own, or gender equality risks being diluted by other issues.

## ENABLING ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

### Goal 7 — Improve Environmental Sustainability: Ensuring Better Management of the Earth's Limited Resources

Indicators to be established on climate change (energy efficiency/intensity, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions), biodiversity, agriculture and food security, and water resources (fisheries/oceans).

The focus must extend beyond climate change and prevent the loss of environmental resources — for example, forests, fish stocks and biodiversity.

Originally, "climate change" was proposed as the goal, with a suggested target to limit CO<sub>2</sub> to four tonnes per capita by 2030. (See Background Paper) Participants did not feel this was inclusive enough and omitted important elements such as biodiversity. The indicator for climate change should avoid political divisiveness. Participants noted that leading up to Rio+20, there will be major technical and political discussions that could feed back into the MDG process.

### Goal 8 — Achieve Universal Connectedness: Creating Ties That Bind

Indicators on access to transportation networks, energy, information and communication technologies, and financial services to be established.

The current MDG Goal 8 on global partnership includes a target "to make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication." The post-2015 version would expand on this target and reframe it as a goal — connectedness — beyond access to information and communication technology to include reliable electricity, access to transportation and financial services. Connectivity is necessary for economic growth. It allows rural dwellers to reach cities and markets, ensures functioning of day-to-day business, and provides access to markets, government services, and information and knowledge.

A concern discussed with this goal was who (public versus private) would provide access to these services.

There are access indicators — for example, "pass-by" rates measure the ability of people to connect in non-traditional ways, such as group banking and group cellphone use.

### Goal 9 — Improve Disaster Reduction and Crisis Management: Increasing Capabilities to Deal with Disasters and Crises

Indicators need to be established on reducing prevalence of hazard and risk.

This reflects the capability of societies and individuals to deal with crises and disasters and implies much about their level of development. A stand-alone goal will generate attention on improving resilience. Disaster reduction will become a major priority in the coming years.

## ENABLING INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC GOODS

The last three goals are "enabling factors." There was divergence of thought on whether there should be consistency across our framework, or whether we should deviate from the original architecture of the MDGs. These final three goals require more discussion in the future to generate consensus on their content and framing. However, the group felt that they were important elements of sustainable development and, therefore, required independent consideration. An alternative heading for Goal 10 could be "Empowerment and Accountability," so as to avoid replicating or undermining existing human rights architecture. Due to time constraints, we were not able to fully explore the content of these goals and whether it would be better to group them together in a different manner. Our preliminary proposal on these goals is as follows:

### Goal 10 — Civil and Political Rights: Fulfilling People's Right to be Politically Active and Engaged in Decision Making

Indicators are required on transparency (openness of government budgets), accountability, participation and access to justice (provision of legal aid, assistance to obtain legal representation) as well as on basic political freedoms, such as freedom of expression and assembly.

### Goal 11 — Good and Equitable Global Governance: Ensuring Fair Participation, Transparency and Accountability in International Institutions

Indicators on measures of fairness and equity — for example, on voting rights, leadership selection and other indicators of governance — are required.

## Goal 12 — Equitable Economic Rules: Ensuring Rules in the Global Economy Promote Economic Development

Indicators on trade policy, intellectual property rights policy and rules around concessional finance should be established.

This goal would address systemic issues that distort potential for countries to participate in the global economy

This set of 12 goals addresses the concerns of respondents in the Voices of the Poor exercise (World Bank, 2011). It had concluded the four priorities of the poor were a job, better connections to the rest of the world, reduced threat of violence, and ending humiliation and disrespect. The new development paradigm and goals should not, of course, be handed down from above. Those most affected should be invited to contribute to setting the goals. A new system of accountability will need to accompany the new paradigm, placing the poor, vulnerable and marginalized at the centre of the policy and practice considerations that shape their lives. We must also strive to regain transparency and trust in our institutions, both nationally and internationally.

### CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

---

There were several issues that could not be resolved at the Bellagio meeting. Population, job /income creation and economic growth were all discussed as possible post-2015 goals, but there consensus was not reached on adding these issues.

**Population:** Some participants felt that this should be its own goal, given the limited carrying capacity of the planet. For example, per capita CO2 emissions could be 50 percent higher if the global population was six billion rather than nine billion. However, limiting population was deemed to be too controversial —population control could be addressed in other goals that have demographic elements. Examples of indirectly addressing population growth are reproductive and sexual health, family planning, secondary education, or consumption and environment indicators.

**Job/Income Creation:** Proponents for the ability to generate income as a stand-alone goal wanted it framed in terms of “livelihoods” and to include indicators on access to resources or to a bundle of goods and services needed to live a full life. More than just a “job” is needed. A “livelihood” implies a level of human dignity. Some argued that “poverty reduction” was not ambitious enough. We need broad-based growth in per capita income, although poverty reduction may be easier to communicate.

**Economic Growth:** The Background Paper’s proposed post-2015 Goals were criticized for neglecting the importance of growth. More and more research shows that countries need to grow for progress to be made in a large number of areas. We are still mostly focused on distribution issues. We were reminded that wealth creation and income growth have almost always been the preconditions for making progress in all the MDG areas. “Wealth creation and income growth are necessary, but not sufficient — so why do we spend all our time on the ‘not sufficient,’ and almost none on the ‘necessary’?” And, “we must help all these poor people and they must rise by dignity and respect (and not savings ratios and employment created by wealth creation).” There was general agreement on the need to abandon an aid-based approach to development and growth, but there was little consensus to include economic growth per se as a goal. Instead, participants agreed to emphasize enabling conditions for growth and to have growth indicators for several goals.

### COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION

---

We propose to succeed the eight current MDGs with 12 post-2015 goals (outlined below). We will contribute to the debate in several forums:

- UN Secretary General’s High-level Panel on Global Sustainability;
- ECOSOC’s Committee on Development Policy;
- G20 Development Working Group; and
- IFRC’s General Assembly and International Conference with governments.



Current MDGs



Post-2015 Goals



## WORKS CITED

Brook, Simon, and Jeremly Holland (2009). "A Mixed-method Approach to Measuring Empowerment in the Context of Social Policy Monitoring in Jamaica." The World Bank. Available at: [www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000333037\\_20091104015329](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/main?menuPK=64187510&pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&entityID=000333037_20091104015329).

FAO (2011). State of Food Insecurity in the World, 2011. Available at: [www.fao.org/publications/sofi/en/](http://www.fao.org/publications/sofi/en/).

Jupp, Dee, and Sohel Ibn Ali (2010). "Measuring Empowerment? Ask Them: Quantifying qualitative outcomes from people's own analysis." *Sida Studies in Evaluation*. 29. Available at: [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/22/17/46146440.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/22/17/46146440.pdf).

Owen, Taylor (2004). "Challenges and Opportunities for Defining and Measuring Human Security." Human Rights, Human Security and Disarmament Forum. Available at: [www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art2138.pdf](http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art2138.pdf).

Sumner, Andy, and Meera Tiwari (2011). "Global Poverty Reduction to 2015 and Beyond." *Global Policy* 2, no. 2.

United Nations (2000). United Nations Millennium Declaration, Resolution 55/2. Available at: [www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm).

Vandemoortele, Jan (2011). "If not the MDGs, then what?" *Third World Quarterly* 31, no. 1.

Waage et al. (2010). "The Millennium Development Goals: a cross-sectoral analysis and principles for goal setting after 2015." *Lancet* and London International Development Commission. September 13. Available at: [http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(10\)61196-8/fulltext](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(10)61196-8/fulltext).

World Bank (2011). Documents and Reports. Available at: [www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=64187283&siteName=WDS&entityID=000094946\\_00042605311270](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=64187283&siteName=WDS&entityID=000094946_00042605311270).

WHO (2011). "Health statistics and health information systems." Global Burden of Disease. Available at [www.who.int/healthinfo/global\\_burden\\_disease/metrics\\_daly/en/](http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/metrics_daly/en/).

\_\_\_\_ (2011). Obesity and overweight Fact sheet N°311. Available at: [www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/](http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs311/en/).



# AGENDA

## MEETING OBJECTIVES

---

- Design a set of future goals and targets.
- Design a mechanism for ensuring continuing input from beneficiaries to set goals and priorities, and to rate the effectiveness of development interventions.
- Design a communications strategy to promote our ideas and influence decisions on the post-2015 development paradigm.
- Identify possible future activities for the group.

### Monday, June 20, 2011

Participants arrive at the Bellagio Center mid to late afternoon.

19:00                      Cocktails

19:30–20:30              Working dinner: review objectives of the conference and agree on agenda

### Tuesday, June 21, 2011

8:00–9:00                Breakfast

9:30                        Meeting

Objective: To establish our approach for selecting the goals, our criteria and our underlying principles for this process.

*Chair:* Maureen O'Neil

*Introductory remarks:* Jan Vandemoortele, Francisco Sagasti and Katherine Lay

- What are the criteria for setting the goals? What is the time frame?
  - What are the critical questions of acceptability and feasibility we are to consider?
  - How do we structure the goals so there is an inherent incentive to achieve them?
- Can we agree that the goals will be global, with nationally set targets?
- How do we deal with the challenge of empowerment? Inequality? Gender? (Can they be accounted for through clever target setting?)
- Do we believe we can develop a constructive framework that will not be criticized as simplistic and inadequate?

13:00–14:00              Lunch

14:15                        Meeting

Objective: To agree on a proposed set of future goals and targets to be vetted using a global platform with widespread bottom-up feedback.

*Chair:* Richard Manning

*Introductory Remarks:* Wonhyuk Lim and Aki Sawyerr

Consider the background paper's draft goals and consider scope, modifications and improvements. Discuss potential targets and measurement aspects of the goals.

- The background paper has been criticized as overemphasizing distribution issues. The MDGs have been criticized as biasing expenditures toward social rather than economic objectives. More and more research shows that countries need to grow for progress to be made in a large number of areas. Do we need a stronger emphasis on economic growth, productive capacities and employment?
- The Secretary-General's Advisory Group on Energy and Climate Change recommended two goals for 2030 — "Ensure universal access to modern energy services" and "Reduce global energy intensity by 40 percent." Do we need an energy access goal?
- On June 8, Ban Ki-moon said that the world body was aiming for "zero new infections, zero stigma and zero AIDS-related deaths" by 2020. There are other proponents for other diseases. Can we subsume health issues in a single goal?
- The Millennium Declaration has governance references but no reference nor indicators in the actual MDGs. What improvements can we make on the governance front? More on anti-corruption?
- Do we need a post-2015 goal like MDG 8 (to promote fairer trade, increased official development assistance flows and debt relief), despite the shortfalls on aid level promises, the Doha ongoing trade wreck, and new net relief of debt relief instruments?
- Do we need an international peer review mechanism?

19:00                      Cocktails

19:30–20:30              Dinner

## Wednesday, June 22, 2011

8:00–9:00                Breakfast

9:30                        Meeting

*Objective:* To design how to get widespread bottom-up feedback to set priorities.

*Chair:* Mukesh Kapila

*Introductory Remarks:* Ian McKinnon, Pamellah Indiaka, Nilofar Bakhtiar, Betty Bigombe and Amy Pollard

Consider how to generate feedback from the poor on a global basis.

- How do we generate responses and reaction on a global basis? How would we reach the intended beneficiaries?
- What questions would we ask?
- How would we ask them?
- How would we finance the platform?
- How would we manage the feedback?

13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:15	Group Reflection
19:00	Cocktails
19:30–20:30	Dinner

### Thursday, June 23, 2011

8:00–9:00	Breakfast
9:30	Meeting

Objective: To design a communications strategy to launch the global platform generating feedback on our goals and targets.

*Chair:* Lisa Jordan

*Introductory Remarks:* Bob Fowler and David Morrison

Finalize messages tailored to specific audiences; identify potential donors and partners, access points to publications in various countries, and messengers to approach various decision-making groups.

- What is the message for the IFRC general assembly in November?
- How do we frame the message for existing audiences (G20 Working Group on Development; UN bodies, including High-level Panel on Global Sustainability, Rio +20, Committee for Development Policy)?
- Can we advise on a process for broad and inclusive consultations with interested actors in civil society to take place in each and every region so as to avoid the “donorship” problems associated with the current MDGs?
- Can we catalyze the UNDP country offices (135 locations — recall the global Millennium Campaign network with civil society organizations) to help launch the platform?

13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:15	Meeting
19:00	Cocktails
19:30	Dinner

Objective: To identify future activities for the advisory panel.

*Chair:* Barry Carin

- Discuss ideas for future work of advisory panel — beyond delivery of messages.
- Do we want to establish a group of “Friends of MDG 2.0”?

### Friday, June 24, 2011

Participants depart.

## PARTICIPANT LIST

Barry Carin, Project Co-Director, Senior Fellow, CIGI,  
bcarin@uvic.ca

Dr. Mukesh Kapila, Project Co-Director, Under-Secretary  
General, IFRC, mukesh.kapila@ifrc.org

Nicole Bates-Eamer, Project Secretariat, Researcher,  
Centre for Global Studies/CIGI

Mukul Bhola, Project Secretariat, Strategy & Programme  
Development Advisor, IFRC

Nilofar Bakhtiar, Chairperson, Pakistan Red Crescent  
Society

Betty Bigombe, MP, Government of Uganda

Bob Fowler, Senior Fellow, University of Ottawa

Pamellah Indiaka, Head, Organizational Development  
Department, Kenya Red Cross Society

Lisa Jordan, Executive Director, Bernard Van Leer  
Foundation

Katherine Lay, Manager Essential Services Programme  
and Advocacy, Oxfam South Africa

Wonhyuk Lim, Director, Office for Development, Korean  
Development Institute

Richard Manning, Former Chair, Development  
Assistance Committee, OECD

Ian McKinnon, Chair, Canadian National Statistics  
Council

David Morrison, Executive Secretary, United Nations  
Capital Development Programme

Maureen O'Neil, President and CEO, Canadian Health  
Services Research Foundation

Amy Pollard, Lead Analyst on Aid, CAFOD

Francisco Sagasti, Former Executive Director, FORO  
Nacional/Internacional

Akilagpa Sawyerr, Former Secretary General, Association  
of African Universities

Jan Vandemoortele, Independent Researcher, formerly  
with UNDP and UNICEF

## ABOUT CIGI

The Centre for International Governance Innovation is an independent, non-partisan think tank on international governance. Led by experienced practitioners and distinguished academics, CIGI supports research, forms networks, advances policy debate and generates ideas for multilateral governance improvements. Conducting an active agenda of research, events and publications, CIGI's interdisciplinary work includes collaboration with policy, business and academic communities around the world.

CIGI's research programs focus on four themes: the global economy; the environment and energy; global development; and global security.

CIGI was founded in 2001 by Jim Balsillie, co-CEO of RIM (Research In Motion) and collaborates with and gratefully acknowledges support from a number of strategic partners, in particular the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario.

Le CIGI a été fondé en 2001 par Jim Balsillie, co-chef de la direction de RIM (Research In Motion). Il collabore avec de nombreux partenaires stratégiques et exprime sa reconnaissance du soutien reçu de ceux-ci, notamment de l'appui reçu du gouvernement du Canada et de celui du gouvernement de l'Ontario.

For more information, please visit [www.cigionline.org](http://www.cigionline.org).

## CIGI MASTHEAD

<b>Managing Editor, Publications</b>	Carol Bonnett
<b>Senior Publications Adviser</b>	Max Brem
<b>Assistant Publications Editor</b>	Jennifer Goyder
<b>Publications Coordinator</b>	Matthew Bunch
<b>Media Designer</b>	Steve Cross

## COMMUNICATIONS

---

<b>Communications Specialist</b>	Kevin Dias. . . . . kdias@cigionline.org (+1.519.885.2444 x238)
<b>Communications Coordinator</b>	Kelly Lorimer . . . . . klorimer@cigionline.org (+1.519.885.2444 x 265)

## EXECUTIVE

---

<b>Executive Director</b>	Thomas A. Bernes
<b>Vice President of Programs</b>	David Dewitt
<b>Vice President of Government Affairs</b>	Mohamed Hamoodi
<b>Vice President of Public Affairs</b>	Fred Kuntz
<b>Vice President of Operations</b>	Neve Peric







**CIGI**   
57 Erb Street West  
Waterloo Ontario N2L 6C2 Canada  
519 885 2444 | [cigonline.org](http://cigonline.org)



**Recycled**  
Supporting responsible use  
of forest resources  
[www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org)  
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

